

PEŁNE SPRAWOZDANIE Z OBRAD 16 KWIETNIA 2019 R.

(C/2024/3839)

PARLAMENT EUROPEJSKI

SESJA 2019-2020

Posiedzenia od 15 do 18 kwietnia 2019 r.

STRASBURG

Spis treści	Strona
1. Otwarcie posiedzenia	5
2. Oświadczenia Przewodniczącego / Przewodniczącej	5
3. Składanie dokumentów: patrz protokół	5
4. Konkluzje z posiedzenia Rady Europejskiej z 10 kwietnia 2019 r. dotyczące wystąpienia Zjednoczonego Królestwa z Unii Europejskiej (debata)	5
5. Przejrzyste i przewidywalne warunki pracy w Unii Europejskiej (debata)	21
6. Europejski Urząd ds. Pracy (debata)	31
7. Powitanie	41
8. Głosowanie	42
8.1. Statystyki Wspólnoty z zakresu migracji i ochrony międzynarodowej (A8-0395/2018 - Cecilia Wikström) (głosowanie)	42
8.2. Przystąpienie UE do Aktu genewskiego Porozumienia lizbońskiego w sprawie nazw pochodzenia i oznaczeń geograficznych (A8-0187/2019 - Virginie Rozière) (głosowanie)	43
8.3. Działania Unii po jej przystąpieniu do Aktu genewskiego Porozumienia lizbońskiego w sprawie nazw pochodzenia i oznaczeń geograficznych (A8-0036/2019 - Virginie Rozière) (głosowanie) ..	43
8.4. Umowa między UE a Filipinami dotycząca pewnych aspektów przewozów lotniczych (A8-0191/2019 - Jozo Radoš) (głosowanie)	43

Spis treści	Strona
8.5. Umowa międzynarodowa w sprawie oliwy z oliwek i oliwek stołowych (A8-0186/2019 - Eleonora Forenza) (głosowanie)	43
8.6. Powołanie na członka Trybunału Obrachunkowego – Viorel Ștefan (A8-0194/2019 - Indrek Tarand) (głosowanie)	43
8.7. Powołanie na członka Trybunału Obrachunkowego – Ivana Maletić (A8-0195/2019 - Indrek Tarand) (głosowanie)	44
8.8. Ochrona osób zgłaszających przypadki naruszenia prawa Unii (A8-0398/2018 - Virginie Rozière) (głosowanie)	44
8.9. Transgraniczna dystrybucja funduszy zbiorowego inwestowania (dyrektywa) (A8-0430/2018 - Wolf Klinz) (głosowanie)	44
8.10. Transgraniczna dystrybucja funduszy zbiorowego inwestowania (rozporządzenie) (A8-0431/2018 - Wolf Klinz) (głosowanie)	44
8.11. Wymogi kapitałowe (rozporządzenie) (A8-0242/2018 - Peter Simon) (głosowanie)	44
8.12. Wymogi kapitałowe (dyrektywa) (A8-0243/2018 - Peter Simon) (głosowanie)	45
8.13. Zdolność instytucji kredytowych i przedsiębiorstw inwestycyjnych do pokrycia strat i dokapitalizowania (rozporządzenie) (A8-0216/2018 - Gunnar Hökmark) (głosowanie)	45
8.14. Zdolność instytucji kredytowych i przedsiębiorstw inwestycyjnych do pokrycia strat i dokapitalizowania (dyrektywa) (A8-0218/2018 - Gunnar Hökmark) (głosowanie)	45
8.15. Papiery wartościowe zabezpieczone obligacjami skarbowymi (A8-0180/2019 - Jonás Fernández) (głosowanie)	45
8.16. Europejskie urzędy nadzoru i rynki finansowe (A8-0013/2019 - Othmar Karas, Pervenche Berès) (głosowanie)	45
8.17. Unijny nadzór makroostrożnościowy nad systemem finansowym i ustanowienie Europejskiej Rady ds. Ryzyka Systemowego (A8-0011/2019 - Othmar Karas, Pervenche Berès) (głosowanie)	45
8.18. Rynki instrumentów finansowych oraz podejmowanie i prowadzenie działalności ubezpieczeniowej i reasekuracyjnej (Wypłacalność II) (A8-0012/2019 - Othmar Karas, Pervenche Berès) (głosowanie)	45
8.19. Nadzór ostrożnościowy nad firmami inwestycyjnymi (dyrektywa) (A8-0295/2018 - Markus Ferber) (głosowanie)	46
8.20. Wymogi ostrożnościowe dla firm inwestycyjnych (rozporządzenie) (A8-0296/2018 - Markus Ferber) (głosowanie)	46
8.21. Przejrzyste i przewidywalne warunki pracy w Unii Europejskiej (A8-0355/2018 - Enrique Calvet Chambon) (głosowanie)	46
8.22. Europejski Urząd ds. Pracy (A8-0391/2018 - Jeroen Lenaers) (głosowanie)	46
8.23. Zachowanie zasobów rybnych i ochrona ekosystemów morskich za pomocą środków technicznych (A8-0381/2017 - Gabriel Mato) (głosowanie)	46
8.24. Rozporządzenie w sprawie europejskiej statystyki gospodarczej (A8-0094/2018 - Janusz Lewandowski) (głosowanie)	47
8.25. Dochodzenia prowadzone przez OLAF i współpraca z Prokuraturą Europejską (A8-0179/2019 - Ingeborg Gräßle) (głosowanie)	47

Spis treści	Strona
8.26. Ustanowienie instrumentu wsparcia finansowego na rzecz sprzętu do kontroli celnej (A8-0460/2018 - Jiří Pospíšil) (głosowanie)	47
8.27. Ustanowienie programu „Cła” na rzecz współpracy w dziedzinie cel (A8-0464/2018 - Maria Grapini) (głosowanie)	47
8.28. Wprowadzanie do obrotu i używanie prekursorów materiałów wybuchowych (A8-0473/2018 - Andrejs Mamikins) (głosowanie)	47
8.29. Wspólne ramy europejskich statystyk dotyczących osób fizycznych i gospodarstw domowych (A8-0247/2017 - Tamás Meszerics) (głosowanie)	48
8.30. Interoperacyjność między systemami informacyjnymi UE w obszarze granic i polityki wizowej (A8-0347/2018 - Jeroen Lenaers) (głosowanie)	48
8.31. Interoperacyjność między systemami informacyjnymi UE w dziedzinie współpracy policyjnej i sądowej, azylu i migracji (A8-0348/2018 - Nuno Melo) (głosowanie)	48
8.32. Europejska sieć urzędników łącznikowych ds. imigracji (A8-0040/2019 - Cécile Kashetu Kyenge) (głosowanie)	48
8.33. Homologacja typu pojazdów silnikowych w odniesieniu do ich ogólnego bezpieczeństwa (A8-0151/2019 - Róža Gräfin von Thun und Hohenstein) (głosowanie)	48
9. Wyjaśnienia dotyczące sposobu głosowania	49
9.1. Ochrona osób zgłaszających przypadki naruszenia prawa Unii (A8-0398/2018 - Virginie Rozière)	49
9.2. Transgraniczna dystrybucja funduszy zbiorowego inwestowania (dyrektywa) (A8-0430/2018 - Wolf Klinz)	51
9.3. Transgraniczna dystrybucja funduszy zbiorowego inwestowania (rozporządzenie) (A8-0431/2018 - Wolf Klinz)	51
9.4. Wymogi kapitałowe (rozporządzenie) (A8-0242/2018 - Peter Simon)	51
9.5. Papiery wartościowe zabezpieczone obligacjami skarbowymi (A8-0180/2019 - Jonás Fernández)	52
9.6. Rynki instrumentów finansowych oraz podejmowanie i prowadzenie działalności ubezpieczeniowej i reasekuracyjnej (Wyplacalność II) (A8-0012/2019 - Othmar Karas, Pervenche Berès)	52
9.7. Nadzór ostrożnościowy nad firmami inwestycyjnymi (dyrektywa) (A8-0295/2018 - Markus Ferber)	53
9.8. Przejrzyste i przewidywalne warunki pracy w Unii Europejskiej (A8-0355/2018 - Enrique Calvet Chambon)	53
9.9. Europejski Urząd ds. Pracy (A8-0391/2018 - Jeroen Lenaers)	54
10. Korekty do głosowania i zamiar głosowania: Patrz protokół	55
11. Wznowienie posiedzenia	56
12. Przyjęcie protokołu poprzedniego posiedzenia: Patrz protokół	56

Spis treści	Strona
13. Sytuacja w Mozambiku, Malawi i Zimbabwe po cyklonie Idai (debata)	56
14. Sytuacja w Libii (debata)	62
15. Uznanie Wzgórz Golan przez USA za terytorium izraelskie i możliwe przyłączenie osiedli na Zachodnim Brzegu Jordanu (debata)	73
16. Sytuacja w Sudanie (debata)	81
17. Ochrona rzetelności wyborów europejskich, ze szczególnym uwzględnieniem międzynarodowych zagrożeń dla cyberbezpieczeństwa (debata)	84
18. Wykładnia Regulaminu (podjęte działania): Patrz protokół	98
19. Komunikat Przewodniczącego: Patrz protokół	98
20. Ustanowienie programu „Horyzont Europa” oraz zasad uczestnictwa i upowszechniania obowiązujących w tym programie – Program realizacji programu „Horyzont Europa” (debata)	98
21. Nadzór rynku i zgodność z prawodawstwem dotyczącym produktów (debata)	113
22. Propagowanie uczciwości i przejrzystości dla użytkowników biznesowych korzystających z usług pośrednictwa internetowego (debata)	118
23. Lepsze egzekwowanie i unowocześnienie unijnych przepisów dotyczących ochrony konsumentów (debata)	123
24. Przejrzystość i zrównoważony charakter unijnej oceny ryzyka w łańcuchu żywnościowym (debata)	133
25. Dodatkowe świadectwo ochronne dla produktów leczniczych (debata)	140
26. Ewentualna ekstradycja Juliana Assange’a (debata)	146
27. Porządek obrad następnego posiedzenia: Patrz protokół	151
28. Zamknięcie posiedzenia	151

PEŁNE SPRAWOZDANIE Z OBRAD 16 KWIETNIA 2019 R.

PRESIDENZA DELL'ON. ANTONIO TAJANI

Presidente

1. Otwarcie posiedzenia

(La seduta è aperta alle 9.05)

2. Oświadczenia Przewodniczącego / Przewodniczącej

Le Président. – Chers collègues, Notre-Dame a été la première cathédrale de ma vie. En tant qu'ancien citoyen parisien, en tant qu'Italien, en tant qu'Européen, mon cœur est blessé, tout comme celui de chacun d'entre nous. Après ce qui s'est passé hier à Paris, nous sommes aux côtés des Français et de la France. Cette blessure ne cicatrisera pas rapidement. Nous devons tous nous engager. J'accueille favorablement l'idée d'un député qui m'a proposé de collecter des fonds aujourd'hui. Nous allons donc installer une boîte devant l'hémicycle, nous pourrions y mettre ce que nous gagnons aujourd'hui pour envoyer un message de solidarité et essayer de rebâtir ce qui peut l'être. Ce serait un message positif du Parlement européen.

Je veux aussi, au nom du Parlement européen, remercier tous les sapeurs pompiers français qui ont combattu hier le feu qui était en train de détruire la cathédrale.

Je compte sur vous et je pense que ce message du Parlement européen – de même que le soutien, je pense, de la Commission européenne et du Conseil – fera du bien à la France, aux Français et à tous les Européens.

(Applaudissements)

3. Składanie dokumentów: patrz protokół

4. Konkluzje z posiedzenia Rady Europejskiej z 10 kwietnia 2019 r. dotyczące wystąpienia Zjednoczonego Królestwa z Unii Europejskiej (debata)

Presidente. – L'ordine del giorno reca la discussione sulle dichiarazioni del Consiglio europeo e della Commissione sulle conclusioni della riunione del Consiglio europeo del 10 aprile 2019 sul recesso del Regno Unito dall'Unione europea (2019/2694(RSP)).

Donald Tusk, President of the European Council. – Mr President, from this place I would like to say words of comfort and solidarity with the whole French nation in the face of the Paris tragedy. I say these words not only as the President of the European Council, but also as a citizen of Gdańsk, 90 per cent destroyed and burnt, and later rebuilt. You will also rebuild your Cathedral. From Strasbourg, the French capital of the European Union, I call on all the 28 Member States to take part in this task.

I know that France could do it alone, but at stake here is something more than just material help. The burning of the Notre-Dame Cathedral in Paris has again made us aware that we are bound by something more important and more profound than Treaties. Today we understand better the essence of that which is common, we know how much we can lose. And that we want to defend it – together.

Last week the European Council of 27 leaders, in agreement with the Government of the United Kingdom, granted a flexible extension of the Article 50 period until 31 October this year. This extension gives our British friends more time and political space to find a way out of the current situation. I hope that they will use this time in the best possible way.

The European Council will be awaiting a clear message from the UK on a way forward. If the Withdrawal Agreement were to be ratified, the extension period will automatically end on the first day of the following month, meaning that the UK would leave the Union on that day. It is clear to everyone that there will be no re-opening of the Withdrawal Agreement. However, to facilitate the ratification process, the EU27 is ready to reconsider the Political Declaration on the future relationship, if the UK position were to evolve.

Last week, the European Council changed the logic of granting a much shorter extension than requested by the UK, to giving an extension that is much longer. I proposed such a change, as in my view it has a few advantages. First and foremost, only a long extension ensures that all options remain on the table, such as ratification of the current Withdrawal Agreement, or extra time to rethink Brexit, if that were the wish of the British people.

Second, this extension allows the EU to focus on other priorities that are at least as important, like trade with the United States or the new EU leadership. I know that some have expressed fear that the UK might want to disrupt the EU's functioning during this time. But the EU27 didn't give in to such fear and scaremongering. In fact, since the very beginning of the Brexit process, the UK has been a constructive and responsible EU Member State. And so we have no reason to believe that this should change.

Third, this flexible extension delays the possibility of a no-deal Brexit by over six months. Thanks to this, millions of people and businesses have gained at least some certainty in these unstable times.

One of the consequences of our decision is that the UK will hold European elections next month. We should approach this seriously, as UK Members of the European Parliament will be there for several months, maybe longer. They will be full Members of the Parliament, with all their rights and obligations.

I am speaking about this today because I have strongly opposed the idea that during this further extension, the UK should be treated as a second-category Member State. No, it cannot. Therefore, I also ask you to reject similar ideas, if they were to be voiced in this House.

I know that on both sides of the Channel, everyone, including myself, is exhausted with Brexit, which is completely understandable. However, this is not an excuse to say: 'let's get it over with', just because we are tired. We must continue to deal with Brexit with an open mind and in a civilised manner. Because whatever happens, we are bound by common fate, and we want to remain friends and close partners in the future.

During the European Council one of the leaders warned us not to be dreamers, and that we shouldn't think that Brexit could be reversed. I didn't respond at the time, but today, in front of you, I would like to say: at this rather difficult moment in our history, we need the dreamers and dreams. We cannot give in to fatalism. At least I will not stop dreaming about a better and united Europe.

Dear friends, this is our last meeting in your current term. I hope to have the opportunity to meet most of you after the elections.

(Applause)

Jean-Claude Juncker, *président de la Commission*. – Monsieur le Président, Mesdames et Messieurs les parlementaires, la journée d'hier fut terrible pour tous ceux qui aiment la France et qui aiment Paris. Pour nous tous, Paris n'est pas un endroit neutre, c'est un endroit dont nous aimons toujours retomber amoureux. Le spectacle de cette ville aux prises avec une tragédie qui n'est pas seulement architecturale, mais qui concerne la vie du peuple français, le spectacle de ce monument, Notre-Dame, symbole de la grandeur de la France, comme en témoignent ses nombreux visiteurs au fil du temps, détruit par les flammes, nous fend le cœur.

Hier, une partie importante de la France a été profondément touchée par cet événement et nous sommes en quelque sorte tous en deuil aujourd'hui. Je voudrais exprimer à nos amis français toute la sympathie de la Commission, qui s'est d'ailleurs dit prête à soutenir la France dans cette épreuve. L'Europe a été blessée, la France a été blessée, Paris a été blessé, nous avons été blessés et nous sommes solidaires de nos amis français.

Since we finished the European Council in the early hours of last Thursday, the Commission and myself, we are on a Brexit break. We are focusing on the very many other issues for our Union. We are focusing on our positive agenda. With that in mind, I want to be very brief. Last week the European Council, in an agreement with the United Kingdom, took a united and responsible decision to grant an extension of the Article 50 period until 31 October this year.

This was an acceptable outcome for three main reasons. First of all, and with the support of this House, we have adopted the necessary contingency measures and we are ready for a no-deal Brexit. But our Union has nothing to gain from great disruption in the United Kingdom. The only ones who would benefit are those who resent multilateralism and seek to undermine the global legal order, and in any case we will never kick out one of our members.

Secondly, we have protected the integrity and the functioning of this House and all our institutions. If the United Kingdom is a Member on 23 May, it must organise European elections. If it does not do so, and the Withdrawal Agreement is not ratified by 22 May, the extension ends on 31 May. This is now the legal situation.

Thirdly, we have made sure that we do not need to discuss Brexit every other week and have given the United Kingdom the time and space to find a way out of the impasse. Once the Withdrawal Agreement is in force, the Commission will work as closely together with Parliament as we did during the entire Brexit negotiations. The full transparency of our negotiations and the close and effective teamwork with the Brexit Steering Group was our strength in the Brexit negotiations and I want to continue this good practice during the implementation of the Withdrawal Agreement

Whenever a decision will have to be taken in the so-called joint committee, the Commission will therefore closely involve Parliament and take utmost account of your views. We have learned to pay a lot of attention to the House of Commons over the last months, but let me be very clear, on Brexit nothing can be decided against the views of this House of European democracy. Nothing can be decided on Brexit without taking full account of the position of the European Parliament.

Meine sehr verehrten Damen und Herren! Der 31. Oktober ist die neue Frist für einen geordneten Ausstieg des Vereinigten Königreichs – oder, sollte das Austrittsabkommen bis dahin nicht vom britischen Parlament ratifiziert werden, für einen harten Brexit, den wir alle vermeiden wollen. Natürlich kann Großbritannien auch entscheiden, sein Austrittsgesuch zurückzuziehen. Das hat der Europäische Gerichtshof ausdrücklich klargestellt. Aber dies ist nicht meine Arbeitshypothese. So wie es auch nicht meine Arbeitshypothese ist, dass wir über den 31. Oktober hinaus die Frist verlängern. Das ist nicht meine Arbeitshypothese.

Im Übrigen mag ich dieses Datum, 31. Oktober, überhaupt nicht. Der 31. Oktober ist mein letzter Arbeitstag als Kommissionspräsident. Es kann also am 31. Oktober keine Nachtsitzung stattfinden, weil ich um zwölf Uhr den Sitzungssaal verlassen werden muss, aber Donald Tusk kann bleiben.

Ich bin Kommissionspräsident geworden, a) weil ich das werden wollte und b) weil ich die europäischen Dinge beschleunigen wollte. Weil ich gerne gehabt hätte, dass wir in Sachen soziales Europa weiterkommen. Wir sind weitergekommen, aber nicht weit genug, weil ich auch die notwendige Reform der Wirtschafts- und Währungsunion zum Abschluss bringen wollte. Weil ich gerne gehabt hätte, dass wir uns in Sachen Finanzierung der nächsten Periode 2021-2028 verständigen können.

Und ich möchte nicht, dass die vielen Forscher, die vielen Jugendlichen, Erasmusstudenten und andere, zum Opfer dieser Brexitgeschichte werden. Sie haben Besseres verdient, und wir müssen dafür sorgen, dass wir sie nicht weiter von Europa entfernen. Die Antwort, welchen Weg Großbritannien einschlagen wird, muss jedenfalls aus London kommen – je früher, desto besser.

Ich begrüße es sehr, dass die Regierung und die Opposition sich jetzt in einem Gesprächsmodus befinden. Das wird als Fortschritt gefeiert – ist im britischen Kontext ja auch ein Fortschritt. Normal ist es aber nicht, dass die tragenden Kräfte so spät zueinander finden. Das ist nicht normal! Und ich begrüße es deshalb, dass diese Gespräche jetzt endlich stattfinden.

Wann die Briten die Europäische Union verlassen, liegt allein in ihrer Hand. Wie die Briten die Europäische Union verlassen, darauf haben wir uns im November 2018 in Form des Austrittsabkommens mit der britischen Regierung verständigt. Dieses Verhandlungsergebnis gilt auch weiterhin. Zu keinem Zeitpunkt werden Nachverhandlungen über das Austrittsabkommen stattfinden. Über die politische Erklärung zur Zukunft der Europäischen Union können wir reden, wenn dieser Wunsch besteht.

Monsieur le Président, Mesdames et Messieurs les députés, le Brexit n'est pas l'avenir de l'Union européenne. L'avenir de notre Union va bien au-delà du Brexit, qui ne doit pas et ne peut pas entraver nos travaux sur nos grandes priorités. C'est la raison pour laquelle le Conseil européen s'est mis d'accord sur deux principes. Premièrement, tant que le Royaume-Uni sera membre de l'Union européenne, nous comptons sur une coopération constructive, responsable et loyale. C'est un principe directeur du traité qu'il faudra que nous respections.

We do not only respect; we are requesting that there will be a loyal and responsible cooperation.

Deuxièmement, il n'y a pas d'État membre de second rang, mais si un État membre souhaite quitter l'Union européenne, les 27 autres doivent avoir le droit de se réunir séparément pour aborder les questions futures. Ce n'est pas une nouveauté. En décembre 1997, lorsque j'étais président du Conseil européen, j'ai lancé l'Eurogroupe – contre l'avis des Britanniques, des Danois, des Suédois et de quelques autres. Cet Eurogroupe, ce groupe restreint composé de ceux qui se sentent concernés et qui sont concernés par la construction monétaire de l'Europe, avait le droit de se réunir. Il s'est réuni et les résultats ont été appréciables.

L'Union européenne a devant elle des défis stratégiques auxquels elle doit répondre. Tout d'abord, nous discuterons à Sibiu, en mai, de l'orientation stratégique de l'Union européenne pour les années à venir. Ensuite, il y a le prochain budget pluriannuel dont nous devons, en principe, décider en octobre. Il y a par ailleurs l'élection des futurs dirigeants de l'Union européenne. Après le Parlement européen, élu par le plus grand corps électoral après celui de l'Inde, nous devons élire un nouveau président de la Commission et le Conseil européen devra nommer un nouveau président du Conseil.

L'avenir de notre Union, c'est notre place dans le monde, ce sont nos accords commerciaux, nos relations avec nos grands partenaires internationaux, notamment la Chine, avec laquelle nous avons eu la semaine dernière un sommet très constructif. En juin prochain, il y aura le G20 à Osaka, où nous parlerons notamment de l'avenir du commerce mondial. Tout cela, à vrai dire, est plus important que les péripéties autour du Brexit. L'Europe continue.

(Applaudissements)

Commission Declaration for the European Parliament plenary

(in writing)

The Commission recalls its commitment to ensure that the European Parliament is immediately and fully informed, in line with Article 218(10) TFEU, in relation to the work of the Joint Committee and the specialised committees established by the Agreement on the withdrawal of the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland from the European Union and the European Atomic Energy Community («the Withdrawal Agreement»).

For the European Parliament to be in a position to exercise fully its institutional prerogatives throughout the process in accordance with the Treaties, the Commission will ensure that the Parliament receives sufficient and timely information ahead and after the meetings of the Joint Committee or the specialised committees of the Withdrawal Agreement.

Moreover, the Commission considers that given the exceptional nature of the Withdrawal Agreement based on Article 50 TEU, an adequate involvement of the European Parliament is necessary in case the Joint Committee would envisage to adopt any of the following decisions:

— the decision to extend the transition period in accordance with Article 132 of the Withdrawal Agreement, including the determination of the financial contribution referred therein,

— the decision referred to in Article 159(3) of the Withdrawal Agreement relating to the abolition of the United Kingdom independent authority monitoring the implementation and application of Part Two of the Withdrawal Agreement on citizens' rights;

— a decision referred to in Article 20 of the Protocol on Ireland/Northern Ireland that the Protocol in whole or in part shall cease to apply.

Therefore, in relation to these decisions, the Commission will inform sufficiently in advance the European Parliament of its intention to present a proposal for a decision on the position to take in the Joint Committee, and of the gist of its envisaged proposal. The Commission will take utmost account of possible comments of the European Parliament in that respect. It commits, in case it does not follow EP position, to explain the reasons for which it did not.

The Commission understands that, in view of the short time frame available, the matter will be handled in the European Parliament as a matter of urgency.

The Commission will, thereafter, transmit its proposal to the European Parliament for information at the same time as it transmits it to the Council for adoption in accordance with Article 218(9) TFEU.

The Commission recalls that these practical arrangements have to be seen in the context of the exceptional nature of an agreement based on Article 50 TEU and do not constitute a precedent for any other agreements.

Presidente. – Voglio ricordare ai colleghi che durante la riunione del Consiglio io ho insistito sulla dignità del Parlamento, sul ruolo che il nostro Parlamento ha, non si può usare come un taxi, quindi anche in tutta la trattativa sulla Brexit bisognerà tenere conto del ruolo della nostra Istituzione.

Questa per noi è una priorità, credo di poter parlare a nome di tutti i colleghi, siamo la prima Istituzione del Trattato e pretendiamo di essere rispettati da tutti e 28 gli Stati membri.

Grazie, la parola a nome del gruppo del Partito popolare europeo all'on. González Pons.

Esteban González Pons, en nombre del Grupo PPE. – Señor presidente, tengo que hablar del dolor que sentí ayer viendo arder la catedral de Notre-Dame. El incendio de Notre-Dame nos dolió a los europeos como si todos fuéramos franceses: sentimos todos la misma desolación, nos sentimos todos igual de desamparados y, esta mañana, todos queremos sumarnos a la reconstrucción.

Los pueblos no crecen llorando juntos, sino avanzando juntos. Por eso, el incendio de ayer de Notre-Dame nos hace más europeos no porque lloramos juntos, sino porque juntos vamos a reconstruir la catedral.

La Unión Europea debería comprometerse hoy a aportar ayuda económica y artesanos —todos los que sean necesarios— para volver a construir la catedral tal y como se construían las catedrales en el pasado, sumando a todos en el proyecto.

El incendio de Notre-Dame nos recuerda que los europeos nunca estamos solos. Europa es la respuesta al fuego, a la destrucción, al egoísmo y a la pobreza. Por eso anoche, viendo arder la catedral, volví a preguntarme una vez más: «Pero, ¿por qué quieren marcharse de aquí los británicos?».

La Unión Europea es una comunidad de principios y valores. Si te parece que no funciona, los reformas e intentas arreglarlos, pero no te marchas. No te marchas porque los valores no dejan de compartirse y porque en ningún caso se negocian.

Ocurra lo que ocurra hay tres lecciones que hemos aprendido del *Brexit*: primero, en política no se puede prometer lo que no se puede cumplir; segundo, en política las mentiras siempre traen decepciones; y, tercero, los lazos que forja la historia no pueden romperse por egoísmo económico.

Nadie desea un *Brexit* duro, pero peor es un *Brexit* indefinido y sin fecha. Para mí, Europa está incompleta sin el Reino Unido, pero si los políticos británicos no son capaces de encontrar una solución, que le devuelvan la voz al pueblo.

El incendio de Notre-Dame, también nos demuestra que hablamos demasiado del *Brexit* y demasiado poco de todo lo demás. Lo siento por la vanidad de los políticos británicos, pero hoy mi dolor por el fuego de Notre-Dame me hace más europeo que mi indignación por su incompetencia.

Udo Bullmann, *on behalf of the S&D Group*. – Mr President, this morning we stand united when we look at Paris. We rightly say that Notre-Dame is our case. We rightly say 'Paris, you are not alone. The French nation is not alone'. This is our manifestation of European solidarity.

In this spirit of European solidarity, I have to applaud President Tusk. You took the responsibility of granting the United Kingdom this extension because, by doing so, you avoided a cliff-edge crash. Who would have paid the price of the cliff edge crashing? Who would have paid the price? Not the liars, not the ideologists, not those with the false promises. Ordinary citizens in the UK would have paid the price, citizens who have to rely on a decent job in this interwoven economy, which is more interwoven than it has ever been before in the single market. Those responsible know this exactly. They were playing with the fate of the citizens in their country. This is wrong and this was avoided by President Juncker and President Tusk, by the European Council, by responsible decision makers, and this is a good signal.

President Tusk, I also applaud you for what you were saying about the rights of Member States as long as they are members. This is all the more true for the rights of the representatives in this House. This is not a party politics issue. This is an issue of the decency of our constituencies and the decency of our democratic processes. We will of course welcome our representatives from the United Kingdom, and of course they will have the same rights as everybody else here in this House. My party and group will protect that, in any case, in each and every situation.

Ich bin davon überzeugt, dass wir auch nach dem 23. Mai im Vereinigten Königreich eine neue Diskussion haben werden. Es wird der Anfang vom Ende des *Brexit* sein, davon bin ich überzeugt, denn endlich werden die Menschen in Großbritannien auch die Chance haben, sich zu diesem Vorgang zu äußern. Denn wir sind nach wie vor in der Situation, dass das Parlament blockiert ist. Ich war immer der Auffassung, dass man in einer solchen Situation die Menschen fragen muss, wenn der Preis für den falschen Schritt klar auf dem Tisch ist, was sie am Ende des Tages davon halten. 'Taking back control' heißt, die Menschen fragen, nicht die Ideologen fragen. Machen Sie sich das bitte immer wieder klar!

Ich bin der Überzeugung, dass es hier um mehr geht. *Brexit* geht nicht nur um Großbritannien, *Brexit* geht nicht nur um die anderen, die in der Europäischen Union bleiben wollen. *Brexit* geht um sehr viel mehr. Es ist die Frage, ob die Putins und Trumps, die Steve Bannons und die Salvinis das kaputt machen können, was von Robert Schuman und Jean Monnet, von Konrad Adenauer und Willy Brandt aufgebaut worden ist – darum geht es im Eigentlichen. Und deswegen werden wir diese Europäische Union verteidigen, weil sie die richtige Antwort auf die großen Zukunftsfragen ist.

Meine Fraktion steht dazu bereit. Sie sehen in Finnland, Sie sehen in Schweden, dass wir diejenigen sind, die Europa zusammenhalten, wenn die Rechtsradikalen dagegen trommeln. Ich wünschte mir Partner, die das auch tun. Die Europäische Volkspartei muss beantworten, wo sie in Andalusien steht, wo sie steht bei den nächsten Regional- und Lokalwahlen in Italien, ob bei den Europäern oder bei denen, die Europa zerschlagen wollen. Unser Job ist klar: Wir Sozialdemokraten verteidigen diese Europäische Union und werden sie in die Zukunft führen.

Syed Kamall, *on behalf of the ECR Group*. – Mr President, when you look at the pictures last night of Notre-Dame burning, in times like this it's time to put aside politics and wherever you are, whether you are British, European or from the rest of the world, many people shared sorrow when they saw those pictures.

Personally, 25 years ago my wife studied in France and she worked in Paris for a while and we used to go to Notre-Dame. It's an iconic building and we were only there last month and we took photographs of it, bringing back fond memories. Think of the millions of people over the years who have stood and watched that building, whatever their faith, looked at it and it's been a symbol not only of Paris but of the history of Europe, but also the whole feeling it gives. And even though it's a building not of my faith, I share the pain of many of you in this Chamber today and I hope that we can all come together, whether British, European or from outside Europe, come together and do our bit in that rebuilding.

Many of us had hoped that we wouldn't be having this debate today and that the UK would have left the EU on 29 March, or even last week, but we have to deal with life as it is. The British Government is still committed to delivering Brexit in an orderly way ...

(Laughter)

... and leaving the European Union as soon as possible, so that the people in the UK and the EU can focus on the future, or what Jean-Claude Juncker referred to as a 'positive agenda'.

However, I realise that your patience has worn thin and that you look and wonder what is happening in Westminster. But EU membership has been a divisive issue in our country for many years, not just in my party but in the main opposition party too, and you can see these divisions playing out, and I know many people here will ask: well, why didn't you begin cross-party talks sooner? And while that may seem natural to most people in this Chamber, this is not how the UK system of parliamentary democracy works.

You only have to look at the House of Commons, where the two parties sit opposite each other rather than side by side as in this Parliament. On one side sits the government, on the other the opposition, and rather than seeking to build coalitions across, it's a much more adversarial style of politics. So the current talks are naturally uncomfortable for members of both main parties, myself included.

The Article 50 extension agreed at last week's Council may not have been the answer everyone, or perhaps anyone, wanted, but it gives us more time to pursue all the options in search of a breakthrough and I hope that my colleagues in Westminster do not take too long. Our economy, our politics and our country need certainty and we must aim to find a solution in time to avoid participating in the European elections. The time has now come for pragmatism. Let's get it done.

I'd like to thank Mr Tusk for his more constructive approach last week compared to, say, some of his more recent statements. I think, Mr Tusk, that your words in advance of the Council struck the right chord, that this shouldn't be about recriminations or humiliations, and that to remain friends and move forward we have to build a future partnership that can truly stand the test of time.

As a country the UK has been in difficult positions before, but we have a reputation for seeing things through and I believe that this time will be no different.

I just wonder if I could end on a personal note. This may be my last speech from this seat or in this Chamber after nearly 14 years and can I just say to my colleagues that whether we have agreed or disagreed over the years, whether you are re-elected or moving on to new challenges, can I thank you all for your service. Can I thank you all for being part of this amazing experience and can I wish you all the very best for the future.

(Applause)

Guy Verhofstadt, *au nom du groupe ALDE*. – Monsieur le Président, tout d'abord, tout comme mes collègues et comme le président Tusk et le président Juncker, je tiens à exprimer ma douleur face au grave incendie qui a eu lieu hier soir à Paris. Je suis sûr qu'ensemble nous allons faire renaître Notre-Dame de Paris. Elle rayonnera à nouveau, plus belle encore que par le passé, cette Notre-Dame de Paris, qui est Notre-Dame de France, Notre-Dame d'Europe; j'en suis sûr.

I know that this Parliament has, in fact, no say in the decision that you made on Wednesday, but nevertheless, I want to warn you for one thing and that is for the consequences of the decision of last week, because, until now, we kept the unity in the European Union – the unity among the 27 Member States, but also the unity between the three institutions, the Council, the Parliament and the Commission, and unity built around our negotiator, I want to recall that here today, Mr Michel Barnier, who I want to applaud here for all the work he has done.

(Applause)

This unity, in my opinion, Mr Tusk, I have to tell you that very frankly, is at risk now. Instead of sending Mrs May back to London with no extension at all, or maybe with an ultimately very short one – a few days, a week – you gave her six months. But six months, everybody knows that 31 October is in fact too near for a substantial rethink of Brexit, and at the same time, too far away to prompt any action. That's the problem with the decision that has been taken. I would not go so far as Mr Coburn here who would call it rubbish and because he calls everything rubbish in Parliament, but I fear that it will continue the uncertainty. I fear that it will prolong the indecision, and I fear most of all that it will import the Brexit mess into the European Union. And, moreover, that it will poison the upcoming European election. Moreover, my fear is that it will make from this Parliament that we say that in Dutch, I don't know if you have that expression, a pigeon house – a dovecoat – the British Members flying in, the British Members flying out, and at the same time, waiting on the substitute benches, a number of Members of 14 other European countries. Banksy, colleagues, has already done a work on this. He painted the house in Westminster as a house full of monkeys. He could be inspired to maybe make a second work, to paint this Hemicycle in Strasbourg full of pigeons.

My fear, Mr Tusk, is that, with this decision, the pressure to come to a cross-party agreement, as Mr Kamall has talked about, disappears, as we (inaudible) the last days and that both parties, Conservatives and Labour, will again do what they did already for months – run down the clock – and the proof of this is, was that the first decision the House of Commons have taken after your decision was to go on holidays.

So really – and I never thought I should say that in my life here in this Parliament – but maybe the only thing that can save us now is Nigel Farage. Why? As you will hear today, he's already campaigning. He's already rallying with a new party, the Brexit Party, catching up with the Conservatives in the polls and the old parties, Labour and the Conservatives risk to be wiped out during the European election. My advice to you Mr Corbett is that, if they are not stupid, both parties should make a cross-party deal now, immediately, in the coming days, to avoid this imminent disaster.

Finally, Mr Tusk, in the aftermath of the decision, you said something and you have repeated it a few moments ago, you said we may avoid Britain leaving the EU, and I'm against Brexit and leaving the EU, but it's not our decision. It was a decision of the British people. So what my fear is that instead of killing Brexit, the decision could risk killing Europe. At least bogging it down again for years, putting our energy in negotiations with British leaders like Mr Corbyn or Mr Johnson, who, in fact, in their hearts, despise Europe, and this at the moment when we need all our energy, to put all our energy in the reform, in the renewal of our European Union. That is what we, and you also, should solely focus on as President of the European Council. And that spirit was, in my opinion, absent last week, Wednesday.

IN THE CHAIR: MAIREAD McGUINNESS

Vice-President

Gabriele Zimmer, *im Namen der GUE/NGL-Fraktion*. – Meine Herren und Damen Präsidenten, liebe Kolleginnen und Kollegen! Ich glaube, es gibt Momente, in denen Wahlkampfauseinandersetzungen einfach mal ganz kurz gestoppt werden sollten. Der Brand gestern in Paris hat uns gezeigt, wie verletzlich unsere Welt, wie verletzlich Europa, wie verletzlich Kultur, Geschichte und auch unsere Zukunft sind. Das ist mehr als das, was wir hier manchmal unter uns austragen. Notre-Dame ist ein Symbol – ein Symbol für Europa, ein Symbol für Frankreich.

Ich habe mich als Ostdeutsche vor vielen Jahren entschieden, Französisch zu lernen – und zwar vor 45 Jahren –, gerade weil ich ahnte, dass ich vielleicht nie die Möglichkeit haben werde, nach Paris zu kommen und Notre-Dame zu sehen. Für mich ist das ein Schock. Ich möchte allen französischen Kolleginnen und Kollegen hier im Parlament – und zwar unabhängig von den Fraktionen – sagen, dass wir eng bei ihnen stehen und dass wir aber auch einfordern – einfordern, dass wir uns dieser Verletzlichkeit bewusst sind, auch der Verletzlichkeit der Europäischen Union.

Das hat etwas mit dem zu tun, was wir jetzt diskutieren. Ich bin überhaupt nicht damit einverstanden und freue mich überhaupt nicht über das Ergebnis des letzten Gipfels – ich finde es fatal. Ich finde es fatal, weil auch ich der Meinung bin: Entweder, wir kriegen mal eine Entscheidung – dafür oder dagegen, Austritt oder kein Austritt. Aber sechs Monate heißen: Sie setzen dieses Europäische Parlament und vor allem den demokratischen Vorgang der Europawahlen aufs Spiel. Der hat überhaupt keine Rolle bei Ihren Entscheidungen gespielt, überhaupt keine.

Wenn sich am 2. Juli das neue Parlament konstituiert, dann beginnt danach die Sommerpause. Im September fängt die Konstituierung des Parlaments im Wesentlichen an, die Arbeitsfähigkeit. Ja, wir wollen allen britischen Kolleginnen und Kollegen, die dann im Parlament sind, auch volle Rechte gewähren. Heißt das, wir müssen von Anfang an einen Plan B machen, wir müssen die Ausschüsse doppelt berechnen? Denn es könnte ja sein, einen Monat, nachdem die Arbeitsfähigkeit hergestellt wird, gehen alle wieder raus, dann kommen andere nach, dann verändert sich die Zusammensetzung der Fraktionen. Haben Sie darüber mal nachgedacht?

Haben Sie darüber nachgedacht, wie wir denn Menschen begeistern sollen, zur Europawahl zu gehen – und das ist in jedem Land schwer genug –, wenn wir von vornherein einfach wissen, es ist ein Zirkus, den wir hier abziehen? Deshalb bleibe ich dabei: Entweder gleich, oder Sie hätten fünf Jahre vorschlagen sollen – eine ganze Wahlperiode.

Molly Scott Cato, *on behalf of the Verts/ALE Group*. – Madam President, well it's Easter and we're still here, and I and millions of my fellow British citizens couldn't be more delighted about that. For me it's ...

(Applause)

... absolutely wonderful to be able to see through the mandate that I was given by the people of South-West England and Gibraltar in 2014. I'm equally delighted that the UK will be holding European elections in May and the Greens are going to use these democratic and proportional elections as a celebration of the values of the European Union. We will mobilise one of the most powerful pro-European forces in our continent and we will champion a fairer, greener, and more democratic EU.

I'd like to thank the Council, and particularly President Tusk, for allowing us the breathing space to reconsider our vote to leave the EU. Building Europe has never been easy and he has shown the vision of the founding fathers, who persevered in difficult times to welcome and even include those countries which were having difficulties at home, perhaps particularly those countries.

As a Green MEP I've always been tough on Brexit but we also need to be tough on the causes of Brexit. We must address the issues that gave rise to feelings of powerlessness, of alienation, of being left behind, that prompted so many of our fellow citizens to vote to leave in 2016. So I wish my colleagues happy campaigns. Let's share a message of hope about the positive change that the European Parliament can bring to their lives. Let's resist the siren song of the far right with its politics of division, hate and fear.

In Britain, a strong pro-European vote across the country will massively increase the chances of winning a future people's vote and convincing our fellow citizens that our best future is as part of the European family.

(Applause)

Nigel Farage, *on behalf of the EFDD Group*. – Madam President, well I have tried for 20 years to do myself out of this job and I thought I'd succeeded. Little did I realise what the UK political class would do, so the morning message is: I'm coming back. In fact lots and lots of us are coming back because Mr Verhofstadt is right. Yes, I said that. First time ever! You're quite right, the Brexit party will sweep the board in these elections and there is only one way it can be stopped and that is if the governing party of Ms May and the opposition of Mr Corbyn come together and agree to a permanent customs union and indeed effectively membership of the single market.

If that happens, the Brexit party won't win the European elections but it will win the general election ...

(Applause from certain quarters)

... because the betrayal will be so complete and utter.

So I don't believe it's going to happen, and in 15 years as a joint or sole president of a group, I have been to dozens of European summits and again and again I've seen conflict between nation states and the European institutions, whether it was the Austrians, or the Irish, or the Hungarians, or indeed the Greeks. And there is one golden rule, always, and that is that Brussels wins. The power and might of Brussels always wins.

But I've never been to a European summit quite like last week, where for the second time in two weeks a British prime minister comes along and begs, begs for an extension to Article 50. It was humiliating, not just to be in Brussels, but humiliating for the standing of our country around the world. You know, the Commonwealth, America, many of these countries that actually like us, still believe that we are a great nation and yet we have sunk to this: a Prime Minister that promised us we'd leave on 29 March, that then said we might leave on 12 April, that we would definitely leave on 30 June, and now we're being told we'll leave on 31 October.

Halloween trick or treaty, make your minds up and if it's your last day, Mr Juncker, well I hope that we leave together on that day. But actually, if it's left to this appalling Prime Minister, if it's left to our politicians in Parliament, I know that it's not going to happen.

In the past, I know I've always criticised the power without accountability of senior bureaucrats in Brussels, but for once I have to say that this mess is not your fault. Your position has been clear from the start. The mess is the fault of British politics, of two parties which both promised us in their manifestos they would deliver Brexit, which signed up to Article 50, which expressly said we would leave with or without a deal.

That is where the betrayal is and I do share Members' great sadness about the appalling tragedy of Notre-Dame cathedral in Paris being burnt down yesterday – something very beautiful has been lost – but something very vital is being lost in the United Kingdom and I thought the deaths column of The Times newspaper yesterday summed it up rather well: 'UK Democracy, on 29th March 2019, aged 312. It was with sad regret that Democracy died quietly in her sleep at 11pm, on the 29th March 2019. The cause of death was by foul play and the culprits have yet to be brought to justice. Democracy campaigned for the rule of law, human rights [...] and [always] favoured the majority in all her decisions. She will be sorely missed. God have mercy on [our] soul.'

What is happening in British politics, beginning on 23 May isn't now just about Brexit, isn't now just about us leaving the European Union. It's about what kind of country we are. We have the oldest, longest serving continuous parliament in the world. The mother of parliaments. We have fought and given much for that principle of nation state democracy, not just for us but for our friends in Europe too.

I sense among some in my country disillusionment. But in others I sense a burning anger. Not one to put on yellow vests and protest, but one that says we need a peaceful political revolution in our country. We need to sweep away the two-party system that has let us down so badly, and I think you're all going to be very surprised by what happens on 23 May. It will be a new future for British democracy and goodness me, it's needed.

(Applause from certain quarters)

President. – I have received some blue-card requests, but because the President has set the precedent, we don't give blue-card requests during the leaders' speeches.

Gerard Batten, on behalf of the ENF Group. – Madam President, (inaudible) would never be happening if the referendum decision of 2016 had been honoured, then Britain would have left long ago. Instead, the democratic decision of 17.4 million people is being deliberately and cynically betrayed. The European elections in May will inevitably be a re-run of the referendum question. Whatever the political parties say, the voters' choice will boil down to voting 'do we remain in the European Union' or 'do we leave the European Union'. The Remainers should vote for the Liberal Democrats. They are the true party of Remain. Leavers should vote for the UK Independence party; UKIP is the true party of Leave. Voting Conservative or Labour is truly a wasted vote because nobody, including them, actually knows where they stand on this issue. UKIP's policy is clear and straightforward. It is one of unilateral and unconditional withdrawal. But these elections will divide people into two distinct groups, not just in the UK but across Europe. One group will be those who consent to be governed by a foreign power: The European Union. The second group will be those who vote to rebel against further EU integration and in favour of returning democratic powers to the nation state. One group will be voting for freedom and independence. The other group will be voting for subservience and submission. One thing that we can be sure of is that Eurosceptic MEPs will return in big numbers and their voters will be voting for a return to democratic accountability, an end to austerity measures and for their economies to be run in their interests and for their benefit. They will be voting to end mass uncontrolled immigration. They will be voting for parties that want to preserve their cultures and their civilisation. There will be a great populist vote across Europe. In the United Kingdom we have the simplest choice: vote to remain or vote to leave. It was the electoral threat of the UK Independence Party that brought about the referendum in the first place, and UKIP will continue to fight to make Brexit happen. UKIP MEPs elected on the 23 May will continue the political struggle to set Britain free from the European Union, and a vote for UKIP on 23 May will send a clear message to Her Majesty's Government: leave on WTO terms immediately. UKIP does not just campaign for Brexit; we actually want to make it happen. A vote for UKIP is always a vote to leave the European Union and the British public should vote UKIP on 23 May.

Kazimierz Michał Ujazdowski (NI). – Pani Przewodnicząca! Widok płonącej katedry Notre-Dame był dojmujący. Jednocześnie pokazaliśmy, że jesteśmy wspólnotą pragnącą żyć. Wspólnotą, o której Ortega y Gasset pisał, iż żyje podskórnie, a w momentach nadzwyczajnych przejawia wolę swojej egzystencji.

Chcę podziękować Radzie Europejskiej i jej przewodniczącemu za racjonalne decyzje w sprawie przedłużenia terminu. To zapobiega wstrząsowi i katastrofalnym skutkom. Tylko ktoś, kto źle życzy Wielkiej Brytanii i Europie, może nie rozumieć tych decyzji. Nie dziwię się panu Farage'owi, bo trzyma się stałej, egoistycznej linii w tej sprawie, ale bardzo się dziwię panu Verhofstadtowi, który jest przeciwny tej decyzji i zachowuje się tak, jakby chciał wypchnąć Brytyjczyków z Unii Europejskiej. Po raz kolejny dogmatyczny federalizm współpracuje z eurosceptycyzmem. Ten sojusz Farage-Verhofstadt nie jest tutaj przypadkowy.

Przyszłością Unii Europejskiej jest zaufanie do integracji europejskiej i pragmatyczna formuła współpracy. Wierzę, że władze unijne następnej kadencji pójdą tą drogą.

Elmar Brok (PPE). – Frau Präsidentin, Herr Ratspräsident, Herr Kommissionspräsident, Kolleginnen und Kollegen! Werden wir im Oktober eine neue Lage haben, oder werden wir dann in derselben Situation sein wie heute, weil die Dinge sich nicht aufgelöst haben? Ich hoffe, dass Corbyn und May einen Deal finden. Jedenfalls sollte man sich im House of Commons anstrengen, eine konstruktive Lösung so oder so zu finden: drin zu bleiben oder rauszugehen, möglichst nicht mit einem *hard Brexit* hinauszugehen und nicht dieses unwürdige Spiel fortzusetzen.

Wir brauchen in diesem Haus die Fähigkeit, mit den großen Aufgaben der Zukunft voranzukommen, mit den Fragen, die wir uns stellen – von Migration über die Handelskriege, die Fragen der inneren und äußeren Sicherheit, die Fragen, die mit Klimawandel zu tun haben und manchem anderen. Wir müssen klarstellen, dass die Europäische Union die alleinige Kraft ist, um gemeinsam bei der Verteilung dieser Welt, die die Trumps und Xis und Putins betreiben, Europa zu retten, uns voranzubringen, uns dastehen zu lassen als eigene Kraft, und nicht die Zersplitterung des Nationalismus, der hier wieder von einigen der Redner gepredigt worden ist.

Dieses Europa steht für Solidarität, für Frieden und Freiheit, für Menschlichkeit, für wirtschaftlichen Erfolg. Und dieses Europa hat dies, glaube ich, in hervorragender Weise bisher geleistet. Dies ist heute meine letzte Rede in diesem Haus – nach 39 Jahren –, und ich möchte feststellen, dass dieses Europa eine Erfolgsgeschichte ist. Als ich Mitglied wurde, waren wir neun Mitglieder in einer Zollunion, die nicht richtig funktionierte. Heute sind wir 28 Mitglieder mit einem Parlament, das alles zu sagen hat. Damals hatten wir nichts zu sagen. Dieses Parlament muss dieser Würde gerecht werden, der Macht, die wir erreicht haben, und das muss den Wählern auch mitgeteilt werden.

Notre-Dame, das ist nicht nur ein schönes Gebäude, das ist ein Gebäude des geistigen und geistlichen Europas, des Christentums, das zu uns Europäern gehört. Ich erinnere mich noch an die Bilder, als Präsident Mitterrand dort seine Trauerfeier hatte, und an einen weinenden Helmut Kohl. Dieses war und ist das Europa, das uns voranbringt und die Untaten der Geschichte hinter uns lässt. Lasst uns dieses Europa nicht zerstören! Präsident Mitterrand hat in diesem Haus gesagt: Nationalismus heißt Krieg! Das sollten wir immer im Auge behalten.

(Die Abgeordneten erheben sich von ihren Plätzen und spenden dem Redner Beifall.)

President. – Thank you, Mr Brok. This is your last speech in this Chamber. You have served us well and I hope you do not completely forget about European politics. You will be looking at it from afar. Thank you, and I think the House has honoured you with the applause.

(Applause)

Richard Corbett (S&D). – Madam President, may I also join those people who have commented on Notre-Dame, and in particular your words, Mr Tusk, on sharing the pain of the French people, when you said we are bound by more than just treaties.

That's very true, and that's why I was so shocked when you said that, that Mr Farage – who's no longer with us, as usual – shouted out 'rubbish'. I think that illustrates the attitude of some of those on that side of the House. But they are the voices of the past. The British people are beginning to see through the lies that they have told for years about the European Union. They're beginning to see through the lies they have told about Brexit. Remember they told us it would be easy; well it's turning out to be pretty complicated. They told us it would save lots of money that would all go to the National Health Service; it's turning out to cost a fortune. They said there would be new trade deals ready with countries across the planet to replace any lost trade with Europe; in fact we're losing all the trade deals we have via the European Union if we go ahead with Brexit. The British people are beginning to see through that, and that is why *they* are so afraid of having another referendum, because they know what the answer would be if we had one.

(Applause)

And that's also why the Conservatives are *(inaudible passage)* European elections, because they know they would be hammered in those elections. I'm a bit surprised that Mr Verhofstadt and some others in this House were afraid of those elections. There's no need to be afraid. The majority of British Members being returned will not be of the ilk of those on that side of the House.

(Mixed reactions)

And in any case, Brexit – the European Union losing a Member State for the first time in its history – the consequences of that decision are far more significant than the inconvenience of one Group having a few more Members than another Group in these elections. Have a sense of perspective.

(Applause)

This extension must be used, as Mr Tusk rightly said. I have no great hopes for the talks between the two front benches, because Mrs May cannot move position without a rebellion in her party. But it does give us the time to go back to the people and end this damned mess that we have got ourselves into.

(Applause)

James Nicholson (ECR). – Madam President, can I also identify with the remarks to the French people here this morning and I think we all have a feeling for them at this moment.

The latest development in kicking the can down the road as far as possible just happened last week. Yes, the extension gives the opportunity to really address the real problem and you'll not be surprised, Mr Barnier, I still consider that problem to be the backstop. I'll not change that. It has haunted these negotiations since the beginning and will continue to do so as long as you retain your position. I have to say, the extension to October, I can see no agreement at the end of that time. I really believe now it will take a new Commission. It will take a new Parliament. It will take new views to bring an answer to the end of this problem. My view has always been simply, if you're part of a club, you should be in the club. They cannot be half in the club or half out of it and that is the trouble where the UK found itself.

If I may – Mr Brok has gone – this will be my last speech, not maybe, will be my last speech in this Parliament after 30 years and I want to take the opportunity to say that it has been a great pleasure and honour to represent the people of Northern Ireland in this House for 30 years. There have been some good times and some extremely sad times where we have been through some of the most terrible terrorism ever faced in any part of Europe, and I had to go through that. But it was this House, it was Jacques Delors who stood by the people of Northern Ireland when he brought about – and when Ian Paisley and John Hume and I went to see him back in 1994 at the beginning of the peace process – he asked us, how can Europe help you? And Europe did, with over 2 billion extra funds that touched many people up and down the length and breadth of Northern Ireland.

So, as I say farewell to this Parliament today, I can say I have enjoyed myself. I hope I have given it something and I hope I have represented my people well during my time here because they are a proud people, they are a great people, the people of Northern Ireland.

(Applause)

President. – Thank you very much, Mr Nicholson, and as somebody who worked with you and works with you on the Committee on Agriculture and Rural Development, can I say you have been a very constructive colleague, looking after the interests of those you represent for over thirty years, and we wish you well. We thought your last speech previously was going to be the final one, but you've had an opportunity – a day extra. So, thank you Mr Nicholson, and I am apologising to the time-keepers here. I am in trouble already.

Martina Anderson (GUE/NGL). – Madam President, nothing has changed: London violates the Good Friday Agreement, Dublin continues to leave the North behind, six more months of uncertainty as the British push back on what they agreed in December 2017. Their Brexit violates and involves stripping people of their rights, including the right to vote – a demand that was at the core of the civil rights movement. So we are facing an election that the Tories and the DUP did not want; an election that Fine Gael and Fianna Fáil didn't want the people in the North to vote in.

So let's send a clear message to London, Dublin, and Brussels. Let's pass judgement on this Brexit chaos, on this act of wanton political vandalism. All voters in Ireland, by electing Sinn Féin MEPs, can also take a step towards a democratic way out of this Brexit mess: a step on the democratic pathway back into the EU for the North of Ireland and another sensible, rational, logical step towards Irish unity.

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

Seán Kelly (PPE), blue-card question. – I don't, as you know, normally take issue with colleagues – in fact this is only the second blue card in 10 years in Parliament – but when I hear Ms Anderson saying that Dublin has left the North behind, when everybody knows that the Irish Government did everything possible with our colleagues Michel Barnier and others, how can she say that when Sinn Féin themselves don't take their seats anywhere?

Martina Anderson (GUE/NGL), blue-card answer. – Well, I think you'll find I'm taking my seat here, and Sinn Féin has been very clear with regard to the position of the Dublin government. The Irish Government is only one of a few Member States here in the European Parliament that deprives its Irish rightholders of the right to vote in European elections when they don't reside in their Member State.

You would know, Seán, that in the North of Ireland my mother, my mother's generation and people like that went to London with John Hume to fight for one man, one vote. Your party thought that they could give us Mark Durkan – one man, no vote. You know nothing about ...

(The President cut off the speaker)

Alyn Smith (Verts/ALE). – Madam President, as a Scottish and UK Member, it turns out reports of our demise were greatly exaggerated, but I am grateful to the Council for the time, as President Tusk said, to find a way out of this, and President Tusk – to paraphrase John Lennon – you may say that you're a dreamer, but you're not the only one. There's plenty dreamers in Scotland, there's plenty dreamers in the UK who know that the best Brexit is No Brexit. So thank you for the time to find our way out of this.

(Applause)

But turning to the European elections, which my party is preparing for and looking forward to, I have a warning and a plea – learn the lessons of Brexit. The ingredients of Brexit exists in all our countries. Populism is on the rise. Misinformation, populism is a risk to all of us and I have to say frankly the UK's democracy is in trouble, and I urge you to send international observers to make sure our European elections are properly conducted, because I don't have faith in our domestic authorities. It's proven the leave campaigns lied, it's proven they broke electoral law, data protection law, campaign finance rules, and there is every indication they will do it again. This election is going to be a fight for Europe. It's going to be a flight for international solidarity. My party and Scotland stands ready. You can count on us. I hope that we can count on you also.

(Applause)

Julie Girling (PPE). – Madam President, I'd like to thank everybody here for their patience and statesmanship at the highest level, and I'd like to single out Mr Tusk. I'd like to say to you, I have had so many letters and emails and texts asking me to come and shake your hand and say thank you for what you've done for the UK. You have a cult status now.

Your acceptance of the responsibility of avoiding no deal is in sharp contrast to many politicians in the UK – particularly Conservatives, who have lied, cheated and prevaricated. Indeed, this seems to be an essential element of their CV for party leadership and to be the next Prime Minister. But the work of Mr Barnier, Mr Tusk, Mr Juncker – senior EPP politicians – has given us the chance to vote on 23 May, and we are grateful. We'll use this opportunity to make the case for EU membership. I'll be working with Change UK – brave Westminster colleagues who put country before party – and we will make sure that we deliver a result which will make sure that we indicate it's time for that second referendum and that referendum can take place in September, and by 31 October we will remain.

Seb Dance (S&D). – Madame la Présidente, au nom du peuple de Londres, je souhaiterais exprimer notre profond amour pour la ville de Paris, ainsi que notre admiration pour le courage de ses pompiers. Nous reconstruirons Notre-Dame ensemble.

Brexit is a process and the people over there are denying that process. They deny the fact that when you look at all of the Brexit options available, there are negatives, and no one wants to own those negatives. So it is far easier for them to stand aloof and cry betrayal. But the truth is that Brexit is undeliverable, the one that they promised is undeliverable.

I hope that we have EU elections in the UK so that there is a clear choice between those on that side of the Chamber that cry betrayal at every opportunity and those of us on this side of the Chamber that stand ready to work with our colleagues to build a better Europe, because that's what this place is for – working together for a common future – and we are ready to play our part in that.

(Applause)

Hans-Olaf Henkel (ECR). – Madam President, I travelled with my bicycle via Luxembourg and Belgium for the very first time to Paris, and I went into the church which burned down yesterday, and when I looked at it on the television, I had tears in my eyes. President Tusk, you mentioned that Gdańsk was reconstructed. Let me give you another example of a successful reconstruction: the Church of Our Lady in Dresden. It was reconstructed with the help of the British, of people from Coventry. I would like to support what Mr González Pons said earlier, that it should be a joint project to help to reconstruct that church in Paris. I think this Parliament should declare that this is a priority number one for the next legislature: to reconstruct this church.

Mr Tusk, you also said that it should be done by all 28 nations. Now the answer must come from London – I heard it from you, and from President Tusk and others. But I think there's something you can do so that you get the right answer from London. You can make sure that Britain remains a participant in the reconstruction of the church in Paris under the auspices of the European Union. Make sure Britain stays a member of the European Union.

Danuta Maria Hübner (PPE). – Madam President, for the European leaders the new Brexit deadline was a difficult choice to make, but openness and constructiveness have won. Now it's up to the British side to use this additional time in a constructive way, and I would like to assure Mr Farage that we don't count on him.

Unfortunately – and it has been disappointing for all of us here – over the last week we have heard comments and read tweets from anti-European English politicians about how they are going to sabotage our work in the months to come. Those politicians deserve to be told that we will not allow for that. We will protect the European Union and its citizens. The EU will continue to be the source of stability, also for this absurd and sad process of Brexit.

Unfortunately, on the British side there is no sign that a cross-party breakthrough is near. However, what is absolutely clear now is that the real problem is not the backstop. The real problem is the future. So maybe a solution is around the corner. What is needed, however, from UK politics is to define what it really wants.

Seán Kelly (PPE). – Madam President, firstly my sympathy as well, on behalf of the Irish Government, on the destruction of the iconic Notre-Dame.

As regards Brexit, it could be summarised as: the plot thickens, the uncertainty remains, and the people suffer. That is definitely the situation in my country in relation to businesses affected by Brexit and, for instance, farmers who are taking EUR 100-200 less per animal now than they were last year directly because of the uncertainty of Brexit. So hopefully, Theresa May and Jeremy Corbyn can come to an agreement, but that seems to be doubtful. If they don't, a decisive decision has to be made to postpone Brexit indefinitely. We have to retain certainty.

It is also affecting my constituency. We were to elect five Members of the European Parliament, but it now seems that we are electing four. But we can't actually blame the British for that. It's our own fault, because I asked two years ago that we shouldn't distribute any seats until the British had left, because it was discourteous to them and also there was a possibility – remote, as it seemed – that they might not go on 29 March. My words have come to pass, so now we are in a bit of a mess. But let's get over it and let's end Brexit if no decision is taken to agree the Withdrawal Agreement this week.

Catch-the-eye procedure

Paulo Rangel (PPE). – Senhora Presidente, eu gostaria de dizer que é com gosto que vejo que o Conselho Europeu e as instituições europeias mostraram flexibilidade com o Reino Unido como eu aqui tinha pedido. É com gosto que vejo também que o Reino Unido está disponível para organizar eleições europeias e, portanto, que existe alguma possibilidade de o povo britânico vir no futuro a decidir pela manutenção na União Europeia.

Em todo o caso, queria deixar claro: esta decisão continua a criar enorme instabilidade nas pessoas, nas empresas, eu diria nos Estados em geral. E, portanto, eu pedia muito à Comissão Europeia e aos governos nacionais para fazerem tudo o que têm ao seu alcance para poderem dar expetativas, certezas, às pessoas que estão a sofrer com esta indecisão provocada pelo Parlamento britânico e pelas suas decisões.

Ana Gomes (S&D). – Madame la Présidente, nous sommes tous très tristes pour la France et pour l'humanité, parce que Notre-Dame, c'est l'humanité qui l'a bâtie et c'est l'humanité qui va la reconstruire.

I would like to say that I regret that the Council has not set in the agenda for Britain the obligation to go for a people's vote. It's the way, the democratic way, to sort out the mess. It's the way to prevent indeed that Britain will get out of the European Union and I trust that that message will now be given to the British people, to the British parties, from all those responsible in EU governments and that we will indeed as well address the causes of the alienation felt by many citizens that is not just behind Brexit, but as well the divorce of many of our citizens from this Union that we need absolutely to reform and rebuild.

Ana Miranda (Verts/ALE). – Senhora Presidente, este domingo fui a Londres. Ali estive com a comunidade galega, que é muito numerosa, que vive no Reino Unido. Têm incertezas, incertezas quanto à livre circulação de pessoas, incertezas quanto aos serviços, incertezas também quanto à questão dos medicamentos. Trabalham, vivem e estudam no Reino Unido. Sentem-se europeus e europeias e não sabem o que vai acontecer.

O que dizer também, Presidente Tusk e Presidente Juncker, da política das pescas e dos serviços? A flexibilidade de que se fala hoje aqui neste derradeiro plenário desta legislatura é a nossa obrigação, como deputados europeus, a flexibilidade para dar também às pessoas que vivem no Reino Unido, e que se sentem europeias, certezas.

Juan Fernando López Aguilar (S&D). – Señora presidenta, presidente Juncker, *Europe has to move on*, Europa tiene que seguir adelante y concentrarse por fin, después del hartazgo del *Brexit*, en lo que nos une, como el sentimiento de devastación ante el fuego de Notre-Dame de París, de Francia y de Europa.

El 26 de mayo vamos a una elección decisiva, existencial para la Unión Europea. Y añade todavía más incertidumbre y dificultad la duda sobre su composición y sobre su funcionamiento, sobre la participación del Reino Unido en las próximas elecciones europeas.

Y no veo la hora de que respondan por ello, no solamente los incompetentes, incapaces de alcanzar un acuerdo en la Cámara de los Comunes, sino los demagogos frívolos, que llevan veinte años en el Parlamento Europeo defendiendo la causa contra la Unión Europea.

Y no veo la hora de que el 26 de mayo los europeístas derroten con contundencia la demagogia de la eurofobia, no solamente en el Reino Unido sino en el conjunto de la Unión Europea.

Paul Brannen (S&D). – Madam President, for the hour is late, and the time is short. The European Union was built out of the nightmare of the Second World War and it was a dream born of that nightmare that created the place in which we are today. So I endorse President Tusk's comments that we still need dreamers.

In the words of T. E. Lawrence, 'All men dream: but not equally. Those who dream by night in the dusty recesses of their minds wake in the day to find it was vanity, but the dreamers of the day are dangerous men, for they may act their dreams with open eyes, to make it possible.' For the hour is late and the time is short.

So dream on, President Tusk, dream on. Dream on, remainers, dream on. Then act on those dreams and make them possible. We can remain. We will remain.

(Applause)

Gunnar Hökmark (PPE). – Madam President, I think this whole debate shows one thing and that is the strength of European unity. The problems in Westminster are caused by the fact that belonging to the European Union means a lot for a society and it is difficult to break up. I must say, and I will give him credit for that, Mr Farage is a funny person, but he is just funny. You have never seriously contributed to European security, to economic growth in Europe, to open markets in Europe. You have been funny all the time, and why should we be afraid of you? You are trying to make us afraid of people like you coming back. Well you're just a funny clerk at the court. We like to listen to you sometimes, but we really don't listen to what you say, because what you say has no real meaning for the unity of Europe or for the people of Europe, you are just funny and we are not afraid of you and I hope that the United Kingdom can stay in a United European Union.

(Applause)

(End of catch-the-eye procedure)

Jean-Claude Juncker, *Präsident der Kommission*. – Frau Präsidentin, meine sehr verehrten Damen und Herren! Ich ergreife das Wort, um mich nach jahrelanger gemeinsamer Wanderung hier in Straßburg bei den Mitgliedern dieses Hauses zu bedanken, bei diesem Parlament. Ich werde auch noch am Anfang der Tätigkeit des nächsten Parlaments hier sein, aber ich werde in diesem neuen Parlament meinen guten Freund Elmar Brok sehr vermissen. Ich bin mit ihm 40 Jahre lang durch dick und dünn gegangen, wir haben gestritten, wir haben uns geeinigt, wir haben gelacht, manchmal auch geweint. Es war schön mit Dir, Elmar, vielen Dank!

Donald Tusk, *President of the European Council*. – Madam President, I have just one remark. For many weeks now, the participation of the UK in the elections to the European Parliament has evoked emotions, especially in this Chamber. I want to remind everybody that the UK has the right and obligation to take part in this election as long as it is a member of the EU. This is not subject to negotiation. I also can't agree to establishing a second-category membership.

I understand party interests, but they cannot overshadow the legal reality. Mr Verhofstadt was heartily and energetically applauded by Mr Farage. This is a good enough reason for you, Mr Verhofstadt, to deeply re-think and reformulate your argumentation.

(Applause)

President. – The debate is closed.

Written statements (Rule 162)

Carlos Zorrinho (S&D), *por escrito*. – O debate sobre as conclusões do Conselho Europeu de 10 de abril sobre a saída do Reino Unido da UE foi marcado por um profundo sentido de tristeza decorrente da destruição na véspera, pelo fogo, da Catedral de Notre Dame em Paris. O compromisso assumido pelo Conselho Europeu de que a sua reconstrução será uma tarefa partilhada por todos os Membros da UE mostra a força política, económica, social e cultural da parceria. Uma parceria que o Reino Unido mostrou intenção de deixar, após um referendo.

A UE definiu de forma robusta um quadro de saída com um acordo a que até agora as instituições britânicas não conseguiram aprovar nem propor alternativa. A prorrogação do tempo de saída para 31 de outubro foi mais uma manifestação de boa vontade da UE. Se aceitar o acordo até 22 de maio, o RU deixará a UE. Se o não fizer, então o Reino Unido deverá realizar eleições europeias no calendário e os seus eurodeputados deverão manter a plenitude das suas funções até ao momento da eventual saída. A UE não pode ficar suspensa da indefinição britânica. Definidas as regras, os Britânicos têm que se decidir.

(The session was suspended for a few moments)

5. Przejrzyste i przewidywalne warunki pracy w Unii Europejskiej (debata)

President. – The next item is the debate on the report by Enrique Calvet Chambon, on behalf of the Committee on Employment and Social Affairs, on the proposal for a directive of the European Parliament and of the Council on transparent and predictable working conditions in the European Union (COM(2017)0797 – C8-0006/2018 – 2017/0355(COD)) (A8-0355/2018).

Enrique Calvet Chambon, *ponente*. – Señora presidenta, *Madame la Commissaire —de nouveau ravi de vous avoir parmi nous—*, señorías, me cabe el honor de presentar aquí el trabajo de todo un equipo al que agradezco la colaboración denodada durante meses, pero bajo presión temporal, para sacar o proponer sacar una Directiva que, de alguna manera, desarrolla una Directiva anterior, de hace veintiocho años, y que va mucho más allá.

Empezaré destacando la importancia política de esta Directiva en este momento. Esta Directiva se inscribe en el desarrollo del pilar social que este Parlamento siempre tendrá el honor de haber proclamado en Gotemburgo el año pasado.

Es un primer paso —yo diría de gigante— para la implementación práctica y concreta de los derechos que se recogen en el pilar social y, en ese sentido, es una Directiva que afecta a todos los trabajadores de la Unión Europea y, por lo tanto, a todos los ciudadanos que generalmente están o preparándose para el trabajo o trabajando —si pueden— o gozando de los derechos que adquirieron mientras trabajaban. Por lo tanto, afecta a quinientos millones de ciudadanos europeos que están llamados a las urnas dentro de un mes. De ahí también la importancia de que en esta legislatura se apruebe esta Directiva de equilibrio que ha habido que encontrar entre todas las fuerzas.

Esta Directiva —que quede muy claro— lo que hace es establecer unos «derechos mínimos» iguales para todos los trabajadores de Europa: «derechos mínimos». No establece leyes, no establece métodos, no establece concreciones de aplicación, porque eso lo harán los Estados miembros. Que quede muy claro: no hay ninguna injerencia en el principio de subsidiariedad; lo que establece son «derechos» y «mínimos» para que en Europa se pueda hablar de una Europa social donde desarrollar la vida profesional.

Su contenido es en lo que menos me puedo detener porque es lo que más conocen y han leído ustedes: se dan unos derechos de información muy, muy mejorados con respecto a la Directiva de 1991; se dan unos derechos de no abuso, de no abuso de los períodos de prueba; y derechos de formación, que son absolutamente universales en Europa a partir de ahora o a partir de cuando se transponga, pero que ya son referencia.

Y la gran aportación de este texto: se dan derechos sustantivos particularmente dirigidos a todas las nuevas formas de contratación —*on demand*, plataformas, lo que se llama trabajo precario, todo lo que ustedes quieran—. Todos estos trabajadores, que ahora están en una especie de limbo que les priva de derechos, a partir de ahora tendrán la referencia del Tribunal de Justicia de la Unión Europea y la referencia de esta Directiva para que nadie pueda abusar ni sobreexplotar la indispensable flexibilidad que se reconoce.

Tiene también su importancia esta Directiva en el caso del *level playing field* —una cosa que no se nota o que no se dice tanto—, es decir, asegura que ese famoso fantasma del dumping social nunca se hará a costa de un mínimo de calidad de vida de los trabajadores, puesto que este será el mismo en toda Europa.

Por favor, tengan en cuenta que estamos fabricando Europa —que ayer sufrió una destrucción lamentable— y concretamente la Europa social.

Muchas gracias a todos los que me han ayudado en este trabajo.

PRÉSIDENTE: SYLVIE GUILLAUME

Vice-présidente

Marianne Thyssen, *Member of the Commission*. – Madam President, I am very happy to be here with you before the vote on this directive, one of the key deliverables of the European pillar of social rights. I would like to thank the rapporteur Mr Calvet Chambon, for bringing this file to a swift and successful conclusion.

We have been under considerable time constraints to close this file during the current parliamentary term. Reaching a provisional agreement would not have been possible without goodwill and cooperation both from Parliament and the Council and not without the rapporteur's tireless commitment to seek a good compromise text during the negotiations.

The proposed directive is a significant achievement for social Europe. With the directive we will provide 200 million workers across Europe with more transparent and predictable working conditions. We are modernising European labour law and adjusting it to the new world of work. As Members of this Parliament know, today a growing number of workers, and in particular young and female workers, are in atypical forms of employment with often very flexible contracts. This is why we needed to find the right balance. We must ensure protection for workers without overburdening employers and without stifling innovation, and that is exactly what we have done with the proposed directive.

With the new rules in place we will first of all ensure more transparency. All workers in the EU will receive information on key working conditions. Workers will know at the beginning of their employment – this means within the first week – what their basic rights and obligations are. This includes information on their remuneration, their working schedule and the duration of their contracts, and thanks to Parliament, extra information for temporary agency workers.

Around two to three million workers that so far were excluded will now be covered. This includes platform workers, domestic workers, voucher workers, workers on zero-hour contracts and other short-term workers.

However, we do not stop at information rights. The directive also provides completely new substantive rights, like, for example, a limitation on probation periods, a ban on unjustified exclusivity clauses, a right for workers on on-demand contracts to know within which time slots they can be called to work and thanks to this Parliament, a right to compensation if an employer cancels a work assignment on short notice and measures to prevent abuse of on-demand contracts. And there is also the principle that mandatory training should be cost-free to the worker and, again thanks to Parliament, that it should count as working time.

All in all, what you are voting on today is a substantial improvement in the working conditions for all EU workers. We are breaking new ground with this directive and it will therefore be extremely important that we get the implementation right. The Commission will work closely with national authorities to ensure the final objective: concrete rights for precarious workers, without unnecessary red tape for business.

Maria Arena, *rapporteuse pour avis de la commission des droits de la femme et de l'égalité des genres*. – Madame la Présidente, Madame la Commissaire, aujourd'hui, en Europe, plus de quatre millions de personnes travaillent avec des contrats qui les couvrent pour moins de huit heures par semaine. 1,6 million ont un contrat à durée déterminée d'une durée inférieure à un mois. Six millions sont à temps partiel non choisi. Et, parmi toutes ces personnes, les femmes sont finalement les plus vulnérables face à l'emploi précaire. Malheureusement, cette tendance se renforce: les emplois qui ont été créés depuis la crise de 2008 sont souvent, trop souvent, des emplois précaires, mal payés, mal protégés, qui ne donnent aucune perspective à ces travailleurs et travailleuses. Ces travailleurs sont incapables de se projeter à moyen terme, incapables d'obtenir un prêt bancaire, incapables d'organiser leur vie, tout simplement.

Le texte que nous adopterons aujourd'hui a sans doute pour objectif d'améliorer la situation, de garantir une meilleure protection et, surtout, une plus grande transparence et plus d'informations dans les contrats de travail en Europe. C'est bien entendu une avancée, Madame la Commissaire, vous l'avez dit. Mais il est regrettable que les États membres aient exclu de la directive les contrats de travail de moins de douze heures par mois. Il est regrettable que les États membres aient été incapables de s'accorder sur l'interdiction pure et simple des contrats «zéro heure».

Je dirais donc que l'Europe a proposé une avancée. C'est toutefois une directive minimale, comme nous l'avons dit; les États membres devront être plus ambitieux en matière de protection des travailleurs, si nous voulons que ces travailleurs et ces travailleuses adhèrent à l'idée européenne.

Dennis Radtke, *im Namen der PPE-Fraktion*. – Frau Präsidentin, Frau Kommissarin, liebe Kolleginnen und Kollegen! Ich bin stolz auf das vorliegende Ergebnis. Es ist im Endergebnis sicherlich ein Kompromiss, der typisch ist für die Arbeit hier in unserem Haus. Ein guter Kompromiss zeichnet sich ja dadurch aus, dass am Ende jeder, der daran mitgewirkt hat, vielleicht ein oder zwei Punkte hat, wo er sagt: Das hätte ich mir vielleicht anders gewünscht oder hier hätte ich gerne einen Akzent anders gesetzt. Aber im Endergebnis haben wir ja doch mit einer großen Mehrheit auch im Ausschuss gesagt, dass das hier insgesamt in die richtige Richtung geht.

Und ich will für die EVP-Fraktion drei Punkte herausstellen, die auch mir in meiner Arbeit als Schattenberichterstatter sehr wichtig gewesen sind. Erstens: Wir haben durch die neue Richtlinie ein Mehr an Arbeitnehmerrechten und mehr Schutz vor allen Dingen für prekär Beschäftigte. Zweitens – die Kommissarin hat darauf hingewiesen: Der bürokratische Mehraufwand für Unternehmer und den Mittelstand hält sich wirklich in überschaubaren Grenzen, sodass wir hier wirklich sagen können, wir haben hier auch einen echten Ausgleich von Interessen vorgenommen. Und drittens – das ist gerade uns als Fraktion auch sehr wichtig gewesen: Es ist uns gelungen, dass die Legaldefinition des Arbeitnehmerbegriffes, die die Kommission vorgeschlagen hatte, nun nicht im Text enthalten ist, sondern dass diese Definition weiterhin durch die Mitgliedstaaten vorgenommen wird. Eine einheitliche Definition auf europäischer Ebene hätte mehr rechtliche Unsicherheit als rechtliche Sicherheit bewirkt.

Ich will als deutscher Abgeordneter auch sagen: Auch diese Richtlinie wird die Situation von Arbeitnehmern in meinem Heimatland verbessern – mein Heimatland, das an vielen Stellen ja berühmt ist für den Schutz von Arbeitnehmerrechten. Aber auch in meiner deutschen Heimat ist die Tarifbindung beispielsweise nur noch bei 52 Prozent. Das heißt, auch Millionen Arbeitnehmer in Deutschland werden von dieser Richtlinie profitieren.

Was mich im Wahlkampf irritiert: Wenn Sozialdemokraten, Grüne und Linke davon sprechen, dies sei ein Europa der Banken und der Unternehmen. Da kann ich nur sagen: Wo sind Sie in den letzten fünf Jahren gewesen? Dies ein wichtiger Beitrag zum sozialen Europa, und ich bin stolz, daran mitgewirkt zu haben.

Javi López, *en nombre del Grupo S&D*. – Señora presidenta, hoy aprobamos la Directiva relativa a unas condiciones laborales transparentes y previsibles en la Unión Europea, una norma que permitirá proteger a más de doscientos millones de trabajadores europeos, que mejorará las condiciones de trabajo de aquellos que sufren trabajos precarios especialmente —con contratos atípicos, mal pagados y con malas condiciones— generando garantías y seguridad.

Esta Directiva, además, cubrirá y protegerá a los trabajadores en plataforma, los trabajadores en plataformas digitales, que hoy tienen en muchos Estados miembros legislación ineficiente para protegerles socialmente. Incluye medidas relevantes para combatir los abusos que se dan en los contratos de cero horas o los trabajos según demanda.

Hay que agradecer y reconocer el trabajo hecho por la Comisión Europea, y especialmente por nuestra comisaria de Empleo y Asuntos Sociales, Thyssen, por el Parlamento Europeo y los que hemos sido responsables de este dossier, y por la presidencia del Consejo, la Presidencia rumana, que a contrarreloj hemos podido sacar hacia adelante, en este último Pleno, una directiva que da forma al pilar europeo de derechos sociales.

Porque hay que decir que hoy no aprobamos solo una norma. Hoy mostramos un camino, señalamos un camino para Europa. Una Europa útil que protege, que recupera y reivindica su alma social, que hace del pilar europeo de derechos sociales una realidad, no solo una lista de buenas intenciones, y que quiere que aterrice en normas, herramientas y presupuesto. ¿Por qué?

Porque hoy la dimensión social europea no es la consecuencia de la integración. Hoy es la condición previa para la integración en Europa. Necesitamos amortiguar y combatir las desigualdades. Tenemos que proteger a los desamparados por la globalización y generar seguridad económica y certidumbre en el mercado laboral. Es la única forma de proteger y cuidar de una frágil democracia europea.

Anthea McIntyre, *on behalf of the ECR Group*. – Madam President, throughout my time here in the Parliament and in the Committee on Employment and Social Affairs (EMPL), I've championed the Better Regulation Agenda, and this, my friends, is not better regulation.

In a mad rush to conclude legislation at any cost, we've abandoned our commitment to the Parliament text on this Directive. We had clear wording to exclude the self-employed from the Directive, but this was watered down to a little recital, not legally binding. How can the EPP support that? How can the S&D support a text which still allows the abuse of pilots in the pay-to-fly for training? Across the political spectrum, we agreed that workers' rights and workers' safety should be protected, whether you work for a large company or a small company, whether you work in the public sector or the private sector. But the trilogue text exempts civil servants, it exempts firefighters, emergency services, police authorities, judges and prosecutors, it undermines the political message, and it allows Member States to exempt themselves. This does a real disservice to this Parliament.

Paloma López Bermejo, *en nombre del Grupo GUE/NGL*. – Señora presidenta, quiero agradecer al ponente el trabajo realizado y, al mismo tiempo, lamentar que el Consejo, una vez más, haya bloqueado cualquier avance en los derechos de las trabajadoras y los trabajadores europeos.

El mandato del Parlamento aseguraba derechos a los trabajadores con condiciones más precarias y el texto que vamos a votar les ha dejado prácticamente sin ningún tipo de protección. Se ha excluido a los servicios de emergencia, a los cuerpos de seguridad, a los funcionarios, a los trabajadores del mar, a las trabajadoras del hogar en determinadas condiciones y a quienes tienen contratos de menos de doce horas mensuales, entre muchos otros trabajadores.

Como dicen los sindicatos, esas exenciones son discriminatorias y un precedente peligroso con respecto al enfoque de derechos mínimos de la Unión Europea que, por definición, debe ser universal. Se ha vuelto a perder la oportunidad de construir una Europa social que reclaman los trabajadores.

Pero lo que se pone encima de la mesa es un problema mucho más profundo, y es el entramado institucional de la Unión Europea, donde el Consejo —los Estados miembros— bloquea de forma permanente las decisiones del Parlamento Europeo, que es el que votan los ciudadanos.

Ustedes son los que contribuyen a ampliar la desafección ciudadana en las instituciones y, con ello, el avance de la extrema derecha. Cuando pretendan corregir el rumbo, lo mismo ya llegan demasiado tarde.

Jean Lambert, *on behalf of the Verts/ALE Group*. – Madam President, like some of the other speakers, my group feels that this has been a real missed opportunity to fully modernise the Written Statement Directive. Of course we can welcome measures such as the increased and better information contract at an earlier point, the compensation for cancelled on-demand work, but we do have problems about the definition of ‘worker’ and that the variants with the different Member States means that we’re undermining a certainty there. We also have grave problems in accepting the right of Member States to cover fewer workers in terms of the scope, not least the exemptions as has just been referred to, for example in the public services, emergency services, loopholes round household workers, when at the same time we are also urging Member States to invest in good public services as a key component of social Europe, and I’m not sure how this also works for workers who work multiple jobs, all on short-hours contracts. So we think, as others have said, that Council here could have followed the European Parliament, it could have followed the Commission, on putting in real strong, sound substance to help build social Europe, but what Council has given with one hand it has taken away with another.

Joëlle Mélin, *au nom du groupe ENF*. – Madame la Présidente, assurer des conditions de travail prévisibles et transparentes, c’est-à-dire la stabilité du contrat de travail pour intégrer au mieux les nouvelles formes d’emploi, est un défi de taille pour tous nos pays.

Les entreprises, les employeurs et les législateurs nationaux doivent faire face à une évolution extrêmement rapide et brutale du marché du travail. Les nouvelles formes d’emploi, dites «atypiques», se multiplient à une telle vitesse que depuis 2014, c’est 20 % des emplois créés qui correspondent à cette catégorie.

Il est de notre responsabilité de prendre les devants et d’encadrer ces nouvelles pratiques. Il nous faut aussi prévenir des pratiques potentiellement abusives dans le travail domestique, dans le travail à temps partiel marginal, parfois de très courte durée, le travail basé sur des chèques et surtout le travail lié aux plateformes numériques. Car la législation est trop souvent à la remorque des évolutions sociétales.

Lors de l’élaboration de ce texte, encore insuffisant, certes, j’ai, au nom de mon groupe ENL, fait des propositions et apporté mon soutien à certaines propositions concrètes du rapporteur. Il est indispensable que tous nos concitoyens soient protégés de la même manière, quelle que soit la précarité de leur emploi.

N’oublions pas que la paupérisation généralisée de l’Europe, à laquelle les politiques de l’Union européenne ne sont bien évidemment pas étrangères, est à l’origine de cette myriade de mini-jobs et de la précarité qui en découle. C’est la fragilité de nos entreprises qui provoque l’instabilité de l’emploi. Si je m’oppose à ce modèle qu’on cherche à nous imposer, je sais aussi qu’il faut pallier des situations plus urgentes. L’Union européenne tente aujourd’hui d’estomper ou de réparer les conséquences des dégâts qu’elle a elle-même provoqués en partie. Dans le respect de la souveraineté de chaque État membre, l’objectif de notre groupe est de promouvoir un emploi sûr et plus prévisible, tout en améliorant les conditions de vie et de travail.

Zoltán Balczó (NI). – Tisztelt Elnök Asszony! 2017. novemberében Göteborgban kihirdették a szociális jogok európai pilléréről szóló megállapodást, amit minden ország állam és kormányfője aláírt. A ma tárgyalt jogszabályok ennek a pillérnek az építését kezdik meg. Az unióban részletes szabályokat hoztak az egységes piac megfelelő működése érdekében. Itt az ideje annak, hogy kialakítsuk a munkavállalói jogokra vonatkozó minimális szabályokat. A jelentés külön foglalkozik a változó munkaidőbeosztású személyekkel. Kiemeli, hogy a verseny nem áthatja alá a munkavállalók alapvető jogait. Mégis, ma ezt tapasztalhatjuk például Magyarországon. A kormánypártok által megszavazott túllátótvény, amit a köznyelv egyszerűen csak rabszolgatörvénynek nevez, a globális cégek érdekeit szolgálja. Ez ellentétes az európai szociális modellel, amelyik deklaráltnan szeretné megakadályozni a munkavállalók kizsákmányolását az új, rugalmasabb foglalkoztatási formák esetében is.

David Casa (PPE). – Sinjura President, niringrazzja l-ewwel nett lir-Rapporteur ghal dan ix-xoghol illi ghandna quddiemna ghaliex matul is-snin ix-xoghol inbidel u issa ahna rridu nadattaw ghal din ir-realtà ġdida u biex naslu ghal dan, ir-regoli tal-Unjoni Ewropea jridu jkunu aġġornati u modernizzati. Dan hu pass żgħir, imma pass iehor biex noholqu Ewropa soċjali illi ilna nahdmu ghaliha, speċjalment f'dawn l-aħhar hames snin, u hawn irrid niringrazzja lill-Kummissarju Marianne Thyssen kif ukoll lill-President Jean-Claude Juncker u flimkien mal-membri ta' din il-kamra, speċjalment lill-Kumitat tal-Affarijiet Soċjali, l-Affarijiet tax-Xoghol ghamilna hilitna kollha biex inhallu l-Ewropa iktar soċjali milli hija llum.

U din id-Direttiva li ghandna quddiemna, din id-dikjarazzjoni, hija bżonjuża ghaliex illum ix-xoghol hu diġitali u ghandna tipi ta' kuntratti ġodda u anki forom differenti ta' impjegi. Ir-realtà hi li l-kuntratti "short term", qosra, kuntratti maghrufa bhala "zero hours" u kuntratti "on demand" infirxu kullimkien, u issa din id-Direttiva qiegħda tagħmel indirizz fuq dan it-tip ta' kuntratti. U allura ahna ghandna issa mod ta' kif niproteġu iktar lill-haddiema, fuq dawk li qed jahdmu fuq pjattaformi diġitali. U allura ghal darba ohra niringrazzja lil dawk kollha li kienu involuti biex illum ghandna dan id-dokument quddiemna.

Czesław Hoc (ECR). – Pani Przewodnicząca! Unijna dyrektywa w sprawie przejrzystych i przewidywalnych warunków pracy w Unii Europejskiej to ciekawe dossier. Promowanie i budowanie bezpieczniejszego i bardziej przewidywalnego zatrudnienia, a równocześnie zapewnienie zdolności adaptacji rynku pracy oraz poprawa warunków życia i pracy wszystkich pracowników to fundament podmiotowości pracownika. Poczucie pewności na rynku pracy i bezpieczeństwa ochrony prawnej pracownika, w tym pracowników zatrudnionych na umowach niestandardowych, to klucz do jego zadowolenia, a zadowolony pracownik to z kolei najlepsza wizytówka i PR firmy, zatem korzyści obopólne i dające perspektywę rozwoju i satysfakcji obu stronom. Ale czy owe zasady są zapewnione w tym dokumencie? Otóż – niezupełnie. Zatem w praktyce należy zadbać, by owe rozwiązania były roztropne, racjonalne i proporcjonalne, by zachowały zdolność adaptacji i innowacyjności rynku pracy oraz unikały nakładania nadmiernych obciążeń na małe i średnie przedsiębiorstwa, a szczególnie na mikroprzedsiębiorstwa.

Ernest Urtasun (Verts/ALE). – Señora presidenta, a pesar del buen trabajo del Parlamento —y que quiero agradecer a las personas que se han dedicado a este dossier— el Consejo ha diluido elementos clave de esta pieza legislativa fundamental para la Europa social.

Hemos perdido una definición incluyente y exhaustiva de qué es un trabajador o trabajadora, y el texto final ofrece también grandes posibilidades para que los Estados miembros otorguen exenciones para todos los trabajadores que trabajan menos de doce horas al mes y también para una larga lista de profesiones, como han denunciado los sindicatos.

Además, solo se exige la existencia de un contrato por escrito a partir del séptimo día, y en la práctica esto significa que, para los que contraten en negro, un trabajador solo habrá estado allí seis días cuando el inspector de trabajo se presente.

Finalmente, como se ha dicho, tampoco se prohíben los vergonzosos contratos de cero horas que sufren muchos de nuestros conciudadanos. La realidad es que una creciente legión de trabajadores y trabajadoras que hoy trabajan en precario no quedan suficientemente protegidos.

La Europa social merece ambición y convicción, y no el regate permanente y exasperante al que nos tiene acostumbrados el Consejo, a pesar de las reiteradas peticiones del Parlamento Europeo.

Σωτήριος Ζαριανόπουλος (NI). – Κυρία Πρόεδρε, οδηγία γνωστοποίησης των όρων εργασίας στους εργαζόμενους, όχι απλά κοροϊδία περί δήθεν κοινωνικής Ευρώπης. Μέσα από το ελάχιστο νομιμοποιείτε το χειρότερο. Δεν δίνετε δικαιώματα στον εργαζόμενο· στους εργοδότες δίνετε. Αρκεί να ενημερώνουν, βέβαια, πασάροντας ένα ραβασάκι για τους όρους της εργασιακής ζούγκλας. Νομιμοποιείτε τις πιο βάρβαρες μορφές εργασίας, όπως συμβάσεις μηδενικών ωρών, προστατεύοντας την ευελιξία των εργοδοτών —όπως λέτε— και αποκλείετε χιλιάδες οικιακούς βοηθούς, ναυτεργάτες, κ.α., ακόμα και από αυτό.

Ίδού ο ευρωπαϊκός κοινωνικός πυλώνας που ψήφισαν ΣΥΡΙΖΑ, Νέα Δημοκρατία και ΠΑΣΟΚ. Η Ευρωπαϊκή Ένωση μόνο προς το χειρότερο αλλάζει, διότι δεν αλλάζουν τα μονοπώλια που την έστησαν. Στις ερχόμενες ευρωεκλογές η λαϊκή δυσαρέσκεια να μην εγκλωβιστεί σε υποσχέσεις βελτίωσής της, Σοσιαλδημοκρατών τύπου ΣΥΡΙΖΑ και άλλων, ούτε και στον ευρωσκεπτικιστικό εθνικισμό για τα συμφέροντα των εκμεταλλευτών κάθε κράτους ξεχωριστά. Να βρει ο λαός τον δικό του δρόμο, τον ταξικό, με ενίσχυση όσων στοχεύουν στην καρδιά του θηρίου, τον καπιταλισμό, την Ευρωπαϊκή του Ένωση, τα μονοπώλια σε κάθε κράτος, και με ενίσχυση του Κομμουνιστικού Κόμματος Ελλάδας.

Agnieszka Kozłowska-Rajewicz (PPE). – Pani Przewodnicząca! Pani Komisarz! Szanowni Państwo! Przede wszystkim gratuluję konsekwencji, z jaką Komisja Europejska, za sprawą komisarz Thyssen, wprowadza kolejne regulacje, które materializują Europejski filar praw socjalnych.

Nowa dyrektywa o przejrzystych i przewidywalnych warunkach pracy jest ważna dla wszystkich pracowników Unii Europejskiej, ale szczególnie dla tych, którzy podejmują pracę na podstawie tak zwanych niestandardowych czy nietypowych umów. Chodzi o pracę dorywczą, na żądanie, na zlecenie, w systemie czekowym, za pośrednictwem platform internetowych itd. Już dziś jedna czwarta obywateli Unii Europejskiej pracuje w ten sposób, a połowa nowo powstałych miejsc pracy w ostatnich latach ma właśnie charakter takich umów nietypowych czy niestandardowych.

Ci pracownicy nie podlegają dotychczasowej dyrektywie o obowiązku informowania pracowników o warunkach zatrudnienia. Dlatego nowa dyrektywa jest bardzo ważna i daje pracownikom dodatkowe prawa, to znaczy mają oni otrzymywać szersze informacje, bardziej precyzyjne i mają otrzymywać je szybciej. Przede wszystkim jednak ta dyrektywa obejmie bardzo dużą część z rosnącej rzeszy pracowników na tych nietypowych, niestandardowych kontraktach. Tylko osoby, które pracują mniej niż dwanaście godzin miesięcznie, nie będą podlegały tej dyrektywie. Jest to rewolucja, na której skorzystają szczególnie kobiety, gdyż to one zasilają gros prekariackich stanowisk na rynku pracy.

Pani Komisarz, potrzebujemy inteligentnego połączenia elastyczności zatrudnienia z przewidywalnością pracy, bo tylko przewidywalność daje pracownikom poczucie jakiegoś minimalnego bezpieczeństwa.

Brando Benifei (S&D). – Signora Presidente, onorevoli colleghi, il numero di cittadini europei che sono impiegati in forme di lavoro precario è in aumento anche a causa della rapida espansione di nuovi settori dell'economia, delle piattaforme digitali. Chi ne soffre maggiormente sono, ancora una volta, i più giovani e le donne, spesso intrappolati in quelle forme di lavoro cosiddette atipiche, a volte fraudolente, tra cui il falso lavoro autonomo o i contratti a zero ore.

La direttiva che votiamo oggi migliora nettamente la normativa europea in vigore, offrendo ai lavoratori maggiore trasparenza e certezza sulle loro condizioni di lavoro e nuovi diritti fruibili per oltre duecento milioni di lavoratori. Bisogna tuttavia fare di più. Il mio gruppo politico, quello dei Socialisti e Democratici continuerà a richiedere una direttiva quadro sulle condizioni di lavoro dignitose in tutte le forme di occupazione.

Sono determinato inoltre a portare avanti una battaglia fondamentale: mettere al bando gli stage non retribuiti in tutta l'Unione europea, come siamo riusciti a fare all'interno del Parlamento europeo, dopo tre anni di battaglie. Le cose si possono e si devono cambiare.

Arne Gericke (ECR). – Frau Präsidentin, werte Frau Kommissarin! Von Teilzeit sind zum großen Teil Frauen betroffen, ganz besonders sind es aber die Mütter. Das ist familienfeindliche Politik, denn gerade hier im Beschäftigungsbereich hätte man sie mit einbinden können. Erziehungsleistung als Arbeit anerkennen – Arbeit, die in Krippen, Kindergärten, Kinderheimen und in ähnlichen Bereichen bezahlt wird; ein Erziehungsgehalt, das sich am Mindestlohn des jeweiligen Mitgliedstaats orientiert; gegen die Rentenlücke, für die wir im Elternbereich besonders bei Müttern auch in dieser Wahlperiode keine Lösung gefunden haben.

Hier könnte uns Ungarn in besonderer Weise als Muster dienen, wenn es um die Berücksichtigung von Eltern geht. Ich denke, dass wir da in der nächsten Wahlperiode durchaus noch eine große Aufgabe offen haben.

Michaela Šojdrová (PPE). – Paní předsedající, je jasné, že evropská legislativa musí reagovat na změny na vnitřním trhu. Pracovní trh se mění a přibývá flexibilních pracovních úvazků. Na rozdíl od některých kolegů já tomu neříkám prekérní práce. Nemyslím si, že flexibilní úvazky vždy musí vést k vykořisťování zaměstnanců, naopak někteří zaměstnanci preferují i tyto úvazky. Samozřejmě, obecně jde o to, aby práce byla jistá, předvídatelná, a v tomto smyslu podporuji návrh směrnice i tu dohodu, která zde byla předložena.

Děkuji panu zpravodaji, kolegovi Radtkeovi, paní komisařce, že dosáhli nakonec přijatelný kompromis. Především zde bylo již zmíněno, že matkám na rodičovské dovolené to umožní flexibilní úvazky a vrátit se dříve do zaměstnání, skloubit jejich práci s pečovatelskými povinnostmi. Myslím si, že právě sladování pracovního a soukromého života je jednou z priorit, a paní komisařka i v této věci hodně pracovala.

Tedy na flexibilních pracovních úvazcích jsou dnes závislá i některá ekonomická odvětví a my bychom si neměli plést zavádění jistot pro pracovníky s rušením některých druhů úvazků, jako je práce na vyžádání nebo nulový počet hodin. Musíme jít cestou přiměřené regulace a ne zákazu.

Michael Detjen (S&D). – Frau Präsidentin, werte Frau Kommissarin! Ich begrüße die Verbesserungen, die wir erreicht haben. Wir stärken die Mindestrechte von 200 Millionen Beschäftigten, denn wer einen Vertrag hat, kann sich auch darauf berufen. Es ist allerdings beschämend, dass sich Deutschland als wirtschaftlich führendes Land den größten Niedriglohnsektor in Westeuropa leistet.

Es ist gut, dass wir diesen prekär Beschäftigten mehr Rechte geben. So soll der Arbeitsvertrag vor dem ersten Arbeitstag, spätestens jedoch nach einer Woche vorliegen. Dass Arbeitgeber künftig, wenn sie einen Vertrag nicht entfristen, nach einem halben Jahr begründen müssen, warum sie das tun, gibt auch mir Hoffnung, dass in Deutschland die leidenschaftslos geführte Diskussion um das Verbot der sachgrundlosen Befristung weitergeführt wird.

Durch die Blockade im Rat gerade der konservativen Regierungen konnten wir keinen ganz großen Erfolg erzielen. Das komplette Verbot der Arbeit auf Abruf wäre mir wichtig gewesen. Und es ist geradezu absurd, dass Menschen, die weniger als 32 Stunden im Monat arbeiten, von all den Verbesserungen ausgenommen werden. Die Mitgliedstaaten bleiben hier in der Pflicht, mehr für die europäischen Arbeitnehmer zu tun.

Christofer Fjellner (PPE). – Fru talman! Det är lite surrealistiskt att stå här, inte bara för att det är ett av mina sista anföranden i plenum, utan framför allt för att svenska socialdemokrater säger att det här inte sker. Vi har inte den här debatten. EU håller inte på att reglera svensk arbetsmarknad. Om EU gör det, så har det i alla fall ingenting med det sociala toppmötet och den sociala pelaren göra. Sveriges statsminister, Stefan Löfven, kallade det rentav för en skröna.

Om jag sedan läser kommissionens förslag, så inleds det måhända med att detta initiativ är en av kommissionens viktigaste åtgärder i uppföljningen av den sociala pelaren för sociala rättigheter som lades fram vid toppmötet i Göteborg 2017. Men – det här händer inte. Huvudbudskapet är att i vår verklighet händer detta absolut inte.

Ibland vaknar de upp, svenska socialdemokrater, till exempel i november förra året, då de kallade förslaget för oacceptabelt, det riskerar att kraftigt påverka den svenska modellen med våra lagar och våra kollektivavtal. Det har de rätt i. Det är oacceptabelt, men det obegripliga är att de röstar för det. Nu verkar de i stället återigen hävda att detta inte inträffar, och det är kanske därför de inte är här i dag och deltar i debatten. Det som sker här, det sker nämligen inte – i alla fall enligt socialdemokraterna.

Interventions à la demande

Danuta Jazłowiecka (PPE). – Pani Przewodnicząca! Żyjemy w czasach bardzo szybko postępujących zmian na rynku pracy. Co chwila pojawiają się nowe zawody, zapotrzebowanie na nowe umiejętności czy nowe formy zatrudnienia. Elastyczność na rynku pracy jest szalenie ważna tak dla pracownika, jak i dla pracodawcy. Elastyczne formy zatrudnienia pomagają pracownikom połączyć życie zawodowe z rodzinnym, a pracodawcom – dostosować się do zmiennego popytu na rynku. Naszym obowiązkiem jest zapewnienie, żeby bez względu na formę zatrudnienia pracownicy mieli zagwarantowane co najmniej minimalne prawa na poziomie europejskim.

Po niełatwych pracach w Komisji Zatrudnienia i trudnych negocjacjach z Radą udało się wypracować kształt dyrektywy, który, z jednej strony, zwiększa ochronę pracownika, a z drugiej strony, nie nakłada na pracodawców nadmiernych obciążeń i wymagań, respektując różne modele prawa pracy w państwach członkowskich. Chciałabym zwrócić uwagę na wprowadzenie w dyrektywie wspólnych wymogów dotyczących przekazywania pracownikom informacji o warunkach zatrudnienia w formie pisemnej, informacji podstawowych do siedmiu dni od rozpoczęcia pracy i do trzydziestu dni informacji rozszerzonych. Także wspólny maksymalny okres próbný sześciu miesięcy z pewnością poprawi sytuację pracowników w wielu krajach.

Jude Kirton-Darling (S&D). – Madam President, in 2016, the Committee on Petitions (PETI) of this Parliament heard directly from McDonald’s workers from across Europe about their precarious employment contracts and conditions as part of their ‘Unhappy Meal’ campaign. I’ve worked with them and I’ve been inspired by the mostly young workers in the fast food industry, who’ve joined together in their unions to say, ‘Enough is enough, we deserve fair working conditions and decent pay’.

This week we’ll be voting on a step in that direction. The draft rules on transparent and predictable working conditions are not as radical as I would have liked to see. I would have liked an explicit ban on exploitative zero-hours contracts and an explicitly universal coverage for all workers, regardless of public or private, and regardless of how many hours they work. But, as the European TUC have said, these rules give new important rights to precarious workers and shift workers across Europe. These rules must be implemented comprehensively, without loopholes or exceptions. These are minimum rights. Let’s do better. Growing precariousness at work is fuelling economic insecurity on which the far right feed. Let’s stop that feast.

Ruža Tomašić (ECR). – Poštovana predsjedavajuća, Europska unija mora nastaviti biti globalni predvodnik u osiguravanju dobrih radnih uvjeta. Digitalna transformacija gospodarstva i društva u cjelini otvorila je brojne nove prilike, ali ne smijemo dozvoliti da taj val promjena uslijed četvrte industrijske revolucije odnese milijune ljudi na marginu društva.

Novi fleksibilni oblici zaposlenja omogućavaju maksimalno iskorištavanje prilika koje nudi digitalna ekonomija, a tijekom oporavka od posljednje globalne krize mnoge su ljude održali iznad površine. Bolja informiranost radnika nužna je da bi oni koristili sva svoja prava na dinamičnom tržištu.

Istaknula bih da naš zadatak, kao zakonodavca, nije nametanje obrazaca radnicima i poslodavcima već osiguravanje da u njihovom odnosu postoji ravnoteža. Ostalo treba biti prepušteno njima i njihovim udruženjima.

Κωνσταντίνα Κούβεβα (GUE/NGL). – Κυρία Πρόεδρε, πώς θα γίνει να έχουμε διασφαλισμένες και προβλέψιμες ώρες εργασίας στην Ευρωπαϊκή Ένωση, όταν στερούμε την πληροφόρηση από εκατομμύρια εργαζομένους; Αυτό θα κάνουμε αν υπερψηφίσουμε το αποτέλεσμα του τριμερούς διαλόγου. Θα νομιμοποιήσουμε την επισφαλή εργασία, διότι το κείμενο με τις προτάσεις του Συμβουλίου δεν ενισχύει την προστασία των εργαζομένων αλλά μόνο την ευελιξία. Γιατί τους στερεί την ενημέρωση που πρέπει να έχουν για τις συνθήκες και τον μισθό της εργασίας τους από την πρώτη μέρα της πρόσληψής τους; Αγνοεί παντελώς ότι πολλοί αυτοαπασχολούμενοι είναι στην πραγματικότητα μισθωτοί. Το Συμβούλιο δεν έχει καταλάβει τίποτε από την εξέγερση των κίτρινων γιλέκων στη Γαλλία, δεν έχει καταλάβει τίποτε από τη φωνή του προκαριαίου που σιγά σιγά δυναμώνει σε όλη την Ευρώπη. Εμείς εδώ οφείλουμε να ακούσουμε.

Francis Zammit Dimech (PPE). – Sinjura President, il-kondizzjonijiet tax-xoghol huma importanti ħafna għaliex fl-aħħar minn l-aħħar ix-xoghol huwa parti mill-iktar integrali fil-ħajja tagħna.

Jiena, bhala shadow għall-grupp EPP fil-Kumitat għall-Affarijiet Legali kont fuq din id-Direttiva, għamilt ukoll laqgħat ta' konsultazzjoni mal-unions ta' haddiema u anke ma' min ihaddem għewwa Malta. U inkredibbli dak li inti tisma' dwaru. Haddiema li jidhlu jahdmu mingħajr kuntratt tax-xogħol, bil-paga tagħhom ma jafux meta se jibda. Sitwazzjoni ohra li tlqajt magħha hi rigward haddiema li jkollhom jagħmlu tahrig mandatorju imma jhallsu tiegħu huma, u dan anke fis-settur pubbliku.

Għalhekk, din id-Direttiva li anke jekk għad hemm lok fejn wiehed jagħmel passi ohra 'l quddiem, tagħti messaġġi ċara. Jiena nemmen li mhux biss favur il-haddiema imma anke favur in-negozji, għaliex aktar ma jkun hemm kondizzjonijiet minimi ċari u garantiti, aktar ikollok kompetizzjoni għusta bejn in-negozji kollha.

Julie Ward (S&D). – Madam President, the lead miners breaking their backs underground in the north Pennine hills in the 1800s had zero job security. The same was also true for the dockworkers of Liverpool in the 1900s. So how is it that in the 21st century, when we can put a man on the moon and send a probe to Mars, we cannot yet give the ordinary man and woman job security? With the rise of zero-hour contracts in the UK, through the emergence of the gig economy, and the transformative way our world is changing through the fourth industrial revolution, we must adapt legislation to ensure that workers are protected in this new ecosystem in the world of work. So with the UK Government still trying to leave the EU, and with the risk that the Conservatives will seek to water down workers' rights, we must recognise that good regulation for predictable and transparent working conditions, along with collective bargaining for all citizens in all 28 Member States, is the best way for the UK, for the 27, for unions and for workforces.

Νότης Μαριάς (ECR). – Κυρία Πρόεδρε, είμαστε ξανά στο ίδιο έργο θεατές. Αυτό που βλέπουμε είναι ότι, τελικά, η Ευρωπαϊκή Ένωση επιβεβαιώνει την πολιτική της, δηλαδή πρακτικά αφήνει τις εργασιακές σχέσεις στο πεδίο της ευελιξίας και στις άτυπες μορφές, και επί της ουσίας δεν διασφαλίζει ούτε τη μόνιμη απασχόληση ούτε —κυρίως— ρυθμίσεις οι οποίες πραγματικά στηρίζουν την ίδια την απασχόληση των εργαζομένων. Και αυτό είναι ένα μεγάλο έλλειμμα της συγκεκριμένης νομοθετικής πρωτοβουλίας που συζητούμε. Θέλω ακόμη να επισημάνω ότι πρέπει να σταματήσει η υπερεκμετάλλευση των αναπληρωτών δασκάλων και των αναπληρωτών καθηγητών. Χιλιάδες εκπαιδευτικοί είναι σε ομηρία αυτήν τη στιγμή στην Ελλάδα και δεν ρυθμίζονται οι σχέσεις τους με βάση την οδηγία 1999/70/ΕΚ, δηλαδή με την εξασφάλιση συγκεκριμένων δικαιωμάτων και δυνατότητας διορισμού. Είναι ένα σοβαρό θέμα, το οποίο συζητήσαμε στην Επιτροπή Αναφορών και πρέπει να ρυθμιστεί.

Tania González Peñas (GUE/NGL). – Señora presidenta, las nuevas formas de trabajo, como el trabajo a demanda, basadas en una extrema flexibilidad de regulación, inestabilidad y total disponibilidad no pueden seguir siendo, como hasta ahora, nuevas formas de empleo barato y precario que se nutren de las personas que se quedan fuera del sistema.

Esta Directiva podría haber sido ambiciosa e inclusiva porque su objetivo estaba dirigido a dar certezas al mercado laboral. Sin embargo, al dejar fuera los contratos de cero horas o excluir del capítulo sobre requisitos mínimos a colectivos como el servicio público de urgencias, el funcionariado, los investigadores o los trabajadores de la mar —entre otros—, no protege a las personas que más lo necesitan, muchas de ellas mujeres, como es el caso de las empleadas del hogar que realizan tareas domésticas y de cuidados y que, una vez más, se han quedado fuera de esta legislación, algo que no se entiende, más después de que esta Cámara aprobase un informe para dignificar sus condiciones.

No podemos apoyar esta regulación excluyente e injusta con quienes más lo necesitan.

(Fin des interventions à la demande)

Marianne Thyssen, Member of the Commission. – Madam President, I have already thanked the rapporteur, but let me also thank the shadow rapporteurs and also the Romanian Presidency for their constructive and successful negotiations. Honourable Members of Parliament, with the proposed directive on transparent and predictable working conditions, we focus on what is really necessary for workers in today's labour market. Flexibility is today inevitable, just like digitalisation. Therefore, we have not sought to prohibit new types of employment, but to support the workers concerned with protection against excessive practices and with the minimum of predictability that everybody needs to organise life. The implementation of this directive will be a common task for Member States, employers and workers, with all the adequate room for social partners to make the rules a success on the ground.

I call on you to support the Directive. It's a crucial measure of social justice and solidarity for all our citizens. As I said before, Madam President, this directive is also a major achievement to make the European pillar of social rights a reality. We should all be proud of this milestone.

Honourable Members, allow me to conclude by making the connection between this directive and our other initiatives – posting of workers, protection against cancelled work, access to social protection for all, the Accessibility Act, the skills agenda, a more European semester and, not to forget, work-life balance.

I believe all these initiatives, those decisions, they show what this Commission and this Parliament, together with the Council, have done during our mandate, bringing social Europe back at the centre of the Union's action.

(Applause)

Enrique Calvet Chambon, *ponente*. — Señora presidenta, respeto absolutamente, y es a los únicos a los que voy a contestar, a los que manifiestan reticencias. Si les consuela, que no lo creo, les diré que yo soy también de los frustrados por no haber ido más lejos; pero mi trabajo como representante del Parlamento era encontrar un punto de equilibrio.

Básicamente, lo que se nota son tres «dolores», podríamos decir. El primero es que no engloba a todo el mundo, porque se exigen tres horas semanales y doce horas. Es verdad, y hubiéramos preferido que englobara a todo el mundo; pero fíjense ustedes, de todas maneras, en el avance con lo que teníamos antes, que pedía dos meses. En cualquier caso, les recuerdo que hemos pedido a la Comisión que ejerza una gran vigilancia activa para que, si proliferan, por ejemplo, contratos de once horas al mes, pues evidentemente habrá que tomar medidas.

En segundo lugar, también está el tema de las exclusiones. No las he entendido, no las apruebo, no comprendo esos *lobbies* —por ejemplo los trabajadores del mar—, pero no había manera de sacar un acuerdo de equilibrio sin pasar por ahí. Lo digo tranquilamente. Y entonces me encuentro ante las cero horas. Las cero horas las hemos dificultado muchísimo y además son, a partir de este momento, irrepetibles. No se pueden renovar.

Llegados a este punto, lo que les quiero decir a mis colegas es que se planteen lo que yo me he planteado: ¿es bueno, aunque no sea perfecto, es bueno que haya esto para los futuros años de los trabajadores europeos? ¿Es mucho mejor que nada? Mi conclusión ha sido que sí, y yo les pido, respetando sus ambiciones, respetando absolutamente su hombría de bien —o mujería de bien— a la hora de criticar el texto, que se planteen si lo perfecto no es enemigo de lo bueno y si no merece la pena, de todas maneras, un fuerte respaldo de todo el Parlamento a esta etapa en la construcción de la Europa social.

La Présidente. – Le débat est clos.

Le vote aura lieu mardi, le 16 avril 2019.

6. Europejski Urząd ds. Pracy (debata)

La Présidente. – L'ordre du jour appelle le débat sur le rapport de Jeroen Lenaers, au nom de la commission de l'emploi et des affaires sociales, sur la proposition de règlement du Parlement européen et du Conseil établissant une Autorité européenne du travail (COM(2018)0131 – C8-0118/2018 – 2018/0064(COD)) (A8-0391/2018).

Jeroen Lenaers, *Rapporteur*. – Voorzitter, de gemeenschappelijke Europese markt is gebouwd op vrijheden: het vrij verkeer van personen, het vrij verkeer van goederen, kapitaal en diensten. Die vier vrijheden hebben ons veel gebracht: meer economische groei, meer handel, meer welvaart.

Europa gaat echter over meer dan alleen markt, geld en handel. We moeten ervoor zorgen dat die gemeenschappelijke markt ook echt een eerlijke markt wordt: een markt waar werknemers krijgen waar ze recht op hebben en niet uitgebuit worden, waar geen ruimte is voor schijnzelfstandigheid, sociale dumping of verdringing op de arbeidsmarkt, waar bedrijven en burgers onder duidelijke voorwaarden grensoverschrijdend actief kunnen zijn zonder de dupe te worden van oneerlijke concurrentie van malafide bedrijven. Dus niet alleen een vrije markt, maar vooral een eerlijke markt. Niet alleen vrij verkeer van personen en diensten, maar eerlijk verkeer van personen en diensten.

Om dat te bereiken hebben we twee dingen nodig: strenge en duidelijke Europese regels, maar ook goede handhaving van die regels. Aan die regels hebben we hier de afgelopen jaren hard gewerkt. We hebben met de detachingsrichtlijn gelijk loon voor gelijk werk op dezelfde plek tot een realiteit gemaakt, we hebben de strijd tegen zwartwerk geïntensiveerd, we hebben werknemers beter beschermd tegen het werken met gevaarlijke stoffen en we hebben via de Europese pijler van sociale rechten heel veel gedaan om een eerlijk en sociaal Europa tot een realiteit te maken.

Regels zijn echter het papier waarop ze gedrukt staan niet waard als ze niet ook voldoende, goed en efficiënt gehandhaafd worden. Daar ligt een hele grote uitdaging. Meer dan 17 miljoen Europeanen wonen of werken in een ander land dan waar ze vandaan komen. Dat aantal is in de afgelopen tien jaar verdubbeld en zal in de nabije toekomst alleen maar toenemen.

Tegelijkertijd zien we dat sociale en arbeidsinspecties in de lidstaten nog veelal beperkt zijn tot de eigen landsgrenzen, waardoor grensoverschrijdende handhaving verre van effectief is. Daar maken we vandaag een einde aan: met de oprichting van de Europese Arbeidsautoriteit geven we grensoverschrijdende handhaving en controle een stevige boost. We laten hier vandaag zien dat we die uitdaging ook als Parlement heel erg serieus nemen.

En we laten zien dat het Europees Parlement kan leveren, want de Europese Commissie deed het voorstel amper een jaar geleden en de Europese Arbeidsautoriteit kan al daadwerkelijk aan de slag. Betere informatievoorziening voor burgers en bedrijven over hun rechten en plichten, collega's uit verschillende landen samenbrengen om gezamenlijk inspecties en handhaving te realiseren, bemiddelen tussen lidstaten die het oneens zijn over hoe Europese regels te handhaven, risicoanalyses maken van onze zwakke plekken en hoe we daar beter op kunnen treden: er is meer dan genoeg te doen voor de nieuwe arbeidsautoriteit.

Ik ben blij dat het een autoriteit is, want een autoriteit heeft tanden nodig. Tandem om misbruik tegen te gaan. Tandem om ervoor te zorgen dat het vertrouwen in de interne markt in de toekomst behouden blijft.

Ik wil dan ook graag mijn dank uitspreken. Allereerst aan commissaris Marianne Thyssen, zonder wiens initiatief, energie en bevologenheid dit resultaat er vandaag niet geweest zou zijn. Dank ook aan het Roemeense voorzitterschap, met wie we een bizar intensief schema van onderhandelingen gevoerd hebben. Dankzij dat commitment hebben we vandaag dit resultaat. Tot slot dank ik mijn collega's van de andere fracties. Sommigen van hen heb ik in de periode van onderhandelingen vaker gezien dan mijn eigen vrouw. Zeg het niet tegen mijn vrouw, maar het was het absoluut waard. We zitten hier vandaag met een goed resultaat en dat danken we aan de plezierige en constructieve samenwerking tussen ons allemaal. En vooral ook tot slot, Voorzitter, een groot woord van dank aan alle medewerkers en adviseurs die dit mogelijk gemaakt hebben. Want zonder hen zou er in dit Parlement niks voor elkaar komen.

Marianne Thyssen, *Member of the Commission*. – Mr President, I am also very happy to be here before the vote on the regulation establishing the European Labour Authority (ELA). I have always considered this regulation to be the final piece of the agenda of this Commission for fair labour mobility in Europe.

I presented the proposal in March 2018 and, one year later, we are here to vote on the final regulation. This impressive result in decision-making owes a lot to the constructive approach taken by both co-legislators and to the commitment and hard work of Parliament's rapporteur and the successive Council Presidencies. I would like to thank the rapporteur, Jeroen Lenaers, for his extraordinary commitment and his extremely efficient handling of the negotiations on behalf of the Parliament. I would of course also like to thank the shadow rapporteurs and the Council Presidency for their constructive work in bringing the file to a rapid and successful conclusion.

The European Labour Authority will be the Union's first operational agency in the area of labour mobility. Its establishment is much needed. Today, 17 million European citizens are living or working in another Member State than that of their citizenship. The European Labour Authority will be there for them, to ensure that European labour mobility rules are applied in a consistent, thorough and fair manner. The Authority will pursue three objectives, which are equally important. First, it will facilitate access to information and services to companies and citizens. When moving across borders, they need to know what their rights and obligations are. ELA will ensure that Member States comply with their information obligations, for example in the area of posting of workers, and it will manage the day-to-day activities of EURES, the European job mobility portal. Second, the authority will facilitate and support cooperation between national authorities that enforce EU legislation in the areas of labour mobility and social security coordination. The Authority will thus enable Member States in cross-border contexts to fight social fraud, abuse of workers' rights and undeclared work more efficiently.

Building on the examples of Eurojust and Europol, the European Labour Authority will bring national experts together under one roof in order to facilitate information exchange and cooperation. No doubt this will significantly contribute to the creation of a common enforcement culture, to efficient exchanges and mutual trust. The European Labour Authority will also give the necessary support for national inspectorates to cooperate through concerted and joint inspections. Third, the European Labour Authority will provide a forum for mediation between national authorities in case of disputes. By promoting dialogue and out-of-court settlements of issues, we aim to facilitate swift responses to disputes which involve cases of individual citizens or companies.

I know that, two years ago, when we started referring to the possible establishment of the European Labour Authority, some had doubts about the added value of another European agency. Our proposal already made clear that we wanted to set up an authority with operational tasks that were not yet exercised at EU level, and this is exactly what this regulation has done. The European Labour Authority will be of great practical value in the day-to-day enforcement of labour mobility rules and, at the same time, it will open opportunities for a fair mobility of labour within the European Union. Once adopted, this Commission is ready to take the first practical steps to make the European Labour Authority operational by autumn 2019. I'm really looking forward to your observations later on.

Jens Geier, *Verfasser der Stellungnahme des mitberatenden Haushaltsausschusses*. – Frau Präsidentin, verehrte Frau Kommissarin Thyssen, liebe Kolleginnen und Kollegen! Die Arbeitsmarktbehörde wird sich um die effektive Anwendung und Durchsetzung von europäischem Recht zur Arbeitsmobilität kümmern – das ist gut. Sie ist zukünftig die erste Ansprechpartnerin für nationale Arbeitsinspektoren, die grenzüberschreitende Kontrollen durchführen, um Lohn- und Sozialdumping zu unterbinden – auch das ist gut. Dadurch erhalten auch ehrliche Unternehmen mehr Schutz vor unfairem Wettbewerb – das ist auch gut. Nicht so schön ist, dass wir noch ein bisschen warten müssen, bis diese Agentur voll funktionsfähig sein wird. Gleichwohl ist sie ein wichtiger Meilenstein.

Wir hätten uns allerdings durchaus stärkere Kontrollkompetenzen für die Arbeitsbehörde gewünscht. Besonders bedauerlich ist, dass es nicht gelungen ist, Sanktionsmöglichkeiten gegen kooperationsunwillige Mitgliedstaaten durchzusetzen, und auch die schwache Einbindung von Sozialpartnern im Management der Agentur ist meiner Meinung nach ein Fehler. Mir ist bis heute unverständlich, wie die konservativ-liberalen Fraktionen das vernachlässigen konnten. Und wir hoffen, dass beim Streit um den Sitz dieser Arbeitsbehörde mehr Rationalität waltet, als das zuletzt beim Sitz von Agenturen der Fall war.

Karima Delli, *rapporteuse pour avis de la commission des transports et du tourisme*. – (*début de l'intervention hors micro*)... aux abus, la mise en place d'une autorité européenne du travail est plus que nécessaire: elle est indispensable. L'Europe sociale n'existe que dans les textes et jamais dans la réalité, ça suffit! Donnons-nous les moyens de mettre la loi en application et une fois pour toutes, mettons fin au dumping social.

Cette autorité permettra d'aider et d'accompagner, non seulement les travailleurs détachés, mais également les personnes établies dans un autre État membre pour y travailler. L'Union européenne doit enfin réellement agir pour les droits des travailleurs au sein de l'Union européenne afin qu'ils soient respectés et que la libre circulation demeure une réelle opportunité.

L'autorité européenne du travail pourra notamment coordonner les inspections sur tout le territoire et veiller au respect des règles sociales en vigueur. Il s'agit très clairement, mes chers collègues, d'une avancée de l'Europe sociale car, concrètement, elle existe bel et bien dans les textes, mais n'est toujours pas mise en œuvre ou respectée: cela ne pouvait plus durer et il ne faut plus que cela dure!

J'espère, mes chers collègues, que tous ensemble nous adopterons ce texte à une très large majorité.

Ангел Джамбазки, *Докладчик JURI*. – Г-жо Председател, за пореден път сме свидетели как чрез манипулации по темите „социален дъмпинг“ и „социални права“ се прави опит да се налагат ограничения на пазара. Нещо повече, виждаме предложение да се създаде агенция, която от една страна не би трябвало да се намесва в националните разпоредби и свободното движение на работници, но от друга страна би трябвало да санкционира държавите членки.

За пореден път – и без да има особена причина за това – сухопътният транспорт е изрично споменат в доклада. Това значи, че правителствата в Западна Европа продължават да се плашат от предприемачите и работниците от Изтока и решават с лека ръка да въвеждат все повече и повече нови регулации.

Трудовата мобилност в Съюза е от полза за европейските граждани, икономиките на държавите членки и държавите членки като цяло. Всички усилия относно регулирането на икономическите взаимоотношения в Съюза трябва да бъдат подчинени на принципа на улесняването на предприемачеството.

В случай че този орган все пак се създаде, би било прекрасен знак от страна на Европейския съюз да реши най-сетне централата му да бъде преместена в държава, в която няма европейска агенция. Такава например е България, която в рамките на своето председателство на Съвета на Европейския съюз доказа, че е достойна да бъде домакин на такава агенция.

Emilian Pavel, *Raportor LIBE*. – Doamnă președintă, dați-mi voie să salut doi prieteni de acolo, de la tribună. Doamnă comisar, vă mulțumesc foarte mult pentru această propunere și pentru munca din ultimul an. Îl felicit pe domnul Boianțiu și felicit președinția rotativă a României pentru că am reușit în mai puțin de un an să finalizăm această negociere. Următoarea Autoritate Europeană a Muncii are o misiune foarte importantă, iar doamna comisar a ridicat câteva probleme care se vor realiza datorită acestei autorități.

Ce îmi doresc eu? Îmi doresc ca această autoritate să fie în România și am și argumente. Pentru că la nivel de România avem acest sistem numit ReviSal, prin care oferim o transparență cum nu o găsim în alte state membre. Oferim cele mai rapide răspunsuri la solicitările europene când vine vorba de cooperare transfrontalieră și date necesare despre muncitorii pe care îi detașăm, pe care îi trimitem în alte state membre. Acest lucru ne califică și cred că este o garanție că, dacă această autoritate va avea sediul în România, va avea aceleași rezultate pe care le are, iată, președinția rotativă a României în tot ce înseamnă domeniul muncă.

Jordi Solé, *rapporteur for the Committee on Women's Rights and Gender Equality*. – Madam President, the establishment of the European Labour Authority is a step forward in the protection of workers' rights and the enforcement of labour law provisions for those many EU workers using their right to free movement.

However, as rapporteur for the Committee on Women's Rights and Gender Equality (FEMM), I wish that more of the proposals put forward in our Opinion had been taken on board. For instance, the introduction of a clause to ensure gender mainstreaming, the need to carry out a gender impact assessment before the drafting of annual and multiannual programming, the need to liaise with the European Institute for Gender Equality (EIGE) – not only with Eurostat – when compiling statistic-relevant data, ensuring gender-sensitive reporting and evaluations, including the collection of gender-disaggregated data, and finally, not aiming at, but ensuring, gender balance in the composition of the European Labour Authority's governing and consultative bodies.

Nevertheless, we fully support the report and hope that the Authority will become operational as soon as possible.

David Casa, *fisem il-grupp PPE*. – Sinjura President, nixtieq nibda billi nifrah lir-Rapporteur Jeroen Lenaers għar-riżultat eċċellenti li kiseb f'din il-leġiżlazzjoni u li b'hekk ħadna passi importanti biex inkomplu niksbu Ewropa iżjed soċjali u gusta.

Iva din hija storja ta' suċċess oħra fl-implimentazzjoni tal-prinċipji tal-pilastru Ewropew tad-drittijiet soċjali u suċċess ukoll fl-opportunitajiet offruti mis-suq komuni. L-Awtorità Ewropea tax-Xogħol se tkun hemm biex tgħin u tassisti lill-awtoritajiet individwi tal-Istati Membri biex jiġġieldu kontra kwalunkwe abbużi u frodi u jagħmlu din l-istess mobbiltà faċli għaċ-ċittadini. Ser ikun hemm ukoll biex tgħin fil-koperazzjoni bejn il-pajjiżi Ewropej u biex tinforza l-ligijiet li japplikaw. Biex nagħmlu dan, kellna nikkreaw regoli ċari, ġusti u li jiġu infurzati kif suppost fuq il-mobbiltà għax-xogħol. Huwa biss b'sinerġija u kooperazzjoni tajba bejn l-awtoritajiet tal-Istati Membri illi dan huwa possibbli. Mingħajr ma ninsew ir-rwol importanti li l-imsiehba soċjali għandhom f'dan il-proċess.

Kif nafu, is-suq komuni huwa ċentrali għall-pjan u l-proġett Ewropew, u l-mobbiltà fl-Unjoni Ewropea hija realtà li naraw u nesperjenzaw kuljum fejn miljuni ta' ċittadini Ewropej jaħdmu, jgħixu u jivvjaġġaw.

Georgi Pirinski, *on behalf of the S&D Group*. – Madam President, the establishment of a European-level authority called on to play an essential role in ending labour exploitation, ensuring fair worker mobility and tackling undeclared work is a landmark achievement. President Juncker's call in September 2017 was followed by a Commission proposal as early as March of last year and intensive work by this Parliament, together with the Council, in arriving today at the point of agreement in record time. It is of vital importance to endeavour to make the European pillar of social rights everyday living reality for each and every European citizen, no matter from which Member State he comes. Moreover, it must become the guiding light for achieving superior competitiveness of European businesses on the basis of fully-fledged social partnership, collective bargaining and environmental sustainability.

The lure for business to succumb to short-termism and the wages race to the bottom not only entails severe exploitation and abuse of mobile labour but also undermines the very foundations on which citizens base their allegiance to the Union and, what is more, their willingness to engage in highly-productive and efficient work.

Let me end by urgently inviting all of us here and all those concerned to turn the launching of the European Labour Authority (ELA) this autumn into a high-profile event, and to recommit to building a truly social union with vigorous welfare states as the only possible way to provide citizens with a life in dignity and security and the Union with a promising future in this ever-more challenging world of ours. In these last few seconds I would just like to join in thanking my colleague Mr Lenaers for the terrific work he organised, the Commission and Ms Thyssen for her commitment, Council and all those who made an input to this success.

Marian Harkin, *on behalf of the ALDE Group*. – Madam President, can I thank the rapporteur for his constructive approach, the shadow rapporteurs, our co-legislators in the Council, and Madam Thyssen and the Commission.

When I looked at this proposal initially, I did have some questions around its added value and the impact it would have on EURES, the platform for undeclared work, etc. But I believe that the piece of legislation that we have now has, in short, the necessary cooperation and streamlining to give us an efficient and effective ELA. The other question I had at the beginning was: what problems are we trying to solve, and will this piece of legislation actually solve those problems?

Free movement of workers is working, but from time to time issues arise that can undermine the trust in the system and that question fairness and compliance. Those issues, I believe, require an independent authority that will strengthen operational coordination and cooperation between Member States, mediate in cross-border disputes and facilitate dispute settlements. I believe that the final piece of legislation addresses many of the identified problems around the day-to-day operational free movement of workers, and by doing so, I believe it facilitates free movement of workers for all EU citizens and a more streamlined system because of cooperation between Member States, and crucially, it will help to restore trust in the system, trust between Member States and trust between citizens. This won't be my final intervention in Parliament, but it's one of the last, and I'm especially pleased today to be able to say that I was part of a team that helped to deliver a piece of legislation that will enhance the free movement of workers while at the same time reassuring citizens and Member States that this is a system they can trust and believe in.

Rina Ronja Kari, for GUE/NGL-Gruppen. – Fru. Formand! Også tak til ordføreren. Hver eneste dag overalt i Europa lever tusindvis af mennesker med urimelige arbejdsvilkår. Med lave lønninger, der er dårlige arbejdsforhold, ingen kontrakter og ingen rettigheder. De er ofte nødt til at have flere job bare for at klare sig. Social dumping er den menneskelige bagside af EU's indre marked og af den frie – den uhæmmede frie – bevægelighed. Det er det indre marked, som sætter virksomhedernes rettigheder langt over arbejdstagernes rettigheder. Som sætter profit over mennesker. Og det er et indre marked, som flytter magten langt væk fra borgerene, ja langt væk fra vores folkevalgte politikere, og som begrænser vores demokratiske muligheder. De tusindvis af mennesker, der lever med konsekvenserne, de kræver naturligvis løsninger, de forventer, at vi gør noget effektivt for at stoppe den sociale dumping, for at sikre ordnet løn og ordnede arbejdsvilkår. Men hvilket svar får de så her fra EU? De får et svar, der handler om endnu mere EU: en EU-myndighed, som kommer til at kræve masser af ressourcer og masser af bureaukrati. Når svaret jo i virkeligheden burde være mindre EU og meget mere magt til borgerne, så bliver svaret endnu engang endnu mere EU og endnu mere magt til EU. Det er dybt useriøst. Borgerne har ikke brug for flere EU-myndigheder, de har brug for et opgør med det indre marked, de har brug for at få magten tilbage over deres arbejdsmarked.

Margrete Auken, for Verts/ALE-Gruppen. – Fru formand! Jeg er rigtig glad for, at vi nu har fået en EU-myndighed mere: dette europæiske arbejdsmarkedstilsyn, som er en slags EUROPOL light for arbejdsmarkedet, der kan hjælpe nationale myndigheder med at afværge såvel snyd med ydelser som social dumping, bl.a. ved hjælp af inspektioner.

14 millioner europæere arbejder i et andet EU-land end deres eget. De betaler skat, bidrager til samfundet og skal selvfølgelig være socialt sikret ligesom deres kollegaer, hvis de mister deres job. Folk kommer for at arbejde, ikke for at snyde.

Alligevel blomster mistilliden til såvel den vandrende arbejdskraft som til arbejdsgiverne. bl.a. pga. forfærdende sager som den på den dansk-tyske grænse, hvor 200 filippinske chauffører nærmest blev holdt som slaver.

For mit danske parti, SF, er fri bevægelighed og gode forhold for vandrende arbejdstagere centralt, ligesom beskyttelsen af den danske velfærdsmode.

Til sidst vil jeg gerne minde om, at vi Grønne gerne ville styrke ELA yderligere ved at give de europæiske borgere ret til at klage direkte til dem. Det blev desværre stemt ned. Men uanset dette nederlag er det et godt projekt, som vi naturligvis støtter.

Κωνσταντίνος Παπαδάκης (NI). – Κυρία Πρόεδρε, για να ελέγξει το Σώμα Επιθεώρησης Εργασίας στην Ελλάδα όλους τους χώρους δουλειάς μία φορά τουλάχιστον, χρειάζεται 13 ολόκληρα χρόνια. Η Ευρωπαϊκή Ένωση και οι κυβερνήσεις ρημάξαν και αυτούς τους ελάχιστους και ανεπαρκείς κρατικούς ελεγκτικούς μηχανισμούς. Στόχος είναι η εργοδοσία με λυμένα χέρια να ξεζουμίζει ανεμπόδιστα τους εργαζόμενους. Σε αυτά τα συντρίμια των επιθεωρήσεων εργασίας σε κάθε χώρα έρχεται να συγκροτηθεί η λεγόμενη Ευρωπαϊκή Αρχή Εργασίας. Στόχος του νέου ευρωμηχανισμού είναι να πολλαπλασιάσει την κινητικότητα των εργαζομένων, γιατί —όπως προκλητικά αναφέρει η Ευρωπαϊκή Ένωση— μόνο 700.000 εργαζόμενοι μετακινούνται ετησίως από χώρα σε χώρα. Προστατεύετε δηλαδή και προωθείτε την εργασιακή γαλέρα και τη μαύρη ανασφάλιστη εργασία, με βάση τον αντεργατικό ευρωπαϊκό πυλώνα τον οποίο συνυπέγραψαν ΣΥΡΙΖΑ, Νέα Δημοκρατία και ΚΙΝΑΛ στην Ελλάδα. Προωθείται η αντικατάσταση των συλλογικών συμβάσεων, με εργατικά δικαιώματα ακόμη πιο κάτω, στο ναδίρ, που βαφτίζονται ελάχιστοι κανόνες. Κριτήριο ψήφου κι αυτά για τους εργαζόμενους, με ταξική οργάνωση και ισχυρό ΚΚΕ παντού, ώστε να αντεπιτεθούν και ναβάλουν εμπόδια στην εργασιακή ζούγκλα της Ευρωπαϊκής Ένωσης.

Agnieszka Kozłowska-Rajewicz (PPE). – Pani Przewodnicząca! Pani Komisarz! Szanowni Państwo! Mobilność jest jednym z fundamentalnych praw obywateli Unii Europejskiej. Mamy pracowników delegowanych, pracowników transgranicznych i miliony osób, które po prostu pracują czasami przez całe lata w innym kraju niż ich kraj ojczysty.

W tej kadencji Komisja Europejska, Parlament i Rada wielokrotnie dyskutowały na temat praw dla pracowników mobilnych. Mówiliśmy i o pakiecie mobilności, i o dyrektywie o pracownikach delegowanych, o przepisach w sprawie koordynacji systemów zabezpieczenia społecznego, rozmawialiśmy, a nawet stworzyliśmy platformę współpracy państw członkowskich na rzecz przeciwdziałania pracy nierejestrowanej. Te dyskusje często były kontrowersyjne – czasami bardzo kontrowersyjne – i mieliśmy wiele wątpliwości, bo to prawo jest momentami bardzo skomplikowane. Dlatego pomysł, aby powstał taki urząd ds. pracy, który informuje, pomaga, wspiera, pomaga zrozumieć to prawo i je stosować jest oczywiście bardzo dobry. Ten urząd jest bardzo potrzebny.

Natomiast w tych debatach pojawiały się takie pomysły, żeby wyposażyć tę agencję w silne kompetencje kontrolne. I chciałabym tutaj bardzo jasno powiedzieć, że o ile popieram funkcje wspierające, informacyjne, o tyle sprzeciwiam się tym funkcjom kontrolnym, ponieważ na etapie wprowadzania nowego prawa powinniśmy pomagać firmom zrozumieć prawo i je stosować – to jest ważne szczególnie dla małych przedsiębiorstw – a nie od razu wprowadzać takie funkcje kontrolne.

Mercedes Bresso (S&D). – Signora Presidente, onorevoli colleghi, la creazione europea dell’Autorità europea del lavoro è un grande successo del nostro gruppo al Parlamento europeo e un primo risultato dell’approvazione del pilastro dei diritti sociali. Sono ormai anni che ci battiamo in questo senso, a dimostrazione che il nostro obiettivo di un’Europa sociale e giusta non si limita ai proclami, ma interviene concretamente per migliorare la vita dei cittadini e per aiutarli nella ricerca di un lavoro.

La nuova Autorità sarà uno strumento importante per assicurare maggiori tutele, pari dignità e diritti ai lavoratori in mobilità all’interno dell’Unione, compresi quelli transfrontalieri, a supportare gli Stati membri nella lotta contro il dumping sociale, il lavoro sommerso e nero, a garantire maggiore coerenza sul tema del distacco dei lavoratori.

Ricordo anche alla Commissione che per il Parlamento sarà imperativo partecipare alla scelta della sede perché, come per l’EMA, condividiamo la competenza per il suo finanziamento e quindi condividiamo anche quella per la localizzazione.

(La Presidente ritira la parola all’oratrice)

Enrique Calvet Chambon (ALDE). – Señora presidenta, señora comisaria, soy yo otra vez. ¡Qué le vamos a hacer! Soy un drogadicto de las políticas sociales y de la Europa social.

Solo quería decirles que esto se inscribe directamente dentro de la línea que expuso la comisaria al final del debate anterior, dentro de ese gran esfuerzo que hacemos a final de mandato Comisión, Parlamento y, más reticentemente, el Consejo hacia la creación de la Europa social, hacia su evolución positiva.

Agradezco al ponente y a todos los ponentes alternativos lo que han hecho. Evidentemente esto podría haber sido perfecto, pero, aun así, es un enorme paso hacia la facilitación de la movilidad de los trabajadores, hacia la vigilancia de los abusos, hacia la correcta implementación de los derechos mínimos europeos y, por lo tanto, no puede ser más que bienvenido y apoyado por este Parlamento.

Tom Vandenkendelaere (PPE). – Voorzitter, oneerlijke concurrentie op de werkvloer tussen binnenlandse en buitenlandse collega’s is iets waar mensen me heel vaak over aanspreken. Grensoverschrijdende sociale fraude raakt onze burgers elke dag.

Nochtans weten we perfect wat we moeten doen. De lacunes in de wetgeving zijn heel erg duidelijk. Het probleem ligt hem bij de lidstaten bij wie de wil ontbreekt om effectief ook iets aan de controle te doen. Het jammerlijke resultaat is dat het draagvlak voor de Europese eengemaakte markt wegsmelt, net terwijl we diezelfde interne markt meer dan ooit nodig hebben. In mijn regio, West-Vlaanderen, smeken bedrijven om arbeidskrachten en worden werkwilligen met open armen verwelkomd. Arbeidsmobiliteit ondersteunt de economische groei en zo ook de welvaart.

Maar arbeidsmobiliteit kan alleen duurzaam zijn als ze op een rechtvaardige manier verloopt. En daar wringt hem de schoen. Vele burgers hebben het gevoel dat de cowboys in de verschillende sectoren er telkens mee weggomen als ze zich aan fraude schuldig maken. Zij die buiten de lijntjes kleuren, worden niet bestraft.

Met de oprichting van de Europese Arbeidsautoriteit moet hier verandering in komen. Snelle en accurate gegevensuitwisseling door lidstaten is de beste remedie om fraude uit te roeien.

In het begin van deze zittingsperiode werd ons een sociale triple A beloofd. De Europese Arbeidsautoriteit past in de uitbouw van een Unie waarbij het sociale aspect weer op de voorgrond komt, niet in de laatste plaats dankzij commissaris Thyssen. Concrete stappen als deze kunnen helpen om frustraties bij onze burgers weg te werken en geven ook de geloofwaardigheid van het Europees project een *boost*. Ik hoop dat er nog vele zullen volgen.

Guillaume Balas (S&D). – Madame la Présidente, Madame la Commissaire, il faut soutenir cette Autorité européenne du travail, car c'est un pas en avant qu'il ne faut pas négliger. Néanmoins, nous savons que nous sommes encore trop, aujourd'hui, dans la conciliation sur ces sujets, notamment ceux de la régulation et de la lutte contre la fraude.

C'est pour cela qu'il faudra d'autres pas en avant. Je vois pour ma part d'autres étapes à franchir pour l'avenir. Tout d'abord, une véritable inspection européenne du travail, qui pourra notamment sanctionner les fraudeurs non seulement sur le plan financier, comme cela existe déjà dans certains États membres, mais aussi sur le plan pénal, car on sait que, de ce point de vue, il faut que la peur change de camp. Les fraudeurs qui organisent aujourd'hui le dumping social doivent savoir que, s'ils persistent sur cette voie, ils en paieront personnellement les conséquences.

Ensuite, il faut que la Commission européenne mette sur la table une carte électronique de sécurité sociale qui sera réellement un outil de portabilité des droits.

Voilà donc un premier pas en avant, de nombreux seront à faire encore pour faire en sorte que le dumping social devienne un mauvais souvenir et ne soit plus une réalité.

Marita Ulvskog (S&D). – Fru talman! Fru kommissionär! I maj förra året antog vi överenskommelsen om utstationeringsdirektivet. Det var en stor seger för många löntagare och för den fackliga rörelsen, det vill säga lika lön för lika arbete på samma plats. Nu krävs det att medlemsländerna inför det här direktivet ordentligt och att vi följer upp detta. Den europeiska arbetsmyndigheten är en viktig pusselbit för den uppföljningen.

Myndigheten kommer även att bidra till bättre informationsdelning mellan medlemsländerna. Vi vet att det sker så mycket fusk med betalningar till socialförsäkringssystem. Utan information är det omöjligt att komma till rätta med detta. Alla arbetstagare i Europa måste vara fullgott försäkrade. Det som EU och myndigheten verkligen kan bidra med är att se till att människor inte faller mellan stolarna när de rör sig mellan länder. Det ska vara ordning och reda och rättvisa på arbetsmarknaden.

Jag är samtidigt väldigt glad över att vi nådde en kompromiss som respekterar nationell kompetens och de centrala parternas roll. Jag vill också passa på att tacka kommissionären för samarbetet under denna valperiod. Det har varit roligt...

(Talmannen fråntar talaren ordet.)

Interventions à la demande

Michaela Šojdřová (PPE). – Paní předsedající, já bych chtěla nejprve poděkovat a poblahopřát paní komisařce a také našemu zpravodaji kolegovi Lenaersovi, protože myslím, že dosáhli dobré dohody. Já nejsem příznivcem vzniku nových agentur, ale chci říct, že tento orgán má určitý potenciál řešit problémy na vnitřním trhu, se kterými se potýkáme, a vynutit evropské právo tam, kde se ho zatím nepodařilo vynutit. Například se spoléhám na ochranu proti protekcionistickým opatřením, které některé státy zavádějí. Myslím, že ani nemusím jmenovat *loi Macron*, zákon *MiLoG* a další.

Myslím si, že bude třeba při implementaci sledovat, aby skutečně nedošlo k překrývání s činností jiných agentur a orgánů. Bude třeba zajistit, aby účast inspektorů byla skutečně dobrovolná a aby členské státy respektovaly to postavení, které mají inspektoři v daném státě mít.

Ruža Tomašić (ECR). – Poštovana predsjedavajuća, velika sam zagovornica osiguravanja visoke razine prava radnika i stvaranja društvene klime u kojoj će biti normalno da se ta prava poštuju. U dijelu Europe to još uvijek nije tako unatoč tome što postoji dobar zakonski okvir i sva sila birokracije koja ga stalno nadopunjava i provodi.

Pitat ćete se kako je to moguće? Vrlo jednostavno: administrativna tijela nisu jamstvo poštivanja radničkih prava ni osiguravanja dobrih radnih uvjeta. Rekla bih da je upravo suprotno: što je više zakona i birokracije, to je lošija zaštita radnika u praksi.

Ne mogu podržati osnivanje Europskog nadzornog tijela za rad jer bi to značilo povećanje birokracije i novu borbu za nadležnosti s ionako neučinkovitim nacionalnim tijelima.

Netko taj birokratski cirkus mora platiti, a to su upravo radnici kojima ne treba dodatno opterećenje od kojega neće imati previše koristi.

Κωνσταντίνα Κούνεβα (GUE/NGL). – Κυρία Πρόεδρε, Ευρωπαϊκή Αρχή Εργασίας· αυτός ο τίτλος ακούγεται πολύ ωραίος. Αλλά τι λέμε σε τόσες χιλιάδες εργαζομένους που δουλεύουν απλήρωτοι, χωρίς κοινωνική ασφάλεια, συχνά και χωρίς ασφάλιση επαγγελματικού κινδύνου; Οι πολίτες πέφτουν κατά χιλιάδες θύματα των σύγχρονων δουλεμπορίων στην Ευρωπαϊκή Ένωση και δεν χρειάζονται τα καλά μας λόγια· τα σωστά μέτρα χρειάζονται. Πότε θα έχει αξία μια νέα Αρχή Εργασίας; Όταν δεν θα ασχολείται μόνο με τον έλεγχο και την καταγραφή των παραβιάσεων, αλλά θα προφυλάσσει πραγματικά τους εργαζόμενους από τους εργοδότες που ψάχνουν τα θύματά τους στη διασυννοριακή απασχόληση. Δηλαδή μια Ευρωπαϊκή Αρχή για την εργασία, που θα παρίσταται και στα δικαστήρια στο πλευρό των εργαζομένων, ώστε να γίνει το ευρωπαϊκό στήριγμά τους.

Danuta Jazłowiecka (PPE). – Pani Przewodnicząca! Zadania nowej agencji nadają jej duży potencjał wpływu na rzeczywistość mobilności w Unii Europejskiej. Niektóre z nich podkreśliła pani komisarz: nacisk na informowanie na temat praw i obowiązków w zakresie mobilności, zbieranie danych, dokonywanie analiz, ocena sytuacji na rynku wewnętrznym, wsparcie współpracy między instytucjami kontrolnymi państw członkowskich. To tylko część zadań nowej agencji, które mają szansę walczyć z niesłuszną percepcją mobilności w Europie czy z chęcią stosowania protekcjonizmu.

Czy ten potencjał zostanie jednak wykorzystany, zależy od ludzi, którzy będą nią kierować, w niej pracować. Będzie to zależało od działań zarówno dyrektora wykonawczego i zarządu, jak i szerokiej reprezentatywności grupy zainteresowanych stron. Spodziewam się, że nie będzie bez znaczenia narodowość osób zasiadających na najwyższych stanowiskach. Będziemy obserwować zarówno proces wyboru siedziby, jak i sposób selekcji kandydatów na najwyższe stanowiska. Jest to w interesie całej Unii, żeby nie były one podważalne i nie prowadziły do poczucia dawania przyzwolenia na protekcjonizm czy na inne hamulce dla wewnętrznego rynku. Ten etap tworzenia samej agencji jest więc kluczowy dla wizerunku Europy i przyszłości mobilności silnika rozwoju całej Unii Europejskiej... (*Przewodnicząca odebrała mówczyni głos*)

Νότης Μαριάς (ECR). – Κυρία Πρόεδρε, η Ευρωπαϊκή Ένωση, αντί να στηρίζει την προσπάθεια δημιουργίας ενός ευρωπαϊκού ελάχιστου μισθού, αντί να θεομοθετήσει ένα ευρωπαϊκό ελάχιστο επίδομα ανεργίας, αντί να αντιμετωπίσει τις παραβιάσεις της εργατικής νομοθεσίας στα κράτη μέλη —με κλασική περίπτωση την παραβίαση της οδηγίας 1999/70/EK η οποία αφορά τις άτυπες εργασιακές σχέσεις, αντί να σταματήσει την ομηρία χιλιάδων εκπαιδευτικών, αναπληρωτών δασκάλων και καθηγητών στην Ελλάδα, ωραιοποιεί την κατάσταση και μας λέει ότι πρέπει να δημιουργηθεί μια Ευρωπαϊκή Αρχή για τα θέματα της εργασίας. Πρόκειται για έναν νέο γραφειοκρατικό μηχανισμό· μια προσπάθεια υπαρπαγής αρμοδιοτήτων των κρατών μελών. Ας κοιτάξει η Ευρωπαϊκή Ένωση τις παραβιάσεις που γίνονται καθημερινά και να δώσει εκεί τη δική της ενέργεια.

(*Fin des interventions à la demande*)

Marianne Thyssen, Member of the Commission. – Madam President, as I said before, our proposal for setting up the European Labour Authority has been the final piece of the legislative reform that we launched towards ensuring fair labour mobility. When I received my portfolio on employment, social affairs, skills and labour mobility, I knew that labour mobility would not be the easiest area. I am therefore very happy that, after the division of the Posting of Workers Directive, you are now asked to vote on this regulation, which is another milestone for ensuring fair labour mobility in Europe. It realises the principle of the pillar of social rights in a cross-border context.

Unfortunately, it has not yet been possible for the co-legislators to agree on the proposed modernisation of the social security coordination rules. I am confident, however, that the position that you adopt Thursday in first reading will laid the grounds for a fruitful and, hopefully, swift adoption after the European Parliament's elections.

The millions of citizens for whom labour mobility is a daily reality, an opportunity, or sometimes a bare necessity, merit to benefit from updated rules as soon as possible. Free movement has always been a founding principle for our European Union and it has remained so even more today. The economies and labour markets of our Member States have become deeply intertwined. Free movement also feeds the connection between our citizens and peoples.

Facilitating free movement while at the same time ensuring that the European rules are applied in a fair way, these have been the guiding principles in my proposals on labour mobility. These guiding principles allowed us to obtain legislative reforms, supported by east and west and north and south, and these principles also underpin the regulation establishing the European Labour Authority. I just call on you to support this regulation.

Jeroen Lenaers, Rapporteur. – Madam President, it says something about the importance of the European Labour Authority (ELA) that so many colleagues have entered the Chamber to make sure not to miss the end of this debate. Thank you all for your attention. For those of you who weren't here at the beginning, let me tell you that today is a very good day. By establishing the European Labour Authority we are taking a crucial step towards realising a truly fair and a truly social European labour market, where we move from the free movement of workers only to ensuring fair labour mobility – a market where workers' rights are guaranteed and protected, where there is no room for bogus self-employment, social dumping or unfair competition. In order to achieve all this we need better enforcement of the European rules in the area of labour mobility, and that is exactly what the European Labour Authority is going to do and it will start doing it very soon. This is a landmark achievement and it shows that the European Union can deliver in an area of citizens' concern and that it can deliver fast.

So, once again, a big thank you to the European Commission, Commissioner Thyssen, to the Romanian Presidency and to all our colleagues who worked together in a very good, a very constructive and a very efficient manner to get this done. I count on all of you to keep this commitment going, because we all need to work together to ensure ELA's success in the future.

(Applause)

La Présidente. – Le débat est clos.

Le vote aura lieu mardi, le 16 avril 2019.

Déclarations écrites (article 162)

Evelyn Regner (S&D), schriftlich. – Die EU-Arbeitsbehörde kommt. Und das ist ein Riesenerfolg für die Beschäftigten in Europa. Mit der EU-Arbeitsbehörde soll die Entsende-Richtlinie in ganz Europa kontrolliert werden. So können wir wirklich dafür sorgen, dass der gleiche Lohn für die gleiche Arbeit am gleichen Ort bezahlt wird. Denn die besten Gesetze gegen Lohn- und Sozialdumping nützen nichts, wenn sie nicht ordentlich grenzüberschreitend kontrolliert werden. Die EU-Arbeitsbehörde kommt, weil wir SozialdemokratInnen und GewerkschafterInnen im Europaparlament nicht lockergelassen haben. Wir sind drangeblieben, obwohl die Konservativen und viele Mitgliedsstaaten – allen voran auch die österreichische Regierung – die Behörde möglichst kleinhalten wollte. Ich setze mich nach wie vor für Österreich als Standort der EU-Arbeitsbehörde ein – denn die Probleme des europäischen Lohngefälles kennen wir nur zu gut.

Valdemar Tomaševski (ECR), raštu. – Šiandien mes aptariame pranešimą, kuris yra labai svarbus daugumai Europos Sąjungos gyventojų, nes jis susijęs su darbuotojais ir tais, kurie dirbs ateityje. Atsirandanti Europos darbo institucija turėtų padėti valstybėms narėms užtikrinti, kad būtų veiksmingai taikomos Sąjungos teisės nuostatos darbo jėgos judumo ir socialinės apsaugos koordinavimo srityse. Ši institucija, norėdama vykdyti savo funkcijas, turi būti pagalbinė valstybėms narėms, o ne priiminėjanti sprendimus. Būtent valstybės narės geriausiai žino savo darbo rinkos poreikius ir problemas. Institucija turėtų padėti piliečiams didinti socialinį teisingumą šalyse ir skatinti laisvą darbuotojų ir paslaugų judėjimą bendrojoje rinkoje, kartu laikantis proporcingumo ir subsidiarumo principų. Šiuo tikslu Agentūra turėtų padėti valstybėms narėms ir Komisijai visose valstybėse narėse, pasitelkiant EDA svetainę, didinti darbuotojų ir darbdavių prieigą prie atitinkamos naujos informacijos apie jų teises ir pareigas tarpvalstybinio darbo jėgos judumo atveju ir galimybes naudotis atitinkamomis paslaugomis ir skatinti valstybių narių bendradarbiavimą. Agentūra taip pat turėtų skatinti bendradarbiavimo rėmimą tarp valstybių narių, kad būtų užtikrintas veiksmingas šių sričių Europos Sąjungos teisės taikymas, taip pat tarpininkauti ir padėti rasti tarpvalstybinių ginčų susijusių su darbo vietų atvejais sprendimus.

PRESIDE: RAMÓN LUIS VALCÁRCEL SISO

Vicepresidente

7. Powitanie

El presidente. – Señorías, antes de iniciar el turno de votaciones, permítanme unas palabras con las que dar la bienvenida a Greta Thunberg.

Hoy tenemos con nosotros a una invitada especial en la tribuna de visitantes, una persona que se diría que no necesita ser presentada.

Se trata de una joven ciudadana de la Unión Europea, proveniente de Suecia, que con su historial personal, con su coraje, con sus ideas y con su claridad se ha convertido en un símbolo de la lucha contra el cambio climático, dada la urgencia y ambición que este requiere.

(Aplausos prolongados)

Greta Thunberg nos urge a nosotros, los legisladores, pero también a las empresas y a los ciudadanos a redoblar nuestros esfuerzos ante la crisis climática.

La trayectoria del Parlamento Europeo a lo largo de esta legislatura ha demostrado que compartimos en gran medida la urgencia y la ambición de esta joven europea.

Podremos recordar esta legislatura sabiendo que la Unión Europea se ha embarcado en un camino irreversible con respecto al clima y a la protección del medio ambiente.

Tanto si nos fijamos en las emisiones del sector del transporte como en la reforma del régimen de comercio de derechos de emisión, ha sido el Parlamento la institución que siempre ha puesto el listón más alto en interés de la sostenibilidad, sin mencionar la ratificación en tiempo récord del Acuerdo de París, que impulsamos y celebramos en esta Cámara en presencia del entonces secretario general de las Naciones Unidas Ban Ki-moon.

Pero también sabemos que esto no es suficiente, que todos debemos hacer más a nivel individual, local, nacional, europeo e internacional si queremos evitar un calentamiento global superior a 1,5 °C y la devastación que ello implica. La próxima legislatura va a ser clave a este respecto.

Ella hablará en un intercambio de puntos de vista en la Comisión ENVI a las dos de la tarde, en una sesión abierta a todos los diputados.

Le dimos antes un aplauso; creo que no sería malo volver a repetir esa bienvenida a Greta Thunberg.

¡Bienvenida, Greta!

(Aplausos)

Franck Proust (PPE). – Monsieur le Président, chers collègues, hier, c'est le cœur serré que catholiques, Parisiens et Français ont découvert l'image de Notre-Dame de Paris, vieille de neuf siècles, en flammes. C'est également le cœur serré que je tiens ici à exprimer, au nom de la délégation française, mais aussi, j'en suis sûr, en votre nom à tous, notre profonde tristesse face à cet événement catastrophique.

Hier, c'est un trésor du patrimoine français qui a été partiellement détruit. Hier, c'est un bout de l'héritage culturel européen qui a pris feu. Hier, en voyant Notre-Dame en flammes, c'est un petit bout de nous qui brûlait avec elle. Honneur aux sapeurs-pompiers qui ont vaillamment combattu les flammes toute la nuit pour que cette belle cathédrale reste debout.

Je vous le dis, chers collègues, la France et les Français seront résilients dans cette épreuve. Ce que les bâtisseurs de cathédrales ont érigé hier, nous le reconstruirons demain.

Je tiens ici à vous remercier, chers collègues, de votre soutien à la France. Quand un trésor de notre patrimoine est touché, c'est toute l'Europe qui est à son chevet. Comme le disait Victor Hugo dans *Notre-Dame de Paris*, chaque flot du temps, chaque individu apporte sa pierre. Nous apporterons nous aussi la nôtre à la reconstruction de ce symbole.

Jean-Marie Cavada (ALDE). – Monsieur le Président, je voulais ajouter une chose qui prendra quinze secondes. En 1163, quand la construction a commencé, il y a eu une main-d'œuvre spécialisée dans la pierre et le bois venue non seulement de France, mais de toute l'Europe. On a trouvé des Allemands, des Espagnols, des Italiens et même des gens d'Europe centrale et du Nord, pour venir apporter leur pierre à ce monument de la civilisation qui demeure aujourd'hui notre civilisation, le grand projet européen.

Mais ce n'est pas ce que je voulais dire. Monsieur le Président, vous m'avez nommé président du comité d'éthique pour ce mandat, aux côtés de M^{me} Delvaux, M. Karim et M. Maštálka. Nous avons subi au cours de ce mandat maintes pressions des lobbies qui se sont installés dans nos institutions. Je voudrais rappeler, Monsieur le Président, que lors du vote sur la directive «droits d'auteur», pour n'évoquer que de celui-là, sans parler de ceux à venir demain et après-demain, les lobbies ont aussi agi de façon maléfique. Ils se sont installés dans nos institutions et, pour ce qui concerne le Parlement européen, jusque dans la phase interinstitutionnelle, où ils n'avaient rien à faire. Je demande donc que vous puissiez laisser au prochain Parlement, en légation de notre conception de la droiture d'un député et de notre Parlement, l'obligation de renforcer les règles pour faire barrage aux lobbies, dès l'instant où les textes arrivent en plénière, une fois pour toutes.

8. Głosowanie

El presidente. – Pasamos ahora al turno de votaciones.

(Para los resultados y otros detalles de la votación: véase el Acta).

8.1. Statystyki Wspólnoty z zakresu migracji i ochrony międzynarodowej (A8-0395/2018 - Cecilia Wikström) (głosowanie)

8.2. Przystąpienie UE do Aktu genewskiego Porozumienia lizbońskiego w sprawie nazw pochodzenia i oznaczeń geograficznych (A8-0187/2019 - Virginie Rozière) (głosowanie)

— *Antes de la votación:*

Marianne Thyssen, *Member of the Commission*. – Mr President, the Commission supports the recommendation to the European Parliament to give its consent to the accession of the European Union to the Geneva Act. On the substance, however, the Commission's position differs from the one taken by the Council and the European Parliament as regards the possibility for all Member States to join the Geneva Act in view of the European Union's exclusive competence in this case. The Commission would, very exceptionally, have been ready to agree that in this particular case, the seven Member States that have been parties to the Lisbon Agreement for a long time could have been authorised to accede to the Geneva Act in the interest of the European Union. In this respect, I would like to refer to the Commission's statement on this issue, which has been submitted to the Council and to the European Parliament.

8.3. Działania Unii po jej przystąpieniu do Aktu genewskiego Porozumienia lizbońskiego w sprawie nazw pochodzenia i oznaczeń geograficznych (A8-0036/2019 - Virginie Rozière) (głosowanie)

8.4. Umowa między UE a Filipinami dotycząca pewnych aspektów przewozów lotniczych (A8-0191/2019 - Jozo Radoš) (głosowanie)

8.5. Umowa międzynarodowa w sprawie oliwy z oliwek i oliwek stołowych (A8-0186/2019 - Eleonora Forenza) (głosowanie)

— *Antes de la votación:*

Eleonora Forenza, *Relatore*. – Grazie Presidente, vorrei sottolineare l'importanza di questa raccomandazione perché la produzione di olio di oliva è un importante settore per le economie dell'Europa mediterranea – tra queste l'Italia – ed è un prodotto di eccellenza dell'export europeo, duramente colpito, ad esempio penso all'olivicoltura salentina, colpito da gelate e colpito dal distaccamento.

Sono favorevole affinché il Parlamento dia parere favorevole alla conclusione dell'accordo, per garantire che l'Unione europea continui a contribuire attivamente alla cooperazione internazionale sull'olio d'oliva e sulle olive da tavola. Tuttavia, non posso non deplorare il ritardo della trasmissione del presente accordo al Parlamento europeo e la mancanza di informazioni tempestive da parte di altre istituzioni durante i negoziati.

Gli accordi internazionali relativi alla politica commerciale dell'Unione europea sono soggetti al consenso del Parlamento. Per tale ragione, invito il Consiglio e la Commissione a informare adeguatamente il Parlamento, in particolare in merito a qualsiasi decisione che possa essere presa in relazione all'articolo 4 della decisione del Consiglio.

8.6. Powołanie na członka Trybunału Obrachunkowego – Viorel Ștefan (A8-0194/2019 - Indrek Tarand) (głosowanie)

— *Antes de la votación:*

Indrek Tarand (Verts/ALE), *Rapporteur*. – Mr President, I know how much we hate the speeches by rapporteurs which disturb the smooth flow of votes, but unfortunately, today I'm obliged to explain the dilemmas we are facing. We all know the old Israeli joke – how many times the policeman laughs when you tell him a joke – but during this mandate we have had eight appointments to the European Court of Auditors (ECA) and, with the outstanding exception of the Republic of Ireland, all of them have been political appointments – and, I must underline, increasingly so by the new or eastern-European Member States including, Estonia, Finland, and Hungary. I am not going to say that we, the politicians, are unsuited or incapable to carry out other professional work. On the contrary, our colleague Ms Maletić has very good credentials to become an auditor again. Yet the procedure for how the Member States pick up the candidates is far from transparent and fair. I hereby call on the Member States to listen finally to the calls of this Parliament and propose

always two candidates to achieve a gender balance and follow the Irish example – that means having fair, public competition to select those people, in the spirit of Article 255 in our European Treaties.

Dear colleagues, we must reconsider whether we really need an ECA member from all the Member States simultaneously. Is there really so much to be audited? Why can't we manage this institution by taking turns: 14 auditors for one period and 14 for another? If we fail, there will be more disgruntled and unhappy people around, ready to destroy Bastilles all over Europe. So please vote this time as the rapporteur has suggested, but keep in mind the fact that a process taken by the Romanian and Croatian governments has not met the high standards and ideals of the European Union. And indeed, the policeman only laughs once when you tell him a joke.

8.7. Powołanie na członka Trybunału Obrachunkowego – Ivana Maletić (A8-0195/2019 - Indrek Tarand) (głosowanie)

— *Antes de la votación:*

Željana Zovko (PPE). – Mr President, I would just like to remind my colleague that today we are voting on the usual procedure and we shouldn't be listening to this highly ideological speech in this Parliament. Please decide on it on its merit.

8.8. Ochrona osób zgłaszających przypadki naruszenia prawa Unii (A8-0398/2018 - Virginie Rozière) (głosowanie)

8.9. Transgraniczna dystrybucja funduszy zbiorowego inwestowania (dyrektywa) (A8-0430/2018 - Wolf Klinz) (głosowanie)

— *Después de la votación:*

Wolf Klinz, Berichterstatter. – Herr Präsident, liebe Kolleginnen und Kollegen! Nach knapp fünfzehn Jahren werde ich am Ende der Wahlperiode dieses Haus verlassen. Ich habe deshalb hier heute zwei Berichte, die meine letzten sind als Berichterstatter.

Die Arbeit an ihnen hat mir gezeigt, dass dieses Haus imstande ist, über parteipolitische Grenzen hinweg Konsens zu finden und Brücken zu bauen, im Gegensatz zu vielen nationalen Parlamenten, wo eher Gräben ausgehoben werden.

Viele von euch werden sich wieder der Wahl stellen und dem nächsten Parlament angehören. Ich möchte an euch alle appellieren, im Kampf für die europäische Idee nicht nachzulassen. Die Europäische Union hat uns seit mehr als 60 Jahren Frieden, Freiheit, Demokratie, Rechtsstaatlichkeit und einen relativen Wohlstand beschert. Wir sind es unseren Kindern und Enkeln schuldig, dass das europäische Projekt nicht scheitert und Europa zusammenbleibt. Europa ist unser aller Zukunft. Wir haben keine andere.

(Beifall)

8.10. Transgraniczna dystrybucja funduszy zbiorowego inwestowania (rozporządzenie) (A8-0431/2018 - Wolf Klinz) (głosowanie)

8.11. Wymogi kapitałowe (rozporządzenie) (A8-0242/2018 - Peter Simon) (głosowanie)

8.12. Wymogi kapitałowe (dyrektywa) (A8-0243/2018 - Peter Simon) (głosowanie)**8.13. Zdolność instytucji kredytowych i przedsiębiorstw inwestycyjnych do pokrycia strat i dokapitalizowania (rozporządzenie) (A8-0216/2018 - Gunnar Hökmark) (głosowanie)**

— *Antes de la votación:*

Gunnar Hökmark, *Rapporteur*. – Mr President, *(inaudible)* do the same as Mr Klinz. Thank you all from me for a fantastic 15 years: fantastic friends all over the borders, from political borders and national borders. I would like to underline that here lies an opportunity to make Europe stronger: a free society open for all individuals, strong in a global environment that needs cooperation. The European Union is a fascinating thing. We might sometimes have different views, but the good thing is that we have a common task and a common aim. So thanks to all of you for a fantastic 15 years. Those are my last two reports, and I hope they will contribute to a more stable Europe.

(Applause)

8.14. Zdolność instytucji kredytowych i przedsiębiorstw inwestycyjnych do pokrycia strat i dokapitalizowania (dyrektywa) (A8-0218/2018 - Gunnar Hökmark) (głosowanie)**8.15. Papiery wartościowe zabezpieczone obligacjami skarbowymi (A8-0180/2019 - Jonás Fernández) (głosowanie)****8.16. Europejskie urzędy nadzoru i rynki finansowe (A8-0013/2019 - Othmar Karas, Pervenche Berès) (głosowanie)**

— *Después de la votación:*

Pervenche Berès, *rapporteuse*. – Monsieur le Président, je pensais attendre le vote du troisième rapport mais, comme mes collègues Wolf Klinz et Gunnar Hökmark, après 25 ans passés à vos côtés, il s'agit là de mon dernier rapport. Je voudrais tous vous remercier: ceux que j'ai combattus, ceux avec qui j'ai eu des complicités, tous ceux avec qui on a fini par trouver une position européenne. Remercier aussi les interprètes, tous les fonctionnaires de cette maison et vous dire que je quitte un Parlement européen qui a profondément changé. Nous aussi, nous avons changé. L'Europe a changé. Mais ce Parlement est devenu le vrai Parlement des citoyens. On dit toujours qu'il est trop à l'écoute des lobbies, mais il est aussi en osmose, en phase avec cette vague montante d'Européens qui sont convaincus que l'Europe est leur meilleur avenir. Ce Parlement est un Parlement moderne, original, démocratique: c'est celui des citoyens. Gardez-le ainsi!

(Applaudissements)

8.17. Unijny nadzór makroostrożnościowy nad systemem finansowym i ustanowienie Europejskiej Rady ds. Ryzyka Systemowego (A8-0011/2019 - Othmar Karas, Pervenche Berès) (głosowanie)**8.18. Rynki instrumentów finansowych oraz podejmowanie i prowadzenie działalności ubezpieczeniowej i reasekuracyjnej (Wypłacalność II) (A8-0012/2019 - Othmar Karas, Pervenche Berès) (głosowanie)**

8.19. Nadzór ostrożnościowy nad firmami inwestycyjnymi (dyrektywa) (A8-0295/2018 - Markus Ferber) (głosowanie)

8.20. Wymogi ostrożnościowe dla firm inwestycyjnych (rozporządzenie) (A8-0296/2018 - Markus Ferber) (głosowanie)

8.21. Przejrzyste i przewidywalne warunki pracy w Unii Europejskiej (A8-0355/2018 - Enrique Calvet Chambon) (głosowanie)

— *Antes de la votación:*

Paloma López Bermejo, *en nombre del Grupo GUE/NGL*. – Señor presidente, con arreglo al artículo 59, apartado 3, del Reglamento interno, quisiera pedir una votación procedimental con votación nominal para votar las enmiendas en primer lugar, antes del acuerdo provisional.

Estas enmiendas eliminan excepciones discriminatorias en la aplicación de la Directiva y así conseguiremos una protección para el conjunto de los trabajadores, sobre todo para aquellos que están en una situación especialmente precaria como las trabajadoras del hogar y los marineros.

Por tanto, solicito un voto favorable a esta votación procedimental.

Enrique Calvet Chambon, *ponente*. – Señor presidente, respetando las excelentísimas intenciones, y probablemente compartiendo las opiniones que están detrás de esta solicitud —puesto que también hay exclusiones que no he podido evitar y que yo no comparto— por el bien del trabajo parlamentario, por el bien de una pieza que tiene mucho más que eso, ruego, por favor, por respetar el equilibrio tan difícil que se ha conseguido en las negociaciones, que no se acepte esta petición y que votemos el texto sin fragilizarlo.

(El Parlamento rechaza la solicitud).

— *Después de la votación:*

Enrique Calvet Chambon, *ponente*. – Señor presidente, aprovechando que este es el último texto de este mandato — porque les prometo que volveré—, quiero dar las gracias absolutamente a todo el Parlamento, a todos los que han estado en contra o a favor. Quiero agradecer a todo mi equipo, a la Presidencia rumana y a la señora Thyssen el haber marcado este hito en la historia de la construcción de la Europa social porque, con todo honor, me llevo este último texto como mejor recuerdo de mi paso por esta magnífica institución.

8.22. Europejski Urząd ds. Pracy (A8-0391/2018 - Jeroen Lenaers) (głosowanie)

8.23. Zachowanie zasobów rybnych i ochrona ekosystemów morskich za pomocą środków technicznych (A8-0381/2017 - Gabriel Mato) (głosowanie)

— *Antes de la votación:*

Gabriel Mato, *ponente*. – Señor presidente, simplemente para decir que han sido tres años de trabajo, cientos de reuniones, dos intentos de reformar este Reglamento en los últimos dieciséis años, un acuerdo único que engloba treinta reglamentos distintos, y, por tanto, pedir el voto favorable a un acuerdo que ha sido un acuerdo frágil pero que ha alcanzado un gran consenso.

Peter van Dalen (ECR). – Voorzitter, ik beroep me op artikel 59, lid 3, van het Reglement, want ik denk dat het absoluut noodzakelijk is dat we teruggaan naar het Commissievoorstel, bijlage V, deel E. En ik doe dat in kleding van Nederlandse vissers. Want als wij het dialoogvoorstel gaan aannemen, dan draaien wij de nek om van dit soort gezinnen. Deze gezinnen werken met de pulsvisserij. Die toekomst wordt voor deze kinderen en kleinkinderen – er is net over die kinderen en kleinkinderen gesproken – de nek omgedraaid. Daarom moeten wij eerst apart stemmen over de amendementen. Ik verzoek de collega's die dat steunen om nu te gaan staan.

El presidente. – Viene usted bien provisto. Le falta el barco.

(El presidente cuenta las manos alzadas).

Perfecto. Tranquilícese. Sí, efectivamente, más de treinta y ocho diputados. Bien, pues vamos a someter a votación la propuesta del señor van Dalen, a mano alzada.

Yannick Jadot (Verts/ALE). – Monsieur le Président, chers collègues, c'est quand même extraordinaire, ce vote est l'un de ceux qui a le plus grand retentissement dans l'opinion publique européenne! C'était un vote pour les écosystèmes, pour les pêcheurs artisans, contre les lobbies de l'argent et de la pêche industrielle, et ce vote a été extrêmement important! On en a parlé dans tous vos pays. Alors je demande à ce Parlement de tenir son mandat et de tenir sa promesse pour les écosystèmes et pour les pêcheurs artisans de toute l'Europe, contre l'industrialisation de la pêche et contre la pêche financière!

(Applaudissements)

Gabriel Mato, ponente. – Señor presidente, simplemente para mostrar mi posición en contra de la petición del señor van Dalen. Por una sencilla razón. Porque lo que pretende con su enmienda es dejar sin efecto el acuerdo tremendamente mayoritario de esta Cámara de acabar de prohibir la pesca eléctrica.

Ese es el mandato que tenemos y es el mandato que yo pido que se vote, y, por tanto, votar en contra de la posición del señor van Dalen en estos momentos.

(El Parlamento rechaza la solicitud).

8.24. Rozporządzenie w sprawie europejskiej statystyki gospodarczej (A8-0094/2018 - Janusz Lewandowski) (głosowanie)

8.25. Dochodzenia prowadzone przez OLAF i współpraca z Prokuraturą Europejską (A8-0179/2019 - Ingeborg Gräßle) (głosowanie)

8.26. Ustanowienie instrumentu wsparcia finansowego na rzecz sprzętu do kontroli celnej (A8-0460/2018 - Jiří Pospíšil) (głosowanie)

8.27. Ustanowienie programu „Cła” na rzecz współpracy w dziedzinie ceł (A8-0464/2018 - Maria Grapini) (głosowanie)

8.28. Wprowadzanie do obrotu i używanie prekursorów materiałów wybuchowych (A8-0473/2018 - Andrejs Mamikins) (głosowanie)

— Después de la votación:

Andrejs Mamikins, Rapporteur. – Mr President, I would like to stress the importance of the regulation we just adopted today. I say ‘vital’ importance because it serves in preventing terror attacks being carried out with the use of homemade bombs, and hundreds of lives of our citizens, compatriots, our Europeans would have been spared over the last five years if we had had stronger restrictions on explosive precursors.

It was a difficult but urgent task to regulate the online sales of precursors, but we did it, and the proof for that is 100% approval of the document in the Committee on Civil Liberties, Justice and Home Affairs (LIBE) vote, which is a manifestation of general support for this result. Again and again, I would like to thank the shadow rapporteurs for their spirit of good cooperation and their support in trilogue negotiations and all the colleagues for their cooperation.

8.29. Wspólne ramy europejskich statystyk dotyczących osób fizycznych i gospodarstw domowych (A8-0247/2017 - Tamás Meszerics) (głosowanie)

8.30. Interoperacyjność między systemami informacyjnymi UE w obszarze granic i polityki wizowej (A8-0347/2018 - Jeroen Lenaers) (głosowanie)

8.31. Interoperacyjność między systemami informacyjnymi UE w dziedzinie współpracy policyjnej i sądowej, azylu i migracji (A8-0348/2018 - Nuno Melo) (głosowanie)

8.32. Europejska sieć urzędników łącznikowych ds. imigracji (A8-0040/2019 - Cécile Kashetu Kyenge) (głosowanie)

— *Después de la votación:*

Cécile Kashetu Kyenge, Relatore. – Grazie Presidente, con l'adozione di questo regolamento mettiamo un tassello ulteriore alla politica di gestione del fenomeno migratorio. Ringrazio i relatori ombra che mi hanno sostenuta in questo percorso e, con grande senso di responsabilità, hanno consentito la rapida adozione del regolamento e spero di tornare per la prossima legislatura in questo europarlamento, per poter continuare il lavoro che ho fatto in questo mandato con grande senso di responsabilità, grazie.

8.33. Homologacja typu pojazdów silnikowych w odniesieniu do ich ogólnego bezpieczeństwa (A8-0151/2019 - Róža Gräfin von Thun und Hohenstein) (głosowanie)

— *Antes de la votación:*

Róža Gräfin von Thun und Hohenstein, sprawozdawczyni. – Panie Przewodniczący! Koleżanki i Koledzy! Ja się nie żegnam. Ja się nie żegnam. Ja walczę dalej o bardzo mocną Unię Europejską. I dlatego chcę was prosić o głosowanie za tym rozporządzeniem, które mamy przed sobą, bo ono przyczyni się do ocalenia przed śmiercią w wypadkach drogowych tysięcy Europejczyków. Uratuje kolejne tysiące osób przed poważnymi obrażeniami. Dzięki tym nowym systemom – dziękuję wam bardzo za wsparcie – które wynegocjowaliśmy, a które będą instalowane w nowo produkowanych pojazdach, nasze europejskie drogi będą bardziej bezpieczne, i to nie tylko dla kierowców i pasażerów, ale przede wszystkim dla wszystkich niechronionych uczestników ruchu drogowego. Myślę o pieszych, rowerzystach itd.

I na koniec, ostatnie zdanie. Bezpieczeństwo drogowe to tylko jeden z wielu przykładów, jak Unia Europejska przyczynia się do ratowania naszego życia, do lepszego wspólnego bezpieczeństwa na naszych drogach w bardzo konkretny sposób, bezpieczeństwa Europejczyków w naszym życiu codziennym. A ci, którzy chcą opuścić Unię Europejską, zrozumieją to dopiero po szkodzie. My mówimy głośno i dumnie o tym wszystkim, co udaje się nam osiągnąć.

(Oklaski)

El presidente. – Con esto concluimos el turno de votaciones.

9. Wyjaśnienia dotyczące sposobu głosowania

9.1. Ochrona osób zgłaszających przypadki naruszenia prawa Unii (A8-0398/2018 - Virginie Rozière)

Explicaciones de voto orales

Morten Messerschmidt (ECR). – Hr. formand! Vi bryster os meget af at have et indre marked, sådan at vi allesammen med 500 millioner forbrugere kan blive rigere og forhåbentlig også tryggere. Men det skaber ikke vækst og tryghed, hvis ikke alle landene formår at implementere reglerne på samme måde, men derimod spekulerer i at lave reglerne således, at det lige gavner den enkelte virksomhed selv. Jeg har flere gange i Udvalget om Konstitutionelle Anliggender været ordfører for netop rapporteringen om, hvordan vores medlemslande er i stand til at implementere de regler, vi laver. Og det er – på trods af, at de fleste efterhånden skulle have lært reglerne i Unionen – rærligt at se, hvordan nogle lande hele tiden trækker det og trækker det, endda ligefrem obstruerer at gennemføre de regler, som egentlig skulle sikre det indre marked. Det duer ikke, vi er nødt til at følge de samme regler, hvis vi også skal have den samme velstand og den kollegialitet, det kammeratskab, som Unionen kræver, i det indre marked.

Michaela Šojdrová (PPE). – Pane předsedající, já jsem se rozhodla podpořit směrnici, která má důležitý cíl, a sice chránit ty, kteří se dozvěděli o porušení unijních předpisů a upozorní na toto porušení. Rozhodli se tedy nahlásit toto porušení. Je to ve veřejném zájmu a je tedy na místě tyto dotčené osoby také chránit, aby se nestaly obětmi nějaké odvety.

Tento veřejný zájem by se ale mohl dostat do střetu s jinými oprávněnými zájmy zaměstnavatelů, a proto považují za správné, aby zaměstnavatelé nastavili vnitřní procesy, kterými zaměstnanci mohou diskrétně nahlásit toto porušení. Zároveň tato směrnice pamatuje na malé a střední podniky, kterým se tímto nekomplikuje život. Souhlasím také s tím, že zaměstnanci musí nejdříve využít těchto interních předpisů. Věřím, že směrnice bude sloužit svému účelu.

Bogdan Andrzej Zdrojewski (PPE). – Panie Przewodniczący! Nie zabierałbym dzisiaj głosu, gdyby nie wczorajsza debata. Zaniepokoiły mnie zwłaszcza dwie sytuacje. Pierwsza to lekceważenie rzeczywistości tej dyrektywy, tej propozycji przez skrajne siły, które, krótko mówiąc, chcą doprowadzić do sytuacji takiej, aby wiele podmiotów funkcjonujących w życiu publicznym było, krótko mówiąc, bezkarnych. Ale drugi element był jeszcze ważniejszy. Otóż zwracam uwagę nie tylko na konieczność ochrony sygnalistów, ale także walki z tymi, którzy są sygnalistami fałszywymi. Wydaje mi się, że musimy zwracać uwagę na to, że wśród sygnalistów pojawiają się tacy, którzy bezpodstawnie, podkreślam, bezpodstawnie często atakują podmioty gospodarcze czy osoby fizyczne, prowadząc do ich zniszczenia albo finansowego, albo także psychicznego. Zwracam uwagę na konieczność tego bilansu, właściwego bilansu. W innym wypadku szkód może być więcej niż pożytku.

Emmanuel Maurel (GUE/NGL). – Monsieur le Président, nous revenons de loin. Le Parlement européen avait rédigé un texte très protecteur pour les lanceurs d'alerte, mais le Conseil avait manœuvré pour en vider sa substance et il a fallu l'émoi très légitime des populations européennes pour que ces manœuvres échouent. Les lanceurs d'alerte ne seront donc pas tenus de prévenir leurs supérieurs hiérarchiques avant de divulguer des informations. De plus, leur entourage proche, ainsi que ceux qui ont concouru à la manifestation de la vérité, seront eux aussi protégés.

Il restait un point controversé, c'était l'interdiction de divulguer des informations classifiées relatives à la protection du secret défense. On comprend les préventions qui ont conduit à cette limitation, mais on ne peut avoir qu'à l'esprit la situation et les révélations d'un Julian Assange, à qui je pense particulièrement aujourd'hui, ou d'une Chelsea Manning, qui en enfreignant ces principes ont éclairé l'opinion publique internationale sur des actes criminels, qui avaient été perpétrés par exemple au moment de la guerre d'Irak.

Donc, l'essentiel est là. Le texte est bon, les lanceurs d'alerte sont protégés et nous avons accompli notre travail.

Andrejs Mamikins (S&D). – Mr President, breaches of Union law are one of the elements that anti-Europeanists use to fuel people's frustration with the institutions. Numerous right-wing politicians have tried to capitalise on the fact that Union law is not perfectly designed, but no law is exempt from weaknesses. We must give our citizens major freedom and protection while reporting such weaknesses.

If we want people in the EU to be more engaged and participative in European politics, we must give them the instruments. So it's us, the partisans of a strong and integrated Europe, who must take the lead in this fight.

Maladministration can manifest itself in multiple forums, starting from word-based relations, in the management of EU funds. In every possible case the reporting person must be covered by guarantees. That is why, colleagues, I voted in favour.

Daniel Hannan (ECR). – Mr President, there comes a moment when you realise you're one of the longest-serving Members in this Chamber. I'm old enough to remember the Tillack affair, when a German journalist was arrested, had his notebooks, his private papers rifled through, because he had been exposing fraud in the anti-fraud authorities. Nobody, by the way, rifled through the private papers of the alleged fraudsters. I'm old enough to remember the Marta Andreasen affair, when an accountant was brought in to clean up the Commission's accounts, discovered that in some cases they weren't even using double-entry bookkeeping, and the reaction in the Commission was to fire her. Why does this happen? Well of course, all organisations become interested in protecting their own position. That's human nature; it's not exclusive to Brussels institutions. But I think it is exacerbated by the intimidating fervour, the almost religious belief that people have in the European project, that makes them think that the ends justify the means and that critics can be legitimately silenced. Tackle that and you'd solve a great many problems.

Pirkko Ruohonen-Lerner (ECR). – Arvoisa puhemies, epäkohdista, kuten erilaisista rahavarojen ja muun omaisuuden väärinkäytöksistä, veronkierrosta ja muista varkauksista ja rikoksista ilmoittaminen on edellytyksenä sille, että vallitseviin ongelmiin voidaan puuttua. Jos väärinkäytöksiä havaitsevat voivat luottaa ilmoitusten asianmukaiseen käsittelyyn, he todennäköisemmin myös tekevät ilmoituksen. Tällöin rikollinen toiminta, joka saattaa aiheuttaa suuriakin taloudellisia menetyksiä koko yhteiskunnalle ja julkiselle edulle tai yksittäiselle yritykselle, saadaan tutkinnan kohteeksi ajoissa.

Pidän tärkeänä sitä, että väärinkäytösten ilmoittajat voivat tehdä ilmoituksen joko organisaation sisällä tai suoraan viranomaisille. Kummassakin tapauksessa heitä suojellaan mahdollisilta kostotoimenpiteiltä, kuten irtisanomisilta tai alempiin työtehtäviin siirtämisiltä. Olen erittäin tyytyväinen siihen, että olemme viimein saaneet väärinkäytösten ilmoittajien suojelulle koko EU:ta koskevat minimisäännöt. Useissa maissa ei ole toistaiseksi lainkaan asiaa koskevaa lainsäädäntöä, minkä johdosta toivon, että direktiivi pannaan mahdollisimman nopeasti toimeen kaikissa jäsenvaltioissa.

Stanislav Polčák (PPE). – Pane předsedající, i já chci vítat tuto právní úpravu, která konečně sjednocuje tuto ochranu na evropské úrovni, protože skutečně mnohé státy neměly tuto ochranu zakotvenou ve svých právních řádech, a nás by měla především zajímat ochrana využívání evropských fondů, protože možnost zneužití, daňových podvodů je skutečně reálná. My máme v České republice zkušenosti se zneužíváním evropských fondů. Myslím si, že ta ochrana oznamovatelů je skutečně důležitá. My jim musíme dát nástroje, které umožní plnit i jejich poslání, samozřejmě zajistit přímý kontakt s institucemi a důvěrnost takovýchto jednání.

Chtěl bych rovněž upozornit na to, aby byla chráněna případně i ta druhá strana, ta, která je z těchto podvodů případně obviněná, protože možnost zneužití je velmi vachrlatá, velmi tenká. Ta linie překročení spravedlivého zájmu na těchto informacích a možnost neoprávněného obvinění je skutečně velmi tenká. Byl bych rád, abychom mysleli i na tu druhou stranu v případě, kdy někdo tímto způsobem zavádí orgány činné ve vyšetřování trestného činu.

9.2. Transgraniczna dystrybucja funduszy zbiorowego inwestowania (dyrektywa) (A8-0430/2018 - Wolf Klinz)

Explicaciones de voto orales

Stanislav Polčák (PPE). – Pane předsedající, zde bych rád uvedl, že přeshraniční distribuce fondů kolektivního investování má jasný proevropský důvod legislativy. My zde občas hlasujeme o legislativě, která, myslím, není zcela v souladu s tím, co vytyčují evropské smlouvy, že může být regulováno evropskou úrovní. Ale tady přeshraniční prvek při distribuci fondů kolektivního investování je nepochybný.

Schválili jsme zde pozměňovací návrhy, které ukotvují rovné podmínky pro subjekty kolektivního investování, samozřejmě se odstraňují překážky volného pohybu jednotek a akcií fondu kolektivního investování. Cílem je vytvořit jednotnější ochranu investorů, zároveň jsou zde stále překážky, které brání správcům těchto fondů ve využívání právě tohoto volného pohybu. Takže jsem rád, že jsme učinili tento pokrok, je to Evropa bez překážek, kterou já podporuji, a jsem rád, že se tento úkol podařilo splnit v tomto volebním období.

9.3. Transgraniczna dystrybucja funduszy zbiorowego inwestowania (rozporządzenie) (A8-0431/2018 - Wolf Klinz)

Explicaciones de voto orales

Morten Messerschmidt (ECR). – Hr. formand! Stadig flere sparer op til deres alderdom i pensionsordninger, og stadig flere påtager sig selv at investere pengene i de aktier, som de enten af økonomiske eller moralske eller andre årsager finder er det, fremtiden skal bygge på. Både deres privatøkonomi og samfundet som et hele. Det er grundlæggende godt, at flere mennesker tager personlige ansvar og også kan gøre det igennem investeringsforeninger, hvor man samler midlerne og således har en større økonomisk muskel at investere. Men det skaber også nogle udfordringer, og det har vi set inden for den frie bevægelighed for kapitalen. Især i forhold til privatpersoner, der begiver sig ud på det store junglemarked, hvor man investerer selv. Derfor har vi brug for nogle meget klare regler for transparens og gennemsigtighed og for forbrugerbeskyttelse, sådan at folk har nogle fundamentale garantier, når de sætter økonomien ind i investeringsforeningerne. Dette direktiv lever op til en del af det, men ikke nok, og derfor afstod vi fra at støtte det.

9.4. Wymogi kapitałowe (rozporządzenie) (A8-0242/2018 - Peter Simon)

Explicaciones de voto orales

Morten Messerschmidt (ECR). – Hr. formand! Når jeg beder om ordet i denne debat, så skyldes det det helt generelle problem, vi har med Baselkomitéen. Det er jo grundlæggende godt, at de vesteuropæiske lande har fundet sammen i et råd, hvor vi i fællesskab kan lave nogle regler for den frie økonomi og reglerne for kapitalens fri bevægelighed osv. Men der er en tendens til at vi især her i Europa-Parlamentet – i EU – er alt, alt for underdanige alt for lydhøre overfor alt det, som kommer fra Baselkomitéen. Amerikanerne kan for eksempel godt forstå og formå at sige fra, når de krav som Baselkomitéen lægger frem til forhandling, ikke passer ind i den amerikanske model. Vi i Danmark skal for eksempel gang på gang kæmpe for det, som er selve kernen i vores økonomiske system, vores boligmarked osv., nemlig realkreditsystemet, simpelthen fordi det ikke passer ind i den måde, man tænker på i Baselkomitéen. Der kunne jeg godt efterlyse, at næste parlament her i Strasbourg og Bruxelles har lidt større vilje og kraft til at sige fra, når de krav der kommer fra Basel, ikke passer ind i vores europæiske eller i vores danske system.

Stanislav Polčák (PPE). – Pane předsedající, v případě této zprávy jsem hlasoval pro, dovolím si odůvodnit zde své hlasování. Řešili jsme zde ještě důsledky finanční krize z roku 2007-2008, kdy se nevyřešily všechny problémy, které jsou spojeny právě se stabilizací evropského bankovního systému nebo obecně se snížením rizik u finančního sektoru. Řešili jsme otázku úvěrového rizika protistrany, pákového poměru a čistého stabilního financování.

S pozměňovacími návrhy, které schválil Evropský parlament, samozřejmě souhlasím. Jedná se o zpřístupňování informací a podávání zpráv v rámci subjektů, které působí ve finančním sektoru. Chtěl bych zdůraznit působnost toho pákového efektu, který tato legislativa přináší. Je zejména založen na tom, aby nepůsobil efektem nadměrné páky v období vzestupu, to si myslím, že je velmi pozitivní opatření, a proto jsem tuto zprávu podpořil.

Seán Kelly (PPE). – Mr President, I voted in favour of the capital requirements regulation and directive to propose revisions and address continuing challenges to financial stability. The risk reduction measures proposed will improve conditions for investment in goods and services and strengthen the resilience of EU banks. The revision of requirements for smaller banks will positively impact small and medium enterprises (SMEs). I am supportive of more flexible lending conditions for small and medium enterprises, supporting their growth by treating smaller banks in a proportionate way.

I support the focus placed here on risk sensitivity. It is a highly important factor in building stability and ensuring a robust and strong European economy post-crisis. There is a good balance struck here between reducing risks while continuing to encourage funding and investment. Mr Simon and his colleagues have done a good job.

9.5. Papiery wartościowe zabezpieczone obligacjami skarbowymi (A8-0180/2019 - Jonás Fernández)

Explicaciones de voto orales

Νότης Μαρτιάς (ECR). – Κύριε Πρόεδρε, τα ομόλογα που είναι διασφαλισμένα με κρατική εγγύηση είναι ένας μηχανισμός ο οποίος δεν μπορεί να ρυθμίσει τα προβλήματα που υπάρχουν στη λειτουργία της ευρωζώνης. Θα πρέπει, καταρχάς, να υπάρξει θεσμοθέτηση των ευρωομολόγων και από κει και πέρα θα πρέπει να υπάρξουν αλλαγές στον τρόπο λειτουργίας της ποσοτικής χαλάρωσης.

Ο κύριος Draghi παρανόμως έχει αποκλείσει τα ελληνικά κρατικά ομόλογα από τη ρύθμιση της ποσοτικής χαλάρωσης. Με τον ίδιο τρόπο έχει επίσης αποκλείσει και τα ομόλογα των ελληνικών εταιρειών από την ποσοτική χαλάρωση, με αποτέλεσμα να μην υπάρχει αυξημένη ρευστότητα στην ίδια την ελληνική οικονομία. Μια οικονομία η οποία διαλύθηκε από την τρόικα.

Ταυτόχρονα, θα πρέπει να υπάρξουν και άλλες ρυθμίσεις, προκειμένου χώρες οι οποίες έχουν προβλήματα —όπως η Ελλάδα— να μπορέσουν να ανασάνουν. Γι' αυτό το κίνημά μας, «Ελλάδα – Ο άλλος δρόμος», προτείνει να υπάρξει μια ειδική σχέση της Ελλάδας μέσα στην Ευρωπαϊκή Ένωση και την ευρωζώνη.

9.6. Rynki instrumentów finansowych oraz podejmowanie i prowadzenie działalności ubezpieczeniowej i reasekuracyjnej (Wypłacalność II) (A8-0012/2019 - Othmar Karas, Pervenche Berès)

Explicaciones de voto orales

Seán Kelly (PPE). – Mr President, I support these amendments to the Solvency II Directive. The introduction of more refined tools in this area is to be welcomed. Establishing notification and collaboration platforms will facilitate information exchange between national and supervisory authorities. This is just one of the proposed tools for encouraging convergence and cooperation in the insurance field. I'm in favour of this consumer-focused approach to supervision. Improved communication between Member States, balanced by the supervision of data reporting service providers, will protect consumer interests. I support the strengthening of the single market for insurance as part of a broader, continued European integration in financial supervision while preserving a balance in the competences of the European Insurance and Occupational Pensions Authority and of national authorities. It's a good balance here. Well done to Mr Karas and Ms Berès.

9.7. Nadzór ostrożnościowy nad firmami inwestycyjnymi (dyrektywa) (A8-0295/2018 - Markus Ferber)

Explicaciones de voto orales

Seán Kelly (PPE). – Mr President, well done to my colleague, Markus Ferber. The revision of rules concerning investment firms is good. The risks involved in the business model of investment firms must be addressed, particularly where the scale of these firms means that their failure poses a systemic risk to the economy. Because investment firms are exposed to much less credit risk than banks, they may act with more impunity. It makes sense that where a firm acts on a scale that could present a risk to the economy, it is subjected to the same rules as are applied to banks. The introduction of more tailored rules for smaller, non-systemic investment firms will also improve transparency and level the playing field.

Of course we have to remember that the flow of investment and saving across the EU is facilitated by investment firms. This is why the adoption of enhanced and tailored supervisory rules to better accommodate the business model of investment firms is important.

9.8. Przejrzyste i przewidywalne warunki pracy w Unii Europejskiej (A8-0355/2018 - Enrique Calvet Chambon)

Explicaciones de voto orales

Michaela Šojdrová (PPE). – Pane předsedající, jsem ráda, že tato směrnice nakonec prošla velkým počtem hlasů. Samozřejmě předvídatelné a transparentní pracovní podmínky jsou velmi důležité pro zaměstnance, ale také pro zaměstnavatele, aby měli jistotu, co a jaké informace, v jakém časovém horizontu musí svým potenciálním zaměstnancům i stávajícím zaměstnancům poskytnout.

Dohoda z dialogu tedy je, myslím, relativně vyvážená jak pro zaměstnance, tak pro zaměstnavatele, proto jsem ji nakonec podpořila. Především zaměstnanci budou dříve informováni o svých právech a měli by mít také snazší přístup ke stabilnímu zaměstnání. Finální znění respektuje národní úpravu, která může lépe zohlednit národní specifika pracovního trhu, a neměla by také vést k nepřiměřené byrokratické zátěži pro zaměstnavatele, to považuji za velmi důležité.

Bogdan Andrzej Zdrojewski (PPE). – Panie Przewodniczący! Bardzo często podkreślałem mocne opóźnienie biurokracji parlamentarnej, ale także Komisji, jeżeli chodzi o podejmowane tematy. Tym razem jest jeszcze mocniej. Trzeba pamiętać, że odnosimy się do dyrektywy, która jest z 1991 r. To bardzo długi czas oczekiwania na reagowanie na zmieniający się rynek pracy. Ale przy tej okazji, mówiąc właśnie o pracy, chcę podziękować dwóm grupom. Po pierwsze, chciałem podziękować tłumaczom. To nie była łatwa dla nich kadencja. Odnoszę się do ich pracy z uznaniem i z wielkim szacunkiem. Dziękuję bardzo. A druga grupa, to jest grupa, którą dzisiaj pan reprezentuje, czyli fotoreporterzy. Pracują w warunkach zastanych, cały czas tych samych, przy świetle sztucznym. Są grupą zauważaną, ale zbyt często niedocenianą. Dziękuję też grupie fotoreporterów. Photoservice, thank you very much. Good job.

Alex Mayer (S&D). – Mr President, I am delighted to support this report. Labour MEPs, alongside our Socialist and Democrat colleagues, have fought tooth and nail for these new rules that will improve conditions and give new rights to millions of workers on insecure zero-hours contracts and working in the gig economy. I am sick and tired of hearing from people who work hard, but don't know from one week to the next, whether they will be able to afford to pay the bills. But the fight back has begun. An end to work cancelled at the last minute without compensation. Workers given enough to notice about new shifts. No more paying for your own training. Europe is changing because we are voting to make it better. A fair deal at work for the many, not the few.

Νότης Μαρτιάς (ECR). – Κύριε Πρόεδρε, οι δικαίες συνθήκες εργασίας στην Ευρωπαϊκή Ένωση προϋποθέτουν την εφαρμογή της ίδιας της νομοθεσίας της Ευρωπαϊκής Ένωσης. Είναι γνωστή η οδηγία 1999/70/EK, η οποία διαμορφώνει συνθήκες προστασίας όσων δουλεύουν με άτυπες μορφές εργασίας, όσων δουλεύουν με συμβάσεις ορισμένου χρόνου. Επιμένει η οδηγία αυτή, του 1999, ότι θα πρέπει οι συμβάσεις ορισμένου χρόνου —στον βαθμό που εξυπηρετούν πάγιες και διαρκείς ανάγκες— να μετατρέπονται σε αορίστου χρόνου. Κλασική τέτοια περίπτωση είναι η περίπτωση της «ομηρίας» των χιλιάδων ελλήνων δασκάλων οι οποίοι δουλεύουν με το σύστημα των αναπληρωτών και βρίσκονται —όπως είπα— σε «ομηρία». Πρέπει επιτέλους το ελληνικό κράτος να εφαρμόσει την οδηγία του 1999 και να διορίσει τους καθηγητές και τους δασκάλους που εργάζονται ως αναπληρωτές.

Andrejs Mamikins (S&D). – Mr President, I welcome this directive establishing minimum rights that apply to every worker in the Union and I am glad to see that it contains a very detailed list of criteria that governs the relations between the employer and the employee. High working standards is one of the flagship achievements of the EU, but in some cases it can also become a factor of discrimination that creates first class and second class workers, which is unacceptable, by the way. Our citizens need greater predictability in employment contracts and we must finally stop the shameful practice of unlimited probationary periods. In addition to that, the European Parliament has taken a good step recently in abolishing unpaid traineeships but it's the turn of the private sector to become fair and good.

John Howarth (S&D). – Mr President, I'm happy to support this report as an important first step in recognising the problem of zero-hours employment, and a first step to ensuring that those employment practices are brought under control. It is not unreasonable to ask for equal treatment of people at work regardless of the contract that they have. We know that the flexible economy is here to stay and it's a reality, and therefore it's essential that we regard framing the rights of those individuals as a trans-European problem because if it isn't at the moment, it will be eventually. It is not asking too much to expect predictable employment hours and income from a job, it is not unreasonable to expect to be able to plan your budget. It is unreasonable to want exclusivity from people in that position of taking flexible work and it is unreasonable to insist that they pay for their own training. This nonsense simply has to end.

Nicola Caputo (S&D). – Signor Presidente, onorevoli colleghi, i cambiamenti demografici degli ultimi anni hanno determinato una maggiore diversificazione della popolazione attiva.

La digitalizzazione ha agevolato la creazione di nuove forme di lavoro subordinato, configurando nuovi e più flessibili rapporti di lavoro. Oggi, un contratto di lavoro su quattro corrisponde ad una forma atipica di occupazione. La direttiva sulla trasparenza delle condizioni di lavoro consente a tutti i lavoratori di essere informati dei loro diritti e obblighi fin dall'inizio del rapporto lavorativo. I lavoratori avranno il diritto di concordare con il datore di lavoro i periodi in cui sono disponibili e le modalità di preavviso. I lavoratori a chiamata non potranno più essere licenziati se rifiutano un lavoro con un preavviso molto breve e i datori di lavoro non potranno più impedire ai lavoratori con un contratto a zero ore di accettare un ulteriore incarico da un altro datore di lavoro.

Oggi dunque mettiamo su un altro mattone del pilastro sociale, un passo in avanti per un'Europa al servizio dei più vulnerabili.

9.9. Europejski Urząd ds. Pracy (A8-0391/2018 - Jeroen Lenaers)

Explicaciones de voto orales

Michaela Šojdrová (PPE). – Pane předsedající, já jsem nakonec podpořila toto nařízení, kterým se zřizuje nový orgán pro pracovní záležitosti. Přestože nejsem příznivcem toho, aby vznikaly nové orgány, tak jsem podpořila tento návrh, protože je zde potřeba dohlížet na naplňování evropského práva na vnitřním trhu ve věcech vysílání pracovníků, dodržování legislativy, která se týká zaměstnávání osob, a tak dále.

Považuji za důležité, aby se tento orgán, který zůstal s názvem orgán, přestože to je spíše agentura, nepřekrýval s dalšími kompetencemi jiných agentur. Tady bude důležitá implementace a dozor Evropského parlamentu. Velmi bych si přála, aby sídlo této nové agentury bylo v novém členském státě, nejlépe na Slovensku. Myslím, že by to bylo velmi dostupné a dobré řešení.

Rory Palmer (S&D). – Mr President, for too many people the economy under this Conservative government is simply not working. I see this every day across the East Midlands: insecure jobs; zero-hours contracts; levels of in-work poverty going up faster than employment; demand at food banks increasing.

There are parties who in the coming weeks will have nothing useful, if anything at all, to say about these issues, but I'm proud to have voted in this Parliament for measures to tackle insecure employment, to tackle low pay and exploitation, and to ban zero-hours contracts.

So when people vote in a few weeks' time, elect MEPs – Labour MEPs – who are committed to contributing positively and constructively in this place, committed to working here in the European Parliament to tackle unfairness and inequality, and who will ensure people in all our communities – whether they voted remain or voted leave – have hard-working, serious representation in this Parliament.

Bogdan Andrzej Zdrojewski (PPE). – Panie Przewodniczący! Przy okazji Europejskiego Urzędu ds. Pracy rozmawialiśmy o zwiększonej mobilności. Ta mobilność zwiększyła się w naszej kadencji prawie dwukrotnie. Brzmi to jak komplement, ale komplementem nie jest, bo wiąże się z ogromną ilością problemów, które narastały w czasie tej kadencji, a my, krótko mówiąc, nie nadążaliśmy z ich rozwiązaniem. Zwracam na to uwagę.

Ale korzystając z okazji, chcę podziękować swojej grupie politycznej PPE za współpracę przez te pięć lat. Nie była to współpraca wyłącznie łatwa, ale była źródłem satysfakcji. I chciałem podziękować swoim współpracownikom zarówno tym w Brukseli: pani Justynie Szczepańskiej i Kamilowi Majowi za bardzo dobrą pracę, jak również tym, którzy pracowali we Wrocławiu: Agacie Marzanowicz, Bartkowi, także Januszowi Dzikowskiemu, Ani Mądry. Chcę, żeby to wybrzmiało właśnie na tej sali, bo wykonali naprawdę pracę, która pomogła mi wypełnić ten mandat należycie.

Νότης Μαρίας (ECR). – Κύριε Πρόεδρε, η Ευρωπαϊκή Ένωση, αντί να δρομολογεί την ίδρυση ευρωπαϊκής υπηρεσίας για την εργασία, καλό θα είναι να εξετάσει —κυρίως με την Επιτροπή— την εφαρμογή της ήδη ισχύουσας νομοθεσίας και να παραπέμψει στο Δικαστήριο όσα κράτη παραβιάζουν τη νομοθεσία της Ευρωπαϊκής Ένωσης.

Επανέρχομαι για πολλοστή φορά στην εφαρμογή της οδηγίας 1999/70/EK του Συμβουλίου και ζητώ την εφαρμογή της, όπως είπα και σε προηγούμενες ομιλίες μου. Ζητώ την εφαρμογή της συγκεκριμένης οδηγίας για την περίπτωση των αναπληρωτών δασκάλων. Από τους 80.000 δασκάλους οι 20.000 είναι αναπληρωτές, βρίσκονται σε «ομηρία», τους εκμεταλλεύεται το ελληνικό Δημόσιο και πρέπει επιτέλους να προχωρήσει στον διορισμό τους. Δεν μπορεί οι άνθρωποι αυτοί να βρίσκονται υπό πίεση προκειμένου να πετύχουν την επαναπρόσληψή τους την επόμενη χρονιά. Πρέπει να υπάρξει οριστική ρύθμιση της περίπτωσης αυτής.

Andrejs Mamikins (S&D). – Mr President, the European Labour Authority is a long-awaited measure that we need to complete our social pillar. We must guarantee the freedom of movement of workers and their equal rights across the whole European Union.

However, it is not acceptable that this European Labour Authority acts as a simple information point. Currently, it's designed to provide information sources and services on labour mobility, but it's still unable to help our citizens resolve their problems related to work. In my opinion, the European Labour Authority must be able to enforce the measures to guarantee social cohesion and make sure that no unemployment arises from the new legislation at EU level. I am speaking particularly about the Central and Eastern European countries that still have inadequate social protection systems in case of unemployment. It must be one of the tasks of this new Authority to implement the social pillar and to guarantee that the new, high working standards do not lead to the first closure of enterprises and, as a result, the loss of jobs.

Jan Zahradil (ECR). – Pane předsedající, sociální politika je stále ještě rozhodující doménou pro národní vlády stejně jako sociální systémy. Já jsem proto nepodpořil tento text, nejenom z toho důvodu, že nesouhlasím s vytvářením jakýchkoliv dalších nových evropských agentur nebo institucí. Já jsem nepodpořil tento text také proto, že se obávám, že taková agentura by se snažila vměšovat se do národního pracovního práva jednotlivých států a ovlivňovat i sociální systémy. To je něco, co podle mého názoru by překračovalo rámec evropského práva, protože to skutečně Evropské unii nepřináleží. Máme tady dvacet osm, brzy tedy dvacet sedm ekonomik, které jsou rozdílné, máme tady státy, které jsou relativně bohaté a relativně chudé, a není možné se je snažit zažehlovat tímto způsobem do jednoho právního rámce. Proto jsem tento text podpořit nemohl.

10. Korekty do głosowania i zamiar głosowania: Patrz protokół

(Se suspende la sesión a las 13.32 horas).

VORSITZ: EVELYNE GEBHARDT

Vizepräsidentin

11. Wznowienie posiedzenia

(Die Sitzung wird um 15.00 Uhr wieder aufgenommen.)

12. Przyjęcie protokołu poprzedniego posiedzenia: Patrz protokół**13. Sytuacja w Mozambiku, Malawi i Zimbabwe po cyklonie Idai (debata)**

Die Präsidentin. – Als nächster Punkt der Tagesordnung folgen die Erklärungen des Rates und der Kommission zur Lage in Mosambik, Malawi und Simbabwe nach dem Zyklon Idai (2019/2684(RSP)).

Die Ratspräsidentschaft ist etwas verspätet, weil sie noch in der Ausschusssitzung festgehalten ist. Deswegen erlauben wir uns heute einfach, die Reihenfolge etwas umzustellen. Herr Kommissar, Sie haben das Wort!

Christos Stylianides, Member of the Commission. – Madam President, on behalf of the Commission, I would like first of all to express my personal condolences to the families and friends of the hundreds of victims in Mozambique, Malawi and Zimbabwe. Definitely our thoughts are with the millions of people affected by this devastating disaster.

I have said it many times in this room: Europe is about solidarity. Europe is about solidarity not only inside Europe, but also outside Europe. So we stood by the side of all three countries, with emergency funding, with in-kind assistance, and with experts on the ground.

Allow me to summarise our response, our European response, to this catastrophe. First, funding. Just a few hours after the landfall of the cyclone, we released an immediate package of assistance of EUR 3.5 million, to support access with air services to cut-off areas and hard-to-reach communities and for immediate shelter, water and sanitation.

On 9 April, we mobilised an additional EUR 12 million in humanitarian assistance for the three countries to provide shelter, water and sanitation, food, health and psychosocial support. This brings the total EU humanitarian assistance to over EUR 15 million.

Second, in-kind assistance. With separate funding of EUR 4 million we helped to deploy through our excellent instrument – the EU Civil Protection Mechanism (UCPM) – relief items and in-kind assistance offered by nine EU Member States: Portugal, Spain, France, Austria, UK, Luxembourg, Germany, Italy, and Denmark. I am really grateful to these countries. In parallel, we produced and shared 57 Copernicus satellite maps upon the request of Mozambique, Zimbabwe and Malawi.

Third point, on expert teams. We immediately deployed eight EU humanitarian, epidemiology and hydrology experts to the ground, to conduct assessments and support the response in the three countries, including to the recent cholera outbreak, unfortunately. In addition, a civil protection team of 13 people was deployed on 23 March via the EU Civil Protection Mechanism, and of course we also helped to deploy expert teams from our Member States. All of them are still in Mozambique as we speak and are helping to save lives on the ground.

Allow me to make a nominal reference to these teams because I strongly believe we have to show to our people that our teams can do excellent work on the ground. As I said, they are still in Mozambique because they are real heroes on the ground. Portugal sent one search and rescue and one medical team. Luxembourg sent a satellite communication team to help with connectivity in affected areas. Germany and Denmark sent a team to help with water purification – very important especially because of the cholera outbreak. Italy, Spain and Germany sent emergency medical teams and equipment, also very important because of the problem of cholera and maybe other diseases. So it is thanks to rescEU, our new system to fight against natural disasters, that we can help decisively the Member States to deploy assistance

inside and outside the European Union. And of course help save more lives as our campaign inside Europe.

Since day one, my team and I are monitoring the situation in the three affected countries around the clock, 24/7. Through our Emergency Response Coordination Centre (ERCC) – you will know about this – in Brussels and of course through our experts on the ground. We will continue to lead the international support efforts to the three countries, and you can rest assured that the European Union will do its best, our best, to support the longer-term reconstruction needs in the three affected countries.

Die Präsidentin. – Vielen Dank! Ich sehe, dass unsere Kollegen aus dem Umweltausschuss endlich die Ratspräsidentschaft losgelassen haben. Wenn Sie erlauben, warten wir die paar Sekunden, bis Frau Ciot hier ist und uns mitteilen kann, was sie im Namen des Rates mitteilen möchte.

Melania Gabriela Ciot, President-in-Office of the Council. – Madam President, thank you for giving me the time to present our points. I would like to thank the honourable Members for inviting me to address this important topic today.

Disasters call for solidarity, for acting together in support of those in need. Disasters teach us valuable lessons. We should translate them into life lessons of strength and resilience. The tropical cyclone Idai and the subsequent flooding we witnessed in recent weeks have brought enormous destruction and human losses to southern Africa. Nearly three million people have been affected in Mozambique, Malawi and Zimbabwe, and almost 1 000 people have lost their lives. Many are still missing.

In Mozambique alone, 240 000 houses have been destroyed, damaged or flooded, more than 160 000 people have been internally displaced, and over 4 000 cholera cases have been reported. Malaria is on the rise. In Malawi, the cyclone and the floods have destroyed many fields of recently planted crops. The potential loss of harvest will have a severe impact on the livelihoods of small-scale farmers who depend on agricultural production. Women and children are heavily affected. In Zimbabwe, the floods aggravated an existing severe humanitarian crisis caused by drought and a poor harvest. Food insecurity and malnutrition, which were already at alarming levels, risk worsening further. In all three countries, the humanitarian needs are enormous. They include food, drinking water, shelter, health and nutrition, as well as education, protection and logistics. The Mozambique Humanitarian Response Plan and the Zimbabwe Flash Appeal are asking for a total of USD 342 million. Currently only 23% has been funded so more efforts will be needed.

As you know, the EU and the Member States mobilised quickly in response to these natural disasters. Humanitarian and civil protection assistance has been offered by the Commission and the Member States in support of the affected countries. In support of the EU response to this disaster, the Presidency of the Council took the necessary actions to raise awareness on the humanitarian and funding needs by opening a monitoring page on the EU's Integrated Political Crisis Response arrangements (IPCR) web platform. In this respect, we moved the IPCR into monitoring mode. This has facilitated a constant exchange of information between the Member States, the Commission, the European External Action Service (EEAS) and the relevant EU agency on the evolving situation, the humanitarian needs and the EU response. We included the disaster caused by the tropical cyclone Idai on the agenda of the relevant Council working parties to facilitate in-depth discussions among Member States and the Commission. We welcome the fact that Parliament's Committee on Development (DEVE) is also interested in discussing the situation. Our intensive exchanges through various channels have shown that the EU and its Member States were quick to react in response to this disaster. Member States have contributed extensively by providing humanitarian – and that means more than EUR 60 million – and civil protection assistance in kind, including shelters, food and power generators, as well as the deployment of water purification, satellite communication, medical emergency teams, flood rescue and relief modules, experts all provided through the EU Civil Protection Mechanism. A European civil protection team led by a Romanian expert has been deployed to Mozambique since 23 March 2019 in order to assess the needs and ensure coordination and distribution of the aid provided by Member States. There is very good cooperation and coordination on the ground. A number of Member States also made available military assets, such as ships, helicopters and aircraft for logistics and transport. Member States have allocated substantial amounts of funding to the humanitarian response. Thus, the necessary services are currently being contracted and implemented. We welcome the fact that the Commission has also allocated more than EUR 50 million euros for humanitarian support.

This brings us to the importance of implementation. Our close consultations with Member States and the Commission have shown that protection must be at the heart of our emergency response. Many families have been separated. Women and children are disproportionately affected by displacement, and women and girls are particularly vulnerable to gender-based violence and sexual exploitation. We also need to ensure that education can resume as soon as possible for thousands of children affected by the crisis. Lastly, we should consider using cash assistance wherever the circumstances allow for it.

This is our analysis of the immediate needs and the emergency response. A post-disaster needs assessment will indicate the necessary action to address the long-term recovery needs. I now look forward to hearing your views and the information that the Commission will provide.

Paulo Rangel, *em nome do Grupo PPE*. – Senhora Presidente, a minha primeira palavra vai, naturalmente, para as vítimas deste desastre do ciclone Idai, em Moçambique, Malawi e Zimbabue e, feita esta declaração, para populações que já viviam muito mal, em grande miséria e em grande sofrimento, naturalmente que isto é uma tragédia que tem consequências, eu diria, muito, muito graves para todas estas famílias, para todas estas populações.

Queria deixar três notas: a primeira, dizer que, ao contrário do que aqui foi dito, a reação da União Europeia foi tardia. A União Europeia demorou a reagir e é inaceitável. Não o faria com outros países, mas, como se está a falar da África e da África subdesenvolvida, a União Europeia teve uma reação que foi lenta no início. Devia ter feito mais, ofereceu pouco no início, agora está a responder bem, mas falhou na sua resposta inicial.

Em segundo lugar, queria dizer que, finalmente, a proposta do PSD, que aliás agendou este debate para o mecanismo europeu de proteção civil, mostra que ele era necessário, que temos que o reforçar ainda e que ele, agora sim, está a funcionar bem.

Finalmente, espero que isto não seja apenas um episódio e que na recuperação a União Europeia seja capaz de dar uma resposta com mais prontidão e mais consistência do que aquela que deu nos primeiros dias, nos dias iniciais, em que foi fraca, foi frágil e foi tímida, e, se não fossem os portugueses, teria sido ainda mais lenta.

Enrique Guerrero Salom, *en nombre del Grupo S&D*. – Señora presidenta, señor comisario, en primer lugar, agradecer el esfuerzo de la Comisión, de usted mismo y de los países que han respondido, quizá con algo de lentitud pero con esfuerzo a este gran desastre climático.

Un mismo desastre ha afectado a tres países que conjuntamente tienen la misma extensión que Francia, España e Italia juntas. ¿Se necesita mayor reflexión para entender que estamos ante un fenómeno —el calentamiento global— que afecta a todos y al que debemos responder globalmente?

Los países que están implicados en este desastre natural, sin embargo, tienen otra condición. Son países pobres. Y el mismo desastre climático destruye más aquellos que menos tienen. Destruye escuelas, destruye viviendas y destruye sistemas sanitarios.

En la que quizá sea mi última intervención como ponente permanente de ayuda humanitaria de este Parlamento quiero reclamar que en la próxima legislatura se avance en la regulación de la figura del refugiado climático. Cada vez tendremos más y más personas que tengan que huir del hambre y de la destrucción como consecuencia de desastres naturales.

Y tenemos que darles la esperanza de poder atenderles reconociendo sus derechos, porque aquellos que han perdido todo menos su dignidad no pueden finalmente perder la esperanza en nosotros.

João Pimenta Lopes, *em nome do Grupo GUE/NGL*. – Senhora Presidente, a ajuda mobilizada pela União Europeia para acorrer à catástrofe causada pelo ciclone Idai e pelas inundações subsequentes em Moçambique, no Zimbábue e no Malawi é uma gota de água no oceano de necessidades com que estes países e as suas populações estão confrontados.

As necessidades ao nível dos cuidados de saúde, alimentação, habitação e alojamentos, comunicações, transportes, logística e infraestruturas diversas, proteção civil, entre outras, são imensas. Em face delas, os 15 milhões de euros e a equipa de onze, apenas onze, peritos mobilizados pela União Europeia ficam muito aquém do possível e do necessário. São uma gota de água no oceano de possibilidades da União Europeia que ficam muito aquém do que vários países da comunidade internacional já mobilizaram.

Para além da ajuda de emergência, que deve ser aumentada sem demora, há que pensar nas fases subsequentes, no necessário reforço e eventual reprogramação das dotações do Fundo Europeu de Desenvolvimento, de vários apoios setoriais, e em medidas como o mais do que justo cancelamento da dívida.

Bodil Valero, *för Verts/ALE-gruppen*. – Fru talman! Vi har precis lyssnat på Greta Thunberg och hört vad vi måste göra här i Europa för att minska våra utsläpp. Jag tänker dock att vi måste prata om vad vi ska göra också för alla dem som drabbas av konsekvenserna av våra utsläpp – dem i andra delar av världen. För de extrema vädren blir ju allt häftigare och vanligare, och det är andra som drabbas allra mest. Det är jättebra att vi ger humanitärt stöd, men vi måste också förebygga. Då handlar det om stora mängder med resurser som måste gå in för att förebygga, anpassa fattiga länder till de nya förutsättningarna.

Detta är ingenting nytt i exempelvis Moçambique. År 2000 var det en jätteöversvämning i Moçambique. År 2013 var jag där efter ännu en stor översvämning. Jag besökte Gazaprovinzen och biståndsprojekt där man har flyttat människor längre upp så att man inte längre bor i de låglänta områdena. Det behövs dock så mycket mer. Och nu har vi den här enorma översvämningen 2019. Vi måste också arbeta långsiktigt. Moçambique har stora gasfyndigheter. Det kan ge landet en rikedom. Men all den gasen kan bara vändas emot dem i slutänden. Så hur ska vi göra för att få en långsiktig lösning?

José Manuel Fernandes (PPE). – Senhora Presidente, em primeiro lugar, uma palavra para as famílias das vítimas, uma palavra de amizade também para todas as populações afetadas e sobretudo para o povo moçambicano.

Em boa hora reforçamos o novo mecanismo de proteção civil, mas fica claro que é preciso ainda um reforço adicional. A União Europeia é solidária internamente e externamente, mas é uma solidariedade que deve ser sempre reforçada, até porque as alterações climáticas e os seus efeitos serão cada vez mais gravosos. E neste momento, apesar da ajuda que foi dada, é necessário um reforço dessa ajuda, mais meios no terreno.

Há mais de um milhão de crianças que estão numa situação dramática e de emergência, o que significa que é preciso uma atuação rápida. E, depois de tudo isto, é ainda necessário que não se esqueça a reconstrução. Também aí a União Europeia tem de dizer presente e tem de reforçar através, por exemplo, da ajuda ao desenvolvimento do Fundo Europeu de Desenvolvimento os montantes para os territórios afetados, e nomeadamente para Moçambique.

Carlos Zorrinho (S&D). – Senhora Presidente, o ciclone tropical Idai teve, na noite de 14 de março de 2019, o primeiro impacto em Moçambique, com chuvas torrenciais e ventos fortes, dirigindo-se depois para o Zimbábue e provocando inundações maciças no Malawi. O ciclone deixou um rasto de devastação no seu percurso.

Além de milhares de desalojados, destruiu infraestruturas e deixou várias regiões de Moçambique completamente vulneráveis e dependentes da ajuda internacional. Verificaram-se mais de mil mortos nos três países, 60 % dos quais em Moçambique, e muitos milhares de feridos. Problemas de cólera começaram agora a causar novas baixas, principalmente em Moçambique. Há um número desconhecido desaparecidos.

A União Europeia, como disse o Senhor Comissário, já assegurou ajuda financeira de 15 milhões de euros. A pedido de Moçambique, foi também ativado o Mecanismo de Proteção Civil da União Europeia. As ofertas recebidas vieram sobretudo de Portugal, mas também da Áustria, Alemanha, Dinamarca, Espanha, França, Itália, Luxemburgo e Reino Unido.

É preciso continuar a ajudar as populações afetadas e tirar para o futuro consequências do que aconteceu. Isto é muito importante, tirar consequências para o futuro. A cooperação internacional na resposta e na prevenção de catástrofes é fundamental. As alterações climáticas são uma realidade que não atende a PIB, geografia, grau de desenvolvimento, riqueza ou atitude. São um flagelo transversal que importa combater com medidas efetivas que permitam cumprir o acordo de Paris e preservar o que ainda for possível do nosso planeta.

As minhas sinceras condolências e a minha associação total às famílias de Moçambique do Malawi e do Zimbábue.

Spontane Wortmeldungen

José Inácio Faria (PPE). – Senhora Presidente, Senhor Comissário, em primeiro lugar uma palavra para as vítimas deste ciclone Idai. Um mês depois de o ciclone Idai ter devastado partes de Moçambique, do Malawi e do Zimbábue, causando centenas de mortos, milhares de pessoas que viram as suas casas e as suas plantações destruídas permanecem em campos de deslocados lotados, sem acesso a serviços essenciais de água, saneamento e saúde e sujeitas agora a epidemias de cólera, tifo e malária. Entre a população afetada contam-se um milhão e seiscentas mil crianças que, além da ameaça destes surtos, estão também vulneráveis agora à exploração e ao abuso laboral e sexual.

A União Europeia que, além de ter ativado o seu mecanismo de proteção civil, embora tardiamente, disponibilizou já mais de 15 milhões de euros em ajuda humanitária para responder a esta catástrofe, tem também agora que ter a vontade política para compatibilizar esta solidariedade com a implementação do tão falado plano Marshall para África que aposte também num modelo de transição ecológica que permita converter a violência destes fenómenos naturais extremos numa exceção, e não na regra.

A solidariedade europeia tem que ser mais célere e abrangente. Não basta criar mecanismos que depois não servem os objetivos para os quais foram criados.

Ana Gomes (S&D). – Solidariedade com as vítimas do ciclone Idai em Moçambique, Malawi e no Zimbábue sim, mas em Moçambique é preciso entender que desgoverno e espiral de corrupção são a todos os níveis, incluindo ao mais alto nível político, o pior inimigo do povo que tenta recuperar da devastação e das doenças deixadas pelo Idai. São o inimigo que a União Europeia e todos os países doadores devem ajudar a combater para que o povo de Moçambique não seja mais prejudicado, apesar da solidariedade e da ajuda de emergência que não foi, e não devia ter sido, regateada.

Corrupção e impunidade são o que explica que as autoridades de Moçambique, incluindo, inacreditavelmente, a PGR, até hoje não tenham aceite as ofertas de ajuda das polícias e PGR de Portugal para localizarem o empresário português Américo Sebastião, raptado por forças governamentais há quase três anos, na província de Sofala.

Corrupção e impunidade são o que explica o assassinato do constitucionalista francês Gilles Cistac e os assassinatos, tortura, raptos e agressões a jornalistas e a outros corajosos moçambicanos que ousam expor e criticar as dívidas ocultas e as ostensivas que afundam Moçambique.

Não ajudaremos o povo Moçambique se fizermos vista grossa à corrupção e à impunidade que desgovernam este país irmão e entravam a recuperação pelo seu sacrificado povo de desastres climáticos como o ciclone Idai e de outros desastres.

(Ende der spontanen Wortmeldungen)

Christos Stylianides, *Member of the Commission*. – Madam President, thank you so much again for this opportunity and this discussion. It is helpful to all of us and I am grateful for your sensitivity on this issue. We should not allow these disasters to be forgotten. The people in these countries – Mozambique, Malawi and Zimbabwe – need our help, and I totally agree with my dear colleague José Manuel Fernandes and others about their proposal that we need to continue our support through development aid and to see real funding for reconstruction.

As I said, the European Union stands ready to continue its support towards the people affected by this cyclone through our humanitarian and civil protection and development tools.

Cyclones, floods and disease outbreaks will continue to affect the southern Africa and Indian Ocean region. Climate change is here. It is not fake news, as I have said time and again. I totally agree with my dear colleague here from the Greens and my dear friend Enrique Guerrero Salom: yes, we have to deal with this problem and I am really proud because the European Union is leading by example in this field, especially because we are the most important factor to implement the Paris Agreement.

Sorry, dear colleague, but I totally disagree with you: the European Union started its support to Mozambique from the beginning of the cyclone. We can go to our emergency centre in order to see the programme about our support. I am very proud of this centre, because when we had the request we started immediately. All UN agencies, all local NGOs and international organisations had already recognised European support to Mozambique, Malawi and Zimbabwe. So thank you so much for this important debate. The facts speak for themselves.

Melania Gabriela Ciot, *President-in-Office of the Council*. – Madam President, I would like to thank the honourable Members for this discussion on this urgent topic. The EU and its Member States are at the forefront of this international emergency response. The recovery and reconstruction phase will last far beyond our Presidency. When our Foreign Minister spoke to the Committee on Development in January, he explained that disaster risk reduction and the nexus between humanitarian and development assistance are the two key priorities of the Romanian Presidency in the field of humanitarian aid.

The scale of the disaster we are witnessing in southern Africa is a painful reminder that there is much work to be done in both of these fields. We need to ensure that our emergency response is complemented by our development cooperation efforts in southern Africa. When the emergency phase is over we will need to help the affected countries build back better and improve their resilience and preparedness for future shocks. As much as we would wish otherwise, the scale of climate-related hazard is only set to increase in the future. Let us all work together to ensure that the damage and loss of lives this could cause may nevertheless get smaller and smaller.

Die Präsidentin. – Die Aussprache ist geschlossen.

Schriftliche Erklärungen (Artikel 162)

João Ferreira (GUE/NGL), *por escrito*. – Congratulamo-nos com a realização deste debate, que só peca por tardio. A ajuda mobilizada pela UE para acorrer à catástrofe causada pelo ciclone Idai e pelas inundações subsequentes, em Moçambique, no Zimbábue e no Malawi, é uma gota de água no oceano de necessidades com que estes países e as suas populações estão confrontados. As necessidades ao nível dos cuidados de saúde, alimentação, alojamentos, comunicações, transportes, logística, entre outras, são imensas e, em face delas, os 15 milhões de euros e a equipa de onze (apenas onze!) peritos enviada pela UE, ficam muito aquém do possível e necessário. Ficam aquém do que vários países da comunidade internacional já mobilizaram.

Só Cuba, por exemplo, com incomensuravelmente menos meios do que a UE (mas incomensuravelmente maior na atitude e no exemplo), enviou mais de 40 médicos, a somar aos 372 profissionais de saúde que já tinha no terreno.

As Nações Unidas, através da UNICEF, já alertaram em especial para a situação particularmente preocupante das crianças. Para além da ajuda de emergência, que deve ser aumentada sem delongas, há que pensar nas fases subsequentes, no necessário reforço e na eventual reprogramação das dotações do Fundo Europeu de Desenvolvimento, de vários apoios sectoriais, e em medidas como, o mais do que justo, cancelamento da dívida.

14. Sytuacja w Libii (debata)

Die Präsidentin. – Als nächster Punkt der Tagesordnung folgt die Erklärung der Vizepräsidentin der Kommission und Hohen Vertreterin der Union für Außen- und Sicherheitspolitik zur Lage in Libyen (2019/2693(RSP)).

Die Hohe Vertreterin ist noch nicht da, Herr Preda auch nicht, Frau Valenciano ebenfalls nicht. Herr Tannock, dann bekommen Sie zunächst das Wort für die ECR.

Charles Tannock, on behalf of the ECR Group. – Madam President, at a time when the two sides in Libya were supposed to be sitting down to discuss a road map towards elections under a UN-mediated settlement, we are instead witnessing General Haftar's LNA troops battling militarily for control of Tripoli. The British Government has warned that any LNA advance on Tripoli would be very damaging for the political and diplomatic solutions on offer and risk a descent into more widespread violence and chaos.

Prime Minister al-Sarraj of the UN-supported Government of National Accord in Tripoli has given further warnings that the advance on Tripoli risks sparking a fresh migration crisis in the Mediterranean if the situation worsens. With reports suggesting that many refugees are being forced to join the various militias operating throughout Libya, these warnings should not go unheeded.

Given the complexity of the situation and the multitude of actors involved, the way ahead is fraught with hazards. However, the UN-mediated talks are the only peaceful options still on the table. The EU and EU Member States must therefore do all they can to support these talks with one united voice.

To those who see in General Haftar a potential strong man who could consolidate power and bring order to that chaotic country, I would urge them to pay attention to the various reports in the public domain that question such simple assertions. Significant military and political opposition remains in his way and there is little evidence to suggest that he could easily hold the country together in the longer term.

Die Präsidentin. – Vielen Dank, Herr Tannock.

Ich sehe, dass die Hohe Vertreterin gerade eintrifft. Und ich weiß, dass gerade in dieser letzten Plenarsitzungswoche, die wir im Europäischen Parlament haben, alles drunter und drüber geht. Das merken wir hinten und vorne, auch in meinem Terminplan. Ich freue mich, Frau Mogherini, Ihnen nun das Wort geben zu dürfen.

Federica Mogherini, Vice-President of the Commission / High Representative of the Union for Foreign Affairs and Security Policy. – Madam President, the recent escalation in Libya started at a moment just when the possibility for peace was becoming real. The LNA, led by General Haftar, attacked Tripoli at the very time when UN Secretary-General Guterres was visiting the country and on the eve of the National Conference, a conference that still has the potential to represent a new beginning for Libya.

The European Union has worked for almost one year together – very closely together – with the United Nations and the Special Envoy to prepare the ground for a Libyan-led and Libyan-owned National Conference that would prepare the ground for elections under the appropriate legal and constitutional conditions, and we have seen day by day the aspiration, the readiness, the desire of all the Libyan people, the citizens of Libya, to move their country forward, to turn the page, to unite and build unity and peace for a country that has potentially an enormous capacity to move forward, a lot of resources and a lot of potential.

The National Conference still represents the hope of an entire country. And just a few days before that military escalation took place, I was myself, together with Guterres, with the Secretary General of the League of Arab States, with the Chairperson of the African Union and with Ghassan Salamé, the UN Special Envoy, in Tunis at the margins of the League of Arab States summit, reaffirming the unity of the international community to support this Libyan-led, Libyan-owned political process that would have helped in turning the page and uniting the country in peace.

The offensive against Tripoli has been, is still, an attack against hope, an attack against the concrete perspective of achieving peace in Libya, and we have seen this happen before. When peace becomes a real possibility – concrete, possible – it is then also that we see that the resistance against peace gets stronger and more evident.

Now we are facing a protracted conflict with victims in high numbers, including civilians, and a stalemate on the ground. A situation that is blocked on the ground in terms of the line of the conflict, but still very active in terms of clashes, with the use of arms that we shouldn't be seeing used in Libya.

This confirms what we have always known in Europe and in the international community, at least in recent years – the reason there cannot be any military solution to the Libyan conflict. If the war continues, it will only lead to greater suffering and if someone continues to seek military victory everybody will lose. The only scenario where the whole country, where all Libyans, in an inclusive and unified manner, move forward, is a negotiated political solution.

If the Libyan parties will not seek a win-win solution that the international community, starting with the European Union, would be ready to accompany and support – and the Libyan parties will not seek, I would say, a win-win solution – then all the people of Libya will continue to suffer and the entire region will continue to suffer.

I just spoke again today with the UN Special Envoy, Ghassan Salamé. Our work is joint and the European Union supports his work on a daily basis. Our support for his work, I would say, is even stronger today than it has ever been in the past, along three main lines on which the European Union and our Member States have acted united in these last weeks.

First, to affirm the need to open humanitarian corridors as a matter of urgency and fully respect humanitarian international law.

Second, to establish an immediate ceasefire, that I am sure the UN is ready to negotiate.

Third, to go back to the political track with the holding of the National Conference as soon as possible to give Libyans, the Libyan people, men and women of all generations, of all cities and in the countryside of the country, the chance to outline their common way forward.

These are the three elements on which I am sure – for sure the European Union, for sure the United Nations – but I'm sure also the rest of the international community would be ready to support and accompany the Libyan people.

Let me add that it is not only Libyans, not only the region, that are suffering. Refugees and migrants trapped in detention centres are also at risk. We are working with the IOM and with UNHCR to evacuate them outside Libya or to move them to safer places inside Libya. The most recent flights that brought dozens of migrants back home safely and voluntarily left Tripoli just a few days ago. Our work with the UN agencies continues but obviously conditions on the ground are more and more difficult by the day and this is also why we call on all parties to allow the swift and unconditional evacuation of detention centres on the front line, as also requested by High Commissioner Grandi last week.

The work we have done together within the UN agencies, with the help of the African Union on the ground, with the help of the Libyan authorities on the ground, has brought in this last year enormous results with tens of thousands of migrants voluntarily and safely repatriated through the work of the IOM and those in need of international protection protected through the UNHCR channels.

The conflict in Libya, the escalation from the military perspective – I know that some in Europe perceive it as a growing threat of growing flows, but it also represents first and foremost a threat to the lives of those migrants and refugees that are trapped in Libya and whose lives are more at risk than others, and for which we have been trying with the UN agencies to work to try and save lives and to try and empty the detention centres. The military offensive is also making this work more difficult.

To conclude, let me restate very clearly, a swift return to the negotiating table is essential, it is still possible. We believe more than ever that the UN track and the National Conference are the only real opportunity for a peaceful resolution. The multiplication or the proliferation of different initiatives may lead to destruction that would definitely not be helpful at this moment. Humanitarian corridors and respect for international humanitarian law, ceasefire negotiated by the UN and a return to the negotiating table and the holding of a National Conference as soon as possible, with the full participation of the Libyan people.

I would like to add that when I say Libyan people, I refer to Libyan men and women. Let me take a moment to praise the Libyan women that have been sometimes in the shadow trying to accompany the political process, so far, in difficult conditions and I believe that the European Union, together with the United Nations, has an interest, as in every conflict we face, in promoting the role of women at the negotiating table and in the reconciliation process on the ground.

This is what we are trying to contribute to achieving, supporting the UN work, trying to unite the Europeans, and I can say that if in the past we have seen different approaches, I believe today that all European Union Member States understand that our common work is required to avoid Libyans turning in different directions and disaggregating the potential of unity through a political dialogue that is in their hands.

We stated clearly last time, last week, the European Union's united position along these lines in the name of all the 28 - Member States, and I would now appeal to all the regional players and the international players to unite in support of the United Nations' work, in support of the political perspective for dialogue and unity in Libya, to avoid the Libyan stakeholders themselves finding external reasons for disuniting even further. On the European side, I can say that today they find a common, united front in support of the United Nations' efforts to bring the parties around the table and define a common perspective for Libya in peace and security.

Cristian Dan Preda, *au nom du groupe PPE*. – Madame la Présidente, Madame la Haute représentante, la situation que l'on observe cette dernière semaine en Libye est d'autant plus regrettable qu'au mois de février, il y a quelques semaines, un accord avait été conclu entre le chef du gouvernement, M. al-Sarraj, et le général Haftar. Cet accord prévoyait, entre autres, l'organisation d'élections générales. Pourtant, il y a deux semaines, le général Haftar a abandonné ce scénario. Il a décidé de replonger le pays dans une situation de chaos, mettant ainsi en danger la population civile. Il compromet de fait les perspectives d'un avenir pour les Libyens. Il est clair que les liens avec la Russie et ses appuis à l'extérieur sont beaucoup plus importants que le soutien dont il dispose dans son pays, exception faite, bien sûr, des forces militaires.

Je soutiens pleinement ce que vous avez dit: il n'y a de solutions que négociées. Il faut exclure la voie militaire et nous avons besoin d'exercer une pression sur Haftar afin qu'il abandonne la voie des armes.

Elena Valenciano, *en nombre del Grupo S&D*. – Señora presidenta, en realidad poco que añadir a lo que ha dicho la alta representante en esta Cámara, que es la única posición razonable para la Unión Europea.

Es verdad que algún tiempo se ha perdido y algunos Estados miembros han tardado en comprender que su apoyo a Haftar era un apoyo peligroso, porque finalmente Haftar siempre propondrá una solución militar. Es evidente también que solo el diálogo entre los libios podrá empezar a construir una Libia con una cierta estabilidad y sin guerra.

También es verdad que está tan cerca de nosotros Libia que es nuestra obligación principal mantener unidos a los Estados miembros, hablando con una sola voz, apoyando al enviado especial de las Naciones Unidas, a las Naciones Unidas, a la Unión Europea, a la Unión Africana, para tratar de construir un cierto escenario de confianza para que sea posible un acuerdo político.

Y también es verdad que no debemos dejar de mirar a la situación de los refugiados, que también habíamos empezado a gestionar de manera positiva y que probablemente van a convertirse en un nuevo foco de riesgo en los próximos meses.

Así que, por parte del Grupo socialista, todo nuestro apoyo al trabajo y las gestiones de la alta representante una vez más.

Barbara Spinelli, a nome del gruppo GUE/NGL. – Signora Presidente, onorevoli colleghi, visto che la guerra in Libia non si risolverà pacificamente, chiedo alla Vicepresidente di parlare chiaro sui migranti intrappolati nei lager perché non vengano da noi, l'evacuazione è limitatissima dice l'UNHCR.

Dunque chiedo questo: che l'operazione Sofia torni subito a dotarci di navi per impedire naufragi. Il Mediterraneo è l'unica via di fuga, bloccarla è un crimine contro l'umanità. Che la Commissione raccomandi l'immediata cessazione dei rimpatri in un paese sempre più insicuro, che l'evacuazione sia facilitata da corridoi umanitari nelle zone di guerra, che acqua e cibo arrivino ai migranti detenuti.

Cochetel, dell'UNHCR, ha detto il 9 aprile che nel Mediterraneo non si fa più *search and rescue*, ma *search and return*, e che l'Unione dando alla Libia navi e tecnologie si rende complice di torture, stupri e schiavitù. Vorrei sapere come risponde a questa accusa.

Barbara Lochbihler, im Namen der Verts/ALE-Fraktion. – Frau Präsidentin! Es war richtig, dass die EU seit Jahren die UN-geführten Vermittlungsbemühungen unterstützt. Dennoch blieb dieses Engagement für einen Friedensprozess erfolglos. Wer jetzt aber Hoffnung darin sieht, eine Konfliktpartei würde gewinnen und es würde durch die Eskalation der Gewalt dann zu mehr Stabilität im Land kommen, der erliegt einem schweren Irrtum.

Die EU-Mitgliedstaaten dürfen sich in diesem Konflikt nicht auf die eine oder andere Seite schlagen. Stattdessen muss den Konfliktparteien unmissverständlich deutlich gemacht werden, dass eine Lösung nur am Verhandlungstisch erreicht werden kann.

Die anhaltenden Kämpfe in Libyen bedeuten für die Flüchtlinge dort eine weitere Gefahr. Es ist beschämend, dass die EU durch die Kooperation mit der libyschen Küstenwache immer noch dazu beiträgt, dass Geflüchtete in Lager in Libyen zurückgebracht werden, wo ihnen grausame Misshandlungen drohen. Die Versuche der EU, die Situation in diesen Lagern zu verbessern, haben wenig bis keine Wirkung gezeigt. Jetzt in der aktuellen Gewalteskalation muss alles dafür getan werden, das Leben der Menschen in diesen Lagern zu retten und sie von dort wegzubringen.

Fabio Massimo Castaldo, a nome del gruppo EFDD. – Signora Presidente, onorevoli colleghi, in Libia ormai si combatte una guerra per procura, ed è chiaro a tutti, Arabia Saudita, Egitto, Russia, Turchia e Qatar hanno chiare agende politiche.

Molto più grave è però che questo gioco letale sia portato avanti anche da Stati membri, infischandosene della posizione dell'Unione europea e delle Nazioni Unite, che faticosamente stanno cercando di alimentare e tenere vivo un processo di pace tra le parti. La dichiarazione francese di estraneità alle azioni di Haftar sembra un palese caso di *excusatio non petita, accusatio manifesta*. E sono inquietanti alcuni scoop giornalistici degli ultimi giorni, che testimonierebbero l'opposizione francese a una prima versione della dichiarazione europea, ritenuta troppo anti Haftar, nonché la presenza di consiglieri militari francesi sul campo.

E quindi, cari colleghi, io vi chiedo: a che gioco stiamo giocando? Dopo l'accordo di Aquisgrana l'europeismo ipocrita di Macron smentisce e svilisce per la seconda volta la politica estera europea. Mi rifiuto categoricamente di pensare che questi otto anni di incubo libico siano serviti solamente a sostituire un dittatore con un altro più compiacente. Denuncio questa ipocrisia, chiedo che il Presidente Macron venga a rispondere a queste domande, in questo Parlamento, altrimenti che getti la maschera una volta per tutte.

Mario Borghezio, a nome del gruppo ENF. – Signora Presidente, onorevoli colleghi, i rapporti dei servizi italiani e anche le dichiarazioni esplicite di Sarraj parlano di un numero impressionante di rifugiati e comunque di immigrati che si trovano attualmente in Libia, centinaia di migliaia pronti a ripartire verso le coste italiane.

È un problema molto grave, ma mi pare che l'impegno esposto dall'Alto rappresentante non ci dia molte speranze concrete su quella che possa essere l'effettiva influenza dell'Unione europea e degli Stati membri per una soluzione a breve tempo e soprattutto per evitare che la Libia precipiti immediatamente o prossimamente nel caos.

L'impasse dei combattimenti fra l'esercito del generale Haftar e le milizie che difendono il premier Sarraj potrebbe indicare una svolta, potrebbe infatti lasciare nuovamente ampi margini alla politica e al negoziato. Haftar non ha sfondato il fronte, non è penetrato nel cuore della capitale e con ogni probabilità la defezione di alcune milizie di Tripoli su cui contava non si è verificata. Quindi vi è un bilancio di dieci giorni ancora modesto e definire quella in corso a Tripoli una guerra civile è sicuramente un eccesso, voluto forse da ambienti che non vedono l'ora di sfruttare questo pretesto per far magari riaprire i porti italiani a nuove ondate di immigrati illegali.

Io credo che a questo punto si debba dire che il fallimento delle opzioni militari fa risalire le quotazioni e l'importanza di un paese chiave come l'Italia, il cui governo mi pare che abbia le carte in regola per poter essere coprotagonista di un processo di riequilibrio e di riordino di un'area importantissima per l'Europa, estremamente pericolosa se pensiamo alla presenza di jihadisti, di guerrieri di Allah.

Ma allora direi perché oltre ad avere ottimi rapporti con entrambi i leader rivali non sfruttiamo la posizione dell'Italia, che ha mantenuto aperta la sua ambasciata e si conferma come paese pronto ad avere un ruolo preponderante, un ruolo importantissimo che mi pare sia molto superiore a quello assolutamente insussistente di questa Unione europea.

Γεώργιος Επιτήδειος (NI). – Κυρία Πρόεδρε, οι εξελίξεις των τελευταίων εβδομάδων στη Λιβύη αναδεικνύουν για μια ακόμη φορά τα σφάλματα της εξωτερικής πολιτικής της Ευρωπαϊκής Ένωσης σχετικά με τη χώρα αυτή. Τα κράτη μέλη της Ένωσης, τα οποία σε συνεργασία με τις Ηνωμένες Πολιτείες ανέτρεψαν το 2011 τον Gaddafi, δεν κατόρθωσαν να βοηθήσουν τη χώρα. Την άφησαν στο έλεος του ISIS, με αποτέλεσμα να υπάρξει μια μακροχρόνια και επικίνδυνη κρίση.

Μετά από πολεμικές συγκρούσεις πέντε ετών, οι δυνάμεις του στρατηγού Haftar κατόρθωσαν στα τέλη Ιανουαρίου του 2019 να καταλάβουν το τελευταίο οχυρό του ISIS στην πόλη Sabha. Ωστόσο, η ειρήνη δεν επετεύχθη, διότι στις 4 Απριλίου ο Haftar επετέθη εναντίον της Τρίπολης για να την καταλάβει. Για ακόμη μία φορά η διεθνής κοινότητα και η Ευρωπαϊκή Ένωση φαίνονται αδύναμες να παρέμβουν αποφασιστικά στην όλη κατάσταση.

Η Λιβύη είναι η χώρα της Αφρικής που έχει τα μεγαλύτερα αποθέματα πετρελαίου και με αυτά ως έπαθλο θα συνεχιστεί ο εμφύλιος πόλεμος, που θα διατηρήσει την κρίση, θα επηρεάσει τις γειτονικές χώρες και θα γεμίσει την Ευρωπαϊκή Ένωση με μετανάστες και τρομοκράτες.

Elmar Brok (PPE). – Frau Präsidentin, Frau Vizepräsidentin, Kolleginnen und Kollegen! Dies zeigt, dass wir seit dem Ende von Gaddafi keine westliche und europäische Strategie gehabt haben. Wir haben viele Bemühungen unternommen, aber wir haben das nie in den Griff bekommen. Das kann man auch nicht einem Einzelnen anlasten, da sind wir alle ein Stückchen schuld. Aber wir sehen, das ist ja ein Land, das klassisch immer in zumindest zwei Gebiete geteilt war: Das östliche Gebiet, das heute Haftar vertritt und das jetzt den anderen Teil übernehmen will – dafür gibt es gute historische Gründe –, und das ist auf der anderen Seite die legitime Regierung, die mit Hilfe der Vereinten Nationen und mit unserer Hilfe installiert worden ist, und der es trotz aller Zusagen nie gelungen ist, die Dinge zusammenzubringen.

Ich würde mir auch die Möglichkeit anhören – vielleicht können die Kollegen dort den Mund halten, sorry –, dass wir feststellen müssen, dass es vielleicht auch gut ist, wenn europäische Länder unterschiedliche Kontakte haben, damit beide Seiten an den Verhandlungstisch gebracht werden. Und wenn ich mir die Situation der Migranten dort anschau, dann sind das wieder andere Gruppierungen, die weder von Tripolis noch von Haftar kontrolliert werden. Und damit ist die katastrophale Lage von Migranten gegeben.

Frau Mogherini, kriegen Sie es wieder hin, unter diesen Umständen und hoffentlich unter besseren Umständen, dass über Sophia und andere nicht nur die Menschenrettung stattfindet, sondern gegen die Menschenhändler vorgegangen wird, die das Übelste von allem sind! Ich glaube, da müssen wir wieder stärker tätig werden.

Inés Ayala Sender (S&D). – Señora presidenta, de nuevo lamentar que en Libia vuelve a haber conflicto armado, vuelve a haber muertos, y esta vez con una amenaza militar. Tal vez, de todos modos, escuchando al señor Brok y antes a otros colegas, si nos hubiésemos centrado más en Libia y en la población libia y menos en hacer de Libia un teatro de nuestras querellas europeas, hubiéramos sido seguramente bastante más eficaces.

De ahí que apoye especialmente todo el trabajo que está haciendo la alta representante precisamente para plantear una solución de tregua, una solución de conferencia, una solución multilateral que vaya por encima de las querellas europeas. Y desde luego, sería muy negativo para libios y libias, para las víctimas que ya ha habido y sus familias, y también para los más desvalidos, que son los inmigrantes, que de nuevo sobre Libia hiciésemos caer nuestros debates de antes de las elecciones europeas.

Yo creo que la Unión Europea tiene que estar ahora más unida que nunca, precisamente tras las propuestas de la alta representante y del alto comisionado de las Naciones Unidas. Y desde luego, dejémonos, por favor, de electoralismo y sobre todo sobre las vidas de los libios y de las libias.

Anna Elżbieta Fotyga (ECR). – Madam President, the crisis in Libya is escalating quickly, and we may face yet another proxy war in the making. I call for the immediate cessation of hostilities and a return to the negotiation table, and also an end to General Haftar's aggression. If Tripoli falls, we may have to cope with yet another wave of migration – a really big one this time. We support the UN-led peace process, the efforts of UN special envoys, and also your efforts, Madame Vice-President/High Representative.

Gilles Lebreton (ENF). – Madame la Présidente, l'armée du maréchal Haftar, l'homme fort de l'est libyen, a lancé une offensive sur Tripoli. Le gouvernement d'union nationale, reconnu par l'ONU, lui résiste au prix de violents combats. La situation est préoccupante, car cette déstabilisation de la Libye risque d'avoir de graves conséquences sur toute la région et au-delà sur l'Europe. C'est donc à juste titre que les États européens appellent les belligérants à un cessez-le-feu. La mission de l'ONU, la MANUL, a hélas échoué à instaurer une trêve. Quant au Conseil de sécurité de l'ONU, il est bloqué par la rivalité entre les États-Unis et la Russie. Les États-Unis veulent en effet l'inciter à appeler Haftar à arrêter son offensive, alors que la Russie voudrait plutôt l'inciter à appeler les deux belligérants à cesser les hostilités. Le conflit libyen est en réalité l'expression d'une lutte d'influences entre ces deux grandes puissances, mais pas seulement entre elles. Comme la Russie, la France du président Macron soutient Haftar, ce que lui reproche l'Italie. L'Europe est divisée et ne paraît donc pas en mesure de peser sur les événements.

Je regrette particulièrement que la France ne soit pas à la hauteur du rôle qu'elle devrait avoir. C'est elle qui a déstabilisé la Libye en 2011 à cause de la décision imprudente du président Sarkozy de renverser le colonel Kadhafi. C'est elle qui compromet aujourd'hui la recherche d'une solution. Il nous faudrait pourtant avancer unis, car l'offensive d'Haftar risque de déclencher une nouvelle vague migratoire vers l'Italie. Un rapport des services de renseignement italiens fait état d'au moins 6 000 réfugiés étrangers situés en Libye qui seraient déjà prêts à s'embarquer pour l'Italie. À terme, ce sont 800 000 migrants qui pourraient déferler en Europe, selon les estimations du Premier ministre italien. Ne ruinons pas les efforts du gouvernement italien, qui ont permis de réduire de 90 % en un an le nombre de migrants en provenance de Libye. Avançons unis!

José Ignacio Salafranca Sánchez-Neyra (PPE). – Señora presidenta, señora alta representante, señorías, tras la caída del régimen del coronel Gadafi, Libia ha vivido una situación de gran inestabilidad que se ha traducido claramente en una situación fuera de control en la que las milicias luchan por el control del territorio.

Evidentemente, esto se ha traducido en dos gobiernos, uno en Trípoli y otro en Tobruk, y esta ofensiva del mariscal Haftar lógicamente ha creado mayor inestabilidad. ¿Qué puede hacer la Unión Europea ante esta situación?

Como ha señalado la alta representante, tiene que tratar de mantener la calma, que se produzca un cese de las hostilidades, que al mismo tiempo se respete el embargo de armas para las dos partes, que se apoye y se evite una crisis humanitaria como la que se avecina —todavía mayor—, que se atienda la emergencia de los miles de refugiados, que se encuentran en una situación terrible, y al mismo tiempo, que la Unión Europea apoye estos esfuerzos en favor de la estabilidad, en favor del orden y del Estado de Derecho a través de un diálogo entre los propios libios, como ha señalado el secretario general de Naciones Unidas, António Guterres, sobre el terreno hace muy poco tiempo.

Entendemos que todos estos esfuerzos son unos esfuerzos vitales, señora presidenta, no solo para el país sino también para la región y para el conjunto de los intereses de la Unión Europea, que tiene que actuar —como han señalado otros colegas— de forma unida, de forma conjunta, bajo la guía y bajo la representación de la alta representante y vicepresidenta.

Knut Fleckenstein (S&D). – Frau Präsidentin, liebe Kolleginnen und Kollegen! Selbstverständlich stehen wir hinter dem, was die Hohe Vertreterin uns gesagt hat: Alle militärischen Optionen müssen unverzüglich eingestellt werden, humanitäre Waffenstillstände müssen beachtet werden, und die Parteien müssen den politischen Dialog wieder aufnehmen und sich an dem UN-geführten Prozess beteiligen. Es kann nur – richtig – eine politische Lösung geben; darin sind wir uns einig.

Wir können diese Debatte aber nur ernsthaft führen, wenn wir uns auch verdeutlichen, dass es unsere Pflicht ist, sehr aktiv dort beizutragen, die Lage in Libyen zu verbessern. Denn wir haben eine Teilschuld an der Situation in diesem Land. Diktatoren aus dem Amt zu drängen, ohne sich umfassend Gedanken über das Hinterher zu machen, ist unverantwortlich, wie sich zeigt. Libyen ist ein Beispiel dafür, wie der sogenannte Westen nicht agieren darf.

Aber, Herr Epitideios, es war nicht die EU, die das angerichtet hat, sondern es waren einzelne Mitgliedstaaten und andere Verbündete, die dieses Chaos angerichtet haben. Und es ist die EU und die Hohe Vertreterin und der Auswärtige Dienst, die immer wieder versucht haben, aus dieser Situation etwas zu machen. Wenn wir es gemeinsam versuchen, haben wir eine Chance. Wenn wir weiterhin nur so tun, als ob wir es gemeinsam machen, haben wir sie nicht.

Puhetta johti HEIDI HAUTALA

varapuhemies

Bas Belder (ECR). – Voorzitter, voor een Europese stellingname tegenover het complexe Libische strijdtoneel is Europese diplomatieke eensgezindheid toch een vereiste.

Treurig genoeg ontbreekt het daaraan. Parijs en Rome hebben onderscheiden belangen in het door twee regeringen en talloze militias volstrekt verscheurde Libië, *a failed state*. En als ik de *Frankfurter Allgemeine* die ik vanmorgen opensloeg mag geloven, heerst zelfs binnen de Italiaanse regering – het is jammer dat collega Castaldo al weg is – diepe verdeeldheid over het Libische dossier. Binnen één EU-lidstaat al.

Het grote gevaar voor de EU van de uitslaande Libische brand vormen de jihadistische groeperingen, die onder andere door Turkije op grootscheepse schaal van wapentuig worden voorzien. Dat vraagt om een urgente Europese indammingspolitiek. Dat leg ik daarom ook voor aan de hoge vertegenwoordiger, in alle bescheidenheid.

Claude Moraes (S&D). – Madam President, of course, Ms Ayala Sender, Mr Brok, Mr Castaldo and others have correctly described the situation of intervention which has brought us to this situation, but the Vice-President is here to talk about coping with this immediate situation now. The External Action Service came before our committee recently to talk about those coping strategies, and I really want to ask her – along with my colleague, Ms Spinelli – how we are going to do this now with the extension of Operation Sophia without the support of naval assets and other issues. Is there any scope here for flexibility? Are we going to change our views if this situation does worsen?

And, of course – I mentioned Ms Ayala Sender – we saw Tariq al Seka detention camp ourselves, we know what you are also dealing with. This is not an issue of blaming anyone; this is an issue of working together. But the risk of thousands of refugees and migrants who remain trapped in detention in the Qasr bin Ghashir detention centre, and the communications we are all receiving having visited Libya, indicates that this is a crisis which will only get greater during this very politically tense period. So I ask you again: is there any flexibility in the approach? And please tell us about the Operation Sophia situation.

Marek Jurek (ECR). – Pani Przewodnicząca! Panie i Panowie Posłowie! W przypadku tragedii libijskiej mamy do czynienia z kolejną odsłoną tego wielkiego dramatu, który zaczął się w naszym bezpośrednim sąsiedztwie wraz z Arabską Wiosną. To jest wielka tragiczna lekcja dla następnej Komisji Europejskiej i dla ludzi, którzy przyjmą odpowiedzialność również w tym parlamencie.

Nasz stosunek do partnerów w świecie poza Europą powinniśmy oceniać na podstawie kryteriów rzeczowych, porównując ich politykę, którą można proponować jako alternatywę, ale nie na podstawie naszych życzeń czy naszej ideologii. Widzimy tę tragedię w Syrii. Teraz widzimy ją jeszcze mocniej, jak eskaluje w Libii – walka o demokrację do ostatniego Syryjczyka czy Libijczyka. Czas naprawdę myśleć w kategoriach odpowiedzialności za ludzi.

Cécile Kashetu Kyenge (S&D). – Signora Presidente, onorevoli colleghi, non è tempo di divisioni. L'inferno della Libia ci richiama tutti alle nostre responsabilità: istituzioni europee, organismi internazionali e governi nazionali. La necessità più urgente è quella di un cessate il fuoco, ma dobbiamo anche tutti contribuire alla ricerca di una soluzione politica duratura, una soluzione che abbia come prospettiva di lungo termine la pacificazione, la stabilizzazione e la ricostruzione del paese.

Il bilancio in termini di vite umane è pesantissimo. Sono stati presi come bersaglio scuole, ospedali, campi di rifugiati, ancora soggetti vulnerabili, molti dei quali imprigionati in una situazione di grave pericolo, che si aggiungono al numero di donne, uomini e bambini che non possiamo lasciare sprovvisti di protezione internazionale. Eppure, nell'inferno della Libia c'è ancora chi la considera un paese di sbarco sicuro. C'è ancora chi specula sulla vita delle persone alla ricerca di facili consensi elettorali.

Adesso più che mai i governi europei devono dare prova di responsabilità e dobbiamo tornare all'operazione Sophia. Chiedo all'Alto rappresentante: ma la Libia è considerata un paese sicuro? Abbiamo bisogno di una risposta e grazie per il suo lavoro.

Alfred Sant (S&D). – Sinjura President, L-Ewropej għandhom id-dmir li juru kif l-akbar interess tagħhom fil-Libja hu l-gid tal-poplu Libjan. Mhux iż-żejt. Mhux min se jikkontrolla d-dahla lejn ir-rizorsi minerali tal-Afrika Ċentrali. L-ewwel irridu naqblu fuq l-essenzjali. Għall-Ewropa, l-essenzjali għandu jkun li l-Libja ma tispicċax bejta għat-terroriżmu. Sadanittant, li għandu bżonn il-poplu Libjan hi l-istabbiltà. Minnha, xi darba, tard jew kmieni, forsi se jinbtu l-paċi u d-demokrazija. Mingħajr l-istabbiltà, xejn minn dan ma jista' jgħri. M'għandniex naħdmu biex fil-Libja, malajr kemm jista' jkun, jitwaqqaf reġim li joghġobna, għal raġuni jew oħra. L-indhil barrani fit-tmexxija tal-Libja wassal għall-qagħda ta' anarkija li teżisti bħalissa. F'dan, l-Ewropej iġorru responsabbiltà kbira. Għandna nġhinu, iva, f'kull sforz ta' rieda tajba, li jsir biex il-forzi kollha fil-Libja, li jirrappreżentaw interessi ġenwini, ikunu mismugħa u mogħtija saħħa. Imma f'dal-proċess, ma nistgħux nibqgħu naqblu mal-paralizi eżistenti f'kif il-poplu Libjan jista' jipproċedi biex iwaqqaf istituzzjonijiet nazzjonali. L-appoġġ tagħna għandu jingħata lil dawk il-forzi li lesti, f'għaqda bejniethom, irazznu l-anarkija prezenti, jipprovd u sigurtà lill-poplu Libjan u jressqu lill-pajjiż lejn l-istabbiltà essenzjali biex is-soċjetà Libjana tkun tista' tiffunzjona b'mod normali.

Kati Piri (S&D). – Voorzitter, 147 mensen gedood, 614 gewond en 8 000 ontheemd. Dat is de tol van de laatste gevechten in Libië. Vorige maand kwamen premier al-Serraj en generaal Haftar bijna tot een overeenkomst om de situatie te normaliseren door het houden van verkiezingen. Desondanks begon Haftar op 4 april met een dodelijke opmars in het dichtbevolkte zuiden van Tripoli. Hij heeft maar één doel: het opvoeren van de druk op al-Serraj. Zo denkt Haftar zijn positie aan de onderhandelingstafel te verstevigen.

Dit mogen wij niet tolereren. Haftars strategie minacht het VN-vredesproces, leidt tot grote aantallen burgerslachtoffers, vermeerdert het aantal migranten dat Libië ontvlucht en vergroot het speelveld voor terroristische groeperingen. Ik vraag de hoge vertegenwoordiger dan ook onmiddellijk op te roepen tot een staakt-het-vuren en de terugtrekking van Haftars troepen. De onderhandelingen onder leiding van de EU en de VN moeten een eerlijke kans krijgen. Alleen dan ligt een duurzame vrede binnen bereik.

Pyynnöstä myönnettävät puheenvuorot

José Inácio Faria (PPE). – Senhora Presidente, Senhora Alta Representante, a recente escalada militar na Líbia, aliada às tensões sociais que se vivem na Argélia e em Marrocos, tem tido graves consequências económicas, humanitárias e securitárias para a Europa, potencia um novo êxodo migratório a caminho do nosso continente e faz cair por terra os argumentos dos que pretendem que a Líbia é um país seguro para a devolução dos imigrantes resgatados no Mediterrâneo.

A União Europeia, que anunciou este mês uma ajuda humanitária de 6 milhões de euros à Líbia, não pode deixar que os poderosos interesses económicos de alguns dos seus Estados-Membros naquele país impeçam uma posição conjunta que apela às partes beligerantes em Tobruk e em Trípoli o cessar imediato dos conflitos armados, o respeito pela trégua humanitária na capital e o regresso à via negociada que permita estabelecer um verdadeiro executivo de unidade nacional que possa garantir a paz e a estabilidade para todos os líbios.

No fundo, como a Senhora Alta Representante já aqui disse, dar uma chance aos líbios para que eles possam coletivamente decidir o seu futuro.

Patricia Lalonde (ALDE). – Madame la Présidente, Madame la Haute représentante, la situation en Libye est des plus préoccupantes: au moins 150 personnes ont déjà trouvé la mort, 614 sont blessées et 18 000 ont été déplacées depuis l'offensive du maréchal Haftar. Il s'agit de la troisième guerre civile depuis le renversement du colonel Kadhafi en 2011.

Les efforts de paix de l'ONU sont remis en cause par cette offensive. Il est certain que la division entre les États membres de l'Union européenne a empêché de trouver une solution à ce conflit, alors que certains d'entre eux sont pourtant directement responsables de cette situation – je pense à la France et à l'Italie.

Le ras-le-bol de la population vis-à-vis du désordre milicien et de la menace sécuritaire constante joue en faveur du maréchal Haftar, mais les groupes terroristes en Libye continuent d'exister et cette nouvelle période de guerre représente une aubaine pour ces milices islamistes et pour Daech. Cette situation risque d'entraîner une nouvelle vague de migrants et de déstabiliser à nouveau la région – je pense particulièrement à la Tunisie, qui se trouve à 150 kilomètres seulement de Tripoli.

La situation est explosive et l'Union européenne doit être à l'initiative d'un retour à la table des négociations pour trouver une solution pacifique, en accord avec la réalité du terrain, afin d'éviter un nouveau bain de sang.

Bill Etheridge (EFDD). – Madam President, Libya and the whole Arab Spring situation is a salutary lesson in Western intervention into nations that we don't understand and places where we cause more harm than good. Look at what happens: chaos, refugees, deaths. And who gains from it? Despots rise; terrorist groups draw power. We need to understand that, in future, going in with bombs and military into places like this is not going to be the solution. Nine times out of ten, it will make it worse. We need to be there to talk to people, to help, to have diplomacy and to trade, but certainly, we must understand that the days of muscular liberalism and intervening in these places must be behind us. The only way forward is trade and talk.

Jiří Pospíšil (PPE). – Paní předsedající, já jsem velmi pozorně poslouchal paní vysokou komisařku i stejně tak celou rozpravu. Shodně se na popisu situace, shodně se na tom, že hledáme politické řešení, že tažení, které nyní předvádí generál Haftar, může celou situaci ještě více destabilizovat. Ale bohužel mám pocit, že nemáme jasnější strategii, také to zde někteří kolegové říkali, a že nám chybí konkrétní kroky.

Co tedy v této těžké situaci uděláme, o co se pokusíme? Protože vím, že ta situace vůbec není jednoduchá, aby politické řešení tohoto konfliktu zvítězilo. Je to dotaz na vás, paní Mogheriniová. Víím, že situace není jednoduchá a že to nelze vyřešit jedním jednáním, ale obávám se, že pokud o tom budeme pouze hovořit na půdě Evropského parlamentu a nepokusíme se udělat něco aktivně pro mírové řešení, pak důsledkem bude to, co říkali moji kolegové – další destabilizace a možný pochod statisíců uprchlíků do Evropy. A to je věc, kterou bychom měli nějakým způsobem řešit.

Bogdan Andrzej Zdrojewski (PPE). – Pani Przewodnicząca! Chciałbym na wstępie docenić wysiłki pani wysokiej przedstawiciel, jak również przedstawicieli ONZ. Uważam, że strony reprezentujące ten świat cywilizowany robią wszystko to, co jest możliwe.

Natomiast chcę się upomnieć o jedną rzecz: o wiedzę, o lepszą, bardziej precyzyjną wiedzę. Niestety w efekcie braków informacji jesteśmy zaskakiwani, czasami rozczarowywani. Od czasu do czasu ponosimy także straty finansowe. W większości wypadków jesteśmy po prostu bardziej bezradni. Wydaje mi się, że tworzone służby w chwili obecnej powinny posilkować się wiedzą lepszej jakości, przede wszystkim po to, abyśmy mogli działać w długiej perspektywie, być bardziej konsekwentni, krótko mówiąc, bardziej skuteczni. Wielokrotnie wypowiadałem się w wielu kwestiach dotyczących właśnie polityki zagranicznej, konfliktów w Afryce, na Bliskim Wschodzie i to, co dla mnie jest nie do zaakceptowania, to właśnie ten element zaskoczenia, element tej negatywnej niespodzianki, tego wielkiego dramatu. Stąd też mój postulat: pozyskujmy lepszą, precyzyjniejszą wiedzę.

(Pyynnöstä myönnettävät puheenvuorot päättyvät)

Federica Mogherini, Vice-President of the Commission / High Madam Representative of the Union for Foreign Affairs and Security Policy. – Madam President, first of all I'm sorry that some of the colleagues that asked questions then left the room. I would have loved to answer these questions; maybe I will do that anyway.

Let me also say it is somehow sad that as we discuss something so serious on which there is no surprise – unfortunately for years now we have been struggling and working, not only the European Union, but also the United Nations and some of our partners in the region like the African Union or the Arab League, we have been struggling with the situation – it is somehow sad for me to see that in what is the last part-session of this mandate in Parliament there are more spectators at these debates than Members of the Parliament.

Sorry to say this, but I think this issue deserves a little bit more attention from your colleagues. But this is praise for those of you who are in the room.

I would also like to thank you for the support for the work we have done in these recent weeks. It has not been easy in these recent years to build a common European position on this. You know that the starting points were not necessarily always converging but today we do have a converging European policy and action to stabilise the country, giving the Libyans, the citizens, the stakeholders, the different interlocutors, the different institutions, as fragile as they are, as conflictual as they are, the possibility to find their own way to unite in the country.

I want to thank this Parliament for its support for this work and I think that we have managed to achieve some good work even in these very difficult circumstances. I think we can be proud of at least two things. One is the support we have consistently given to the UN and the UN Special Envoys over time. They have always very much counted and relied upon the European Union support – politically, financially, diplomatically, and on the ground.

I was also very proud of the fact that our personnel went back to Tripoli before the personnel of most of our Member States. Recently this has changed, but I'm looking forward to having them back in Tripoli as soon as possible. I myself visited the premises of our offices in Tripoli, reinaugurating them after a long period of absence from the city, and I'm very much looking forward to this situation going back to sort of normal – probably it's never fully normal in Libya and for sure not in these times – but I think that the Libyans know that the Europeans, and the European Union as an institution, have always been trying to help in a constructive, honest manner, again, both financially, politically and diplomatically. This has been also thanks to the support of this Parliament.

The second thing I'm proud of in this difficult environment is the work that we've managed to finally start, and that we need to consolidate, on the detention centres, aiming to empty them and close them together with the UN agencies. I would have dreamt of a debate in this Hemicycle today on Libya and Libyans and not always on Libya and migration, because if the situation is deteriorating on the ground in the military escalation in Libya, let me tell you very frankly my first concern is for the human losses, for the deterioration of the perspectives for the political dialogue.

Obviously there is a risk of migration for the European Union but there is first and foremost a risk for the migrants themselves, for their lives, and I thank those of you that have raised this, because I think we have to take into consideration first and foremost the fact that every person we are referring to is a human being, and secondly that there is work we need to do with Libya and with Libyans for the sake of Libya and Libyans themselves. It's not only a transit country: it is a neighbouring country, and it's a country, that deserves to be treated as a partner from our side.

But having said that, yes, in recent years we have started to work with the UN agencies the IOM and UNHCR, and with the African Union, to empty detention centres, to combat the trafficking and smuggling of human beings, and in one year or so, we have managed to help the IOM and UNHCR, and in particular the IOM, to evacuate some 40 000 stranded migrants and refugees from the detention centres back to either the UNHCR centres from where they are then protected further, and/or to their countries of origin, also with the cooperation of the African Union and its Member States.

Obviously all of this work, as I was signalling, in a situation that is militarily escalating and is less secure on the ground, becomes more difficult. This is why I supported, and I reiterate this again, the call that Filippo Grandi made last week for all the parties to guarantee access to the personnel, the staff of the UNHCR and the IOM, to the detention centres and this work to be continued because it is extremely important and vital for their own sake.

Some of you asked me specific questions that relate more to our work on migration than to Libya. I'm happy to be very clear on that. I'm on the record already on these issues, I've been very clear. No, the European Union does not consider Libya as a safe country. This is something that not only I, but also other colleagues from the Commission, have repeatedly stated. This position has not changed, and it seems quite self-evident given the current circumstances.

Some of the Members of this European Parliament asked me about Operation Sophia. As you know, because this has not been a secret, my suggestion to the Member States was not that of withdrawing the naval assets. I've always argued in favour of the naval assets remaining in the international waters because they have proven to be a very effective deterrent for the smugglers and the traffickers. If arrivals from Libya to Italy have gone down by more than 80% in the last couple of years it is thanks to the presence of Operation Sophia at sea; among other things, but mainly that. Obviously you see the contradiction in terms of having a naval operation without naval assets.

Unfortunately, the decision of Member States has been in another direction. I still hope that they can reconsider their decision and decide to redeploy naval assets in the international waters. I think that in these particular circumstances it would make a lot of sense, not only to deter the activities of the smugglers and the traffickers of human beings across the Mediterranean, but also to fulfil the duties, the responsibilities, we have taken of implementing the UN Security Council Resolutions when it comes to the arms and the oil embargo control which obviously can be much more effectively carried out with a naval presence at sea.

I believe – and again I have no problem in saying this in this Hemicycle, I've said it publicly already, very openly – that without the naval assets Operation Sophia is not able to fulfil its full mandate in an effective manner, so I hope the Member States will reconsider this decision. It's their responsibility, it's their choice, and I hope they will come to different conclusions in the coming weeks.

I would like to conclude by saying that I would like to thank again all of you from the different political groups for the support for this strong call and strong work that we're doing on the ground, not since yesterday but for years, together with the UN, for at this moment going back to a Libyan-owned and a Libyan-led political process that can be the only hope for the country to get out of this endless transition, out of the conflict, to de-escalate the military tensions and attacks, and to find a way to create strong inclusive institutions and peace in the country.

I believe that we can clearly say that, apart from a few voices, I have seen here broad support for this strong call, first of all for the open humanitarian corridors for delivery of urgent humanitarian aid, an immediate ceasefire, and a return to the political track and the convening of a National Conference under the auspices of the UN that we have prepared together, supported together, and that I believe still represents the hope for Libyans to have a proper country and a proper present and future.

Puhemies. – Keskustelu on päättynyt.

Kirjalliset lausumat (162 artikla)

Ana Gomes (S&D), in writing. – The EU cannot excuse itself on what Libya became. Lack of Europe, absence of the EU, played into the hands of the Member States, entering in new and old rivalries for oil, arms and influence, after the fall of Gaddafi. Likewise UN, the EU neglected the need for SSR/DDR to ensure that any Libyan governance would be controlling a national chain armed command. PM Ali Zeidan came to beg us that help in 2013, as he also begged NATO, to no avail. Instead, EU MS, led by Italy, choose to fabricate a fake 'Libyan Coast Guard' which is no more than a militia torturing migrants and refugees to keep the human trafficking supply flourishing. No wonder that Haftar, backed by Egypt, the UAE, Saudi Arabia but also France just dared to disrupt the UN-organised National Conference in Ghadames leading to so much bloodshed and suffering in Tripoli. No wonder that, under Haftar, ISIS, Al-Qaeda, the Makkdali and other terrorist groups will gain ground for sanctuary in Libya. They will come to haunt us, as much as they already haunt the people of Libya. Then, we all will deeply regret that there was No EU to act and help Libya.

15. Uznanie Wzgórz Golan przez USA za terytorium izraelskie i możliwe przyłączenie osiedli na Zachodnim Brzegu Jordanu (debata)

Puhemies. – Esityslistalla on seuraavana komission varapuheenjohtajan ja unionin ulkoasioiden ja turvallisuuspolitiikan korkean edustajan julkilausuma Yhdysvaltojen päätöksestä tunnustaa Golanin kukkulat osaksi Israelia ja Länsirannan siirtokuntien mahdollinen liittäminen Israeliin (2019/2702(RSP))

Federica Mogherini, Vice-President of the Commission / High Representative of the Union for Foreign Affairs and Security Policy. – Madam President, today we discuss with this debate two separate issues. Both originate from the war of 1967, but they are separate ones – on the one hand, the decision by the US administration to recognise the Golan Heights as Israeli territory, and on the other, the Israeli Government's settlement policy in the West Bank. So let me tackle the two issues separately during this debate.

First, the US recognition of the Golan Heights. The European Union has a very simple and clear position that I've had the possibility to reiterate and restate in a very clear manner over time. More recently, the European Union does not recognise Israeli sovereignty over any of the territories occupied by Israel since June 1967, in line with international law and with UN Security Council resolutions 242 and 497 – and this also applies to the Golan Heights. On 27 March, I issued a declaration on behalf of all the 28 Member States, clarifying that this is the position of the European Union on the status of the Golan Heights. It has always been our position and it has not changed.

In parallel, the five European Union Member States who currently sit in the UN Security Council, which are the United Kingdom, France, Germany, Belgium and Poland, expressed this common position in New York in a joint stakeout. So we always ask for the European Union, as Member States, to speak with one voice. This was effectively done in this case, and this is not the only one. I have to say, I want to thank the five Member States that are currently sitting in the UN Security Council, because the practice of coordinating positions – they're expressing these positions together, including with public press statements done jointly by the five of them, including meetings with myself to coordinate positions of the EU Member States in the Security Council – is more and more often. I think this is also fulfilling the responsibility that we, as Europeans, have to support the multilateral system and the rules-based international order in these times more, in general.

Coming back to our points on the agenda today, the second issue to discuss is the Israeli Government's settlement policy. I will not comment on the potential policies of a future government that is not even established yet. What I can say is what we are seeing in recent times: over the past months, the Israeli settlement's construction has continued. Only last week, plans for more than 4600 new housing units were advanced by the Israeli authorities. Right after the announcement, we issued a statement to repeat that we consider all settlement activity illegal under international law, and that settlements erode the viability of the two-state solution. In fact, the two-state solution is not only fading away; it is being dismantled piece by piece. I think it is important for us, the European Union – again, united in this – to say clearly that abandoning the two-state solution would bring greater chaos not only to the Holy Land, but also to the entire Middle East, which is already facing a very difficult situation due to the proliferation of crises we have seen in the region in the last years.

The next escalation of violence in Israel and Palestine could easily spiral out of control, and it would have tragic consequences in a region as unstable as today's Middle East, not to mention the importance that the two-state solution and the creation of a Palestinian state consequently has for the entire public opinion in the Arab world – again, in a region that has known relevant turmoil in the last years. Our first duty, then, is to keep the two-state perspective alive and to preserve the possibility of new negotiations towards peace to take place. In order to be realistic and successful, any future plan for Israel and Palestine will have to start from the internationally agreed parameters, recognise them, and this includes the 1967 lines with mutually agreed swaps and the status of Jerusalem as the future capital of the two states. On this as well, the European Union has been united and very clear over the years and we will continue to do so.

The European Union will recognise changes to the pre-1967 borders only if and when agreed by the parties, including with regard to Jerusalem. This is a principled position, but it is also based on a realistic assessment of the situation on the ground, because the two-state solution is, first and foremost, essential for peace, but is also essential for security, starting from the security of Israel. It is essential for democracy, both in Israel and in Palestine and it is essential to guarantee a truly sustainable economic growth for both Israelis and Palestinians. And let me add – most importantly, even – it is essential for peace, security and economic growth for the entire region, starting from the neighbouring countries.

If the situation does not improve, it will get worse. That is the reality we have seen in these years, and in these difficult times I believe that keeping this perspective alive is the most courageous and the most fruitful contribution we can do and the best service to peace and stability and security in the region. This is what the European Union will continue to do in the coming months, with all those who are ready to engage towards a just and lasting and sustainable peace.

Starting from our Arab partners, let me say that in the last few months we've had the chance of meeting with the leadership of the Arab League countries both in the first-ever European Union League of Arab States summit in Egypt, and, with my participation, the third in a row to the summit of the League of Arab States just a few weeks ago. I can tell you that this position of the European Union on the two-state solution, but also on the Golan Heights, has been probably one of the main elements of discussion and is probably one of the main elements that brings together the Europeans and the Arabs in this difficult moment in our common difficult region. So I'm very much looking forward to continue working together with them on this specific issue that is so important for security and peace in the Mediterranean.

Cristian Dan Preda, *au nom du groupe PPE*. – Madame la Présidente, Madame la Haute représentante, mon groupe s'est opposé à la tenue de ce débat. La position de l'Union européenne concernant le plateau du Golan est très claire: on ne reconnaît pas, conformément aux résolutions 242 et 497 du Conseil de sécurité, la souveraineté d'Israël sur ce territoire. Vous l'avez rappelé vous-même, Madame la Haute représentante, le 27 mars dernier dans vos déclarations.

La décision de l'administration Trump ne changera en rien la situation sur le terrain et la déclaration du 6 avril sur la Cisjordanie a été faite dans le contexte des élections israéliennes.

Ne voyez donc aucune raison de soutenir la stratégie électoraliste de l'extrême gauche de notre Parlement. Notre débat ne fera que nuire à la crédibilité de l'Union européenne comme acteur dans le processus de paix. Mais si on en discute, il faut aussi admettre que l'effondrement de l'État syrien a créé une situation encore plus volatile autour du plateau du Golan. Si l'on veut avoir une approche équilibrée, il faut aussi prendre en compte la sécurité d'Israël face à la prolifération dans la zone des milices chiïtes, syriennes ou soutenues par l'Iran, comme le Hezbollah.

Elena Valenciano, *en nombre del Grupo S&D*. – Señora presidenta, la verdad es que lo que está sucediendo entre Israel y Palestina, el camino que ha adoptado la Administración Trump tomando de la mano al señor Netanyahu no es ninguna novedad. Está clarísimo lo que están haciendo, aunque al señor Preda le sorprenda.

El problema es qué hacemos nosotros. Por qué seguimos siendo tan tímidos en la denuncia de lo que es, evidentemente, una trasgresión de la legalidad internacional. Lo que nosotros consentimos al Gobierno de Israel y lo que nosotros consentimos en este caso a la Administración norteamericana está fuera de la ley internacional. Y no podemos exigirles a unos que cumplan la ley internacional y a otros permitirles que no la cumplan.

Me da la impresión de que somos demasiado tímidos porque no sabemos cómo hacer para relacionarnos con una Administración norteamericana que es claramente hostil a la Unión Europea.

Creo que una de mis primeras intervenciones en este Pleno fue sobre el conflicto entre Israel y Palestina. Y esta es mi penúltima intervención en el Pleno, y también es sobre un conflicto que está retrocediendo en sus posibilidades de convertirse en un camino de paz, una situación que somos incapaces de gestionar, que produce injusticias enormes y que va a hacer imposible la solución de los dos Estados en términos físicos.

Vamos a seguir reclamando los dos Estados en términos políticos, pero en términos físicos no podremos hacer los dos Estados. Y creo que ya es hora de que levantemos un poco más la voz.

Bas Belder, *namens de ECR-Fractie*. – Voorzitter, wie de Golan heeft bezocht, weet hoe cruciaal dit grondgebied is voor de veiligheid van Israël en zijn burgers. Wie de Golan heeft bezocht, weet dat vlakbij, op Syrisch grondgebied, Iran en Hezbollah militair present zijn. Wie Iran en Hezbollah serieus neemt, weet dat de islamitische republiek en haar Libanese terroristische bondgenoot de volledige vernietiging van de Joodse staat beogen. Wie dat werkelijk tot zich laat doordringen, volgt het Amerikaanse voorbeeld van de erkenning van de Golan als Israëlisch grondgebied. En wie dat doet, draagt bij aan de-escalatie in de regio. Want de Israëlische opgave van de Golan zal echt geen vrede brengen met het Syrische schrikbewind. Wie de Golan erkent als Israëlisch grondgebied, heeft ook historisch besef van de eeuwenlange Bijbelse banden van de Golan met het Joodse volk.

Een oproep, mevrouw de Voorzitter, EU, inclusief mijn eigen land, Nederland: stop met een selectieve interpretatie van het internationaal recht en erken de Golan als Israëlisch [...], zoals onze bondgenoot – onze bondgenoot, mevrouw Valenciano – de Verenigde Staten, dat doet. Dat zijn bondgenoten.

Hilde Vautmans, *namens de ALDE-Fractie*. – Voorzitter, mevrouw de hoge vertegenwoordiger, ik ben heel erg bezorgd. Ik ben bezorgd over de situatie in Israël. Want ik denk dat we meer en meer signalen ontvangen dat Israël de tweestatenoplossing achter zich laat. Premier Netanyahu wil eigenlijk de soevereiniteit van Israël uitbreiden en de Westelijke Jordaanoever annexeren. We staan, denk ik, echt wel op een heel kritisch punt. Het vredesproces wordt naar mijn gevoel eenzijdig teruggeschroefd. En waar je vroeger toch kon zeggen dat de Verenigde Staten van Amerika meebouwden aan de internationale oplossing, heb ik nu het gevoel dat ze meer en meer de schendingen van het internationaal recht wel accepteren of misschien zelfs zelf begaan.

Vandaar, mevrouw de hoge vertegenwoordiger, zou ik je willen vragen om ons standpunt toch duidelijker, nog luider, nog meer te laten horen. We hebben hier over heel wat resoluties gestemd. Het is heel duidelijk: wij kiezen voor de tweestatenoplossing met de grenzen die zijn vastgelegd in 1967, waarbij Israël en Palestina vreedzaam zij aan zij kunnen leven. Eigenlijk zijn we nu aan het wachten op een standpunt van de regering-Trump, die naar wij denken met een nieuw plan gaat komen. Gisteren hebben 37 staats- en regeringsleiders een open brief aan u gericht. Ik denk dat dit een belangrijk signaal is. Een heel erg belangrijk signaal vanuit Europa, waarbij we u heel duidelijk vragen: laat onze stem luider klinken. Laten wij als Europa nog duidelijker zeggen dat er maar één oplossing is. Er is maar één oplossing om uit het conflict te komen en dat is die tweestatenoplossing. Ik vraag u om gehoor te geven aan deze open brief.

Marisa Matias, *em nome do Grupo GUE/NGL*. – Senhora Presidente, é verdade que nenhuma destas situações é nova, mas também é verdade que temos assistido a uma escalada que põe cada vez mais em causa o processo de paz no Médio Oriente. É verdade que a anexação de territórios palestinianos já acontece, mas é verdade que ela agora é declarada pelo primeiro-ministro israelita. E a questão é muito simples.

Eu não tenho dúvidas da sua posição, Sra. Mogherini, mas nós temos outros instrumentos e, tendo o reconhecimento do problema tal como existe, o que é que vamos fazer? Quais são as consequências? Porque nós temos outros instrumentos à nossa disposição, existem acordos de associação. Suspendemos ou não suspendemos os acordos de associação?

A defesa das fronteiras de 67, o acordo de paz, é para ficar só nas palavras e no papel, ou é para levar mais a sério? Essa é que é a questão. Nós estamos a dizimar um povo e a pactuar, apesar de não ser essa a posição oficial da União Europeia. E com isto quero terminar.

Sr. Preda, no dia em que os direitos humanos forem invocados como razão eleitoralista estaremos muito mal. Eu não sei como é que o senhor dorme de consciência tranquila. Eu não durmo e acho que é a nossa obrigação defender os direitos humanos, deem eles votos ou não. O senhor, sim, tem uma agenda eleitoralista. A minha agenda é a defesa de direitos humanos.

Puhemies. – Täällä ei ole tarkoitus huudella toiselle puolelle salia. Täällä voidaan pyytää sinisiä kortteja, mutta koska kukaan ei ole sellaista pyytänyt, niin etenen sitten puheenvuorolistalla.

Margrete Auken, *on behalf of the Verts/ALE Group*. – Madam President, I would like to thank High Representative Mogherini for her words and for keeping the EU together and being clear in language.

But, up to now, it has cost Israel nothing to continue its old and illegal occupation – and you know that. We must go now from words to some kind of acts. I would remind you also about the letter – just mentioned yesterday – from former foreign ministers and prime ministers, saying that now something must happen. They refer to UN Resolution 2334 on now taking differentiation. That's much more than labelling. Still peaceful and legal means, but we cut all connections with illegal settlements – that's business, education, that's everything. We now also want the list published of all the businesses working at the settlements. I'm sure that, if there is a price, we will help all our very important friends in Israel, as well as in Palestine, so that they don't give up hope on the two states and they can still count on us, because words no longer help. You know that as well as I do.

Maria Arena (S&D). – Madame la Présidente, Madame la Haute représentante, il est vrai que la politique étrangère européenne n'a jamais été aussi éloignée de la politique américaine qu'aujourd'hui. C'est le cas avec le Moyen-Orient, mais pas uniquement. Par exemple, les États-Unis se sont désolidarisés de l'accord iranien que vous avez soutenu, ils se sont également désolidarisés de la COP 21, et quand il s'agit d'Israël, bien entendu, les États-Unis soutiennent la partie la plus extrême du gouvernement israélien, particulièrement en décidant de changer son ambassade vers Jérusalem en la considérant comme étant la capitale. Et maintenant, avec la reconnaissance par les États-Unis de la souveraineté d'Israël sur le Golan, la Maison blanche envoie valser le droit international et les résolutions des Nations unies. Pourtant, la Commission, soutenue par le Conseil, a confirmé hier sa volonté de poursuivre ses négociations commerciales avec les États-Unis, que je considère comme un État voyou qui bafoue ainsi tout multilatéralisme actuel.

Alors que faire? Vous avez, Madame la Haute représentante, utilisé tout ce qui était entre vos mains, la politique, la diplomatie. Mais je pense qu'il y a deux outils qui n'ont pas été activés: ce sont les accords commerciaux et ce sont les accords d'association. Il n'y a que par les sanctions que ces pays, que ces États, pourront réagir demain pour enfin répondre à votre souhait, qui est la solution à deux États. Cette solution est de plus en plus loin aujourd'hui, loin de la politique israélienne qui parle d'annexion, mais loin aussi des Palestiniens qui ont perdu tout espoir. Je pense que l'Europe doit reprendre le flambeau et pouvoir défendre cette solution à deux États.

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

Cristian Dan Preda (PPE), *question «carton bleu»*. – Chère Maria, tu viens de dire que les États-Unis étaient un «État voyou». Ne crois-tu pas que de telles affirmations nuisent profondément à la relation entre l'Europe et les États-Unis? Ne considères-tu pas que l'aile gauche du parti socialiste et l'extrême gauche, qui ont insisté pour que se tienne ce débat, sont aussi responsables de la détérioration de notre entente et des bonnes conditions de travail avec les États-Unis? Jusqu'où irez-vous pour irriter les Américains, chère Maria?

Maria Arena (S&D), *réponse «carton bleu»*. – Franchement, cher Monsieur Preda, cher Dan, les États-Unis n'ont pas attendu la gauche européenne pour bafouer le droit international.

Quand M. Trump décide de mettre des tarifs sur l'aluminium pour interdire l'exportation d'aluminium aux États-Unis pour des raisons de sécurité, le droit international est bafoué, des accords sont bafoués. Quand les États-Unis reconnaissent le Golan comme étant sous la souveraineté israélienne, des accords sont bafoués. Alors on ne peut pas venir dire que c'est la gauche européenne qui vient aviver la mauvaise entente entre les États-Unis et les Européens. Excuse-moi, mais si tu as envie de t'aplatir devant M. Trump, c'est ton choix, ce n'est pas le choix de la gauche européenne!

Pyynnöstä myönnettävät puheenvuorot

José Ignacio Salafranca Sánchez-Neyra (PPE). – Señora presidenta, señora alta representante, señorías, se puede ser amigo de Israel, pero eso no quiere decir que cada vez que el presidente de los Estados Unidos tiene una nueva ocurrencia, la Unión Europea tenga que salir corriendo a cambiar sus posiciones. Y eso vale, señora presidenta, para el estatuto sobre Jerusalén y la Resolución 478 del Consejo de Seguridad de las Naciones Unidas, eso vale también para la soberanía sobre los Altos del Golán —Resoluciones 242 y 497—, y eso vale también para la anexión de los asentamientos en Cisjordania.

Estas decisiones unilaterales lo único que hacen es fragmentar y romper el consenso internacional, dificultar el ya de por sí muy complejo proceso de paz en Oriente Próximo y hacer más complicada todavía la doctrina de dos Estados que defiende la Unión Europea, de dos Estados viables que coexistan pacíficamente y en unas condiciones de seguridad a las que aspiran tanto Israel como el pueblo palestino.

Arne Lietz (S&D). – Frau Präsidentin, sehr geehrte Hohe Beauftragte! Ich bin der Hohen Beauftragten dankbar und stimme ihr zu, dass Europa nicht den Fehlern des US-Präsidenten Trump folgen darf, internationales Völkerrecht zu brechen und die Golanhöhen anzuerkennen. Mit einem Wahlsieg Netanjahus sind Fortschritte im israelisch-palästinensischen Friedensprozess leider schwer vorstellbar. Der amtierende Ministerpräsident schürt den Konflikt mit seiner Ankündigung, die Annexion von Teilen der Westbank fortzusetzen und auf dem Anspruch auf die Golanhöhen zu bestehen, nachdem er bereits im Wahlkampf die Spaltung des Landes weiter vorangetrieben hat.

Die Europäische Union muss bei diesen Szenarien ihre Außen- und Handelspolitik gegenüber der israelischen Regierung genau auf den Prüfstand stellen. Europa darf für eine auf Dauer angelegte Besatzung oder Annexion nicht zur Verfügung stehen. Die EU hat in der Amtspräsidentschaft von Trump leider die USA als Partner für einen engagierten Friedensprozess mit einer Zweistaatenlösung verloren. Ich bitte jetzt, hier auch klar zu sein in der Frage, dass die Europäische Union am völkerrechtlichen Status quo auch der Botschaften festhalten muss. Europa darf seine Botschaften nicht nach Jerusalem verlegen, wie es die USA getan haben. Hier bitte ich auch die aktuelle Ratspräsidentschaft, an der Seite der Hohen Beauftragten und des Parlaments zu stehen.

Arne Gericke (ECR). – Frau Präsidentin! Die ganze biblische Geschichte Israels beruht auf dem Stammland des jüdischen Volkes – „Gottes Segen für das Volk Israel“. Wenn wir nun über die Golanhöhen und die Westbank reden, können wir das nur tun, indem wir die Sicherheitslage Israels berücksichtigen. Doch Europa hat den Iran stark gemacht. Der Iran dringt nach Syrien ein und erhöht das Gesamtrisiko Israels im Golan. Der Schutz von Medina und Mekka ist eine Selbstverständlichkeit, aber wenn es um Israel geht, da reden wir plötzlich eine ganz andere Sprache.

Wir müssen als europäische Partner auf ein Gleichgewicht der Mächte setzen und dem Frieden – und nur dem Frieden für die Region – und den drei zentralen monotheistischen Religionen in der ganzen Welt einen Weg ebnen. Und so gibt es aufgrund der Gesamtsituation nur einen verlässlichen Partner im Nahen Osten: Das ist das Volk der Juden in Israel, der einzige Rechtsstaat dort, der sich schon seit Jahrtausenden an ein Rechtssystem hält, das unserem sehr nahe kommt und was die Sicherheitslage betrifft – hier und dort – uns als sehr gutes Vorbild dienen muss.

UN-Resolutionen gegen Israel entbehren jeglicher Grundlage: Gegen die Vertreibung der Juden aus den achthundertmal größeren arabischen Ländern hat die EU nichts Ähnliches geleistet.

Rosa D'Amato (EFDD). – Signora Presidente, onorevoli colleghi, anche in quest'ultima seduta plenaria ci ritroviamo a discutere dell'appoggio conclamato dell'amministrazione americana ad una violazione del diritto internazionale da parte del governo Netanyahu.

La pretesa di annessione da parte di Israele delle Alture del Golan, un territorio conteso, abitato da 25 000 drusi arabi e da 20 000 coloni israeliani risale al post-1967 e il riconoscimento di una parte della comunità internazionale di questa pretesa e della costruzione di altre colonie in Cisgiordania ci preoccupa. È come se si fosse deciso che la soluzione «due popoli, due Stati» sia ormai una chimera da intellettuali e non, invece, l'unica soluzione praticabile per fermare un conflitto ormai senza fine.

La mia delegazione si schiera per il rispetto del diritto internazionale, per il rispetto dei confini pre-1967 e il riconoscimento dello Stato della Palestina. Ho visto con i miei occhi, nel febbraio del 2016, come intere generazioni di uomini e donne vivono e crescono con la disperazione negli occhi, cacciate dalle loro case e calpestate nei loro diritti fondamentali.

Ringraziamo quegli israeliani che si oppongono a questa deriva autoritaria e illegittima, che schiaccia ed umilia i fratelli palestinesi nella cosiddetta unica democrazia del Medio Oriente. Resistete, per favore, per voi, per la Palestina, ma per il mondo intero.

Milan Zver (PPE). – Gospa predsednica, torej, mirovni proces je že dalj časa v krizi. Tudi koncept dveh držav oziroma dveh narodov v dveh državah postaja vse manj verjeten in lahko rečem, da se je položaj Izraela v tem kontekstu precej spremenil: ZDA, ameriška vojska je zapustila regijo, Iran je vse bolj agresiven, Izrael ni priznan s strani političnih, ključnih dejavnikov, kot je Hamas, in tako naprej.

Vendarle bi rad apeliral, da Evropska unija mora igrati vseeno bolj proaktivno vlogo v tem procesu. Nikakor pa ne bi smeli dovoliti, da bi na eni strani ZDA podpirali Izrael, Evropska unija pa stala ob strani zgolj Palestini. Evropska unija mora biti ključen dejavnik ali pa med ključnimi dejavniki, torej tudi pogajalec, nikakor pa ne le plačnik.

Andi Cristea (S&D). – Madam President, this House has the responsibility to keep a balanced approach, especially when we are preparing to enter an electoral campaign. It is a very good thing that we are talking about the Golan Heights this evening, but a debate about the Golan Heights must also refer to the grave security risk Israel confronts in the north. I should name Iranian entrenchment in Syria, Shia militias in Syria and the Hezbollah terror organisation. The EU, in order to keep a balanced approach, must also show commitment to Israel's security.

Colleagues, correct me if I'm wrong, but I would say that this debate does not serve any purpose, as the situation on the ground is unchanged and the position of the European Union is well known.

Branislav Škripek (ECR). – Vážená pani predsedajúca, dnes počívame voči štátu Izrael množstvo obvinení a dozvedáme sa z úst našich kolegov a množstvo vyjadrení o hrozných dôsledkoch, ktoré vraj majú izraelské opatrenia na civilné obyvateľstvo. Ja považujem takéto výroky za ideologicky zmanipulované.

Dovoľte mi však povedať dve zásadné otázky k celej veci. Izrael má právo ako legitímny štát, právo brániť sa. Nemôže sa vzdať vzdušnej a pozemnej kontroly jordánskeho údolia a Golanských výšin. Kto ste tam boli, viete, že je to neuralgický bod, odkiaľ môžu rôzne nepriateľsky naladené armády poľahky zaútočiť na štát Izrael, a ťažko by bolo odtiaľ sa brániť. Z nedávnej minulosti vieme o prítomnosti iránskych šiitských milícií v Sýrii a o teroristických operáciách Hizballáhu. Je morálne neprípustné, aby Izrael tieto hrozby ignoroval a nepodnikol žiadne kroky na zabezpečenie svojej bezpečnosti a pokoja pre svojich občanov.

Ohľadom debaty o území Judey a Samárie poviem toľkoto. V prospech izraelskej prítomnosti lepšie hovoria čísla ako politika. Izraelské firmy zamestnávajú viac ako 15 000 Arabov s priemerným platom o 200 % vyšším, ako ponúka palestínska samospráva svojim zamestnancom.

Κωνσταντίνος Παπαδάκης (NI). – Κυρία Πρόεδρε, μετά την αναγνώριση της Ιερουσαλήμ ως πρωτεύουσας του Ισραήλ και τη μεταφορά εκεί της αμερικανικής πρεσβείας, αποτελεί πρόκληση πρώτου μεγέθους η αναγνώριση των κατεχόμενων Υψιπέδων του Γκολάν, τα οποία άρπαξε το Ισραήλ από τη Συρία το 1967. Πρόκειται για κινήσεις αναβάθμισης των αμερικανικών συμφερόντων στη Μέση Ανατολή και στη Συρία και στήριξης της εγκληματικής πολιτικής του Ισραήλ έναντι των ανταγωνιστών τους, πρωτίστως της Ρωσίας, για τον έλεγχο των αγορών των πλουτοπαραγωγικών πηγών σε βάρος των λαών της ευρύτερης περιοχής.

Τεράστιες είναι οι ευθύνες και της κυβέρνησης ΣΥΡΙΖΑ-ΑΝΕΛ που, με την ανοχή των άλλων αστικών κομμάτων στην Ελλάδα, ξεπλένει τις Ηνωμένες Πολιτείες, το NATO και την Ευρωπαϊκή Ένωση και απορρίπτει προκλητικά την υλοποίηση της απόφασης της Ελληνικής Βουλής για αναγνώριση του παλαιστινιακού κράτους, αναβαθμίζοντας —όπως και η Ευρωπαϊκή Ένωση— τις πολιτικές, οικονομικές και στρατιωτικές σχέσεις του Ισραήλ σαν να μην τρέχει τίποτα. Να σταματήσει, λοιπόν, τώρα η κατοχή του Γκολάν από το Ισραήλ και να δυναμώσει η αλληλεγγύη στον παλαιστινιακό λαό για άμεση αναγνώριση ανεξάρτητου παλαιστινιακού κράτους με πρωτεύουσα την Ανατολική Ιερουσαλήμ στα σύνορα του 67.

(Pyynnöstä myönnettävät puheenvuorot päättyvät)

Federica Mogherini, Vice-President of the Commission / High Representative of the Union for Foreign Affairs and Security Policy. – Madam President, let me restate clearly what I think I've already stated several times in this Hemicycle. The European Union sees Israel and the Israelis as partners and friends, it sees the Palestinians and the Palestinian Authority as our partners and friends, and we also continue to see our American friends in the United States as our partners and friends.

This doesn't mean that our positions or our policies are determined elsewhere. Our positions are determined on the basis of the conviction of what we believe is in the best interest of peace and stability in the region – which is also our European region – and on respect for international principles and international laws, and this doesn't change.

Reaffirming clearly and in a united manner, as you mentioned, our position doesn't mean being hostile to interlocutors or partners that, in the meantime, might change their position. It means being self-confident about the fact that we've always believed – and we continue to believe – that, first, 'might makes right' is not a good principle on which to base foreign policy. The idea that you can change borders with the use of military force is a dangerous one – in Europe, in the Middle East and elsewhere. This is why our position on the Golan Heights has been so clear, because we believe that international rules, international law and international standards must be upheld, and that this is a principle that it is in the interest of everybody to uphold in a very consistent and coherent manner.

If you think of the situation in the Middle East, but also if you think of the situation in Europe or elsewhere, international law affirms it very clearly: borders cannot be changed by military force and this is a principle behind which the European Union will continue to firmly stand in a united manner.

I think this unity and this clarity together have made us relevant in upholding a principle and a situation in very difficult circumstances. The image I have in my mind at this moment when I think of the Middle East, where you actually do not have a process at all – it's not that the process is stuck, you do not have a peace process currently – the image I have in my mind is that of – I don't know if this is an English expression, but in Italian we say 'put your foot in the door to avoid it banging'. It doesn't mean opening the door wide and it doesn't mean being able to restart a peace process.

To tell you the truth, to start a peace process that is consistent today we would need to have an international and regional consensus on the parameters – on the need to have a two-state solution – and you would need to have political will on the two sides and also in Washington. On the European side, it's full and it's clear.

What we have to avoid today, together with our partners in the region, starting with the Arab countries – and I think in particular of Egypt that has such an important role both in the Arab League but also on Gaza, and of Jordan that has such an important role on the holy places – what we have to avoid is that this trend continues, consolidates and becomes irreversible to a point where, as Elena Valenciano mentioned, the two-state solution becomes impossible, and avoid that the dismantling of the two-state solution gets to the impossibility of achieving it whenever the political will is there.

I know that this is a minimal approach, but you have to be pragmatic and realistic when dealing with foreign policy. I remember that very well. When I started my mandate, my first visit was to Israel and Palestine. I said back then – almost five years ago, four-and-a-half years ago – that it is possible to solve this conflict, and it is true. I still believe it because the international parameters are clear, but without the political will of the parties and without international consensus – which we don't have at the moment – on those international parameters, I do not see this process producing an outcome in terms of a two-state solution. We Europeans know very well that if it's not going to be a two-state solution, it's not going to be a solution. I believe that the Israelis know that perfectly well, the Palestinians know it perfectly well and the region knows it perfectly well.

So I believe that, as friends of Israel, as friends of Palestine, and as friends of the region – let me also refer to the Arab Peace Initiative that I still consider a good basis for negotiations – the European Union is convinced, and will continue to be united and clear on this conviction, that it is in the interest of the Israelis, the Palestinians and the region to continue to have in mind a two-state objective and a two-state solution. That is also vital. I would like to say this very clearly for those in the Hemicycle who have raised this. It is also vital for the security of Israelis and of Israel as such.

I think I will stop here on this point. I am looking forward to the continuation of our debates on the next points.

PRZEWODNICTWO: BOGUSŁAW LIBERADZKI

Wiceprzewodniczący

Przewodniczący. – Zamykam debatę.

Oświadczenia pisemne (art. 162)

Péter Niedermüller (S&D), *írásban.* – Ennek a mai vitának nincs sok értelme. Legfeljebb arra lehet „használni”, hogy azok, akik ebben érdekeltek tovább szítsák az Izrael ellenes hangulatot. Hiszen a politikai, katonai helyzet nem változott, az EU álláspontja az izraeli-palesztin viszonyt, illetve a Golant illetően jól ismert. Az is tudjuk, hogy Donald Trump elsősorban azért ismerte el Izrael fennhatóságát a Golan felett, mert segíteni akarta Netanyahu választási kampányát. Izrael helyzetén azonban ezzel nem sokat segített. Ugyanakkor mindannyian tudjuk, nem lehet a Golanról úgy vitatkozni, hogy nem vesszük figyelembe Izrael saját biztonságával kapcsolatos jogos elvárásait. Minden ország, minden nemzet számára elsődleges kötelesség polgárai biztonságáról gondoskodni. Így van ez Izrael esetében is, amelynek északi határai különösen sérülékenyek. Iráni jelenlét Szíriában, a Hezbollah terrorakciói, hogy csak néhány példát említsek. Ha ezeket a szempontokat nem vesszük figyelembe, akkor csak egyoldalú álvitát folytatunk. Mint ahogy sehova nem vezető álvi a követelés is, hogy a béke előfeltétele az 1967 előtti határokhoz való visszatérés. Az ilyen viták, mint ez a mai csak arra jók, hogy ne kelljen szembenézni a politikai realitásokkal, ne kelljen innovatív új megoldásokat keresni. Mindez

nem jelenti azt, hogy ne kellene demokratikus megoldást találni a palesztin problémára. De a megoldáshoz nem az ilyen értelmetlen viták vezetnek.

16. Sytuacja w Sudanie (debata)

Przewodniczący. – Kolejnym punktem porządku dziennego jest oświadczenie wiceprzewodniczącej Komisji / wysokiej przedstawiciel Unii Europejskiej do spraw zagranicznych i polityki bezpieczeństwa Federiki Mogherini w sprawie sytuacji w Sudanie (2019/2703(RSP))

Federica Mogherini, Vice-President of the Commission / High Representative of the Union for Foreign Affairs and Security Policy. – Mr President, the people of Sudan are asking for change. For four months now they have demonstrated, not only against the dramatic increase in the price of essential goods, but mainly and also for freedom, peace and justice. The image of a Sudanese student – a girl standing in a white dress on the roof of a car, speaking to the crowd – has already become a symbol. She's now called the Sudanese Statue of Liberty, and we Europeans want to support this aspiration to liberty. The Europeans want the people of Sudan to succeed. We want their call for liberty to be heard and to translate into real change for a country that has already suffered too much.

Last week the Sudanese military took over power and put Omar al-Bashir under house arrest. As you all know, al-Bashir has been indicted by the International Criminal Court, and we have repeatedly asked to execute the arrest warrant. The military leaders initially announced a two-year transition to be led by a transitional military council, composed of different strands of the security forces. This announcement was quickly rejected by both the protesters and the opposition parties. They asked for a concrete guarantee of a much quicker civilian transition. We have supported this request, indicating that a military council would not provide the right answers to the people's demands and requesting a swift handover to a civilian transitional government. Over the last few days, the military establishment has tried to bridge the gap with a certain show of goodwill. The head of the transitional military council was changed; the head of National Intelligence and Security Service resigned; and some political detainees were freed.

These steps have signalled that there may be space for a negotiation. It is clear that, without a true transition, the crisis in Sudan is likely to continue. To prevent such a scenario, there has to be a swift handover to a civilian transitional government with real decision-making authority. This would open the way for a peaceful, credible and inclusive political process to finally address the Sudanese people's demand for political and economic reforms.

Our first priority must be to prevent further violence. We welcome the lifting of the curfew established on the day of the coup, and we call on all parties to refrain from the use of force and any form of provocation. We also expect further confidence-building measures to be taken by the transitional military council, such as the liberation of all remaining political detainees and the reform of the security sector. Security forces must be held accountable for the deaths and the abuses that have occurred in recent weeks and months. These measures would help create the right environment for meaningful political negotiations, so that all parties – including a transitional military council, the Sudanese Professionals Association and other political actors – can cooperate in good faith. It is also important that the opposition remains united at this critical moment.

Let me conclude by referring to the fact that in our statement, in our positions last week, we referred to the position taken by the chairperson of the African Union Commission, Moussa Faki. Today, I can only subscribe to the position taken yesterday by the African Union's Peace and Security Council. The African Union has demanded the immediate handover of power to a civilian-led transitional authority, which should happen in the next 15 days, and this transitional authority, once installed, should ensure an inclusive and consultative process to agree on the exact modalities of the transition towards free, fair and transparent elections. And, just like our African brothers and sisters, we want the transition to be managed by civilians. So we fully support the African Union demand and position on this issue, as on many others. As long as this is not the case, as long as the transition is not managed by civilians, the European Union will not recognise the legitimacy of the transitional military council. But as soon as a civilian transition takes place, the European Union will be ready to accompany it, both politically and also economically.

Joachim Zeller, *im Namen der PPE-Fraktion*. – Herr Präsident! Wieder ist Afrika in Bewegung geraten. In Algerien und im Sudan haben die Menschen in friedlichen Protesten und mit großem Mut das vorher fast unmöglich Scheinende geschafft: Sie haben zwei Diktatoren zum Rücktritt gezwungen. Doch die Menschen wollen mehr: Sie wollen eine freie, auf demokratischen Prinzipien aufgebaute Gesellschaft. Jeder weiß, wie schwierig es ist, nach jahrzehntelanger Gewaltherrschaft und Verbrechen gegen die Menschlichkeit im eigenen Land das zu erreichen. Und noch ist die Lage im Sudan sehr fragil. Keiner weiß, ob die im Land herrschenden militärischen Strukturen den Weg zu einer zivilen Regierung freigeben werden.

Die EU ist gefordert, aus der Vergangenheit zu lernen. Wir brauchen eine einheitliche, kohärente Haltung aller Mitgliedstaaten unter Vorsitz der Hohen Vertreterin zum Sudan, um in Zusammenarbeit mit der Afrikanischen Union die zivilen Kräfte im Sudan zu unterstützen, damit aus dem Sudan kein zweites Libyen wird. Als erstes sind die politischen Gefangenen freizulassen, und darüber hinaus sind den bisher unterdrückten Minderheiten Autonomierechte zu gewähren.

Enrique Guerrero Salom, *en nombre del Grupo S&D*. – Señor presidente, señora alta representante, estamos ante una expectativa de cambio. Cambio ampliamente demandado por la población de Sudán, protagonizado fundamentalmente por las mujeres y por algunos sectores de la sociedad que representan la capacidad de ese país para progresar.

Pero esta situación de treinta años de Gobierno autoritario se sobrepone a una situación de crisis humanitaria de primera dimensión. En torno a siete millones de personas están en riesgo de hambre severa en el país. Hay cerca de dos millones de desplazados internos y hay más de un millón de refugiados procedentes de países vecinos. Todo ello en un contexto donde Eritrea, Etiopía, Sudán del Sur, Somalia y Yibuti conforman probablemente la crisis humanitaria más importante del mundo.

Un conjunto de en torno a veinte millones de personas en extrema necesidad. Y es a esa población a la que tenemos que dar respuesta a través de la ayuda humanitaria, pero sobre todo apoyando la consecución de un régimen estable y la consecución de la paz.

Por tanto, apoyo desde mi grupo la posición manifestada por la Comisión —o por la alta representante— de apoyar una transición civil, de no reconocer un Gobierno militar, de seguir empujando a Bashir a la Corte Penal Internacional y de pedir el fin de la represión a doctores, a médicos y a elementos fundamentales para luchar contra la crisis humanitaria.

Marietje Schaake, *on behalf of the ALDE Group*. – Mr President, the youth of Sudan is the population of Sudan, with an average age of 19 years old, and the youth raise their voices, with a clear role for female leaders like Alaa Salah, whose image you referenced. They managed what the international community did not see through: the ousting of Omar al-Bashir, a dictator sought by the International Criminal Court for crimes against humanity – crimes against the Sudanese people.

Let the events in Sudan be reminders of: one, the fact that repression cannot outlast calls for liberty and an end to corruption and injustice; two, that dealing with dictators in the EU's short-term self-interest for, for example, managing migration, is a bad gamble against the young people of North Africa and the African continent; and three, that transitions are both very hopeful but also very hard. With institutions, democratic movements, civil society and other efforts crushed, state resources systematically robbed at the cost of education to sustain the security apparatus. So to avoid a repetition of the so-called Libya scenario, we should invest in democracy and peace and prevent the militia but also the military from taking the space left open and recruiting desperate youngsters. As one of the demonstrators, Salma Ali, said to The New York Times: we've cut off the head but the body is still alive.

As this is my last debate with you, Madam High Representative, I wanted to thank you for everything you've done. I think we need a stronger Europe in the world more today than we did five years ago, and I wish you all the best.

Marie-Christine Vergiat, *au nom du groupe GUE/NGL*. – Monsieur le Président, j'ai beaucoup hésité avant de savoir ce que je pouvais, ce que je devais dire dans ce débat que la Gauche unitaire européenne a demandé pour soutenir le peuple soudanais et exprimer notre solidarité, notamment vis-à-vis de ces milliers de femmes soudanaises qui manifestent pacifiquement, sans répit depuis le 19 décembre, malgré la répression, les dizaines de morts, les centaines de blessés et les milliers d'arrestations.

J'ai souvent eu l'occasion, vous le savez, Madame la Haute représentante, de dénoncer ici les relations de l'Union européenne avec la dictature d'Omar el-Béchir. Mais il n'est plus temps de juger le passé, ou il est trop tôt pour le faire. Il doit être question d'avenir et pour cela l'Union européenne doit, au-delà de la demande d'un gouvernement civil, mettre tout son poids, comme l'Union africaine et la troïka, pour aller vers un nouveau gouvernement transitoire. Non, le gouvernement militaire actuel ne peut pas être reconnu – seuls la Russie, les Saoudiens et les Émiratis l'ont fait. Son numéro un est et a été le responsable des forces soudanaises au Yémen, et le numéro deux est celui des Forces rapides, les ancien Janjawids. Ils doivent être jugés comme Omar el-Béchir et tous les responsables de crimes contre l'humanité dans ce pays.

Nous pouvons, vous pouvez les aider. Vous pouvez aider le peuple soudanais dans sa demande de réel changement de régime, pour que cela ne reste pas une révolution de palais. Il y va vraiment de la stabilité dans la région.

Neena Gill (S&D). – Mr President, High Representative, we've heard already Sudan has experienced massive changes in the last weeks: Al-Bashir ousted after 30 years; temporary military leader installed and no free media; food prices beyond the reach of many; political opposition blocked for years; and to top it all, the second-highest inflation in the world. However, the people, and especially the women, of Sudan are resilient and have aspirations and are hankering after real change. They rightly have reservations about the military regime and want to have a transition towards proper civilian government, following free, fair and transparent elections. The EU and this House should show solidarity with peaceful demonstrations, and we should have concerns about two years' length of transitional military council and need to work quickly to ensure that impartial media are set up and restrictions on internet are lifted. High Representative, I welcome your statement that only credible and inclusive political process can meet the aspirations of Sudanese and lead to political and economic reforms the country needs. But my questions to you are: what mechanisms and alliances are you proposing to move democracy on in the short term, and also, will the EEAS examine closely the financial flows towards Sudan, as the US did when it fined the French-backed BNP Paribas USD 9 billion for violating US sanctions against Sudan? And can you confirm that the arms exports towards Sudan from the EU are still prohibited and this prohibition is fully respected?

Zgłoszenia z sali

Νότης Μαριάς (ECR). – Κύριε Πρόεδρε, έχουμε συζητήσει επανειλημμένα για το Σουδάν. Το τελευταίο διάστημα, οι πάντες είχαν καταγγείλει την πολιτική του al-Bashir και είχαν ζητήσει να λάβει μέτρα η Ευρωπαϊκή Ένωση προκειμένου να σταματήσει αυτή η κατάσταση, να σταματήσει η καταπίεση των ανθρωπίνων δικαιωμάτων και να δοθεί ελευθερία στο Σουδάν. Τελικά, όπως συμβαίνει πάντοτε, ο ίδιος ο λαός έδωσε τη λύση. Έτσι, με τις διαδηλώσεις κατάφερε καταρχάς να ανατρέψει τον al-Bashir. Όμως, οι δυνάμεις του καθεστώτος και κάποιοι άλλοι παραμένουν στην εξουσία, μια και έχει επιβληθεί στρατιωτικός νόμος. Αυτή η στρατιωτική κυβέρνηση είναι δεδομένο ότι δεν μπορεί να περάσει στη δημοκρατική μετάβαση και είναι βέβαιο ότι δεν μπορεί να παραμείνει. Γι' αυτό και πιστεύω ότι πρέπει να ασκηθεί μέγιστη πίεση από πλευράς Ευρωπαϊκής Ένωσης, ούτως ώστε να οργανωθούν δημοκρατικές εκλογές, να μπορέσουν να λυθούν τα μεγάλα πολιτικά προβλήματα στο Σουδάν και, κατ' επέκταση, τα τεράστια κοινωνικά προβλήματα στη χώρα, αλλά και τα ευρύτερα προβλήματα ανθρωπιστικής κρίσης στην περιοχή.

Fabio Massimo Castaldo (EFDD). – Signor Presidente, onorevoli colleghi, dopo trent'anni il Sudan si appresta a voltare pagina, l'impossibile diventa finalmente possibile. Omar al-Bashir, il presidente dittatore ricercato per anni per il genocidio in Darfur è stato finalmente destituito l'11 aprile scorso, ma la caduta del generale avvenuta per mano dell'esercito non ha fermato la mobilitazione popolare.

Troppo forte il senso di beffa dei manifestanti di fronte alla formazione di un esecutivo militare, seppur provvisorio. Troppo grande la paura di ripiombare sotto le grinfie di un regime dispotico come quello di al-Bashir. Le proteste continuano e non si fermeranno, fintantoché non verranno soddisfatte le richieste più che legittime dell'opposizione: transizione immediata a un governo civile, giustizia per i manifestanti uccisi dalla polizia e soprattutto consegna e processo di tutti i leader dell'ex regime per un completo sradicamento del «deep state» di Bashir.

Alla luce di questi eventi, plaudo quindi all'approccio dell'Alto rappresentante. Solo un processo credibile e inclusivo può andare incontro alle aspirazioni del popolo sudanese e realizzare quelle riforme di cui il paese ha bisogno, ma per innescare questo processo è necessario un trasferimento immediato del potere a un governo civile. L'Europa deve garantire che questo passaggio avvenga in modo pacifico, con tutto il nostro peso politico ed economico. Non possiamo permettere che si riconosca un governo militare. Non possiamo permettere che si versi ancora altro sangue innocente.

Paul Rübzig (PPE). – Herr Präsident! Ich glaube, im Sudan ist es vor allem wichtig, dass wir uns um die Ziele für nachhaltige Entwicklung kümmern, besonders um das Ziel Nummer 2 – Sichere und nachhaltige Ernährung – und das Ziel Nummer 6 – Sauberes Wasser und Abwasser. Viele Krankheiten könnten wir bekämpfen, indem wir hier Strategien entwickeln und InvestEU hier so schnell wie möglich anwenden und natürlich auch das Ziel Nummer 7, nämlich erneuerbare Energie. Wenn wir das in den ländlichen Räumen gemeinsam mit den kleinen und mittleren Betrieben verbinden, dann hätten wir viel erreicht, und ich glaube, das könnte eine Zukunft geben, die auch dem Sudan Stabilität wie in Europa ermöglichen könnte.

(Koniec zgłoszeń z sali)

Federica Mogherini, Vice-President of the Commission / High Representative of the Union for Foreign Affairs and Security Policy. – Mr President, I would like to thank all colleagues for their very clear support for the position we have taken in the work we are doing. I would maybe answer a specific question that was raised about what kind of strategy and what kind of alliances we plan to put in place. We are already building to try and achieve this transition towards a civilian government and free, fair and democratic elections. As I said in my opening remarks, as always whenever our positions converge – which happens often – our first interlocutor here is the African Union. I refer to the very clear position that the African Union has taken in these days, which I believe has been extremely important, also considering what some other colleagues were mentioning: the fact that these changes in Sudan are part of a bigger shift, that is a mix of hope and challenges in the broader region around the Horn of Africa, with some winds of change that are blowing also in other countries. By that, I mean the opportunities that the opening of talks between Ethiopia and Eritrea is bringing, but also the very severe challenges both from a security perspective and from a humanitarian perspective that the region is still facing.

Our role, I think, with the full support of this House – and I know I can speak here for the Commission but also for the Council – is that of accompanying this democratic transition, bringing it hopefully to a civilian outcome, and working hand-in-hand with the African Union and the countries in the region to try and make sure that this happens and that, in particular, the women and the young people of Sudan find their aspirations met in this transition. But, as with all transitions, it is difficult; there are some opportunities, but also some risks and some challenges.

I would also personally like to thank the colleagues that have taken the opportunity in their last interventions in this last part-session of the plenary to thank me, and I want also to reciprocate and say that it has been a pleasure for me to work with this Parliament, and in particular with those colleagues that are most involved in foreign and security policy issues. I will be with you until Thursday, until the votes at the very last sitting, so I guess that we will have other opportunities to say goodbye and thank each other for the good cooperation we have had during these five years.

(Applause)

Przewodniczący. – Zamykam debatę.

17. Ochrona rzetelności wyborów europejskich, ze szczególnym uwzględnieniem międzynarodowych zagrożeń dla cyberbezpieczeństwa (debata)

Przewodniczący. – Kolejnym punktem porządku dziennego są oświadczenia Rady i Komisji w sprawie ochrony rzetelności wyborów europejskich, ze szczególnym uwzględnieniem międzynarodowych zagrożeń dla cyberbezpieczeństwa (2019/2696(RSP))

Melania Gabriela Ciot, President-in-Office of the Council. – Mr President, honourable Members, next month the European elections will take place in a very different political context than the previous ones. Mass disinformation campaigns and malicious cyber-activities, including attacks on the electoral infrastructure, are increasingly aiming to discredit and undermine the electoral processes and our democracies, while polarising our societies.

As elections take place in all Member States during the same period of four days, they are particularly sensitive from the point of view of the risk associated with cyber-attacks and disinformation. If some attacks were to be successful in one Member State, it would most likely have a domino effect and affect the democratic processes in the other 27. Thus, it would discredit the EU institutions as a whole.

In addition, it is a particularly important period for our national authorities, as more than fifty presidential, national, local or regional elections are due to be held in Member States by 2020. When setting out our six-month Presidency programme, we identified as a priority the need for streamlined and sustained action to protect free and democratic EU elections. Combating disinformation and increasing the EU capacities to deter and respond to cyber-attacks were also regarded as key elements in view of securing the electoral process. We attach great importance to this subject, which has been recurrent on the agenda of the European Council in recent months.

The EU institutions and Member States have indeed an important and complementary role to play, each in the remit of their competences in the protection of the democratic processes. It requires concerted efforts by the EU and the Member States, but also from civil society and industry online platforms. Our response is comprehensive, with a focus on both the internal and external dimension of the threat.

In February 2019, the Council and its Member States adopted conclusions on securing free and fair European elections. They welcomed the Commission package, which included a legislative proposal amending the regulation on European political parties and foundations, which was in the meantime adopted by the co-legislators. They also welcomed the joint action plan against disinformation.

Honourable Members, I take this opportunity to thank you for the good cooperation which allowed for the swift adoption of the new rules to prevent the misuse by European political parties or foundations of personal data in the EP elections. The Council conclusions set out a comprehensive approach to protect the European elections from interference such as cyber-attacks and disinformation campaigns from inside and outside the EU. A comprehensive approach is our motto. We do not want to leave any loopholes. All strands of action and all actors should be connected.

To achieve this objective, the conclusions identified actions to be taken and which, indeed, have been implemented in the last month: the holding of regular meetings of the European election cooperation network, in which Member States share expertise and good practices and jointly identify threats; the setting-up and launch of the Rapid Alert System, where national contact points in Member States share information rapidly on disinformation campaigns; the enhancement of strategic communication dedicated to European values and policies; the strengthening of the European Media Ecosystem by facilitating networks of independent fact-checkers; the promotion of media and digital literacy and awareness-raising activities to protect the integrity of the electoral process, together with the private sector and civil society; the assessment of cyber-threats in the electoral context and measures to address them and preserve the integrity of the electoral system in this regard (and, following the recommendation in the Compendium on Cyber Security of Election Technology, a table-top exercise on protecting the 2019 European elections took place on Parliament's premises two weeks ago); a call on social media platforms to invest in resources to deal in a responsible and accountable manner with election-related online activities; in the same vein, the European Council in March called for the full implementation of the Code of Practice; and finally, among this set of actions, cooperation with relevant international actors.

To contribute to the efforts of countering disinformation, the Presidency launched a mapping exercise to identify the actions undertaken at national level, which demonstrated the significant efforts made by Member States to combat disinformation. The answers provided by the delegations will form the basis for a synthesis report that will feed into the discussions on the possible ways forward, including beyond the 2019 elections, foreseen for the European Council in June.

Julian King, *Member of the Commission*. – Mr President, this is indeed a timely debate – thanks for scheduling it. With the European Parliament elections rapidly approaching, we're in what you might call the final straight when it comes to taking measures to ensure that they are secure. What have we been up to? Well, we've heard some of the things that we are doing. Briefly, to recap, over the last six months or so we've brought together the Member States election commissioners, cybersecurity experts, data protection experts in the reinforced election cooperation network, in order to share best practice and promote cooperation with a view to better securing our elections. We've set up a rapid alert system among the EU institutions and the Member States in order to spot and tackle coordinated disinformation campaigns. We have worked with this house, MEPs and the political parties to raise awareness around the transparency of particularly political advertising online as well as the security and resilience of electoral systems. Indeed, we organised a workshop with you, Mr President, in Parliament to that end. Earlier this month, as we heard, we carried out a table-top cyberse-

curity exercise, together with Parliament, Member States and our EU Cybersecurity Agency to check how cyber-secure. That, I'm glad to say, was opened by your colleague, Vice-President Wieland. We've seen the big internet platforms sign up to our Code of practice on disinformation, last summer, which was reinforced by the publication of our Action Plan on tackling disinformation in December.

Under the Code and the Action Plan, the platforms have been reporting month by month on their progress to tackle disinformation, particularly political disinformation. We recognise that there has indeed been progress, but those reports have been patchy, and they continue to show that – at least in some areas – efforts are lacking. While some credible progress has been made in the area of political ad transparency, platforms still need to improve independent scrutiny through better access for fact-checkers, researchers and civil society to the data they need. We don't want the platforms to be marking their own homework. We want to see greater action against fake accounts and bots. We need to see more quick and prominent corrections, for example, through a pilot programme of the Correct the Record initiative that's been advocated by civil society.

We have now received the latest reports from the platforms on what they're doing, covering the month of March and we'll publish our assessment of those reports in the coming days. In a way, this represents a final push in areas where we can realistically still have a meaningful impact in the fight against disinformation before the EP elections. At first sight, the latest reports do indeed suggest further progress has been made, for example, in terms of transparency for political ads and indeed ads in general, but there are still some outstanding issues.

Finally, let me say that Member States' computer security response teams are going to come together in a further exercise on election cybersecurity integrity in mid-May. That'll be a last opportunity for us to test how robust our cybersecurity measures are in the run up to the EP elections.

One issue that I just want to mention, one of the outstanding issues that we're dealing with the platforms, in particular with Facebook, is Facebook's decision not to permit cross-border political advertising. I know that this has raised concerns in this House. As President Juncker said in his exchange of letters with President Tajani, this was a decision that Facebook made. There's nothing in the Code of practice that limits political advertising to advertisers residing only in a given Member State. Obviously, it's up to Facebook to respect the law. It's also up to them to decide how they do so, and in this case the decision they've taken, the interpretation that they have given to respecting national electoral rules has raised concerns about the ability of EU institutions and bodies and Europe-wide political parties to communicate effectively in the run up to the EP elections. We discussed this in the Conference of Presidents last week and I'm glad to say now that the Secretary-General of this institution, the Council and the Commission have written to Facebook setting out again our concerns very clearly and asking that Facebook reconsider their approach in this area as a matter of urgency. We'll have an opportunity to address these concerns direct with Facebook at an upcoming meeting that we are having with them.

I just want to say that, of course, the issue of election security will not disappear after 26 May. As we've heard, elections continue – indeed there's an election somewhere in Europe every week, and so we're going to need to continue our efforts to protect elections and our political lives in this digital age. This process is going to include a discussion at the European Council in June on an initial assessment of how the EP elections have gone. Any lessons that we learn from that on the basis of a report prepared by the Presidency, the Commission and the High Representative will be an opportunity to look ahead, learn lessons and establish a strategy for the future.

Depending, indeed, on what happens between now and the end of May, I think we should discuss how to react, how to learn the lessons and to take the necessary steps for the future. We will also review the Code of practice later in the year and look again at whether we need to do more to reinforce transparency around the activity of online platforms in this political space.

I look forward to our debate today. This is not a challenge of just the next few weeks. This challenge will not go away. We need to maintain our current push for immediate action in the run-up to the EP elections, but we also need to look further ahead, to the future, to ensure that our democratic processes remain as robust as we need them to be.

Danuta Maria Hübner, *on behalf of the PPE Group*. – Mr President, I would also like to thank both the Council and the Commission for the strong commitment visible here in what they said to us. For us, elections are an important element of democracy. Compromised cybersecurity in elections can lead to the loss of confidence in the electoral system, in democratic processes and in leadership. Europeans are increasingly aware and worried about all aspects of electoral security. A recent Eurobarometer survey showed that 61% were concerned about possible manipulation of the European elections via cyber-operations.

To fight against cyber-threats and ensure that the cyber-environment is safe we need a society-wide approach as well as international cooperation. In this context, amending European regulations on the statute and financing of European political parties and foundations, aiming at protecting the electoral process from online disinformation campaigns based on misuse of voters' personal data, introducing financial sanctions on European political parties or foundations that infringe data protection rules deliberately to influence or attempt to influence the outcome of European elections, as well as the Commission's actions to build strong cybersecurity in Europe, support and awareness at the level of the Member States, all that can help citizens to make their political choices in fair, secure and transparent elections.

Claude Moraes, *on behalf of the S&D Group*. – Mr President, I welcome the measures the Commissioner has taken. He's worked hard on this issue, but this is a very tough issue. Electoral interference is proven, it's happened and it's going to happen again. And there is a sense of urgency in all of this. When the Commission followed up Parliament's calls on a code of conduct to stamp out the spread of fake news online and reported on the code of practice against disinformation, we looked at the progress and we saw that the Commissioner warned that Facebook still has 116 million fake accounts on its platforms. We really can't control this spread unless we really use the tools that we have, so there is a sense of urgency.

Signatories to this: it's not just Facebook, it's Google and Twitter, and we know that the Commission will follow up this work and we really need to act as a team to ensure that this happens. But this is about online and offline actions. This is not just about cybersecurity. So online, we have called for full algorithmic accountability and transparency. This is essential for citizens to be able to protect themselves against any manipulation and to protect our electoral processes from foreign interference. We also have to look at how political parties and campaigns are using social platforms for campaign purposes.

Offline: we have to have electoral safeguards, such as rules on transparency and limits to spending, respect for silence periods, equal treatment of candidates, banning of profiling for electoral purposes, and social media platforms should label content shared by bots and speed up the process of removing fake accounts.

Offline and online is important, but we also need to ensure that we understand that the General Data Protection Regulation is not the only model for protection. We may need to end the deadlock on e-privacy regulation to ensure that the rights of citizens, especially regarding the protection of users against targeting, are protected. So, we need to think about what we do about Facebook and the Cambridge Analytica scandal, using all of the tools we have here in the European Union.

There are three regulators in the world: China, the United States and the European Union. I am in the European Union. I want the EU to act on foreign actors interfering in our elections. What is more important than that as we enter the European elections?

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

Bill Etheridge (EFDD), *blue-card question*. – Thank you, Claude; it's really not a hostile one. I've got to know you since we've been here; you're a fair and reasonable man. Do you not see, despite all of the things that you've stated in your speech – much of which I can understand and go with you on – that there is a danger when these tools are applied from state level, from government level, that free speech itself could become impaired, particularly online? We disagree on many things, but I would always stand for your right to say what you believe. I would hope that would apply to everyone.

Claude Moraes (S&D), *blue-card answer*. – What I said at the beginning – and I know that the Commissioner will agree with me when he finally sums up – is that we're not talking just about free speech, which is the most valuable thing that we are protecting; we're talking about interference in our sovereign elections by foreign powers. This is a proven issue in the 2016 presidential election and a proven issue in the Brexit referendum. Not make-believe; proven evidence. When that interference happens, our whole democratic structure is unstable, and many of the things like free speech and the things that we hold dear are then made unstable. That is my answer to you: that I hold free speech as dear as you do, but unless we can have integrity in our elections through these online and offline checks, we will have nothing.

Anna Elżbieta Fotyga, *on behalf of the ECR Group*. – Mr President, information techniques, technology and influence operations have been used by Russia against the West for quite a long time already, including in elections. What for? To undermine faith and confidence in democracy, to exacerbate existing divisions, to confuse truth and to amplify narratives that are friendly to Russia. Now, today, the third reading was completed in the State Duma of the legal act isolating the Russian internet from the rest of the world. What for? We have to learn as soon as possible for our security as well as for the security of the Russian people.

Pavel Telička, *on behalf of the ALDE Group*. – Mr President, I will refrain from repeating what you have said, because I think that a lot of what has been said is a reality and is something that one can subscribe to. I think that it is correct to say that we have made progress. It is also correct to say, as the Commissioner has said, that there is still an effort to be done, by all means. But, in order not to be repetitive, let me say that while all that has been said with regard to the platforms is definitely relevant and there is still a lot of room to cover, there are also other aspects that we need to be aware of. I need to draw a parallel with the recent negotiations on the Cybersecurity Act, because, after all, elections and our sovereignty are key, but also the health and lives of our people, are equally key. The fact, Madam Minister, is that regarding what you have said just a few minutes ago – as relevant as it is – I don't see the backing in a number of Member States for that. I don't see the recognition on the side of a number of Member States on different levels that we are facing the threat that some of the colleagues have already spoken about, whether it is the question of European elections and the other elections, lives or safety. We even see Trojan horses in the European Union; that is a reality. So I think it is fair to say that, while we have managed to progress both on the legislation as well as what you have said with regard to our safety, but also with regard to the European elections, what we really need – and the Commission knows my point of view on that, because we were in a debate just some weeks ago – is a real mindset change, because this is a reality. We are confronting a war which is led against us – not by means of arms, but something as dangerous as that – and I think that unless we recognise it and unless we are consistent in our attention and our efforts – and not just before European elections – we will be hit, we will be vulnerable and we will be damaged.

Marisa Matias, *em nome do Grupo GUE/NGL*. – Senhor Presidente, este é, de facto, um problema muito complexo. As *fake news*, a interferência e a ingerência nos processos eleitorais combatem-se através de cibersegurança, mas não apenas. Para não repetir o que já foi dito, quero realçar apenas alguns dos aspetos que não foram referidos. Penso que enquanto não se defender o direito à informação e proteger os jornalistas e o jornalismo, estaremos a criar espaços para que a informação fácil, viral e sem qualquer verificação nas redes, à qual toda a gente tem um acesso muito mais fácil por via das redes sociais, continue a proliferar. É óbvio que se tem de combater também as manipulações internas, como aqui foi referido, mas também em relação ao *Facebook*, quero dizer que, se continuarmos a aplaudir o Sr. Zuckerberg por alterar as regras de privacidade do *Facebook* sem parar para pensar por um segundo sobre aquilo que as pode fazer ainda mais semelhantes ao que é utilizado atualmente no *WhatsApp*, só significa que tudo pode ficar pior e mais difícil para quem está por detrás de cada uma das campanhas. Por isso precisamos, obviamente, de soluções de cibersegurança, mas também de ações que tenham a ver com a educação digital, de proteger o jornalismo e de mais democracia.

Klaus Buchner, *im Namen der Verts/ALE-Fraktion*. – Herr Präsident! Wenn es um den Schutz unserer fairen, freien und geheimen Wahlen im digitalen Zeitalter geht, stehen wir als Gesetzgeber noch ganz am Anfang. Unsere Aktionen kommen sehr spät und sind nur erste, allerdings gründliche, Versuche. Deswegen gilt mein Dank zunächst einmal vor allem der Kommission, die sich dieses Themas ernsthaft annimmt.

Aber ich habe ein Problem bei der ganzen Sache: Wir brauchen eine Zurückdämmung der Versuche, unsere Wahlen von außen zu beeinflussen. Um das zu erreichen, brauchen wir die *Dual-use*-Vereinbarung. Die *Dual-use*-Regulierung wird bis jetzt vom Ministerrat seit über einem Jahr blockiert. Das bedeutet, dass EU-feindliche Kräfte leicht auf unsere Technologie zurückgreifen können, um auch unter anderem Wahlen zu beeinflussen. Deshalb meine dringende Bitte an den Ministerrat, hier endlich die Blockade zu beenden.

Bill Etheridge, *on behalf of the EFDD Group*. – Mr President, so we have to protect ourselves from these evil Russians who are controlling the internet, do we? Who are sending misinformation; who single-handedly won the referendum on Brexit because of their bots, apparently. But we don't worry at all about the fact that actually what this could lead to is censorship and control of free speech. We talk about power. The power of the establishment forces over the mainstream media is unparalleled. Look at the BBC in the UK – one of the largest, if not the largest distributor onto the internet – highly biased in favour of the state. That's okay, it seems, because it's not an anti-EU force. What we're looking at here is very, very dangerous.

Of course, Facebook and other profiles need to weed out bots and so on and so forth, but if you give the State power, if you give laws, rules and regulations this way to clamp down, who is using them? Just imagine for a second if a right of centre, pro-capitalist, anti-green lobby took control of the European Union. Just imagine it. Horrifying, isn't it? If that were to happen and they suddenly clamped down on the free speech on the internet of people protesting against them, how would you feel? Is it not conceivable that we should allow people the right and the freedom to express themselves. We always hear about freedoms here. What's more important than the freedom of expression and freedom of speech? In my opinion, there is nothing greater.

There are many people – if not most people – in this room who I disagree with, but I would be the first to man the barricades and fight to defend your right to express your opinions, however you choose to do it.

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

Pavel Telička (ALDE), *blue-card question*. – I would definitely agree with you on the question of freedom of expression, but I did not detect in your remarks any concern regarding, let's say, possible cyber-attacks from the east or elsewhere with interference in European any other elections. So my question is: do you share that concern, and if you do, how would you tackle it in terms of means to confront that risk and how would you minimise it?

Bill Etheridge (EFDD), *blue-card answer*. – Thank you for the question; it's a well put question. I do share that concern. I don't want interference from any agency that gets in the way of free elections. But, if it were a choice between the risk – because life is all about risks – of giving up that ability for people to freely express themselves and freely make their views, and the risk of the state and potentially a road towards totalitarianism, I choose the risk involved in free speech, but I do accept that we need to try our best to avoid foreign agencies.

Jean-Marie Le Pen (NI). – Monsieur le Président, Mesdames et Messieurs, à cette tribune, il y a 25 ans, François Mitterrand lança une formule lapidaire, mais inexacte: le nationalisme, c'est la guerre. L'image était forte, mais la pensée de courte vue.

En effet, naguère, c'étaient des armées nationales qui s'affrontaient. Désormais le danger qui menace le continent boréal de Vladivostok à Gibraltar n'est pas imputable à un ou des nationalismes, mais à un phénomène démographique mondial de dimension tellurique. Civile, l'invasion de nos territoires n'en est pas moins une terrible menace sur nos indépendances, nos libertés et même notre survie. Nous avons le droit et le devoir d'y faire face, avec tous les moyens nécessaires pour la vaincre. Or, l'Union européenne est aujourd'hui un carcan qui paralyse les nations qui la composent, au moment où leur défense et donc leur capacité de mobilisation est plus nécessaire que jamais. Il n'y a pas, quoi qu'en pensent les fédéralistes, de nation européenne, ni de peuple européen. Votre assemblée elle-même est élue par les peuples des nations composant l'Union européenne. La nation est le cadre légal, moral et politique de tous les pays du monde et leur expression supérieure est l'ONU, l'Organisation des Nations unies. La nation reste donc le cadre le plus naturel et le plus efficace pour faire vivre et défendre les peuples qui s'y sont assemblés. C'est d'elle que procèdent le sentiment national, l'amour de son sol, de son histoire, l'amour de sa patrie. C'est elle qui dépasse et prolonge les destinées individuelles et qui est la garante de l'avenir des générations. En revanche, il y a une civilisation européenne éblouissante et un concert d'instincts qui créent la nécessité d'une étroite coopération des nations du continent boréal, au-delà même de la seule Europe de l'Ouest. La révolution démographique, qui a porté en 50 ans la population mondiale de 3 à 8 milliards d'habitants, chiffre en croissance exponentielle, a déclenché un phénomène migratoire géant dont nous ne percevons que les prémices. Il menace de submerger le continent boréal dont fait partie l'Europe qui est, elle, en

déficit démographique. Un immense fossé est en train de se créer de surcroît entre les besoins et les productions du monde. La misère du monde fait apparaître ce continent comme un eldorado, alors qu'il n'est plus guère qu'un radeau de la Méduse qui coulerait sous le poids de nouveaux arrivants.

Face à ces perspectives angoissantes, l'Europe se révèle impuissante. Pire, elle paralyse les réactions nationales qui devraient mobiliser les peuples qui la constituent. Députés, vous qui êtes restés aveugles, sourds et muets, la postérité vous maudira.

(Applaudissements de son groupe)

Przewodniczący. – Dziękuję bardzo Panu Jean-Marie Le Pen. Prawdę mówiąc, nie było to dokładnie na temat debaty, którą prowadzimy. Tym niemniej bardzo Panu dziękuję.

Carlos Coelho (PPE). – Senhor Presidente, Senhor Presidente do Conselho, Senhor Comissário King, nas eleições europeias de maio os cidadãos terão de escolher que Europa querem para enfrentar os desafios do futuro. E essa escolha tem de ser livre. Não sejamos ingénuos. Há quem queira destruir o projeto europeu. Temos forças externas que querem minar a União e que contam com aliados cá dentro. E que, como se viu em eleições recentes, estão dispostas a usar todas as armas que têm à sua disposição, sobretudo no mundo digital.

Mas desengane-se quem pensa que os europeus não estão conscientes dessas ameaças. 73% dos cidadãos estão preocupados com campanhas de desinformação, 67% estão preocupados com a proteção dos seus dados e 55% estão preocupados com a sua liberdade de intervenção pública *online*. É a estes receios que temos de responder.

Temos de assegurar a segurança da infraestrutura dos nossos sistemas eleitorais blindando-os a qualquer ataque informático. Temos de proteger os dados dos nossos cidadãos exigindo das plataformas digitais os mais elevados padrões de exigência. E temos de combater as campanhas de desinformação e as notícias falsas, as *fake news*, apelando à responsabilidade dos *media* tradicionais e das redes sociais.

Liberdade, democracia e Estado de direito são mais do que valores da União. São a nossa identidade. Uma identidade que alguns querem destruir com novas armas. Defendê-la não é uma decisão que tenhamos que tomar, é uma obrigação a que temos de responder.

Eugen Freund (S&D). – Mr President, let me say at the outset this should not be a partisan issue. We should actually all be united in the fight against fake news, disinformation and propaganda. But I'm afraid – and this is also what Mr Telička said – that the Member States are not aware of this issue and they do not pay enough attention to the dangers that arise from that. I will continue in German, unfortunately, Mr King.

Das digitale Medienumfeld, das in den letzten Jahren entstanden ist, bringt viele positive Veränderungen mit sich. Umgekehrt munitioniert es aber auch zunehmend Gegner der Demokratie und der Pressefreiheit. Die Wahl Donald Trumps und das Brexitreferendum haben es gezeigt: Manipulation der öffentlichen Meinung über das Internet und die sozialen Media-Plattformen nehmen zu.

Das Ausmaß ist mittlerweile so groß, dass es demokratische Wahlen beeinflussen kann. Diese Entwicklungen werden auch für die kommende Wahl zum Europäischen Parlament eine Rolle spielen und ein Problem darstellen. Wenn nämlich eine Falschmeldung erst einmal im Raum steht, dann dauert es seine Zeit, bis diese widerlegt ist. Hinzu kommt der technische Fortschritt. Auch hier dürfen wir hinter den aktuellen Entwicklungen nicht hinterherhinken. So spielt neben klassischen Social-Media-Kanälen wie Facebook, Instagram und Twitter natürlich auch Whatsapp eine, sagen wir mal, fragwürdige Rolle.

Darüber hinaus wird künstliche Intelligenz es möglich machen, Falschmeldungen oder Propaganda in bisher noch ungeahnter Weise zu verbreiten. Will die Europäische Union die Legitimität der Europawahl und anderer Wahlen schützen, dann muss sie diese Entwicklungen so früh wie möglich erkennen und entsprechende Gegenmaßnahmen setzen. Europa benötigt eine schlagkräftige, ganzheitliche Strategie, um auf die Verbreitung von Lügen, Unwahrheiten und die Manipulation von Meinungen zu reagieren.

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

PRESIDENZA DELL'ON. DAVID-MARIA SASSOLI

Vicepresidente

Paul Rübиг (PPE), *Frage nach dem Verfahren der „blauen Karte“*. – Ich möchte mich insbesondere beim Kollegen Freund bedanken, weil er als Journalist die Problematik gut erkannt hat. Wir wissen, dass wir diese Woche noch den *Cyber security Centre Act* in der ersten Lesung beschließen werden. Es ist wichtig, dass wir in allen 28 Mitgliedstaaten hier dementsprechende Vorkehrungen treffen.

Bei STOA, dem Scientific Technology Options Assessment Panel des Europäischen Parlaments, gibt es vier Studien über Cybersicherheit, und wir haben einen *Science-Media Hub* gegründet, um *analytics* zu testen. Glauben Sie, dass diese Maßnahmen für die Europäische Union ausreichen, oder sollte man hier in diesem Bereich mehr unternehmen?

Eugen Freund (S&D), *Antwort auf eine Frage nach dem Verfahren der „blauen Karte“*. – Ich glaube, man kann nie, lieber Herr Kollege Rübиг, genug unternehmen, um hier entschieden vorzugehen. Ich fürchte nur, dass das jetzt im Zusammenhang mit dem Problem und der Problematik, von der wir sprechen – nämlich der europäischen Wahl –, zu spät kommt, dass wir dieser Problematik hier aber besondere Aufmerksamkeit werden schenken müssen, weil wir sonst in eine Situation kommen, wie wir sie schon beim Brexit und bei Trump erlebt haben.

Ангел Джамбазки (ECR). – Г-н Председател, безспорно е, че нашата демокрация е нещо, което трябва да пазим и за което трябва да се борим. Очевидно е също така, че редица представители на тази институция се притесняват, че предстоящите избори за Европейски парламент ще бъдат похитени от някакъв външен фактор. Като пример за това често в тази зала чуваме заклеймяването на популисткото „дясно“ и колко опасни са електоралните успехи на десните партии в Европа.

Нагlostта на либералите в тази зала няма край и не спира да ни учудва. Те подценяват здравия разум на европейския избирател, опитват се да пробутват тези, че шом определени партии имат успех на избори, то задължително това е резултат от някаква мистериозна външна намеса.

Нека припомня на уважаемите представители от либералните елити, че вече повече от две години слушаме как мощна руска намеса на президентските избори в Съединените щати през 2016 г. била помогнала на президента Тръмп. Разследването, водено от Робърт Мюлер, не откри никакви конспирации. Разберете, не можем да обвиняваме всеки, чиито позиции не харесваме, че е избран благодарение на външни сили. Това подкопава доверието не само към институциите, но и към демокрацията и по-специално към способността на хората да правят информиран избор за бъдещето си.

Marietje Schaake (ALDE). – Mr President, the democratic rights of all European citizens are at stake with attempts at hacking election systems and the sprawling of disinformation by those seeking to trick people into votes they might not have independently cast without having been exposed to automated lies that spread online like wildfire. And whether it's foreign or domestic meddling, or profit-driven, we need to be vigilant.

Of course, we see the ad hoc efforts that the tech platforms are promising, like YouTube, Facebook, Google or Twitter, but without independent oversight over algorithms, we outsource our responsibility, because without algorithmic accountability and research, no one can say for sure what the impact of technology use is on our democracy, and that is unacceptable. We must act now.

For example, the US Department of Housing has filed a case against Facebook because the platform allows for the selling of ads in a way that likely discriminates. So let us begin by ensuring that what is not allowed offline isn't allowed online either. But in order to deliver on that promise we need to investigate the collection of data and the practices of micro-targeting ads and conduct stress tests on election technology. We have no time to lose.

But lastly – and this is an appeal to everyone in this room and in this Chamber – all political parties of Europe, we need to take our own responsibility. So I call on colleagues and fellow candidates for the European Parliament elections to all sign the election pledge on electionpledge.eu because we must all stand for the very principles that are at stake through election meddling and take our own responsibility. Europe is only as strong as our weakest link and we have to make sure that in our measures we respect the fundamental rights of all Europeans.

Indrek Tarand (Verts/ALE). – Mr President, the integrity of electoral systems is a must, but the more difficult and equally important task is to ensure the integrity of elections as a whole, and we must prevent the legitimate manipulations of voters by players like Cambridge Analytica and AggregateIQ. I very much agree with what Ms Schaake has been saying just now, but I would like to underline that Facebook is such a big company and we – as legislators – could consider doing something to make it responsible for giving data to third parties, like the above-mentioned Cambridge Analytica, for instance.

Once the data is out there, that is it. There is no way to put the cat back in the bag, as the data set can be copied and duplicated indefinitely. In this sense, rogue data sets are much like nuclear waste, and that's why Facebook has to keep its user data on a tight leash or be fined or punished, whatever this Parliament decides to apply.

Thank you, colleagues, and leave Facebook – it makes you a better person. I did it, and I'm happy.

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

Maria Grapini (S&D), *Întrebare adresată conform procedurii „cartonaşului albastru”.* – Domnule Tarand, ați spus, între altele – și sunt de acord – că sunt manipulări făcute de platforme. Pe de altă parte, ați spus că nu sunteți prieten cu Facebook. Totuși, digitalizarea trebuie să existe, avem acest program. Cum vedeți, atunci, să nu se mai facă manipularea? Cum vedeți ca Facebook, unde, cu toate avertismentele pe care noi le-am dat aici, există încă conturi false, există copia datelor de identitate, îl blochezi și apare din nou... Cum vedeți să putem să eliminăm aceste lucruri, mai ales acum în preajma alegerilor electorale?

Indrek Tarand (Verts/ALE), *blue-card answer.* – I wish I were so smart to reply to your question but I agree with what Marietje Schaake said: what is not allowed offline shouldn't be allowed online. I closed Facebook because most of the comments were: 'I'm going to kill you, bastard'. So why should I be in this dirt? I closed it and now they can kill themselves until they come to the conclusion that they need to leave Facebook as well, which is not to say that digitalisation and social media should not be developed but it must be controlled. It has to remain a human space rather than a sort of violent, inhuman – I don't know an English word even, it's a four-letter word anyway.

Gilles Lebreton (ENF). – Monsieur le Président, les élections européennes doivent être libres et équitables, j'approuve donc l'adoption par le Conseil d'un texte qui vise à les protéger contre d'éventuelles campagnes informatiques de désinformation. La création d'un réseau européen de coopération électorale est également à saluer dans la mesure où elle favorise l'échange d'informations entre États membres, sans porter de nouvelle atteinte à leur souveraineté.

Je mets toutefois les institutions européennes en garde contre leur propension à glisser du souci légitime d'assurer la cybersécurité à la tentation de censurer les réseaux sociaux et de formater l'information. Les partis nationaux ont le droit de critiquer l'Union européenne et même de proposer de la remplacer par une Europe des nations. Il ne faut jamais l'oublier, sous peine de porter atteinte à la liberté d'expression politique qui est au cœur des démocraties européennes.

Емил Радев (PPE). – Г-н Председател, в последните години международната среда се промени значително и станяхме свидетели на редица кибератаки, ръководени както от държавни, така и от недържавни участници, по време на предизборния процес в САЩ, Франция и други страни. Тези атаки са предназначени да сътворят хаос и да попречат на нормалното протичане на най-демократичния процес, да подкопаят доверието в неговото изпълнение и резултат, да създадат усещането, че демокрацията е лесно уязвима – с един клик и тя може да бъде поставена на колена.

С оглед на предстоящите избори за Европейски парламент – най-демократичната институция на Европейския съюз, нашето задължение е да гарантираме, че изборният процес ще протече нормално, без да бъде възпрепятстван, и неговата легитимност няма да бъде поставена под въпрос заради кибератака. Тук са необходими усилията не само на европейско ниво чрез споделяне на информация за заплахите, но и подготовка от страна на националните органи, които ще гарантират киберсигурността на вота.

Затова приветствам наскоро проведената симулация, която събра на едно място представители на националните органи за киберсигурност, Европейския парламент, Европейската комисия и Европейската агенция за киберсигурност. Важно е такива симулации да се случват и на ниво държави членки, за да бъде подготвена всяка една от тях да реагира на евентуална кибератака преди и по време на вота.

Нека да бъде ясен – ако изборите дори в една държава членка бъдат поставени под съмнение, изборите в целия Европейски съюз ще бъдат поставени под съмнение. Това би била недопустима победа за тези, които искат да разделят Европейския съюз и да отслабят неговата сила, и ние не трябва да го допускаме.

Jeppe Kofod (S&D). – Mr President, thank you for this very important debate. I think it's very important for us, as we are the only institution that is directly representing the people of Europe.

We are keen to protect their free right to vote in an election without being subject to cyber-attacks, disinformation, vile deception or any other type of meddling in the free right of free elections. And I don't think we need to be naive. We will see a lot of attacks on our free elections in Europe, we have seen it already, and we will see more. Therefore, I agree with my colleagues. The platforms need to be very transparent and accountable and follow the law which goes on in normal society and also goes on in the online society; they need to be transparent. But I want to say that democracy is also a way of culture, a way of life, and we need also to agree across all parties to stick to the truth and fight any lies from foreign powers who want to interfere in our elections. We need to stand together and protect our European democracy.

Sajjad Karim (ECR). – Mr President, the web has been woven right across the European Union. Practically No Member State is untouched. Through this web narratives are constructed and propagated, a result of which is that compromised political actors today sit in this very Chamber and in Chambers right across the European Union. In the Commissioner's country and mine, the United Kingdom, we have left it simply to individual journalists to call it out: people like Carole Cadwalladr, James O'Brien.

Brexit's dark money and influence through Facebook tackled by Damian Collins, Chair of the Select Committee for Digital, Culture, Media and Sport; executive-level action, literally nothing; and now the Brexit Party. PayPal, through donations of under GBP 500, is facilitating the flow of money into the European Union and to Nigel Farage. And I ask him as a Member of this House to come and explain to this House: Nigel Farage, where is your money actually coming from?

José Inácio Faria (PPE). – Senhor Presidente, caros Colegas, a União Europeia, que durante demasiado tempo escolheu a pior das opções para lidar com o problema das ciberameaças internacionais a fingir que ela não existia, não pode agora, depois de escândalos como o da *Cambridge Analytica*, ignorar o impacto dos algoritmos do Facebook e da Google nas democracias europeias. Nem a formação da opinião pública, especialmente dos jovens, com o recurso a aplicações que automatizam e massificam discursos de ódio, fortalecendo eurocéticos e populistas que querem paralisar a União a partir do seu centro.

O risco de manipulação das próximas eleições europeias por *fake news*, campanhas de desinformação e ataques informáticos é amplificado ainda pela influência nefasta de países de fora da União, como mostram o financiamento russo da campanha do *live.eu* que conduziu ao desastre que é o Brexit, como o nosso colega ali acabou de referir. A comprovada interferência também do Sr. Putin nas eleições francesas de 2017 ou as suspeitas de espionagem chinesa em dispositivos de quinta geração móvel, apenas para dar alguns exemplos. Uma vez que estas ameaças no ciberespaço não conhecem fronteiras, só uma abordagem conjunta da União, que inclua a partilha de informações entre os Estados-Membros, impedirá que, em maio próximo, as tropas cibernéticas chinesas, ou as fábricas de *hackers* e *trolls* do Kremlin, possam minar a credibilidade das democracias liberais europeias.

Mercedes Bresso (S&D). – Signor Presidente, onorevoli colleghi, signor Commissario, l'uso massiccio di Internet e la digitalizzazione delle nostre economie hanno creato, come molti hanno ricordato, una nuova emergenza strategica che è quella di garantire a tutti i cittadini e agli attori economici la possibilità di crescere e svilupparsi in spazi virtuali protetti.

Dobbiamo agire rapidamente, proprio nel momento in cui stiamo discutendo dello sviluppo della rete 5G, delle sue possibilità e dei suoi rischi, e delle possibili interferenze della Russia e di altri soggetti nelle prossime elezioni. A quaranta giorni dalle elezioni queste minacce sono estremamente reali. Le istituzioni pubbliche, in Germania, Estonia, e in altri paesi sono già state oggetto di attacchi coordinati. Per questa ragione abbiamo la responsabilità di rispondere a questi pericoli.

L'azione della Commissione, che ha proposto un pacchetto normativo su tali sfide, va accolta favorevolmente, ma l'Unione purtroppo è ancora in ritardo, e abbiamo il compito di andare oltre. Abbiamo bisogno di maggiori investimenti, di rafforzare il coordinamento degli Stati membri, evitare interferenze inaccettabili come quella di Cambridge Analytica che ben conosciamo. Questo è l'obiettivo che dobbiamo perseguire tutti insieme.

Pirkko Ruohonen-Lerner (ECR). – Arvoisa puhemies, vapaissa ja demokraattisissa vaaleissa kansalaiset saavat ilmaista oman tahtonsa siitä, mikä on politiikan suunta seuraavien vuosien aikana. Tulevat Euroopan parlamentin vaalit ovat ratkaisevan tärkeitä, sillä EU on maahanmuuttokriisin ja brexitin myötä tienhaarassa.

Näkemyseroistamme huolimatta olemme kaikki varmasti yhtä mieltä siitä, että demokratiaa on suojeltava. Vain kansalaisten on saatava päättää EU:n tulevasta suunnasta. Ulkopuoliset toimijat, kuten vieraat valtiot tai jopa yksittäiset pahan tekijät, voivat pyrkiä vaikuttamaan vaalitulokseen esimerkiksi levittämällä disinformaatiota teknisiä työkaluja hyödyntäen tai tietoturvojen tai palvelunestohyökkäysten avulla, mikä on havaittava ja ehkäistävä ajoissa.

Motiivina tällaisessa toiminnassa voi olla myös pyrkimys vaikuttaa mielikuvaan vaalien luotettavuudesta. Meidän on vahvistettava kansalaisten luottamusta poliittiseen järjestelmään, jos haluamme saada alhaiselle tasolle monessa maassa vajonneen äänestysaktiivisuuden jälleen nousuun.

Tomáš Zdechovský (PPE). – Pane předsedající, vážení kolegové, tato debata je hezká, je hezká v tom, jak všichni chceme udělat více pro to, aby tyto volby byly, řekl bych, neutrální ve světě kybernetické bezpečnosti. Ale já bych vám chtěl říct jednu věc: Není tato debata příliš pozdě? Není tato debata jenom vyměňováním si, řekl bych, názorů na to, jakým způsobem jsme měli dříve zasáhnout proti různým aktérům, kteří ovlivňovali důležité dění v Evropské unii?

I já vítám balíček, který připravila Evropská komise, ale pane komisaři, ruku na srdce, tyto volby s tímto balíčkem stejně zvláštním způsobem nebudeme chránit. Je potřeba pracovat systematicky i potom, co nebudete komisařem, na dalších opatřeních, aby žádné volby, žádná referenda a žádné jiné akty demokracie nebyly nikým ovlivňovány.

Bylo zde napříč politickým spektrem zmíněno, jak chceme bojovat proti šíření *fake news*, ale proti *fake news* můžete bojovat pouze tím, že budete mít vzdělané občany, kteří se nebudou bát ověřovat informace a budou zkoušet hledat pravdu. Já vás, milí kolegové, vyzývám, chtějme informované občany, kteří hledají pravdu.

Νότης Μαριάς (ECR). – Κύριε Πρόεδρε, η διασφάλιση της ακεραιότητας των ευρωεκλογών είναι κάτι πολύ σημαντικό. Σημαίνει ότι τα μέσα μαζικής ενημέρωσης πρέπει να διασφαλίζουν την πολυφωνία. Όταν υπάρχει φήμωση και λογοκρισία είναι βέβαιο ότι αυτό θα οδηγήσει και σε *fake news*, γιατί επί της ουσίας αποκρύπτεται η αλήθεια. Έχω επανειλημμένα καταγγείλει εδώ τον αποκλεισμό και τη φήμωση του κινήματός μας, «Ελλάδα – Ο άλλος δρόμος», καθώς και τη δική μου φήμωση από τα συστημικά μέσα μαζικής ενημέρωσης στην Ελλάδα, είτε δημόσια είτε ιδιωτικά, τα οποία δεν δίνουν την ευκαιρία για προβολή των απόψεών μας: μάς έχουν κυριολεκτικά φιώσει. Ταυτόχρονα, στο ίδιο μήκος κύματος κινούνται και οι δημοσκοπικές εταιρείες, οι οποίες δεν βάζουν το κόμμα μας στο ερωτηματολόγιο που απευθύνουν στους πολίτες.

Με τέτοιους όρους δεν μπορεί να λειτουργήσει η δημοκρατία στην Ελλάδα και δεν μπορούμε να πάμε σε ελεύθερες ευρωεκλογές στην Ελλάδα. Αυτό είναι κάτι το οποίο έχουμε καταγγείλει ως ECR και έχουμε στείλει επιστολές διαμαρτυρίας και στα ίδια τα μέσα μαζικής ενημέρωσης και στις δημοσκοπικές εταιρείες και στον υπουργό Εσωτερικών και θέλουμε, κύριε Επίτροπε, την παρέμβασή σας. Με τέτοιους όρους δεν διασφαλίζεται η ελεύθερη κυκλοφορία ιδεών στις επερχόμενες ευρωεκλογές στην Ελλάδα. Κυριολεκτικά μας έχουν φιώσει.

David McAllister (PPE). – Mr President, as Chair of AFET, I would just like to add a few words on the foreign policy dimension of protecting the integrity of our upcoming European elections.

Just in March, this plenary adopted the second report on the EU's strategic communication to counteract propaganda against it by third parties. This report underlined how central freedom of speech and expression, as well as media pluralism, and identified Moscow's aggressive campaigns as the main source of disinformation. I therefore welcome that the European External Action Service is increasing the staffing of the East Strategic Communication Task Force to better enable them to detect, to analyse, and to expose disinformation.

I agree with many colleagues here tonight, but moreover we must strive at both EU level and national level to defend our values and the fight of cyber and information warfare through a robust defence of our electoral processes. We need to raise awareness about these challenges, closely cooperating with the media, civil society organisations and social media platforms. And last, but not least, of course it is crucial that we improve the way in which we communicate about our EU values and policies.

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

Bruno Gollnisch (NI), question «carton bleu». – Monsieur McAllister, vous avez évoqué les fausses informations en provenance de Moscou. Je n'ai pas beaucoup d'exemples en tête et je ne suis pas l'avocat du gouvernement russe, mais je voudrais savoir si vous avez des fausses informations émanant de Russie d'une gravité comparable à celles, par exemple, qu'a répandues dans le monde le gouvernement des États-Unis d'Amérique, en faisant agiter à la tribune de l'ONU, par le secrétaire d'État Colin Powell, une prétendue arme chimique de destruction massive qui ne contenait en réalité qu'une poudre inoffensive.

David McAllister (PPE), Antwort auf eine Frage nach dem Verfahren der „blauen Karte“. – Herr Kollege Gollnisch! Erlauben Sie, dass ich Ihnen auf Deutsch antwortete. Ich weiß nicht, ob Sie jetzt eine ernsthafte Antwort auf Ihre Frage erwarten. Es war mir klar, dass ein Vertreter der französischen Rechten keine Chance auslassen würde, um die russische Führung in Moskau zu verteidigen.

Ich will Ihnen eines deutlich machen, und das hat der Bericht, den wir im März beschlossen haben, klar zum Ausdruck gebracht: Es gibt massive russische Versuche, unsere europäische Einheit zu untergraben. Und es ist kein Zufall, dass ausgerechnet Russen Parteien wie die Ihre aktiv unterstützen. Sie sollten sich schämen, hier in diesem Europäischen Parlament auch nur den Ansatz zu unternehmen, diese Aktivitäten zu verteidigen!

Procedura «catch-the-eye»

Seán Kelly (PPE). – Mr President, this is a very opportune discussion, especially with our European elections only six weeks away. I'd like to compliment Commissioner King for his proposals and his efforts to get to grips with this very worrying situation. Indeed, going back to Mark Zuckerberg when he appeared here in the European Parliament, he did indicate that the incidence of interference was in decline and obviously we need to ensure that it is reduced further.

I'm just wondering, especially in relation to all these fake accounts – 116 million – and I presume the people that were threatening to kill our good friend Mr Tarand probably had fake accounts as well, is there some way that we should look at monitoring fake accounts before they actually are accounts? In other words, is there some type of passport, proving your identity before you actually get on Facebook and the other social media platforms, because as long as fake accounts are there, they're going to be able to do what they like with impunity, to a large degree.

Dariusz Rosati (PPE). – Mr President, Commissioner, this is indeed a timely debate, as many speakers have said. I think that we have a lot of evidence, a lot of signals, of hostile interference in different instances in the European elections and also outside of Europe by Russian trolls and Russian vote participants – unwelcome participants in these elections. I am sure that this is something we have to confront very seriously, because this is indeed a practice that undermines the trust of European citizens in the European Union. We cannot just stay idle in front of these practices.

I would like to tell you, Commissioner, that I think that the exchange of information or exchanging good practices is OK, but still, this is not sufficient. It is not enough. I think we should be much more determined in confronting these practices, and I welcome the announcement that the task force devoted to this task will be strengthened. I think we all should take it very seriously, because otherwise this is going to be a threat to the unity and integrity of the European Union.

Juan Fernando López Aguilar (S&D). – Señor presidente, comisario King, la libertad de expresión no da derecho a insultar, ni a injuriar, ni a calumniar. Y la libertad de información no da derecho a mentir, manipular ni intoxicar. Y, sin este principio elemental, la sociedad abierta es frágil, y la democracia vulnerable a menos que los demócratas hagamos algo al respecto.

Por eso es imprescindible, ante la revolución cibernética, que la democracia se defienda con una estrategia de ciberseguridad, que es lo que exigimos exactamente de la Comisión y del comisario de Seguridad ante este Parlamento Europeo. Para luchar contra las *fake news*, contra las guerras híbridas de trolls y de perfiles falsos en la red. Y exactamente para que haya un debate informado ante las elecciones europeas del 26 de mayo.

Nada de eso nos exime, sin embargo, a los europeos de comunicar y explicar en esas elecciones lo que realmente está en juego. Nada menos que el futuro de la Unión Europea. En un espacio democrático que merezca ese nombre, con un debate público en una sociedad abierta y libremente informada.

Ese es nuestro deber, porque el desafío de la Unión Europea, no les quepa la menor duda, en esta ocasión es realmente existencial.

Ruža Tomašić (ECR). – Poštovani predsjedavajući, za demokraciju na europskom kontinentu od iznimne je važnosti zaustaviti pokušaj svakog vanjskog uplitanja u izbore na svim razinama, pa tako i u izbore za Europski parlament. Nužno je uložiti sve moguće napore kako bi izborni proces bio što transparentniji, a svi alati koji se u njemu koriste provjereni i sigurni.

Ali, za demokraciju u Europi ništa manje opasno nije ni često potpuno neutemeljeno svaljivanje krivnje za promjene na političkoj karti Europe na Rusiju, Ameriku i druge globalne igrače. Bojim se da nas nakon izbora čeka dugo razdoblje samozavaravanja u redovima federalista kakvo možemo vidjeti u Americi, među demokratima.

Političke snage koje su Uniju dovele do toga da je napušta jedna od najvećih, najbogatijih i najutjecajnijih članica bit će kažnjene na ovim izborima. Europljani ne žele superdržavu ni briselsko gaženje država članica. Žele suverene nacije i to će na izborima i pokazati.

Ana Miranda (Verts/ALE). – Señor presidente, esta mañana me insultaron en Twitter con un perfil falso. Esta misma mañana, un partido político me pidió el voto sin haber sido amiga suya en Facebook.

Esta mañana, sentí la necesidad de venir a este debate cuando vi que estaba en el orden del día. No era un asunto personal, sino que era el debate de la manipulación, el ataque a la pluralidad, el ataque a la democracia.

Señor comisario, esta guerra cibernética va más allá de actuar ahora, a última hora, pero, por lo menos, se han dado algunos pasos, ¿no?

Esa necesidad de prevenir los riesgos asociados a la desinformación y a las noticias falsas está de actualidad, con incidentes de ciberseguridad en Facebook que han comprometido las noticias de millones de usuarios, también europeos y europeas.

Esta alteración de la democracia es, en definitiva, una injerencia electoral, pero ¿sabe para qué fundamentalmente? Para los partidos de extrema derecha; fundamentalmente para los partidos que incitan al odio y a la xenofobia y que amplifican un discurso racista y xenófobo. Lo estamos viviendo en estos momentos en el Estado español.

La eliminación de cuentas falsas en Twitter y Facebook, que no se permita el control no solo *online*, sino también *offline*, los análisis independientes y la transparencia política serían nuestro objetivo.

Bogdan Andrzej Zdrojewski (PPE). – Panie Przewodniczący! Przez dwa lata pracowałem w komisji ds. terroryzmu. Tam bardzo często problematyka bezpieczeństwa w sieci była poruszana. Cyberbezpieczeństwo uznane zostało za jeden z ważniejszych problemów. Chcę wyraźnie podkreślić pojawiające się informacje, że terroryści działają nie tylko poprzez wysadzanie konkretnych materiałów wybuchowych. Mogą wysadzać systemy wyborcze także fake newsami. Ale chcę podkreślić jeszcze jeden bardzo ważny element. Rzeczywiście dziś, rozmawiając o sygnalistach, mówiliśmy o dwóch rzeczach jednocześnie: o konieczności ochrony tych, którzy sprawdzają fałszywe informacje, przekazują prawdziwe informacje o stanie instytucji publicznych. Ale też ważne jest, aby, krótko mówiąc, zwalczać także tych, którzy budują fałszywe przekazy, fałszywe oskarżenia, fake newsy, jak również oskarżenia pod adresem określonych partii politycznych czy osób. Jeżeli Europa ma być bezpieczna, to system wyborczy Europy musi być także bezpieczny. Ważna jest nieuchronność skutków wykrycia określonych nieprawidłowości. Ważna jest reaktywność instytucji europejskich, ale i instytucji rządowych wobec ingerencji zewnętrznych w procesy wyborcze. Ale ważna jest także edukacja samych wyborców, aby na to wszystko byli wyczuleni.

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

Julian King, Member of the Commission. – Mr President, thank you for this debate. I'm just going to respond on two points, if that's alright. First of all there have been a number of suggestions, particularly from behind me, that in some way the work that we're doing to tackle disinformation is against free speech, that in some way it amounts to censorship.

I want to be absolutely clear about this. We have never suggested, we will not suggest, that it is the responsibility of someone, whether it is public authorities, still less private sector, to judge whether a piece of political speech or a piece of political information is true or false, good or bad. The measures that we are seeking to promote through the Code are measures to promote greater transparency around political debate and political speech, greater transparency around the provenance of particular pieces of information – where does it come from? – so that we as citizens can be better equipped to assess that information and form our own judgments about it.

That's what is involved in the measures that we are promoting through the Code, to have greater transparency around political adverts, sponsored content, to tackle the problems of bots and fake accounts, to use fact checkers more effectively, to have that independent scrutiny that many of you have spoken about, so that we know what is happening on these social media platforms, to have effective corrections when some piece of demonstrable disinformation has been circulated. For me, that's the essence of defending free speech and free debate, and it is as far away as you can be from any sense of censorship.

The second thing that I want to react to: the importance of our cyber resilience, protecting ourselves from cyber-attacks, cyber-enabled interference. This is absolutely crucial. It's why the Cybersecurity Act that you have voted and supported is so important, the new Cybersecurity Agency and the role that goes with it. But as a number of you have underlined, this needs to be implemented. I can assure you that we will do everything we can from the Commission side to follow up the effective implementation of the Cybersecurity Act, and indeed I hope that you will also support the cybersecurity competence centres and the research into cybersecurity that is going to underpin our future cybersecurity resilience.

We have to protect our critical digital infrastructure, the plumbing of our digital lives, of our digital political debate. Which is why it's so important that we've now got these measures on foreign direct investment (FDI) screening, that we've got measures proposed around 5G security, so that people understand the importance not just of making judgments about digital infrastructure on the basis of price and cost, but also integrating security into those decisions.

Abraham Lincoln said: 'Elections belong to the people. It's their decision'. We need to make sure it stays that way.

Melania Gabriela Ciot, *President-in-Office of the Council*. – Mr President, it is our duty to protect our elections, in full respect of fundamental rights such as freedom of speech, media and association. We do not want to be the 'ministry of truth', but we cannot be naive. These elections will not be business as usual, and our citizens have the right to vote freely.

Protecting elections is at the core of defending our European values. So far, the EU institutions and the Member States have spared no efforts to ensure preparedness. We understood the need for working together, learning from each other with the exchange of information and best practices, and putting in contact authorities which in the past worked in silence.

We put in place measures encouraging greater online transparency, accountability and integrity, ensuring the application of the General Data Protection Regulation and enhancing cybersecurity for the European elections to preserve the integrity of their electoral systems and infrastructure, strengthening citizens' resilience and critical thinking. We are ready for the possible challenges ahead.

Allow me to quote from 1984 by George Orwell, who wrote: 'Power is in tearing human minds to pieces and putting them together again in new shapes of your own choosing'. Some may want to interfere in the free elections of our political classes, reshape the minds of our voters by micro-targeting political advertisements and disinformation attacks. It is our role to protect democracy and internet freedom from such powers. We owe it to our citizens.

Presidente. – La discussione congiunta è chiusa.

Ieri il Presidente ha annunciato due interpretazioni del regolamento proposte dalla commissione per gli affari costituzionali. Il gruppo EFDD ha presentato un'obiezione all'interpretazione dell'articolo 32, paragrafo 5, primo comma, secondo trattino, di conseguenza questa interpretazione del regolamento sarà messa ai voti domani.

Per quanto riguarda l'interpretazione dell'articolo 149 bis, paragrafo 2, non sono state sollevate obiezioni entro il termine di ventiquattrore, questa interpretazione quindi è ritenuta approvata conformemente all'articolo 226.

Dichiarazioni scritte (articolo 162)

Urmas Paet (ALDE), *kirjalikult*. – Oluline on tagada Euroopa Parlamendi valimiste usaldusväärsus ja turvalisus küberjulgeoleku seisukohast. Juba varem on Euroopa Parlament nentunud, et näiteks Venemaa väärinfokampaaniad on Euroopas peamine väärinfo allikas. Samuti on tunda Venemaa, Hiina, Iraani ja Põhja-Korea üha agressiivsemaid samme, millega püütakse õõnestada Euroopa demokraatia aluseid. Vaja on õigusraamistikku hübriidohtude, sh küber- ja inforünakute vastu võitlemiseks ELi ja rahvusvahelisel tasandil.

18. Wykładnia Regulaminu (podjęte działania): Patrz protokół

19. Komunikat Przewodniczącego: Patrz protokół

20. Ustanowienie programu „Horyzont Europa” oraz zasad uczestnictwa i upowszechniania obowiązujących w tym programie – Program realizacji programu „Horyzont Europa” (debata)

Presidente. – L'ordine del giorno reca, in discussione congiunta,

— la relazione di Dan Nica, a nome della commissione per l'industria, la ricerca e l'energia, sulla proposta di regolamento del Parlamento europeo e del Consiglio che istituisce Orizzonte Europa – il programma quadro di ricerca e innovazione – e ne stabilisce le norme di partecipazione e diffusione (COM(2018)0435 - C8-0252/2018 - 2018/0224(COD)) (A8-0401/2018), e

— la relazione di Christian Ehler, a nome della commissione per l'industria, la ricerca e l'energia, sulla proposta di decisione del Parlamento europeo e del Consiglio relativa all'istituzione del programma specifico di attuazione di Orizzonte Europa – il programma quadro di ricerca e innovazione (COM(2018)0436 - C8-0253/2018 - 2018/0225(COD)) (A8-0410/2018).

Dan Nica, Raportor. – Domnule președinte, domnule comisar Moedas, stimați colegi, iată-ne astăzi prezenți la patru luni de la dezbateră din plen dinaintea negocierilor și la zece luni de când Comisia a prezentat noul program-cadru pentru cercetare și inovare *Horizon Europe*.

Orizont Europa este un program extrem de important pentru viitor, cu un impact asupra mediului de cercetare și inovare al Uniunii pentru următoarea perioadă bugetară și cu un impact asupra economiei, competitivității și nivelului de trai din Uniune. Prin știință, inovare și cercetare fundamentală, Europa poate deveni competitivă și poate rămâne în fruntea cercetării și inovării globale, creând locuri de muncă de calitate.

Înainte de această dezbateră am revizuit punctele esențiale pentru Parlamentul European și pot spune că rezultatul acestor negocieri – acest acord parțial – reprezintă un succes pentru că:

1. Principiul excelenței rămâne principiul de bază în selectarea tuturor proiectelor și excelența este susținută și promovată în cadrul întregii Uniuni.
2. Cel puțin 35 % din bugetul total al acestui program va fi alocat pentru a sprijini obiectivele Uniunii Europene în materie de climă, ceea ce va stimula produsele mai ecologice, cu o valoare adăugată durabilă pentru utilizatorii finali.
3. Instrumentul pentru întreprinderile mici și mijlocii va continua într-o formă cât mai apropiată de cea din Orizont 2020. Astfel, cel puțin 70 % din bugetul noului instrument EIC va fi dedicat IMM-urilor și posibilitatea de a avea echivalentul din Orizont 2020 pentru granturi pentru IMM-uri.
4. Decalajul de cercetare și inovare la nivelul Uniunii va fi redus prin creșterea participării în *Horizon Europe* în comparație cu programul-cadru anterior pentru statele membre cu performanțe pe cercetare și inovare scăzute, dar și prin asigurarea unui buget de 3,3 % din viitorul program-cadru pentru aceste state în componenta de *widening* a programului. Doar dacă suntem cu toții mai competitivi pe partea de cercetare și inovare vom face ca Europa să fie cu adevărat competitivă în aceste domenii.
5. Elementele de noutate precum EIC – Consiliul european al inovării – și misiunile vor contribui, pe de o parte, la creșterea competitivității Uniunii Europene și, pe de altă parte, vor produce rezultate tangibile pentru toți cetățenii europeni. Au fost stabilite cinci arii ale misiunilor: unu – adaptarea la schimbările climatice, doi – cancer, trei – oceane sănătoase, patru – orașe neutre din punctul de vedere al crimei, cinci – alimentația și sănătatea solului și așteptăm cu interes selecția primelor misiuni care vor trebui să răspundă nevoilor cetățenilor.

Începând cu ultimele două programe-cadru, s-a pus un accent tot mai mare pe inovare – și nu contestăm importanța acestora – dar Orizont Europa trebuie să sprijine toate etapele cercetării și inovării, inclusiv colaborarea în cercetarea de bază. Cercetarea este excelentă și, în special cea fundamentală, reprezintă un element esențial și o condiție importantă pentru a răspunde obiectivelor și priorităților politice ale Uniunii Europene.

Programul vizează simplificarea administrativă continuă și reducerea sarcinii pentru beneficiari.

Vreau să subliniez că Parlamentul European a fost un partener serios și implicat din punctul de vedere al conținutului, ca și din punctul de vedere al calendarului extrem de ambițios. Acest rezultat va fi validat prin votul din plen cu privire la acest acord parțial.

Rezultatele obținute în cadrul acestor negocieri demonstrează un angajament puternic față de cetățenii și comunitatea noastră de cercetare. Aș dori, de asemenea, să subliniez că chestiunile care nu fac obiectul acestor negocieri, precum bugetul și cooperarea internațională, sinergiile, Parlamentul European se angajează ca, împreună cu un buget de 120 de miliarde de euro – propunerea noastră – să le discutăm în viitorul Parlament European.

Vreau să le mulțumesc în mod deosebit: președinției României, care a avut un rol extraordinar în finalizarea acestui dosar, să îi mulțumesc domnului comisar Moedas și echipei sale pentru modul deosebit în care a reușit să lucreze și să producă aceste rezultate, să le mulțumesc colegilor mei – mulți dintre ei se află în această sală – pentru modul extraordinar în care au colaborat, pentru că, pentru prima dată, Parlamentul European a avut o unanimitate în cadrul grupurilor politice. Vă mulțumesc tuturor și vă doresc să avem împreună succes și să ne bucurăm de *Horizon Europe*.

Christian Ehler, Berichterstatter. – Herr Präsident, Herr Kommissar, Kollegen! Ich glaube, es ist ein guter Tag heute für Europa oder morgen, wenn wir über das Programm abstimmen. Europa wird ambitioniert. Europa wird morgen eines der größten zivilen Forschungsprogramme der Welt verabschieden. Und Europa wendet sich mit dem Programm an Europas Bürger. Wir diskutieren in den Tagen über Klimaschutz. Dies ist das größte Klimaschutzprogramm auf der Welt: 35 % der Forschung Europas werden sich mit Klimaschutz beschäftigen.

Wir beschäftigen uns mit der Gesundheit der Menschen: Wir wollen den Krebs bekämpfen, wir wollen in Europa Kinderkrebs bekämpfen. Wir beschäftigen uns mit Lebensmittelsicherheit. Wir beschäftigen uns mit dem kulturellen Erbe Europas. Wir beschäftigen uns mit neuen Industrien in Europa, wie der Digitalindustrie oder auch der Kreativindustrie.

Dieses Programm ist ambitioniert im Weltmaßstab. Die Programme für *artificial intelligence*, die Ambitionen, was die neue Quantumtechnologie betrifft, die Fragen der Digitalisierung, der Produktion in Europa sind Grenzbereiche, sind Zukunftsbereiche der europäischen Forschung, die sich sowohl an die Wettbewerbsfähigkeit Europas richten als auch an die europäischen Bürger und ihre Interessen, ihre Gesundheit und ihre ganz unmittelbaren Anliegen. Das ist keine abstrakte Diskussion über Forschungspolitik, sondern es ist die Grundlage Europas.

Wir leben in einem Europa der hohen Löhne. Wir leben in Europa auf einem Kontinent, wo wir die meisten Sozialausgaben auf der Welt haben. Der Grund, warum wir wettbewerbsfähig sind, sind Innovation und Forschung. Europa war seit dem 18. Jahrhundert der Ort auf der Welt, an dem Innovation, an dem Forschung, wo gesellschaftliche Weiterentwicklung Grundlage dessen war, was wir als das heutige politische Europa kennen. Die europäische Aufklärung, das europäische Sozialmodell, eine gesamtgesellschaftliche Verantwortung für Freiheit, für die Sicherheit von Menschen, für Demokratie, aber eben auch für neue Herausforderungen wie den Klimawandel, sind Ausdruck dieses Programms.

Aber wir müssen auch realistisch sehen, in was für einer Welt wir uns befinden. Mit diesem Programm – das Parlament fordert 120 Milliarden Euro für dieses Programm – bewegt sich die EU in einem sich rasant entwickelnden globalen Wettbewerb. Unter den zehn größten Forschungsunternehmen auf der Welt – unter den zehn Unternehmen, die am meisten forschen – ist noch ein europäisches. Unter den zwanzig größten sind es gerade noch drei. Von diesen drei Unternehmen sind zwei aus der Automobilindustrie.

Ein Unternehmen wie Amazon hat 2017 20 Milliarden Dollar für Forschung ausgegeben. Das ist mehr als die gesamte Europäische Union 2017 ausgegeben hat. Wir müssen mit diesem Programm sehen – und ich glaube, es ein wichtiger Schritt in die Richtung –, dass wir die Wettbewerbsfähigkeit, aber auch die Deutungsheftigkeit in Europa in ganz entscheidenden Fragen behalten.

Wenn wir uns in diesen Tagen über Klimawandel unterhalten, dann blicken wir auf uns selbst und sagen: Tun wir genügend? Sind wir ambitioniert genug? Was ist unser Beitrag? Aber wir sollten schon auch den Stolz besitzen zu sagen: Dieses Forschungsprogramm gibt es, und es garantiert, dass es überhaupt Klimaforschung gibt. In Amerika sind 3000 Beamte im Umweltministerium entlassen worden, die Mittel sind gestrichen worden. China ist nicht überambitioniert, was den Klimawandel betrifft.

Europa liefert. Dieses Forschungsprogramm ist von entscheidender Bedeutung. Und deshalb darf ich mich ganz herzlich bei den beiden anderen Institutionen bedanken. Wir haben schnell geliefert, wir haben in historisch kurzer Zeit geliefert, wir geben Sicherheit für die *stakeholders*, und wir haben gezeigt, dass Europa gemeinsam agieren kann, schnell agieren kann, und die Herausforderungen auf der Welt annimmt.

Carlos Moedas, *Member of the Commission*. – Mr President, honourable Members, the last time I had the honour to address this plenary was on 11 December last year, and at the time I welcomed the political consensus that emerged at the ITRE Committee – thank you, President Buzek – and the ability of going at speed and quality that was the ambition of Parliament to agree on the framework programme regulation establishing Horizon Europe and a specific programme decision, thus opening the way for the Council and the Commission to start the real negotiations.

And here we are again, four months and three trilogues later, and I'm very happy. Very happy that we reached such a well-balanced agreement on Horizon Europe. Congratulations. Congratulations, Mr Nica; congratulations Mr Ehler, for the great work achieved. It was really impressive how you did it, how you achieved a consensus, how you worked so hard, and how everyone worked so hard. So, really, congratulations and I'll be watching tomorrow on this confirmation.

I wanted also to thank President Buzek, who was also always there with us, in the ITRE Committee. Congratulations to the Council; congratulations to the Romanian Presidency; and – I wanted to be a little bit personal – congratulations, Ambassador, to you, and to your team. You worked very hard, 24 hours a day, to achieve this and I'm really, deeply thankful for that.

(Applause)

Last week, I had a beautiful moment. I think we all had a beautiful moment – to have for the first time in our lifetime a picture of a black hole. Imagine that! A man 100 years ago, Albert Einstein, imagined a black hole, and for 100 years people tried to achieve and to prove that that was right, and we did it. We did it, and Europe was there, touching the button of that picture, which will make for the world things that we cannot even imagine, because even Einstein could never have imagined what he did: how much that would impact the world.

I think there was one scientist there that said, 'you know, there's a history of science before that moment, before the picture, and there will be a history of science after that moment'. I think that, for me, if I could have described European science it was that moment. Because that moment was about open science, about open innovation, and about openness to the world: in that room that day, they were representing 200 scientists. They were representing 40 different nationalities. And so I'm extremely proud, because Horizon Europe is just about that. It is about our leadership as Europeans in science. When you think about everything that we have achieved: that we have decided that on the next programme we will have these missions that Mr Ehler referred to: missions of science that people will understand. That we will communicate with people about the things that we want to do – to cure diseases like cancer. That will link us to the people. And then the ways that we will do it in terms of the European Innovation Council and the way we will innovate on the financing and the funding for innovation. The partnerships where we decided to go for an easier way, for a less complex way of defining those partnerships. And, of course, one of the points that was so important for all of us is that while the programme is about excellence, we have also to help those that are going up that ladder of excellence, and that we owe to you. We owe it to you, to the Parliament, that we achieved that agreement; that we will put 3.3% of the budget for widening measures in the future. That is a big achievement, and I also wanted to congratulate you for that.

So, by agreeing on Horizon Europe, we have sent a strong signal to the MFF negotiators about the importance of science and innovation, and it is now our common task to defend a robust budget for it. This will be the next challenge, my friends, and I count on all of you to make sure that Horizon Europe will become not only the biggest science and innovation programme ever, but also the one delivering the highest impact for our citizens.

Lola Sánchez Caldentey, *ponente de opinión de la Comisión de Desarrollo*. – Señor presidente, nuestra opinión dista de lo expresado hasta ahora por los oradores. El nuevo programa marco reproduce un modelo de I+D opuesto a los valores de justicia, solidaridad y servicio público. Pocos cambios en el cómo y para quién innovamos e investigamos en comparación con el viejo Horizonte 2020.

Me pregunto también por el escandaloso bloqueo al principio de precaución en todo el programa. Nos hubiera gustado tener un programa que pusiera sin dobles y por delante retos como la crisis ecológica, la igualdad de género, la seguridad alimentaria, el empleo, el acceso a la salud o la desigualdad en todo el mundo.

Horizonte Europa va a fracasar a la hora de garantizar un retorno social justo de las multimillonarias inversiones de fondos públicos en proyectos privados. Una vez más, prevalece el lucro sobre el interés general, pues sus objetivos distan mucho de las prioridades que ya he mencionado.

Y, para terminar, y como es mi última intervención como diputada al Parlamento Europeo, no quiero despedirme sin dar las gracias a las votantes que me dieron su confianza en 2014, y especialmente a las compañeras que me han acompañado en esta travesía: Amelia, Viviana, Carlos, Jorge, Jacob, Ana y David, al resto de mi delegación de Podemos en Europa. Muchísimas gracias, porque sin vosotras no hubiera podido.

Nils Torvalds, *budjettivaliokunnan lausunnon valmistelija*. – Arvoisa puhemies, joskus työskentely budjettivaliokunnassa on suoraan sanoen aika tylsää. Rakenteet ovat monimutkaisia eivätkä kovinkaan läpinäkyviä. Joskus EU:n budjetista puhuttaessa joutuu käyttämään sanoja, joita komission jäsen Moedas jo käytti. Kansalaiset uskovat aika usein, että EU:n budjetti on musta aukko, johon kaikki rahat häviävät.

Siitä syystä oli todella mieltä nostavaa olla budjettivaliokunnassa se edustaja, joka sai sanoa, että me tarvitsemme 120 miljardia euroa, jotta tästä olisi jotain hyötyä, ja yhtäkkiä syntyy valtava yksimielisyys. Ei ollut kovinkaan vaikeata vakuutella muita kollegoita siitä, että tällaisia rahoja todella tarvitaan. Joskus kymmenen tai kahdenkymmenen vuoden kuluttua kerään lapsenlapseni ja ehkä silloin on jo lapsenlapsenlapseni yhteen ja kerron, mitä ukki joskus teki Euroopan parlamentissa: sai 120 miljardia euroa tärkeään tutkimustyöhön.

Martina Dlabajová, *zpravodajka Výboru pro rozpočtovou kontrolu*. – Pane předsedající, v dnešním rychle se globalizujícím světě je zásadní zaměřit se na výsledky budoucího výzkumu a inovací v Evropské unii. Ve srovnání s jinými velkými ekonomikami trpí Evropa nedostatečným financováním, ačkoliv výzkum a inovace jsou základem udržitelných pracovních míst a růstu.

Současný program Horizont 2020 již přinesl jedinečnou evropskou přidanou hodnotu v podobě podpory konkurenceschopnosti a spolupráce pro nejlepší vědecké poznatky a inovace na celém kontinentu. Z pohledu rozpočtové kontroly je i nadále potřeba zvyšovat synergie mezi programy v oblasti výzkumu a inovací a jinými programy Evropské unie, pokračovat ve zjednodušování pravidel a postupů a je třeba lépe seznamovat Evropany s výsledky výzkumu a inovací. Toto program Horizont Europe naplňuje svým zaměřením na excelenci, nadnárodní soutěž a spolupráci. Věřím tomu, že splní tato očekávání a bude mít ještě větší dopad než program současný.

Dovolte mi na závěr poděkovat panu komisaři Moedasovi za vždy konstruktivní spolupráci i s Výborem pro rozpočtovou kontrolu.

Cristian-Silviu Bușoi, *Raportor pentru aviz, Comisia pentru mediu, sănătate publică și siguranță alimentară*. – Domnule președinte, stimai colegi, programul Orizont Europa va fi cel mai ambițios program de cercetare și inovare din lume. Doresc să mulțumesc și să îi felicit pe toți colegii raportori, mulțumesc domnului comisar și președinției române pentru excelenta muncă depusă într-un timp record, iar, în calitate de raportor al Comisiei ENVI, mă simt onorat că propunerea din raportul comisiei noastre de a prioritiza cercetarea și inovarea în domeniul cancerului a fost aprobată și la nivelul Consiliului.

Subliniez, de asemenea, că 35 % din bugetul total al programului de 120 de miliarde va ținti combaterea schimbărilor climatice, recomandare venită tot din partea Comisiei ENVI.

Salut, de asemenea, suportul colegilor de a mări bugetul alocat sănătății, de la 7,7 la 9,12 miliarde de euro, ceea ce va permite să abordăm mai eficient provocările enorme din sănătate. În mod special, soluțiile inovatoare în domeniul oncologiei sunt vitale pentru generațiile următoare, având în vedere că, în fiecare an, 35 000 de noi cazuri de cancer sunt înregistrate în rândul tinerilor europeni.

Henna Virkkunen, *liikenne- ja matkailuvaliokunnan lausunnon valmistelija*. – Arvoisa puhemies, haluan kiittää kaikkia neuvottelijoita myös liikennevaliokunnan puolesta erinomaisesta mietinnöstä. Liikennevaliokunnan näkökulmasta tässä on kolme erityisen tärkeää asiaa. Ensimmäinen niistä tietenkin on se, että meidän on kasvatettava Euroopan tutkimus- ja kehitysmäärärahoja kaikkien jäsenvaltioiden tasolla. Mutta myös Horisontti-ohjelman kasvattaminen 50 prosentilla 120 miljardiin euroon on liikennevaliokunnalle tärkeä prioriteetti: jotta teollisuutemme säilyy kilpailukykyisenä tulevaisuudessa ja jotta pystymme vastaamaan suuriin globaaleihin haasteisiin, on investoitava enemmän tutkimukseen ja tuotekehitykseen.

Toiseksi liikennevaliokunta kannattaa erittäin voimakkaasti ilmastotavoitteiden painottamista tulevassa tutkimusohjelmassa. Liikenteen näkökulmasta nimenomaan hiilestä irtautuminen ja toisaalta digitalisaatio ovat ne avainalueet, joihin täytyy investoida Euroopan tutkimuksessa. Kolmanneksi pidämme erittäin hyvänä ratkaisuna sitä, että liikenteelle ei kuitenkaan tehty erillistä omaa klusteria, vaan yritämme toimia mahdollisimman poikkihallinnollisesti ja hyödyntää sekä energia-, ilmasto-, liikenne-, että toisaalta digitalisaation ja teollisuuden määrärahoja. On tärkeää, että perustutkimus ja innovaatio ovat tässä hyvässä tasapainossa myös tulevaisuudessa.

Lambert van Nistelrooij, *Rapporteur voor advies van de Commissie regionaal beleid*. – Voorzitter, rapporteurs, een doorbraak: na 15 jaar werken, zowel in de Commissie regionale ontwikkeling als in de Commissie industrie, onderzoek en energie, kunnen we nu de regionale fondsen ook flexibeler inzetten voor een opschaling van Horizonprojecten, zonder staatssteuntoets per lidstaat in te vullen. Ik zie Horizon 2020 als de nieuwste Airbus, topklasse wereldwijd. En de regionale fondsen kunnen die *landing strip* zijn voor noodzakelijke opschaling. Synergie in de praktijk. Minstens vijf procent, maar het kan meer zijn. Het gaat over miljarden.

Dan onzichtbaarheid. Het Verenigd Koninkrijk – onderzoeksland nummer één – heeft laten zien dat we de burger, de kiezer, helemaal niet bereiken. De EU moet anders gaan opereren. Natuurlijk, onderzoekers uit de ivoeren toren, anders communiceren, begunstigers aan het woord laten. *Let the stars shine*. Door gebruikers en begunstigers van Horizon lokaal en internationaal het woord te geven. Wat wordt er bereikt?

Ten slotte, het was me een genoegen dat ik hieraan heb mogen werken. Resultaten als het Europees Instituut voor innovatie en technologie, als de Europese Innovatieraad en de Widening-projecten, met geld belegd: dat is een geweldig resultaat. Ik heb er graag aan gewerkt. Dank u wel.

Elsi Katainen, *maatalousvaliokunnan lausunnon valmistelija*. – Arvoisa puhemies, Euroopan horisontti -ohjelma on onnistuessaan ratkaisevan tärkeä EU:n kilpailukykyyn kannalta. Me todellakin tarvitsemme rohkean ohjelman, jonka avulla eurooppalainen tiede ja innovaatiot pärjäävät hyvin kansainvälisessä kilpailussa esimerkiksi Yhdysvaltojen ja Kiinan kanssa.

Maatalousvaliokunnan esittelijänä korostan nimenomaan maatalouden, ruuan, luonnonvarojen ja niihin osoitetun kymmenen miljardin euron tutkimusrahoituksen merkitystä. Merten ja sisävesien, metsien ja maatalouden tutkimukseen on panostettava enemmän senkin takia, että pääsisimme irti fossiilisesta yhteiskunnasta. EU:n on pidettävä huolta niin omasta kuin koko maailman ruokaturvasta ja kannettava vastuunsa nälänhädän lopettamiseksi, myös koko maailmassa. Tärkein on kuitenkin yhä sopimatta, eli budjetti. Kun trilogineuvottelut jatkuvat tulevana syksynä osana monivuotista rahoituspakettia, on pidettävä kiinni siitä, että komission esittämä kymmenen miljardin korvamerkintä pysyy vähintään tällä tasolla.

Liliana Rodrigues, *relatora de parecer da Comissão para a Cultura, a Juventude, a Educação, os Meios de Comunicação Social e os Desportos*. – Senhor Presidente, o programa Horizonte Europa será o instrumento fundamental na criação de postos de trabalho e no crescimento económico, no reforço da participação das pequenas e médias empresas e no incentivo às parcerias entre universidades, tanto da União, como de países terceiros, e isso irá, de alguma forma, atrair novos talentos e jovens investigadores, reforçando, deste modo, o Espaço Europeu de Investigação e, deste modo também, iremos evitar a fuga de cérebros.

No entanto, em termos de desenvolvimento científico e tecnológico entre as várias regiões, será preciso uma inclusão geográfica mais equilibrada, nomeadamente no que diz respeito às regiões ultraperiféricas e menos desenvolvidas. Volto a insistir que a distribuição dos recursos, inclusive para a ciência, dentro da União, deverá ser mais justa.

A prioridade assentará na criação e difusão de conhecimentos, tanto a nível de tecnologia como de competências com soluções-base em investigação fundamental e aplicada, mas também contemplando as ciências sociais e humanas e as artes enquanto formas nobres de conhecimento, sob pena de tornarmos a genialidade humana estéril. Serão também mais sucedidos aqueles países que, com a sua liderança política, acreditem na ciência e a coloquem ao serviço de uma sociedade esclarecida e crítica.

Jerzy Buzek, w imieniu grupy PPE. – Panie Przewodniczący! Rzeczywiście pan komisarz ma rację. Mówiliśmy o tym, żeby ten program zrealizować w sposób ambitny, najlepszy jak można, a także szybko. Ale dlaczego to ważne? Ta szybkość. Chcemy, żeby pieniądze, na przykład na innowacje społeczne, na opiekę nad starszymi, telemedycynę itp. płynęły jak najszybciej do naszych uczelni, naszego przemysłu, małych i średnich przedsiębiorstw. W tym programie ramowym wprowadzano misje. To bardzo nowe i dobre podejście. Gratuluję panu komisarzowi. Bo dzięki temu ludzie rozumieją łatwiej, co to znaczy bezemisyjne miasto, walka z rakiem. Wszystkie te pomysły są zrozumiałe dla ludzi, a o to nam chodziło. Ważne jest, aby Europejska Rada Innowacji, którą wprowadza ten program, miała w przyszłości równy sukces jak Europejski Instytut Innowacji i Technologii. Bo nie zapominamy o starych rozwiązaniach, które powinniśmy kontynuować. I wreszcie ważne jest, że rozszerzamy ten program w miarę możliwości poprzez specjalne środki finansowe na kraje, które dzisiaj nie korzystają mocno z tego programu, takie kraje jak Polska. To ważne, żeby wykorzystać cały potencjał Unii Europejskiej. Gratuluję więc panu komisarzowi, prezydentce rumuńskiej oraz moim koleżankom i kolegom z Parlamentu Europejskiego. Naprawdę świetna robota, Panie i Panowie.

Soledad Cabezón Ruiz, en nombre del Grupo S&D. – Señor presidente, señorías, a mi consideración, Horizonte Europa nace con la necesaria ambición para hacer frente a los retos sociales y económicos de la Unión Europea: desde la ciencia excelente, mejorar la competitividad, pero con un carácter inclusivo.

Por ello introduce, a petición del Parlamento, la necesidad de medir el impacto social y no solo económico. La ciencia tiene que resolver las desigualdades y los retos y no generar nuevas desigualdades.

Refuerza el género: Europa necesita todo su talento y no podemos prescindir de las mujeres. Por ello, es un objetivo operativo, tiene una línea específica presupuestaria y también medidas de conciliación.

Viene también a disminuir la brecha entre las regiones; alinea los retos sociales con las líneas prioritarias presupuestarias y con los clústers; refuerza la salud, la lucha contra el cambio climático, las ciencias sociales y humanas, lo digital, la industria creativa, la economía azul, la seguridad alimentaria o la diplomacia científica.

Pero no quiero dejar de resaltar el papel que se ha dado a las pymes, el 99 % del sector empresarial no financiero de la Unión Europea, claves para mejorar la competitividad de la Unión Europea disminuyendo la brecha de la innovación.

Por lo tanto, no tengo más que felicitar a todo el equipo de la Comisión y del Parlamento Europeo que ha hecho posible este gran proyecto para la Unión Europea.

Evžen Tošenovský, za skupinu ECR. – Pane předsedající, v prvé řadě chci poděkovat oběma zpravodajům, Danu Nicovi a Christianu Ehlerovi, za obrovské nasazení a skvělou spolupráci s námi, stínovými zpravodaji. Velmi děkuji a velmi si toho cením.

Program Horizont Europe bude v období let 2021 až 2027 představovat stěžejní nástroj podpory vědy a výzkumu a přispívat k prohloubení spolupráce členských států Evropské unie, a to nejen v této oblasti. Jsem velmi rád, že i když jsme měli málo času, dospěli jsme k vyváženému závěru. Stejně tak mě těší, že kolegové přijali za svůj můj návrh na zahrnutí podpory pro výzkum v tak zvaných uhlíkových regionech. To považuji za nezbytné pro zvládnutí regulací a cílů, ke kterým jsme se v oblasti energetiky v Evropské unii rozhodli. I díky Horizontu bude snazší podporovat sdílení zkušeností s ekonomickými a sociálními proměnami spojenými s útlumem těžby uhlí.

Za velice důležité považuji rovněž oblast tak zvaného *widening countries*. Musíme se do budoucna zaměřit na vyváženější čerpání a odměňování vědeckých pracovníků napříč Evropskou unií. Jedině tak plně využijeme jejich potenciálu a zabráníme jejich odchodu do jiných vědeckých center ve světě.

Lieve Wierinck, *namens de ALDE-Fractie*. – Voorzitter, we hebben het negende kaderprogramma reeds uitvoerig besproken. Morgen staat er een cruciale stemming op het programma. Als we de eerste lezing van Horizon Europa goedkeuren, verzekeren we de continuïteit voor de wetenschappers en innovatieve ondernemers in Europa.

Ik wil van de gelegenheid gebruikmaken om aan te geven hoe uniek deze stemming is. Samen met de Raad en de Commissie hebben we in het Parlement het onvoorstelbare teweeggebracht en een akkoord gevonden in de dialoog. Waar er voor Horizon 2020 achttien maanden onderhandeld werd, hebben we voor Horizon Europa slechts vier maanden nodig gehad. Ik wijt dit aan de constructieve samenwerking en verstandhouding die er bestond tussen de drie instellingen.

Ik wil dan ook mijn speciale dank betuigen aan commissaris Carlos Moedas en zijn hele team dat ons heeft bijgestaan tijdens deze onderhandelingen. Daarnaast wil ik de onderhandelaars van het Roemeense voorzitterschap bedanken. Het Roemeens voorzitterschap is een sterk voorbeeld van hoe de kleinere staten een belangrijke rol spelen in Europa.

In het belang van de Europese burger, in het belang van de toekomst van onderzoek en innovatie, wil ik in de volgende zittingsperiode blijven pleiten voor 120 miljard euro. Maar ondertussen roep ik u allen op om dit belangrijke akkoord goed te keuren.

Marisa Matias, *em nome do Grupo GUE/NGL*. – Senhor Presidente, quero também começar por agradecer aos relatores o trabalho inexecutável e a forma como integraram as propostas dos diferentes grupos parlamentares, à Comissão e ao Conselho pela forma como negociaram este dossiê para chegarmos ao acordo que aqui temos hoje.

Acredito numa ciência inclusiva, que seja igualitária e de cooperação entre investigadores e que seja promotora de inovação. Mas também sei que não há inovação sem conhecimento de base, não há inovação sem ciências sociais e humanidades.

Nós chegámos a um compromisso, que é um compromisso, ou seja, não é perfeito, cada um e cada uma de nós lutou por aquilo que achava que era fundamental integrar neste compromisso que é coletivo. Eu falei muito das ciências sociais e das humanidades, dos direitos dos bolsiros que fazem investigação nos projetos europeus, numa maior igualdade do acesso aos fundos, apoiei essas propostas com uma proposta de termos uma meta no que diz respeito à investigação dedicada ao combate às alterações climáticas.

O que é relevante – e com isto termino – é que eu creio que este programa representa o que de melhor a União Europeia tem neste momento e, para quem me conhece, sabe bem o significado desta afirmação.

A última, última palavra, é para dizer que grande parte dos responsáveis e das responsáveis do sucesso desta negociação está ali escondida na última fila, mas nós sabemos bem quem são.

Jakop Dalunde, *för Verts/ALE-gruppen*. – Herr talman, kommissionär, kära kolleger! För 50 år sedan satte Neil Armstrong sin fot på månen. Månlandningen 1969 var inte bara ett stort steg för mänskligheten utan också resultatet av en visionär och modig forskningspolitik som hela samhället samlades bakom. Vår generations motsvarighet är att med forskningens hjälp bidra till att lösa klimatfrågan.

I morgon röstar vi om Horisont Europa, EU:s program för forskning och innovation. Det har varit långa och intensiva förhandlingar, och jag vill ta tillfället i akt och tacka mina kolleger och kommissionen för gott samarbete.

De satsningar som Horisont Europa innebär gör oss bättre rustade att möta de globala klimatutmaningar som vi står inför. Om budgetförhandlingarna går vår väg, garanterar Horisont Europa att minst 420 miljarder kronor satsas på förnybar energi, hållbar mobilitet och gröna industrier. Det är nu det gröna paradigmskiftet börjar.

Rosa D'Amato, a nome del gruppo EFDD. – Signor Presidente, onorevoli colleghi, da relatrice ombra di entrambi i file legislativi sono soddisfatta, perché abbiamo riportato un giusto equilibrio fra le attività di ricerca e innovazione, perché abbiamo spinto per una particolare attenzione sul cambiamento climatico, abbiamo sostenuto la trasversalità e l'inclusione delle scienze sociali e umanistiche in tutte le attività del programma e, inoltre, abbiamo garantito un adeguato supporto non solo all'università e ai centri di ricerca, alle startup, ma anche alle micro, piccole e medie imprese attraverso uno strumento per le piccole e medie imprese, appunto.

Siamo però delusi per non avere permesso l'accesso libero ai dati che è ancora fortemente limitato dalla difesa di interessi commerciali privati e siamo scontenti della rilevanza marginale attribuita alla ricerca incrementale. Per quanto riguarda la struttura della decisione, le aree di intervento individuate nel pilastro sfide globali e competitività industriale europea permettono di agire sulla salute, sulla cultura, sulla sicurezza, inclusi i disastri naturali, ma anche sull'industria, sul clima, l'energia e la mobilità, sui prodotti alimentari, sulle risorse naturali, sull'agricoltura e sull'ambiente in modo da poter migliorare il benessere dei cittadini europei.

Il lavoro su Orizzonte Europa dovrà essere concluso nella prossima legislatura, ma quanto fatto finora raccoglie gli elementi fondamentali per il sostegno ai cardini necessari a costruire e migliorare il nostro futuro, ossia la ricerca e l'innovazione.

Seán Kelly (PPE). – Mr President, I am delighted to see after a tough negotiation our rapporteurs were able to get an agreement on the Horizon Europe programme and I congratulate colleagues Ehler and Nica. And also congratulations to Commissioner Moedas who, in his exuberance I thought was going to congratulate everybody in Parliament, but congratulations, Commissioner, to you for your good work.

This is a hugely important programme for the next multiannual financial framework (MFF). It will build on the achievements of some of our recent programmes, such as Horizon 2020 and FP7 and help us to reach our targets and create jobs, particularly in the areas of renewable energy, food production, digital etc. This is the most ambitious research programme ever and will strengthen the EU's science and technology capacity and, indeed, leadership in a number of areas.

I particularly welcome the significant budget that has been allocated to agriculture and food production. Producing sufficient sustainable and sufficiently healthy food for all, now and in the future, in Europe and globally, while facing extreme weather, resource scarcity, changing markets and demanding consumers will require innovation and technological development. Horizon Europe will ensure that our future food production will be more sustainable and competitive, protecting the environment and catering to various needs.

Also I welcome the strong support being given to climate action and also research into cancer. This is a fantastic result for this Parliament. I look forward to voting for it tomorrow and seeing Europe further driving leadership in this area border-wide.

Patrizia Toia (S&D). – Signor Presidente, onorevoli colleghi, l'accordo su Orizzonte Europa è certamente una buona notizia per i cittadini europei. Noi avremo in futuro un programma della ricerca più ricco, più efficace e più semplice, speriamo, e più trasparente. Sicuramente più attento alle ricadute economiche e sociali, come è stato sottolineato, e attento all'innovazione, e penso che per l'apertura su questo capitolo dell'innovazione bisogna dare sicuramente un merito al Commissario Moedas. Un ringraziamento anche ai colleghi Nica ed Ehler e alla collega Cabezón, relatrice ombra, per il loro impegno.

Quello sulla ricerca io penso sia uno dei programmi di maggior successo dell'attività dell'Unione europea e in nessun altro campo come questo si può dire che l'unione fa la forza, ci dà la capacità di affrontare tematiche assai complesse che ogni singolo paese non potrebbe nemmeno affrontare. Allora, sono soddisfatta, personalmente, del sostegno dato nel nuovo programma alle piccole e medie imprese, parte essenziale dell'economia europea e di quella italiana. E lo strumento per le PMI è bene che sia contenuto in Orizzonte Europa anche per il futuro, perché ha dato buoni risultati.

Una sola parola ancora sulle priorità richiamate: quelle della salute, elemento essenziale per la vita dei cittadini, e quelle del clima. Oggi abbiamo ascoltato Greta e penso che il modo migliore per garantire il futuro ai giovani sia proprio quello di impegnare risorse il più possibile sostanziose per affrontare il cambiamento climatico e le nuove sfide che questo ci pone.

Zdzisław Krasnodębski (ECR). – Panie Przewodniczący! Gratuluję sprawozdawcy osiągnięcia porozumienia w sprawie programu Horyzont. Tym bardziej jest to godne gratulacji, że stanowiska Parlamentu i Rady były tak odległe początkowo. Nie ukrywam jednak, że tekst Parlamentu podobał mi się o wiele bardziej. Sprawozdawca, pan poseł Nica, całkowicie zasadnie podkreślał znaczenie likwidacji luki badawczo-innowacyjnej w Europie. I odnoszę wrażenie, że zaproponowane działania wideningowe, poszerzenia form współpracy oraz w ramach pakietu Advancing Europe nie są wystarczające. Mam obawy, że w rzeczywistości nie będzie się to bezpośrednio przekładało na udział w projektach współpracy, misjach i partnerstwie ze względu na brak pomostu pomiędzy wideningiem a działaniami horyzontalnymi. Dlatego konieczne jest myślenie przyszłościowe. Chodzi o plan wychodzenia krajów z tego pakietu wideningowego. Otóż takim rozwiązaniem byłoby wpisanie procentowego celu politycznego do budżetu programów Horyzont Europa przeznaczonych dla tych krajów, które biorą w tym programie rozszerzającym udział. Tak jest to by w przypadku MŚP w wielu programach. Rozwiązanie to gwarantowałoby, że w procesie implementacji programu Komisja Europejska musiałaby uruchomić mechanizmy prowadzące do realizacji tego celu.

Dario Tamburrano (EFDD). – Signor Presidente, onorevoli colleghi, voglio ringraziare i colleghi per i risultati raggiunti. Siamo abbastanza soddisfatti per il 35 % delle attività dedicate al clima, l'attenzione alle PMI, ai patrimoni culturali, alle priorità sociali e umane.

Ma oggi, al termine della legislatura vorrei lanciare un appello, lasciare una riflessione politica di pochi secondi. La civiltà umana è sempre stata intersecata con l'innovazione tecnologica, a partire dalle prime frecce, dall'aratro, l'uomo ha usato la tecnica per migliorare le proprie condizioni di vita. Eppure, d'altro canto, l'innovazione non ha sempre portato solo miglioramenti.

I Sumeri scoprirono che il loro meraviglioso sistema irriguo aumentava la salinità dei terreni, rendendoli meno fertili. La rivoluzione industriale, con il carbone, fu portatrice di grande sviluppo, ma rese le città insalubri. E ancora la mobilità di massa, quando un semplice calcolo di geometria poteva prevedere la congestione delle città.

Oggi il progresso è trainato dall'innovazione digitale, rendendo reale quella che pochi anni fa era solo fantascienza. Ma anche qui si intravedono già importanti effetti collaterali. Gli algoritmi che nelle transazioni ad alta frequenza impattano sui mercati, il controllo pervasivo della vita e delle emozioni degli individui, come già avviene in Cina.

E quel che sarà possibile, nel bene e nel male, con la robotica e l'intelligenza artificiale, finanche forse con la manifestazione della singolarità. Allora, prevenire è meglio che curare, perché poi fare retromarcia diventa più difficile. Lo dimostra la minaccia nucleare, il cambiamento climatico.

Abbiamo bisogno di maggiore saggezza nei ricercatori, tra i portatori di interessi, ognuno al proprio livello, affinché l'uomo, la sua dignità, la salute psicologica e fisica di esso, la stabilità degli ecosistemi siano sempre al centro di ogni futura scelta tecnologica, industriale e legislativa.

La scienza va implementata, è importante sempre *cum grano salis*. Non dimentichiamo mai ciò di cui la natura ci ha dotato, un'intelligenza naturale in un corpo analogico. Operiamo per il nostro futuro per una *mens sana in corpore sano*. La vita stessa, in un pianeta sicuro.

Barbara Kudrycka (PPE). – Panie Przewodniczący! W dzisiejszych trudnych czasach to właśnie nauka musi mieć silny głos. Musi budować mosty wbrew podziałom, stanąć po stronie solidarnej, spójnej i mądrej Europy. Europy, która swoją siłę buduje na wiedzy, nie na stereotypach i populizmie. Wierzę, że „Horyzont Europa” daje nam taką siłę.

W dotychczasowych unijnych programach naukowych pęknięcie na mapie Europy było bardzo głębokie. Tak zwane stare kraje członkowskie uzyskiwały 90 % budżetu, nowa unijna „trzynastka” mniej niż 5 %. „Horyzont Europa” stwarza historyczną szansę, by tę przepaść zmniejszyć.

Nie, nie musimy być skazani na Europę wielu innowacyjnych prędkości. W nowym programie potrajamy budżet na upowszechnianie doskonałości naukowej w krajach i regionach, w których tej doskonałości brakuje. Tworzymy nowe instrumenty, które pozwolą wspierać najzdolniejszych naukowców bez względu na kraj pochodzenia. Oferujemy sprawiedliwsze wynagrodzenia, ale przede wszystkim dajemy polityczny sygnał, że europejska nauka jest silna tylko wtedy, gdy cała Europa działa razem. To wielki krok.

Gdy uczestniczyliśmy w 7. programie ramowym, postulat otwierania się na talenty z Europy Środkowej i Wschodniej był nowy, niezrozumiały. Przy pracach nad „Horyzontem 2020” wypracowano wprawdzie ideę upowszechniania doskonałości, jednak z budżetem poniżej 1 % nie udało się wiele osiągnąć. Dopiero „Horyzont Europa” daje realne szanse, by najlepsi uczeni z Europy Środkowej i Wschodniej nie musieli wyjeżdżać ze swoich krajów. Mamy wreszcie narzędzia, które mogą powstrzymać ten drenaż.

Dziękuję za to panu komisarzowi i sprawozdawcom obu projektów oraz prezydencji rumuńskiej. Ale nic nie dzieje się samo. Zwracam się do polityków i przedstawicieli nowej unijnej „trzynastki”: nie czekajcie z reformami, modernizujcie uniwersytety, wykorzystajcie te dwa lata, by dobrze przygotować się do konkurowania o granty europejskie w nowej perspektywie, nie pozwólcie, by Europa wam uciekła! Jesteście w niej potrzebni!

Angelika Niebler (PPE). – Herr Präsident, verehrte Kolleginnen und Kollegen, Herr Kommissar, verehrter Herr Ratsvertreter! Der Schlüssel für eine erfolgreiche Zukunft sind Investitionen in Forschung und Innovationen. Ich möchte als erstes herzlich danke schön sagen: Es war wirklich eine Mammutaufgabe, eine großartige Leistung von unseren Berichterstattern, allen voran Ihnen, lieber Herr Nica und Herr Ehler, mit allen Kollegen Schattenberichterstattern. Herr Moedas, Herr Ratsvertreter, es ist großartig, dass in der Kürze der Zeit wirklich 120 Milliarden hier auf den Weg gebracht werden sollen, um in Forschung und Innovationen zu investieren.

Zu Recht hat Herr Moedas das bahnbrechende Foto eines schwarzen Lochs angesprochen. Ich war am Sonntag auf der weltgrößten Baumaschinenmesse bei mir in München und habe dort erlebt, was allein im Bereich Baumaschinen an Forschung und Innovation möglich ist, um umweltschonend, klimaschonend zu arbeiten, zu produzieren – innovative, smarte Lösungen. Es war beeindruckend. Deshalb ist es richtig, dass wir mit diesem Programm unsere industrielle Basis in Europa stärken, dass wir unsere Wissenschaftler stärken, und dass wir auch an die Menschen in unserem Lande denken und auch mal die großen Volkskrankheiten, nämlich Alzheimer und Krebs, angehen.

Also ich bin wirklich glücklich – großartige Leistung! Wenn wir morgen mit großer Mehrheit hoffentlich geschlossen hier dieses Programm verabschieden, dann haben wir das richtige Signal auch für die nächsten Jahre in Europa ausgesendet: Investitionen in Forschung, Innovationen, in unsere exzellenten Köpfe, die wir in allen Mitgliedstaaten – ich betone: in allen – haben. Genau das ist der richtige Weg. Ein Dankeschön an alle, die sich so engagiert haben für dieses Programm!

Francesc Gambús (PPE). – Señor presidente, señor comisario, esta es mi última intervención en el Pleno como diputado, y agradezco poderlo hacer en relación con la aprobación del nuevo programa Horizonte Europa, porque sintetiza una idea de Europa y de su futuro que ha regido mi actuación en este mandato.

El nuevo Horizonte define tres grandes prioridades clave para garantizar mejor futuro a las próximas generaciones: lucha contra el cambio climático, economía digital y salud.

Hoy escuchábamos precisamente las palabras emocionadas de Greta Thunberg en la reunión de la Comisión ENVI, y lo hemos repetido en este hemisiciclo muchas veces: actuar contra el cambio climático es urgente y necesario, no es una opción. Debemos seguir liderando esta lucha desde la Unión, pasando de palabras a hechos. *From word to action.* Y, en este sentido, desde aquí hemos planteado que el 35 % de los fondos del programa sean destinados a actividades relacionadas con la lucha contra el cambio climático, yendo incluso más allá del planteamiento inicial de la Comisión.

En segundo lugar, economía digital, para que la Unión siga siendo un polo de atracción de ciencia y conocimiento a nivel mundial. Por ello, Horizonte será el mayor programa a nivel mundial dedicado a la investigación y el desarrollo. Para garantizar nuestra independencia, ni podemos ni queremos quedar detrás o en manos de otras potencias como los gigantes asiáticos o los Estados Unidos.

Finalmente, la salud. Necesitamos más investigación en salud, y dedicaremos una parte importante de los fondos a la lucha contra el cáncer —también el cáncer infantil—, pero sin dejar atrás la investigación en enfermedades raras y de salud mental, que afectan a miles y millones de europeos.

Muito obrigado, Comissário, pelo trabalho destes cinco anos.

Peter Liese (PPE). – Herr Präsident, liebe Kolleginnen und Kollegen! Ich möchte nur zwei Punkte nochmal kurz hervorheben: Viel ist über Klimaschutz gesprochen worden, das kann ich alles unterstreichen. Aber wir gehen ja in diesem Programm sehr gezielt auch in das Thema CO₂-freie Industrieproduktion. Ich finde es wichtig. Wenn wir über Klimaschutz reden, müssen wir über Europa reden. Aber wir müssen auch darüber reden, wie wir Vorbild für die Welt sein können. Chinesen und Inder werden uns nicht folgen, wenn wir zwar keine Emissionen mehr haben, aber auch keine Industrieproduktion mehr. Deswegen arbeite ich mit Christian Ehler und anderen schon seit einiger Zeit daran, wie wir zum Beispiel in Europa das erste CO₂-freie Stahlwerk bauen können. Und dieses Programm hilft auch dabei ganz konkret.

Der zweite Punkt ist das Thema Krebs – ein sehr persönliches Thema für jeden von uns, auch für Manfred Weber, unseren Spitzenkandidaten, der in Helsinki bei seiner Nominierung davon gesprochen hat, dass sein Bruder an Krebs gestorben ist. Manfred, Christian Ehler und ich haben uns schon lange über die Frage unterhalten, wie wir anderen Familien dieses Schicksal ersparen können. Da tun wir ganz konkrete Schritte, indem wir eine *mission* zum Thema Krebs nach vorne stellen und indem wir auch in diesem Programm das Thema Krebs bei Kindern noch deutlicher adressieren. Denn Kinder erkranken Gott sei Dank seltener an Krebs, aber wenn es dann passiert, ist es besonders schlimm. Und nur europäische Zusammenarbeit kann helfen, dass wir dieses Problem angehen. Deswegen: Vielen Dank an alle, die geholfen haben, vor allen Dingen an unseren Berichtersteller von der EVP, Christian Ehler.

Michał Boni (PPE). – Panie Przewodniczący! Panie Komisarzu! Państwo Sprawozdawcy! Serdeczne gratulacje za ten program. Dzięki skali „Horyzontu Europa” nauka po raz pierwszy może odegrać rolę czynnika realnie sprawczego w budowie europejskich przewag konkurencyjnych. Działania programu trzeba wykorzystać do wzmocnienia unijnej bazy naukowej i technologicznej, sprostania globalnym wyzwaniom, zwiększenia nowoczesnej siły przemysłu europejskiego, gwarantując kombinację unijnych nakładów ze środkami prywatnego biznesu.

Priorytetem powinno być włączanie w program państw członkowskich osiągających słabsze wyniki. Nie tylko polityka spójności decyduje o unikaniu podziału na Europę dwóch prędkości. Konwergencja wiedzy jest fundamentalna dla równomiernego rozwoju. Kluczem jest większa otwartość. Niezbędne jest zwiększenie międzysektorowej, interdyscyplinarnej, transgranicznej współpracy i tworzenie nowych sieci badań i innowacji. Takie warunki mogą sześciokrotnie zwiększyć nakłady na potencjał naukowy państw, które dziś dzieli dystans od innowacyjnych liderów Europy.

Nie będzie innowacyjnej Europy bez impetu w badaniach nad zdrowiem, ochroną środowiska, bezpieczeństwem, jakością żywności, efektywnością energetyczną, wsparciem rozwoju sztucznej inteligencji służącej człowiekowi. Wszystkie działania „Horyzontu Europa” powinny być w synergii z innymi funduszami – Europejskim Funduszem Rozwoju Regionalnego, polityką spójności, Europejskim Funduszem Społecznym Plus – zgodne z regionalnymi strategiami inteligentnej specjalizacji badań.

Polska chce tak działać. To zwielokrotni efekt i wówczas „Horyzont Europa” stanie się dla wszystkich dźwignią rozwoju na niebywałą skalę.

Željana Zovko (PPE). – Mr President, as the shadow rapporteur for the Committee on Development for the opinion on Horizon Europe, I already emphasised the importance of Horizon Europe for the developing countries. The same goes for European citizens.

The Horizon Europe programme must create opportunities to finance, establish and maintain local, inclusive societies. We can boost local inventors and entrepreneurs and help them to realise their dreams. We must encourage them to stay and develop these inventions close to their proximity in order for the local society to benefit from their achievement.

The perfect illustration for this is the success story of Croatian entrepreneur Mate Rimac. Thanks to recent European financial support, this amazing, successful young businessman managed to create electronic hybrid cars that not only gained world fame for its astonishing products but also boosted the Croatian economy by the creation of hundreds of jobs. Let this ‘Rimac effect’ be an inspiration for the future of Horizon Europe to foster EU competitiveness by focusing on increased deployment of research, development and innovation.

Procedura «catch-the-eye»

José Inácio Faria (PPE). – Senhor Presidente, Senhor Comissário Carlos Moedas, por muito que fosse desejável, temos visto que a inovação nem sempre se traduz em benefícios proporcionais. Apesar dos saltos tecnológicos serem baseados na inovação, ainda demora até que estejam aperfeiçoados e sejam avaliados e mitigados todos os seus potenciais riscos.

Não podemos, por isso, aceitar que nas áreas de financiamento através do Horizonte Europa o princípio da inovação se sobreponha ao princípio da precaução, até porque entendo que não vale tudo no campo da inovação, sobretudo, Sr. Comissário, em áreas onde precisamos de uma mudança de paradigma, como é o caso do tabagismo, da utilização de combustíveis fósseis e de certos produtos químicos nas áreas industriais e agrícolas.

Não podemos proteger com o princípio da inovação o que já não é politicamente defensável. Mas não se pense que esta cautela vai atrasar a inovação porque sempre que se trate de privilegiar o interesse público, como é no caso da saúde, já existem mecanismos que permitem a aceleração do acesso ao mercado destes produtos inovadores.

O princípio da precaução é para manter, primeiro porque ele é fundado em reservas científicas e numa séria avaliação dos rácios de benefício/risco e de custo/benefício, segundo, porque é também uma fonte impulso para a investigação e desenvolvimento para encontrar soluções que sejam comprovadamente seguras e não sejam prejudiciais à saúde nem ao ambiente.

Νότης Μαρτιάς (ECR). – Κύριε Πρόεδρε, «κάλλιο αργά παρά ποτέ», λέει μια παροιμία. Άργησε η Ευρωπαϊκή Ένωση να καταλάβει ότι η ανταγωνιστικότητα στην ευρωπαϊκή οικονομία πρέπει να στηριχθεί στην καινοτομία και στις νέες τεχνολογίες και όχι βέβαια στη μείωση των μισθών, σε μια συνταγή που επέβαλε στην Ελλάδα και σε πολλές χώρες του ευρωπαϊκού Νότου.

Τώρα, λοιπόν, πρέπει να προχωρήσουμε σε επενδύσεις, γιατί μόνο με επενδύσεις στην τεχνολογία μπορεί να αντιμετωπιστεί ο διεθνής ανταγωνισμός. Ταυτόχρονα, η τεχνολογία πρέπει να μπει στην υπηρεσία του ανθρώπου: να έχουμε παρεμβάσεις στα θέματα της υγείας και να έχουμε —φυσικά— αναδιάρταξη και της ίδιας της χαλυβουργίας, για να μπορέσουμε να βλέπουμε μπροστά. Όμως, η τεχνολογία δεν μπορεί να είναι άλλοθι για να γίνονται μαζικές απολύσεις. Ετοιμάζει 7.000 απολύσεις στην Ελλάδα η περιφημη Deutsche Telekom· η θυγατρική της, δηλαδή ο ελληνικός ΟΤΕ —εν προκειμένω, ο γερμανικός ΟΤΕ.

Δεν μπορεί να ισχύσει αυτό, κύριε Επίτροπε, στο όνομα της δήθεν ανάπτυξης της τεχνολογίας να γίνονται μαζικές απολύσεις, τις οποίες καταγγέλλουν και οι ίδιοι οι εργαζόμενοι στην Ελλάδα. Παρακολουθείστε το θέμα αυτό.

Carlos Zorrinho (S&D). – Senhor Presidente, faz bem este Parlamento em aprovar os programas que estabelecem e implementam o Horizonte Europa em articulação com o Europa Digital que também será votado nesta sessão. E muita coisa ficará adquirida.

Em primeiro lugar, a convergência que conjuga competitividade e coesão e define que o progresso de cada país ou território beneficia a União Europeia como um todo.

Em segundo lugar, a inclusão e a redução de assimetrias, que fortalece a nossa capacidade interna e projeta a nossa voz no plano externo.

Em terceiro lugar, a autonomia estratégica em rede que permite que o potencial de afirmação global da União resulte de múltiplas capacidades e competências desenvolvidas de forma descentralizada.

Em quarto lugar, o compromisso de todos os projetos com o código ético de proteção de valores e dos direitos partilhados na União Europeia.

Em quinto lugar, o contributo dos projetos para o combate às alterações climáticas. E finalmente, talvez o mais importante, a colocação das pessoas no centro de todas as estratégias de investigação e inovação.

Por tudo isto, parabéns, Senhor Comissário, parabéns aos relatores. É muito importante votar os programas em análise.

Miriam Dalli (S&D). – Mr President, allow me straight away to say congratulations to both the rapporteurs and the Commissioner for adopting the new framework programme before the European elections, because this can now allow for the smooth implementation of the many funding instruments, processes and programmes involved. I am glad that this Parliament took the issue of the research and innovation divide in Europe seriously because for far too long we had closed clubs, and it's high time that these closed networks opened up to the lower-performing Member States. I believe that this is the way forward if we honestly want to have a European Union that develops a modern, competitive, innovative and truly sustainable economy.

Specific initiatives need to be established so that we retain existing research talent and attract young promising talent. Helping out the lower-performing Member States when it comes to research and innovation is a matter of shared responsibility and ownership, and it is imperative that the EU take substantive action.

John Howarth (S&D). – Mr President, the ‘elephant in the room’ during many of the discussions on this Horizon programme has been, of course, the position of many UK institutions that contribute in such a major way to the predecessor programmes. It’s not the fault of the rapporteurs or the negotiators that the situation over Brexit is yet to be resolved, but it is at last now clear that even this UK Government will seek closely to associate whatever the outcome of Brexit with this programme. The only remaining threat is the extreme Brexit sought by climate change deniers and anti-science populists.

I’m glad to see, however, scientific excellence maintained as a key criteria for Horizon Europe funding. Excellence is not enhanced by throwing money around, it is enhanced by collaboration with excellence. The contribution of the UK’s world-class research community makes Horizon Europe a bigger, better and more successful programme.

Ruža Tomašić (ECR). – Poštovani predsjedavajući, uspostavu Obzora Europa i dodatna ulaganja u znanost i istraživanje mogu samo pozdraviti. Europa mora više ulagati u znanstvenu izvrsnost i inovacije da bi ostala globalno konkurentna i Unija u ovom području doista može ponuditi dodatnu vrijednost.

No dodatna sredstva neće dati željeni učinak ako se znanstvena postignuća u cijeloj Uniji ne budu jednako vrednovala. Poznato je da velika većina projekata financiranih preko Europskog istraživačkog vijeća odlazi u stare članice, dok nove i slabije razvijene dobivaju mrvice. To se mora promijeniti.

Također, znanstvenici unutar programa Obzor Europa trebaju imati jednaki tretman, neovisno o državi članici iz koje dolaze. Samo na taj način možemo privući mlade da se bave znanosti i inovacijama u cijeloj Europi te stvoriti pretpostavke da ostanu u svojoj domovini i tamo stvaraju prosperitet koji će onda doprinosti rastu cijele Unije.

Alojz Peterle (PPE). – Gospod predsedujoči, gospod komisar, spoštovani kolegi. V dokumentu imamo naslov poglavja Potrebujemo več energije. Jaz bi si želel naslov poglavja Potrebujemo več zdravja! Zdravstveni trendi so v Evropi zaskrbljujoči: eden od treh državljanov lahko računa na raka. In mi ne moremo narediti več Evrope z manj zdravja in z več raka. Zdravje ni sektor ali vidik, ampak je dimenzija naše prihodnosti, in zdravje me zanima veliko bolj kot brexit, ki se bo nekako uredil.

Raziskave kažejo, da si 70 % Evropejcev želi, da bi Evropska zveza naredila več na področju zdravja in preventive. In ljudje imajo prav. In že sedaj vemo dovolj, da bi lahko storili več.

Kot nekdanji bolnik in kot predsednik skupine evropskih poslancev za boj proti raku z velikim veseljem pozdravljam ambicijo za vključitev boja proti raku med pet strateških prednostnih nalog, ki se bodo financirale iz programa Obzorje Evropa.

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

Carlos Moedas, Member of the Commission. – Mr President, I think that tomorrow after the vote we can start preparing, we can start working on the strategic planning on setting up the mission boards and the partnership initiatives to guarantee that in January 2021 the new Horizon Europe programme will be fully operational. That’s what we are doing today.

And let me tell you that I’m very proud to see – and this is the last part-session of this eighth legislature – that tonight, I will keep very fond memories, because from the left to the right to the middle, every one of you, with different ideas, every one of you converged, converged to this agreement, converged to the fact that we can really do something, that we can really change the lives of scientists, of researchers and the lives for the future of our children, so I will keep this amazing memory of tonight.

Thank you to all of you, thank you to the ones behind the scenes that have worked so hard for this to happen. Thank you very much from the bottom of my heart.

Dan Nica, Raportor. – Domnule președinte, aș vrea încă o dată să le mulțumesc tuturor colegilor care astăzi au luat cuvântul și au remarcat faptul că am reușit să luăm toate propunerile care au venit din partea tuturor comisiilor permanente și acest lucru a arătat că la nivelul Parlamentului a existat o unanimitate absolut remarcabilă. Aș vrea să îi mulțumesc colegului Christian Ehler pentru modul remarcabil, impecabil în care am colaborat și am lucrat împreună și pentru deschiderea de care a dat dovadă și îi mulțumesc ambasadorului Boiangiu, pentru că ne-a scos dintr-un impas și am reușit să avem acest proiect.

Domnule comisar Moedas, ultimele cuvinte sunt pentru dumneavoastră. Știu că actuala Comisie va rămâne *in office* - ca să spun așa – până în aprilie anul viitor. Deci vestea bună este că mai aveți un an. Și, în acest an, vreau să vă cer câteva lucruri. Să începeți să vă asigurați că acest program *Horizon Europe* nu va fi afectat de birocrație – deci reduceți povara administrativă și birocratică, pentru ca cercetătorii să se ocupe de cercetare și cât mai puțin de hârtii -, să reduceți perioada în care un cercetător poate să acceseze și să puneteți deja în practică mecanismele de *bottom up*, care au fost introduse în acest program *Horizon Europe* și care vor fi extrem de apreciate, să începeți campania de informare din fondurile de asistență tehnică – țări cum este România și mulți alții au nevoie de această campanie de informare. Toți trebuie să știe cum anume se aplică programul *Horizon Europe*, care sunt procedurile și cine ce trebuie să facă, iar beneficiile vor fi ale noastre, ale tuturor.

Și vă mărturisesc că eu voi fi în viitorul Parlament European și vom avea ocazia ca împreună, începând din toamnă, să ne ocupăm cu mare grijă ca toate aceste lucruri să se întâmple în realitate, pentru că munca dumneavoastră, munca mea și a colegilor mei trebuie să aibă o reflectare în practică imediat, așa cum ați spus, după votul de mâine. Vă mulțumesc pentru tot sprijinul pe mi l-ați dat.

Christian Ehler, Berichterstatter. – Herr Präsident! Ich möchte anlässlich der heutigen Diskussion und der morgigen Verabschiedung des Forschungsprogramms nochmal daran erinnern, dass traurigerweise Europa im Grunde genommen diejenige Insel ist, wahrscheinlich der einzige Ort ist, wo wir hinsichtlich der Vorstellung der europäischen Aufklärung, nämlich der Freiheit der Wissenschaften, noch sichergehen können.

Wenn Sie sehen, dass in den Vereinigten Staaten von der Regierung dekretiert wird, den Klimawandel nicht zu erforschen, wenn Sie sehen, dass in China und in anderen Teilen der Welt die Freiheit der Forschung nicht in diesem Maße gegeben ist, dann sollten wir uns mit dem Programm – auch als Aufgabe für die Zukunft – in Erinnerung rufen, dass der Kampf um die Freiheit der Wissenschaften eine der wichtigsten Aufgaben für die Europäische Union ist. Und wir sollten es auch im globalen Kontext sehen, dass dieses europäische Vorbild ganz wichtig ist für viele Forscher in der Welt.

Ich glaube, es ist wichtig, nochmal zu betonen – auch in Tagen des Brexit –, dass, wie immer die Entscheidung in Großbritannien ausfallen wird – und wir sehen mit großer Sorge auf die Entscheidung in Großbritannien –, Großbritannien selbstverständlich zur europäischen Forschungsgemeinschaft gehört. Mögen wir sozusagen ein Großbritannien des 19. Jahrhunderts porträtieren, mögen politische Entscheidung gefallen sein, aber die Solidarität mit den englischen Forschern, mit Oxford, mit Cambridge ist da, und wir sollten alles tun, das Vereinigte Königreich so nah wie möglich an Europa zu halten.

Anlässlich einer Aussprache im Parlament neigen das Parlament und auch die Berichterstatter und auch dieser Berichterstatter natürlich dazu, tendenziell die eigenen Erfolge und Anstrengungen in den Vordergrund zu stellen. Aber in den Tagen, an denen oft über die Kommission als abstrakte Institution, als Bürokratie gesprochen wird, möchte ich noch einmal hervorheben: Carlos Moedas als Forschungskommissar hat Ehre für die Kommission und für Europa eingelegt. Er hat ein ambitioniertes Programm vorgelegt. Er war manchmal ambitionierter als die eigentlichen *stakeholders*, und insofern war es für uns eine Freude – wenn auch sicherlich eine notwendige Aufgabe –, dieses ambitionierte Programm zu ergänzen. Aber grundsätzlich ist es eine gemeinschaftliche Leistung, dass Europa schnell gehandelt hat und entschieden und mutig in die Zukunft blickt.

ΠΡΟΕΔΡΙΑ: ΔΗΜΗΤΡΙΟΣ ΠΑΠΑΔΗΜΟΥΛΗΣ

Αντιπρόεδρος

Πρόεδρος. – Η συζήτηση έληξε.

Η ψηφοφορία θα διεξαχθεί την Τετάρτη 17 Απριλίου 2019.

Γραπτές δηλώσεις (άρθρο 162 του Κανονισμού)

Karol Karski (ECR), na piśmie. – Gratulując sprawozdawcom osiągnięcia porozumienia w sprawie programu ramowego „Horyzont Europa”, chciałbym zaznaczyć, że dla mnie, jako reprezentanta Europy Środkowo-Wschodniej oraz jako przedstawiciela środowiska akademickiego, tekst Parlamentu zawierał lepsze rozwiązania, jeżeli chodzi o problem likwidacji luki badawczo-innowacyjnej w Europie. Mamy działania wideningowe oraz działania w ramach pakietu *Advancing Europe*. Ale potrzebujemy rozwiązań powodujących wychodzenie państw z tego pakietu wideningowego. Potrzebujemy mostu kierującego ich w stronę większego udziału w projektach współpracy, misjach i partnerstwach. Inaczej za 20 lat znów będziemy tu debatować o środkach na ten sam dział *widening* dla tych samych państw!

W wyniku negocjacji do programu udało się wprowadzić zapis odnoszący się do kryterium „różnorodności geograficznej” jako szczegółowego kryterium ewaluacji. Jednak o wiele bardziej skuteczny byłby bezpośredni zapis dotyczący „widening countries”, a nie ogólnej różnorodności geograficznej. Zapewniłoby to realne włączenie jednostek z tzw. unijnej trzynastki do zamkniętych klubów współpracy, które widzimy przez lata.

21. Nadzór rynku i zgodność z prawodawstwem dotyczącym produktów (debata)

Πρόεδρος. – Το επόμενο σημείο στην ημερήσια διάταξη είναι η συζήτηση επί της εκθέσεως του κ. Nicola Danti, εξ ονόματος της Επιτροπής Εσωτερικής Αγοράς και Προστασίας των Καταναλωτών, επί της προτάσεως κανονισμού του Ευρωπαϊκού Κοινοβουλίου και του Συμβουλίου για τη θέσπιση κανόνων και διαδικασιών σχετικά με τη συμμόρφωση με την ενωσιακή νομοθεσία εναρμόνισης για τα προϊόντα και την επιβολή της, καθώς και για την τροποποίηση των κανονισμών (ΕΕ) αριθ. 305/2011, (ΕΕ) αριθ. 528/2012, (ΕΕ) 2016/424, (ΕΕ) 2016/425, (ΕΕ) 2016/426 και (ΕΕ) 2017/1369 του Ευρωπαϊκού Κοινοβουλίου και του Συμβουλίου, καθώς και των οδηγιών 2004/42/ΕΚ, 2009/48/ΕΚ, 2010/35/ΕΕ, 2013/29/ΕΕ, 2013/53/ΕΕ, 2014/28/ΕΕ, 2014/29/ΕΕ, 2014/30/ΕΕ, 2014/31/ΕΕ, 2014/32/ΕΕ, 2014/33/ΕΕ, 2014/34/ΕΕ, 2014/35/ΕΕ, 2014/53/ΕΕ, 2014/68/ΕΕ και 2014/90/ΕΕ του Ευρωπαϊκού Κοινοβουλίου και του Συμβουλίου (COM(2017)0795 - C8-0004/2018 - 2017/0353(COD)) (A8-0277/2018).

Nicola Danti, Relatore. – Signor Presidente, onorevoli colleghi, Commissario Bienkowska, dopo molti anni, e a seguito dell'ingiustificabile stallo del pacchetto legislativo sulla sicurezza dei prodotti del 2013, ci apprestiamo ad approvare nuove regole per un sistema di controlli più efficaci nell'Unione.

Grazie all'accordo raggiunto, renderemo il sistema europeo più moderno, più efficace e più coordinato per garantire che ai consumatori finali giungano esclusivamente prodotti sicuri e conformi e una concorrenza leale nel mercato unico.

Quotidianamente ci imbattiamo in prodotti pericolosi, illegali, contraffatti, numeri in crescita e che colpiscono soprattutto settori a forte impatto sulla vita quotidiana. Il 32 % dei giocattoli, il 58 % dei dispositivi elettronici, il 47 % dei prodotti da costruzione non soddisfano i requisiti in tema di sicurezza o di informazione ai consumatori previsti dalla legislazione. A questi dati va aggiunta la crescente quota di prodotti contraffatti che colpiscono i paesi più manifatturieri e che rappresentano una delle principali forme di concorrenza sleale nei confronti delle tante imprese europee.

Dietro questi numeri e queste considerazioni iniziali c'è un sistema di vigilanza del mercato ancora troppo inefficiente, senza risorse adeguate, privo di sufficiente coordinamento a livello europeo e poco reattivo ai mutamenti dell'economia globale. Un sistema dove operano 500 autorità nazionali e dove non esiste nemmeno una loro mappatura completa, dove manca un'efficiente comunicazione.

Nel recepire la proposta della Commissione, come Parlamento abbiamo lavorato intensamente su molti fronti. Qui mi limito a citare solo alcune delle nostre priorità. Uno dei principali valori aggiunti del regolamento è rappresentato dalle disposizioni sul cosiddetto operatore di riferimento. Per la maggior parte dei prodotti in circolazione del mercato europeo, tra cui quelli più pericolosi, vi sarà l'obbligo di avere un operatore economico che sia in grado di rispondere in caso di non conformità o di vizi del prodotto stesso.

Non è più pensabile che, dietro un prodotto pericoloso, contraffatto o non conforme alla legge, non vi sia un responsabile. Abbiamo inoltre introdotto disposizioni più specifiche per tutelare i consumatori che acquistano sul web, che devono essere garantiti con lo stesso livello di sicurezza dei prodotti rispetto a quelli venduti nei canali tradizionali.

Crediamo, inoltre, che vi debba essere maggiore cooperazione a livello politico ed operativo tra le autorità degli Stati membri, per costruire strategie comuni e garantire un sistema di controlli uniforme e coerente. In particolare, vogliamo eliminare il cosiddetto «port shopping», ovvero l'esistenza di punti di entrata privilegiati dagli operatori disonesti a causa della minore rigidità o talvolta assenza totale dei controlli alle dogane.

Per questo abbiamo previsto obiettivi e standard armonizzati per i controlli alle frontiere, metodologie comuni del rischio, un maggiore coordinamento e assistenza reciproca tra le autorità nazionali a livello del network europeo. Abbiamo inoltre preteso un sistema di vigilanza, dove non vi sia più spazio né per i conflitti di interesse tra controllore e controllato né trattamenti privilegiati per gli operatori scorretti. Per questo abbiamo sostenuto la proposta della Commissione europea di creare una rete di laboratori pubblici nell'Unione europea, che possano accrescere la capacità di controllo dei singoli Stati membri, sulla base di competenze specifiche e di priorità condivise.

Abbiamo infine incrementato i poteri a disposizione delle autorità nazionali, per esercitare indagini e controlli efficaci anche nel mondo del web, con riferimento ai prodotti più tecnologicamente sofisticati. Questi sono i principali risultati raggiunti. Mi auguro che vi sia un ampio consenso su questa proposta.

Elżbieta Bieńkowska, *Member of the Commission*. – Mr President, I am really happy to see the successful outcome of the negotiations on the regulation on market surveillance and compliance. I would like to thank all of you, the Parliament, for the support for this initiative. It is an important delivery for the single market strategy.

The regulation addresses a very important problem in the single market, which is that there are too many unsafe and non-compliant products on our EU market. It is also a major step forward. It will ensure better protection of consumers and lead to a fairer single market for products in the EU.

Let me thank wholeheartedly the rapporteur, Mr Nicola Danti, and shadow rapporteurs Mr Karas, Mr Selimovic and Mr Dalton. I know that it was a huge effort and I know it has not been easy to finish this file ahead of the elections. As all of us know, there are things that we would have liked to see differently so, on the first point, we will prepare a declaration on the legal basis of this regulation. On the second one, more positive, we will commit to working towards more uniformity of controls at the external borders as they are very important elements of this regulation. We will have the unique opportunity to stop unsafe and non-compliant products before they are put on our European markets. The regulation will improve sharing of intelligence between national inspectors and customs authorities as well.

On several points, the proposal, let me also underline this, was even improved. I am thinking here especially of the addition of peer reviews. This regulation will make as well a fundamental difference for national inspectors. First of all, it will give authorities better tools and powers to investigate products sold online. The regulation gives inspectors the power to deal directly with the new business actors in digital supply chains, such as fulfilment centres and online market places. Further, for many product categories, there will be a business representative in the EU. This will make it easier for authorities to obtain the information they need to verify compliance and to resolve non-compliance cases.

Secondly, the regulation will improve cooperation between authorities and businesses. Preventing non-compliance is even more important than policing the market – I think that we share this view – as some businesses act in good faith but they are ignorant about the rules. The regulation provides businesses with very clear channels for obtaining information on EU product rules.

Thirdly, and perhaps more importantly, it will improve cooperation between all authorities in the European Union. As you know, there are currently more than 500 market surveillance authorities across the EU so the products flow freely across our internal borders but, unfortunately, enforcement does not. The regulation requires Member States to help each other in cross-border cases. It also requires national inspectors to work closer with customs authorities. There will be EU-wide cooperation through the EU product compliance network.

Only one element is missing – the money – especially for cooperation through the abovementioned product compliance network. The money needs to come from the single market programme. I am very pleased that you have been actively engaged in securing this and I count on Parliament's further support in that respect.

To conclude, let me say that I believe that we have reached a very good compromise, a balanced compromise, reflecting the different views and different concerns of all parties. I hope you will also endorse it tomorrow.

Commission Statements

(in writing)

On the legal base:

The Commission takes note that the text agreed replaces the triple legal basis of the Commission proposal (Article 114 TFEU – internal market, Article 33 TFEU – customs cooperation, Article 207 – common commercial policy) by a double legal basis, through deletion of the common commercial policy legal basis. The Commission continues to consider that the triple legal basis is fully justified in relation to the provisions that regulate conditions for access to the EU market of products originating from third countries. Moreover, the common commercial policy legal basis is in line with the legal basis of Regulation (EC) 765/2008 of the European Parliament and of the Council of 9 July 2008 setting the requirements for accreditation and market surveillance relating to the marketing of products and repealing Regulation (EEC) No 339/93. The Commission regrets the deletion of Article 207 TFEU as legal basis of the Regulation.

On the implementing act to set uniform conditions for customs controls (Article 25(8)):

In order to strengthen controls on products at customs, the Regulation empowers the Commission to adopt implementing acts to determine benchmarks and techniques for checks on the basis of common risk analysis on the Union level. The Commission intends to make use of this empowerment.

Miroslav Mikolášik, *spravodajca výboru ENVI* – Vážený pán predsedajúci, bezpečnosť spotrebiteľov a ochrana životného prostredia sú základnými kameňmi vnútorného trhu s tovarom, ktorý je jedným z najväčších úspechov v Európskej únii.

Vítam návrh nariadenia, ktorého cieľom je posilniť dodržiavanie a presadzovanie harmonizačných právnych predpisov Únie o výrobkoch.

Týka sa totiž hračiek, kozmetických a čistiacich prostriedkov, strojových zariadení, batérií a akumulátorov, chemikálií, pneumatík, stavebných i biocídnych výrobkov, odpadu z elektrických zariadení, zdravotníckych pomôcok a iných.

Považujem za neprípustné, aby už dnes zosúladené pravidlá boli obchádzané, o čom svedčí fakt, že napríklad až 32 % hračiek, 58 % elektroniky a 47 % stavebných výrobkov, ktoré prešli kontrolami, nespĺňali požiadavky na bezpečnosť.

Podporujem preto zvýšenie počtu kontrol i zvýšené pokuty na odradenie nepoctivých výrobcov a distribútorov.

Novozriadené testovacie strediská EÚ musia zaručiť spoľahlivosť a konzistentnosť testovania a poskytovať expertízu na najvyššej možnej úrovni v zložitých oblastiach, ako napríklad v súvislosti so škodlivými chemikáliami, ktoré sa pri testovaní až príliš často objavujú v hračkách či v kozmetike.

Othmar Karas, im Namen der PPE-Fraktion. – Herr Präsident, Frau Kommissarin, Herr Berichterstatter Danti, meine Damen und Herren! Der erste Reformversuch, das Marktüberwachungssystem zu aktualisieren, ist 2013 gescheitert. Heute und jetzt nehmen wir einen neuen Startschuss für das neue Marktüberwachungssystem vor. Das war dringend notwendig, auch im Interesse der Verbraucherinnen und Verbraucher. Wir wissen, dass vor allem Spielzeug, Pyrotechnik oder Maschinen jene Produkte sind, bei denen wir die größten Probleme festgestellt haben. Wir sind der Auffassung, wer gefährliche Produkte auf den Binnenmarkt bringt, muss auch die Verantwortung dafür übernehmen. Und wir müssen daher überwachen, damit wir wissen, wer gefährliche Produkte auf den Markt bringt, und sagen können, wer die Verantwortung dafür übernimmt.

Wir wollen auch gleiche Spielregeln für alle. Alle außereuropäischen Unternehmen müssen die gleichen Spielregeln einhalten wie die heimischen Unternehmen, wenn sie auf unserem Markt tätig sein wollen. Wir hatten die Realität, dass Logistikanbieter, große Onlinehändler sich bisher aus der Affäre ziehen konnten. Damit ist jetzt Schluss! Wer es für gerechtfertigt hält, mit gefährlichen oder nicht konformen Produkten ein Geschäft zu machen, kann auch gerne die Rechnung für die Rückholaktionen solcher Produkte begleichen und muss die Verantwortung dafür übernehmen.

Ich bedanke mich beim Berichterstatter für eine großartige Zusammenarbeit und bitte um die breite Unterstützung am morgigen Tag, die wir auch zwischen den Schattenberichterstattern und dem Berichterstatter hatten.

Christel Schaldemose, for S&D-Gruppen. – Hr. formand! Det er en rigtig glædelig dag, men det er også på tide, vi får gjort noget ved at sikre langt bedre kontrol med de produkter, der kommer på EU's indre marked.

Jeg har været medlem af Europa-Parlamentet i 12 år og har i alle de 12 år arbejdet med produktsikkerhed. Det er derfor en stor dag. Det er langt om længe lykkedes os at få nye regler, som gør, at vi får kontrolleret vores produkter langt mere end hidtil. Det er nødvendigt. Noget af det gode nye, der er kommet med i dag, er, at det nu er muligt også at få kontrolleret varer, der kommer online udefra – fra uden for EU ind i EU, det er rigtig vigtigt. En ny undersøgelse i Danmark viser, at ud af 12 legetøjsprodukter, der var købt på en online platform uden for EU og bragt ind, overholdt ingen af produkterne reglerne. Her med håndhævelsesforordningen får myndighederne langt bedre mulighed for at stoppe disse produkter, tjekke dem og få sikret, at forbrugere ikke skal være bange for at købe produkter. Det er en stor dag, det er en vigtig dag, nu mangler vi bare pengene, og nu skal medlemslandene altså til at levere. Tak til os allesammen.

Ruža Tomašić, u ime kluba ECR. – Poštovani predsjedavajući, internet je promijenio način na koji funkcioniramo. Promjene ljudskog ponašanja vidljive su u svim sferama života pa tako, između ostaloga, danas drukčije obavljamo kupovinu u odnosu na vrijeme prije interneta.

Rastom udjela *online* trgovine broj prijevара se drastično povećao, a u novim je okolnostima učinkovita zaštita prava potrošača postala priličan izazov. Usklađivanje proizvoda na jedinstvenom tržištu smanjilo bi broj prijevара i vratilo povjerenje potrošača. Posebnu pozornost treba posvetiti proizvodima iz trećih zemalja koji su često neusklađeni sa zakonodavstvom Unije.

Pritom valja voditi računa o ravnoteži između zaštite interesa i prava potrošača s jedne strane i očuvanja prednosti poput brzine, manjih troškova i jednostavnosti elektronične trgovine s druge strane.

Jasenko Selimovic, *on behalf of the ALDE Group*. – Mr President, two months ago I bought a new iron, and at the first ironing it burnt my shirt. I have a colleague here who has kids, and she bought singing toys that were not able to stop singing: they started singing in the middle of the night, and in order to stop them they had to take all the batteries out and throw them away. And the third one here is a dangerous hairdryer: it more or less takes your hair off and ages you 20 years in a matter of seconds. This is what this legislation is about: making sure that the goods sold on the internal market are safe and compliant with the rules adopted in this Parliament.

It is time to do something about it; we can improve consumer legislation every day, but if the rules are not obeyed, then there is no meaning in it. What we are doing here is actually strengthening the surveillance of the internal market. By that, we are making sure that consumers never again have to endure the warm wrath of the faulty hairdryer or the faulty batteries that are exploding in your bag. This is what we are required to do for the European citizens, and it is actually one good thing that we can give before the elections.

Dobromir Sośnierz (NI). – Panie Przewodniczący! Sprawozdawczość, nowe normy, regulacje, biurokracja, więcej kontroli, nowe organy nadzoru, kary, utrudnienia, komplikacje, większa inwigilacja – to wszystko znajdujemy w tym nowym sprawozdaniu o nadzorze rynku i harmonizacji produktów. Nie mam siły po raz kolejny tłumaczyć Państwu, dlaczego to jest zły pomysł, dlaczego to nie zadziała, więc pomyślałem, że poszukam jakichś pozytywów. Co dobrego można zrobić z tym sprawozdaniem? No i zrobiłem gołąbka, co też wszystkim Państwu polecam.

Sergio Gaetano Cofferati (S&D). – Signor Presidente, onorevoli colleghi, signora Commissario, ha sentito elencare da parte del relatore le percentuali che riguardano i prodotti ancora non sicuri. Sono impressionanti, preoccupano. Pensi al 32% dei giocattoli, riguardano i bambini, prevalentemente, e il 40% dei dispositivi di protezione del personale, sono quelli che riguardano il nostro corpo.

Di fronte a una situazione di questa natura, con la crescita del commercio elettronico è inevitabile che ci siano maggiori rischi ed è altrettanto necessario che si facciano i passi in avanti che abbiamo provato a mettere insieme, con un risultato importante e positivo come quello che stiamo discutendo.

Ora, è anche importante la definizione di un operatore economico che garantisca la conformità di tutti i prodotti. Cose dunque positive e mi resta però il rammarico che potevamo arrivarci prima. Nella precedente legislatura, il Parlamento aveva votato un testo molto ambizioso che riguardava la sicurezza dei prodotti e che era stato bloccato in Consiglio per la contrarietà contro l'introduzione delle regole relative al «*made in*».

Peccato, potevamo arrivare a questo punto con largo anticipo. In ogni caso, guardiamo quel che è stato e adesso toccherà alla Commissione futura rendere attuabile in tutti i paesi quello che positivamente stiamo discutendo e approvando, immagino, nella giornata di domani.

Διαδικασία «*Catch-the-Eye*»

Maria Grapini (S&D). – Domnule președinte, doamnă comisar, stimați colegi, sigur, regulamentul era de mult așteptat, pentru că, da, piața unică și libera circulație a produselor sunt lucruri fundamentale pentru viitorul Europei. Evident că trebuia să avem și o supraveghere, o supraveghere mai bună, pentru că intrarea în piața internă a multor importuri complică situația și trebuie să armonizăm, așa cum s-a și spus în regulament. Și mă bucur că avem o rețea a Uniunii Europene și că avem indicatori de referință și că vom avea norme comune de control.

Numai să nu uităm că trebuie să legăm aceste regulamente, trebuie să avem și cum să verificăm în vamă. Deocamdată raportul referitor la uniunea vamală nu este finalizat și atunci degeaba avem proceduri comune dacă nu avem informatizate vămile, dacă nu avem acest regulament de uniune vamală. Sunt convinsă, însă, că în următorul mandat le vom termina.

Regret că chiar eu am fost raportor pe uniune vamală și nu am reușit să ajungem la negocierea instituțională. Astăzi l-am votat, totuși, și sper, doamna comisar, ca regulamentul să nu rămână doar o teorie, ci să și aplicăm în practică, prin colaborarea între autoritățile naționale.

(Λήξη της διαδικασίας «*Catch-the-Eye*»)

Elżbieta Bienkowska, *Member of the Commission*. – Mr President, dear Members, thank you very much for all your comments and contributions during this discussion, but first and foremost, I want to thank you for your engagement and for your devotion to this file, to this package. With tomorrow's vote, you will be sending a very strong and clear message on the safety and compliance of products in the EU single market.

I am convinced that this regulation, which we have achieved agreement on, is a balanced and comprehensive one. It will ensure, as I underlined before, a much better cooperation between all market surveillance and customs authorities in the EU. It will help market surveillance in the EU to really adapt to the challenges of the 21st century, and of course it will complete our Goods Package.

So, I want to thank all of those involved in this effort. I want to thank Parliament, but of course also the Romanian Presidency for your support on this file. I am convinced that with this regulation we will have taken an important step towards a really true and fair Single Market in the EU.

Nicola Danti, *Relatore*. – Signor Presidente, onorevoli colleghi, permettetemi in apertura di questa replica di ringraziare, cosa che non ho fatto in apertura, i relatori ombra per la cooperazione durante i mesi in cui abbiamo lavorato su questo regolamento, che è un regolamento molto consistente. Abbiamo dovuto affrontare molti temi, molti punti e la cooperazione, devo dire, del team negoziale del Parlamento è stata veramente straordinaria.

Allo stesso tempo, fatemi ringraziare anche la Commissaria Bienkowska e la Commissione, perché nei momenti difficili in cui bisognava cercare una cooperazione ci è stata vicino e ha cercato di mediare le nostre posizioni con quelle del Consiglio e ringrazio, a questo proposito, sia la Presidenza austriaca, sotto la quale ho iniziato questo percorso, sia la Presidenza rumena che ha terminato il percorso.

Nella replica finale, vorrei dire due cose, la prima riguarda le risorse finanziarie. Questo regolamento sta insieme al progetto del Single Market programme, dove abbiamo inserito le risorse finanziarie, come ha detto la Commissaria, che servono a garantire le gambe a questo regolamento, servono a garantire operatività e noi ci auguriamo che con la prossima legislatura, quando andremo a determinare questo programma sul mercato interno, siano confermate le risorse che il Parlamento ha messo per garantire che questa che noi prevediamo nel regolamento sia una sorveglianza di mercato, che è efficace nella pratica e, per far questo, servono anche delle risorse.

Fatemi dire un altro elemento, quello che noi vogliamo fare con questo regolamento e che abbiamo ottenuto, è quello di avere una parità di trattamento tra le aziende europee e le aziende extraeuropee. Troppo spesso le aziende extraeuropee avevano una facilità d'accesso senza dimostrare quelli che erano i necessari elementi di conformità dei beni che immettevano nel mercato europeo. Questa è una cosa che aiuta un maggiore e più equo mercato interno tra le aziende europee e quelle extraeuropee e lo stesso vale per le aziende che commercializzano online e quelle offline.

Proteggere il mercato unico significa garantire ai consumatori il rispetto delle normative europee. Avere una sorveglianza di mercato, Presidente, serve a garantire efficacia e pretendere da tutti gli operatori economici e dalle autorità il pieno rispetto del sistema di leggi e standard che ci siamo dati nel tempo, a tutela della nostra sicurezza e del nostro modello sociale.

Πρόεδρος. – Η συζήτηση έληξε.

Η ψηφοφορία θα διεξαχθεί την Τετάρτη 17 Απριλίου 2019.

22. Propagowanie uczciwości i przejrzystości dla użytkowników biznesowych korzystających z usług pośrednictwa internetowego (debata)

Πρόεδρος. – Το επόμενο σημείο στην ημερήσια διάταξη είναι η συζήτηση επί της εκθέσεως της κ. Christel Schaldemose, εξ ονόματος της Επιτροπής Εσωτερικής Αγοράς και Προστασίας των Καταναλωτών, επί της προτάσεως κανονισμού του Ευρωπαϊκού Κοινοβουλίου και του Συμβουλίου για την προώθηση της δίκαιης μεταχείρισης και της διαφάνειας για τους επιχειρηματικούς χρήστες επιγραμμικών υπηρεσιών διαμεσολάβησης (COM(2018)0238 - C8-0165/2018 - 2018/0112(COD)) (A8-0444/2018).

Christel Schaldemose, *Rapporteur*. – Hr. formand! Ærede kolleger! Vi forbrugere er vilde med dem – onlineformidlingstjenesterne – når vi bestiller hotelværelser, flybilletter, køber tøj, sko, bøger, musik og meget andet. Så tjekker vi udvalget og priserne igennem onlineformidlingstjenesterne. De åbner markedet for os forbrugere og for de virksomheder, der bruger dem til at sælge varer og tjenesteydelser.

Så de er gode på mange måder, men alligevel er de ikke rigtig regulerede i dag, det er lidt som det vilde vesten. Virksomhederne har reelt i dag kun ét valg. Enten at acceptere de vilkår, som onlineformidlingstjenesterne tilbyder dem, eller slet ikke at være der. Og mange gange er de vilkår, man får i dag, helt ulige, urimelige vilkår og i hvert fald ganske uigennemsigtige. Det er ikke godt nok! Derfor er det også glædeligt, at det er lykkedes os at få en aftale om at få lavet nye regler, som gør, at vi får meget mere fairness og gennemsigtighed for onlineplatformene og for de virksomheder, som bruger dem. Det betyder i sidste ende også, at forbrugerne kan være meget mere trygge, når de bruger onlineformidlingstjenesterne til at købe produkter.

Hvad har vi så opnået? Ja, vi er jo ikke kommet fuldstændig i mål med det hele, men vi får startet og får lagt et grundlag for en lovgivning, som gør, at vi kan få en mere reguleret onlinemarked. Vi skaber markant mere gennemsigtighed, og vi skaber også krav og mere fairness for de virksomheder, der bruger onlinetjenesterne. Det er rigtig vigtigt, det er rigtig godt. Helt konkret har vi opnået, at de vilkår, som de virksomheder, der bruger online-tjenesterne, får, skal være meget mere fair. Vi har lavet en lang liste af krav, som en virksomhed, der bruger en onlineplatform, skal have at vide i den kontrakt, den indgår. Og det er meget vigtigt, for det skaber meget mere fairness, så ved virksomheden, hvad det er man er udsat for eller stiller sig overfor, når man bruger en tjeneste.

Vi har formået at komme igennem med rigtig mange ting. Kommissionen stillede forslag om, at opdatering af vilkår skulle varsles med 15 dage, vi har sikret, at man derudover også har ret til at opsige sin kontrakt, hvis man ikke synes, at de opdaterede regler er gode nok. Vi har gennemført en lang række skrappe transparenskrav på en lang række forhold. Herunder f.eks. også hvad det er for nogle vilkår og hovedparametre, der bliver lagt til grund for den ranking, man laver på onlineplatformene. Det er meget vigtigt – det er vigtigt for den virksomhed, der bruger onlineplatformene, at den ved, hvad det er, der lægger til grund for denne ranking. Ranking er vigtig, når forbrugerne skal vælge platformen. Vi har også sikret, at erhvervsbrugerne har minimum 30 dages varslingsperiode, hvis platformen vil opsige deres kontrakt. Vi har også sikret, at mange af disse krav gælder søgemaskiner. Vi har også lagt meget vægt på, at når disse regler engang skal gennemføres og håndhæves, så foregår det ordenligt og effektivt. Medlemslandene er dem, der skal håndhæve reglerne, men vi har brug for at sikre, at det sker bedre, for ellers nytter det ikke noget med nye regler. Og så har vi også valgt at sige, at da der er tale om første lovgivning på dette område, så skal det ikke vare så længe, før vi skal kigge nærmere på, om der er brug for at få revideret reglerne. Derfor har vi også lavet en lang liste af krav til, hvad det er for nogle ting, der skal tjekkes, når vi når dertil, hvor vi skal evaluere lovgivningen igen. Men overordnet kan man sige, at det, der er det gode med dette forslag, er, at vi simpelthen får skabt væsentlig mere gennemsigtighed for de virksomheder, der bruger onlineformidlingstjenesterne, og vi får også skabt mere fairness. Der bliver skabt et mere level playing field for de virksomheder, der bruger dem, og det betyder i sidste ende, at vores forbrugere, som køber varer og tjenesteydelser på platformene, kan være mere trygge ved, at de får det produkt, de forventer. Så det er altså et vigtigt skridt, vi tager, og samtidig bliver vi i EU også dem, som sætter de globale standarder for disse platforme. Det er en rigtig vigtig dag, så jeg takker for det samarbejde, vi har haft, og ser frem til den debat, vi skal have nu til aften.

Francis Zammit Dimech, *Rapporteur għal opinjoni tal-Kumitat għall-Affarijiet Legali*. – Sur President, huwa pjaċir tiegħi nintervjeni wkoll għan-nom tal-Kumitat JURI, niringrazzja lill-kollega anki li hdimna tajjeb hafna flimkien, niringrazzja anki lill-Kummissarju għax naf bl-impenn tagħha f'dan ir-rigward.

Kif smajna huwa fatt li llum in-negozji għandhom bżonn il-pjattaformi. In-negozji żgħar iktar minn dawk kbar. Għandhom bżonn il-pjattaformi biex jilhq lill-konsumaturi tagħhom. Għallhekk il-htieġa ta' ambjent li huwa iktar trasparenti u iktar ġust.

Meta jien għamilt anki konsultazzjoni f'Malta f'dan ir-rigward, smajt kemm l-Ewropa trid anki tgħin iktar it-turiżmu. Insemmi t-turiżmu għaliex hawnhekk min jahdem fil-qasam tat-turiżmu jrid access iktar għall-informazzjoni. Informazzjoni dwar dak li jkun ingabar fuqhom stess.

Mariya Gabriel, *membre de la Commission*. – Monsieur le Président, Mesdames et Messieurs les députés, tout d'abord je tiens à remercier le Parlement européen et notamment la rapporteure, M^{me} Schaldemose, mais aussi les rapporteurs fictifs, pour tous leurs efforts et pour leur coopération en vue de parvenir à un accord sur ce dossier, dans un laps de temps si court.

En effet, le Parlement a contribué à renforcer et à façonner le texte du nouveau règlement. Vos amendements contribueront à créer un environnement plus équitable pour les entreprises dans l'économie des plateformes en ligne. Cela profitera aux consommateurs qui utilisent ces plateformes. Il y aura un ensemble de règles claires et un environnement réglementaire plus prévisible. Cela renforcera à son tour la confiance à travers les frontières. Nous voudrions évidemment que cela aide les plateformes à se développer, à investir et à innover. Certaines de ces dispositions supplémentaires proposées par le Parlement européen aideront plus d'un million de PME européennes, qui offrent leurs biens et services par l'intermédiaire des plateformes en ligne, à atteindre leurs clients.

Permettez-moi de mettre en avant les systèmes d'exploitation, dont le Parlement a comblé une faille potentielle. Il a été clarifié que les services d'intermédiation en ligne ne peuvent pas se soustraire à leurs obligations lorsqu'ils contrôlent les systèmes d'exploitation sous-jacents.

Je me félicite également de l'introduction d'une liste de conditions contractuelles spécifiques visant à garantir un traitement équitable entre les services d'intermédiation en ligne et leurs entreprises utilisatrices, et à interdire certaines pratiques préjudiciables. Cela permettra de faire de ce nouveau règlement un instrument puissant.

Un grand nombre de vos propositions contribueront à notre objectif principal d'accroître la transparence, en particulier en ce qui concerne la question essentielle du classement. Par exemple, et ceci a été cité aussi par la rapporteure, outre les services d'intermédiation en ligne, les moteurs de recherche devront fournir des informations sur tout traitement différencié qu'ils appliquent. Les entreprises seront désormais en mesure de résoudre plus facilement les litiges – par exemple, toutes les plateformes, sauf les plus petites, devront avoir mis en place un système interne de traitement des plaintes et recourir à des médiateurs que les plateformes doivent identifier en amont pour permettre le règlement extrajudiciaire des litiges. Cet équilibre prend en compte les attentes des entreprises.

Le texte final a aussi renforcé le rôle des États membres pour la mise en œuvre du règlement. Les États membres devront mettre en place des mesures pour garantir une application adéquate et efficace des nouvelles règles. Ils devront également collaborer avec nous, la Commission, pour surveiller et évaluer l'impact des nouvelles règles et partager les informations pertinentes.

Mais, bien sûr, notre travail ne se termine pas ici. Nous allons élaborer des lignes directrices qui offriront plus de clarté sur les informations que les plateformes en ligne et les moteurs de recherche doivent fournir sur le fonctionnement du classement. Nous travaillerons évidemment avec l'industrie pour mettre en place des codes de conduite visant à compléter les nouvelles règles.

Je suis heureuse que le compromis auquel nous sommes parvenu préserve l'esprit, les objectifs et l'approche de notre proposition initiale. Il instaure un juste équilibre et permet aux plateformes, notamment européennes, de s'établir et d'évoluer. Il ne s'agit là que d'une première étape. Nous prenons d'ores et déjà les devants, d'une part avec le travail de l'observatoire sur l'économie des plateformes – je rappelle ici que nos experts indépendants sont en train de préparer un rapport préliminaire attendu dans le courant de l'année –, d'autre part avec la révision telle qu'elle est prévue dans le règlement – il y aura une évaluation rigoureuse 18 mois après l'entrée en application.

De notre côté, nous comptons sur votre soutien pour continuer dans ce processus. J'espère également que le Parlement approuvera le règlement au moment du vote de demain.

Anna Záborská, *spravodajkyňa Výboru pre priemysel, výskum a energetiku požiadaneho o stanovisko* – Vážení pán predsedajúci, internetové platformy predstavujú obrovskú príležitosť pre startupy, malé penzióny, rodinné či miestne firmy. Vďaka nim dokážu rozbehnúť biznis, zamestnať ľudí a poskytovať kvalitné služby. My musíme zabezpečiť, aby s nimi tí silní jednali férov.

Dosiahnutý kompromis ide v niektorých bodoch možno trochu ďalej, než som pôvodne navrhovala. V mojom návrhu stanoviska za výbor ITRE som sa totiž snažila obmedziť reguláciu na minimum. Parlament by podľa mňa nemal navrhovať obchodné modely, ale skôr len stanoviť jasné pravidlá. Napriek tomu môžem s čistým svedomím podporiť dosiahnutý kompromis.

Ďakujem kolegyniam a kolegom, ktorí vo výbore ITRE podporili moju predstavu a blahoželám spravodajkyni pani Schaldemose, ako aj nášmu tieňovému spravodajcovi pánovi Juvinovi.

Philippe Juvin, *au nom du groupe PPE*. – Monsieur le Président, parmi les grands succès de l'Union européenne, il y a évidemment le marché unique. Malgré ses défauts, je préfère que les PME de mon pays puissent vendre à 500 millions d'Européens plutôt qu'à 66 millions de Français.

Aujourd'hui, nous franchissons une étape supplémentaire, nous créons un marché unique numérique et dans cette nouvelle économie numérique qui n'a pas de règles, nous dotons l'Union de ses propres règles: ne pas subir les législations étrangères et ne pas subir la loi des puissances économiques les plus fortes. En particulier, nous empêchons désormais les plateformes d'imposer des conditions abusives aux entreprises européennes qui utilisent leurs services et les relations entre les plateformes et les PME doivent être équilibrées. Alors évidemment, le droit national serait tout à fait insuffisant. Si un Français réserve une chambre dans un hôtel en Italie à travers une plateforme qui est basée en Irlande, quel est le droit national qui s'appliquerait? Est-ce le droit français, le droit italien ou le droit irlandais? On voit bien que cela ne marche pas et qu'il faut évidemment des règles européennes. C'est ce que nous faisons, nous protégeons les PME européennes et pour les protéger, il faut d'abord leur offrir la protection d'un droit européen harmonisé et commun dans les 27 États.

Dans ce texte, le Parlement a montré qu'il était un outil démocratique, qui n'obéissait ni aux lobbies ni à aucun intérêt particulier. J'ai eu l'honneur d'y servir pendant deux mandats et Monsieur le Président, au moment où je quitte ce Parlement, je n'ai qu'un seul mot: préservez-le.

Evelyne Gebhardt, *im Namen der S&D-Fraktion*. – Herr Präsident! Ich möchte Frau Schaldemose zu ihrer wirklich hervorragenden Arbeit beglückwünschen und im Namen der sozialdemokratischen Fraktion, der S&D-Fraktion, sagen, dass wir voll und ganz hinter ihrer Arbeit stehen und empfehlen, morgen dem Ergebnis zuzustimmen.

Onlineplattformen wie das Hotelreservierungsportal Booking, der Apple Store oder die Reiseplattform eDreams spielen in der digitalen Welt zunehmend eine wichtige Rolle. Die steigende Marktmacht der Onlineplattformen ist allerdings auch mit einer Abschwächung der Rechte der gewerblichen Nutzer gegenüber den Plattformen verbunden. Die vorliegende Verordnung bringt Fairness in die Plattformwirtschaft über Transparenzanforderungen, über ein Verbot unlauterer Handelspraktiken, über angemessene Beschwerdemechanismen mittels effektiver Rechtsdurchsetzung. Und durch die spezielle Beobachtungsstelle für Onlineplattformen wird auch die Überwachung eine wirksamere sein. Ich denke, das ist eine gute Sache für die kleinen und mittleren Unternehmen und für die Verbraucher und Verbraucherinnen.

Dita Charanzová, *on behalf of the ALDE Group*. – Mr President, the key to any business is honesty and transparency with your consumers, but also with your business partners. This regulation ensures this needed greater transparency, while not imposing unneeded over-regulation on platforms and traders. Online commerce is the future of our economy and we must not destroy our European players in a misguided attempt to attack the international ones.

The path to hell is paved with good intentions. Some in this House saw this regulation as a political tool, as a way to change competition policy through the back door. I am pleased that in the end common sense has prevailed and I can only thank the rapporteur in this regard. She had the courage to seek a good and balanced agreement over fighting for one which would have had a negative effect on our economy and the digital single market. This is why the ALDE Group will support the trilogue outcome tomorrow at the votes, and I encourage both platforms and traders to use this new transparency to its greatest extent. It is only by adopting best practices and effective self-regulation that this market can continue to be fair to all. I fear if platforms don't use this chance that they will not get another one.

Julia Reda, *on behalf of the Verts/ALE Group*. – Mr President, in principle, platforms are a great opportunity for small European business. Whether it's a person who works as a software developer or somebody selling their own products, platforms make it possible for the small players to compete with the big players and to reach customers that they would otherwise never have reached, which is sometimes perhaps also a reason why some big European companies wanted to extend this regulation more than is reasonable. But platforms do become a problem when network effects make them so large that they can dictate unfair terms to their business customers.

We have achieved a regulation that provides transparency and fairness in the platform market, and I think it's to a great extent testimony to the steady hand of the rapporteur, Mrs Schaldemose, who has ensured that there is no free ride for platforms but that there are also no unreasonable obligations that would kill the small players in the European market, who are very important for European businesses.

So I would really like to thank all who have contributed on this work. It's great to see that there can be such great consensus on the platforms file.

Nicola Danti (S&D). – Signor Presidente, onorevoli colleghi, Commissaria Gabriel, questo regolamento ha il merito di riequilibrare i rapporti economici tra le grandi piattaforme e oltre un milione di imprese europee che operano attraverso intermediari online che spesso ne sono dipendenti.

Alcuni esempi su tutti: con le nuove norme avremo maggiore trasparenza sui prodotti e sui servizi offerti online, più informazioni sui parametri che determinano il posizionamento di un'offerta sulla pagina web, maggiori difese dalle modifiche unilaterali dei termini e delle condizioni dei contratti da parte delle piattaforme.

Queste norme porteranno conseguenti benefici ai milioni di cittadini che sempre più spesso scelgono di comprare in rete e che potranno godere di prezzi più bassi, di una maggiore scelta e che vedranno aumentare le informazioni a loro disposizione. In questi mesi il Parlamento europeo ha dimostrato di non piegarsi davanti agli interessi dei colossi digitali, ma di tutelare le imprese europee scrivendo nuove regole in grado di tutelare maggiormente la parte contrattuale più svantaggiata.

Mariya Gabriel, *membre de la Commission*. – Monsieur le Président, je voudrais encore une fois remercier les membres de ce Parlement pour leurs commentaires et observations. Je tiens à souligner encore une fois, au nom de la Commission, que nous nous félicitons de l'accord obtenu sur ce règlement. Comme vous l'avez dit aussi, à juste titre, il reflète un bon équilibre entre les différents points de vue politiques et entre les intérêts des parties prenantes. Un vote en faveur de ce règlement enverra donc aux PME et aux citoyens européens un message fort et clair, à savoir que l'Union européenne est capable de garantir la transparence et une prévisibilité accrue dans l'environnement des plateformes en ligne.

Encore une fois, merci à M^{me} Schaldemose, la rapporteure, ainsi qu'à tous ceux qui ont contribué à ce dossier afin qu'il puisse avancer rapidement.

En conclusion, nous pouvons dire que grâce à notre travail commun, nous avons fait un important pas en avant pour le marché unique numérique, les entreprises et les citoyens de l'Union.

Christel Schaldemose, *Ordfører*. – Hr. formand! Tak for ordet igen, og også tusind tak til jer kolleger for jeres bemærkninger. Jeg deler synspunkterne, jeg er glad for, at vi har fået dette resultat, som er afbalanceret både til fordel for virksomhederne, rimeligt over for platformene og især også noget, som i sidste ende som vil være til stor glæde for vores mange forbrugere. Det var ikke et resultat, vi var kommet igennem med, hvis ikke vi havde samarbejdet så godt. Derfor vil jeg også gerne have lov at sige tusind tak til det rumænske formandskab. Vi havde nogle hårde, men også gode forhandlinger, og jeg synes, vi kom i mål på en rigtig god måde. Tusind tak for det. Og også til Kommissionen og fru kommissær – havde det ikke været for den hjælp, vi fik fra Kommissionen under forhandlingerne, var vi ikke kommet igennem med dette resultat. Så tusind tak for, at det lykkedes. Det viser, at når vi samarbejder, og der er en åbenhed på tværs, så kan vi sagtens få lavet noget, som er rigtig godt for vores virksomheder, så vi kan fortsætte med at have nogle gode og brugbare platforme og samtidig gavne vores forbrugere.

Jeg er stolt af det resultat, vi her har opnået, og jeg er også klar over, at det kun er et første skridt. Jeg glæder mig til at det fortsatte arbejde, ikke mindst resultatet af observatoriet, og til at se, hvad der kan komme ud af det. Jeg tror faktisk på, at vi med denne lovgivning kan blive førende for platformsmarkedet i Europa og i verden på sigt, for der er behov for, at det er reguleret, der er behov for, at det er gennemsigtigt, og der er også behov for, at det er fair. Alt det har vi opnået i denne lovgivning. Tusind tak.

Πρόεδρος. – Η συζήτηση έληξε.

Η ψηφοφορία θα διεξαχθεί την Τετάρτη 17 Απριλίου 2019.

Γραπτές δηλώσεις (άρθρο 162 του Κανονισμού)

Claudia Tapardel (S&D), în scris. – În calitate de raportor al Comisiei pentru transport și turism pe dosarul privind „Promovarea echității și transparenței dintre furnizorii de servicii și platformele online”, obiectivul meu în acest dosar a fost asigurarea unui mediu transparent și echitabil pentru toți actorii implicați în economia digitală: furnizorul de servicii, platformele online și consumatorul, care reprezintă de fapt cetățeanul european.

În contextul evoluției rapide a tehnologiilor digitale, viziunea mea este că digitalizarea reprezintă viitorul. Pentru aceasta, este necesară crearea unui mediu digital corect reglementat, în care modelele tradiționale de business să nu aibă de suferit ca urmare a procesului de digitalizare.

Luând în considerare natura foarte orizontală a propunerii de regulament a Comisiei Europene, mă bucur foarte mult că am reușit să reglementăm câteva aspecte fundamentale ce țin de promovarea și asigurarea transparenței și echității. Mai precis, am introdus prevederi foarte clare pentru ca platformele online să aplice în mod nediscriminatoriu criteriile pentru ierarhizarea furnizorilor de servicii. Din punctul meu de vedere, este esențial să avem un echilibru între formele tradiționale de business și cele bazate exclusiv pe tehnologiile digitale, așa cum este cazul economiei colaborative.

23. Lepsze egzekwowanie i nowocześniejsze unijnych przepisów dotyczących ochrony konsumentów (debata)

Πρόεδρος. – Το επόμενο σημείο στην ημερήσια διάταξη είναι η συζήτηση επί της εκθέσεως του κ. Daniel Dalton, εξ ονόματος της Επιτροπής Εσωτερικής Αγοράς και Προστασίας των Καταναλωτών, επί της προτάσεως οδηγίας του Ευρωπαϊκού Κοινοβουλίου και του Συμβουλίου για την τροποποίηση της οδηγίας 93/13/ΕΟΚ του Συμβουλίου, της 5ης Απριλίου 1993, της οδηγίας 98/6/ΕΚ του Ευρωπαϊκού Κοινοβουλίου και του Συμβουλίου, της οδηγίας 2005/29/ΕΚ του Ευρωπαϊκού Κοινοβουλίου και του Συμβουλίου και της οδηγίας 2011/83/ΕΕ του Ευρωπαϊκού Κοινοβουλίου και του Συμβουλίου όσον αφορά την καλύτερη επιβολή και τον εκσυγχρονισμό των κανόνων της ΕΕ για την προστασία των καταναλωτών (COM(2018)0185 - C8-0143/2018 - 2018/0090(COD)) (A8-0029/2019).

Daniel Dalton, Rapporteur. –Mr President, this package reboots consumer rights for the internet age, bringing new protections and empowering consumers with information whenever they buy.

I'd like to thank the shadow rapporteurs, the Romanian Presidency, and the European Commission for their hard work and commitment to achieve an agreement before the European elections. We had just three weeks from start to finish of the negotiations and we focused on a single trilogue. It turned into a very long day, but after ten hours of negotiation we got an agreement. Now as some of you will be aware, this agreement was subject to further adjustment from the Commission, which had made it clear in the talks that it needed to confirm its mandate. The final text addressing dual quality was therefore tweaked, but the crucial substance remains: consumers can no longer be misled by products made to different standards but marketed as the same in different Member States. It's not right, and the agreement we vote on tomorrow will stop those egregious breaches of consumer trust.

Now I know some colleagues feel that we should have gone further, and I have tabled amendments to that effect for tomorrow. But let me be clear: if any of these amendments pass, this will collapse the entire agreement. The Council and Commission have made it clear that they are already at the edge – they can't give any more. So if they pass, there will be no deal at all. That means no provision at all on dual quality, and there will be no updated consumer law at all – just a few weeks before an election. This will not help consumers, who are currently being misled. There will be no law coming down the track for them. It will not help consumer authorities. They would not, for example, be able to give out penalties that they need to enforce all the other consumer laws. And it would not help producers, who would continue to be undercut by competitors who flout the rules.

I struggle also to see how it would meet political reality. It would risk delaying efforts to tackle dual quality for years, if not for ever. But with the agreement we have found, there is a beginning. Dual-quality products now for the first time are addressed, and in the coming years, the Commission will have to review progress seriously. Those are concrete steps of progress rather than unrealistic amendments. And we should remember that this package is about more than dual quality. There are vital improvements to the consumer protections we cannot, in good conscience, delay.

And the Parliament's demands have been met in many areas. We have banned bulk-buying of event tickets following an earlier law in the UK. This practice penalises real fans, either unable to see their favourite team or artist or forced to pay touts many times the face-value price. And this will now stop, because it's been cheating everyone and it's good news that we are able to ban it here.

We've also succeeded in introducing requirements to improve trust in online reviews, marketplace ranking and the pricing of discounts – all to the benefit of the consumer. I also believe that in the internet era we should trust the informed consumer. The online world contains a wealth of information that can empower the consumer, but it needs to be genuine to be useful. Our measures on online consumer trust will make sure that consumers know when they're getting information that they can rely on, helping them find the product that they are looking for.

I'm glad that we could also get support from the Commission and the Council for a tool to build consumer awareness and use of their rights. The European consumer rights – or, as I like to call it, the 'ECR app' – will give consumers a single identifiable point to know their rights and easy access to the complaints procedure that will help them solve their problems.

We also ensured that changes to the right of withdrawal were rejected. This is an important right for consumers and for their trust in e-commerce, and if we can adopt this agreement tomorrow, it will be just over a year from the adoption of the proposal by the Commission to the conclusion of our work.

So I would like to thank the shadows again, who all helped to ensure the compromise, also the IMCO Secretariat and the Legal Services for their hard work and dedication. These rules will make a real difference to consumers' everyday life. They matter.

So let's not delay their implementation by one more day and let's adopt the text tomorrow.

Věra Jourová, *Member of the Commission*. – Mr President, let me start by thanking rapporteur Mr Dalton, the shadow rapporteurs and the Committee on the Internal Market and Consumer Protection (IMCO) for their hard work, which allowed for a swift agreement on this extremely important file. It goes well beyond the Commission's proposal on many aspects. I would like to thank Parliament for its strong push to improve consumer rights, especially in relation to digital markets. But, in addition, this directive will strengthen the enforcement of consumer rights as we are providing more harmonised sanctions with teeth. Consumer authorities in all 28 Member States will be able to fine companies harming consumers in several or all Member States up to 4% of their annual turnover. Victims of unfair practices will be equipped to claim remedies from traders, such as terminating the contract or compensation of damages. This will also facilitate out-of-court and in-court disputes.

The new directive will also introduce a number of new measures to avoid misleading consumers online and to improve online transparency. We prohibit the displaying of fake consumer reviews. We require a clear indication of commercial sponsoring when it is used in the ranking of goods in market places. There will be no more fake price reductions for goods fooling consumers, and there must be a clear indication that, even if a consumer agreed to a contract which does not entail money, he has rights.

Turning now to the issue of dual quality: I know that many people in this House have been fighting against this for years. This helped to draw more attention to the issue and to bring it onto the political agenda. I am therefore proud that the Commission, in the new deal for consumers, has, for the first time ever, proposed a legislative provision on this issue so that the dual treatment of consumers in the EU will stop, and so that the new rule is the same composition everywhere in the EU.

This has been a very sensitive issue in the negotiations, and the text which is now on the table is a compromise achieved by the Council and Parliament negotiators after – and I agree with Mr Dalton – very tough but, I would say, constructive talks. We want the private sector to take their responsibilities and to end dual quality. It is now absolutely clear that they cannot cheat on the quality and sell under identical packaging foods with a significantly different composition, and this is a huge step forward. I am glad that already now, under the pressure we have imposed on them, many manufacturers have adjusted their recipes to have a single one across the EU. With further steps we made with the Omnibus proposal and following exchanges of views on this issue, I know that many other companies are working on eliminating diffe-

rences. What also helps is the permanent testing which we are now doing, and which shows that there is a significant number of cheated products on our markets which have to disappear.

I expect that producers will stop differentiation. Those who continue must have justified reasons for doing so. Such traders should be in a position to demonstrate their legitimate reasons. This is why we consider that blacklisting of any differentiation as a misleading practice is not the appropriate and workable solution.

The main mechanism of the Unfair Commercial Directive is set out in Article 6, not in the Annex blacklisting misleading practices. I think that it is not less effective. Article 6 of the Unfair Commercial Practices Directive (UCPD) is constantly used as a legal basis by national authorities across the EU. Most recently, for example, the Italian authorities used it to fine Wizz Air or Ryanair for misleading consumers on the real price of their tickets. The consumer protection authorities in the Member States base a lot of their cases on this article. Recently, they published the result of their action against five big car rental companies for not being clear on the real content of their services and preventing informed choices, and they will do so in the future on the illegal use of dual quality.

The Commission is going to closely monitor the implementation of this provision, and we will continue our efforts to improve the enforcement capacities of the Member States. This year again, we are proposing EUR 1 million in grants from the consumer programme on this. Furthermore, thanks to a pilot project from the European Parliament, we are going to implement EUR 1.66 million/EUR 1.2 million of grants for consumer associations to develop their testing capacities.

Finally, there is a clear revision clause in the text, and we commit to re-assessing the situation two years after the entry into force of the directive to see whether we should move to more stringent solutions. Allow me to express my sincere hope that this directive modernising and better enforcing European consumers' rights will be adopted tomorrow.

Róża Gräfin von Thun und Hohenstein, *w imieniu grupy PPE*. – Panie Przewodniczący! Pani Komisarz! W tej dyrektywie oczywiście są dobre rozwiązania dla konsumentów, ale nie rozwiązuje ona podstawowego problemu, jakim jest różna jakość produktów zapakowanych tak samo. Mamy tutaj otwartą listę uzasadnionych wyjątków, jak pani komisarz sama powiedziała, czyli ta dyrektywa w sumie nie zakazuje nieuczciwych praktyk.

Proszę kilka przykładów – serek Almette. To Almette, które kupiłam w Kehl, jest zrobione z twarogu i jest w 100% naturalne, a to Almette ze sklepu w Krakowie jest z twarogu oraz z mleka w proszku i zawiera kwas cytrynowy E330. Kupiłam również serek Philadelphia. Ten kupiony w Krakowie zawiera stabilizator E410, którego ten kupiony w Kehl nie zawiera. Jeszcze jeden przykład – herbata, która też wygląda tak samo: ta kupiona w Krakowie ma 0,1% soku brzoskwiniowego, a ta kupiona tutaj w Strasburgu ma go 50 razy więcej. Dlatego ponad sto koleżanek i kolegów podpisało poprawkę, która bezwzględnie zakazuje takich nieuczciwych praktyk, i proszę was o poparcie, bo w Unii Europejskiej nie mamy przecież konsumentów lepszych i gorszych. Rynek jest sprawiedliwy i musi być sprawiedliwy dla wszystkich tak samo.

Evelyne Gebhardt, *im Namen der S&D-Fraktion*. – Herr Präsident! Ich muss ehrlich sagen, in diesem Maßnahmenpaket, das wir morgen zur Abstimmung haben, haben wir eine ganze Menge von sehr guten Vorschlägen und enorme Verbesserungen für die Bürger und Bürgerinnen, für die Verbraucher und Verbraucherinnen. Ich möchte mich beim Berichterstatter für die gute Arbeit bedanken, aber auch bei der Kommissarin und bei der Ratspräsidentschaft, die sehr daran mitgearbeitet haben, das durchzusetzen.

Unter diesen positiven Maßnahmen ist die Modernisierung der Plattformtransparenz. Wir haben erreicht, dass die Rechte auch für die sogenannten kostenlosen Dienstleistungen gelten. Wir haben dafür gesorgt, dass bessere Rechtsbehelfe für die Verbraucher und Verbraucherinnen bereitgestellt werden. Und wir haben eingeführt, was bisher in diesem Bereich nicht war: Sanktionen bei Verstößen gegen EU-Verbraucherschutzvorschriften. Unter anderem können Verstöße gegen Verbraucherschutzvorschriften mit Bußgeldern von einem Mindestbetrag von 4 % des jährlichen Umsatzes geahndet werden.

Wir haben auch verhindert, was die Kommission an Verschlechterung des Verbraucherrechts vorgesehen hatte, nämlich eine Einschränkung des Widerrufsrechts in der Verbraucherrechterichtlinie. Und wir haben eine ganze Reihe von Maßnahmen auf die schwarze Liste der unlauteren Geschäftspraktiken gesetzt. Ich kann sie nicht alle aufzählen, dazu fehlt mir die Zeit.

Einen Wermutstropfen gibt es allerdings: Es ist uns nicht gelungen, die *dual-quality*-Produkte auf diese schwarze Liste zu bekommen, weil eine Mehrheit von Staaten in der Europäischen Union sich schlicht und einfach geweigert hat.

Nun ist die Frage: Sollen wir alles, was wir jetzt errungen haben, damit in den Papierkorb schmeißen? Meine Fraktion empfiehlt dennoch zuzustimmen und dafür zu sorgen, dass die Revisionsklausel, die wir durchgesetzt haben, auch wirklich in der nächsten Wahlperiode dafür genutzt wird, dafür zu sorgen, dass die Rechte, die die Verbraucher haben, auch wirklich durchgesetzt werden, auch gegen die *dual quality*, denn wir können nicht akzeptieren, dass es Verbraucher und Verbraucherinnen erster und zweiter Qualität gibt.

Deswegen werden wir als Sozialdemokraten, als S&D-Fraktion, weiter daran arbeiten und darum kämpfen, dass dies abgeschafft wird, weil es nicht akzeptabel ist. Aber dennoch werden wir morgen dem errungenen Kompromiss zustimmen.

Branislav Škripek, za skupinu ECR. – Vážený pán predsedajúci, pre našu generáciu, pre moju generáciu a pre ľudí zo strednej a východnej Európy bolo symbolom spájanej Európy pád železnej opony. Ale možno pre naše deti to bude rok, v ktorom začne platiť legislatíva, ktorá zamedzuje predaj potravín, ktoré majú pod tou istou značkou rozdielne zloženie, pretože my sme to vo východnej Európe zažili. Ľudia zo západnej Európy majú kvalitnejšie potraviny ako tie isté vyrábané v našich krajoch vo východnej Európe, na východe Európy.

Preto veľmi dúfam, že boj za rovnakú kvalitu potravín ide do finále. Európska komisia si napriek 20 000 aparátu tento problém všimla až v roku 2017, keď pán predseda Juncker povedal, že citujem: „Slováci si nezaslúžia mať v rybách prstoch menej rýb, Česi menej kakaa vo svojej čokoláde a Maďari menej mäsa vo svojich jedlách.“. Vďaka za politický prielom tohoto typu však v skutočnosti patrí najmä aktívnym občanom, ktorí na to upozorňovali, a všetkým, ktorí výskumami dokázali, že nadnárodné potravinárske koncerny jednoducho klamali a dlho im to prechádzalo. Lenže takáto zmena ohľadne potravín je len prvý krok rovnakého metra v Európskej únii. Je potrebné, aby nasledovali ďalšie oblasti, ako je dorovnanie dotácií pre poľnohospodárov a tak ďalej.

Jasenko Selimovic, on behalf of the ALDE Group. – Mr President, a couple of years ago, online, I booked a room in an amazing hotel for the price of nothing. The rooms were beautiful; the view was amazing; the furniture was just too good to be true. And when I got there, it turned out that it really was too good to be true. It was not beautiful, not amazing, not a hotel. It was actually a garage that somebody had transformed into a kind of room that I was supposed to live in. The purpose of this legislation is to avoid such scenarios in the future, because this is an experience that many European consumers have in everyday trade online.

The proposal that is on the table is actually defending that, and I think, in that way, it is a victory for consumers. It defends the right to withdrawal – which in my case would be very suitable, in that in that position. It actually took a very reasonable stance on the contentious issue of the dual quality of products. I do understand it's very difficult, but it is a good point that we have, and it makes it more difficult for the unserious businesses to trick you. What we are doing, the new transparency requirements online, will make sure that the ranking criteria on your site is clearly visible. That you cannot cheat with that. The new provision will stop the fake reviews from taking place, and the ambition is that, in the future, the amazing view is just simply amazing. I think this is good legislation, and I hope that my colleagues will not fall into the trap of putting it back, sending it back to the committee because of this contentious issue of dual-quality products.

Martin Schirdewan, im Namen der GUE/NGL-Fraktion. – Herr Präsident, werte Kolleginnen und Kollegen! Es ist gut, dass sich die EU dem Verbraucherschutz widmet und einheitliche europäische Standards definiert. Es ist auch gut, dass dabei auf das Parlament als direkt gewählte Institution mehr Verlass ist als auf die Kommission, was wir unter anderem bei der Verteidigung des Widerrufsrechts gegen die ursprünglichen Pläne der Kommission gesehen haben, dieses Widerrufsrecht zu verwässern.

Aber offenkundig gibt es in diesem *new deal for consumers* ein Problem, das uns allen bewusst ist, nämlich das der doppelten Qualitätsstandards. Wenn jemand zum Beispiel aus Deutschland mit seinem Kind nach Polen in den Urlaub fährt und ihm dort seinen Lieblingsbutterkeks kauft, dann sollte dieser genauso viel Butter enthalten, anstatt Palmöl, wie das bei der gleichen Marke in Deutschland der Fall ist. Aber dem ist halt nicht so. Hier werden aufgrund von gewinnmaximierenden Praktiken von Unternehmen einige Europäer und Europäerinnen – vor allem in Mittel- und Osteuropa – zu Verbrauchern zweiter Klasse gemacht. Es ist an der Zeit, dieser Geschäftspraxis im Sinne eines gemeinschaftlichen und solidarischen Europas ein Ende zu bereiten.

Julia Reda, *on behalf of the Verts/ALE Group*. – Mr President, despite the many good provisions on transparency and consumer rights online, one crucial piece is missing from this legislation: a clear ban on the dual quality of products. I regret to see that this Parliament is divided not on ideological lines, but on geographical lines, where Members from the western states seem to think that this deal is good enough, even though Parliament has given up on its position of banning dual quality and the Central and Eastern European Members are asking for a better deal. The Greens/EFA Group is not divided on this. We consider this a matter of treating people equally in the EU, and this is at the core of what European citizens expect: that they will not be discriminated against because of where they live by being sold an inferior product. This is why we would rather take the time to do it right and not adopt a trilogue agreement that has been rushed through and where Parliament has given up on its promise to citizens to ban dual-quality products.

Antanas Guoga (PPE). – Mr President, it's an eventful day that we cannot reach, despite everything, a normal agreement where we do not have discrimination. Discrimination week after week. Just last week we saw discrimination against the peripheral countries in the mobility package. Now we want to discriminate people by having second-hand products. I will call them second-hand. We're giving people second-hand products to consume because we discriminate, and let's own up to it. Do we want a fair Europe for everybody? Do we want the same quality of product for everybody? Yes we do. Let's not give up. Let's keep fighting. Let's keep fighting and let's win so we can all have a fair deal in Europe – that's all we're asking. Equal rights, equal Europe: everyone's a winner.

Olga Sehnalová (S&D). – Pane předsedající, vyjednaná dohoda se zdůvodňuje tím, že jde o změny, které zlepšují postavení spotřebitelů a že pokud ji zítra neschválíme, spotřebitelé tak budou muset čekat další rok.

I to je příklad dvojího metru, kdy se práva některých spotřebitelů berou jako důležitější než práva jiných, třeba těch, kteří se právem cítí jako občané druhé kategorie. Proto jsem nehlasovala pro dohodu na výboru a předložila jsem pozměňovací návrh, který nás, když bude schválen, vrací k jednacímu stolu. Neodcházíme od něj, dokud nebudeme mít v rukou text, se kterým budeme moci s čistým svědomím předstoupit před naše občany a říci jim, že jsme dvojí kvalitu skutečně postavili mimo zákon. Jak to udělat, jsem navrhla. Dvojí kvalita musí být nekalá praktika. Ať se značí stejně jenom to, co je opravdu stejné, a spotřebitel ať má na první pohled jasno, co kupuje. Žádné úlitby byznysu!

Kolegyně a kolegové, neměňte, prosím, pod tlakem svůj názor, který jsme už jednou vyslovili, a to dvojí kvalitu zakázat. V sázce je důvěryhodnost evropských institucí, Evropské unie jako celku, já myslím, že toto není málo.

Dita Charanzová (ALDE). – Pane předsedající, na tomto našem posledním zasedání jsme mohli a měli udělat definitivní tečku za debatami o stejném množství kakaa v čokoládě – abych si propůjčila příměr předsedy Evropské komise. To byl jeho jasný vzkaz. Pro mne jako poslankyni zvolenou za Českou republiku je výsledek zklamáním.

Nechci zde dnes hledat viníka, nechci říkat, která lobby zvítězila. Mohly to být tlaky některých států, mohl to být tlak těch, kteří plní regály méně kvalitním zbožím. Umíme ale přesně říct, kdo je poraženým. Je to spotřebitel, zákazník z východní Evropy.

Na stole dnes máme materiál, který rozmělnil tvrdý a nesmlouvavý postup vůči těm, kdo nás na východě Evropy zásobují, teď se omlouvám za ten výraz, šunty. Je dobře, že po mnohaletých debatách máme na stole novou, konkrétní legislativu, která se o to snaží. Seznam možných výjimek pro výrobce z ní ale dělá legislativu měkkou, symbolickou, spíše než právo, které by nás před nekalými praktikami obchodníků skutečně dokázalo chránit. Dáváme výrobcům do rukou možnosti, jak si opět obhájit různé složení a tedy různou kvalitu výrobků. A to například i včetně výmluv na různé chuťové preference zákazníků. Proto žádám kolegy, aby zítra podpořili naše pozměňovací návrhy a ukončili tím praxi, kdy máme v Evropě dva druhy spotřebitelů.

(Řečnice souhlasila s tím, že odpoví na otázku položenou zvednutím modré karty (čl. 162 odst. 8 jednacího řádu)).

Michaela Šojdrová (PPE), otázka položená zvednutím modré karty. – Já jsem nakonec dala tuto modrou kartu a chci položit otázku paní kolegyni. Nezdá se Vám, že používáte zbytečně silná slova? Vy víte dobře, kolik let se tady hovoří o tom, že dvojitá kvalita potravin, ale i dalšího zboží se musí stát nekalou praktikou. A byla to teprve tato Evropská komise, tato komisařka, která to prosadila jako téma jednání, nebyl to pan předseda Juncker. Byli to poslanci, byly to aktivity, které byly i zde. Já se Vás chci zeptat, jestli myslíte zcela vážně tu kritiku, kterou jste tady předložila.

Dita Charanzová (ALDE), odpověď na otázku položenou zvednutím modré karty. – Vážená paní kolegyně, jak jsem řekla, já jsem zklamaná z toho výsledku. Ano, tento parlament několik let bojoval za to, abychom navždy dali stopku dvojím metru, dvojitým zákazníkům, spotřebitelům v Evropě. To, co já vidím, není text, který chtěl Evropský parlament, není to pozice mého výboru, za který jsem hlasovala a kterou jsem chtěla dosáhnout. Takže já jsem zklamaná.

Kateřina Konečná (GUE/NGL). – Pane předsedající, před rokem nám zde všichni počínaje Komisí slibovali zrušení dvojí kvality věcí na trhu EU. Výsledný text však svědčí o opaku a zachovává současný trestuhodný stav. Z textu navíc pod tlakem přímo nevolené Komise vypadl i minimální požadavek na označování rozdílného složení. Zdůrazňuji, že se tak stalo až po závěrečném trialogu, netransparentně a v zákulisí.

Musím vás tedy varovat, že pokud dojde ke schválení směrnice v předloženém znění, bude to občany ČR vnímáno velmi negativně. A to tak, že na jedné straně nám nutí EU řadu kontroverzních povinností, na té druhé si z nás však západní země dělají zcela nepokryté popelnici. Hrozí, že zemím střední a východní Evropy tak nezbyde nic jiného, než přijmout vlastní národní legislativu, a to i za cenu konfliktu s právem EU. Prosím proto, podpořte naše pozměňovací návrhy, které vrací do textu původně vyjednaný kompromis a bojují proti této ostudné praxi dvojí kvality. Jestli se výsledek zpozdí o pár měsíců, je v tuto chvíli jedno. Protože řekneme všem občanům Evropské unie, že jsou si rovni. A o to v tom pozměňovacím návrhu jde.

Dubravka Šuica (PPE). – Poštovní předsedávající, drago mi je da je u ovu raspravu o Direktivi o pravilima Evropske unije o zaštiti potrošača uključena i tema dvostruke kvalitete proizvoda. Na nekoliko pitanja Komisiji o diskriminaciji potrošača i razlikama proizvoda na zapadu i istoku te pisanih izjava o tim razlikama dobila sam odgovor Komisije da su razlike rezultat ukusa potrošača i poslovnih strategija.

Nezadovoljna takvom pozicijom Komisije, pokrenula sam, uz podršku 44 zastupnika interpelaciju o razlikama u deklaracijama, sastavu i okusu proizvoda na tržištu EU-a. Također sam, uz podršku kolega pokrenula i prijedlog akta Unije kojim smo tražili reviziju zakonodavstva o hrani u Europskoj uniji i ukidanje diskriminacije. Kao rezultat ovih aktivnosti uslijedila je rasprava na plenarnoj sjednici koju sam zajedno s češkom kolegicom Šojdrovom potkrijepila organiziranjem kušanja hrvatskih, njemačkih i čeških proizvoda pod naslovom „Okusi razliku”.

Vjerujem da Europska komisija i sam Juncker, potaknut našim pritiscima u travnju prošle godine, predložio novi sporazum za potrošače *New Deal*, s ciljem uspostavljanja jednakih standarda za sve potrošače u skladu s pravom Evropske unije. Pozicija Parlamenta je jasna, to smo pokazali glasovanjem još u rujnu, no budući da tekst koji je postignut na trijalogu nije zadovoljavajući, supotpisala sam amandmane kojima želimo poboljšati tekst i konačno osigurati jednaku kvalitetu za sve građane Evropske unije.

Apeliram na sve kolege da prihvate ove amandmane jer za mene je i ovo borba protiv Europe dviju brzina. Bit će mi žao ako Europski parlament većinom glasova ne potvrdi ove amandmane jer će ostati i dalje gorak okus da svi ne žele Europu jednakih građana.

Dakle, protiv sam dvostrukih standarda, protivim se razlikama na istoku i zapadu i podsjećam da je sam gospodin Juncker nekoliko puta ovdje rekao da Europa treba disati jednim plućima, jednako i s desnim i s lijevim, jednako s oba plućna krila. I molim vas da vodite o tome računa sutra, prilikom glasovanja.

Maria Grapini (S&D). – Domnule prešedinte, stimați colegi, este clar că era nevoie să modificăm directivele. Și actuala propunere modifică, de fapt, patru directive: practici comerciale neloiale, drepturile consumatorului, clauze contractuale abuzive și indicarea prețurilor. Sigur, majoritatea modificărilor sunt în primele două directive. Este nevoie, într-adevăr, să avem o calitate a produselor unică în piața internă, să respectăm consumatorii, indiferent unde trăiesc.

Trebuie să spunem, în același timp, că, da, s-au făcut câteva modificări bune și nu le putem ignora. Mă refer aici la dreptul consumatorului de a renunța la contract, la dreptul consumatorului de a avea o despăgubire. Evident că, în compromis, nu s-a ajuns la ceea ce mulți dintre noi de aici ne doream, și anume, să fie mai clar precizat ce se întâmplă cu calitatea duală. Pentru că, da, mi s-a prezentat aici o modificare a articolului 6 din directivă, însă, introducându-se acele excepții, a slăbit foarte mult din puterea acestui articol 6.

Sigur că avem o clauză de revizuire și poate să fie o soluție și eu îndemn acum – nu suntem foarte mulți aici – colegii să mediteze ce e mai bine: să respingem sau să votăm și să așteptăm clauza de revizuire. Toți vrem o calitate bună pentru toți consumatorii.

Michaela Šojdrová (PPE). – Pane předsedající, já jsem přesvědčena o tom, že tato směrnice jako celek je přínosem pro spotřebitele. Přispěje k jejich ochraně před nekalými praktikami, se kterými se potýkají ve všech členských státech, včetně agresivního podomního prodeje, falešných placených recenzí na internetu, skrytých reklam při vyhledávání zboží, klamavých slev či podvodného prodeje vstupenek na kulturní a sportovní akce.

Za nejdůležitější část považuji výslovné zařazení dvojí kvality mezi nekalé obchodní praktiky. Jsem hrdá na to, že tento úspěch je do velké míry právě českou stopou. Děkuji paní kolegyni Sehnalové, že dlouhodobě upozorňovala na tento problém a měla tyto aktivity i zde v Evropském parlamentu, Marianu Jurečkovi, bývalému ministrovi zemědělství, který toto téma prosazoval na Radě, a děkuji paní komisařce, která tento návrh připravila a předložila v Evropské komisi.

Tato úprava není dokonalá. Souhlasím s kolegy a kolegyněmi, že by bylo třeba postoupit dále k přesnější definici, ale máme zde prostor po dvouleté kontrole, revizi, po implementaci této směrnice, abychom se k ní vrátili a ty části, které nebudou fungovat, bude možné revidovat. Je to výslovně v této směrnici obsaženo. Myslím, že je to krok správným směrem. Podpořím pozměňovací návrhy, ale pokud neprojdou, podpořím směrnici jako celek, protože je důležité, aby se konečně začaly tyto praktiky potírat.

Biljana Borzan (S&D). – Poštovani predsjedavajući, prije šest godina, kada sam počela raditi na problemu različite kvalitete proizvoda činilo se poprilično nevjerojatnim da ćemo danas imati zakon kojim se ova nepravedna praksa zabranjuje. To je rezultat šest godina uvjeravanja, izvješća, istraživanja, preporuka.

Sada više nitko neće moći tvrditi da na primjer Hrvati ili Bugari baš, eto, žele hranu koja je manje zdrava, ili baš žele tehničku robu koja je lošije kvalitete ili deterdžent koji slabije pere.

Za milijune građana Europske unije ovo je izuzetno emotivno pitanje. Osjećali smo se kao građani drugog reda zbog ovoga, i to s pravom. Ovim zakonom Parlament pokazuje da nema podjele na istok i zapad i da smo jedna Europa. Moramo biti svi isti. Ne smijemo nikako dopustiti ovakvu praksu. Ravnopravnost je izuzetno važna. Danas šaljemo takvu poruku cijeloj Europi.

Jiří Pospíšil (PPE). – Pane předsedající, já jsem také zklamán z kompromisu, který byl uzavřen na trialogu. Jsem přesvědčený, že ten kompromis v praxi nepovede k potírání dvojí kvality potravin. Skončíme u interpretace, co znamená dvojí, rozsáhlá nebo přímo podstatné odlišení složení a znaků, skončíme u soudních přestřelek a ti, co vyrábějí pod stejným názvem dvojí potraviny různé kvality, se tomu budou smát. Uvidíte, že takový bude výsledek.

Paní komisařko, jsem přesvědčený, klidně se s Vámi vsadím, že ta právní úprava, pokud nakonec projde, tak nikoho reálně nepotrestá a skončí se při výkladu neurčitých právních pojmů, kterými je ta kompromisní definice zahlcena. Já jsem byl také pro, aby se jasně řeklo, že dvojí kvalita potravin je nekalá obchodní praktika bez dalšího. Takovéto rozvolňování povede pouze k tomu, že bohaté firmy, které tuto praktiku dělají, si s týmy právníků budou schopny najít cestičku, jak své nekvalitní zboží dále ve východní Evropě prodávat. Jsem z toho smutný, nesouhlasím s tím, pouze mohu konstatovat, že bohužel česká vláda tento kompromisní materiál podpořila, tím trochu vrazila dýku do zad vlastním občanům.

Byl bych strašně rád, kdyby materiál, který připravily dámy poslankyně a který jsem spolupodepsal, zítra prošel a otevřel tak šanci jasně říci, že kdo má a vyrábí výrobky pod stejným názvem různé kvality, takovou věc dělat nesmí. Je to nekalá obchodní praktika bez zkoumání, jak jsou ty rozdíly velké, kde je míra onoho podstatného rozdílu a kde nikoliv. Takže prosím o podporu návrhu paní Sehnalové.

Διαδικασία «Catch-the-Eye»

Cristian-Silviu Bușoi (PPE). – Mr President, I know that the negotiations were difficult and it is not easy to find a good balance between the need to enforce better consumer rights and the need for businesses to be competitive and efficient. It is true that, for the first time, there are concrete references in the legislation regarding double standards and Member States can take coercive measures. But we should be more ambitious and double standards should be better addressed in our legislation as these practices are undermining the trust of European citizens, mainly from central and eastern European countries, in our common market.

So tomorrow we should support the amendment by my colleague, Róza Gräfin von Thun und Hohenstein, which is the same text that was voted initially in the Committee on the Internal Market and Consumer Protection (IMCO) and, with this, the legislation will be better improved.

Maria Gabriela Zoană (S&D). – Domnule președinte, doamnă comisar, dublul standard există și trebuie să recunoaștem lucrul acesta, să facem orice să îl eliminăm. Indiferent ce argumente se aduc pentru dublul standard, indiferent dacă noi considerăm sau dumneavoastră considerați că gusturile europenilor din est diferă de gusturile europenilor din vest, vă spun foarte clar, domnule președinte, vă spun foarte clar, doamna comisar, europenii din est s-au săturat să aibă produse de calitate inferioară. Ne-am săturat să avem produse alimentare de calitate inferioară, ne-am săturat să avem produse vestimentare de calitate inferioară și ne-am săturat să avem mașini de calitate inferioară, autoturisme inferioare față de cele din piața vestică.

Vă asigur că toți europenii din fostul bloc comunist de 30 de ani s-au obișnuit cu calitatea, s-au obișnuit cu gustul democrației, nici pe departe cu gusturi inferioare europenilor din vest. Nu ne mai putem permite să ne mințim singuri și nu mai putem permite nimănui să ne mintă. Produsele destinate pieței vestice trebuie să aibă aceeași calitate ca produsele destinate pieței din est. Nu suntem inferiori, discriminarea în interiorul Uniunii Europene trebuie să înceteze.

Νότης Μαριάς (ECR). – Κύριε Πρόεδρε, η προστασία των καταναλωτών απαιτεί να μην υπάρχουν διπλά στάνταρτς, να μην υπάρχει η έννοια της διπλής ποιότητας, ώστε να μην έχουμε διάκριση εις βάρος των καταναλωτών, ιδίως στην Ανατολική Ευρώπη. Ταυτόχρονα, προστασία των καταναλωτών σημαίνει προστασία του εμπορικού σήματος και της εμπορικής επωνυμίας, ιδίως των επιχειρήσεων εντός της Ευρωπαϊκής Ένωσης, έναντι αθέμιτων πρακτικών από επιχειρήσεις τρίτων χωρών. Αυτό ισχύει ιδίως για τα ελληνικά προϊόντα, τα οποία είναι υψηλής ποιότητας και χρησιμοποιούν τον διακριτικό τίτλο «Μακεδονικό», όπως π.χ. «Μακεδονικό κρασί» ή «Μακεδονικός χαλβάς», και υφίστανται σήμερα έναν αθέμιτο ανταγωνισμό από την πλευρά των Σκοπίων, που χρησιμοποιούν και αυτά την ονομασία «Μακεδονικός», με αποτέλεσμα να δημιουργείται μια τεράστια πρόκληση και —ταυτόχρονα— σύγχυση.

Γι' αυτό κυρία Επιτροпе, κυρία Jourová, απαιτείται η Ευρωπαϊκή Επιτροπή να στηρίξει τα ελληνικά προϊόντα, τα οποία είναι κατοχυρωμένα εδώ και χρόνια, είναι υψηλής ποιότητας και φέρουν τον τίτλο «Μακεδονικό». Αυτό είναι ένα σοβαρό θέμα και πρέπει η Επιτροπή να το εξετάσει.

Anna Záborská (PPE). – Vážený pán predsedajúci, pre Slovensko a ďalšie krajiny východnej Európy je otázka dvojakej kvality výrobkov dôležitá. Testy totiž ukázali, že mnoho firiem ponúka v našom regióne pod rovnakým názvom výrobky s iným zložením a často aj nižšej kvality.

Viem, že nie je jednoduché dosiahnuť dohodu, ale návrh predbežnej dohody, o ktorej máme zajtra hlasovať, nie je dobrý. Musím priznať, že som veľmi prekvapená, že dáva Európskej komisii dva roky nato, aby zase len posudzovala aktuálny stav. A až potom – ak vôbec – navrhne zakázať predaj výrobkov rôznej kvality pod jedným názvom.

My pritom vieme, že takéto praktiky sa dejú a ľudia s nimi nie sú spokojní. Preto budem hlasovať za pozmeňujúce návrhy, ktoré takéto praktiky zakážu. Na spoločnom európskom trhu sa kvalita nesmie merať podľa dvojakej metry.

Момчил Неков (S&D). – Г-н Председател, за мен като гражданин на държава членка, която се е присъединила сравнително скоро, е изключително важно, че темата с двойния стандарт ще намери своя справедлив край в рамките на този мандат. Това е огромен успех за моята политическа група на социалисти и демократи.

По-специално бих искал да поздравя своите колеги Олга Сехналова и Биляна Борзан. Особено заради Олга битката срещу двойния стандарт беше поведена в Европейския парламент. Не е логично единният пазар да се прилага под формата на задължения и изисквания, но да няма единен пазар на предлагането на еднакви продукти. Самият факт, че има доказани случаи на разлики, доказва, че в Европейския съюз няма свободно движение на стоки и услуги, а селективно таква.

Призовавам българските органи в най-кратки срокове да започнат процедура по транспониране на директивата. След над 10 години еврочленство няма как да твърдим, че няма Европа на две скорости, ако липсва законодателство, което да се бори срещу това.

Mihai Țurcanu (PPE). – Domnule președinte, dragi colegi, anumite prevederi din raportul colegului Dalton nu fac decât să steargă cu buretele toată munca pe care eu, împreună cu colega noastră, Olga Sehnalová și doamna Borzan, am făcut-o în ultimii doi ani pe raportul în ce privește dublul standard.

Românii și ceilalți consumatori din vestul Europei se vor întreba: ce face Europa pentru mine? De ce Europa își tratează diferit cetățenii? Dacă valorile pe care este clădită această Uniune sunt respectate egal de către noi toți, Europa de ce nu ne tratează egal? Nu este corect față de cetățenii care ne votează acasă și ne trimit aici pentru că au încredere că le vom apăra interesele. Ori vrem să apărăm doar interesele marilor comercianți, care își clădesc afaceri?

Îmi este rușine că sub președinția țării mele s-a agreat ca românii să fie tratați ca cetățeni de mâna a doua, pentru că îmi pare că ei nu au știut ce pun pe hârtie. Dreptul comerciantului de a adapta produse de aceeași marcă pe diferite piețe geografice datorită unor factori legitimi mi se pare o mare jignire.

Stanislav Polčák (PPE). – Pane předsedající, kdo z nás by preferoval zmrzlinu, která je vyrobena z náhražky, ale nikoliv ze smetany, když je uváděna pod stejným obalem? Toto jsou skutečné příklady, které na jednotném vnitřním trhu v Evropě vidíme. Nebo kolový nápoj, který má nejpodřadnější formu sladidla namísto toho jiného, který je uváděn na trh ve výborné kvalitě. Myslím si, že tyto nešvary musíme potírat, a myslím, že jsme šli velmi dobrým směrem díky paní kolegyni Sehnalové a dalším.

Rovná práva, to nemůže být jenom planý pojem. Dvojitá kvalita v Evropě nemůže existovat. Jde proti pravidlům vnitřního trhu. Nemáme Evropany dvojitou metru, dvojitou kvalitu nebo druhé kategorie!

Myslím si, že je dobře, že jsme se dostali až do této fáze, kdy se máme rozhodnout o pozměňovacích návrzích. Já jsem je podepsal a podporuji je. Je mi líto, že česká vláda bohužel podpořila ten kompromis, který podle mého názoru rozvolňuje ty definice a je nepochybně zhoršením práv spotřebitele, a je důležité se vrátit k těm pozměňovacím návrhům. Já vás prosím o jejich podporu.

(Λήξη της διαδικασίας «Catch-the-Eye»)

Věra Jourová, členka Komise. – Vážený pane předsedající, vážené paní poslankyně, vážení páni poslanci, něco mě má k tomu, abych na závěr hovořila česky. Z dobrých důvodů, protože si myslím, že to, jak jsem přistoupila k řešení dvojí kvality potravin, trošku pramenilo z toho, že jsem česká občanka, kterou to také upřímně štve, když vidí na pultech ve své zemi méně kvalitní zboží než někde v zahraničí.

Kde jsme byli před rokem a půl? Objela jsem řadu zemědělských rad, Radu COMPET, řadu členských zemí a slyšela jsem hodně velké pochybnosti o tom, jestli ten problém vůbec existuje. A zároveň jsem slyšela hlasy z Evropského parlamentu, paní Sehnalovou, paní Borzanovou, další kolegy, kteří léta hlasitě vysvětlovali totéž, že problém existuje, že to není kvazi výmysl někoho, kdo nemá jiné problémy a tak dále. Hodně jsme si toho vyslechli.

To, že dnes máme na stole směrnici, která uznává, že problém existuje, a je to směrnice o neférových obchodních praktikách, to si myslím, že je posun. Kde jsme také byli před rokem a půl? Měla jsem na stole testy z osmi členských zemí, které byly udělány podle různých metodik. Velmi tvrdě jsem jednala se zástupci průmyslu, *food and drink industry*, zástupci asociace značek a slyšela jsem argumenty: No ale ty testy jsou použity různým způsobem, jablka, hrušky a tak dále, nedá se to srovnávat, není to relevantní, nebudeme se tím zabývat. Takže jsme udělali metodiku, investovali jsme do ní, teď testujeme druhou řadu vytipovaných produktů členských zemí a zjišťujeme, že zhruba dvacet až třicet procent produktů má ty významné rozdíly, na které směřujeme touto směrnicí. Metodika, kterou jsme připravili, zároveň říká, jak mají inspekce, ať jsou to potravinové nebo obchodní – my neříkáme státům, kdo se tou věcí má zabývat, takže já budu říkat inspekce –, jak tedy mají inspekce sbírat z různých zemí vzorky a porovnávat je a podrobit ty vzorky testování. Tam jsme dneska, my máme tu metodiku hotovou a dá se říci, že se podle ní dá pokračovat.

Na vaše argumenty: Almette, co tady ještě bylo, čokoláda, zmrzlina, no to jsou přece ty věci, na které se zaměřujeme, které nám tak vadí a kde bychom měli důvěřovat těm inspekcím, že vysbírají vzorky, podrobí je testování a řeknou jasně, že méně kakaa v čokoládě je ošizená potravinou a nemůže se pokračovat, že mléčný prášek místo smetany je ošizená potravinou, které musí zmizet z trhu a tak dále. To jsou přece ty věci, které se dají podle této směrnice řešit, to jsou ty věci, které lidem vadí.

Věřme trochu více těm, kteří dělají dohled nad trhem, že po těch případech půjdou případ od případu a budou dostatečně odvážní aplikovat tuhle novou směrnici. Pan doktor Pospíšil hovořil o neurčitých právních pojmech, to je samozřejmě riziko u každé legislativy. Představte si, kdybychom to charakterizovali tak, že budeme potírat různou kvalitu, no tak s kvalitou jako pojmem se vůbec nedalo pracovat.

Uvědomme si, že toto není směrnice, která mluví jenom o potravinách, která ale zároveň mluví o produktech jako takových. Tím, že jsem si tu věc stáhla k sobě jako spotřebitelská komisařka, tím jsem to vlastně rozprostřela na všechny produkty. Mimochodem teď začneme dělat metodiku testování pro drogistické zboží. Takže se bavíme i o automobilech, o stavebních hmotách, o řadě dalších produktů. Proto jsme museli nějakým způsobem definovat, co vlastně je ta neférová obchodní praktika. Takže věřme, prosím pěkně, našim inspekcím, že po těch případech půjdou a budou spravedlivě měřit *case by case* a budou ty věci sankcionovat.

Já se samozřejmě zabývám i tím, co se děje v mé zemi. Víím, že ministr zemědělství se k té věci chce postavit čelem. Orgány, které mají dohled nad trhem, se připravují na to, že budou pomáhat s příslušnou národní legislativou tak, aby se ta věc dala aplikovat v praxi. Je tady jedna další věc, kde jsme nebyli před rokem a půl – informovanost. Pan Škripek tady říkal, ať se více zapojí aktivní občané. To je přesně to, co se teď nedá udělat, protože ani občané, které to štve a kteří mají jenom podezření, ale nemají důkazy, ani řetězce a maloobchodníci nevědí, že ten producent má pod stejnou značkou různé složení. Tato směrnice je nutí k tomu, aby o tom informovali a v případech, že si dovolí takovou věc, že tam je různé složení, tak budou muset prokazovat proč.

Ošizení výrobku není objektivní a ospravedlnitelný rozdíl. Prostě pro mě to tak není. A věřím tomu, že to tak nebude ani pro ty inspekce. Takže pro mě, která jsem, jak víte, navrhla přísnější úpravu, a toto beru jako kompromis, jako umění možného, protože jak jsme slyšeli, většina členských států byla proti, jsou dvě cesty. Snažit se pomoci tomu, aby implementace v členských státech vedla k výsledku, abychom ošizené potraviny dostali z trhu, to je jedna věc, to znamená spravedlivý a odvážný dohled nad trhem. Odvážný v tom smyslu, že půjde v intencích směrnice, nepůjde za ni, ale bude důsledný. Za druhé, samozřejmě informovanost občanů a *retailu*, aby se dívali po tom, kde jsou jaké informace, které se vztahují k tomu kterému produktu. Samozřejmě třetí věc je možná revize, která se tam dostala, která umožní opravdu sledovat, jestli to je legislativa, která padá na úrodnou půdu, přináší výsledky, pokud uvidíme, že tam je využito případných mezer, tak se prostě bude muset zpřísnit.

Ale to nakročení je učiněno teď. Kdybychom to stáhli, tak nemáme nic a byli bychom tam, kde jsme byli před rokem a půl, což jsem tady před chvílí popsala. Ta konstelace, že budeme v takové koncentraci pracovat na stejném problému, ať už Evropský parlament, tak Komise – tady si dovolím poznamenat osobní poznámku, že já jsem použila veškerou kreativitu a naštvání sebe jako české spotřebitelky a že jsem přišla s tím návrhem –, nebylo to úplně jednoznačné, že bych to měla mít já na starost, ale ta konstelace tady byla. Teď bychom měli té věci dát průchod a sledovat a případně to zrevidovat.

Pro mě jsou tohle cesty pracovat s kompromisním řešením tak, aby to spotřebitel poznal. Pro mě není cesta říkat médiím, že je to další důkaz rozdílu mezi Západem a Východem, další příkop, další rozdělení, to se mi velice přičí tato argumentace, stejně jako se mi přičí argumentace, že střed a východ Evropy je žumpa nebo popelnice Evropy. Já si myslím, že tohle bychom si, dámy a pánové, mohli v naší rétorice odpustit. Omlouvám se, byla jsem velmi dlouhá, ale měla jsem toho hodně na srdci a děkuji vám za to, že jste mě vyslechli a věřím tomu, že být je to kompromis, že bude Evropským parlamentem nakonec schválen.

Daniel Dalton, Rapporteur. – Mr President, it is a big file, but 90% of the interventions have been on one issue, and I agree with what many of you have said on dual quality. That is why we managed to achieve a lot on it. This is a groundbreaking agreement for dual quality, but what I don't understand is why colleagues want to kill the whole agreement, including everything, because we didn't get an impossible demand through. It is simply not viable to demand the same in all countries; there are different taste preferences in different countries, different raw material availability, and it is not always worse because the ingredients are different. I'll give you an example: Coca-Cola in the UK is made with cane sugar; in Belgium and France, it is made with beet sugar. Who is being discriminated against? Please tell me: who has to lose the product they like in the industry that they have? I understand that your worry is about Eastern Europe. Well, in the Coke case, it is isoglucose, which is produced in Eastern Europe and is also the same thing they use in the US. So I ask my question again: which is the best product? Who is being discriminated against? If we passed that amendment, you would have to do this for every single product in the EU – millions upon millions of them. It is just not possible. It is also not possible to pass this amendment and go back to the negotiating table; there will be no negotiating table. The Council and the Commission have made it clear that they have given all they can, and they've given a lot. The time has now gone. It will also be clear to them that there was no point the Commission proposing anything on this, because the EP will take an unrealistic position, which will mean that, in the end, we have no deal. And then we will lose all of the following: what we did achieve on dual quality, on ranking transparency, on the block to the changes to the right of withdrawal, on banning bot selling, on marketplace transparency, on banning fake reviews, on price comparison services, transparency, and on the ability to levy penalties. Let's not throw all of that away.

Just before I finish, I want to thank the people in my office who worked on this: Cameron Smith, Alex Davis and Jonny Goff.

Πρόεδρος. – Η συζήτηση έληξε.

Η ψηφοφορία θα διεξαχθεί την Τετάρτη 17 Απριλίου 2019.

24. **Przejrzystość i zrównoważony charakter unijnej oceny ryzyka w łańcuchu żywnościowym (debata)**

Πρόεδρος. – Το επόμενο σημείο στην ημερήσια διάταξη είναι η συζήτηση επί της εκδήσεως της κ. Pilar Ayuso, εξ ονόματος της Επιτροπής Περιβάλλοντος, Δημόσιας Υγείας και Ασφάλειας των Τροφίμων, επί της προτάσεως κανονισμού του Ευρωπαϊκού Κοινοβουλίου και του Συμβουλίου για τη διαφάνεια και τη βιωσιμότητα της αξιολόγησης κινδύνου στην αλυσίδα τροφίμων στην ΕΕ και για την τροποποίηση του κανονισμού (ΕΚ) αριθ. 178/2002 [σχετικά με τη γενική νομοθεσία για τα τρόφιμα], της οδηγίας 2001/18/ΕΚ [για τη σκόπιμη ελευθέρωση ΓΤΟ στο περιβάλλον], του κανονισμού (ΕΚ) αριθ. 1829/2003 [για τα γενετικώς τροποποιημένα τρόφιμα και ζωοτροφές], του κανονισμού (ΕΚ) αριθ. 1831/2003 [για τις πρόσθετες ύλες στις ζωοτροφές], του κανονισμού (ΕΚ) αριθ. 2065/2003 [για τα αρτύματα καπνιστών τροφίμων], του κανονισμού (ΕΚ) αριθ. 1935/2004 [σχετικά με τα υλικά που έρχονται σε επαφή με τρόφιμα], του κανονισμού (ΕΚ) αριθ. 1331/2008 [για την ενιαία διαδικασία έγκρισης για τα πρόσθετα τροφίμων, τα ένζυμα τροφίμων και τις αρωματικές ύλες τροφίμων], του κανονισμού (ΕΚ) αριθ. 1107/2009 [σχετικά με τα φυτοπροστατευτικά προϊόντα] και του κανονισμού (ΕΕ) 2015/2283 [σχετικά με τα νέα τρόφιμα] (COM(2018)0179 - C8-0144/2018 - 2018/0088(COD)) (A8-0417/2018).

Pilar Ayuso, ponente. – Señor presidente, señor comisario, hoy me complace enormemente que, después de veinte años en este Parlamento, mi última intervención sea como ponente de un informe sobre la cadena alimentaria, ya que yo llegué aquí —hace veinte años, como he dicho— en plena crisis de las vacas locas y después de haber sido responsable de alimentación y de industria agroalimentaria en España.

Intervine activamente en el Reglamento que dio origen a la EFSA y he participado durante estos años ininterrumpidamente en toda la legislación alimentaria. Hoy puedo decir con conocimiento de causa que la Unión Europea tiene la legislación alimentaria más estricta del mundo y que somos un referente en cuanto a seguridad alimentaria. Puedo decir que nuestra industria alimentaria es excelente, innovadora y competitiva, y puedo decir que la EFSA, de la que soy persona de contacto de este Parlamento, desarrolla un magnífico trabajo desde su creación de acuerdo con la legislación vigente.

Sin embargo, se hacía necesario actualizar el Reglamento que la creó en 2002, no solo porque el tiempo nos ha puesto de manifiesto los puntos que eran mejorables, sino también porque los ciudadanos de la Unión Europea cada vez están más interesados en el proceso de determinación del riesgo de la cadena alimentaria y en la transparencia de los estudios científicos en los que se basa la toma de decisiones.

Solo tengo que lamentar que esta legislación se haya gestado precipitadamente, sin apenas tiempo para debatir y bajo una tremenda presión mediática, que no es el mejor escenario.

Pienso que llamar a este Reglamento «ley general alimentaria» es un tanto pretencioso porque solo aborda la cuestión de la transparencia. No podemos olvidar que nuestro sistema de seguridad alimentaria, la responsabilidad de la determinación del riesgo recae sobre la Autoridad, pero la gestión del riesgo no.

No obstante, no quiero quitar importancia al acuerdo al que hemos llegado; creo sinceramente que hemos conseguido nuestro objetivo de asegurarnos un procedimiento de toma de decisiones, basado en la evidencia científica, que mantenga un alto nivel de salud pública y seguridad en la Unión Europea.

Al mismo tiempo, creo que podemos generar un aumento de la confianza pública en la toma de decisiones al hacerlo más transparente. Para garantizar una mayor transparencia, los ciudadanos tendrán acceso inmediato a los estudios científicos, soportes de las solicitudes de autorización; es decir, la información no confidencial se publicará en el momento en que la aplicación sea considerada válida o admisible.

En relación con este espíritu de transparencia, se va a crear una base de datos para garantizar que las empresas presenten todos los estudios cuando soliciten una autorización y no dejen sin presentar aquellos que les sean desfavorables. Además, con ello, las empresas que incumplan esta obligación podrán ser penalizadas.

Con este acuerdo también hemos conseguido encontrar un equilibrio razonable entre la transparencia y los intereses de la industria para seguir fomentando la innovación en el sector alimentario de la Unión Europea; es decir, la divulgación de la información se hará sin perjuicio de los derechos de propiedad industrial o intelectual. Además, para evitar que dicha información sea utilizada con fines comerciales injustos, se han introducido ciertas salvaguardas en el momento de la divulgación de la información, como, por ejemplo, la trazabilidad.

En lo que respecta a la organización de la EFSA, no puedo sino alegrarme por dos motivos: primero, porque a partir de ahora el Parlamento va a tener dos representantes en su Junta Directiva, y, segundo, porque se va a aumentar la participación de los Estados miembros en las comisiones técnicas y científicas. Eso va a hacer que se involucren más estrechamente los científicos de todos los Estados miembros en los procedimientos de autorización.

En cuanto a la lista de elementos confidenciales, es importante que el proceso de fabricación o producción sea incluido como un elemento confidencial. También es necesario mantener que las ideas innovadoras sean incluidas en los elementos confidenciales.

Por último, la parte positiva de este acuerdo, que es la evaluación del riesgo, va a seguir basándose en la evidencia científica, pero, al mismo tiempo, va a mejorar la transparencia sobre la toma de decisiones. Solo lamento que no se haya homologado el proceso con los de la Agencia Europea del Medicamento o la Agencia Europea de Sustancias y Mezclas Químicas.

Y termino pidiendo un voto favorable para este acuerdo.

Jyrki Katainen, *Vice-President of the Commission*. – Mr President, the EU prides itself on having the most robust and efficient food safety system in the world. At the same time, European citizens are more and more interested in the food they eat and where it comes from. Our citizens are understandably sensitive about risk-assessment and risk-management decisions in the food chain.

So, it is not surprising that EU citizens have called for additional reassurances on the safety of their food. The findings of the recent fitness check of the General Food Law and the European citizens' initiative in relation to glyphosate bear witness to that.

But before going any further, let me first congratulate the European Parliament and the Council. The positive outcome of the interinstitutional negotiations on the Commission's proposal for the regulation on the transparency and sustainability of the EU risk assessment in the food chain is an important step.

Both co-legislators have shown a clear commitment to this important fight, following an open intense and constructive exchange. You have managed to reach a provisional agreement on this Commission proposal in a record time of 10 months. This provisional agreement on the EU transparency rules is a significant stepping stone to meeting citizens' expectations for more transparency in the risk assessment of the food chain.

Allow me to elaborate on the agreements' main features and briefly explain its objectives. The provisional agreement is a revision of the EU food safety system, with the focus on transparency. Greater transparency of the risk assessment process will contribute to the legitimacy of the European Food Safety Authority (EFSA). It will increase consumer confidence in the risk assessment system and it will ensure that EFSA is more accountable to EU citizens. With this goal in mind, the provisional agreement provides for the pro-active public disclosure of all scientific studies and data supporting a request for a scientific output. This takes place early in the risk assessment process once an the application has been considered valid or admissible.

This disclosure is more closely linked with two other proposed actions: public consultation on submitted studies and the notification of commissioned studies to support application for authorisation in a database that will be established and managed by EFSA. These measures will ensure that EFSA can access the relevant scientific evidence before it drafts its scientific opinion. Enhanced public scrutiny will also serve to strengthen consumer trust in the risk assessment process.

At the same time, the original agreement bears in mind the need to maintain the competitiveness of the EU food and feed sector. In order to stimulate innovation, the provisional agreement sets out safeguards for the protection of justifiable confidential information. Similarly, the provisional agreement respects existing intellectual property rights, data exclusivity rules and the protection of personal data. Not only is this a crucial ingredient in stimulating innovation, but it is also essential for the global recognition of European product safety.

Furthermore, to assist applicants and, most importantly, small and medium-sized enterprises the provisional agreement introduces the possibility for EFSA to provide pre-submission advice. This advice will facilitate the better understanding of the application process and make life easier for our innovators.

In order to ensure trade transparency and EFSA's long term sustainability, Member States will be represented on the EFSA management board. The management board of EFSA will also include two members appointed by the European Parliament. As the Honourable Members are aware, this deviates from the common approach of Parliament, the Council and the Commission on decentralised agencies of 19 July 2012. The Commission will be transmitting a statement to the European Parliament regretting this deviation. Similarly, and without jeopardising EFSA's independence, Member States will be more actively involved in ensuring the presence of experts on EFSA's scientific panels.

It is important that strong, clear messaging on risks is available to our citizens. The provisional agreement recognises this and aims to improve our communication on risks. The agreement lays the foundation for a comprehensive and effective risk-communication strategy. This will ensure that the message will be clear, comprehensive and consistent regardless of whether it comes from the Commission, EFSA or Member States.

I commend the House on for its active commitment, engagement and dedication in reaching the provisional agreement. I look forward to the positive outcome of the plenary vote.

Commission statements

(in writing)

The Commission welcomes the political agreement reached by the European Parliament and the Council on the proposal for a Regulation on the transparency and sustainability of the EU risk assessment in the food chain.

However, the Commission regrets that the co-legislators have decided to deviate from the Common Approach of the Parliament, the Council and the Commission on decentralised agencies of 19 July 2012.

In particular, the Commission regrets the deviation from the Common Approach with regard to the composition of the Management Board of the European Food Safety Authority (number of members designated by the European Parliament).

This deviation should not be considered as a precedent for other agencies.

Ricardo Serrão Santos, *relator de parecer da Comissão das Pescas*. – Senhor Presidente, Senhor Comissário, quero desde já agradecer e felicitar pelo excelente trabalho efetuado por todos os envolvidos nas negociações, em particular aos diferentes relatores. Lamento não me focar nos muitos aspetos positivos, mas só tenho um minuto. Tenho que alertar para o facto de a produção de alimentos do mar e oceanos continuar a não ser considerada ao mesmo nível da produção agrícola ou industrial.

Apesar das alterações efetuadas, o Conselho de Administração da EFSA continua a não ter nenhum representante de produtos da pesca e aquacultura. Esta questão é tanto mais importante quanto quase 70 % destes produtos que são consumidos na União são importados de países terceiros, pelo que há que garantir que seguem os nossos elevados padrões de produção e de segurança alimentar.

Além disso, os oceanos estão a ser chamados a contribuir para uma alimentação mais saudável num planeta onde a obesidade e um conjunto de doenças associadas se tornaram o novo estigma, com elevados custos financeiros e responsável por mais mortes do que a fome e subalimentação à escala planetária.

Angélique Delahaye, *au nom du groupe PPE*. – Monsieur le Président, Monsieur le Commissaire, chers collègues, tout au long de cette mandature, nous avons vu à quel point la question liée aux pesticides, aux procédures d'autorisation, à l'alimentation est de plus en plus prégnante dans l'actualité de nos concitoyens. Ces derniers veulent savoir comment le système européen fonctionne et il est de notre devoir, en tant qu'élus et législateurs, de répondre à cette demande.

Le texte que nous avons sur la table répond en grande partie à cette problématique en rendant nos procédures plus claires et plus transparentes. Il permettra également, je l'espère, de restaurer la confiance de nos concitoyens dans nos agences et dans nos prises de décision. La question centrale est bien évidemment le moment de publication des données. L'équilibre entre la recherche de la transparence et la protection de la recherche et de l'innovation au sein de l'Union européenne n'est pas si évident que cela à trouver. N'oublions pas que nos entreprises et nos PME font face à la concurrence mondiale, il est donc essentiel de leur permettre de garder un train d'avance en matière de développement et d'innovation. Je tiens donc à saluer le travail de notre rapporteure, Pilar Ayuso, et de l'ensemble des rapporteurs fictifs.

Enfin, je souhaite, une dernière fois avant de la fin de ce mandat, rappeler mon attachement à ce que les décisions que nous prenons se fondent toujours sur des bases scientifiques solides, seules aptes à nous permettre d'avoir des positions incontestables afin de ne pas accentuer les peurs alimentaires, dont certains se servent à des fins politiciennes et électorales. Pour cela, l'indépendance et le bon fonctionnement de nos agences, notamment l'Autorité européenne de sécurité alimentaire, sont fondamentaux.

ELNÖKÖL: LÍVIA JÁRÓKA

alelnök

Miriam Dalli, *on behalf of the S&D Group*. – Madam President, we all remember the scandal around the chemical industries' pressure to get glyphosate-based pesticides approved. It got a lot of coverage and a lot of discussions going on, and this legislation was the response to that scandal. I am glad to say that this was an initiative that shows that the European Union heard the citizens' voice and Parliament is reacting to the European Citizens' Initiative to ban glyphosate and protect people from toxic pesticides.

We have been calling for a more transparent and independent system. We have succeeded in promoting timely public access to information held by the European Food Safety Authority (EFSA). This will increase control over the process of authorising substances that we unwittingly consume in our diet, whether these be pesticides, GMOs, food additives, food contact materials or flavourings. Thanks to the new rules on the active and early disclosure of information during the risk assessment, EFSA opens its doors to citizens and their scrutiny of data provided by the industry. Any information relevant to safety assessment will always be disclosed to the public.

The S&D Group's aim was to stop fraudulent practices such as concealing of unfavourable studies and data or buying favourable results, and we succeeded. We want no more glyphosate-type cases in the European Union; no more decisions behind closed doors and no more gambling with people's health. In today's world where the driving force is money, the only hope for citizens is to have a robust system of authorisation that will be sufficiently resistant to external pressure. I am glad that our Group has proved that we put consumers' health and rights above any commercial interests.

Anja Hazekamp, *namens de GUE/NGL-Fractie*. – Voorzitter, al decennialang bepalen bedrijven als Bayer, Monsanto en Syngenta hoeveel van hun landbouwgif op onze akkers, velden en voedsel terecht komt. De gevolgen zijn duidelijk zichtbaar: bijensterfte, biodiversiteitsverlies, vervuiling van bodem en water, gezondheidsschade bij mens en dier, en boeren die niet eens meer weten hoe ze voedsel kunnen produceren zonder chemische stoffen.

De landbouwgifmengers komen hiermee weg dankzij slappe wetgeving, belangenconflicten bij de Europese Autoriteit voor voedselveiligheid, procedures die gebaseerd zijn op vooringenomen studies van de industrie en achterkamertjespolitiek.

Met het openbaar maken van de industriestudies brengen we een kleine verbetering aan, maar het is nog lang niet genoeg. Gisteren nog werden opnieuw ruim dertig bewezen gevaarlijke pesticiden toegelaten zonder evaluatie of herbeoordeling. Dat kan toch niet waar zijn!

Commissaris, wanneer gaat u het voorzorgsbeginsel nu écht hanteren, in plaats van de aandelenkoersen van Bayer en Syngenta?

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

Martin Häusling, *im Namen der Verts/ALE-Fraktion*. – Frau Präsidentin, liebe Kolleginnen und Kollegen! Ja, heute ist ein guter Tag für Europa, weil wir die Gelegenheit haben, Vertrauen zurückzugewinnen, das im Zulassungsprozess für Glyphosat verlorengegangen ist. Ich darf mich ganz herzlich bei den 1,3 Millionen Bürgern bedanken, die unterschrieben haben für eine Bürgerinitiative „Stoppt Glyphosat“, die diesen Prozess möglich gemacht haben, dass jetzt in den Zulassungsprozess der Chemikalien Transparenz einkehrt, vor allem in Europa.

Wir wissen, dass das Thema Glyphosat ja nicht beendet ist. Das war ja der Auslöser, denn Glyphosat steht auch heute noch in der Kritik. Wir sehen gerade in den USA, dass die Bedenken ernst zu nehmen sind, und wir werden sehen, was bei einem neuen Zulassungsprozess herauskommt.

Was wir jetzt erreicht haben, ist: Es gibt Zugang zu allen Studien, jeder kann da reinschauen. Es müssen alle Studien veröffentlicht werden, also auch die, die vielleicht nicht im Interesse eines Unternehmens sind, und die EFSA kann selber überprüfen. Das sind große Schritte nach vorn, und es ist ein großer Schritt, dass Bürgerinteressen, Umweltinteressen vor Konzerninteressen gehen. Deshalb freuen wir uns über diese Vereinbarung, die wir getroffen haben, und stimmen dem zu.

Sirpa Pietikäinen (PPE). – Arvoisa puhemies, innovaatiot tai liikesalaisuudet tai yritysten ostamat tutkimusten eivät koskaan voi mennä kansanterveyden edelle. Siksi tämä saavutettu sopu ruokatuotteisiin liittyvien tutkimusten läpinäkyvyydestä on niin olennaisen tärkeä. Mitä monimutkaisemmaksi ruokajärjestelmämme käyvät ja mitä enemmän tietoa meillä on ruokaan vaikuttavista osasista, kuten hormonihäiriköistä, eri kemikaalien kulkeutumismekanismeista tai vaikkapa nanomuoveista, sitä enemmän tarvitsemme monialaista tutkimusta, sen julkistamista ja yleistä arviota siitä, mitä voimme pitää turvallisena ja terveellisenä ruokana. Siihen tämä lainsäädäntö tähtää ja siihen itse asiassa aika rujolla tavalla tämä glyfosaattitapaus ajoi Euroopan unionin – niin neuvoston, parlamentin, kuin komission omalta osaltaan – kun tiedot uusista arvioista, jotka olivat täysin ristiriitaisia kansainvälisen terveysjärjestön arvioiden kanssa, jäivät siltä erää salaisiksi. Nyt tämä asia on kunnossa. Seuraavat askeleet liittyvät siihen, miten EFSA veloitetaan käyttämään varovaisuusperiaatetta nykyistä paremmin ruokariskejä arvioidessa ja tutkimuksia tilatessa.

Cristian-Silviu Buşoi (PPE). – Madam President, I would like first to congratulate Commissioner Andriukaitis and the whole European Commission for the excellent proposal, and our colleague, Madam Pilar Ayuso, for the comprehensive report.

It is extremely important for the European Union to regain citizens' trust and maximise the transparency of scientific studies in the field of food safety, especially after the well-known controversies regarding and related to the authorisation of certain sensitive products such as genetically-modified organisms, or certain active substances such as neonicotinoids and the already-famous glyphosate.

In the last trilogue, Parliament managed to reach a balanced, provisional agreement with the Council, establishing a process of evaluation which is independent, transparent and inclusive and involves the online publication of all studies by the European Food Safety Authority and a continuous dialogue with civil society in order to ensure the exclusive predominance of public interest.

However, in order to ensure the full success of this legislative framework, it is of high importance, and I would like to take this opportunity to appeal to the vast majority of Member States to encourage their experts to become members of the scientific risk-assessment groups, for the reason that currently, only six Member States provide two-thirds of the total number of experts.

„Catch the eye” eljárás

Michaela Šojdrová (PPE). – Paní předsedající, v tom minulém bodě jsme hovořili o dvojí kvalitě a nyní hovoříme také o kvalitě, a tou je bezpečnost potravin. Myslím, že to není méně důležité než ta dvojí kvalita. Tato směrnice řeší povolovací režim, který by se měl opírat o jasné vědecké závěry. Nové nařízení by mělo být dobrým kompromisem, který zvýší transparentnost hodnocení rizik prováděného Evropským úřadem pro bezpečnost potravin.

Zároveň by nemělo také ohrozit konkurenceschopnost evropských firem. Větší transparentnost vědeckých studií o potravinách je nutná, protože je potřeba předcházet dezinformacím či dokonce konspiračním teoriím a přitom držet opravdu vysokou bezpečnost potravin. Na druhou stranu také firmy mají potřebu obchodních tajemství, která musí být dodržena. Tudíž lepší výsledek by mohl být dosažen také tím, že bude EFSA pod větším politickým dohledem, včetně Evropského parlamentu.

Νότης Μαρίας (ECR). – Κυρία Πρόεδρε, η αξιολόγηση κινδύνου στην αλυσίδα των τροφίμων έχει ιδιαίτερη σημασία, διότι πραγματικά υπάρχουν σοβαροί κίνδυνοι για την υγεία των καταναλωτών και νομίζω ότι πρέπει να είμαστε αποφασιστικοί στο συγκεκριμένο θέμα.

Το βασικό στοιχείο είναι η ετικετοποίηση, ώστε να γνωρίζουμε πραγματικά τι περιέχουν τα τρόφιμα. Το δεύτερο είναι να προσέξουμε, κύριε Katainen, τις εισαγωγές από τρίτες χώρες, διότι εκεί δεν τηρούν τις προϋποθέσεις. Για παράδειγμα, στην Τουρκία καλλιεργούνται τομάτες και άλλα αγροτικά προϊόντα, με λιπάσματα τα οποία απαγορεύεται να κυκλοφορήσουν στην Ευρωπαϊκή Ένωση. Τρίτη περίπτωση είναι οι παράνομες ελληνοποιήσεις προϊόντων, δηλαδή το γεγονός ότι εμφανίζονται προϊόντα ως δήθεν ελληνικά, ενώ αυτό απαγορεύεται —το έχω καταγγείλει επανειλημμένα. Έχουμε παράνομη ελληνοποίηση γάλακτος που εισάγεται μέσω Αλβανίας και παράνομη ελληνοποίηση κρεάτων που εισάγονται μέσω Σκοπίων. Τα θέματα αυτά είναι σημαντικά τόσο για την προστασία του καταναλωτή όσο και για την αντιμετώπιση της απάτης και, επιπλέον, για την προστασία και σε επίπεδο δασμολογίου. Άρα πρέπει να ληφθούν συγκεκριμένα μέτρα. Αποκαλύπτονται μεγάλα σκάνδαλα, όπως είδαμε με το glyphosate. Η Ευρωπαϊκή Ένωση πρέπει να λάβει αποφασιστικά μέτρα.

Kateřina Konečná (GUE/NGL). – Paní předsedající, tento návrh je reakcí na evropskou občanskou iniciativu proti glyfosátu s velmi širokou podporou veřejnosti či na kauzu *Monsanto papers* odkrývající nezdravé prostředí tvorby vědeckých studií na objednávku společností, o jejichž výrobcích má být na jejich základě rozhodnuto.

Komise navrhla posílit transparentnost procesu posuzování rizik a poskytnout dostatečné ujištění, pokud jde o spolehlivost, objektivitu a nezávislost studií, které úřad EFSA používá při posuzování rizik. Musím říci a neslyšíte to ode mě teď říkat často, že konečný text je výrazným zlepšením současné situace, neboť hodnocení a řízení rizik má být transparentnější a odpovědnější. EFSA bude pod permanentní kontrolou, studie by měly být konečně bez překážek zveřejňovány a dostupné pro širokou laickou a odbornou veřejnost, včetně přihlášek výrobců a další doplňující dokumentace. Nařízení dokonce obsahuje i určité penalizace pro výrobce v případě netransparentního chování. Jedná se o první velmi důležitý krok k znovuzískání důvěry veřejnosti, proto jej moc ráda podpořím.

(„Catch the eye” eljárás vége)

Jyrki Katainen, Vice-President of the Commission. – Madam President, I want to thank the House very much for this very lively and good debate.

Just to conclude, I would like to reiterate that this provisional agreement, thanks to the co-legislators, will reinforce and legitimise the important role played by the European Food Safety Authority (EFSA). That is very crucial because our people want to trust the authorities and they want to apply – and EFSA has always wanted to apply – the precautionary principle and it is very important for our citizens to know this. Because if you don't trust our authorities then we can always auction the truth, politically, which is not good for anybody. Also, this provisional agreement will increase transparency and will strengthen consumer confidence.

So I really want to thank you for a good job, for your decisiveness on this issue. I also want to mention or reply to some of the comments concerning the products sold on our market. All the products sold on the internal market, on the European market, have to fulfil the European food safety criteria, no matter where they come from. This is another point which is very important for our consumers: that the EU is the safest market and our rules, regulations and standards also apply to the products coming from outside of Europe.

So once more, thank you very much for your engagement on this very important topic.

Pilar Ayuso, ponente. – Señora presidenta, yo solamente quiero dar las gracias a todos los intervinientes y a los ponentes alternativos; y muchas gracias, señor Katainen. Y muy especialmente quiero darles las gracias a los servicios de la Comisión, particularmente al comisario Andriukaitis —le ruego que se lo transmita—, a la Presidencia rumana y a los sabios, así como a la señora Sommer, que inició este informe como ponente.

Por los esfuerzos que todos ellos han realizado durante la negociación hemos llegado a un acuerdo, como he dicho, razonablemente satisfactorio. Los servicios de las tres instituciones han trabajado muy duro en los últimos meses. Se ha hecho realmente en un tiempo récord, como usted bien ha dicho, y creo que es importante que reconozcamos el trabajo que han hecho nuestros funcionarios en este informe, y me gustaría agradecerérselo públicamente.

Elnök asszony. – A vitát lezárom.

A szavazásra 2019. április 17-én, szerdán kerül sor.

Írásos nyilatkozatok (162. cikk)

Nicola Caputo (S&D), per iscritto. – Le preoccupanti rivelazioni espresse in merito alla trasparenza degli studi scientifici utilizzati per la valutazione del glifosato hanno determinato la necessità di ripristinare la fiducia dei cittadini nel sistema di valutazione del rischio europeo.

Il «pacchetto trasparenza», che approveremo domani, si tradurrà nella possibilità per i cittadini di avere accesso automatico a tutte le ricerche scientifiche e alle informazioni presentate dall'industria nel processo di valutazione del rischio dei pesticidi. Le parti interessate e il pubblico saranno consultati sugli studi presentati. Allo stesso tempo, quando sarà debitamente giustificato, sarà garantita la riservatezza, stabilendo il tipo di informazioni che possono essere considerate significativamente dannose per gli interessi commerciali e che pertanto non possono essere divulgate.

Presso l'EFSA verrà istituita una banca dati europea contenente le notifiche di tutti gli studi commissionati in modo da garantire che le società richiedenti le autorizzazioni presentino tutte le informazioni pertinenti, senza omettere quelli sfavorevoli. Non tutto quanto richiesto nel dossier consegnato dalla commissione PEST è stato ancora attuato, bisogna lavorare ancora molto, ma è un importante passo in avanti per l'Europa, leader mondiale per gli elevati standard di sicurezza alimentare.

Pavel Poc (S&D), písemně. – Dosáhli jsme skvělého výsledku, který zvýší bezpečnost potravin. Prosadili jsme včasný přístup veřejnosti k informacím Evropského úřadu pro bezpečnost potravin. Díky tomu se zvýší kontrola procesu autorizace látek, které nevědomky přijímáme do těla naší potravou. Ať už jde o pesticidy, GMO, barviva, ochucovadla a ostatní přídatné látky, tzv. éčka. Při hodnocení bezpečnosti se bude vycházet z nejnovějších vědeckých poznatků. Konzultace se třetími stranami zajistí, že žádná informace a žádná data nezůstanou skryta. Zavádíme častější kontroly výzkumných institucí a povinnou registraci studií o bezpečnosti látek. Je konec zatajování nepohodlných studií a kupování příznivých výsledků. To se v některých případech prokazatelně dělo. Soudní případ týkající se herbicidu glyfosát to potvrdil. Do úvodních prohlášení se mi navíc podařilo prosadit, aby orgány veřejné moci informovaly o případech, kdy je záměrným klamáním výrobců ohrožováno naše zdraví. Není fér, když za potraviny poctivě platíme a jsme šizeni. A už vůbec není fér, když se takto pro zisky několika firem hazarduje s našimi životy. Jsem rád, že se při vyjednávání projevilo, že my, sociální demokraté, jsme na straně veřejného zdraví, nikoliv na straně ekonomických zájmů. Nyní je řada na členských státech, aby zvýšily transparentnost i na své úrovni. Abychom se konečně dozvěděli, jak rozhodují o našem zdraví.

25. Dodatkowe świadectwo ochronne dla produktów leczniczych (debata)

Elnök asszony. – A következő napirendi pont a Luis de Grandes Pascual által a Jogi Bizottság nevében készített, a gyógyszerek kiegészítő oltalmi tanúsítványára irányuló javaslatról szóló jelentésről folytatott vita (COM(2018)0439 – C8-0257/2018 – 2018/0229(COD)) (A8-0482/2018).

Luis de Grandes Pascual, *ponente*. – Señora presidenta, señor vicepresidente de la Comisión —muchas gracias por su presencia—, señorías, cuando abordamos la aventura de este informe no parecía posible: me encontré con una división territorial y política que resultaba insalvable.

Después, en el ámbito de los diálogos tripartitos —Comisión, Parlamento y Consejo—, tras arduas negociaciones concluimos un acuerdo equilibrado el pasado 14 de febrero. El acuerdo de compromiso, que modifica la propuesta inicial de la Comisión, se alcanzó en un tiempo récord de dos semanas, fue aprobado por la mayoría de los Estados miembros y se confirmó nuevamente en la Comisión de Asuntos Jurídicos. Y ahora tiene la palabra el Pleno del Parlamento Europeo.

La Unión Europea introdujo el certificado de protección complementario para traer e impulsar la investigación en Europa. Aproximadamente la mitad de la vida de la patente de un tratamiento nuevo se pierde durante los procesos de investigación, desarrollo y regulación, y el certificado contribuyó a restaurar parte de esa vida de la patente.

Pero el mercado ha evolucionado, señorías, y los genéricos fabricados dentro de Europa habían quedado en la indefensión porque, durante el período de la patente y durante este tiempo complementario de protección, no podían ni producir ni almacenar los productos protegidos, incluso cuando es exclusivamente para fines de exportación a terceros países en los que la protección no existe o ha expirado. Mientras tanto, en otros terceros países que no tienen este período complementario, sí lo pueden hacer.

Esto se traduce en que aquellos productores de genéricos que deciden fabricar fuera de Europa tienen una ventaja competitiva en el resto del mundo y, además, sus productos entrarán antes que los genéricos europeos en nuestro mercado.

La industria innovadora, señorías, en Europa es clave y cuando se habla de la estrategia de Europa debemos inexcusablemente seguir defendiendo una economía del conocimiento. No olvidemos que esta parte de nuestra industria invierte aproximadamente 35 000 millones de euros en I+D en Europa, aprueba miles de medicamentos y nuevos principios activos cada año, por lo que es evidente que nuestro sistema de incentivos de propiedad intelectual existe, está funcionando para fabricar y brindar tratamientos nuevos, mejorados a los pacientes que los necesitan.

Pero la industria biofarmacéutica de genéricos debe desempeñar un papel fundamental en el desempeño de las exportaciones de Europa y ser uno de los pilares más competitivos de la economía de la Unión, ayudando a restaurar el crecimiento europeo. La excepción del certificado supone un esfuerzo de equidad del marco existente, para liberar el campo de juego entre los fabricantes de genéricos de la Unión y terceros países.

A partir de ahora, señorías, los fabricantes de genéricos y biosimilares establecidos en la Unión podrán fabricar estos productos para fines de exportación a mercados de terceros países en los que esta protección no existe o ha expirado, ayudando con ello a esos fabricantes a competir de manera eficaz en mercados terceros.

Este Reglamento, además, permitirá que estos mismos fabricantes establecidos en la Unión almacenen los productos en el Estado miembro donde los han fabricado durante los últimos seis meses de la protección. El fin es la entrada en el mercado de cualquier Estado miembro, una vez expirado el certificado, ayudando con ello a competir eficazmente en la Unión inmediatamente después de que expire la protección.

Hemos incluido las salvaguardas adecuadas para no debilitar nuestro compromiso con la propiedad intelectual y la innovación. En ese sentido, se requerirá que los fabricantes de medicamentos genéricos y biosimilares publiquen y envíen información al titular del certificado complementario de protección, para evitar que la industria eluda las reglas de la excepción, y con al menos tres meses de anticipación. La notificación garantizará la transparencia del sistema y aumentará la competencia en los mercados europeos, pero, al mismo tiempo, el Reglamento respeta el mantenimiento de la confidencialidad de una información especialmente sensible.

La aprobación de este Reglamento supondrá un gran beneficio para la industria europea y para el ahorro farmacéutico. La Comisión ha calculado que en 2025 supondrá un incremento en la producción de entre 7 300 y 9 500 millones de euros y la creación de entre 20 000 y 25 000 puestos de trabajo en el territorio de la Unión, así como ahorros en el gasto farmacéutico de hasta un 4 %.

Señorías, este informe no ha sido fácil. Todos hemos tenido que hacer un esfuerzo de comprensión de las posiciones distintas hasta alcanzar un equilibrio y un consenso.

Gracias de verdad a los ponentes alternativos y gracias a nuestros colaboradores, que tanto han trabajado. Especialmente quiero recordar a mi colaboradora, Mercedes, que trabajó de forma intensa. Gracias a la Presidencia rumana por haber estado a la altura de una gran cuestión.

Jyrki Katainen, *Vice-President of the Commission*. – Madam President, the supplementary protection certificate (SPC) waiver was an important element of the Commission's single market strategy. This regulation is likewise an important deliverable for this Parliament. It was explicitly called for in the report by Ms Lara Comi in 2016 on the single market strategy. A positive vote tomorrow will send a strong and clear message to Europe's citizens and to the business community, a positive message on EU competitiveness, a positive message on strong industrial property protection and a positive message on access to affordable medicines for citizens.

Delivering for our citizens and being seen to do so is important. It is also important in the context of Europe's rendez-vous with its citizens next month. The Commission is therefore very happy with the outcome of your successful negotiations. Parliament and the Romanian Presidency did an excellent job.

This has not been an easy fight, far from it. So I would like to thank the rapporteur, Mr de Grandes Pascual, for his tireless work in difficult political circumstances and under severe time constraints. I would also like to mention the rapporteurs for the committee opinions, Mr Wölken and Ms Sánchez and the various rapporteurs.

I say to Members: through your inputs you have contributed to an economically useful waiver and to a clear and balanced legal text. The robust text that you have agreed with the Council will allow EU companies to take part in, and become leaders of, the emerging global market in generic and biosimilar medicines on the basis of a level playing field with manufacturers based outside the EU, delivering upwards of 25 000 net new jobs in the pharmaceutical sector in the EU over the years ahead. And, ultimately, reaffirming Europe's position as a hub for pharmaceutical R&D and manufacturing.

I will now say a few words about the main elements of the regulation on which the plenary is due to vote tomorrow. Firstly, on stockpiling, a sensitive issue for Parliament. I welcome the flexibility shown by the Council, and also by the Commission, in accepting this inclusion. Stockpiling will be allowed during the final six months of the SPC in order to better ensure day-one entry of EU-produced generics and biosimilars after the expiry of SPC protection in the EU. In addition, every five years, an evaluation will take special account of whether the provisions on stockpiling are sufficient, specifically the review clause in Article 21A of the Regulation mandates the Commission to examine, inter alia, whether the six-month stockpiling period is sufficient to satisfy the objectives of the waiver.

Secondly, on the date of application, all three institutions showed flexibility. The waiver will now become an effective reality by 1 July 2022 at the latest. This date respects the dual imperative of being both legally sound and economically useful. That being said, there will be no retroactive impact on acquired rights and, likewise, the core rights in the EU of SPC holders are not affected since market inclusivity in the EU remains intact during the SPC term. In addition, there will be a transitional regime so due account is taken of legitimate expectations of right-holders.

Thirdly, on safeguards. The final compromise is robust and transparent. Exceptions will be accompanied by important but proportionate safeguards. These include appropriate notification rules which come on top of the new classified medicines rules that entered into force in February 2019. But, at same time, the regulation respect the needs of makers of generics and biosimilars to keep certain commercially sensitive information confidential and it complies with our obligation to promote healthy competition both in the EU and beyond. Because in the long run that means lower prices for patients.

Let me conclude. I believe you have reached a good compromise. It reflects a good balance between the various political views and between the sometimes-competing interests of stakeholders. I hope that Parliament will endorse it in the vote tomorrow.

Tiemo Wölken, *Berichterstatter ENVI*. – Frau Präsidentin! Zunächst möchte ich mich beim Berichterstatter und bei den anderen Kolleginnen und Kollegen, den Schattenberichterstattern für die gute Zusammenarbeit bedanken. Es war eine doch zeitlich sehr anspruchsvolle Aufgabe.

Was haben wir mit diesem Bericht erreicht? Ich glaube, dass wir mit diesem Bericht sicherstellen, dass Patientinnen und Patienten in der Europäischen Union besseren Zugang zu günstigeren und sicheren Arzneimitteln bekommen. Damit haben wir einen Auftrag des Parlaments aus verschiedenen Berichten endlich erfüllt. Wir schaffen damit, dass in Europa Generika und Biosimilars hergestellt werden, die wir im Moment nicht in der Europäischen Union produzieren können, weil die rechtlichen Voraussetzungen dafür nicht gegeben sind. Wir erhöhen damit die Sicherheit für die Patientinnen und Patienten. Wir erinnern uns: Es gab verunreinigte Arzneimittel in den letzten Jahren, es gab Knappheit von bestimmten Arzneimitteln. Wenn wir hier in der Europäischen Union produzieren, können wir die Qualität besser begutachten, können wir auch dafür sorgen, dass bei Knappheit die Medikamente hier vorhanden sind. Also insofern sind wir einen echten Schritt nach vorne gegangen.

Der Knackpunkt dieser Verordnung war allerdings das sogenannte *stockpiling*, also die Lagerhaltung für den ersten Tag des Ablaufs des ergänzenden Schutzzertifikats. Und hier haben große Teile im Haus, aber leider auch die Europäische Kommission, versucht, alles zu tun, dass es zu diesem *stockpiling* nicht kommt – und das, obwohl die Folgenabschätzung der Europäischen Kommission selber gesagt hat, dass der größte Nutzen bei einer Herstellung und bei einem *stockpiling* existiert. Wer das nicht glaubt: Seite 42 der Folgenabschätzung.

Insofern haben wir uns sehr lange um etwas gestritten, was eigentlich den besten Nutzen für die Patientinnen und Patienten gebracht hat. Am Ende haben wir jetzt sechs Monate *stockpiling* bekommen. Das ist ein erster guter Schritt, und durch die starke *review clause* haben wir die Möglichkeit, zeitnah zu gucken, ob das wirklich reicht. Ich hoffe, dass wir dann für alle Patientinnen und Patienten wirklich sichere und gute Arzneimittel auf Dauer hinbekommen.

Zuletzt noch ein Dank an alle Mitarbeiterinnen und Mitarbeiter, die wirklich unter Zeitdruck gearbeitet haben.

Kosma Złotowski, *w imieniu grupy ECR*. – Pani Przewodnicząca! Panie Komisarzu! Ja się do tych podziękowań oczywiście również przyłączam. To rozporządzenie jest jednym z nielicznych przykładów tego, że prawo europejskie może być przyjazne również dla polskich przedsiębiorców. W tej kadencji Parlamentu Europejskiego podobne propozycje bardzo rzadko zyskiwały większość.

Na szczęście w przypadku dodatkowych świadectw ochronnych dla produktów leczniczych było inaczej. Udało nam się przyjąć, a później wynegocjować z Radą i Komisją Europejską bardzo dobry tekst, który otwiera nowe rynki i szerokie perspektywy przed europejskimi producentami leków generycznych i biopodobnych. Zmiana tego rozporządzenia to również bardzo dobra wiadomość dla pacjentów, to szybszy dostęp do nowoczesnych i przystępnych cenowo leków. Jestem pewien, że polskie firmy farmaceutyczne w pełni wykorzystają możliwości, jakie ten projekt przed nimi otwiera. To ogromna szansa na nowe inwestycje i miejsca pracy w bardzo innowacyjnym sektorze gospodarki.

Oczywiście nasza grupa poprze jutro ten projekt.

Lieve Wierinck, *namens de ALDE-Fractie*. – Voorzitter, in deze speech zou ik willen onderlijnen dat ik sceptisch blijf over de mogelijke positieve impact van dit voorstel op de patiënt en de farmaceutische sector. Voor mij staat het belang van de patiënt centraal in de wetgeving. En als kankeroverlever blijft de patiënt de blauwe draad door mijn carrière.

Toch vraag ik de Commissie om deze nieuwe maatregel in de gaten te houden en indien nodig opnieuw te bekijken. De patenten die de farmaceutische industrie kregen, zijn er niet zomaar. Dit is een beloning voor het jarenlange werk dat het bedrijf er vooraf heeft ingestoken voordat een nieuw medicijn op de markt kan komen. Ik spreek hier van beloning, waar ik misschien eerder moet spreken van verzekering. De investeringen die bedrijven in nieuwe medicijnen steken, zijn enorm. Om bijvoorbeeld een nieuw antibioticum te vinden, zal slechts een op tienduizend moleculen leiden tot een succesvol medicijn. Toch ga je de 9 999 andere moleculen tot op een bepaalde hoogte ook moeten onderzoeken en ontwikkelen. Om de innovatie te vrijwaren, die zo broodnodig is om nieuwe medicijnen aan te bieden aan de patiënt, moeten we voorzichtig omgaan met patenten en de bescherming van intellectuele eigendom.

Ik vraag u dan ook om niet blind te zijn voor de mogelijke gevolgen die de sector kan ondervinden.

Kateřina Konečná, za skupinu GUE/NGL. – Paní předsedající, výrobci generických a biologicky podobných léčiv se sídlem v EU v současné době nesmějí přípravky chráněné dodatkovým ochranným opatřením vyrábět pro export do třetích zemí, a to ani v případě, že ochrana přípravkům již vypršela. Je jasné, že jde o velké peníze, jde o pracovní místa, ale jde i o přístup k léčivům a inovace. Ve výboru ENVI jsme se snažili najít mezi všemi těmito složitými elementy nějakou rovnováhu. Jak se však dalo předpokládat, výsledek interinstitucionálních vyjednávání je smíšený. Největší problémem, který na výsledku textu vidím já, je datum jeho vstupu v platnost, resp. účinnost. Aby mohli občané a systémy zdravotní péče těžit z tohoto nového nařízení, musí být jeho vstup v platnost co nejdříve. 3leté přechodné období se zdá z tohoto pohledu jako hraniční. Nicméně z celkového pohledu by mělo dojít k pozvolnému zlepšení postavení našich výrobců generik, z čehož by měli mít prospěch všichni. Proto jsem schopna výsledek podpořit.

Julia Reda, on behalf of the Verts/ALE Group. – Madam President, this is my last speech in this European Parliament. I am proud that it is on a file where the European Parliament has stood up to the so-called intellectual property industries, which are sometimes putting profits above access to medicines – which is, after all, a fundamental right.

Supplementary Protection Certificates (SPCs) are not economically justified at all. They just prolong patents on medicines that are already too long. This proposal at least allows the manufacture of generic medicines for sale where they are already legal. This is a small step, but it's a step in the right direction. It comes with an ambitious revision clause to investigate if this 6-month stockpiling waiver is enough to achieve public health or whether we need to question the SPC regime altogether and have a more fundamental reform. So long, and thanks for all the fish.

„Catch the eye” eljárás

Cristian-Silviu Bușoi (PPE). – Madame la Présidente, chers collègues, ce nouveau règlement est d'une importance primordiale, car il prévoit pour nos entreprises européennes une dérogation grâce à laquelle elles pourront fabriquer une version générique ou biosimilaire d'un médicament protégé si cette version est exclusivement destinée à l'exportation vers les pays tiers ou à être stockée en attendant l'entrée dans le marché de l'Union dès le premier jour suivant l'expiration du certificat complémentaire correspondant.

Cette mesure permettra à nos producteurs d'être compétitifs sur le marché des pays tiers où la protection complémentaire n'existait pas ou a expiré et donnera aussi à nos citoyens accès en temps utile à des médicaments à prix réduit, en particulier dans les États membres où les prix des médicaments essentiels sont vraiment trop élevés.

Je voudrais finir en remerciant le rapporteur, Luis de Grandes Pascual, pour son excellent travail.

Νότης Μαρίας (ECR). – Κυρία Πρόεδρε, δεν πρέπει να ξεχνούμε ότι το βασικό θέμα που συζητούμε και στο οποίο πρέπει να επικεντρωθούμε είναι η προστασία της δημόσιας υγείας. Δεύτερον, το συμφέρον των ίδιων των ασθενών, που προϋποθέτει την πρόσβασή τους σε φθηνά φάρμακα. Επομένως, οι όποιες ρυθμίσεις γίνονται για τα διπλώματα ευρεσιτεχνίας και για τη στήριξη της ανταγωνιστικότητας της ευρωπαϊκής φαρμακοβιομηχανίας πρέπει να υπηρετούν αυτούς τους στόχους. Διότι δεν πρέπει να φτάσουμε στο άλλο άκρο, να έχουμε δηλαδή ακριβά φάρμακα στα οποία να μην μπορούν να έχουν πρόσβαση οι ασθενείς. Ξέρουμε ότι έχουν γίνει διάφορα τρικ από τις φαρμακευτικές στην Ευρώπη, προκειμένου να ανεβάσουν την τιμή του φαρμάκου. Κλασική περίπτωση είναι το σκάνδαλο Novartis, το οποίο έχει αποκαλυφθεί —ιδίως στην Ελλάδα— και για το οποίο πρέπει να πάμε μέχρι το τέλος, να αποκαλυφθούν όλες οι ευθύνες και —φυσικά— να επιβληθούν ποινές και στη συγκεκριμένη φαρμακοβιομηχανία.

Πρέπει να προσέξετε κύριε Επίτροπε, κύριε Καταίηνη, το θέμα των αποθεμάτων σε φάρμακα, διότι είναι βασικό. Όπως επίσης, το να μην αξιοποιούν οι πολυεθνικές την ευκαιρία για εξαγωγή των φαρμάκων, που οδηγεί σε έλλειψη μέσα στην Ευρωπαϊκή Ένωση. Αν τα τηρήσουμε όλα αυτά, τότε μπορούμε να έχουμε και ανταγωνιστικότητα της ευρωπαϊκής φαρμακοβιομηχανίας αλλά, κυρίως, προστασία των ασθενών.

Alojz Peterle (PPE). – Gospa predsedujoča, spoštovani kolegi, gospod podpredsednik. Kolegu de Grandesu čestitam za odlično opravljeno zahtevno delo in pozdravljam spremembe evropske zakonodaje na področju dodatnega varstvenega certifikata za zdravila.

Dosežen kompromis je velik uspeh – zagotovili smo tako razvoj novih zdravil v Evropi kot enake konkurenčne pogoje za proizvajalce generičnih in podobnih bioloških zdravil s sedežem v Evropi in tiste, ki imajo sedež drugje. Evropskim proizvajalcem generikov smo omogočili izvoz v tretje države, v katerih ni veljavnega dodatnega varstvenega certifikata, prav tako pa smo jim tudi bistveno olajšali vstop na evropsko tržišče na prvi dan po izteku veljavnosti certifikata.

Spoštovani, cene zdravil in stroški zdravljenj so v zadnjih desetletjih tako narasli, da so le-ta za nove bolnike postala praktično nedostopna. Hitrejši vstop zdravil na evropski trg pomeni zato za naše ljudi tudi hitrejši dostop do cenovno dostopnih zdravil. S tem zakonodajnim predlogom smo ponovno dokazali, da Evropska zveza deluje, da ji ni vseeno za bolnega človeka, ki potrebuje našo pomoč.

(„Catch the eye” eljárás vége)

Jyrki Katainen, *Vice-President of the Commission*. – Madam President, very briefly I want to thank you for this good debate and once more thank and congratulate the rapporteur on a very good job. It's been politically a very sensitive file, but the solution is a showcase of pragmatism, a very practical solution, meaning that EU generic and biosimilar producers have a level playing field vis-à-vis the other producers. At the same time, the patent protection will cover all the innovators.

This is a very simple description of the solution / compromise. We will show the innovators clearly that this continent is all in favour of new innovations. We want to protect you, and at the same time we have created a level playing field for those who are producing generics and biosimilars.

So this is a very good decision for our patients, for our consumers and also a very good decision for producers, for industry and innovators. Thank you very much for your cooperation.

Luis de Grandes Pascual, *ponente*. – Señora presidenta, señor vicepresidente de la Comisión, le agradezco su presencia, sus palabras y su rigor. Reiterar mi agradecimiento a los ponentes alternativos.

Ha habido veces, a lo largo de este trabajo, en que me he sentido solo, porque los ponentes alternativos han sido muy exigentes. Y han hecho muy bien. Han exigido que el equilibrio fuera verdad. A veces, en el Parlamento Europeo, la necesidad de los consensos hace que produzcamos acuerdos menores sencillamente por salir adelante. Es el viejo cuento del parto de los montes. Con mucho ruido y, a veces, el parto es un pequeño ratón. No ha sido este el caso. El producto resultante es realmente riguroso y serio, y produce un equilibrio y una posición de equidad.

Innovadores y fabricantes de genéricos han pugnado en defensa de sus intereses legítimos, pero al final el éxito no ha sido en favor de unos o de otros: ha sido en favor de la sanidad europea. Yo, por eso, apuesto y brindo por que sea eficiente este Reglamento.

Y, como aquí se ha dicho, si no fuera suficiente, para eso hemos establecido esa cláusula de revisión; para poder analizar, y, si es necesario, completar, rectificar o modificar algo que yo creo que cumple los objetivos de este final de legislatura, en el que yo también me marchó para no volver. Pero ha sido un honor trabajar con todos ustedes.

Elnök asszony. – A vitát lezárom.

A szavazásra 2019. április 17-én, szerdán kerül sor.

Írásos nyilatkozatok (162. cikk)

Claudiu Ciprian Tănăsescu (S&D), *în scris*. – Având în vedere importanța deosebită a disponibilității și accesibilității medicamentelor pentru sănătatea publică și pentru cheltuielile publice, disparitățile existente în legislația națională, care îngreunează libera circulație a medicamentelor pe piața internă trebuie să fie eliminate.

De asemenea, la nivelul UE trebuie să fie promovate investițiile în cercetare și inovare necesare pentru dezvoltarea unei noi generații de medicamente care să sprijine tratarea unor boli noi sau să genereze efecte terapeutice mai importante, precum și prevenirea relocării cercetării în domeniul farmaceutic în afara Uniunii, către țări care ar putea oferi o protecție mai bună, asigurând în același timp accesul la medicamente în UE.

Stimularea competitivității industriilor reglementate, cum ar fi industria farmaceutică, conform Strategiei privind piața unică, poate fi realizată prin brevet și certificate suplimentare de protecție (CSP). Astfel, un producător care deține o linie de producție pentru export va putea cu ușurință, după expirarea CSP, să utilizeze aceeași linie pentru producția medicamentelor generice sau biosimilare cu scopul de a aproviziona rapid piața UE.

Jarosław Wałęsa (PPE), na piśmie. – Europa jest i powinna pozostać w czołówce w dziedzinie badań i wytwarzania farmaceutyków, a SPC wspiera również prekursorską rolę Europy w badaniach i rozwoju farmaceutycznym. Przepisy te sprzyjają kreatywności oraz pozwalają utrzymać światowej klasy potencjał innowacyjny przemysłu farmaceutycznego. W pełni popieram zatem proponowane wprowadzenie wyjątku dotyczącego ochrony SPC jako sposobu na wyeliminowanie nie zamierzonej przeszkody prawnej, która uniemożliwiała producentom generycznych i biopodobnych produktów leczniczych mających siedzibę w UE konkurowanie na rynkach eksportowych, na których konkurencja jest jak wiadomo – zacięta, oraz na przywrócenie równych warunków działania dla produkcji w UE i poza UE. Dodatkowe świadectwa ochronne (Supplementary Protection Certificates, SPC) rozszerzają ochronę patentową produktów leczniczych, które przed dopuszczeniem do obrotu muszą zostać poddane długotrwałym testom i badaniom klinicznym. Dzięki zwolnieniu przedsiębiorstwa z siedzibą w UE będą mogły w przyszłości wytwarzać generyczną lub biopodobną wersję leku objętego ochroną w okresie ważności świadectwa ochronnego, jeżeli odbywa się to wyłącznie w celu wywozu na rynek poza UE, na którym ochrona wygasła lub nigdy nie istniała.

Tadeusz Zwiefka (PPE), na piśmie. – Celem wprowadzanych przepisów jest wyrównanie szans na rynku światowym dla małych i średnich producentów farmaceutycznych z UE przy jednoczesnym utrzymaniu ochrony producentów leków oryginalnych. Są to niezwykle ważne zmiany dla polskich producentów farmaceutycznych. Do tej pory ochrona SPC obejmowała zarówno sprzedaż, jak i produkcję leku generycznego na terenie całej UE. Natomiast firmy farmaceutyczne usytuowane poza UE po 20 latach ustania ochrony patentowej mogą dany lek produkować i sprzedawać na całym świecie poza UE, a w momencie zakończenia 5-letniego okresu ochronnego mogą wejść z generykiem również na rynek unijny. To stawia unijne mniejsze firmy na niekorzystnej pozycji.

Dzięki wyrównaniu szans na rynkach trzecich małe i średnie unijne firmy farmaceutyczne będą mogły gromadzić kapitał, by już nie tylko produkować w sektorze leków generycznych i biopodobnych, ale też budować własne zaplecze R&D (badań i rozwoju) dla produkcji nowych leków. Poza tym nie będą zmuszone do wyprowadzania produkcji poza teren UE, co oczywiście da szansę na nowe miejsca pracy dla wysoko wykwalifikowanej kadry. Docelowo także wprowadzone zmiany mają zagwarantować pacjentom szybszy i szerszy dostęp do bezpiecznych leków generycznych produkowanych na terenie UE zaraz po ustaniu ochrony SPC.

26. Ewentualna ekstradycja Juliana Assange'a (debata)

Elnök asszony. – A következő pont a Tanács és a Bizottság nyilatkozatai Julian Assange lehetséges kiadatásáról (2019/2704(RSP)).

Melania Gabriela Ciot, President-in-Office of the Council. – Madam President, thank you for this opportunity to discuss the issue of the possible extradition of Julian Assange. We are all aware that, when acting for the purpose of protecting the general public interest, whistle-blowers play an essential role by disclosing wrongdoing and dangers to society. Therefore they deserve legal protection. I know you discussed this yesterday in the debate on the whistle-blowers' directive. We have all been following recent events related to Mr Assange's case.

Julian Assange took refuge in the Ecuadorian Embassy in London in 2012 to avoid being taken to Sweden to be questioned on charges of rape, molestation and unlawful coercion. He argued that his asylum claim aimed to prevent his being ultimately extradited to the United States and put on trial for publishing thousands and thousands of classified US documents.

As you all know, on 11 April, Ecuador withdrew Mr Assange's asylum, which led to his arrest by the British police. Westminster Magistrates' Court subsequently found him guilty on British charges of breaching bail. In addition to charges in the United Kingdom, Mr Assange currently faces charges in the United States, and the Swedish judicial authorities have indicated that investigations may be resumed into charges of rape against him.

Let me clearly point out that the Council as such has not discussed the issue of Mr Assange's possible extradition and does not have a position on it. As a matter of fact, extraditions are a matter of the exclusive competence of Member States. Therefore, the matter now lies in the hands of the British judiciary and of the UK Home Secretary.

But let me take this opportunity to stress once more that the Council attaches very high importance to the protection of whistle-blowers. As a matter of fact, during the last month, Parliament and the Council focused their efforts on ensuring that an agreement on the whistle-blowers' directive was reached before the end of the current legislative term. That objective was achieved and this plenary voted today on the text agreed by the negotiators of the two co-legislators.

Věra Jourová, *Member of the Commission*. – Madam President, honourable Members, the European Parliament asked the Commission to make a statement on the possible extradition of Julian Assange from the United Kingdom.

We can inform you that extradition between the United Kingdom and the United States is governed by a bilateral treaty and a subsequent EU-US extradition agreement. The latter does not allow extradition in cases where there are reasons to believe it may lead to the application of the death penalty. In addition, the Court of Justice has also decided that a Member State must refrain from an extradition if there are serious risks that fundamental rights of the suspect are affected.

If Sweden decides to issue a new European arrest warrant following the one that it had revoked in 2017, the UK court would have to consider whether to give precedence to this European arrest warrant over the US extradition request. There are no clear-cut EU rules in this respect but rather a list of factors to be taken into account by the court.

As a general remark, I must note that the European Commission does not have the competence to intervene on judicial proceedings pending in front of the courts of Member States. We fully rely on the independence and professionalism of the UK courts to take the right decision, having in front of them the appropriate evidence.

Jiří Pospíšil, *za skupinu PPE*. – Paní předsedající, já chci potvrdit slova paní komisařky, já v zásadě vůbec nechápu, proč tento bod projednáváme na půdě Parlamentu. Tady jde o konkrétní trestní kauzu, konkrétní extradiční, o té se bude rozhodovat podle mezinárodních smluv o extradiční. Na jedné straně bude rozhodovat britský justiční systém, na druhé straně jsou Spojené státy americké jako země, která žádá o vydání. Obě země jsou právními státy, není pochyby o tom, že tedy ten proces proběhne řádně, podle mezinárodních smluv při respektu principu právního státu.

My jako politici si můžeme myslet o skutcích pana Assange určitou věc, můžeme to buď schvalovat, nebo odsuzovat. Já osobně s jeho skutky nesouhlasím. Domnívám se, že svoboda projevu má své limity a nemůže ohrožovat státní tajemství. A v případě třeba aktivit pana Assange pak vojáky, kteří bojují proti mezinárodnímu terorismu. Ale to je můj politický názor. A to, zda pan Assange spáchal trestný čin, musí rozhodovat jenom soudy. To je naše základní stanovisko. Je tedy správné, že Evropská komise jako politický orgán nemá žádné pravomoci, kterými by mohla nějakým způsobem zasahovat do justičního systému jednoho z členských států.

Takže prosím: nechme to na britských soudech, aby danou věc procesně posoudily, aby zvážily, zda jsou splněny důvody k extradiční. Pokud ano, bude pan Assange vydán do Spojených států amerických. Já plně věřím americké justici, že věc posoudí, zda pro mě nepřijatelné jednání pana Assange je případně i trestným činem.

Ana Gomes, *em nome do Grupo S&D*. – Senhora Presidente, a extradição de Julian Assange para os Estados Unidos deve ser impedida. Só assim poderemos garantir que a Europa protege quem defende transparência e verdade e quem quer exprimir-se em sociedades livres e plurais.

Com uma Administração como a de Trump, que faz dos *media* alvo de estimação, Assange nunca teria julgamento imparcial. O julgamento nos Estados Unidos seria instrumentalizável para a destruição da liberdade de imprensa e de expressão, como dizem organizações como a Human Rights Watch e a ACLU.

Assange correria riscos de ser condenado à pena capital. É só ver o que pena hoje a fonte de Assange, Chelsea Manning, sob tortura em confinamento na prisão. Julian Assange deu decisivos contributos para revelar a verdade. Revelou atrocidades no Iraque e no Afeganistão e outros crimes em Guantánamo e nas prisões secretas, e a podridão, a hipocrisia e a criminalidade em sucessivas administrações americanas e até também em governos cúmplices, incluindo na Europa.

Eu própria beneficiei das revelações do WikiLeaks. O ministro que me acusou de enganar quando entreguei à comissão de inquérito do Parlamento Europeu as listas de voos da tortura cometidos pela CIA e de militares que foram autorizados por Portugal com destino e origem em Guantánamo acabou exposto como um rematado mentiroso pelo WikiLeaks. Mas se Julian Assange enfrenta as acusações de crime que lhe são feitas na Suécia, deve responder por essas acusações na Justiça sueca que oferece garantias de imparcialidade. Importa dizer que confiamos na independência dos tribunais do Reino Unido e da Suécia, mas, ao mesmo tempo, pedir-lhes que não cedam às pressões de extradição para os Estados Unidos.

Não desvalorizo, e devo dizer que me inquieta, que um Julian Assange perturbado por sete anos de enclausuramento na embaixada do Equador, país que acabou por o entregar, violando o direito de asilo concedido, possa ter colaborado com a cleptocracia de Putin para interferir nas eleições americanas e atacar o Partido Democrático, como poderá indiciar o procurador especial Muller. Mas é aos tribunais europeus dos Estados-Membros da União Europeia que cabe a responsabilidade de julgar Assange e garantir-lhe justiça, e desde já a proteção como *whistleblower* na linha da diretiva que hoje acabámos também de aprovar.

Proteger Assange é afirmar e proteger os valores e princípios europeus, as garantias dos direitos fundamentais aos acusados em justiça, é dar esperança a todos os que arriscam as vidas pela verdade, pela integridade e contra a criminalidade que tudo infiltra e até captura governos.

Julian Assange merece essa proteção e merece beneficiar de todos esses direitos fundamentais na União Europeia.

O orador aceita responder a uma pergunta «cartão azul» – artigo 162.º, n.º 8, do Regimento

Jiří Pospíšil (PPE), *otázka položená zvednutím modré karty*. – Paní kolegyně, já jsem se zájmem vyslechl Vaše vystoupení a jako bývalý ministr spravedlnosti se ptám: Jak může Parlament jako politické těleso zasahovat do konkrétní trestní kauzy a konkrétní extradice? My na toto jednání můžeme mít určitý názor, já mám třeba jiný, ale toto je extradiční trestní kauza a my jsme politici. My přece nemůžeme nějakým způsobem „chránit“ – Vy jste tento termín použila – a zasahovat do soudního řízení v zemi, kde ta extradice probíhá. Můj dotaz proto zní: Jak byste ho chtěla chránit?

Ana Gomes (S&D), *blue-card answer*. – *(inaudible)* ... we know that No European country should extradite to a country that has the death penalty. That's exactly the case of the United States, I'm very sorry. Indeed Assange, if extradited to the United States, could face an accusation of spying, which would entail the death penalty. That's a very strong reason – political and juridical – why he shouldn't be extradited by a court, be it in the UK, in Sweden or in your own country.

(Applause)

Miguel Urbán Crespo, *en nombre del Grupo GUE/NGL*. – Señora presidenta, la detención de Julian Assange marca un momento muy oscuro para la libertad de la información: su detención, nos afecta a todas y a todos.

Los datos que se han hecho públicos gracias a Julian Assange y WikiLeaks, han permitido desvelar crímenes de guerra, asesinatos de periodistas y numerosas violaciones de derechos humanos en el mundo.

El Grupo de Trabajo sobre la Detención Arbitraria consideró ilegal la detención de Assange. Asimismo, la relatora especial de las Naciones Unidas sobre ejecuciones extrajudiciales alertaba sobre los peligros de la extradición de Julian Assange a Estados Unidos.

Hoy hemos aprobado en esta Cámara una Directiva para la protección de filtradores como Julian Assange. Exijamos que se cumpla.

La extradición de Julian Assange mandaría un mensaje muy peligroso. Quienes se enfrentan a la corrupción, quienes se enfrentan a los abusos del poder, lo pagan caro.

Si permitimos que Julian Assange sea extraditado a los Estados Unidos, estaremos renunciando a una parte fundamental de nuestra democracia, estaremos renunciando al derecho a la información.

No lo permitamos, señorías.

Eva Joly, au nom du groupe Verts/ALE. – Madame la Présidente, en débattant de la possible extradition de Julian Assange, le fondateur de WikiLeaks, vers les États-Unis, nous n'abordons pas seulement le sort d'un homme, nous esquissons aussi l'avenir de nos démocraties. Nous devons défendre haut et fort la liberté d'information et la transparence, car c'est de cela qu'il s'agit. Julian Assange a rendu publiques des informations qui dérangent, notamment sur des crimes de guerre perpétrés par les États-Unis. Plutôt que de rendre compte de leurs crimes, les gouvernements veulent faire taire les voix qui s'élèvent. Nous devons opposer à cela notre attachement intact à des démocraties ouvertes, transparentes et responsables de leurs actes. C'est son courage qui est jugé aujourd'hui. Si nous acceptons d'extrader Assange, nous extraderons demain tous ceux qui publient des informations sensibles: les journalistes du *Guardian*, du *Monde*, du *Spiegel* qui ont publié les documents fuités par WikiLeaks. La France doit accorder l'asile à Julian Assange et défendre les couleurs de la transparence.

William (The Earl of) Dartmouth, on behalf of the EFDD Group. – Madam President, let us start off with one proposition. It is not a good idea for politicians to seek to intervene in the legal process. In fact it's a very bad idea. The separation of politics and law is central to western democracy. In the case of Mr Julian Assange, he was taken into custody, came before a court and sentenced, because he was found guilty of jumping bail. There are entirely separate charges of hacking and the like that have been filed against him in the United States. It is these charges that are to be the subject of an extradition hearing. The hearing will take place before an English judge, and what the Council said was factually wrong: the Home Secretary does not decide. Many people, including me, have disliked and disagreed with some rulings of judges in the UK, but no serious person doubts the objectivity and professionalism of the English judiciary. Nevertheless, Ms Gomes and other colleagues want the legal process to be subject to political interference. This is my last speech in the Parliament, but I have to disagree. To debase the legal process to politics is entirely contrary not just to Western values but, Ms Joly, to all the institutions of democracy. We as politicians should leave the legal matter of Julian Assange well alone.

Now, what were the original legal proceedings that caused Mr Assange to jump bail? Well, it was the European arrest warrant, and this warrant was brought not by a Swedish judge but by the Swedish prosecutor. Despite this, with the European arrest warrant there is no real defence against extradition, and this is very worrying. We hear a lot in this place about human rights, but it is the S&D, the ALDE Group, the British Liberal Democrats – all the unthinking supporters of a European superstate – who are also the same people who are big supporters of the European arrest warrant. Their commitment to civil liberties and the European arrest warrant is highly flawed, as it probably was in the case of Mr Assange. Your commitment to civil liberties and legal due process comes to a grinding halt at Calais, and all in the name of yet more integration. If only these people would think again, and I beg you and urge you to do so.

Stelios Kouloglou (GUE/NGL). – Madam President, well I have listened to Pontius Pilate today. We are in favour of whistle-blowers but we have no competence at all – neither the Council nor the Commission. But here we are a political body, we can have our political opinion about the facts. Listen to what's happening. Let's say a European journalist writes something or makes a disclosure on Iran. If Assange is extradited then there is a precedent. Iran – or Turkey – will be able to demand the extradition of the European journalist, or capture or kidnap the European journalist!

What are you going to say? Because they will say that he or she violated the secrets of Iran or Turkey or whatever. So don't play Pontius Pilate when freedom of information and whistle-blowers are crucified.

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

Ana Gomes (S&D), *blue-card question*. – I agree with my colleague Kouloglou that, indeed, this is a political body and we are entitled to make a political judgment, and we are doing that, saying that there should be no extradition to the US. But, on the other hand, we are expecting that the courts – namely in the UK, that fortunately is still and will stay in the EU – are bound by the Charter of Fundamental Rights and by the European Union Treaties. Therefore, it's on the basis of juridical legal grounds, and not political grounds, that a resolution is expected to prevent extradition to a country that still has capital punishment. Do you agree, Mr Kouloglou?

Stelios Kouloglou (GUE/NGL), *blue-card answer*. – I fully agree. We have to make a statement. We have made statements and statements and statements, about Venezuela, Turkey, about everything.

And you are talking my colleague about the legal procedure. Was the legal procedure respected in the case of other countries? We are making interventions. We are making statements. Why not now? Why? Because the British Government is in a mess because of Brexit, and now the government is trying to escape with an Assange exit.

This is not fair. This is not right. You are a politician and you have to take a position. You are either against the extradition or for it.

William (The Earl of) Dartmouth (EFDD). – Madam President, I very much appreciate you giving me the opportunity to respond. It is a legal matter; that is it. Period. It is a legal matter.

Now if you're an advocate of politicians' interfering and intervening in legal due process that is a perfectly understandable and legitimate point of view, although one that I don't happen to agree with, but that is your privilege. That is your privilege to argue that, but it is completely contrary to the way in which Western democracy and democratic institutions are organised. The separation of the executive and the judiciary is absolutely fundamental.

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

Stelios Kouloglou (GUE/NGL), *blue-card question*. – I would like to ask this question of my colleague, William (The Earl of) Dartmouth. What about the processes in Turkey? Is Turkey right when it says that this is a legal action and you have to respect the legal procedure in Turkey and not interfere? Then why have we done so many statements against processes in Turkey? Why?

William (The Earl of) Dartmouth (EFDD), *blue-card answer*. – I'll answer in just a few seconds. What colleagues are advocating is that the British government intervenes in the judicial process in England. What you're advocating about Turkey is that we intervene or seek to intervene.

I entirely agree with you on your criticisms of Turkey and I only wish my government and other governments would make it clear that Turkey will never become a Member of the European Union, irrespective of whether the UK is a Member or not.

Ana Miranda (Verts/ALE). – Señora presidenta, este lunes tenía una cita con Julian Assange en la embajada de Ecuador en Londres. No fui, porque fue arrestado. Pero fui igualmente a esa ciudad a denunciar la vulneración de su derecho al asilo, enfrente de la cárcel de Belmarsh.

El derecho al asilo significa protección de la pena de muerte y protección integral de derechos. El asilo otorgado por Ecuador a Assange no es solo para salvarlo de una silla eléctrica, sino para protegerlo de la cárcel por ejercer el derecho a la libertad de prensa en un país donde no tendría un juicio justo.

El traidor Gobierno de Lenin Moreno se ha vendido. Y ha degradado el principio de asilo que protege la integralidad de los derechos del asilado, aceptando una cadena perpetua o largas décadas de confinamiento en una cárcel norteamericana para alguien cuyo delito ha sido publicar abusos de poder y violaciones de lesa humanidad.

El Gobierno británico no está exigiendo las garantías a los Estados Unidos sobre la no aplicación final de la pena de muerte, por lo que las cartas exhibidas por la cancillería de Ecuador, en las que afirman que sus pares británicos citan una estipulación sobre no extradición en casos de pena de muerte, no constituyen ni compromiso ni garantía de no extraditar a Julian Assange a los Estados Unidos.

El Reino Unido nunca ofreció ninguna garantía de no extradición, y denunciamos en este Parlamento que Ecuador, el Reino Unido y los Estados Unidos coordinaron la entrega de Assange.

Lo que está ocurriendo, señora comisaria, es muy grave. Ataca a la libertad de prensa y de expresión. Assange no debe ser extraditado a los Estados Unidos. Si él es extraditado, cualquier periodista denunciante está en peligro. En peligro por denunciar injusticias, corrupción y abuso de poder.

„Catch the eye” eljárás

Kateřina Konečná (GUE/NGL). – Paní předsedající, dnes jsme zde odhlasovali směrnici, ve které se mimo jiné praví toto: „Oznamovatelé hrají klíčovou úlohu při odhalování případů porušení práva, při nichž je poškozován veřejný zájem, a jejich předcházení, jakož i zajišťování blaha společnosti jako celku.“ To jsme dnes odhlasovali. V této souvislosti považují za nutné zdůraznit, že všechny velké skandály, které byly odhaleny veřejností od roku 2014, jako například *Luxleaks* nebo *Panama Papers*, vyšly najevo díky jednání oznamovatelů a byly zcela očividně ve veřejném zájmu. Je mi upřímně zcela jedno, jestli je pro vás Julian Assange hrdinou či dezertérem, zda zrádцем či bojovníkem za svobodu slova. To v současné situaci považují za podružné. Za jediné opravdu zásadní považují, že pokud chceme chránit oznamovatele, musíme chránit Assange. Ten má být vydán do země, na jejíž zločiny upozornil a ve které je v současnosti prezidentem někdo, kdo považuje novináře za nepřátele lidu. Nevěřím, že by se mu tam dostalo spravedlivého soudu.

(„Catch the eye” eljárás vége)

Věra Jourová, Member of the Commission. – Madam President, honourable Members, thank you very much for this discussion. I would like to repeat that we fully rely on the independence and professionalism of the courts in the United Kingdom. And I remain convinced that the fundamental rights and the right to a fair trial will be fully respected in the decision of the court.

Melania Gabriela Ciot, President-in-Office of the Council. – Madam President, to conclude, I wish to thank you for the opportunity to debate this topical issue of high importance. We will all closely follow the developments of Mr Assange's case. Thank you very much once again for your attention.

Elnök asszony. – A vitát lezárom.

27. Porządek obrad następnego posiedzenia: Patrz protokół

28. Zamknięcie posiedzenia

(Az ülés 23.15-kor rekesztik be.)

—

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