

**PEŁNE SPRAWOZDANIE Z OBRAD 17 KWIETNIA 2019 R.**

(C/2024/3840)

PARLAMENT EUROPEJSKI

SESJA 2019-2020

Posiedzenia od 15 do 18 kwietnia 2019 r.

STRASBURG

Spis treści	Strona
1. Otwarcie posiedzenia .....	5
2. Debata nad przypadkami łamania praw człowieka, zasad demokracji i państwa prawa (ogłoszenie o złożonych projektach rezolucji): patrz protokół .....	5
3. Skład grup politycznych: patrz protokół .....	5
4. Koordynacja systemów zabezpieczenia społecznego (debata) .....	5
5. Wznowienie posiedzenia .....	20
6. Debata z premierem Republiki Łotewskiej Krišjānisem Kariņšem na temat przyszłości Europy (debata) . . . .	20
7. Skład grup politycznych .....	47
8. Głosowanie .....	49
8.1. Wykładnia Regulaminu: art. 32 ust. 5 akapit pierwszy tiret drugie (głosowanie) .....	49
8.2. Protokół do Umowy między UE a Danią w sprawie kryteriów i mechanizmów określania państwa członkowskiego właściwego dla rozpatrywania wniosku o azyl i w sprawie systemu „Eurodac” (A8-0196/2019 - Ignazio Corrao) (głosowanie) .....	49
8.3. Ustanowienie programu „Horyzont Europa” oraz zasad uczestnictwa i upowszechniania obowiązujących w tym programie (A8-0401/2018 - Dan Nica) (głosowanie) .....	49
8.4. Program realizacji programu „Horyzont Europa” (A8-0410/2018 - Christian Ehler) (głosowanie)	49

Spis treści	Strona
8.5. Nadzór rynku i zgodność z prawodawstwem dotyczącym produktów (A8-0277/2018 - Nicola Danti) (głosowanie) . . . . .	49
8.6. Propagowanie uczciwości i przejrzystości dla użytkowników biznesowych korzystających z usług pośrednictwa internetowego (A8-0444/2018 - Christel Schaldemose) (głosowanie) . . . . .	50
8.7. Lepsze egzekwowanie i unowocześnienie unijnych przepisów dotyczących ochrony konsumentów (A8-0029/2019 - Daniel Dalton) (głosowanie) . . . . .	50
8.8. Przejrzystość i zrównoważony charakter unijnej oceny ryzyka w łańcuchu żywnościowym (A8-0417/2018 - Pilar Ayuso) (głosowanie) . . . . .	50
8.9. Dodatkowe świadectwo ochronne dla produktów leczniczych (A8-0039/2019 - Luis de Grandes Pascual) (głosowanie) . . . . .	50
8.10. Program kosmiczny Unii i Agencji Unii Europejskiej ds. Programu Kosmicznego (A8-0405/2018 - Massimiliano Salini) . . . . .	51
8.11. Program „Cyfrowa Europa” na lata 2021-2027 (A8-0408/2018 - Angelika Mlinar) (głosowanie) . . . . .	51
8.12. Program Fiscalis na rzecz współpracy w dziedzinie opodatkowania (A8-0421/2018 - Sven Giegold) (głosowanie) . . . . .	52
8.13. Program działań na rzecz środowiska i klimatu (LIFE) (A8-0397/2018 - Gerben-Jan Gerbrandy) (głosowanie) . . . . .	52
8.14. Program „Wymiar sprawiedliwości” (A8-0068/2019 - Josef Weidenholzer, Heidi Hautala) (głosowanie) . . . . .	52
8.15. Program „Prawa i Wartości” (A8-0468/2018 - Bodil Valero) (głosowanie) . . . . .	52
8.16. Liczba delegacji międzyparlamentarnych, delegacji do wspólnych komisji międzyparlamentarnych oraz delegacji do komisji współpracy parlamentarnej i wielostronnych zgromadzeń parlamentarnych (B8-0240/2019) (głosowanie) . . . . .	53
9. Wyjaśnienia dotyczące sposobu głosowania . . . . .	53
9.1. Ustanowienie programu „Horyzont Europa” oraz zasad uczestnictwa i upowszechniania obowiązujących w tym programie (A8-0401/2018 - Dan Nica) . . . . .	53
9.2. Program realizacji programu „Horyzont Europa” (A8-0410/2018 - Christian Ehler) . . . . .	55
9.3. Nadzór rynku i zgodność z prawodawstwem dotyczącym produktów (A8-0277/2018 - Nicola Danti) . . . . .	55
9.4. Lepsze egzekwowanie i unowocześnienie unijnych przepisów dotyczących ochrony konsumentów (A8-0029/2019 - Daniel Dalton) . . . . .	56
9.5. Przejrzystość i zrównoważony charakter unijnej oceny ryzyka w łańcuchu żywnościowym (A8-0417/2018 - Pilar Ayuso) . . . . .	56
9.6. Dodatkowe świadectwo ochronne dla produktów leczniczych (A8-0039/2019 - Luis de Grandes Pascual) . . . . .	56
10. Korekty do głosowania i zamiar głosowania: patrz protokół . . . . .	57
11. Wznowienie posiedzenia . . . . .	57

Spis treści	Strona
12. Przyjęcie protokołu poprzedniego posiedzenia: patrz protokół	57
13. Europejska Straż Graniczna i Przybrzeżna (debata)	57
14. Kodeks wizowy (debata)	73
15. Wznowienie posiedzenia	83
16. Głosowanie	85
16.1. Dostosowanie niektórych aktów prawnych przewidujących stosowanie procedury regulacyjnej połączonej z kontrolą do art. 290 i 291 TFUE – część II (A8-0190/2019 - József Szájer) (głosowanie)	85
16.2. Dostosowanie niektórych aktów prawnych przewidujących stosowanie procedury regulacyjnej połączonej z kontrolą do art. 290 i 291 TFUE – część I (A8-0020/2018 - József Szájer) (głosowanie)	85
16.3. Dostosowanie niektórych aktów prawnych w obszarze sprawiedliwości przewidujących stosowanie procedury regulacyjnej połączonej z kontrolą do art. 290 TFUE (A8-0012/2018 - József Szájer) (głosowanie)	85
16.4. Wykonanie i finansowanie budżetu ogólnego Unii w 2019 r. w związku z wystąpieniem Zjednoczonego Królestwa z Unii (A8-0197/2019 - Jean Arthuis) (głosowanie)	85
16.5. Umowa w sprawie współpracy naukowej i technologicznej między UE a Rosją (A8-0188/2019 - Christian Ehler) (głosowanie)	86
16.6. Zmiana Statutu Europejskiego Banku Inwestycyjnego (A8-0189/2019 - Danuta Maria Hübner) (głosowanie)	86
16.7. Sprzeciw na podstawie art. 105 ust. 3 Regulaminu: Wdrażanie i eksploatacja współpracujących inteligentnych systemów transportowych (B8-0239/2019) (głosowanie)	86
16.8. Europejska Straż Graniczna i Przybrzeżna (A8-0076/2019 - Roberta Metsola) (głosowanie)	86
16.9. Kodeks wizowy (A8-0434/2018 - Juan Fernando López Aguilar) (głosowanie)	86
16.10. Środki ochrony zasobów i jej egzekwowania mające zastosowanie na obszarze podlegającym regulacji Organizacji Rybołówstwa Północno-Zachodniego Atlantyku (A8-0017/2019 - Ricardo Serrão Santos) (głosowanie)	86
16.11. Zasady ułatwiające korzystanie z informacji finansowych i innych informacji (A8-0442/2018 - Emil Radev) (głosowanie)	86
16.12. Europejskie Centrum Kompetencji w dziedzinie Cyberbezpieczeństwa w kwestiach Przemysłu, Technologii i Badań Naukowych oraz sieć krajowych ośrodków koordynacji (A8-0084/2019 - Julia Reda) (głosowanie)	86
16.13. Instrument „Łącząc Europę” (A8-0409/2018 - Henna Virkkunen, Marian-Jean Marinescu, Pavel Telička) (głosowanie)	86
16.14. Zapobieganie rozpowszechnianiu w internecie treści o charakterze terrorystycznym (A8-0193/2019 - Daniel Dalton) (głosowanie)	87
17. Wyjaśnienia dotyczące sposobu głosowania: patrz protokół	87
18. Korekty do głosowania i zamiar głosowania: patrz protokół	87

Spis treści	Strona
19. Normy emisji CO <sub>2</sub> dla nowych pojazdów ciężkich (debata) . . . . .	87
20. Promowanie ekologicznie czystych i energooszczędnych pojazdów transportu drogowego (debata) . . . . .	96
21. Stosowanie narzędzi i procesów cyfrowych w prawie spółek (debata) . . . . .	103
22. Transgraniczne przekształcanie, łączenie i podział spółek (debata) . . . . .	106
23. Europejski Fundusz Obronny (debata) . . . . .	111
24. Ekspozycje w postaci obligacji zabezpieczonych – Obligacje zabezpieczone i nadzór publiczny nad obligacjami zabezpieczonymi (debata) . . . . .	121
25. Negocjacje z Radą i Komisją w sprawie wniosku ustawodawczego dotyczącego uprawnień śledczych Parlamentu Europejskiego (debata) . . . . .	125
26. Program InvestEU (debata) . . . . .	131
27. Przesunięcia środków i decyzje budżetowe: patrz protokół . . . . .	140
28. Porządek obrad następnego posiedzenia: patrz protokół . . . . .	140
29. Zamknięcie posiedzenia . . . . .	140

## PEŁNE SPRAWOZDANIE Z OBRAD 17 KWIETNIA 2019 R.

PRESIDENZA DELL'ON. DAVID-MARIA SASSOLI

*Vicepresidente*

### 1. Otwarcie posiedzenia

*(La seduta è aperta alle 8.37)*

### 2. Debata nad przypadkami łamania praw człowieka, zasad demokracji i państwa prawa (ogłoszenie o złożonych projektach rezolucji): patrz protokół

### 3. Skład grup politycznych: patrz protokół

### 4. Koordynacja systemów zabezpieczenia społecznego (debata)

**Presidente.** – L'ordine del giorno reca la relazione di Guillaume Balas, a nome della commissione per l'occupazione e gli affari sociali, sulla proposta di regolamento del Parlamento europeo e del Consiglio che modifica il regolamento (CE) n. 883/2004 relativo al coordinamento dei sistemi di sicurezza sociale e il regolamento (CE) n. 987/2009 che stabilisce le modalità di applicazione del regolamento (CE) n. 883/2004 (COM(2016)0815 - C8-0521/2016 - 2016/0397(COD)) (A8-0386/2018).

**Guillaume Balas, rapporteur.** – Monsieur le Président, en décembre 2016, la révision du règlement (CE) n° 883/2004 sur la coordination des systèmes de sécurité sociale a été proposée par la Commission. Il est en effet nécessaire aujourd'hui d'améliorer considérablement la situation concernant la liberté de circulation des travailleurs dans l'Union européenne, puisque nous sommes face au paradoxe suivant: un marché permettant la liberté de circulation, mais des systèmes sociaux très différents, donc des situations de fragilité pour les travailleurs en termes de protection des droits et de portabilité des droits. C'était là, et c'est toujours là, toute l'ambition de cette révision.

Nous avons travaillé pendant plus d'un an au Parlement et nous sommes arrivés, je crois, à trois avancées majeures.

La première, qui est absolument essentielle, est le renforcement de la législation applicable, c'est-à-dire, savoir quelle est la législation applicable à un travailleur mobile – les travailleurs détachés, par exemple, mais ils ne sont pas les seuls. Pour cela, une question est essentielle aujourd'hui: s'assurer qu'un travailleur est effectivement affilié à un système de sécurité sociale et qu'il jouit de tous ses droits. Voilà pourquoi nous avons proposé qu'il y ait trois mois de travail préalable avant de pouvoir être envoyé dans un autre pays, pour s'assurer du lien d'affiliation entre un travailleur et un système de sécurité sociale, et cela bien sûr pour éviter la fraude qu'on connaît si massive.

De la même manière, une autre proposition a été retenue: la notification préalable par une entreprise de l'envoi d'un travailleur dans un autre pays. C'est absolument essentiel aujourd'hui car, nous le savons, une grande part des travailleurs envoyés dans un autre pays ne sont même pas connus de ce pays. Certaines législations nationales, notamment, admettent qu'en deçà d'une certaine période, il n'y ait besoin d'aucun document pour aller travailler dans un autre pays et qu'aucun contrôle ne puisse se faire. Il y a là, je crois, une atteinte grave à la dignité des travailleurs, à leur sécurité, à leur droit à être affilié à un système de sécurité sociale. Voilà la raison de cette proposition de notification.

L'amélioration de la coopération entre les États a également été souhaitée par le Parlement, notamment par un système très original qui allie la contrainte sur les États membres par le dépôt de caution et la liberté de circulation. Cela offre une grande souplesse, notamment pour la capacité des travailleurs de passer d'une frontière à une autre.

Des mesures de justice sociale sont aussi proposées, notamment à travers les six mois d'exportation des prestations de chômage, car comment peut-on imaginer que quelqu'un puisse travailler des années dans un pays et qu'à son départ, il n'ait droit qu'à trois mois d'exportation des prestations de chômage? Six mois, c'est mieux; ce n'est peut-être pas assez, mais c'est déjà ça. Nous avons évidemment aussi imaginé, pour les travailleurs frontaliers, cette liberté d'affiliation au système de sécurité sociale, qui est un grand progrès.

Je tiens à dire la chose suivante, notamment et principalement à la droite, aux droites, mais pas seulement: ne croyez pas que c'est en imitant le populisme et le nationalisme que vous allez répondre au populisme et au nationalisme. C'est même, parfois, un tel paradoxe que certains nationalistes sont devenus plus sages que vous sur les sujets de coordination des systèmes de sécurité sociale. Arrêtez cette obstruction parlementaire permanente, laissez le débat se faire, laissez-nous voter pour que nous puissions, nous Parlement, avoir une position forte en vue du prochain mandat. Alors, oui, votons cette proposition en première lecture. Pour l'avenir, je voudrais donner à M<sup>me</sup> la Commissaire – que je remercie de tout le travail qu'elle a fait – mon plein accord pour que le règlement de coordination soit désormais révisé à la majorité simple au Conseil, afin de lever les blocages constatés, notamment pas plus tard qu'il y a deux semaines. Cela serait une avancée majeure pour les travailleurs européens qui pourraient être enfin protégés face aux égoïsmes nationaux.

**Marianne Thyssen**, *Member of the Commission*. – Mr President, I am pleased to be here for this debate on the revision of the regulations on social security coordination. Fifteen years after the last revision, this Commission has proposed a new and necessary modernisation. That modernisation is much needed to address new challenges and opportunities in the fields of long-term care, unemployment benefits, family benefits and the rules on applicable legislation for posted workers. We adopted our proposal more than two years ago in order to ensure fairness in the free movement of workers and citizens in the internal market. I would like to thank the rapporteur, Mr Guillaume Balas, and the many Members of the Parliament who deeply invested in this file, to bring about the improvements that our citizens, our workers and our businesses are waiting for. Facilitating parental leave allowances for mobile citizens, clarifying the right of citizens in need of long-term care, giving job seekers more opportunities to find work abroad – these are some examples on how the proposed modernisation would improve citizens' daily life.

For me, honourable Members, it has always been essential to coordinate social security systems with rules that are clear, fair and enforceable. This is indeed the only way to secure continued support for our internal markets. Fairness means that the rules are equitable to all and not designed to benefit one category of stakeholders to the detriment of the others. It means taking into account the interests of both the Member States of origin and the receiving Member States. Fairness means rules that allow mobile citizens and workers to move to another country in proper conditions and take into account the interests of taxpayers and the interest in maintaining adequate social security systems. Fairness means for me also preserving the business opportunities for all the companies and the self-employed that make use of free movement in good faith to serve clients across Europe, be it businesses or consumers. And fairness also means preserving and improving tools to fight abuses and fraud. These are the principles on which we have based our proposal.

These have also been the objectives that have guided us throughout the interinstitutional negotiations with the Parliament and the Council. The provisional agreement that we reached in trilogues has not been confirmed, because there was no sufficient majority amongst the Member States. But I believe that the compromise that we reached should inspire us for the work that remains to be done.

Mr President, dear rapporteur, shadow rapporteurs, Members of Parliament, this Parliament now has the opportunity to agree on its position in first reading and thereby open the way for further progress in this important file. I count on your constructive spirit and on our shared motivation to make good use of this opportunity. This is what our citizens, our workers and our businesses expect from us.

**Presidente.** – Grazie Signora Commissaria, e adesso ascoltiamo il parere dei gruppi politici e, in questa prima fase, non accettiamo «blue card».

Per il gruppo del Partito popolare, on. Schulze, un minuto e trenta.

**Sven Schulze, im Namen der PPE-Fraktion.** – Herr Präsident, sehr geehrte Frau Kommissarin, meine Damen und Herren! Aus meiner Sicht ist die Koordinierung der Systeme der sozialen Sicherheit eines der wichtigsten Gesetze. Das hat Europa wirklich weit vorangebracht. Wir regeln damit ganz wesentlich die Arbeitnehmerfreizügigkeit, eine der Grundideen unseres vereinten Europas.

Für dieses wichtige und sehr umfangreiche Gesetz wurde uns Abgeordneten aus meiner Sicht aber zu wenig Zeit eingeräumt. Die Kommission hat den Gesetzesvorschlag auch relativ spät vorgelegt. Es ist nun vor der Europawahl natürlich schwierig, ein faires Ergebnis zu erzielen. Unter großem Zeitdruck mussten wir im Ausschuss abstimmen, und auch für den Trilog blieb nicht genug Zeit – zu wenig Zeit offensichtlich, um ein Ergebnis zu finden, dem auch der Rat hätte zustimmen können.

Dabei gibt es doch Positives, was wir auch im Trilog erreicht haben. Wir haben zum Beispiel nun auch Koordinierungsregeln für die Langzeitpflege, wir haben eine wichtige Ausnahme bei Entsendungen, nämlich die Ausnahmen bei Dienstreisen, sodass wir auch kurzfristige Entsendungen weiter ermöglichen.

Es gibt aber auch Schattenseiten. Weniger gefällt mir die Idee, dass man sich nach Vorstellung des Europäischen Parlaments zukünftig bei jeder Entsendung abmelden soll. Die Idee ist eigentlich gut gemeint, aber vermutlich nur mit moderner Technik, mit Digitalisierung umsetzbar. Ein Beispiel: Wenn man als Lehrer oder Lehrerin einen Schulausflug ins Nachbarland plant – ist das bereits eine Entsendung oder nicht?

Auch beim Thema Arbeitslosenleistungen geht der Bericht des Ausschusses zu weit. Die Exportleistungen wurden schon angesprochen, oder auch das Thema Rosinenpickerei, was wir kriegen können, wenn wir zukünftig beim Thema Grenzgänger das Wahlrecht einführen. Im Trilogergebnis haben wir es zwar rausbekommen, aber das Trilogergebnis steht ja hier nicht zur Abstimmung.

Ich glaube, wir könnten ein besseres Ergebnis erzielen. Wir brauchen dazu im neuen Parlament mehr Zeit, nach der Europawahl. Die EVP-Fraktion wird bereit sein, dazu beizutragen, dass wir nach der Europawahl ein besseres Ergebnis erzielen.

**Agnes Jongerius, namens de S&D-Fractie.** – Voorzitter, voor ons ligt een veelomvattend pakket waar absoluut goede dingen in zitten, maar ook slechte punten. Onder de streep moet de PVDA echter tegen dit voorstel stemmen. Wij zijn niet tegen de overdraagbaarheid van werkloosheidsuitkeringen, maar wel tegen deze uitwerking.

In Nederland hebben we de afgelopen jaren twee grote zaken van georganiseerde fraude met werkloosheidsuitkeringen gezien. Werknemers moeten er zeker van kunnen zijn dat iedereen bijdraagt en dat niemand onterecht een uitkering krijgt, want via de premies draaien de werknemers daar ook voor op. In dit voorstel vervalt in de praktijk de sollicitatieplicht en het beschikbaar zijn voor de arbeidsmarkt. Ook draagt de verlenging van de overdraagbaarheid van werkloosheidsuitkeringen bij aan een exportcarrousel. Het ene half jaar nemen werkgevers mensen aan, maar het andere half jaar wordt het contract niet verlengd en worden mensen naar een uitkering verwezen.

Daar moeten we eerst iets aan doen als we werknemers echt willen blijven beschermen tegen werkloosheid. Voor ons staat de solidariteit van het stelsel voorop en dat is met dit voorstel niet gegarandeerd.

**Helga Stevens**, *namens de ECR-Fractie*. – Voorzitter, collega's, iedereen is het erover eens: sociale fraude moet keihard worden bestreden. Zo moeten de sociale inspecties van alle lidstaten veel vlotter en beter kunnen samenwerken.

Daarnaast moet er een minimumtermijn aan gewerkte dagen zijn vooraleer buitenlandse werknemers aanspraak kunnen maken op onze werkloosheidsuitkeringen. Het is toch volkomen logisch dat niet-Belgische werknemers eerst voldoende hebben bijgedragen aan de Belgische sociale zekerheid vooraleer ze recht hebben op een werkloosheidsuitkering.

Daarom blij ik achter het Commissievoorstel staan van minstens drie maanden werk vooraleer men een uitkering kan krijgen. Zes maanden werkvereiste zou zelfs nog beter zijn. Maar het tegendeel is waar: de linkerzijde zou de werkvereiste tot één dag willen beperken, wat je reinste waanzin is. Zo ondergraaf je het draagvlak voor onze sociale zekerheid.

Ook wil de linkerzijde toestaan dat werkzoekenden hun werkloosheidsuitkeringen meenemen als ze weer naar hun land van herkomst verhuizen. Maar zo wordt de controle op activering helemaal onmogelijk gemaakt. Dit werkt misbruik in de hand. Uit de statistieken blijkt overigens dat een aanzienlijk aantal personen dat terugkeert naar hun eigen land, geen werk vindt binnen drie maanden. Waarom zouden ze ook zoeken? Met een Belgische werkloosheidsuitkering kan men zeer comfortabel leven in een Oost-Europees land!

Vlaanderen is een exportgerichte economie, maar onze sociale zekerheid is geen exportproduct! Met andere woorden: zonder bijdragen geen uitkering!

**Marian Harkin**, *on behalf of the ALDE Group*. – Mr President, as legislators, our responsibility is to ensure that whatever legislation we support tomorrow will improve the current situation, will address identified problems or blockages, will contribute to free and fair movement of workers, and will ensure trust, certainty and social fairness and a level playing field for all workers. That's our benchmark in the Group of the Alliance of Liberals and Democrats for Europe (ALDE). Therefore, in ALDE, we believe that the original Commission proposal is a decent attempt at achieving an improved regime.

The draft agreement at trilogue had a number of positive elements, but the Council could not support it. There are positive elements in today's report on family benefits, on long-term healthcare and on the non-codification of the European Court of Justice (ECJ) judgments. However, we believe that the amendment on Article 13, which could include drivers, would cause nightmares for drivers and employers, potentially subjecting drivers to a number of different social security regimes, and we have tabled amendments to remove that proposal. We do not agree that frontier workers can choose which social security system they will benefit from. This would cause huge uncertainty for Member States and undermine the social contract between cross-border workers and national workers. We don't support one aggregation. Again, this will, in some Member States, create an anomaly between cross-border and national workers. If our amendments on these matters are accepted, we can, on balance, support this legislation. But, if they are not accepted, we believe it will not deliver balanced and fair legislation.

Finally, can I thank the rapporteur and shadow rapporteurs for their commitment to this dossier. We didn't always agree, but we certainly worked our best.

**Gabriele Zimmer**, *im Namen der GUE/NGL-Fraktion*. – Herr Präsident, meine Damen und Herren! Mir scheint, nachdem ich Ihnen zugehört habe, dass ein Teil meiner Kolleginnen und Kollegen hier im Parlament das Grundprinzip der Koordinierung der sozialen Sicherungssysteme nicht verstehen will. Es geht darum, dass Ansprüche, die erworben worden sind, bei einem Wechsel in ein anderes Land anerkannt werden – um nichts anderes. Wer da sagt: Man kann nur Ansprüche bekommen, wenn ich in das jeweilige nationale System eingezahlt habe, in dem ich arbeite, verkennt genau dieses Grundprinzip. Da können wir ja gleich aufhören, von einer sozialen Union überhaupt nur reden zu wollen. Bitte bekennen Sie sich endlich dazu!

Hören Sie auf, mit allen möglichen Tricksereien eine Debatte um die Position des Ausschusses für Beschäftigung und soziale Angelegenheiten bei der Abstimmung verhindern zu wollen. Das halte ich für undemokratisch. Wir können es verändern, wenn die Mehrheit es will. Aber einfach die Debatte beenden und in dieser Legislatur keine Abstimmung haben wollen, das hat nichts mit parlamentarischer Demokratie zu tun. Diese Rosinenpickerei, die zerstört die Europäische Union. Freizügigkeit muss für alle Menschen in der Europäischen Union gelten. Sie muss für alle sozial abgesichert sein. Darüber reden wir hier. Die Mehrheit im Ausschuss für Beschäftigung und soziale Angelegenheiten hat eine sehr fortschrittliche Position erreicht. Die stellen wir zur Debatte. Darüber kann abgestimmt werden.



Wir stimmen als Linke dafür, weil es einen längeren Export von Arbeitslosengeld geben soll – sechs Monate. Wir stimmen dafür, weil Schlupflöcher für Sozialversicherungsbetrug bei der Entsendung geschlossen werden. Und wir stimmen auch dafür, weil Pflegeleistungen als eigenständige Leistung koordiniert werden.

Wir sind aber insbesondere dagegen, dass einige versuchen – insbesondere Konservative und Rechtsextreme –, die Kindergeldindexierung durchzusetzen. Osteuropäerinnen – in Deutschland zum Beispiel – sollen weniger Kindergeld bekommen, wenn ihre Kinder zu Hause in Polen oder Rumänien bleiben. Diese Menschen sollen diskriminiert werden – Menschen, die hart arbeiten, die eingezahlt haben, die ihre Leistungen bezahlen, die Steuern und Sozialabgaben zahlen, und die ihre Kinder zu Hause auch besuchen wollen. Wir werden diese Indexierung ablehnen.

Abschließend zur Frage der sozialen Gleichbehandlung: Die soziale Gleichbehandlung aller EU-Bürger müssen wir im Parlament verteidigen. Niemand darf als EU-Bürger zweiter Klasse behandelt werden. Das muss beim Arbeitslosengeld gelten. Wenn jemand in einem Land eingezahlt hat, muss es in einem anderen anerkannt werden. Und es gibt noch eine fundamentale Lücke im Rahmen der EU-Freizügigkeit: Wir müssen als EU dafür sorgen, dass die Bürger und Bürgerinnen in allen Ländern das Recht auf Zugang zu sozialen Sicherungssystemen haben.

**Jean Lambert**, *on behalf of the Verts/ALE Group*. – Mr President, when I first came to this Parliament some 20 years ago now, the first legislative file I worked on was the overall revision of the coordination of social security systems. We voted through that agreement, now Regulation (EC) No 883/2004, in the final plenary week of that parliamentary term. I had hoped by the time I had finished my time in Parliament to be voting through a similar agreement with Council on the latest update, but unfortunately that's not going to be the case due to big divisions in Council. And why not? Because I believe this file has become a mix of narrow national political interests and people trying to use the regulation to fix problems which are not its core business.

My political group has tried to keep the citizen as the person concerned in the language of the text at the centre of that approach, and those citizens are not only workers, family members, students, travellers, but anyone covered by a social security system and in a cross-border situation. We welcome the clear inclusion of long-term care in the updated regulation, but we start from the belief that the overwhelming majority of citizens and their employers want to stay on the right side of the rules and thus protect their entitlements, so it helps if the rules are clear and as easy as possible to follow, with a degree of flexibility that reflects and assists daily life. It also helps if there is an effective administration that responds quickly and assists people, rather than acting as a bureaucratic barrier that pushes people to take chances.

Generally, we support the committee report. The only amendment – Amendment 197 – that we've reintroduced concerns this blessed A1 form, an attestation and not a permission, and we've proposed the issuing of an open A1, valid for three months, so that an individual who travels often on business doesn't have to make multiple applications that are time-consuming for the person concerned and the administration.

As regards the other amendments tabled, we don't support the indexation of family benefits. We believe that a cross-border worker is entitled to equal treatment, and that such a measure is not cost effective, though some governments may find it politically expedient.

We also point out that this report strengthens the oversight possibilities for Member States and they can always adopt bilateral measures if necessary, which makes far more sense than trying to adapt the whole regulation to fix a bilateral problem. So we believe the committee has found a sound basis for this proposal, and we believe it provides a sound basis for negotiation for the next Parliament.

**Sven Schulze (PPE)**. – Herr Präsident! Es ist ja keine *blue card* erlaubt, aber zur Geschäftsordnung würde ich eines gern sagen: Sie sind zehn Minuten zu spät gekommen, wir haben die Debatte zehn Minuten zu spät begonnen, wir können deshalb keine *blue card* machen. Hätten wir das gemacht, hätte ich gern mal Frau Zimmer gefragt, was sie denn hier als Tricksereien empfindet, wenn Parteien ihr ganz normales Recht wahrnehmen, Anträge zu stellen. Das ist keine Trickserei, Frau Zimmer, das muss ich Ihnen ganz klar sagen. Und, Herr Präsident, wären Sie pünktlich gekommen, hätten wir auch das *Blue-card*-Verfahren nutzen können.

**Joëlle Mélin**, *au nom du groupe ENF*. – Monsieur le Président, notre groupe a eu une position d'attentisme et de réflexion concernant ce texte. En effet, si le texte qui permet la libre circulation des personnes est très ancien, il peut parfaitement être entendu dans le cadre des coopérations, telles que nous les entendons, au sein de l'alliance européenne des nations à laquelle nous aspirons.

Ce texte apporte selon nous quelques améliorations, en particulier sur le plan de la sécurité donnée aux travailleurs transfrontaliers et aux familles dont les parents travaillent dans des pays différents. Mais nous érigeons aussi bien évidemment en dogme absolu le principe selon lequel le pays collecteur des cotisations doit être celui qui verse les prestations.

En revanche, nous nourrissons aussi quelques regrets sur ce texte. Nous déplorons la détermination du périmètre des maladies de longue durée, dont il faut savoir qu'en France, elles représentent 70 % du budget de la sécurité sociale, un taux qui doit être comparable dans beaucoup de pays d'Europe.

Nous regrettons aussi le fait que, dans le texte présenté par le rapporteur, l'obligation légale de résidence ait disparu et que seule compte la jurisprudence qui, elle-même, est sujette à interprétation.

Enfin, nous regrettons que des oppositions, notamment de la droite, ne nous aient pas permis de garantir l'autorisation préalable. C'est pour cela que le trilogue n'a pas pu aboutir.

Cela étant, il est tout à fait clair que nous souhaitons que ce texte puisse passer, puisque c'est une avancée, mais nous demandons instamment que ce texte prévoie un système permettant d'empêcher les fraudes potentielles: il faut impérativement qu'il y ait autorisation préalable.

**Dobromir Sośnierz (NI)**. – Panie Przewodniczący! Każda sytuacja, w której zabiera się pieniądze jednym, żeby dać innym, kiedy zabiera się tym, którzy pracują, a rozdaje tym, którzy nie pracują, jest niemoralna i głupia. I teraz ci, którzy robią więcej tych głupot, domagają się solidarności w głupocie od tych, którzy robią tych głupot mniej. Już rzut oka na te drobiazgowo regulacje pokazuje, z jaką biurokracją mamy do czynienia. Jeśli państwo potrzebuje definicji podróży służbowej, to jest chorym krajem.

Nie bierzcie, proszę, w zęby swobody przemieszczania się i wolności, kiedy jednocześnie postulujecie zezwolenia, kontrole, zgłaszanie, ograniczanie czasu delegacji. Jeśli w dodatku uważacie, że prawa do zasiłków przeszkadzają ludziom się przemieszczać, to ja mam prosty pomysł: znieśmy zasiłki i będzie spokój. Mówicie, że to sprzyja oszustwom. No kto by się spodziewał, że to może sprzyjać oszustwom! Znieśmy zasiłki – nie będzie oszustw.

Dorzucanie w ostatniej chwili przez upadającą lewicę takich kontrowersyjnych projektów, kiedy już wiecie, że ludzie mają was dość, i kiedy wynika to z sondażu, jest przejawem obłudy, podobnie jak jednoczesne powoływanie się w tym momencie na demokrację, bo ludzie nie chcą tych waszych dalszych eksperymentów socjalistycznych. Socjalizm bankrutuje i dziękujemy Państwu.

**David Casa (PPE)**. – Sur President, din hija leġiżlazzjoni importanti hafna li se jkollha riperkussjonijiet fil-pajjiżi membri kollha tal-Unjoni Ewropea u l-moviment hieles tal-haddiema fl-istess Unjoni. L-emendi proposti huma estensivi u essenzjalment jindirizzaw miżuri għal min hu qiegħed, beneficiju għal kura fit-tul, għall-posted workers: dan huwa naturalment pożittiv.

Però d-diskussjonijiet riċenti dwar dan ir-rapport u l-pożizzjonijiet diverġenti fuq din il-kwistjoni tqajjem dubji dwar dan. Jien inhoss li għad jonqosna ftit aktar x'nagħmlu biex nilhqu l-miri tagħna u n-nuqqas ta' qbil proviżorju jpoġġi t-titjib ta' dan id-dritt friskju. Dan ukoll minhabba nuqqas ta' maġġoranza fil-Kunsill.

Għalhekk ma nistgħux niżbaljaw. Irridu niżguraw li kwalunkwe tibdiliet li jsir fil-liġi ttejjeb il-hajja tan-nies u ma jkunx ta' xkiel għaċ-ċittadini, għal min jahdem, kif ukoll għal min ihaddem jew hu self-employed. Jien konxju li hemm numru ta' emendi proposti fuq il-mejda tal-Kamra. Bil-voti tagħna għandna naċċertaw li dawn l-emendi jtejbu din il-leġiżlazzjoni u jkun ta' beneficiju għaċ-ċittadini Ewropej kollha.

Fl-aħhar nett irrid niringrazzja lir-Rapporteur u lix-Shadow Rapporteurs kollha, li naturalment mhux dejjem qbilna imma nahseb nixtieq niringrazzjahom għall-effort li għamlu biex jipprovaw insibu xi haġa li dwarha nistgħu naqblu, forsi anke fil-futur.

**Mercedes Bresso (S&D).** – Signor Presidente, onorevoli colleghi, gentile Commissaria, non c'è dubbio che l'aggiornamento delle norme per facilitare la mobilità del lavoro e assicurare un equo accesso ai sistemi di sicurezza sociale per i lavoratori mobili che continuano a crescere in Europa è un tassello importante nella costruzione di un'Europa più inclusiva e più sociale e il coordinamento dei regimi di sicurezza sociale va incontro a questo principio europeo della libertà di movimento, anche se, naturalmente, poiché i regimi di sicurezza sociale sono soggetti all'esclusiva degli Stati, questo è solo un coordinamento, però questo coordinamento sarebbe stato un grande passo avanti verso una maggiore chiarezza e armonizzazione legislativa.

Purtroppo su alcune questioni che noi consideriamo importanti, come quella relativa ai lavoratori transfrontalieri e transnazionali, che possono decidere dove ricevere l'indennità di disoccupazione e sono lavoratori fragili che meritano protezione – l'altro punto in discussione complesso è quello sulla maniera e la località dove ricevere l'indennità di disoccupazione per chi cerca lavoro in un altro paese europeo – sono norme che purtroppo non riusciremo completamente a definire. È un peccato, perché io credo che sulle proposte del trilatero, se si fosse riusciti a raggiungere un accordo, avremmo ottenuto un buon risultato. Come diceva Lei, Commissaria, purtroppo, dovremo rinviare alla prossima volta.

**Anders Primdahl Vistisen (ECR).** – Hr. formand! Den lovgivning, som man er på vej til at vedtage her om sociale ydelser i Europa, er endnu en sørgelig milepæl i Europas vedvarende angreb på den danske model. Det er et forsvar for velfærdsturisme, det er et forsvar for den sociale dumping, og det er et skridt i den fundamentalt forkerte retning. Det er jo ikke sådan, at disse sikringsordninger vil betyde ens rettigheder for EU-borgere og nationale borgere, i en række tilfælde vil de betyde bedre rettigheder for EU-borgere end for nationale borgere. For eksempel når det kommer til de danske dagpenge: Det er jo fuldstændigt vanvittigt, at man skal kunne optjene dansk dagpengen i en forsikringsordning, som er på et langt lavere niveau, og derfor afviste Dansk Folkeparti klart, at man på nogen måder skal kunne få adgang til nationale velfærdsydelser uden at have optjent dem på nøjagtigt samme vilkår som nationale borgere. Og kan vi ikke komme igennem med det, så bør man i det mindste få indekseret disse velfærdsydelser, så de ikke har et eksorbitant højt niveau, når man tager dem med hjem til hjemlandet, uanset om det gælder S.U., dagpenge eller den myriade af andre velfærdsydelser, som EU giver EU-borgere ret til i Danmark.

**Yana Toom (ALDE).** – Mr President, one of the four freedoms enjoyed by EU citizens is the free movement of workers. Free movement is hardly possible without social guarantees for workers and their family members, and efficient coordination of Member States' social security systems. When mobile workers move between EU Member States for jobs, one key concern is that they can lose social rights earned in another country. It is also clear that the number of cross-border workers could increase if there was better coordination of social security systems between neighbouring Member States.

Regretfully, the current regulation is outdated and ought to be revised. Hard work was done in both my parliamentary committees, the Committees on Petitions and on Employment and Social Affairs, but as we know, our trilogue agreement was finally not possible due to the conflicting views in the Council. No doubt we'll go back to this topic in the very near future. In this context, I would also like to underline that national discrimination against mobile workers is clearly outlawed by the Treaties. I regret any attempt to put artificial obstacles for Eastern European workers in their access to social benefits in the old Member States.

Most importantly, I cannot support the indexation of family benefits in the place of residence of the children. This measure is both inappropriate and discriminatory, and it creates a complex, expensive and unnecessary bureaucratic monitoring system. Similar discriminatory measures should not be included in any future proposals regarding coordination of Europe social security systems.

**Rina Ronja Kari (GUE/NGL).** – Hr. formand! Kære kolleger, vi står i dag med det grundlæggende spørgsmål: Hvor meget skal EU egentlig blande sig i landenes dagpengesystem? Og vi er nødt til at holde os for øje, at landene har vidt forskellige systemer. Et forslag, som måske kan virke godt i ét land, kan have katastrofale følger i et andet land. Vi skal beskytte borgerne, men vi skal ikke undergrave velfungerende systemer. Og helt ærligt, det forslag der ligger på bordet i dag, risikerer at undergrave det danske dagpengesystem – et system, som ellers er bygget på solidaritet mellem arbejdstagerne. Et system, hvor dem i arbejde midlertidigt hjælper dem, der er uden arbejde. At give ret til dagpenge efter blot én dags arbejde i et andet EU-land og give ret til at tage dem med ud af landet i 6 måneder, det er simpelthen at åbne for en ladeport af social dumping. Det vil have katastrofale følger. Så spørgsmålet er nu grundlæggende: Skal EU virkelig blande sig i vores dagpengesystem? Mit svar er helt klart: Nej, EU skal blande sig helt udenom!

## IN THE CHAIR: MAIREAD McGUINNESS

Vice-President

**Terry Reintke (Verts/ALE).** – Frau Präsidentin, liebe Frau Kommissarin, liebe Kolleginnen und Kollegen! Das Brexit-Drama, das wir gerade in Großbritannien miterleben müssen, hat nicht erst vor drei Jahren mit dem Referendum begonnen. Jahrzehntlang vorher ist wirklich systematisch gegen die Europäische Union gehetzt worden, und gerade in den letzten Jahren vor allem auch gegen EU-Bürgerinnen und —Bürger, die in Großbritannien leben. Diese Debatte war ganz häufig auf einer Diskussion um die Indexierung von Kindergeld aufgebaut – eine Neiddebatte, die absolut nichts zum sozialen Ausgleich in Großbritannien beiträgt, sondern nur das gesellschaftliche Klima vergiftet und die Gesellschaft spaltet.

Ich will das ganz klar sagen: Eine Indexierung des Kindergeldes würde kein einziges Problem sozialer Ungerechtigkeit in Großbritannien oder in anderen europäischen Ländern lösen, sondern würde nur eine Ungleichheit von Arbeitnehmern und Arbeitnehmerinnen nach sich ziehen und mehr Bürokratie schaffen. Deshalb: Wenn wir in einem geeinten und sozialen Europa leben wollen, dann müssen wir die Indexierung des Kindergeldes ablehnen.

Gleichzeitig müssen wir uns aber auch klarmachen, dass wir für soziale Gerechtigkeit innerhalb der Europäischen Union sehr viel mehr tun müssen. Denn die Regionen in Großbritannien, die am stärksten von sozialer Ungleichheit und Armut betroffen sind, sind auch die, die in dem Referendum am stärksten für *Leave* gestimmt haben. Die EU hat lange Zeit nicht genug getan, damit Arbeitnehmer und Arbeitnehmerinnen und Bürger und Bürgerinnen nicht gegeneinander ausgespielt werden können.

Wir müssen uns klarmachen, dass die Voraussetzungen für einen Brexit in allen Mitgliedstaaten der Europäischen Union gegeben sind. Wachsende soziale Ungleichheit zusammen mit einer Hetze gegen die Europäische Union sind eine absolut explosive Mischung. Wenn wir wollen, dass dieses gemeinsame europäische Projekt weiter zusammenwächst, dann müssen wir es sozialer machen, und dann müssen wir diese beiden Herausforderungen gemeinsam angehen. Eine gute Koordinierung sozialer Sicherungssysteme ist eine absolut essenzielle Voraussetzung dafür.

**Danuta Jazłowiecka (PPE).** – Pani Przewodnicząca! Ponieważ dalszymi negocjacjami zajmie się nowy parlament chciałabym zaapelować do nowych posłów o rozważę i ostrożność. Po pierwsze, musimy zagwarantować równe traktowanie dla pracowników migrujących. Osoby, które decydują się na przeprowadzkę do innego państwa członkowskiego, aby tam podjąć pracę, powinny jak najszybciej znaleźć się w systemie zabezpieczenia społecznego państwa przyjmującego. Dla pracowników migrujących ważne jest także wydłużenie okresu, podczas którego mogą eksportować nabyte świadczenia z tytułu bezrobocia z trzech do sześciu miesięcy. Potrzebne są także szczególne rozwiązania dotyczące pracowników przygranicznych. Nie może być także mowy o wprowadzeniu indeksacji świadczeń rodzinnych.

W przypadku pracowników delegowanych powinniśmy unikać znaczących zmian. Firmy świadczące usługi za granicą borykają się z ogromnymi obciążeniami administracyjnymi oraz nowymi przepisami wynikającymi z nowej dyrektywy o delegowaniu pracowników. Należy unikać zapisów, które prowadziłyby do fragmentacji zabezpieczenia społecznego. Pracownik musi mieć pewność, gdzie płaci składki i gdzie ubezpieczeni są on oraz jego rodzina. Dlatego konieczne jest utrzymanie okresu dwudziestu czterech miesięcy podczas których składki płacone są w kraju wysyłającym. Należy także utrzymać obecne brzmienie art. 13 rozporządzenia 987/2009 roku, który dotyczy osób pracujących w dwu lub więcej państwach członkowskich, a więc na przykład kierowców. Osoby te powinny być ubezpieczone w kraju w swojego pobytu. Przed nowym Parlamentem Europejskim trudne zadanie, ale wierzę, że nowi europosłowie wykażą się rozsądkiem i rozważę.

**Emilian Pavel (S&D).** – Doamnă președintă, doamnă comisar, vreau să vă mulțumesc foarte mult pentru munca depusă, pentru propunerea dumneavoastră și pentru modul în care apărați – să spun așa – sau combateți această indexare a beneficiilor sociale pentru creșterea copilului. Vreau să vă mulțumesc pentru poziția fermă pe care ați avut-o de fiecare dată și pe care v-o mențineți. Vreau să ne spuneti, poate la final, cum stăm în Austria, ce se întâmplă cu acea procedură de *infringement*, dacă le prelungiți sau nu această procedură.

Vreau să constat, totuși, că, în această dezbatere, unii colegi, care se cred de stânga, uită că acum câțiva ani de zile am votat *social dumping*-ul în Parlamentul European. Atunci se spunea „pentru muncă egală, plată egală”. Dragi colegi, pentru muncă egală, protecție socială egală peste tot în Europa! Haideți să nu mai pierdem voturi către extrema dreaptă și să continuăm să fim pro-europeni. Acest program, acest raport este unul de compromis, dar este unul care duce Uniunea Europeană mai departe. Este unul care trebuie votat și trebuie continuată munca la el.

**Ruža Tomašić (ECR).** – Poštovana predsjedavajuća, mobilnost radnika otvorila je važno pitanje socijalne sigurnosti radnika na prekograničnom radu. Da bi oni mogli neometano konzumirati svoja prava, nadležna tijela država članica moraju bolje međusobno surađivati, a nacionalna zakonodavstva biti maksimalno usklađena.

Svjesna sam potrebe da se u ovom području naprave određeni pomaci, ali ne mogu podržati predloženo rješenje jer uvodi nove komplikacije i otvara prostor prijevarama. Socijalni sustav mora ostati prvenstveno u nadležnosti država članica, a prava na naknade mobilni radnik treba ostvarivati u matičnoj zemlji do njihova isteka ili dok ih se ne odrekne.

Do tog trenutka ne bi trebao ostvarivati pravo na naknadu u državi članici u kojoj želi pronaći posao. Uključivanjem na tržište rada u drugoj državi, radnik bi trebao izgubiti pravo na naknadu u matičnoj državi ili onoj članici u kojoj je prethodno ostvarivao to pravo.

Kompliciranija rješenja, iako na prvi pogled djeluju povoljnije za radnike, samo će uvesti pravni nered i dodatno opteretiti socijalne sustave.

**Morten Løkkegaard (ALDE).** – Fru formand! I Venstre går vi ind for, at vandrende arbejdstagere i Europa skal have ordenlige forhold. Ingen tvivl om det. Men det mål er desværre langt fra opnået med dette lovforslag. Det forslag, der foreligger nu, skaber stor juridisk usikkerhed, det risikerer at stille vandrende arbejdstagere bedre end deres kollegaer i det land, de kommer til, og det åbner for en helt urimelig eksport af dagpenge og børneydelser. Det forslag, vi står overfor her, er væsentligt ringere end det, som vi desværre ikke kom igennem med i en redigeret form. Det er Kommissionens første forslag. Det er et stykke lovgivningsmæssig makværk for at sige det ligeud, og jeg vil kraftigt opfordre til, at vi stemmer det ned.

**Κωνσταντίνα Κούνεβα (GUE/NGL).** – Κυρία Πρόεδρε, κάθε χώρα της Ευρωπαϊκής Ένωσης έχει διαφορετικά συστήματα κοινωνικής ασφάλισης, διαφορετικούς κανόνες, προϋπολογισμούς και κανόνες για το πώς κατανέμει τα επιδόματα ανεργίας, μητρότητας, πατρότητας, τα οικογενειακά ή προσυνταξιοδοτικά επιδόματα. Όμως, όσα επιδόματα και αν παρέχονται, τα ερωτήματα είναι αμείλικτα. Θέλουμε ή δεν θέλουμε μια ενιαία Ευρώπη; Θέλουμε ή δεν θέλουμε ελεύθερη κυκλοφορία των εργαζομένων; Θέλουμε ή δεν θέλουμε να μην υπάρχουν διακρίσεις σε βάρος του δανού ή του έλληνα εργαζόμενου όταν αλλάζει τόπο διαμονής; Στηρίζουμε την έκθεση Balas, που υποστηρίχθηκε και από ένα ευρύ φάσμα βουλευτών. Μόνον έτσι μπορούμε να φτάσουμε σε ενιαίο ευρωπαϊκό ασφαλιστικό σύστημα. Αυτός είναι ο δρόμος και για ενιαίο φορολογικό σύστημα, χωρίς διαφορές μεταξύ μας, για να χτίσουμε μια πραγματικά ενωμένη Ευρώπη.

**Verónica Lope Fontagné (PPE).** – Señora presidenta, desde las instituciones europeas tenemos que seguir trabajando para facilitar que la libre circulación de trabajadores de la Unión venga acompañada de la garantía del Derecho de los trabajadores.

Es una lástima que no se haya alcanzado una mayoría cualificada del Consejo, ya que la propuesta incluía aspectos positivos, como el aumento del periodo de exportación de las prestaciones por desempleo —que facilitaría la búsqueda de empleo y reforzaría la movilidad laboral de los trabajadores—, la mejora de la coordinación europea de las prestaciones por cuidados de larga duración y la preservación del principio de igualdad de trato que evite la indexación de las prestaciones por hijos a cargo.

También consideraría importante que se respetasen las especificidades de sectores de alta movilidad, que hay que tener en cuenta a la hora de legislar.

Y para concluir, como hoy es mi última intervención en esta casa, quisiera despedirme dando las gracias por estos diez años. Se ha trabajado mucho, con consenso entre los distintos grupos, y eso nos ha permitido —y refiriéndome concretamente a la Comisión de Empleo— llevar a cabo una gran labor a favor de los más desfavorecidos, un esfuerzo desconocido en muchos casos por los ciudadanos europeos. Y solo deseo que esta concordia siga existiendo en la próxima legislatura, ya que es importante si queremos conseguir una Unión más fuerte y más unida.

**Michael Detjen (S&D).** – Frau Präsidentin, werte Frau Kommissarin! Wir hätten heute Gelegenheit, die Erfolgsgeschichte der Entsenderichtlinie fortzuschreiben: gleicher Lohn für gleiche Arbeit am gleichen Ort. Die gleichen sozialen Rechte in ganz Europa wären das, was wir uns als Europäerinnen und Europäer auf die Fahne schreiben sollen.

Guillaume Balas hat hierzu einen guten Vorschlag gemacht. Der europäische Binnenmarkt besteht nicht nur aus dem Euro und der Freizügigkeit, sondern auch aus der sozialen Absicherung dieser Rechte. Die Rechte der Menschen, die Guillaume Balas vorgesehen hat, sind wichtig für die Mobilität der Menschen, und wir tun gut daran, die Menschen zu unterstützen. Die Horrorgeschichten über den Export von Arbeitslosengeld und Kindergeld entbehren jeder faktischen Grundlage. Fakt ist, das ist reine nationalistische Propaganda, denn keine Tausend werden diesen Missbrauch betreiben.

Ich werde mich morgen für die Revision der sozialen Sicherungssysteme aussprechen. Ost gegen West, Nord gegen Süd auszuspielen, das sollten wir den Nationalisten überlassen.

**Tom Vandenkendelaere (PPE).** – Voorzitter, collega's, gisteren hebben we de oprichting van een Europese Arbeidsautoriteit goedgekeurd en ook de regels rond contracten herbekeken. Eerder pakten we al de detachingsregels aan, waardoor nu het principe "gelijk loon voor gelijk werk op dezelfde plaats" verankerd is. Eerder hebben we ook al gewerkt rond de sociale pijler en de balans tussen werk en privéleven. Europa toont eindelijk zijn sociale geelaat.

De coördinatie van de socialezekerheidsstelsels moet de kroon op het werk worden. Maar wat we zien is dat eigenlijk een technisch dossier snel een explosief dossier in de media geworden is. In het verslag wordt bepaald welk land in welk geval verantwoordelijk is voor de uitbetaling van de uitkeringen. In heel wat gevallen vielen mensen vroeger tussen de plooiën van het sociale vangnet. Zo kon je als Belg twintig jaar lang het beste van jezelf gegeven hebben in Duitsland en nadien vaststellen dat je noch in België, noch in Duitsland kon rekenen op een werkloosheidsuitkering. Dat wordt verleden tijd.

Toch zal ik mij morgen onthouden. Ik doe dat vanwege een specifiek Belgische situatie. Ik kan me niet vinden in de regeling dat slechts tot één maand werkloosheidsuitkeringen zouden worden uitbetaald. Ik kon mij meer vinden in het voorstel van commissaris Thyssen. Want met slechts één maand werken creëer je geen band met de arbeidsmarkt. Dit gezegd zijnde, gaat het in mijn land concreet over 179 mensen, vooral Nederlanders en Fransen, in het jaar 2017. Al snel wordt geroepen over welvaartstoerisme. Dat is een bewust foute voorstelling van de feiten. Dat wil ik toch ook nog even zeggen.

**Ole Christensen (S&D).** – Fru formand! Jeg er meget enig i, at vi skal have nogle klare regler, der sikrer den vandrende arbejdstager socialt. Men der er behov for en bedre balance end den, der er i betænkningen af Balas. Rettigheder og pligter følges ganske enkelt ikke ad, og nationale borgere bliver diskrimineret i forhold til den vandrende arbejdskraft. De tre største problemer er følgende: for det første retten til dagpenge fra første dag. Hvor stor en tilknytning har man egentlig til et lands arbejdsmarked, hvis man kun har været beskæftiget der i kort tid? Jeg tror, at tilknytningen til det arbejdsmarked, man kom fra, er større, derfor en længere optjeningsperiode, gerne 3 måneder. For det andet retten til at eksportere dagpenge i 6 måneder. Der er forskellige grader af arbejdsmarkedspolitikker, der påvirkes meget negativt af dette. Og der er ingen beviser for, at en forøgelse af eksporten af dagpenge øger antallet af job. Derfor fastslår vi at holde fast i 3 måneders eksport. For det tredje et fritvalgssystem for grænsearbejdere, det tror jeg ganske enkelt ikke på. Vi har brug for mere klare regler.

**Jeroen Lenaers (PPE).** – Voorzitter, steeds meer Europeanen wonen of werken in een ander land dan waar ze vandaan komen. Juist voor die mensen moet de sociale zekerheid goed geregeld zijn. Mensen mogen nooit benadeeld worden puur en alleen omdat ze een grens overgaan. Zeker in een grensregio als mijn eigen Limburg is dat cruciaal.

Toch moet ik morgen met pijn in het hart tegen deze tekst stemmen, ook al worden er veel goede dingen geregeld. Dat komt door de werkloosheidsuitkeringen. Werkloosheidsuitkeringen zijn belangrijk. Mensen die ze ontvangen, moeten zo snel mogelijk weer aan het werk geholpen worden. Dat is goed voor hen en voor de samenleving als geheel. Dus goed voor ons allemaal.

Er moeten dus voldoende échte prikkels zijn om actief naar werk te zoeken. We zien dat die prikkels bij de export van werkloosheidsuitkeringen simpelweg ontbreken. Om een voorbeeld te geven: in Nederland exporteren wij ongeveer vierduizend werkloosheidsuitkeringen per jaar. Van die vierduizend vindt 0,6 procent daadwerkelijk een nieuwe baan in de periode van de export. 0,6 procent: dat is een absurd laag cijfer. Dit ondermijnt het draagvlak voor onze collectieve sociale zekerheid en het raakt aan het sociale rechtvaardigheidsgevoel in onze samenleving. Die periode van export nu verdubbelen zonder dat er echte prikkels worden toegevoegd om daadwerkelijk naar werk te zoeken, is wat ons betreft niet verantwoord, en dus ook onacceptabel voor het CDA.

**Maria Arena (S&D).** – Madame la Présidente, les libertés fondamentales, dont la liberté de libre-circulation, sont assorties de règles, qui sont, en matière de mobilité des travailleurs, des règles de protection sociale, parce que l'Europe est une Europe des protections sociales, mais aussi des règles de concurrence non déloyale. Or, la révision de la coordination des systèmes de sécurité sociale, telle que proposée par le rapport de mon collègue, M. Balas, va dans ce sens. Elle n'est sans doute pas parfaite, mais elle a le mérite de faire des propositions claires pour améliorer la situation des droits des travailleurs au sein de l'Union et lutter contre la fraude, qui est un sport pratiqué, Mesdames et Messieurs, non pas par les chômeurs qui iraient se dorer la pilule au soleil, mais par des entreprises peu scrupuleuses qui recrutent des travailleurs non protégés aujourd'hui en Europe. C'est donc contre cette concurrence déloyale qui vient déforcer les systèmes de sécurité sociale que nous devons lutter et nous devons donc soutenir cette proposition pour confirmer une position du Parlement européen qui soit européenne, et non pas soutenir les positions nationales, voire nationalistes de certains États membres.

**Sofia Ribeiro (PPE).** – Sendo esta a minha última intervenção em plenário permita-me, Senhora Presidente, que a faça em jeito de balanço das prioridades do mandato, sendo que esta proposta de coordenação dos sistemas de segurança social ilustra bem as prioridades sociais que defendemos para a União Europeia em que no topo das prioridades tínhamos a proteção do modelo social europeu que nos distingue do resto do mundo, um modelo que protege o cidadão em todas as fases, garantindo maior dignidade, maiores condições de equidade social, maiores condições de convergência social, numa convergência que é associada ao crescimento, numa Europa que tira partido da mobilidade, da sua diversidade, no sentido de potenciar as capacidades de cada cidadão.

Ora, a mobilidade tem de estar associada a maior responsabilidade social para não cairmos em situações de aproveitamento da fragilidade dos trabalhadores. Mas a Europa que apela à unidade no que concerne à mobilidade não pode depois refugiar-se nos nacionalismos, no que respeita à proteção dos cidadãos.

Defendemos, por isso, que os Estados-Membros que se servem de mão-de-obra e conhecimento especializado transnacional europeu, assumam as suas responsabilidades sociais para com esses trabalhadores e as suas famílias. Defendemos, por isso, que as prestações sociais sejam pagas pelo nível das contribuições do Estado-Membro em que o trabalho foi prestado. É, por isso, necessário garantir que o trabalhador tenha os mesmos direitos que os nacionais do país onde presta trabalho. A liberdade de circulação tem de estar associada a equidade na proteção por uma Europa mais justa, mais equitativa.

Senhora Presidente, Caros Colegas, deixem dizer-vos que foi uma honra representar os portugueses deixando aqui o contributo para uma Europa mais social.

**Monika Smolková (S&D).** – Vážená pani predsedajúca, najväčšia vymoženosť spoločnej Európy je voľný pohyb osôb, tovaru a služieb. Mobilita osôb je skutočne značná a je úplne jedno, či je to za prácou alebo štúdiom. Ďalším fenoménom je cezhraničná pracovná sila, preto musíme koordinovať systém sociálneho zabezpečenia pre nich tak, aby sme odbúrali administratívne prekážky, jazykové bariéry, a poskytnúť takýmto migrujúcim osobám maximálnu pomoc a ochranu.

Koordináciu systémov sociálneho zabezpečenia vnímam ako proces, ktorý budeme zdokonaľovať, zlepšovať a ktorý bude schopný garantovať všetkým pracovníkom bez rozdielu ich práva v rámci celej Európskej únie. O koordinácii je potrebné hovoriť aj preto, lebo niektoré členské štáty si už teraz upravujú vlastné podmienky pre sociálne zabezpečenie pracovníkov a ich rodinných príslušníkov, čím porušujú už platné pravidlá EÚ a sú z tohto pohľadu diskriminačné. Ako negatívny príklad uvediem Rakúsko a jeho indexáciu rodinných prídavkov.

**Andrejs Mamikins (S&D).** – Madam President, the increase in labour mobility means that the social rights need to be protected better. However, the freedom of movement of workers is currently challenged by a blocking minority in the Council.

But colleagues, we are speaking about the things that are most important for the total majority of our workers, their social entitlements. In many cases, allowances determine how the citizens perceive the quality of their citizenship and as a result, how they appreciate the functioning of the EU.

It is regretful that the Council does not give that much importance to social benefits. The indexation actively promoted by some countries is the road to the disaggregation of the EU. It puts our social systems in competition and favours the outflow of young workers from the new Member States. It's true that in the current framework, the Member States are free to decide on the conditions for benefits and insurance, but these decisions must be made in accordance with the principle of equal treatment and non-discrimination.

**David Coburn, on behalf of the EFDD Group.** – Madam President, it's all very interesting but this is a very dangerous thing for the United Kingdom. Britain's social security system is based on need, and not on contributions as it is on the continent. In France, for example, you can only draw out what you pay into the system. If you have not paid in, you can't draw out. This is why migrants queue at Calais to go to the United Kingdom but they are not queuing at Dover to come to Calais. This is because the social security system is more open to people who have just arrived.

There's nothing wrong in that. Our system is good for the system we've got. Your system is good for what you have. But the trouble is, the two systems are utterly incompatible. Any change to that system could bankrupt Britain's social security system, which is one of the major reasons we voted for Brexit. We are basically concerned that it would bankrupt our social security system and put enormous stress on our health service, which is also free at point of use so people can just turn up and use the system.

This creates problems. It means that we could never have a true integration of these systems. And why should we? Why should we not have competition throughout Europe? Why should we all have some monosyllabic Soviet system which is decided by the European Council or decided by the Commission? That really isn't going to work.

We need to have competition in wages. We have to have competition in everything. That's what makes a vibrant economy and why the British economy is booming, despite Brexit, and the European economy is not doing very well at all. The euro looks as if it's in a very bad state. Even Deutsche Bank is having problems and the Italian banks are all on the rocks. So, all in all, our system does seem to be superior.

Any attempt to try and make all the systems in Europe exactly the same is going to lead to one thing: a form of, I don't know, Soviet communism, whatever. It's a very, very bad and dangerous idea and I'm afraid Britain can have nothing to do with it, which is all the more reason for us to leave.

#### *Catch-the-eye procedure*

**Maria Grapini (S&D).** – Doamnă președintă, doamnă comisar, sincer, nu înțeleg poziția unor colegi de aici. E o confuzie totală! Noi nu vrem să se facă un singur sistem de securitate socială, ci să fie respectat pentru lucrătorul care beneficiază de mobilitate și merge într-un stat – să fie respectat același sistem de securitate ca pentru lucrătorul autohton. Este incredibil să vrem o piață unică, să avem mobilitatea lucrătorilor, dar să nu fie respectate condițiile de securitate și de plată a salariului la muncă egală.

Sigur, nu e poate cea mai bună variantă, dar haideți să comparăm – nimic cu ceea ce aduce nou acest raport. E un compromis, îl susțin. Trebuie să nu mai avem cazuri ca Austria, care a diminuat și este în *infringement* acum. Dar ne-a anunțat și premierul Danemarcei că va vrea să aplice o diminuare a alocațiilor sau alocații diferențiate pentru copiii lucrătorilor din alte state.

Vrem o Europă unită? Vrem o piață unică? Asta este prevăzut în tratat. Și atunci trebuie să respectăm nu numai salarizarea „la muncă egală, plată egală”, ci trebuie să respectăm și sistemele de securitate.



**Νότης Μαρίας (ECR).** – Κυρία Πρόεδρε, πρέπει να ξεκαθαρίσουμε ότι τα ασφαλιστικά συστήματα είναι αρμοδιότητα των κρατών μελών. Δεύτερον, η ευελιξία στην εργασία που εφαρμόζεται τα τελευταία χρόνια και ιδίως το σύστημα των αποσπασμένων υπαλλήλων, ένα σύστημα που δημιουργεί κοινωνικό ντάμπινγκ, έχει περιπλέξει όλα τα ζητήματα. Κανένα ασφαλιστικό σύστημα δεν θα πρέπει να μετατρέπεται σε σύστημα επιδότησης γειτονικών χωρών, όπως συμβαίνει αυτή τη στιγμή με το ελληνικό σύστημα ασφάλισης έναντι των 200.000 εργαζομένων στην Ελλάδα από τη Βουλγαρία. Τρίτον, καμία διάκριση σε όσους εργάζονται νόμιμα στα κράτη μέλη. Ταυτόχρονα όμως, όχι πολιτική εξαγωγής επιδομάτων. Το επίδομα ανεργίας στηρίζει όσους βρίσκονται σε ανεργία, προκειμένου να βρουν δουλειά. Επομένως, θα τους στηρίζει για όσο παραμένουν στη συγκεκριμένη χώρα. Η μόνη δυνατότητα εξαγωγής θα πρέπει να αφορά τη σύνταξη, διότι πρόκειται για ένα δικαίωμα το οποίο μπορεί κανείς να κουβαλήσει και στη χώρα του. Ως εκ τούτου, θα πρέπει να δούμε όλα αυτά τα θέματα, όπως και το brain drain, το οποίο έχει οδηγήσει σε αφαιμάξη κοινωνικής ασφάλισης.

*(Η Πρόεδρος διακόπτει τον ομιλητή)*

**Jeroen Lenaers (PPE).** – Madam President, it was not necessarily a blue card, it was more a point of order. Obviously Mr Coburn, or anybody else from the EFDD, didn't bother enough with this debate to actually show up in time for the start of this debate, and I think it's a bit unfair that after he's had his beauty sleep and his breakfast he decides to show up and still has a speaking time afterwards. I don't understand where this comes from. If you really care about these debates you can show up on time and participate. If you don't show up, that's your choice.

**President.** – I am a very fair chairperson, so I think people who are on a list, if they arrive, I usually allow them speak. But your point is well made and I'm sure Mr Coburn will set his alarm clock earlier for the next early debate that we have.

**Ana Miranda (Verts/ALE).** – Senhora Presidente, Senhora Comissária, preocupa-me muito este debate. A continuidade e o respeito dos direitos sociais dos trabalhadores e trabalhadoras, para evitar fraude, concorrência desleal, casos de ausência de direitos, incertezas legais, é a nossa obrigação.

Vou dar-lhe vários exemplos. A mobilidade para os galegos chama-se emigrar: os marinheiros galegos que cotizaram na Noruega e que continuam neste mesmo ano à espera de cobrar as suas prestações sociais – uma saudação para eles, Long Hope; os trabalhadores galegos e do norte de Portugal que vão de um lado para o outro e que muitas vezes têm situações sociais complexas; os emigrantes retornados de outros Estados europeus, e também da Suíça, que voltam ao nosso país e aos quais não são reconhecidas doenças nem tão pouco as prestações sociais.

A mobilidade laboral no meu país chama-se emigrar, insisto nisto, Senhora Comissária, e por isso apresentei várias perguntas parlamentares sobre estas três problemáticas, e por isso há que trabalhar para ter esta igualdade de tratamento.

**João Pimenta Lopes (GUE/NGL).** – Senhora Presidente, esta proposta, que alguns tentam bloquear, tem um conjunto de avanços face à proposta da Comissão na garantia da proteção dos direitos dos trabalhadores. Mas sejamos claros, a coordenação dos sistemas de segurança social só pode ocorrer se estes existirem para coordenar, mantendo a sua dimensão pública, universal e solidária que assegura um carácter redistributivo e uma justa e digna remuneração após uma vida a trabalhar.

Não é esse o caminho que a União Europeia quer fazer como ficou claro, há duas semanas, com a aprovação de um fundo pan-europeu de pensões que abre caminho para a privatização da Segurança Social, ou quando alenta teses de aumentar a idade da reforma para garantir a sustentabilidade dos sistemas de segurança social, de que é exemplo um estudo que o patronato encomendou recentemente em Portugal.

Os recentes avanços alcançados em Portugal, com a nossa proposta e contributo, ainda que insuficientes, determinam que é na criação de emprego e na valorização de salários que se garante essa sustentabilidade dos sistemas de segurança social a que deve crescer o aumento e valorização dos direitos laborais e sociais.

*(End of catch-the-eye procedure)*

**Marianne Thyssen**, *Member of the Commission*. – Madam President, let me thank the honourable Members for this interesting and lively debate on this important matter. We proposed a modernisation of the rules on social security coordination two and half years ago, so well in time, and we launched the proposal because we need to preserve the social protection of the increasing group of mobile citizens.

In the context of increased labour mobility and major demographic changes, the existing rules must be updated to adequately protect citizens' rights. Free movement of workers only exists if mobile workers preserve their social protection.

The modernisation will provide the national administrations with better tools to fight fraud and abuses. Citizens and employers will greatly benefit from the clear deadlines that we wish to introduce for cooperation between national administrations, national authorities, and I also mentioned the legal certainty that we owe to our citizens, to workers and businesses that exercise their free movement.

These are all reasons why we cannot afford to postpone the modernisation of the coordination of social security rules and the Commission therefore counts on this Parliament to adopt a position in first reading that shows our citizens and workers and businesses alike that we care about social security rights and that we care about a good functioning of our internal market, because indeed coordination of social security systems is crucial for free movement, and free movement of workers, the self-employed and companies is crucial for the internal market.

I trust that this Parliament will show citizens, up to the last day of its mandate, that their rights also count. That this Parliament will show Europe's businesses that it understands their needs, and also the needs of the SMEs, and that it will show to all that Europe can deliver.

And if you will allow me, Madam President, to use one more minute of your time: this is my last intervention in a debate in this Parliament and the cooperation between the Commission and the Members of the Parliament, especially the members of the Committee on Employment and Social Affairs (EMPL), has always been excellent. I think we were able to realise a lot together and I want to thank you for all the achievements that we were able to make together. I wish you all the best.

(Applause)

**President**. – Thank you Ms Thyssen. I'm sure the colleagues on the Committee on Employment and Social Affairs know you better, perhaps, but I want to say, on my own behalf, thank you for your cooperation and for always meeting groups and keeping in mind the best interests of our citizens. I wish you well, on behalf of Parliament here this morning, in your endeavours for the future. Thank you so much.

**Guillaume Balas**, *rapporteur*. – Madame la Présidente, Madame la Commissaire, puisque c'est votre dernière intervention, un mot pour vous dire que, si je suis un adepte du clivage gauche-droite, vous m'avez montré que, parfois, bien des gens de droite peuvent être plus progressistes que bien des gens de gauche. Je voulais vous en remercier.

Vous savez ce que disait Gandhi: nous pensons que l'ennemi c'est la haine, alors qu'en fait c'est la peur. J'ai entendu beaucoup de peurs dans les interventions de ce matin. Beaucoup de peurs qui amènent d'ailleurs à dire n'importe quoi, par exemple en affirmant que permettre l'exportation de seulement six mois de prestations de chômage acquises en travaillant 20 ans dans un pays, ce serait un cadeau dont certains travailleurs de l'Est de l'Europe profiteraient au détriment de ceux du Nord ou de l'Ouest. On sait qu'une étude du Parlement européen a justement montré qu'exporter six mois de prestations de chômage permet de mieux s'intégrer au marché du travail et de retrouver plus facilement du travail qu'avec trois mois, mais on entend systématiquement l'inverse ici! Des députés de l'Europe du Nord, de l'Europe de l'Ouest, ne disent pas un mot sur les grandes entreprises qui, elles, organisent le dumping social – car ce ne sont pas les travailleurs de l'Est qui organisent le dumping social, ce sont ces très grandes entreprises –, et ne cherchent à aucun moment à contraindre ces grandes entreprises afin d'assurer une protection effective aux travailleurs. Je vois bien, alors, que c'est la peur qui est en train de présider, la peur de ces grandes multinationales que vous n'osez pas aujourd'hui affronter, et je trouve cela éminemment triste. Je suis triste notamment d'entendre certains parler d'abord des travailleurs de leur pays plutôt que de l'ensemble des travailleurs européens – et dire que parmi ces voix-là, certaines, minoritaires heureusement, se disent de gauche! Comment peut-on d'abord parler de son pays, des intérêts de son pays, parce qu'il y a des élections européennes, sans d'abord s'intéresser à l'ensemble des travailleurs qui partagent des intérêts communs face justement à ces grandes entreprises, dont on sait qu'elles mettent en concurrence les travailleurs les uns contre les autres pour affaiblir nos protections à tous? Alors oui, je lance un appel à tous les progressistes de ce Parlement, à tous

ceux qui pensent que l'Europe peut être synonyme de progrès, voire que l'Europe n'a de sens que si elle amène du progrès pour tous les citoyens, indifféremment de leur nationalité, que c'est sur ce principe que se fonde l'Europe. Alors oui, j'en appelle à eux, non pas en disant que ce texte est parfait, qu'il résout tout, mais qu'il est un signe aujourd'hui d'unité, de progrès et de relations pacifiques entre les salariés, de lutte contre la concurrence déloyale qu'on cherche à créer entre eux, bref faire en sorte qu'enfin Europe et progrès soient deux mots qui riment ensemble.

**President.** – Thank you to our rapporteur. If only we could replace fear with hope. Because I have time and I am in poetic mood, I will repeat again the lines of a very famous Irish poet, Seamus Heaney: 'So hope for a great sea-change on the far side of revenge. Believe that a further shore is reachable from here. Believe in miracles and cures and healing wells'.

The debate is closed.

*Written statements (Rule 162)*

**Ádám Kósa (PPE), írásban.** – Elfogadhatatlan, hogy ezt a dossziét azután, hogy a Tanácsban elbukott, az EP baloldali többsége úgy erőlteti szavazásra, hogy nincs mögötte sem számszerű, sem pedig elvi többség. A rendelet jelenlegi formájában inkább falakat épít Nyugat- és Kelet-Európa közé. A rendeletervezet és az ehhez beadott baloldali módosítók mind az alkalmazandó jog, az adminisztrációs előírások, a kiküldetésekhez kapcsolódó előzetes bejelentések, mind pedig a családi ellátások indexálása kapcsán elfogadhatatlanok, sőt, szembemennek az uniós szerződésekkel is. Már sokszor elmondtam: az EU-ban nem lehetnek másodrendű gyermekek! Aki egy nyugat-európai országba dolgozik, az ugyanolyan befizetésekkel járul hozzá az adott ország szociális biztonsági és adórendszeréhez, mint a helyi munkavállalók, miért részesülne mégis kevesebb ellátásban csak azért, mert gyermeke egy másik tagállamban él? Ez egyértelmű diszkrimináció! Összességében úgy ítélem meg, hogy sem az alapszöveg, sem pedig a javasolt módosítások nem érik el azt a szintet, ami lehetővé tenné számomra, hogy a jelentés mellett szavazzak. Különösen igaz ez annak fényében, hogy amit az EP a közelmúltban a mobilitási csomag kapcsán fogadott el. A kettő sok tekintetben szorosan összefügg. Ezért nemmel fogok szavazni erre a javaslatra, mert az csak a Nyugat-Európai országok protekcionizmusát, nem pedig Európa javát szolgálja.

**Csaba Molnár (S&D), írásban.** – Mint történelme során már annyiszor, az Unió válaszút előtt áll. Hatvan békés év alatt Európa teljesen átalakult. Eltűntek a határok, az európai polgárok szabadon mozoghatnak, dolgozhatnak, élhetnek bármely tagországban. Vállalataink növekvő része számára a piac ma már az Unió egészét jelenti. Fiataljaink magától értetődő módon mennek külföldre tanulni. Európa elvont földrajzi fogalomból valódi, közös otthonunkká vált, de a polgárok többet akarnak. Az Unió csak akkor tölti be hivatását, ha meghallja hangjukat, és megfelel a jogos elvárásnak. Az elvárás pedig nem más, mint a szociális Európa. Olyan Unió, amely gondoskodik róla, hogy polgárainak ne csak deklarált jogai legyenek, hanem meg is legyen a lehetőségük arra, hogy e jogokkal éljenek.

Aki dolgozik, az ne nyomorogjon. Aki végigdolgozta az életét, az legyen biztonságban idős korára is. Senkinek ne kelljen tartani attól, hogy egy váratlan betegség nyomorba dönti a családját. Mindenki számíthasson arra, hogy ha bajban van, a szociális háló megvédi, éljen vagy dolgozzon bármely tagországban. Mindennek egyik alapvető feltétele a tagállamok szociális és munkaügyi rendszereinek összehangolása. Európa csak akkor lehet igazán közös, csak akkor lehet sikeres, ha az Unió középpontjában maga az ember áll. Ezért támogatom az előttünk lévő javaslatot, ezért állok ki az erős, szociális Európáért!

*(The session was suspended for a few moments)*

## PRESIDENZA DELL'ON. ANTONIO TAJANI

*Presidente***5. Wznowienie posiedzenia***(La seduta è ripresa alle 10.07)***6. Debata z premierem Republiki Łotewskiej Krišjānisem Kariņšem na temat przyszłości Europy (debata)**

**President.** – The next item on the agenda is the debate with the Prime Minister of the Republic of Latvia, Krišjānis Kariņš, on the Future of Europe (2019/2673(RSP)).

Today, it is possible to start immediately. Everybody knows our friend, a former Member of this Parliament for this year, the Prime Minister of Latvia. Thank you, Mr Kariņš, for accepting our invitation for this important debate on the future of the European Union. You are at home today. You know this Parliament very well and the debate with you will be very easy. You know very well the position of the European Parliament, the importance of the European Parliament. You know the President of the European Commission and the Vice-President of the European Commission.

Thank you for coming. As you know, we want the European Parliament at the centre of the political debate on the future of the European Union. You are a Member ad honorem of this Parliament, for this, welcome and I immediately give you the floor.

**Krišjānis Kariņš, Latvijas premjerministrs.** – Augsti godātais Tajāni kungs! Priekšsēdētāj Junkera kungs! Cienījamās deputātes! Godājamie deputāti! Dāmas un kungi! Draugi!

Man ir patiesi milzīgs prieks šodien jūs uzrunāt par tik nozīmīgu tēmu — par Eiropas nākotni.

Kā jūs zināt, es gandrīz desmit gadus esmu strādājis šajā parlamentā kā parlamentārietis, un es šo to šajā laikā arī varbūt paguvu iemācīties.

Die eine Sache, die ich gelernt habe, ist, dass, wenn man hier eine Rede halten möchte, man sich mindestens in drei Sprachen ausdrücken können muss, sonst geht es nicht. Also das ist jetzt die zweite Sprache.

Le français est trop difficile pour moi, malheureusement. Je comprends la langue, mais pour un discours, c'est un petit peu trop difficile.

But I'll continue in English. This is language four. This is a time of change: the end of the term, the coming of the elections. It really is a time for reflection. But, before we look forward, I want to go a little bit back in history to give a little bit of context.

Latvia. Europe. What binds Europeans? Really, when you think about it, it is the shared history coming from Ancient Greece and Rome, through Christianity that spread throughout Europe. As Christianity and this culture had spread throughout Europe, the last remaining outpost were the Baltics that still had not become part, shall we say, of this common shared cultural and religious heritage. It was only at the turn of the 12th and 13th century that the Pope in Rome said "OK" to a crusade against the non-Christians in the Baltics.

Since that time, our country has gone through all of the cultural developments, changes and upheavals that the rest of Europe went through, whether it is the Renaissance, the Reformation or the Enlightenment. Today, our country is predominantly, at least historically, a Lutheran country with strong Catholicism in the south east. It is very clear that, through our history, we have been part of the northern European cultural area. We view ourselves as being rather pragmatic, very patient, and – we'd like to think – rational and law-abiding as well. In culture there's a strong creativity and personal enterprise that always presses its way through.

For hundreds of years after the introduction of Christianity, our country faced various periods of political and military occupation, coming at times from Germany at times from Poland, at times from Sweden, and at times from Russia. Throughout this time, of course, we maintained our identity and our language and culture. It was not until the end of the First World War in 1918 that we finally declared our own independence. And it took two more years for the War of Independence to free the country of the remaining German and Russian armies which was still there at the time.

If you want a personal family history, my father's father – my grandfather – entered the Tsarist Army as a soldier for the Tsar, then he became a Bolshevik soldier, fighting the Revolution against Tsar, and then, when his unit heard that our country had declared independence, he came home and became a freedom fighter for independence. A typical history at the time.

Our country developed between the wars. Then the Second World War came. It did a lot of damage throughout Europe. That's where I come into the picture. I am the son of refugees, wartime refugees. My parents were children in 1944 – my mother was eight and my father was 14 – and fled in small boats from Latvia to Sweden. About 5 000 Latvians came to Sweden and about 200 000 fled to Germany as the advancing Soviet army was coming a second time, devastating the country. My parents grew up in Sweden, met and married, and then they emigrated further to the US, where I was born, together with my two sisters.

I first came to Latvia in 1984. At the time, I was a high school student in the last refugee school, the Latvian Refugee High School, in Münster in Germany. That's when I first came to Latvia. It was a different world, a different country. Everything was grey, people didn't smile on the streets, Soviet soldiers on leave, but everywhere, everything was in Russian. You could see a visible lack of investment in any kind of infrastructure, whether they were buildings or roads or bridges. You could see decay.

As Solidarity came in the late 1980s in Poland and the Berlin Wall fell at the end of 1989, change happened in our country as well. We finally regained independence in 1991. In a very short amount of time, we developed democratic institutions, we developed free enterprise, we developed a banking system, and we developed a market economy, basically from scratch. In 2004, only 13 years after regaining independence, we joined the EU and NATO. In a couple of weeks' time, we're going to celebrate 15 years since we joined the European Union and I can say, on behalf of my country, we have not regretted a single day since we joined the EU.

*(Applause)*

So what is the EU? Well, first of all – and it must be stressed – it is a union of values, freedom, democracy and the rule of law. Historically, in Europe, how were disputes settled? With soldiers, with guns, with rifles, with tanks, and with destruction. How do we do it today? Tiresome debate, discussion votes, but it is a heck of a lot better than the way it was done before.

The EU is also about economic development, and at the core of that, is the single market. By opening up our borders to one another, we have created one of the largest markets in the world: over 500 million people, in sheer economic size roughly equivalent to the United States, which is considered the world's strongest economy.

But all is really not well in the EU. All of us know, as politicians, that there's a lot of anti-EU sentiment going around. There are politicians who are offering very simplistic answers to very complex issues. Generally, they are referred to as populists. My simple message is: don't fight the populists – it is a worthless endeavour – but try to understand why people are listening to the populists, and why people are unhappy.

So why are people unhappy? What happened? Go back 10 years to 2008-2009. A bank collapsed in the US. Ok, they collapse every once in a while. That led into a chain reaction of a banking crisis around the world, especially in Europe. That led to an economic crisis, the biggest we had had since the Great Depression. My own country's GDP fell by almost one quarter, one of the steepest drops in about a year and a half. Other countries fell as well, maybe not so badly. As we were coming out of the economic crisis, what happened a few years ago? The migration crisis. The unrest in the Middle East. It started as peaceful revolutions that turned into bloody revolutions and then refugees, migrants.

The result of all of that is what I would call a political crisis, people losing faith in the system. It's understandable that they have lost faith. We have to help them regain it. If you look at voters, what are their main concerns? I say there are four: jobs, the way of life – translated into immigration – the environment; and safety and security. To talk about the future of Europe, you need to address all these four issues.

So what about jobs? The EU has a mechanism to foster job growth and it is that which is simply referred to as the single market. I think of a story I remember as a child – it may have been one of Aesop's Fables – where a father has three sons. He gives a stick to one of his sons and says, "break this stick" and the son breaks the stick. Then he gives another stick to the son. The son breaks the stick and he says, "well, what's the difficulty?" Then he gives the son a whole bundle of sticks together. He says, "now break the stick". He tries and tries again, gives it to a brother, can't. The third brother – can't. The simple moral of the story is, when you're alone, you can be broken easily, like a stick, like a twig. When you're united, you're powerful, and that is the beauty of the single market.

We have challenges to the single market coming from the outside. There is a rising China and there's a US whose administration seems to be faltering a little bit in its belief that it has a leading role to play in organising world affairs and world trade.

Now, what about China? A country that openly subsidises its huge industries. These industries are coming into Europe and competing with an unfair advantage. At the same time, European companies don't have equal access to Chinese markets. What's the answer? I say the answer to unfair competition is not protectionism.

We cannot go the way of the Chinese. We should not become more like the Chinese, but demand that the Chinese become more like us in terms of opening up their market. We have a lot of clout as a union and as a single market. This is what we need to use, not as individual sticks, but as that bundle that cannot be broken and can change things in the world.

Inside the EU we still have hurdles to overcome and this has to do with the internal barriers still to the single market, especially in the digital sphere, as well as in the services sphere. Ask yourselves: why are the largest internet companies coming from the US? Why aren't they European? I think the answer is pretty obvious. The US has a dollar zone, it has a federal government and a federal budget, and it has zero barriers between the states in terms of trade. They have a truly united single market, smaller than ours – 330 million. We have a larger one, but we have too many hurdles.

So, if we talk of wanting to have national champions, I don't think that we should bend our competition laws to artificially create national champions. I think we have to tear down the barriers within the single market to let those champions grow themselves and they can take on the world, they can take on the US, and they can easily take on China.

*(Applause)*

One of the cornerstones of the single market is the financial system, the banks. Ten years ago, the biggest threat to the banks was liquidity, so we created a banking union to make sure that the ECB is overseeing the largest banks and to make it safer and ensure that the banks will be there tomorrow morning when we wake up. The world has changed since those ten years. Liquidity is not the main problem. A new problem has emerged, which is terrorism in Europe and the financing of terrorism. How does that often happen? Through illicit funds moving through the European banking system.

So where are we on anti-money laundering (AML)? In this House, I was the co-rapporteur, with Ms Sargentini, on the last two AML directives. I learned a thing or two about policy. Anti-money laundering legislation is all about risk assessment and reducing the risk of dirty money entering the system. To the east of Europe, we have a country, a big economy, Russia, and, for the past 20 years, money from Russia has been wanting to flee that country. Why? Because Europe is safe. Europe has the rule of law. In Europe no one takes their money away without going through the courts. You can't do that.

That money wants to come to Europe. Some of it is clean, maybe most of it is clean, but some of it is not clean and those who are working with unclean money, the criminals – I'm not talking about people looking to optimise their tax returns and itemising something that may be an expense or not, I'm talking about hardened criminals that are moving millions of euros – are flying like hawks above the ground and they're looking at the weak links in the chain: in this country, you can do that, in this country, you can do that, in this country, you can do that. Our country was also part of this chain and not alone.

Money laundering is a European problem. Since becoming Prime Minister, I don't have the patience to wait for all of us to get our act together so I'm cleaning up my house.

*(Applause)*

We're going to have the cleanest and the most resilient banking system in Europe. In one and a half years' time, we'll gladly consult anyone in this room in and in this House on how to clean up a banking system, but it is a little bit like fighting rats. I can make sure that I get the rats out of my house and my house will be clean, but what about my neighbours? The criminals may have left Latvia for now, but they have unfortunately – I'm convinced – not left Europe. So we have to clean the whole neighbourhood. That means that anti-money laundering supervision has to be centralised, just as prudential supervision, a very strong and important step forward.

*(Applause)*

Another concern of voters is immigration, the way of life. There are no simple answers here. I don't have them. I don't think anyone does. The truth is that Europe is a fantastic destination to come to live and to work. We have stable economies, we have stable democracies, we have the rule of law, we have individual freedom, and a lot of our neighbours do not. As autocracy grows, the pressure on wanting to come into the EU will only increase. It will not go away. So we have to learn to deal with it.

My country has dealt with a little bit of immigration as well. During the 50 years of Soviet occupation, more than 700 000 people – migrants – arrived in our country. That's one third of the population. We're only two million and 700 000 came in. Our government had no say over this because we had no government. It was Moscow making the decisions: fully making the decisions, no co-decision, no say.

After regaining independence, how have we dealt with it? With the one big "I" word: integration. You have to work with the people, you have to work on your educational system, bring the people into our culture, bring the immigrants into your cultures. This is the way forward. We cannot fight that. You cannot stop people wanting to come into Europe. We are a preferred destination, but we have to work on integrating these people. But we can do something to mitigate the flows and the obvious answer to that is the outer border, Frontex. This is a wonderful programme that needs to be strengthened.

*(Applause)*

Because, if we can show our voters that we control the outer border, then we can have free inner borders and we won't have the situation of a few years ago where, within the Schengen zone, we remember going between Strasbourg and Germany – those of us who stayed in hotels there – that the bridge was sometimes closed or they were checking every car. This is not the way forward. We need open internal borders for a single market to work, which means we need firm borders on the outside.

We will have to fund refugee camps, it is inevitable. We will have to fund development of economies and the rule of law in third countries. This is inevitable. And we have to work on integration. Europe is still a Union of 28 sovereign countries with their own national identities. It's extremely important that we maintain our national identities, cultures and languages, and we do this through the process of integrating people who have come in. The arrivals have to adapt to our countries because that's the way of the world, and this is what we need to work on. If we can show that we control the outer borders and we can integrate the arrivals, the voters will become much more relaxed about the entire issue.

The third concern: environment. Climate change – I won't go into it deeply – is real. Mankind's coal, oil and gas burning is contributing. We need to stop this. So the legislation, the direction, is absolutely correct: reduce CO<sub>2</sub> emissions, increase renewables, increase energy efficiency. All of this has to be done. But we have a difficulty, which is that not all Member States have the same kind of energy mix. My own country is just behind Sweden. We are almost at 40% of renewables. We're way ahead of the curve, but not everyone is ahead of the curve that way. Some countries are very coal-dependent and we cannot just wish fossil fuels away. Someone has to pay for the transition. So we need a little bit of time.

Regardless of how quickly we want to move, there's one structural change that we need to make to make that change faster, and that is again – I'm a single market kind of person – opening up the market in energy to competition. You have to have competition for renewables to advance. I'll just take one example: the electricity market. Many countries have regulated electricity prices. Consumers pay the same Monday morning, Monday evening, Monday night, Sunday morning, Sunday evening, Sunday night, so no one is motivated to think about when to turn on the dishwasher or the washing machine. It doesn't matter: you pay the same all the time, so you are not motivated to save.

But in those markets where competition has been opened up, you have service providers that help you automatically regulate when you're buying electricity based upon the price signals. In this way, we can reduce the overall needed capacity to supply the demand peak hours because, during the peak hours, you will be motivated, say, not to have your refrigerator go warmer by one or two degrees. If you can do that for millions of households, the savings are enormous. But you have to have deregulated markets. If you want renewables, you have to have deregulated markets. Competition everywhere.

*(Applause)*

The fourth concern: safety and security. It means different things to different Europeans. I think, in the south of Europe, when people think of safety and security, they are thinking about the threat of uncontrolled immigration, migration, terrorism – that's another threat that people feel – and, in the west of Europe, maybe the biggest threat right now is of an uncontrolled Brexit, not only for trade but also for peace in Northern Ireland, a very, very real concern. I come from Latvia and it is no secret to anyone that, when Latvians think of safety, we think of Russia.

Russia is our eastern neighbour – as it is for all of Europe. Russia has a government that has one basic policy: it feels and it is convinced – and it is in their policy papers – that they are surrounded by enemies and always under attack. That is their dogma. That is their belief. So the way that they fight back is to make their enemies weaker. Right now in Europe, the biggest threat from Russia is not military. It's a threat, but it is not the biggest threat. We have NATO and we have our own preparedness. The biggest threat is the threat of false, misleading, and downright lying information.

We live in the world of these wonderful devices that all of us have in our pockets or on our desks. I thought, as many of us did a few years ago, that this information is the age of having unlimited access to knowledge, to facts. Preparing a speech, you can go on the internet and find all kinds of crazy, good things.



But it also turns out that social media is a fantastic way to disseminate propaganda and downright lies instantaneously. As more and more people move away from getting their news from the mass media, from educated journalists that have certain ethics in checking their sources, and as more and more people are getting the news from social media, we have to do one important thing, namely to think seriously about legislating the responsibility of platforms, providers on the internet, of the content that is being disseminated. It's a slippery slope, I admit, because it is a fine line between looking for responsibility and introducing censorship. As a Latvian, I will never support censorship. There is too much history there.

But we have to find that fine line, because this is an attack on our way of life. What are they looking to do? To divide society, to make us fight one another and to make us dislike one another. Think of the debate about vaccination. Where in the world does this argument come from that vaccination leads to autism? You can trace it back to the Russian outlets. They are disseminating this. They are still making people not be vaccinated and it is resulting in very serious health repercussions throughout Europe.

Immigration, the immigration debate behind that: also Russia. Brexit: very involved. We even have this bubble throughout all of Eastern Europe of George Soros as some terrible person who is somehow undermining our way of life, we're being told. It all comes from one single source and, if we do not accept that fact, we cannot begin to address it. But I say, for safety and security, militarily, my country invests two per cent of its GDP into the military. We are part of NATO. We think everyone should be doing this. But military is one part of the equation. The second part – equally important – is combating the dissemination of false and misleading information, and there we have to consider legislation.

*(Applause)*

Finally, I wouldn't be a Latvian politician if I didn't mention at least a couple of things about the multiannual financial framework (MFF), the seven-year budget that all of us are in the midst of trying to come to terms with. I completely agree, as this Parliament does, that we in Europe need to invest more in research and development, and into the clever young minds that are going to really create the jobs and the growth in value and in wealth in the future. This is extremely important.

*(Applause)*

But it is equally important that, as we're investing in R&D, we don't just do it in one, two or five select capitals, but that investment moves throughout Europe. Why? Clever minds are everywhere in Europe. Everywhere in Europe needs growth. If we think of excellence only concentrated in a few countries, we actually do ourselves a disservice. So "yes" to R&D, but it really has to go around Europe. That is very important.

Clever cohesion: cohesion is still important, but it has to be clever. We have to make sure that the poorer regions are converging upwards, a very important aspect of that.

Last but not least, the farmers in Europe. We know that historically the European budget has been all about the common agricultural policy (CAP). It was years back and it is still important, but, as a reminder. We have a historic chance to write a historic injustice.

All farmers in Europe compete in the same market so, if you sell grain, whatever, you sell it on the market. The price is what the market gives you. We subsidise, through direct payments, our farmers in Europe, but there's a catch. We don't subsidise our farmers equally or even close to equally. The three countries that are near the bottom of the pile, well below the average, are the three Baltic countries, Latvia, Lithuania and Estonia, for obtuse mathematical reasons dating back to the 1990s.

Our farmers are competing with everyone else's farmers. The only way that they can compete is at the cost of their own well-being. They are forced to be poor to compete in the same market. So, if we subsidise – and I am open to not subsidising anyone, but I don't think we'll get there in the next seven years – we should do it equally across the board for everyone.

My speech comes to an end. You can breathe easier. Friends, the EU is not, and never will be, perfect. It's not. But it is the best damn thing that I can think of. In Europe for hundreds – really thousands – of years, differences were settled through the force of muscle. Who was stronger prevailed, who was weaker: tough luck. No. The way that we work is by far better than anything that anyone has come up with to date.

Member States have joined of their own free will and with the consent of their citizens. Member States can leave the EU, but we see in Brexit that actually none of us realised how difficult that would be. But it is a testament to how Europe works – and also as a member of the Council I can say – that the goodwill and the unanimous position, the sticking together, of the remaining EU 27 is a testament that we can get through difficult times, through discussion, through debate – sometimes very long debate – without resorting to any kind of violence. This is the key to how the EU works: that we talk with one another and do not fight one another.

So what about the future? To sum up, I say we need to strengthen the basics.

Strengthen the single market, tear down the barriers, control our outer borders, and bring down the threat of uncontrolled immigration. Have a clever transition to clean energy, bringing in more market forces to play, and focus on our common security, not only through the military, but also through the security of the information world that we live in. Don't fight the populists. Address the causes of people's malcontent.

Left alone, we're like Aesop's sticks. We're just individual sticks and we can be broken one by one. Even the large European countries are small in the world, but united, as that bundle of sticks, the European Union is a major force in the world and we can bring our core values – freedom, democracy and the rule of law – to take bearing on other countries.

(Applause)

**President.** – Krišjānis, you are very popular in this Parliament.

**Jean-Claude Juncker**, *président de la Commission.* – Monsieur le Président, Monsieur le Premier ministre, Mesdames et Messieurs les députés, je suis heureux de retrouver ici le Premier ministre de la Lettonie, qui connaît bien cet hémicycle pour y avoir siégé pendant neuf ans. Je suis d'autant plus heureux de le voir que je me rappellerai toujours de la première présidence lettone du Conseil des ministres. Je m'en rappelle parce que ce fut la première vraie présidence de cette Commission, après deux mois de cohabitation avec la présidence italienne. Je me souviens en particulier du dernier jour de cette présidence lettone: dans la nuit du 29 au 30 juin fut adoptée la directive sur les frais d'itinérance, qui garantit l'accès libre et sans discrimination à l'internet. Cela prouve par ailleurs qu'en Europe, il faut avoir de la patience et la garder jusqu'au tout dernier jour. Nous discutons souvent, comme si nous n'avions pas d'autres choses à faire, du Brexit. Avant les élections, il serait peut-être recommandable d'attirer l'attention des citoyens sur ce que nous avons su réaliser au cours des dernières années, notamment la décision utile sur le *roaming*. Le Brexit est important, mais la vie quotidienne des citoyens l'est plus.

(Applaudissements)

Nous avons voulu être la Commission du dialogue et nous l'avons été. Nous avons organisé des rencontres avec les citoyens: 1 600 dialogues citoyens, ce qui prouve d'ailleurs que les commissaires ne s'enferment pas dans le bunker du Berlaymont, mais circulent à travers l'Europe. Ce qui prouve aussi que la Commission n'est pas une bande de putschistes, d'illégitimes, mais que nous sommes quotidiennement au contact des citoyens.

L'Europe ne peut pas se faire contre la volonté des peuples ni sans les nations: les nations sont importantes. Ceux qui pensent que les nations sont une invention provisoire de l'histoire se trompent lourdement, les nations se sont installées dans la durée et par conséquent il ne faut plus, me semble-t-il, parler des États-Unis d'Europe, car cela donne l'impression que l'Union européenne est en train de s'étatiser. L'Europe ne sera jamais un État copiant le modèle des États-Unis d'Amérique, jamais! Nous voulons être Lettons, Allemands, Bavarois, Bretons, Français, Luxembourgeois, tout en étant aussi Européens. Il n'y a pas de contradiction entre le patriotisme responsable et l'appartenance à un ensemble plus grand que constitue l'Union européenne.

Notre Commission a voulu cesser d'interférer dans toutes les petites choses de la vie quotidienne des citoyens et se concentrer sur les grands enjeux de l'avenir. Tel fut le contrat que la Commission a passé avec vous, représentants élus de l'Europe, lorsqu'en juillet 2014, je vous ai présenté les grandes priorités politiques de ma Commission. Ce ne furent pas des propos en l'air. En mai 2018 déjà, nous avons présenté toutes les propositions et initiatives annoncées en 2014. À ce jour, 350 de nos propositions ont été adoptées et 164 restent sur la table des colégislateurs. Elles portent sur des réformes importantes, notamment le régime d'asile – j'aurais souhaité que nous puissions adopter toutes les directives qui gravitent autour de la nécessaire réforme du régime d'asile. J'ai tout de même une satisfaction: jamais, dans l'histoire parlementaire de l'Europe, autant de progrès n'avaient été accomplis en matière sociale. Le domaine social fut, pendant de trop longues années, l'enfant pauvre de la construction européenne. Je voulais remercier les députés d'avoir accompagné avec volonté et détermination les progrès sociaux que la Commission a initiés.

Language number two, Mr President. Latvia is a country that knows better than most what it takes and what it is worth to be part of our Union – the Prime Minister made this clear in his excellent speech a few moments ago. Your country, Prime Minister, has always taken its destiny into its own hands. You have lived up to the words of one of your famous poets, who said: «We will be as great as our will». And you are, because your will is great.

*(Applause)*

You have fought for your freedoms in difficult circumstances – by far, more difficult than Western Europeans can ever imagine. You have made history, instead of being the victims of history imposed by one of your biggest neighbours. You have said «no» to the guns and to the tanks, and you have fought for your liberty, for your freedom, and it is one of the best events in recent history that Latvia and others have gained freedom and have fought for their place in the sun. The place of Latvia was not in the dark and in the shadow; the place of Latvia is in the sun, and we are happy that you have joined the European Union. Not a single day did we regret that Latvia became a member of the European Union.

*(Applause)*

You have joined the Schengen area, and I fully agree with what you have said about internal borders and the protection of external borders. The Commission has proposed coastguards and border guards of 10 000 people, men and women. The Council was postponing this to 2027, whereas the Commission had proposed 2020, but everyone is saying we have to protect our external borders. Let's do it. The proposals are on the table.

*(Applause)*

You are helping to make Europe stronger and safer. You are one of the 25 Member States that launched Permanent Structured Cooperation on defence matters in December 2017, and I am delighted that you are playing a full role in a number of European projects, from making cross-border military mobility easier – that's important for Latvia, military mobility – you are making cross-border military mobility easier, and you are countering the threat of sea mines.

In doing so, you have become the embodiment and living proof of how Europe enhances national sovereignty and influence. Take energy – you mentioned this very important dimension of European policy. Your history and your geography meant that Latvia and the Baltics were an isolated energy island cut off from the rest of Europe. When we took office, we made it clear that the European Union will never leave its citizens out in the cold and will never leave a Member State in the dark. For me, this was a Baltic issue, yes, but not only a Baltic issue: it was a European one. This is why, when we took office, we created an Energy Union and made it a top priority to provide Latvia and its Baltic neighbours with stable, securer and cheaper energy they need. Today, we are well on the way to synchronising the Baltic electricity grid with the rest of Europe by 2025. We are investing in infrastructure, and we now have the world's most ambitious and advanced climate and energy framework.

I'm delighted that we turned the Energy Union vision into reality and I thank you, I'm grateful to the Prime Minister for his leadership and work as a Member of this Parliament, and as a Prime Minister today.

Herr Präsident, *language number three*:

Lettland bringt seine volle Kraft in Europa ein. Deshalb ist es normal, dass Europa auch in Lettland investiert, denn in Lettland zu investieren, heißt in die europäische Zukunft zu investieren. Die Letten wissen aus erster Hand, welche Wirkung dies haben kann: 50 000 lettische Arbeitssuchende und fast 9 000 Beschäftigte konnten seit 2014 dank europäischer Mittel neue Qualifikationen erlernen, um auf dem Arbeitsmarkt durchzustarten. 300 Kilometer neu gebaute oder instandgesetzte Straßen, aus EU-Mitteln finanziert, werden dazu beitragen, das Wirtschaftszentrum Riga mit den ländlichen Regionen sowie den Nachbarn Litauen und Estland zu verbinden. 960 Millionen an Investitionen wurden dank des sogenannten Juncker-Fonds in Lettland mobilisiert.

Die lettische Zukunft betrifft unser aller Zukunft. Deshalb schlagen wir vor, im nächsten EU-Haushalt 100 Milliarden Euro in Innovation und Forschung zu investieren. Wir wollen in die großen Herausforderungen investieren, denen wir uns nur gemeinsam als Team stellen können. So wird beispielsweise die Finanzierung für stärkere Grenzen und Sicherheit verdreifacht. Wir werden sicherstellen, dass jeder vierte Euro des Haushalts unsere Ziele für Klima und nachhaltige Entwicklung unterstützt, und die Mittel für das Erasmus+-Programm werden auf 30 Milliarden Euro verdoppelt. Ich danke dem Premierminister und seiner Regierung für die anhaltende Unterstützung, um uns auf diesem Weg aktiv zu begleiten.

Ich würde aber auch gern etwas zu Ihrer Bemerkung die mittelfristige Finanzplanung betreffend sagen: Es ist richtig, dass wir in Innovation, Forschung, Jugend und Verteidigung investieren. Das können wir aber nur tun, wenn wir in bestehenden Politiken einige Kürzungen vornehmen: Agrar- und Kohäsionspolitik. Ich bin darüber nicht glücklich. Aber wenn wir alles so belassen, wie es ist, plus die neuen Prioritäten, auf die sich Rat und Parlament verständigt haben, auch finanzieren müssen, dann bräuchten wir den europäischen Haushalt auf ein Niveau von 1,4 %.

Das will niemand – mich würde das überhaupt nicht stören. Europa ist mehr wert als 1,4 % seines Bruttonationalprodukts, aber sogar das Parlament – in Haushaltsfragen weniger zurückhaltend als der Rat – hat das obere Limit für die Festlegung des europäischen Haushalts auf 1,3 % festgelegt. Wenn wir als Kommission 1,4 % statt 1,1 % vorgeschlagen hätten, dann hätten sogar Sie dem nicht zugestimmt und viele hier im Hause auch nicht. Insofern muss man Prioritäten setzen, ohne die bestehenden Politiken in der Mottenkiste unterzubringen. Denn Agrar und Kohäsion sind wichtig und für einige Länder wichtiger als für andere.

Lettland hat schwierige Jahre hinter sich, nicht nur wegen seiner geografischen Lage und wegen der historischen Belastung, der es unterliegt, sondern auch, weil die Wirtschaftskrise in Lettland voll zugeschlagen hat. Aber fünf Jahre nach dem Beginn unserer Amtszeit geht es der lettischen Wirtschaft deutlich besser. Das ist auch das Verdienst eines Ihrer Vorgänger, Valdis Dombrovskis, der Lettland auf Kurs gebracht hat. Und deshalb habe ich mich sehr darum bemüht – mit Erfolg, wie man sieht –, dass er Vizepräsident der Europäischen Kommission wird und zuständig für Euro und sozialen Dialog. Valdis, ich danke dir für deine Arbeit!

*(Beifall)*

Also mir fiele vieles ein zu dem, was du gesagt hast. Aber du hast so lange geredet, dass ich jetzt Schluss machen muss.

Lettland – mag ja sein – ist ein kleineres Land – ich bin Spezialist für kleinere Länder –, aber es ist ein Land mit großen Ambitionen, und es ist ein Ort, an dem West und Ost aufeinandertreffen. West und Ost dürfen nicht auseinanderdividiert werden, sondern sind die zwei Lungenflügel der Europäischen Union. Und wenn Europa gern eine gute Zukunft hätte, dann muss es mit beiden Lungen atmen.

Dies ist die letzte Rede, die ich vor diesem Parlament halten darf. Mit schwerem Herzen sehe ich einige Kollegen sich aus der Politik oder aus dem Parlament zurückziehen. Ich habe die Arbeit hier sehr gemocht – habe viel gelernt, habe viel gestritten, aber wir haben auch einiges geschafft. Es bleibt so, wie ich am ersten Tag meiner Amtszeit gesagt habe: Europa muss man lieben. Wenn man es nicht liebt, ist man zur Liebe nicht fähig. Ich liebe Europa, es lebe Europa!

*(Lebhafter Beifall)*

**Le Président.** – Merci beaucoup, Monsieur le Président de la Commission, merci beaucoup, cher Jean-Claude. Je te remercie pour cette coopération. Nous avons certes eu quelques fois certains échanges de vues, mais c'est cela le débat entre la Commission et le Parlement.

Le plus important est que nous avons travaillé tous pour nos citoyens, les citoyens européens. Nous avons besoin de l'Europe: bien sûr, il faudra la changer et l'améliorer, mais défendre l'Europe est la seule façon de protéger nos citoyens. Nous avons une histoire commune. Ce qui s'est passé il y a deux jours à Notre-Dame a démontré qu'il y a un cœur européen, que nous avons un héritage commun, que nous partageons les mêmes valeurs. Et cela même si nous parlons des langues différentes.

Voilà pourquoi je te remercie pour ton engagement, pour ton travail, pour les débats que nous avons eus ici. Un grand merci encore une fois, Jean-Claude. Nous nous verrons au Conseil, mais je te remercie pour ta disponibilité et ta présence ici, au Parlement. Un grand merci et bon travail.

**Manfred Weber, on behalf of the PPE Group.** – Mr President, what a great final speech in our row of Future of Europe discussions. I first want to thank our President for organising this format of the Future of Europe discussions and it's great to have Krišjānis Kariņš now as the final speaker here in this plenary, with a great contribution, with a forward-looking vision for Europe and, we all can feel it, with your knowledge, Krišjānis, about how Europe works, how the European Parliament works. I probably can say that it would for the future be a great thing to have more prime ministers in office with the background of being a former Member of the European Parliament. That is what we really enjoyed today, thank you so much.

*(Applause)*

What I really like is that you started first of all with optimism. When we speak about Europe, about the future of Europe, it's your country, about Latvia, the success story economically in the last years, all of this with the support, the contribution of Valdis Dombrovskis under his leadership. It's a great economic success. It is a great success for the country when it is about the investments, which Jean-Claude Juncker mentioned, and about the security feeling, that Latvians feel protected because they are part of this strong union of the European Union, and it is about Russia and the external threats towards us.

Success stories when we speak about our mandate at the European level, which Jean-Claude underlined. In the last five years what we managed, what we have brought to the people of Europe, the success stories on management of the external border, the millions of new jobs created with the Juncker Plan, the sustainable growth and the front-runner to be at the front on the question of the fight against climate change on a global level. So we can be proud about what we did in the last five years under the leadership of Jean-Claude Juncker.

Generally speaking, I'm 46 years old. I'm the first generation of this continent who can say that I live all over Europe in peace and freedom. My father's generation enjoyed peace, but half of the continent was locked up behind the Iron Curtain and my grandfather's generation was in war, and that's why the first generation, and this broader historic perspective, to have this in mind when we go out of this plenary and do our campaign. It must start with optimism. It's a great Europe we are living in today and we will protect this against all the egoists and nationalists.

*(Applause)*

The second point you mentioned is about the concrete issues on the table. The answers on the demand, the questions, the concerns of the people. You mentioned migration – we fully support your idea about protecting our borders. The state decides who is on European soil and it is not the smugglers who decide. We need a resettlement programme, an ambitious one, and we need a plan for Africa, with probably in the future also a Commissioner for Africa who combines all the efforts we need, all the activities we do in regard to our neighbouring continent.

The jobs question – research is key. The regional funds are key, especially for the poorest regions in Europe. Trade is key, and the single market. I like your appeal to strengthen the single market because that's the home base. Looking for new jobs, we first of all look to our strengths and not to the strengths of the others. And then climate change. All these things are on the agenda, but when we are speaking about the future of Europe you also have to be frank, because one thing is the content, the political approach, but the other is the method: how we come to results, and you know the problems.

On a lot of fields where we need a stronger Europe, we have the problem of the unanimous vote. I call it the problem of the unanimous vote. When it is about the Russian policy, we always need all 27 countries on board to come to conclusions and that's why we have to stop. If we want to make the European Union into a strong political actor at global level, then we need the majority-making decision process in external affairs. That's why the methods must be changed.

When I speak about methods, I think keeping the bridge-building approach alive is needed. I tell you on migration: my own country Germany was, in the migration debate, against all the Commission's ideas in regard to a binding quota on the question of distribution of migrants – until the year 2015, because then the migration problem arrived in Germany and immediately, in one, two, three months' time, Germany changed its mind and immediately started asking for a binding quota mechanism on Europe. And what does this tell us? This tells us: don't look from an egoistic point to Europe. We have to learn that we also have to take into account the problem of the others when we want to have a strong European Union.

(Applause)

Finally, on the method: a Europe which is democratic. We all know what we speak about. It's a question of right of initiative here in this House, strengthening the investigation capacity of this House. The implementation of the rules must be checked also by this institution, and Krišjānis, I'm really grateful that you support the idea of the *Spitzenkandidat*, the idea that you have to show up before the elections to tell people, 'I'm a candidate from all the parties in this House, and we have programmes and we ask for this support'. So a democratic Europe.

And finally, the future of Europe means that we have to protect the essence of Europe. We spoke about the European way of life, about democracy, independence of our judiciary, equal treatment of men and women, and, as a title, freedom: freedom of expression, of religion, of the press. We have to guarantee these rights for the future with an upgraded rule of law mechanism, give the world a positive example of how to manage positively society in a human way; that Europe is an offer, the European way of life is an offer to the world – that's the future of Europe.

(Applause)

**Mercedes Bresso**, a nome del gruppo S&D. – Signor Presidente, onorevoli colleghi, Primo ministro, è un grande onore oggi darle il benvenuto nelle Sue nuove funzioni di Primo ministro in questo emiciclo che, come Lei ha ricordato, conosce bene per essere stato deputato durante quasi dieci anni. Un onore ancora più grande perché Lei non solo è l'ultimo capo di governo prima delle prossime elezioni europee, ma anche per aver enunciato nel suo discorso, e La ringraziamo, importanti prospettive sull'Unione che avremo il dovere di costruire dopo il 26 maggio e, per queste ragioni, Le porgo il benvenuto a nome del gruppo dei Socialisti e Democratici.

Come ultimo capo di governo che viene a visitare questo Parlamento, che è ormai agli sgoccioli dell'ottava legislatura, la Sua visita è per noi anche un'eccellente opportunità per discutere sul Suo paese, la Lettonia, e il ruolo all'interno dell'Unione europea. Per noi parlamentari europei, è sempre un evento positivo incontrare uno dei nostri ex colleghi, come molti hanno ricordato, nelle vesti di rappresentanti di un esecutivo nazionale. Ne siamo lieti, speriamo che aumentino.

Detto questo, siamo portavoce in questa Assemblea di un'aspirazione comune e concreta dei cittadini europei, quella di costruire insieme un'Unione forte per essere in grado di affrontare le sfide del nostro tempo, poiché, da solo, uno Stato membro che sia di piccole dimensioni come il suo o con una popolazione maggiore come il mio paese, l'Italia o la Francia o altri, non solamente Lei ce lo ha ricordato, non può fare nulla contro gli effetti negativi della globalizzazione o dei cambiamenti climatici, ma neppure può assicurare la propria difesa o garantire uno sviluppo economico al suo paese di una certa importanza.

Per inciso, Presidente Juncker, anch'io come Lei amo l'Europa, ma milito per gli Stati Uniti d'Europa, Stati al plurale, non al singolare, quindi, non grande Stato europeo ma degli Stati Uniti veramente d'Europa e quindi non vedo dov'è il problema. Grazie comunque per il Suo impegno per l'Europa, anche da parte del mio gruppo, visto che oggi, come ha ricordato, è la Sua ultima presenza in questo Parlamento. Abbiamo apprezzato il Suo impegno, se non per gli Stati Uniti d'Europa per un'Europa unita, che forse è ancora di più degli Stati Uniti d'Europa.

Signor Primo ministro, speriamo che quello che ci ha detto rappresenti un più grande impegno europeo del Suo governo, che fino ad ora ha manifestato alcuni segnali di ambiguità riguardo appunto al suo colore europeista. In un contesto in cui gli Stati europei non riescono più a pesare individualmente nello scacchiere internazionale, non sarebbe il tempo, come ha ricordato anche il collega, di porre fine alla regola dell'unanimità nelle decisioni del Consiglio, che anche Lei d'altronde sostiene ed accetta, regola che valorizza purtroppo solo gli interessi individuali e particolari degli Stati membri a scapito dell'interesse generale dell'Unione?

Vuole continuare a svolgere la funzione di cane da guardia di un conclave europeo dove le decisioni necessarie sono continuamente rimandate o persino non prese, proprio quando il bisogno di un'Europa forte è così doveroso ed inderogabile, Lei ce lo ha ricordato. In quale capitolo vuole trovarsi nei libri di storia, dalla parte degli interessi dei cittadini europei o di coloro che avranno difeso l'interesse di élite moderatamente e tiepidamente europeiste?

Mi permetto di insistere, vuole trovarsi dalla parte di chi ha reso il progetto europeo in attivo, proteggendo il dominio riservato di un gruppo o di una élite o dalla parte di chi ha dato allo stesso progetto gli strumenti utili, compreso anche un bilancio per sviluppare appieno le proprie potenzialità?

Per noi socialisti e democratici, l'Europa si costruisce attraverso la legge e mediante il rispetto. I diritti umani, naturalmente, ma anche i diritti civili, nonché il rispetto della parola data alla comunità. Da gennaio le affermazioni che Lei ha espresso in Europa e nel Suo paese hanno sollevato numerose domande alle quali vorremmo Lei desse qualche risposta.

In primo luogo, a proposito del rispetto dell'impegno europeo per il ricollocamento dei rifugiati in Europa. Lei ha affermato di essere contrario a questo reinsediamento. Ma come fare le redistribuzioni? Come fare se abbiamo, come Lei ha detto, una frontiera comune? Questa posizione contraddice quel principio di solidarietà che Lei ci ha richiamato e che si applica a tutte le nostre politiche comunitarie compresa ad esempio la politica di coesione. Quindi che cosa ci può dire concretamente su questa questione?

In secondo luogo, che dire del Suo rifiuto di sostenere il lancio della procedura di infrazione sulla base dell'articolo 7 nei confronti di Ungheria e Polonia. Come spiega questo Suo rifiuto, con le Sue critiche giuste alla politica di Vladimir Putin e al Suo sostegno nei confronti dell'asse di estrema destra che va appunto da Salvini a Orbán? Può illustrarci le sue opinioni in proposito? Non ritiene che questa sia una contraddizione?

Ultimo punto, ma non per importanza, quali sono le misure messe in atto dal Suo governo di fronte all'inasprimento delle discriminazioni nei confronti delle persone LGBT? Nella relazione della Commissione europea contro il razzismo e l'intolleranza dello scorso marzo, questa Commissione indica gravi disfunzioni nell'attuazione di misure a tutela di queste minoranze. La nostra Unione è un'Unione sotto il segno della tolleranza e Lei e il Suo paese, come ci ha ricordato, ne fanno parte e ne condividono i valori.

La ringrazio, ancora una volta, per il suo intervento e anche per le risposte che vorrà dare alle mie domande.

**Roberts Zīle**, ECR grupas vārdā. – Prezidenta kungs! Komisijas priekšsēdētāja kungs! Premjerministra kungs! Prieks jūs šeit redzēt un paldies par enerģisko un ļoti saturisko runu kā lieliskam valodniekam, politiķim un arī labam kolēģim, ar kuru mēs esam strādājuši gan Latvijas politikā, gan arī šeit, Eiropas Parlamentā, roku rokā daudzus jautājumus.

Un es gribētu arī kolēģu uzmanību vērst uz lieliskajām dāmām, kas ir Krišjāņa Kariņa komandā. Jūs redzat tajās pirmās rindās ap viņu. Es domāju, ka mēs varam lepoties visādā ziņā ar mūsu diplomātisko korpusu Latvijā. Un paldies par jūsu darbu!

Es arī nenožēloju nevienu dienu ne iestāšanos Eiropas Savienībā, ne eirozonā, bet tai pašā laikā es varu teikt to, ka es esmu ļoti daudzas reizes nožēlojis to un nevaru lepoties vai piekrist tai Eiropas Savienības politikai, kas šeit tiek realizēta, un arī par viņas tēlu un seju, ja tā varētu teikt. Un es par to arī runāšu savā tālākajā runā.

I am really and glad that your speech didn't include so simple an approach. Everything is all right here in the European Union, and so let's peacefully evaluate our achievements and let's make an ever-closer Union. I'm very thankful that you did it more in detail and with more analytical suggestions.

The European Conservatives and Reformists Group (ECR) is always a political family which supports a pure, real single market in any sector of the economy. I think we have here some doubts, which partly you shared already. You said you are not very happy with European champions, which should be created. I trust you, but national champions are European Union champions, so we can see a bit of disagreement with your *Spitzenkandidat* Mr Manfred Weber, who some time ago said in the media that you would agree to change some rules on state aid and competition in the EU to allow the creation of such champions, which I think is the wrong message to the economy, because also the message "Europe which protects" sounds good – but to protect from whom? From the outside world? Okay, for a short-term it works, but in the longer run, it's a wrong way. Even more dangerous, I think, is protection inside the single market, and here I can give an example, which you partly already said on the basis of the US, with zero barriers between states in the US, if you would like to see a similar situation in the European Union.

We recently approved Mobility Package I with a very controversial procedure, I would say. After this vote, it's clear that it was the Latvian government, the Lithuanian, Polish governments, Romanians, Hungarians: many countries were against it in Council, and MEPs from different political families from those countries were against it. Then it's a question if it's bad for those countries and it's good for Europe, where is Europe? This, I think, is a bad signal. If you can imagine the US doing the same Mobility Package I approach in the road freight market in the US, for example, to return an empty truck from New York to Wyoming, I think it would be a disaster, and I'm not even speaking about the things for the budget. We are fighting here for around 1% of GDP, and we will fight after the new Parliament as well. But, at the same time, we forget that the US federal budget is over 20% of GDP, and that's why people also living in the same Wyoming. I think we have to think about these things if we really would like to create some more kind of a federalist approach – not the ECR, but other Groups, you have to remember this.

I fully agree with the AML function, which is the tax arrears report also here evaluated Latvian achievement on definition in the legislation about shell companies, which are very big points in anti-money-laundering issues, and at the same time there was not named in the TAX3 report about Latvia, but there was named some country which is not very far from here, and it's between Brussels and Strasbourg.

I also would like to say that it's good that you touch a point on R&D. Of course, research and development innovations are very important as well, and it's good that it's growing. You rightly said "but" – but how it is distributed – and it's a very important point, not only what you named but also from a demographic point of view. It means if we will continue or even with a widening programme – the Horizon Programme – which is a good programme, but it's still not working enough. So we will expect that the demographic situation in the European Union will be even more divided if we continue like that, because the best researchers, the best brains and best young people should go to those centres, to those countries in the EU Member States, and it means peripheral countries will have a lot of demographic problems. Some countries will solve in the medium term the demographic situation in the country and also achievement in economy, but disparities in the European Union will be even greater than they are now.

I just made a few points which partly agree with you and partly, I just like to continue on this problem. In general I think in the new Parliament we can have a good, reasonable political family cooperation between different Groups on a pure, real, single market, keep as a core principle in the European Union in the future.



**Pavel Telička**, *on behalf of the ALDE Group*. – Mr President, let me welcome the Prime Minister back to the European Parliament. Prime Minister, you made a comment at the beginning of your speech that you had learnt a few lessons in the European Parliament. I cannot resist drawing a parallel, a fake one in fact, because under that assumption I would like, even though I would never vote for him, the Czech Prime Minister to be a Member of the European Parliament and maybe then we would have a different policy by the Czech Government on European affairs.

But apart from that of course, you had one advantage. You had knowledge and you had attitude. I'm afraid that these are absolutely necessary otherwise you cannot evolve. So I'm afraid that that doesn't go hand in hand with the parallel that I've made for the Czech Prime Minister.

Now you also mentioned the question of languages. I'm sure you speak a number of languages and understand quite a few. I don't think that you speak or understand Czech, but I must say that what you have said is like reading the election manifesto of my own political movement, Voice or *Hlas*, and that is positive news, because that means that regardless of the fact that you're in the PPE and I'm a Liberal, there are a number of questions on which we can and we should seek European solutions, on a number of issues that we can also agree with other parties, and I think that this is what we need to be aiming at after the next election. So I'm sure there are a number of points where we would have a large degree of coherence.

Let me pick up on a few points that you raised.

Simplified solutions: you referred to nationalists and populists. I agree entirely. We should be tackling the cause of these, the cause of the concerns and also the concerns of those that we have lost somewhere in the process of globalisation. But then we also need to be honest and fair and say that we also have some homework to do, that even in our own political families, in our political groups, in political parties, we will find those that are providing these simplistic solutions. So I think that we need to tackle this across the political spectrum and I'm definitely ready to do that.

Now on the points that you raised. You spoke about the internal market. I think that there is hardly anyone in this Parliament that would say that the internal market is not successful. That we need to evolve it, yes, In fact, only 35% of the internal market is really open. That means that we have a potential of 65%. How come we do not manage? And you have said it clearly. There is a reason to go and do business in the US because you have an internal market in the US. If you invent an application, you go to the US because you will have one authorisation and three, let's say, contracts with mobile operators. We need 28 still. So the question is: if we want a true internal market, are we ready to go for one regulator, a true internal market?

You made the parallel also, or let's say the connection, with the unfair competition from China and elsewhere, and again I agree and we should not lean towards protectionism. But we need to understand that if we open up the market – and I'm all in favour – then the advantage is on the side of those that cheat and also of those that are big. So let's not fool ourselves that we will establish an internal market and suddenly our start-ups will be in the same position as Huawei or Microsoft, or whoever.

So that means that we need to work also on the standards, on the norms, and also on competition policy. We need to have a fair environment inside and the question is: do we have the courage and the willingness to go and establish a true internal market, and not at 35% but 100%. I'm all in favour. If you are, let's work on it.

Now you spoke also about the question of external borders. Absolutely! I mean this is absolutely key but we still are failing in this respect. I'm afraid, if I look at the Czech Republic, there are a lot of statements on the side of the political elite and again they lack the courage, the ability, the vision to understand that we will have an internal market, we will have free movement, if we really secure the border.

Final two remarks: on climate change, and again this is just a sign that on climate change we have an ability to work across the political spectrum.

And the very final point. You touched on the common agriculture policy and fair treatment for farmers. Yes, indeed. We do not have a common agriculture policy because from a number of national budgets we have additional subsidies that go beyond. So we need a free and, as well, a fair treatment of our business people, of our entrepreneurs, of our consumers, and again also of farmers.

**Δημήτριος Παπαδημούλης**, εξ ονόματος της ομάδας GUE/NGL. – Κύριε Πρόεδρε, η σημερινή συζήτηση είναι ιδιαίτερα σημαντική, διότι σε λίγες ώρες ολοκληρώνονται οι εργασίες της Ολομέλειας του Ευρωπαϊκού Κοινοβουλίου. Είναι η τελευταία ομιλία του προέδρου Juncker ενώπιον της Ολομέλειας και υποδεχόμαστε τον λετονό πρωθυπουργό, ο οποίος ήταν και για εννιά χρόνια συνάδελφός μας στο Ευρωπαϊκό Κοινοβούλιο και είναι ο δωδέκατος πρωθυπουργός που έρχεται εδώ για να συζητήσουμε σχετικά με το μέλλον της Ευρώπης. Σαράντα ημέρες πριν από τις σημαντικές ευρωεκλογές που έχουμε μπροστά μας, δεν νομίζω ότι είναι η ώρα να αυτοεπαινούμαστε και να επισημαίνουμε κάποια θετικά που έχουν γίνει. Πρέπει να δούμε το μέλλον, τις προκλήσεις του μέλλοντος και όσα δεν έχουμε κάνει ή όσα έχουμε κάνει λάθος, για να καταλάβουμε ότι αυτός είναι ο τρόπος αντιμετώπισης της ανερχόμενης λαϊκίστικης ακροδεξιάς που θέλει να διαλύσει τόσο την ευρωπαϊκή ενοποίηση, ως σχέδιο, όσο και τις κοινωνίες μας.

Αναφερθήκατε, κύριε Καριγξ, στον αρχαιοελληνικό μύθο του Αισώπου με τις βέργες —μία βέργα σπάει εύκολα, πολλές βέργες μαζί δεν σπάνε. Αυτό είναι σωστό, αλλά πρέπει να δούμε εμείς, στην Ευρωπαϊκή Ένωση, πού βρισκόμαστε δέκα χρόνια μετά την κρίση της Lehman Brothers. Έχουν μεγαλώσει οι ανισότητες, κοινωνικές και περιφερειακές, έχει υποχωρήσει μέσα στην Ευρώπη το κράτος δικαίου και η κοινοβουλευτική δημοκρατία, το Ευρωπαϊκό Κοινοβούλιο και η Επιτροπή έχουν ζητήσει την ενεργοποίηση του άρθρου 7 εναντίον των κυβερνήσεων της Πολωνίας και της Ουγγαρίας, και στο Συμβούλιο δεν κάνετε τίποτα για τις παραβιάσεις της δημοκρατίας.

Το Ευρωπαϊκό Κοινοβούλιο και η Επιτροπή έχουν ολοκληρώσει μια πρόταση για τη μεταρρύθμιση των πολιτικών ασύλου, συνολικά επτά φακέλους, και στο Συμβούλιο οι κυβερνήσεις δεν κάνετε τίποτα. Η Επιτροπή, η Ευρωπαϊκή Κεντρική Τράπεζα και το Ευρωκοινοβούλιο θέλουν την ολοκλήρωση της τραπεζικής ενοποίησης, με τον τρίτο πυλώνα που αφορά το ευρωπαϊκό σύστημα εγγύησης καταθέσεων, και στο Συμβούλιο δεν κάνετε τίποτα. Ακριβέστερα, κάποιες κυβερνήσεις, όπως της Γερμανίας και της Ολλανδίας, έχουν θέσει ουσιαστικά βέτο. Αν θέλουμε, λοιπόν, να προχωρήσει η Ευρώπη και να γίνει πιο ισχυρή η πολιτική ενοποίηση, ισχυρότερη η πολιτική διαφάνεια, να ενισχυθεί η κοινωνική συνοχή και να κάνουμε περισσότερα πράγματα για την αντιμετώπιση της κλιματικής αλλαγής, όπως μας ζήτησε χθες η δεκαεξάχρονη Greta Thunberg, τότε θα πρέπει να σταματήσει η Ευρωπαϊκή Ένωση, κύριε Weber, να είναι μια ομάδα κρατών όπου συζητούν είκοσι οχτώ και στο τέλος αποφασίζουν οι Γερμανοί. Αυτό πρέπει να αλλάξει.

Και θέλω να σημειώσω ότι συμφωνώ με την παρατήρηση του προέδρου Juncker, ότι για να υπηρετήσουμε τους στόχους που έχουν τεθεί χρειάζεται και ένας ισχυρότερος κοινοτικός προϋπολογισμός με περισσότερα χρήματα στο κοινό ταμείο. Γιατί πρέπει να μην περικοπούν αλλά, αντίθετα, να ενισχυθούν τα κονδύλια για την κοινωνική συνοχή. Να μην περικοπούν αλλά, αντίθετα, να ενισχυθούν τα κονδύλια για την Κοινή Αγροτική Πολιτική. Να δώσουμε περισσότερα χρήματα για τη νεολαία, το Erasmus +, την απασχόληση, την έρευνα και την καινοτομία. Και σας ρωτώ, κύριε Καριγξ, ως εκπρόσωπο του Συμβουλίου, αλλά και ως παλιό ευρωβουλευτή: γιατί έχετε πετάξει στα σκουπίδια τις προτάσεις της επιτροπής Monti για την αύξηση των ιδίων πόρων; Πώς μπορεί να προχωρήσει η πολιτική ενοποίηση της Ευρώπης, η οικονομική ολοκλήρωση της ΟΝΕ και η νομισματική ενοποίηση, χωρίς να κοιτάμε το κοινωνικό θέμα;

Κύριε Juncker και κύριε Καριγξ, στο Γκέτεμποργκ εγκρίθηκε η κοινωνική ατζέντα, αλλά παραμένει μια απλή ετικέτα. Δεν έχει αποκτήσει περιεχόμενο και, όσο αυξάνονται οι ανισότητες, θα κερδίζει έδαφος ο λαϊκισμός των ακροδεξιών που θέλουν να διαλύσουν τόσο την Ευρώπη όσο και τη δημοκρατία. Πριν από ογδόντα χρόνια, οι πολιτικοί πρόγονοι του κυρίου Salvini, της κυρίας Le Pen και του κυρίου Orbán —που κακώς τον κρατάτε, κύριε Weber, με αναστολή στις γραμμές του Ευρωπαϊκού Λαϊκού Κόμματος— οδήγησαν στον φασισμό και τον ναζισμό και σε έναν πολύνεκρο πόλεμο. Εάν θέλουμε, λοιπόν, να υπερασπίσουμε τη δημοκρατία, πρέπει στις επόμενες ευρωεκλογές να αποκτήσει μια ισχυρή πλειοψηφία μέσα στο Ευρωπαϊκό Κοινοβούλιο η άποψη που λέει ότι χρειαζόμαστε μια περισσότερο ενωμένη πολιτικά, δημοκρατική και κοινωνική Ευρώπη, που να μειώνει τις ανισότητες και να μην τις αυξάνει.

**Philippe Lamberts**, *on behalf of the Verts/ALE Group*. – Mr President, Prime Minister Krišjānis Kariņš, welcome back to a parliament you know very well indeed. We've not always been of one mind on economic affairs, but I have always been very impressed by the strength of your commitment to our common European project, and again today was a testament to that. And actually you are quite typical of that commitment that you find in the Baltic republics. I believe that the three Baltics and the Benelux countries should cooperate much more deeply, because if they can find agreement between them, I think they could be bridge-builders and foster unity in Europe maybe better than the Franco-German duo, which seems to be a bit at odds at the moment.

I liked very much your speech. I liked you reminding us that the European Union is a peace project solving differences through dialogue rather than sheer force. This is not just a justification for the past century. It is today's justification for the European project. I liked very much the metaphor of the bundle. Like you, I come from a small country, but even big countries in Europe, as you said, are actually small as a yardstick globally.

I liked very much also what you said about the single market. The single market is the ultimate free trade agreement. But it is very specific, because unlike all other free trade agreements, it is governed by democratic institutions: the European Parliament, the European Council. You don't find that elsewhere in other free trade deals. I liked also very much the fact that you were upfront about money laundering, and I think that you found the right words, and we like to hear them, because I know that your commitment on that is very strong. However, I'd like also to beg to disagree, not necessarily with what you said, but with a number of positions and actions of the Latvian Government.

First, for us Greens the European project must resolutely choose to be a leader: the engine of the ecological transition of our societies. If we can't make them fit within the boundaries that nature sets us, it's the survival of humankind that is at stake. It's also a matter of leadership: if we Europeans don't lead in that transition, others will, and we will be left with buying their solutions rather than providing ours to the rest of the world. One case in point, and you mentioned it, is agriculture. The common agricultural policy is the EU's largest budget. We should make sure every euro-cent spent on it is used and contributes to the transformation of our agricultural model so that it reduces CO<sub>2</sub> emissions and restores biodiversity and the quality of our soil. Arguably, the CAP predominantly promotes a productivist model that goes against these goals – and your government supports it – and actually you find it already too green for your taste. I understand that your country – and I agree with that – wants its fair share of the CAP. We are convinced, though, that the best chance of achieving that target is actually to fight for a greener CAP that moves away from the productivist model and to industrial farming.

The second aspect relates to citizenship. You mentioned the European values, and actually if you read Article 2, the first value that is mentioned there is human dignity. Human dignity cannot be divided: it is for all, present and to come. Latvia's history as an unwilling part of the Soviet Union has resulted in a significant part of your citizenship originating from former Soviet republics. While we understand that the wounds of the past cannot be ignored, we believe that, as a member of the EU, Latvia is strong enough not to keep more than 10% of its population stateless. Similarly, we believe that your country could and should do more to promote minority rights and fight discrimination, especially when it comes to age, disability or sexual orientation.

Thirdly, we have welcomed – and again, today you managed to avoid this – the fact that all three Baltic republics have avoided the toxic grandstanding that we have seen on the topic of asylum and migration. I really appreciated your words on that. However, recently your government opposed any binding relocation scheme – which is actually the only way to organise European solidarity. It has also refused to sign the UN Global Migration Compact, which, contrary to the allegations of the national populists, is simply providing guidelines as to how to handle this challenge. You and I know that it is not legally binding and that it is grounded in values of state sovereignty, responsibility-sharing, non-discrimination and human rights, and it recognises that only a cooperative approach will allow us to meet this challenge. Latvia's signature should be on that document.

With the European elections now upon us, this is the last debate on the future of Europe in this European Parliament. Count on us to relentlessly defend the first-ever attempt at building a transnational democracy. But equally, count on us to make it work for everyone, by putting human dignity rather than short-term economic profits at the front and in the centre. A more just, more sustainable, more free and democratic Europe is what our citizens want. We will ask that they trust us to deliver just that.

**David Coburn**, *on behalf of the EFDD Group*. – Mr President, a Happy Easter to you all, when it comes. Public outpouring of distress about the destruction of the Notre-Dame Cathedral in Paris shows how deeply we care about the cultural and religious heritage of Europe. Any unity the continent of Europe has, based on its philosophical and religious heritage deriving from Roman law, Greek philosophy, Christian faith and, dare I say, British democracy (as a more recent example), while it was drawing up the constitution of Europe, later the Lisbon Treaty, which we didn't like very much, the EU rejected any reference to God or Christian religion in Europe. Well, this is something alien to the continent of Europe. The EU itself, with its project of aggressive secularism – as Roger Scruton called it, oikophobia – is the rejection of our own heritage and culture, which is the basis of our current cultural weakness and why many people throughout Europe are more and more rejecting the European Union.

The European project is like a terrifying religious cult, something invented by Mr Robespierre or something of that ilk. The Prime Minister, Mr Kariņš, with all due respect, said Russia had something to do with Brexit. Sorry, sir. The British people, who stood alone in 1940 against authoritarianism, are quite capable of making up their own minds about Europe. What they don't want is bureaucratic authoritarianism from unelected European bureaucracy. I mean, let's be honest, this Parliament is a bit of a eunuch. They want to be ruled by their own sovereign parliaments. At the moment our own parliament is dominated by an establishment which has been infiltrated over 30 years or more by members of the Euro-cult, who are preventing a simple Brexit – something that could easily be done; we could have easily just said we're leaving with WTO rules or give us a better deal. And if they didn't, we could have left with WTO rules. But the Euro-cultists decided otherwise, including, may I say, our own Prime Minister, Mrs May, who has misled the country in many ways.

Dreaming up lots of nonsense about unnecessary backstops in Ireland, which seem intended to break up the EU for daring to leave the Euro-cult, the establishment at Westminster are out of touch with their own voters, and this is seen increasingly to be the case. If the EU and its UK-establishment allies force Mrs May's grossly unfair and ludicrous deal down Britain's throats (which is actually worse than actually being in the European Union), to avoid a European election (which I think you're all trying to do at the moment; Mrs May certainly is – you probably want it too), because it will be won by Mr Farage's Brexit party. And if not, may I tell you, if you don't have that election, the following general election in great Britain will be won by Mr Farage's Brexit party. Evidently, we need to clean out the Euro-cultists out of the parliament of Westminster to get a proper Brexit.

I told Mr Barnier (sadly he is not here with us today), who I think is an excellent negotiator – I wish he was on our side – to his surprise, may I say, that the British Parliament cannot bind its successors. If you don't give us a fair deal, it won't stick, so you're wasting your time. However, it seems more important to the Euro-cultists to make sure that they get their cult together, that they keep the project going, than a profitable deal with Great Britain, which benefits the citizens of not only Europe, but great Britain.

The European Union must govern by consent, not punishing, like a modern inquisition, those countries or individuals who do not share your faith. Learn from history, especially people in the Low Countries – Mr Lamberts, for example – learn from history. The free thinkers of the Spanish Netherlands in the Low Countries overthrew the Inquisition, which was dominating Europe and stopping people thinking and acting for themselves. Their rebellion against the Spanish Inquisition led to free-thinking democracies in the Low Countries and in the United Kingdom. Thank God for them. The free thinkers of today are what you call populists. Personally, I'd rather be a populist than an un-populist, but there you are. What you dismissively describe as populist will be elected shortly, from all over Europe to this next Parliament, and they will dominate it. They will dominate it and they will change radically the EU, or they will break it. Bend with the wind or be crushed, I think is the thing you've got to think about. The EU is as much a threat to European democracy in the same way the Inquisition was in the 16th century to free thinking and democracy.

Prime Minister Kariņš said, we do not have to worry about migration, and that many people want to come to a stable, democratic continent. I don't blame them. If I were living in the third world or any other part of the world that wasn't Europe, I'd want to come here too. Who can blame those people? If I were in their position, I'd want that. But if the numbers change, the philosophy and the democratic nature of the European continent, that is neither in the interests of the people who live here or the people who are coming here. It will be a disaster. So the other thing to worry about is the crushing of their health service. So Europe can only survive by rule by consent, not the force they have used on the UK. You have frightened a lot of counties but not in a good way.

**Presidente.** – Onorevole ha ragione, l'onorevole Coburn ha parlato più del tempo concesso, ma ho concesso a tutti i presidenti dei gruppi di parlare di più. Non è che posso concedere a chi condivide più tempo e a chi non condivide meno tempo. Le regole sono uguali per tutti.

**Nicolas Bay, au nom du groupe ENF.** – Monsieur le Président, Monsieur le Premier ministre, l'effroyable incendie qui a frappé Notre-Dame de Paris nous conduit bien sûr à prendre conscience de la fragilité de notre patrimoine. Voir l'un des plus beaux joyaux et des plus beaux symboles de notre civilisation européenne ravagé par les flammes a meurtri le cœur des Français et des Européens. Heureusement, l'action admirable des sapeurs-pompiers a permis de sauver une large partie de l'édifice, qui pourra ainsi être restauré et retrouver sa splendeur. Et quelle joie d'apprendre que le trésor de Notre-Dame, la couronne d'épines et la tunique de Saint-Louis ont été sauvés! Mais cette tragédie doit provoquer un sursaut, une prise de conscience sur la nécessité de protéger, de transmettre notre patrimoine, bien sûr, mais, d'une manière plus générale, notre héritage de civilisation européenne et chrétienne.

Monsieur le Premier ministre, vous avez évoqué tout à l'heure ceux que vous appelez les eurosceptiques, considérant qu'ils seraient opposés à l'idée même de la construction européenne. Vous faites une erreur totale: nous croyons en l'Europe. Nous sommes convaincus qu'il y a une civilisation européenne, une culture commune, et qu'il y a d'immenses défis à relever ensemble. Mais cette volonté exige aussi de la lucidité. Vous avez dit tout à l'heure, s'agissant de l'immigration, que vous n'aviez pas de solution, que nous ne pouvions rien faire pour empêcher cette immigration. La réalité est que nous pouvons agir et Matteo Salvini, en Italie, le montre chaque jour. Mais il y a clairement deux choix: d'un côté, M. Avramopoulos, le commissaire européen, qui nous disait qu'il fallait de l'immigration pour compenser le déficit démographique et, de l'autre, les gouvernements courageux en Italie, en Hongrie, qui mettent en œuvre de grandes politiques – sociales, fiscales, de soutien aux familles, d'encouragement à la natalité européenne. Clairement, il y a deux visions qui s'affrontent, entre ceux qui acceptent ou qui encouragent l'immigration et ceux qui veulent au contraire la fermer et l'immigration et l'encouragement à la natalité européenne.

En matière d'économie, l'Union européenne s'est caractérisée par la suppression de toutes les protections: à l'intérieur, avec le marché commun, avec la concurrence déloyale, avec le travail détaché, et à l'extérieur, en multipliant les accords de libre-échange et l'abaissement des tarifs douaniers. Aujourd'hui, la Chine ou les États-Unis se protègent, sont capables de mettre en place toutes les protections utiles pour leur marché intérieur et, évidemment, sont conquérants, offensifs, dans le reste du monde. Ils utilisent bien souvent le continent européen comme un espace où ils peuvent agir économiquement très librement, souvent au détriment de notre économie réelle, de nos unités de production et de nos salariés. Là encore, clairement, deux visions politiques s'affrontent, entre ceux qui considèrent l'Espace économique européen comme un terrain de jeu totalement ouvert et ceux qui, comme nous, veulent une Europe qui soit économiquement et commercialement protégée.

S'agissant de son organisation institutionnelle, l'Europe doit renouer aussi avec la démocratie. Face au pouvoir aujourd'hui exorbitant de la Commission européenne, j'ai entendu tout à l'heure M. Weber, les socialistes, mais aussi les soutiens d'Emmanuel Macron en France, nous dire qu'il fallait aller encore plus loin en supprimant la règle de l'unanimité – un nouveau cliquet dans le fédéralisme. Les mêmes d'ailleurs demanderont demain la suppression de la majorité qualifiée, puis la fin de la majorité simple pour aboutir finalement à un fonctionnement de plus en plus opaque et de plus en plus autoritaire. Clairement, là encore, deux visions s'affrontent: l'Europe des nations, l'Europe des coopérations, ou l'Europe de la Commission avec l'accélération vers le fédéralisme.

Nous sommes à cinq semaines des élections européennes. La construction européenne est évidemment à la croisée des chemins. Le continent européen détient en lui les capacités du sursaut et du renouveau pour assurer le rayonnement à nouveau de nos nations, collectivement, sur la scène mondiale. Mais il faut pour cela rompre avec les grands dogmes actuels de l'Union européenne et s'affranchir enfin de la logique technocratique. L'Europe protégera son économie ou elle deviendra le laquais des autres grandes puissances. L'Europe remettra les nations et les peuples au cœur de son projet ou elle se disloquera. L'Europe défendra ses racines, son identité et sa civilisation ou elle disparaîtra.

**Bruno Gollnisch (NI).** – Monsieur le Président, Monsieur le Premier ministre, cher ancien collègue, vous nous entretenez de l'avenir de l'Union européenne. Disons les choses franchement, cet avenir sera bien sombre si l'on ne change pas radicalement de perspectives.

Au cours des 30 années que j'ai passées dans ce Parlement, j'ai vu se développer une dynamique de groupe perverse, prométhéenne, je devrais dire luciférienne, telle que la majorité de nos collègues se sont crus aptes à donner au monde entier des principes qu'ils proclament, mais qu'ils ne suivent pas à l'égard de leurs collègues de la minorité.

En outre, ils se persuadent qu'ils ont mandat pour gérer tous les aspects de la vie politique, économique, sociale, culturelle, sexuelle même, de 500 millions d'Européens. Ils croient participer à l'édification radieuse d'un super-État euromondialiste bourré de directives, surchargé de normes, de règles, de contraintes, mais ouvert à la concurrence de pays qui n'en ont aucune ou qui en ont très peu.

Monsieur le Premier ministre, vous dont le pays s'est libéré de l'oppression de l'Union des républiques socialistes soviétiques, ne cédez pas au mirage de la nouvelle Union soviétique mondialiste qui s'échafaude ici. Il faut radicalement changer de direction. Il faut fonder notre Europe sur les vraies valeurs de notre civilisation, sur l'accueil de la vie et non sur l'avortement massif, sur la famille et non sur la promotion systématique des minorités sexuelles, qui n'en demandent d'ailleurs pas tant.

Le brassage généralisé des hommes, des marchandises et des capitaux n'est pas forcément gage de prospérité ni de bonheur. Il faut organiser la coopération des nations libres par des programmes précis, chiffrés, dans des domaines concrets dont les citoyens pourraient mesurer et les coûts et les bénéfices. La révolte des peuples contre ceux qui veulent les contraindre, méprisent leurs identités particulières, bafouent leur volonté, est en marche. Ici même, nous avons fait tomber les murs des mensonges et de la désinformation qui empêchaient les patriotes de divers pays de communiquer entre eux. Sur cet univers feutré d'hypocrisie, les peuples commencent enfin à ouvrir les yeux. Nous avons semé, d'autres récolteront, qui savent que la liberté des nations est la condition du maintien de notre civilisation européenne. Vive l'alliance des peuples libres dans une Europe des nations renouvelée.

**Presidente.** – Sono stato flessibile per il primo giro di interventi, siccome il voto è previsto per le 12.30, e vorrei far parlare tutti coloro che hanno chiesto di partecipare al *catch-the-eye*, vi prego di rispettare i tempi a voi assegnati, perché altrimenti rischiamo di non far parlare qualche parlamentare.

Siccome questa è l'ultima sessione vorrei che tutti quanti uscissero dall'Aula soddisfatti, compreso il Primo ministro Kariņš.

**Krišjānis Kariņš, Prime Minister of Latvia.** – Mr President, if the first intervention was a little long, this intervention will be very brief.

There are two ways to deal with differences of opinion. The best way is the way that this House does it: we debate, we listen to one another, we respect one another, but then at the end of the day we vote and we move forward. There's another way to do it – something that my country experienced for a very long time under the occupation of the Soviet Union. That is, you have no say, you have no right to express your opinion, there is no vote, someone else decides, and they push you out of the way as they're moving forward.

It's clear which is the best way. I am happy and willing to engage with anyone who believes that the way forward is to work with one another. This is the strength and the power of the EU. The fact that we have been able to maintain individual, sovereign, national countries with strong identities, distinct languages, unique cultures, independent and interrelated histories, and yet at the same time that we can work together, to open up the markets to trade, to find a way to pool our common resources into a single and strong and powerful voice in the world. The EU, for someone who does not know what the Soviet Union is, has nothing in common with the Soviet Union. Absolutely nothing.

(Applause)

This is a union of free will. Free will of participation by the Member States, free will of participation by the citizens, and we see that if citizens change their mind, no one is standing in the way. It truly is a free union. It's a unique experiment in the world. The United States is a country based upon immigration. The original Americans are not a people who have tremendous rights in the United States. The people that we call Americans, generally speaking, have come from Europe, have come from Africa, have come from Asia, have come from everywhere, with the acceptance that they leave something behind and become something together. But in Europe, none of us has to go anywhere. We can maintain our languages and identities, yet come together on a political level and an economic level to further the interests of our own citizens.

So this is the way forward: we don't have to give anything up. We can pool resources and be stronger as one individual. We're much stronger as a collected unit.

(Applause)

*Procedura «catch-the-eye»*

**Tunne Kelam (PPE).** – Mr President, this is also my last speech in this Parliament. The Prime Minister mentioned Russian threats. Today, Prime Minister, I think we need seriously to ask ourselves what more can be done, and what has been neglected, to efficiently counter these threats? Parliament has insisted on assessing the crimes of Communist totalitarianism equally with Nazi crimes. But this is not an historic problem. It has been a burning, everyday political problem for the last 19 years. If the Soviet KGB had received equally with Hitler's Gestapo the same international and binding verdict as a criminal, murderous organisation, there would have been no chance that a Soviet Gestapo officer could have risen to lead today's Russia.

But it's not only about one person. In fact the Soviet Gestapo *in corpora* has usurped power from the Russian people, establishing a Mafia state. This state can endure only thanks to the merger of Russian and European corruption. At least USD 1.3 trillion of stolen Russian money has been laundered by Western banks. If we move effectively to stop these flows, Mr Putin will cease to exist.

(Applause)

**Presidente.** – Voglio ringraziare l'onorevole Kelam che è stato per tanti anni un parlamentare esemplare. L'ho detto pubblicamente, per me è stato sempre un esempio da seguire. Ho grande stima e ammirazione per lui, per come ha combattuto per la libertà della sua patria, per la democrazia e per l'Europa. Lo ringrazio per il grande contributo che ha dato alla nostra Unione e a questo Parlamento.

**Juan Fernando López Aguilar (S&D).** – Mr President, Prime Minister, it is the very end of the mandate of this European Parliament, and it's time to show respect to your powerful pro-European speech. It is time to show gratitude to this round of debates with heads of government and prime ministers within the European Parliament, and it is even time to salute the work of President Jean-Claude Juncker, who gave you a warm response of high quality. But I still have two points to raise having heard your statements.

First, you talked about not fighting populism, but the root causes of populism. It's not incompatible. You have said it live. When you hear such demagoguery nonsense, simplistic nonsense, here live in this European Parliament, do we not have to fight back? Second, you talked about migration. Yes, we've got to strengthen the external borders of the European Union, but you didn't say a word about solidarity, which is also a mandate of the Treaty of the European Union – solidarity among Member States when it comes to handling together with a common management both migration fluxes and asylum seekers.

**Joachim Starbatty (ECR).** – Herr Präsident! Jean-Claude Juncker hat gesagt: Man muss Europa lieben. In der Tat! Ich liebe Europa auch, aber gerade wenn man Europa liebt, muss man auch die Schwächen Europas sehen, der Europäischen Union. Ich habe in diesem Haus gehört: Wir wollen unsere Völker nicht auf dem Altar Europas opfern. Wie oft, Herr Dombrovskis, habe ich hier gehört: Wir müssen was für die Jugend tun. Die Perspektive der Jugend darf nicht sein, auszuwandern. Wir müssen etwas innerhalb der Länder schaffen.

Herr Premierminister, Sie haben davon gesprochen, dass wir nichtregulierte Märkte brauchen. Wir haben zwei zentrale Märkte, die völlig reguliert sind: die Wechselkurse und die Zinsen. Und wenn die Wechselkurse und die Zinsen fixiert sind, dann müssen andere Aktionsparameter die Kraft setzen, dann erfolgt die Anpassung über Arbeitsmärkte – der härteste Anpassungsmechanismus, den es gibt.

Ich wünsche mir für dieses Haus, dass in Zukunft nicht mehr gesagt wird: Wir dürfen unsere Völker nicht auf dem Altar Europas opfern. Wir müssen Arbeitskräfte in unserem eigenen Land beschaffen können. Und Fonds aufzulegen, löst das Problem nicht: Die Länder müssen selbst wettbewerbsfähig werden. Das ist ihre Aufgabe in der Zukunft.

**Miroslavs Mitrofanovs (Verts/ALE).** – Mr President, initially I was going to speak about brain drain as we – our country, Latvia, and other new EU members – are losing our young specialists, and what we can do at the EU level to stop this process.

But I must react to one part of the speech from our Prime Minister. Why? Because he asked Parliament and the European Union to follow the good example of integration in Latvia. I must say to you that it is not a story of success. It is a shameful story of the destruction of minority education. After the restoration of independence, the majority of minorities were supporting independence and the development of an independent country, but now we are living in depression because children from minority families will not have the possibility to receive education in their mother tongue. Please, colleagues, do not follow this example.

**Krisztina Morvai (NI).** – Tisztelt Elnök Úr! „Hazám, keresztény Európa. / Útálom és arcába vágom: / Száz év, de tán kétezer óta / őrült, mocskos, aljas világ ez, / ez a farizeus Európa! [...] hazám, boldogtalan Európa, / ha túléléd a harcok végét, elbírod-e még te az Istent, / a Szeretetet és a Békét?” Kedves Kollegák! Szabó Lőrinc magyar költő 1923-ban írta azt a verset, amelynek első és utolsó versszakával búcsúzom az Európai Parlamenttől. Isten óvja és vezesse hazámat, Magyarországot és a keresztény Európát! Isten áldja Önöket, vizionlátásra!

**Milan Zver (PPE).** – Gospod predsednik, spoštovani gospod predsednik latvijske vlade, jaz vas občudujem, pa ne zaradi tega, ker ste postal predsednik, ampak zaradi načina, kako ste postal predsednik – glede na to, da ste bil član zelo majhne, obrobne politične stranke, ste vendarle zbral izjemno pomembno večino, da lahko danes vodite latvijsko vlado učinkovito. Odgovor poznam, zato ker izžarevate zaupanje, verodostojnost, poštenost in pa zlasti kompetentnost. Ste zgodba o uspehu, tako kot vaša država, ki jo vodite.

Sedaj pa vprašanje za milijon evrov: živite v državi, tako kot jaz, Slovenija, ki je tudi tranzicijska, in vprašanje vladavine prava je vselej zelo pereče vprašanje. V moji državi je po veliki sodni farsii, ki se je imenovala Patria, izbruhnila še ena, ki se imenuje dr. Novič, glede na to, da je sodstvo obsodilo po krivici znanstvenika za umor.

Jaz verjamem, da tudi druge države, tranzicijske države, imajo probleme s pravosodjem, ampak vendarle vas sprašujem, ali menite, da bi Evropska unija morala posredovati v takih primerih z nekim ustreznim mehanizmom, ko se kršijo temeljne človekove pravice in svoboščine zlasti v tranzicijskih državah.

**Pilar del Castillo Vera (PPE).** – Mr President, it is a real pleasure to see this Prime Minister, who was an excellent colleague, but not only that. I must say, Krišjānis Kariņš, that you left a mark in this Parliament when you were coordinator, when you were in charge of so many different dossiers, and so on and so forth. But what is most important today is you left a vision of the European Union – about the past, the about the present, and most importantly about where we go and how we go. And in that path, in that way, you very rightly mentioned the role to be played by the common market – more specifically, the digital single market.

You mentioned the barriers that we have, and as we know, the main barrier is normally in the Council. The most reluctant institution in the European Union is not the Commission; it is not the Parliament: it is the Council, when it comes to the breaking of these barriers. Now you have a privileged position in the Council. You have a seat in the Council and you can be a strong voice for really going forward, moving forward and ending this barrier. Good luck!

(Applause)



**Miapetra Kumpula-Natri (S&D).** – Mr President, I had the honour to get to know Mr Kariņš, now Prime Minister, as a good colleague in the Committee on Industry, Research and Energy (ITRE) working for the energy, digital and common Europe. I liked very much your statement on the beauty of the Single Market and really describe it, and I'm enthusiastic myself to work for that Europe, where we are brave enough to take advantage of the fact that we present – together and only together – more than 20% of the gross national product of the world. More than 20%, so please tell me from where comes these populist ideas to close the inner borders or close the trade between the other parts of the continent? I do not see a single good reason showing how that would help Europeans.

But the beauty of the Single Market is also that we can be brave when we talk about climate change, because together we can steer the markets, which no country can do alone. And that is also the beauty for normal families – families with children, where there is a need for a car – that in the car markets there are new, cheaper cars available, not only with the belt but with lower emissions, and with the market of more than 20% of the Single Market, we can do it.

So I'm also looking forward to seeing Europe talk to its citizens. In the election we can talk to citizens, and I think also that everyone has to know that we work also for workers, who have the possibility to move across the border, and we have worked this mandate to create more fair trade markets and labour markets, also for European citizens.

**Mark Demesmaeker (ECR).** – Dank u, mijnheer Kariņš. Na uw sterke speech geloof ik meer dan ooit in de kracht van kleine, goed presterende democratische naties. *Small is beautiful*. Letland heeft na een lange dominantie door sterke burens het recht op zelfbeschikking uitgeoefend en heeft daar een geweldig succes van gemaakt.

Maar we zien tegelijk dat de Europese Unie vandaag maar moeilijk om kan met dat recht. Naties zoals Schotland en Catalonië streven op een democratische en geweldloze manier naar zelfbeschikking, maar dat streven wordt weggezet als verschrikkelijk gevaarlijk. Er komt geen veroordeling van het brutale geweld tegen kiezers in Catalonië, noch van de mateloze repressie van hun politieke leiders. Dat is ontluisterend. Want burgers zullen het EU-project alleen blijven steunen als ze zien dat hun fundamentele democratische rechten verzekerd en verdedigd worden. Vandaar mijn oproep, mijn vraag, mijn pleidooi om als klein land groot te zijn en niet mee te willen goed praten wat krom is. We rekenen op u.

**Gunnar Hökmark (PPE).** – Mr President, I would like to say that the development of Latvia, Estonia and Lithuania belongs to the miracles of modern European history – the peaceful transformation, freedom. Thirty years ago I started in Sweden a campaign for supporting Baltic independence. We were in Estonia, Latvia and Lithuania. I remember I met with Sandra, Tunne and a lot of others fighting for independence in Soviet territory, and now a very good friend of mine, sitting here – you are nice as well, Mr Šadurskis – has, after having been a leading parliamentarian in this Parliament, become the leader of the free and independent Latvia.

This is a miracle, and in some way I would like to say to all colleagues here – because for me this is the last speech – that it couldn't be better than to have you here, Krišjānis Kariņš. But I would also like to say, don't we need the Coburns and the Farage as co-stewards, telling us the absurdity of not having European Union? Because what you have achieved and what you lined out as a vision of political change – not diving into institutional discussions, but how to change Europe – is manifesting the best we can do and they are representing the absurdity of not doing it.

You are the best of Europe: your country and our country, and as a Swede, we are proud of having you as a neighbour.

(Applause)

**President.** – Thank you, Gunnar, for your work and for your engagement with this Parliament. Thank you very much.

**Franc Bogovič (PPE).** – Lep dober dan, spoštovani Kristijan, prav vesel sem, da te zopet vidim. Delila sva lepe trenutke kot kolega v Evropskem parlamentu in navdušen sem bil nad tvojim govorom. Tudi slovenski premier je imel priložnost, pa jo zavrnil, da bi danes nagovoril tu v Parlamentu, in zato hvala tebi za ta fantastični zaključni nagovor v tej epizodi, ko predsedniki vlad govorijo o prihodnosti Evrope.

Izhajaš iz države, ki ima težko zgodovino, tudi tvoja osebna je predstavljena kot zgodovina migrantskega otroka, zato me navdušuje ta pripadnost Evropski uniji, ideji skupnega trga, enotnega razvoja, skupni moči, na drugi strani pa svobodi in vsem, kar je bilo izrečeno. Podpiram to, kar je bilo rečeno, da je potrebno Evropo razvijati na vseh koncih, tudi v raziskavah, delovnih mestih, zato je moje vprašanje povezano z večletnim finančnim okvirom.

Ali je med predsedniki vlad, predvsem tisti, ki so neto plačniki, dovolj razumevanja, da je inštitut solidarnosti, ki ga izvajamo preko kmetijske in pa tudi kohezijske politike, vreden tega, da plačamo 1,3 % v proračun Evropske unije, in da bo to vezivo Evropske unije še naprej ohranilo Evropo povezano in jo naredilo uspešnejšo in lepšo? Hvala za odgovor.

**José Blanco López (S&D).** – Señor presidente, señor primer ministro, durante esta legislatura hemos sido capaces de trabajar juntos, y lo digo en esta mi última intervención en esta Cámara.

De trabajar juntos para hacer un mercado eléctrico más integrado, más competitivo y más descarbonizado, junto con la Comisión y el comisario Cañete. De trabajar juntos para tener una legislación que haga frente a los desafíos del cambio climático, que es la gran amenaza que tiene el planeta, consiguiendo una Directiva de eficiencia energética muy ambiciosa, porque sabemos que la energía que no se consume es la energía más limpia.

De trabajar juntos en la Directiva de energías renovables para tratar de que haya una mayor penetración, y por supuesto una mayor descarbonización, en sectores que contaminan mucho como el transporte, la refrigeración y la calefacción. De trabajar juntos para reducir las emisiones y, por lo tanto, para tener en la Unión Europea un marco global legislativo que nos hace ser los actores mundiales que primero tienen una regulación ambiciosa en la lucha contra el cambio climático.

Europa tiene futuro si hacemos frente a los grandes desafíos como lo hemos hecho en esta legislatura al desafío del cambio climático.

Muchas gracias, señor primer ministro, por su contribución.

**Aleksejs Loskutovs (PPE).** – Priekšsēdētāja kungs! Kolēģi, ministru prezidenta kungs! Šodien vairākas reizes izskanēja pierādījumi tam, ka Eiropas Parlaments ir īsta kadru kaluve. Un jūsu piemērs ir tiešām iepriecinošs un pārliecinošs. Mums ar jums ir dažas kopīgas lietas, savulaik vadot Korupcijas novēršanas un apkarošanas biroju, un jūs strādājāt kā referents naudas atmazgāšanas jautājumos. Zinām, kas ir netīra nauda un kāda ir tās nozīme. Tā ne tikai nāk no noziegumiem, bet arī veicina noziegumu izdarīšanu, tiek izmantota terorisma finansēšanai, cilvēku kontrabandai, arī negodīgu amatpersonu uzpirkšanai. Un, ja man būtu dota tāda iespēja, nākamajā parlamentā es uzrunātu kolēģus un visu sabiedrību efektīvi vērsties gan pret naudas atmazgāšanu, turpinot jūsu iesākto, gan vērsties pret korupciju. Paldies!

**Inese Vaidere (PPE).** – Mr President, I'm very proud of our Prime Minister. Prime Minister, your speech was a brilliant programme for the future of Europe. You didn't avoid even painful issues. Thank you very much for it.

Es esmu lepna arī par to, ka tev izdevās izveidot Latvijā valdību, ka tā saucamajiem jaunajiem spēkiem tas neizdevās, bet vecie pieredzējušie premjera kandidāti vienkārši nobijās no šī grūtā uzdevuma, un tev tas izdevās. Bet Latvijas valdībai stāv priekšā ļoti grūti uzdevumi. Samazināta Eiropas budžeta apstākļos kohēzijas politika, reģionālā politika — tas viss ir tas, par ko būs ļoti jācinās.

Politika lauksaimniekiem. Mums tiešmaksājumi joprojām ir daudzreiz mazāki nekā citās valstīs, un tu to jau minēji.

Sabiedrības integrācija. Mēs šodien jau dzirdējām šeit, šajā zālē, kā Padomju Savienības rusifikācijas politikas turpinājums, ar ko mēs cināties jau daudzus gadus desmitus, tiek vienkārši uzdots par minoritāšu problēmu Latvijā. Latvija ir vienīgā valsts, kur pagaidām vēl notiek mācības pilnā apjomā — nez kāpēc — trešās valsts valodā un valsts valoda tiek diskriminēta.

And finally, protection of the external borders. It's a tough task for Latvia as well, but safe Europe is in all our interests. Thank you very much and good luck to you.

**Victor Boştinaru (S&D).** – Mr President, dear Prime Minister, I would like to thank you for your robust, pragmatic and consistent speech, and equally for your realistic and consistent assessments and contributions. I share many of your contributions. My country, Romania, and I see Russia like you and your country do. So, in this context, how does Latvia assess the building up of European defence, and what future relationship between European defence and NATO should we envisage?

**Bendt Bendtsen (PPE).** – Hr. formand! Kære statsminister, kære Krišjānis Kariņš, tusind tak for en stærk og en visionær tale her i Parlamentet i dag, også bemærkningerne omkring det indre marked.

Jeg vil gerne bede dig om at tage det med omkring frihandel også i Rådet. Også når europæiske interesser trues af det kommunistiske Kina.

Det, vi oplever i øjeblikket, er jo, at europæisk shippingindustri udsættes for unfair konkurrence. Vi har set COSCO og China Shipping fusionere. Vi ser, at de får massiv statsstøtte til at skrotte deres ældre skibe. Herefter bruger man det overskud, der er på kinesiske værfter, til at sælge billige skibe til et statsejet kinesisk selskab. Det betyder altså unfair konkurrence for europæisk shippingindustri, og de gør det med åben pande. De bryder WTO's regler, og de siger direkte, at de vil overtage markedet, som i dag køres af private aktører i Europa uden statsstøtte. Vi må ikke være naive, og jeg håber, du vil bringe dette videre, og at Kommissionen også ser nærmere på denne sag.

**Paulo Rangel (PPE).** – Mr President, let me congratulate the Prime Minister for one of the most inspiring speeches that we have heard here from Prime Ministers.

Senhor Presidente, gostaria de fazer uma pergunta sobre a política de coesão e os fundos de coesão. A Comissão apresentou uma proposta em que um país, como a Letónia, que fez tantos esforços e está tão abaixo da média do PIB europeu, perde 14 % dos fundos de coesão, Portugal perde 7 %, a Croácia também perde 5 %.

Será aceitável que os países mais pobres venham a perder fundos na política de coesão? Como é que o primeiro ministro Kariņš pensa tratar disto? Será que fará como o Governo português e o antigo ministro Pedro Marques, que estão muito contentes por a Comissão retirar a países que cumpriram todas as regras europeias e que são mais pobres do que a Espanha, do que a Itália, do que a Finlândia, e esses sobem a política de coesão e estes descem a política de coesão. Que medidas é que estes países podem e devem tomar frente à proposta da Comissão?

**Andrejs Mamikins (S&D).** – Paldies, priekšsēdētāja kungs! Premjerministr! Nu ko, dedzīga runa. Jūs parādījāt visiem šeit klātesošajiem arī savu mobilo telefonu un pasaku pastāstījāt par tēvu un trim dēliem, bet nepalīdzēja — zāle joprojām ir pustukša.

Jūs pateicāt par daudzveidību Eiropā. Bet vai atgādināt jums, kā Jūs nosaucāt savus šeit sēdošos kolēģus — tikai par to, ka viņi parakstījuši vēstuli Latvijas valdībai ar lūgumu saglabāt izglītību valsts vidusskolās minoritāšu valodās, — par muļķiem? Paldies, Kariņa kungs! Viens no muļķiem esmu es un daudzi desmiti sociāldemokrātu, kuri parakstījuši šo vēstuli.

Jūs teicāt par savu ziņojumu kopā ar kolēģi Sargentini. Labs ziņojums. Tiešām. Mums jācīnās pret netīro naudu, bet kāpēc Jūs nepateicāt par to afēru, kurā iesaistīta Jūsu sieva, — ar nekustamo īpašumu pārdošanu ofšorā, ar nezināmas izcelsmes naudu. Jūs teicāt, ka Jūs apmelojot prese. Presei tā mēdz gadīties. Bet vai tas ir labs piemērs? Kariņa kungs, ja gribat mainīt Eiropu, sāciet ar sevi! Atsakieties no ASV pilsonības, esat eiropietis! Paldies!

**Seán Kelly (PPE).** – Mr President, I would like to say to Prime Minister Krišjānis Kariņš that, for five years he sat here between myself and Gunnar Hökmark, where Carlos is now, and he was a great colleague.

Prime Minister, I want to remind you of one thing: when I came here ten years ago, I went to the canteen on the first day and I must have looked like a lost soul, because you and some of your colleagues invited me to share lunch with you. I haven't forgotten that. It shows the decency of you, Krišjānis, a great friend. Thank you for standing by Ireland. We mentioned it again last night at our PPE meeting. It is much appreciated.

Just one question: I was delighted that you led by mentioning money laundering and criminality and how you cleaned up the whole murky business in your country. And then you said they would move from one country to another. What would you like us to do in the next parliament to try and move that forward, to reduce money laundering and criminality for the benefit of citizens?

Again, welcome. You were a great colleague, and long may you reign as Prime Minister of Latvia.

**Ana Gomes (S&D).** – Mr President, I would like to welcome Prime Minister Kariņš. Prime Minister Kariņš, I'm glad to see you here and I enjoyed working with you, namely in the team that negotiated the fourth and the fifth anti-money laundering directives. Like yourself, I've learned a lot, also on the basis of the inquiry committees of the European Parliament on these matters and on tax matters, and I do appreciate what you said and I support fully that we need European central supervision on anti-money laundering.

But let me ask you: will you now, as Prime Minister, also push for a European FIU, as we proposed in the Parliament in the context namely of the fifth anti money laundering directive? Also, will you push for the reform of the VAT that the Commission has proposed and that has been blocked by the Council, despite the fact that it is giving piles of money to organised crime, and even to terrorist organisations, through the scheme of so-called carousel fraud? And will you also push for the MQV in taxation matters, which is a crucial question according to the Commission, to indeed fight the tax dumping that distorts single market competition rules?

**Brian Hayes (PPE).** – Mr President, this is my last speech to Parliament, and I'm delighted that my good friend and colleague Prime Minister Kariņš is with us today. What he has set out today is a positive pragmatic agenda for the future of the European Union. The best way to counter populism and nationalism across all our Member States, whether it comes from the hard left or the hard right, is to ensure that we have prosperity in the European Union. The European Union is not just a peace project; it is also a project of economic and social progress. Your agenda, Prime Minister, today is clear: more trade, taking down the barriers that prevent the proper single market, standing up to protectionism, more open investment to the European Union, and proper competition. That is the agenda which ensures that we will have more jobs, more investment, more growth and more hope for the future of our citizens here in the European Union.

It has been an honour to serve with you. We stand by you and the pragmatism that you have brought to that great country of yours in the democracy, freedom and rule of law values that you spoke about so eloquently to this House this morning.

**Henna Virkkunen (PPE).** – Arvoisa puhemies, toisin kuin monet kollegani, itse toivon, että tämä ei olisi viimeinen puheenvuoroni Euroopan parlamentissa. Haluan lämpimästi kiittää pääministeri Kariņšia hänen energisestä ja positiivisesta puheestaan Euroopan tulevaisuudesta. Oli ilo työskennellä kanssanne täällä kaikki nämä vuodet teollisuusvaliokunnassa, ennen kuin teistä tuli pääministeri.

Kun lähdimme tälle kaudelle, päätavoittemme oli saada Eurooppaan lisää työtä, yrityksiä ja investointeja. Voimme sanoa, että tässä olemme onnistuneet. Euroopassa on enemmän ihmisiä töissä kuin koskaan. Kasvuvauhti, samoin kuin investointien taso, on saatu talouskriisiä edeltäneelle tasolle. Mutta kansainvälinen kilpailu on kiristynyt, digitalisaatio muuttaa maailmaa. Mihin teidän mielestänne nyt jäsenvaltioiden ja Euroopan unionin on keskityttävä, jotta voimme vahvistaa taloutta ja kilpailukykyä myös seuraavina vuosina?

**Zigmantas Balčytis (S&D).** – Gerbiamas Pirmininke, gerbiamas Ministre Pirmininke. Iš tikrųjų šiandieną noriu padėkoti už tą gerą kalbą ir už tai, kad palietėte ne tik Latvijos, aš manau, bet ir kitų dviejų Baltijos šalių, tai yra, Lietuvos ir Estijos, tokią karčią istorinę praeitį ir integravimą, mūsų kelią į Europos Sąjungą. Aš šiandieną nieko neklausiu, taip pat kaip ir nemažai mano kolegų. Šiandien yra mano paskutinė kalba Europos Parlamente. Aš tikrai paprasčiausiai noriu paprašyti ir toliau, gerbiamas Premjere, Europos Taryboje palaikykite realios Europos Sąjungos nepriklausomos energinės rinkos sukūrimą. Antra, ko labai norėčiau paprašyti, tai yra ir toliau palaikykite projektą „Rail Baltic“, kuris yra strategiškai svarbus ne tik Baltijos šalims, bet ir visai Europos Sąjungai. Kartais sugrįžkite prie socialinio teisingumo klausimų. Taip pat labai teisingai buvo keltas tiesioginių žemės ūkio išmokų klausimas. Ir iš viso, sėkmės Jums, ateiptyje politikoje ir visuose kituose Jūsų asmeniniuose dalykuose.

**Paul Rübzig (PPE).** – Herr Präsident! Ich möchte mich bei Krišjānis Kariņš sehr herzlich bedanken, weil er etwas ganz Substanzielles in seiner Rede erwähnt hat, nämlich den digitalen Binnenmarkt. Krišjānis, du hast völlig recht: Wenn wir nicht die Grenzen niederbrechen in Europa, insbesondere beim Roaming, dann wird es uns nie gelingen, diese Plattformen, die wir in Europa dringend aufbauen müssen, effizient aufzubauen. Wir brauchen die Möglichkeit, dass wir eine SIM-Karte in allen 28 Mitgliedstaaten kaufen können. Wir brauchen eine starke Entwicklung in diesem Bereich, denn das wird den Wettbewerb der Zukunft entscheiden. Insofern bedanke ich mich bei allen Kolleginnen und Kollegen, die gemeinsam für einen Binnenmarkt gekämpft haben, der die Zukunft unserer Jugend sichert.

**Hannes Hanso (S&D).** – Mr President, thank you for this fantastic opportunity. For many people here, it's the last opportunity to speak in this forum. For me it's the first and the last in one, as I'm a very new Member, only having joined about 10 days ago. So I can ask Mr President to make an exception for statistical purposes: perhaps, can you note down two interventions from me, my first and last in one? But thank you, Prime Minister, and *labrīt, labdien*.

I wanted to ask the same question as my Romanian colleague did about EU defence. So, let me ask you about your opinion of the EU-Russia relationship. Russia has violated international norms and rules by illegally occupying many of the neighbouring states: Georgia, parts of Ukraine, also Moldova. What are your opinions on this and how do you see this difficult relationship that we have with Russia – due to their own actions – developing in the future? *Paldies*.

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

**Krišjānis Kariņš, Prime Minister of Latvia.** – Mr President, I took notes as everyone was speaking. I have lots of notes that I'll be processing in the next while. The topics: security, energy, cohesion, agriculture, immigration, money laundering, social justice, China-EU, Russia, etc., etc. I think if I truly tried to answer them my second speech would even be longer than my first. You don't get to the votes and then you really turn, so I won't do that.

But what I do want to do is to say a couple of things.

First of all, as a former MEP, I want to thank each and every one of you for the opportunity, the pleasure and the honour that I had of working with you. The past almost 10 years, and also this past term, has been a tremendous time for me – even getting a little emotional it seems – but I really want to thank all of you for the great cooperation.

*(Applause)*

Many of you are saying that this is your last speech in Parliament, but for me, I can say this is my first speech in Parliament as Prime Minister. So I'm very pleased about that indeed.

To sum up on the debate.

Colleagues, the EU is not perfect. It's not perfect, and when voters are telling us that something is wrong, we need to listen to the voters. We don't need to say: no, everything is fine, you're wrong. No, we need to listen to them because people have real concerns. Whether it's about their jobs, whether it's about immigration, whether it's about the climate, whether it's about security, these issues are real. But we also have real answers to these. We can work forward in the future as a Union of sovereign and independent nations, not giving up one square centimetre of our national identity or pride or languages, but pulling together to fight and to pull as one.

We are a Union of values: freedom, democracy and the rule of law. As a Latvian, I can say that we know what it means to live without freedom, to live without democracy and to live without the rule of law.

*(Applause)*

This is not something that anyone should ever need to experience.

We have a key way to unlock economic growth within the EU and this is the simple thing called the single market. What we need to do is to tear down the barriers of the single market within the EU, to create the environment so that our own companies, national companies, can grow to become European companies, can grow to be real, tough and successful players on the international stage. This is in our power.

*(Applause)*

We can address the tough issue of immigration by strengthening our outer borders. This has to be done, because when we strengthen the outer borders, we can keep the internal borders open and not hamper the single market. We can have a clever transition to clean energies, again the key is to make sure that market forces are at play. Let the market in, deregulate prices, green energy will take off, smart technological solutions will take off, consumers will participate, and the market will help us make this transition.

And regarding our common security, I see no contradiction between membership in NATO – my country is – and stronger EU security and defence cooperation.

*(Applause)*

We need to work as a union to strengthen ourselves as a member of the NATO alliance. There is no contradiction. But in terms of our security we need to go one step further than military security. This is security of our information, the information environment our citizens are living with, and as I said previously, I think it's time to consider seriously legislation to look at the responsibility of social media platforms concerning the dissemination of false and misleading information which is a hamper to our democratic development.

*(Applause)*

Colleagues, we don't need necessarily to fight the populists. The populists are being listened to because people are unhappy. We need to address the root causes, remind them that as a union we are stronger. Like the bundle of sticks. You take any one stick, you break it, break it, break it, like our little nations. All nations in Europe on the world stage are small, but united we're like that bundle of sticks that cannot be broken, and we can take our way of life, our idea of free trade and push it on other markets, not have them push themselves onto us.

*(Applause)*

We have a great responsibility, which is to take the values of freedom, democracy, the rule of law, with the single market and to move it forward. We do this in a peaceful way. We do it through debate. We do it in a way that includes citizens, and we move forward.

*(Sustained applause)*

**Presidente.** – Onorevoli colleghi, si conclude il dibattito. È l'ultimo dibattito con un Primo ministro capo di governo sul futuro dell'Europa.

Credo che sia stato molto importante per tutti quanti noi, come parlamentari europei, essere protagonisti di questa fase preparatoria, di questo confronto sul futuro dell'Europa. Porterò i risultati di questo lavoro di questi dibattiti al prossimo Consiglio europeo in Romania, il 9 maggio, e colgo l'occasione per ringraziare tutti i parlamentari che hanno partecipato a questi dibattiti, rendendoli vivaci, diversi dal solito. Credo che sia stata un'iniziativa positiva del Parlamento europeo. Abbiamo fatto vedere che il Parlamento è il cuore della democrazia.

Grazie ancora e buon lavoro a tutti e buona campagna elettorale e buona Pasqua.

*Dichiarazioni scritte (articolo 162)*

**Indrek Tarand (Verts/ALE), kirjalikult.** – *Premjerministra kungs*, teie kõne lõppedes säutsusin: „Pean tunnistama, et Läti peaminister jätab väga hea mulje”. Palju parema, kui nii mõnegi muu suure või väikese riigi peaminister, kes meie parlamendi ees esinenud on. Võimalik, et see headus tuleneb Läti poliitilisest kultuurist, kus kehtib põhimõte „kaua tehtud, kaunikene”, mille kinnituseks on ka see aeg, mis kulus Lätis just nimelt Teie juhitud valitsuse moodustamiseni. Eestis on hästi teada Hando Runneli luulerida „ei saa me läbi Lätita ja Venemaa meelest ei lähe...”. Sellele saab tänasel päeval – ennekõike Teie kõnes avaldatud mõtetele tuginedes – lisada vaid üht: me peame iga päev meeles pidama ka ELi, kuhu mõlemad kuulume. Sest vaid ELi ja liikmesriikide koostöö aitab meil üle saada traumast, mida Venemaa Stalini ja ta järglaste poliitika kaudu meie rahvastele tekitas. Ning ainult tänu sellele võime hakata Venemaast mõtlema ka muul

moel kui traumast. Vaid EL saab meid selles toetada. Aga me peame temast mõtlema ka selles võtmes, et Kremlil on õnnestunud üha enam tekitada liikmesriikides radikaliseeruvaid ELi vastaseid ning Eestis on need jõud ka osaks valitsusk koalitsioonist. Lätis neid veel pole, sest, nagu ma ütlesin, Teie kandis tehakse asju kauem, aga nad võivad ka Riias juuri ajada. Soovin Teile selget pilku ja kindlat meelt nende õigeaegsel äratundmisel ja ohjeldamisel. Elagu Läti, elagu Euroopa Liit!

**Iuliu Winkler (PPE), írásban.** – Az Európa jövőjéről szóló vita szerves része a Keleti Partnerség államaival való kapcsolatok elemzése. Ezek az országok közeledni akarnak az Európai Unióhoz, sajnos a nemes nyilatkozataikat nem mindig fedik a tettek. Figyelmeztetni kell szomszédjainkat, hogy az EU nem csak a gazdasági haszon, hanem az értékek uniója is. Az emberi méltóság tiszteletét, a törvények és szabályok betartását nemcsak hirdetni, hanem gyakorolni is kell. Április 6-án az ukrán hatóságok megtagadták Kelemen Hunor, az RMDSZ szövetségi elnöke, Románia Parlamentjének diplomata útlevéllel utazó képviselője belépését az országba, és semmilyen magyarázattal nem szolgáltak. Egyszerűen tudomására hozták, hogy nem léphet be Ukrajnába. Utólag, Ukrajna romániai nagykövete közölte, hogy a kijevi hatóságok már 2017-ben kitiltották Kelemen Hunort az országból.

Teszi mindezt az az Ukrajna, melynek állampolgárai vízummentesen utazhatnak az EU országaiba! Tűréshatárunkat túllépi az ukrán hatóságok cselekedete. Megalapozott a gyanú, hogy Kelemen Hunor amiatt kerülhetett tiltólistára, mert RMDSZ-elnökként határozottan fellépett minden alkalommal a kárpátjai magyar közösséget ért jogtiprások ellen. Ezt fogjuk a jövőben is megtenni, mi mindannyian, RMDSZ-politikusok, amikor a kárpátjai testvéreink jogait lábbal tiporja az ukrán állam. A kárpát-medencei magyar összefogás számunkra nem egy szlogen, hanem magyar nemzeti ügy. Határozottan követeljük, hogy legyen vége a magyarelles „incidenseknek” Ukrajnában és mindenütt a Kárpát-medencében!

#### IN THE CHAIR: PAVEL TELIČKA

*Vice-President*

## 7. Skład grup politycznych

**President.** – Mr David Borrelli leaves the non-attached Members and joins the Group of the Alliance of Liberals and Democrats for Europe (ALDE) with effect from 17 April 2019.

**Reinhard Bütikofer (Verts/ALE).** – Mr President, citing Rules 1 and 115 of our Rules of Procedure, I want to call the attention of the House to an issue that is of grave concern to our European democracy. Facebook has been enforcing, since the beginning of this week, a new advertising policy that is hampering the possibilities and the capabilities of the European Parliament, as well as European political parties, to do EU-wide advertising. The President of this House and sections of the Parliament and the Commission and the Council have written letters to Mr Nick Clegg protesting against this new practice, but so far Facebook is not reacting.

I believe that it is completely unacceptable that a private company acting from a boardroom somewhere in the United States would decide how European elections are being run. It's arrogant and completely unacceptable, I repeat, that Facebook tries to dictate the democratic organisations and institutions like the EP and the European political parties that have legitimate grounds for EU-wide campaigning, and EU-wide advertising rules that make this impossible. I would call upon colleagues to join forces, and I propose that the European political parties get together and write an open letter to Mr Zuckerberg protesting and demanding an immediate change to the rules.

**Róza Gräfin von Thun und Hohenstein (PPE).** – Mr President, many of my colleagues have asked me why I distribute those yellow daffodils. Tomorrow they will also be distributed in the corridors. Many of you have got them already.

Please listen for a second. 19 April is the anniversary of the Warsaw Ghetto Uprising. In Warsaw we always commemorate this day with those daffodils. Thousands of people in Warsaw wear those daffodils or carry fresh ones. On the last day of this mandate, let us give a very clear signal that we remember together and that we are here in order not to allow such horrors to happen ever again. Never again.

*(Applause)*

**Godelieve Quisthoudt-Rowohl (PPE).** – Herr Präsident! Da ja das Dossier von INTA von der Tagesordnung abgesetzt worden ist, wollte ich diese Minute wahrnehmen, um mich nach 30 Jahren Anwesenheit und Mitarbeit hier in diesem Parlament zu bedanken. Wir haben, speziell was Handelsfragen angeht, in den letzten Monaten, in den letzten Jahren viel erreicht. Ich habe angefangen, da waren wir 12 Staaten; jetzt sind wir 28. Ich habe angefangen, da gab es noch nicht mal einen Plenarsaal für uns; jetzt sitzen wir hier.

Ich möchte mich vornehmlich bei meinem Bundesland – Niedersachsen – und bei Deutschland bedanken, dass ich als nicht geborene Deutsche, mit 25 Jahren nach Deutschland gekommen, 30 Jahre haben dienen können. Das ist echt europäisch!

Ich wünsche allen meinen Nachfolgern jetzt das Beste für die nächsten Jahre. Liebe Kollegen, lasst uns stolz sein auf das, was wir gemeinsam oder gegeneinander erreicht haben – aber jedenfalls erreicht haben! Vielen herzlichen Dank für alles! Ich hoffe wirklich, dass es ein Leben nach dem Parlament gibt.

*(Beifall)*

**President.** – Thank you, colleague, and let me also wish you the very best. The very last speaker under this Rule of Procedure's point of order is Mr Castaldo, then we will vote.

**Fabio Massimo Castaldo (EFDD).** – Mr President, I would like to make a point of order on Rules 226 and 227. The interpretation we are going to vote on today is in fact a full amendment to the Rules of Procedure. This is the last attempt to have an old proposal adopted by simple majority. This is precisely what is required for interpretation. It is the same proposal that, as an amendment to the Rules of Procedure, did not reach an absolute majority in this House last January. Indeed the proposed text raises new, crucial legal questions, which would remain open, giving rise not only to different interpretations but also to highly discretionary assessments.

What are the parameters for defining the substantive, distinctive and genuine character that are required for a Group's political statement regarding the common political orientation? Who decides whether these are respected? The President of Parliament alone or with the consent of the Conference of Presidents? By majority, by consensus? Again, what are the consequences of an assessment of non-compliance? Finally, what are the legal remedies? There are no answers to any of these questions.

Once again, at the end of the parliamentary term and in a hurry, we witness an attempt to change the rules about group formation, definitely a most sensitive issue. The proposal not only leaves important legal issues open, but above all jeopardises the democratic functioning of our common House. This vote is a real attack on the heart of the concept of democracy and I strongly ask you to join me in rejecting that. Say no to this interpretation. Say yes to democracy.

*(Applause)*

**President.** – Mr Castaldo, we have followed the Rules of Procedure. I will not quote provisions three and four of Article 226. There was a full debate and, after all, this is a question of guidance.



## 8. Głosowanie

**President.** – The next item is the vote.

(For the results and other details of the vote: see Minutes)

### 8.1. Wykładnia Regulaminu: art. 32 ust. 5 akapit pierwszy tiret drugie (głosowanie)

### 8.2. Protokół do Umowy między UE a Danią w sprawie kryteriów i mechanizmów określania państwa członkowskiego właściwego dla rozpatrywania wniosku o azyl i w sprawie systemu „Eurodac” (A8-0196/2019 - Ignazio Corrao) (głosowanie)

### 8.3. Ustanowienie programu „Horyzont Europa” oraz zasad uczestnictwa i upowszechniania obowiązujących w tym programie (A8-0401/2018 - Dan Nica) (głosowanie)

### 8.4. Program realizacji programu „Horyzont Europa” (A8-0410/2018 - Christian Ehler) (głosowanie)

### 8.5. Nadzór rynku i zgodność z prawodawstwem dotyczącym produktów (A8-0277/2018 - Nicola Danti) (głosowanie)

— Before the vote:

**Marco Zullo**, a nome del gruppo EFDD. – Signor Presidente, onorevoli colleghi, relatore, prendo la parola per chiedere all'Aula la possibilità di votare i nostri emendamenti a difesa del *made in*, ai sensi dell'articolo 59, paragrafo 3, del regolamento del Parlamento.

Voglio ricordarvi che l'introduzione dell'obbligo di riportare in etichetta l'origine dei prodotti favorisce la protezione della salute, della sicurezza dei marchi registrati e blocca e scoraggia le pratiche di concorrenza sleale. È vero che l'accordo raggiunto in trilogia contiene norme importanti sulla conformità dei prodotti, ma approvare il pacchetto beni significa mettere una pietra tombale sul pacchetto arenato in Consiglio dal 2013 che contiene il *made in*. Per cui, come sosteniamo da mesi, all'interno del pacchetto beni non può non trovare spazio la norma a tutela del *made in*.

Il *made in* è una forma di tutela fondamentale per le imprese, l'occupazione e i cittadini. Questo Parlamento si è più volte schierato a difesa del *made in* e chiediamo che lo faccia di nuovo.

**Nicola Danti**, Relatore. – Signor Presidente, onorevoli colleghi, devo dire che noi ci opponiamo a questa richiesta, forse l'onorevole Zullo non è stato così presente ai triloghi e non ha la percezione della difficoltà che abbiamo avuto per raggiungere un accordo come questo dopo tanti anni, che permetterà finalmente di avere un mercato sorvegliato e non come oggi, un mercato nel quale abbiamo il 32 % di giocattoli non conformi e il 58 % di beni elettrici non conformi alle norme.

Noi abbiamo lavorato duramente su questo testo e questo testo ha avuto il voto favorevole dell'onorevole Zullo e del gruppo EFDD. Ha avuto il voto favorevole anche del governo italiano in sede di Consiglio e ci aspettiamo, se sta così a cuore all'onorevole Zullo e al gruppo EFDD la norma sul *made in*, lo può fare nel testo ancora presente in Consiglio, lavorando e chiedendo al ministro Di Maio di fare ciò che dovrebbe essere fatto e ciò che noi abbiamo fatto nel nostro governo. Pertanto chiedo di rigettare questa proposta.

(Parliament rejected the request)

**8.6. Propagowanie uczciwości i przejrzystości dla użytkowników biznesowych korzystających z usług pośrednictwa internetowego (A8-0444/2018 - Christel Schaldemose) (głosowanie)**

**8.7. Lepsze egzekwowanie i unowocześnienie unijnych przepisów dotyczących ochrony konsumentów (A8-0029/2019 - Daniel Dalton) (głosowanie)**

— *Before the vote:*

**Róza Gräfin von Thun und Hohenstein (PPE)**, *on behalf of more than 38 Members*. – Mr President, unfortunately this directive does not solve the burning issue of the dual quality of products, and I come to it again. It contains an open list of exemptions, which allow to sell products of different quality in seemingly identical packaging, and it obliges the consumer to prove every time that he or she was treated unfairly. So in the name of over 100 Members from 25 Member States who signed the amendment which prohibits this unfair practice, I ask you all to vote on the submitted amendments individually.

*(Applause)*

**Daniel Dalton**, *Rapporteur*. – Mr President, we spent ages getting an agreement. This is the final agreement that was agreed by all Groups, all Groups in the trilogue agreed to this agreement. We've got significant new rules on dual quality that address the issue that you all have. Any amendment that we pass on this will kill this file dead and that means the entire new consumer acquis in a whole load of areas will die. We've got an agreement, it is a good agreement, I would back Parliament to back that agreement and get this new law into force as soon as possible.

*(Parliament rejected the request)*

**8.8. Przejrzystość i zrównoważony charakter unijnej oceny ryzyka w łańcuchu żywnościowym (A8-0417/2018 - Pilar Ayuso) (głosowanie)**

**8.9. Dodatkowe świadectwo ochronne dla produktów leczniczych (A8-0039/2019 - Luis de Grandes Pascual) (głosowanie)**

— *After the vote:*

**Luis de Grandes Pascual**, *ponente*. – Señor presidente, no tema, seré breve.

Quiero dar las gracias a la Cámara por este resultado, que estoy seguro de que va a redundar en beneficio de la sanidad europea. Quiero dar las gracias a los ponentes alternativos por su colaboración exigente, que era natural que así fuera y que ha contribuido a este resultado de consenso.

Quiero agradecer a toda la Cámara el día en que me marchó, después de quince años, su colaboración y su trabajo.

Quiero decir a todos los diputados y diputadas, con independencia de a qué grupo o ideas pertenezcan, que ha sido un honor para mí estar en esta Cámara. Quiero hacer profesión de fe en Europa, a la que siempre soñé y que no me ha defraudado en este tiempo.

Y quiero, permítanme, finalmente dar las gracias a mis colaboradoras de estos años. Ellas han sido para mí parte esencial de mi trabajo. En mi recuerdo por su trabajo, por su lealtad, mi agradecimiento a Ana, a Mercedes, a Macarena, a Alexandra.

Muchas gracias a todos. Adiós.

*(Aplausos)*

**President**. – Mr de Grandes Pascual, may I wish you also the very best and also congratulations, because the European Parliament has concluded its first reading on your report.

## **8.10. Program kosmiczny Unii i Agencji Unii Europejskiej ds. Programu Kosmicznego (A8-0405/2018 - Massimiliano Salini)**

— *Before the vote:*

**Elżbieta Bieńkowska**, *Member of the Commission*. – Mr President, this is an important file showing our intention first to maintain, but also to strengthen, the EU's position as a second space power. In line with the results of the negotiation, the Commission would like to make five statements on configurations of the committee, Member States' participation, SST and related implementing acts, access to space, security configuration of the committee and Copernicus market development as a core task of the EU agency. This text will be given to the services of the European Parliament.

*Commission statements*

*(in writing)*

*Configurations of the committee:*

'As regards the introduced by the co-legislators configurations of the committee (within the meaning of Regulation (EU) N0 182/2011), the Commission notes that the Member States remain free and solely responsible to choose their representatives in the committee and the Commission does not interpret this provision as conferring on it any power to indicate or select the right experts for a particular configuration.'

*Member States' participation in SST and related implementing act:*

'In the understanding of the Commission, its empowerment under Article 56(4) of the Regulation includes inter alia, as indicated in recital 65a, establishing whether offers submitted by Member States under Article 56(3) should relate to all or some orbits. The Commission furthermore understands that Article 56(3) allows the presentation of several joint proposals, each of them by at least 5 Member States and that the Commission may select several offers to maximise the participation of Member States in SST.'

*Access to space:*

'As stated in recital 4, in view of the limited budget, activities under Article 5 on access to space should be without prejudice to the main implementation of the programme components indicated in Article 3 (a) to (e). The Commission therefore intends to prioritise the implementation of the programme's components.'

*Security configuration committee for security:*

'The Commission emphasises that, due to the sensitivity of the security aspects of the programme and in accordance with Article 3(4) and Article 6(2) of Regulation (EU) 182/2011, it is particularly important that the chair of the Programme Committee meeting in the Security Configuration makes every effort to find solutions which command the widest possible support on the security aspects of the programme within the Committee.'

*Copernicus Market Development as core task of the EU Agency:*

'The Commission regrets that additional tasks (Copernicus market development) will be given to the EU Agency while it would not have the resources to cope with them. Bearing in mind the overall resources constraints, the Agency may have to cope with these new activities by means of internal redeployment, notably through seeking further synergies and efficiencies.'

## **8.11. Program „Cyfrowa Europa” na lata 2021-2027 (A8-0408/2018 - Angelika Mlinar) (głosowanie)**

— *Before the vote:*

**Elżbieta Bieńkowska**, *Member of the Commission*. – Mr President, this vote confirms the commitment to implement for the first time a European approach for building up digital capacity and infrastructure in strategic areas, such as, for example, artificial intelligence, cybersecurity, and of course it will support also the digital single market. The Commission would like to make, however, the following statement.

‘The Commission cannot agree to the changes regarding the provision of transfers, of resources allocated to Member States under shared management. These changes raise questions of compatibility with other legislative proposals, in particular the Common Provisions Regulation. The Commission would like to highlight the need to ensure a horizontal approach on this issue in the negotiations on the next MFF for the consideration of the co-legislators.’

**8.12. Program Fiscalis na rzecz współpracy w dziedzinie opodatkowania (A8-0421/2018 - Sven Giegold) (głosowanie)**

**8.13. Program działań na rzecz środowiska i klimatu (LIFE) (A8-0397/2018 - Gerben-Jan Gerbrandy) (głosowanie)**

— *Before the vote:*

**Elżbieta Bieńkowska**, *Member of the Commission*. – Mr President, this legislative proposal is really very timely, coming at a time when European citizens, especially youngsters, are protesting and coming onto the streets, asking to do more for the climate and more for the environment. The agreement of the European institutions on this regulation is a very good signal to show our commitments.

However, the Commission makes the following three statements: ‘The Commission regrets that the co-legislators decided to maintain the LIFE logo. This runs counter to the horizontal approach of not having programme-specific logos under the future long-term budget. Second, the Commission considers that there is a lack of justification for the examination procedure of the non-opinion clause. Third, the Commission confirms that the open-ended duration of the programme is without prejudice to the prerogative of the Commission to present a LIFE successor programme for the next MFF. For the full consideration, of course, by the co-legislators.’

**8.14. Program „Wymiar sprawiedliwości” (A8-0068/2019 - Josef Weidenholzer, Heidi Hautala) (głosowanie)**

— *After the vote:*

**President**. – Colleagues, before the last report, this is the last time I will be chairing the vote, so I would like to extend my appreciation for the last two-and-a-half years in the chair. I wish the very best to those of you who are running in the elections, and to those of you who are not, I wish you all that comes next.

(Applause)

Thank you colleagues, the applause is meant especially for you.

**8.15. Program „Prawa i Wartości” (A8-0468/2018 - Bodil Valero) (głosowanie)**

## 8.16. Liczba delegacji międzyparlamentarnych, delegacji do wspólnych komisji międzyparlamentarnych oraz delegacji do komisji współpracy parlamentarnej i wielostronnych zgromadzeń parlamentarnych (B8-0240/2019) (głosowanie)

**President.** – That concludes the vote.

## 9. Wyjaśnienia dotyczące sposobu głosowania

### 9.1. Ustanowienie programu „Horyzont Europa” oraz zasad uczestnictwa i upowszechniania obowiązujących w tym programie (A8-0401/2018 - Dan Nica)

#### Oral explanations of vote

**Alex Mayer (S&D).** – Mr President, a brain drain. That's what being unable to apply for European Research Council (ERC) funding could trigger according to the University of Cambridge, because it is not just the hard cash that is important, EU funding is key in enabling international collaboration and attracting the very best scientists, and Horizon 2020 also means that University of East Anglia scientists are building prototype, clean, cheap and energy efficient batteries, while at the University of Hertfordshire, Ph.D. researchers are exploring photovoltaic technologies. Today we discussed the successor programme, Horizon Europe for 2021-2027.

Now I appreciate that's rather far in the future for the British Government, who currently seems to only operate on an hour-by-hour basis, but in or out of the EU, we need to be in the Horizon Europe. Our current reputation is for groundbreaking research, but we know well that reputations are hard won and easily lost.

**Rory Palmer (S&D).** – Mr President, Horizon funding is making a real difference in my region: GBP 110 million supporting cutting-edge research at East Midlands universities, GBP 37 million to support business and enterprise across the region. This funding is vital, just like the European funding programmes over the years that have underpinned regeneration and economic development, and which have supported important programmes across social priorities like adult learning.

The British Government must now commit to replacing these funding programmes pound for pound. Anything less will not be acceptable. If billions can be found for a no-deal Brexit, then money can be found to replace these EU funding programmes on a pound-for-pound basis. Anything less will not be acceptable. Remain or leave, all areas in my region must get their fair share in the future, and that's what I'll be arguing for.

**Nirj Deva (ECR).** – Mr President, Horizon 2020 has been one of the most extraordinary research vehicles for a long time. Because this might be one of the final times we speak in this Parliament, I wanted to say that the research activities of the European Parliament and the people involved with me over the last 20 years in producing original research for legislation have been phenomenal. I want to particularly thank the following for their innovation and research: Susan Kerr, Ben Harnwell, Rhiannon Price, Daniel Hamilton, Ingrid Grosu, Lin Gai, Liakath Kabir, Armen Andonian, Edward Robinson and Daniel Howard. They have made a significant contribution to the work of this Parliament in the last 20 years working with me.

**Adam Szejnfeld (PPE).** – Panie Przewodniczący! „Horyzont Europa” – sama nazwa już jest wspaniała, bowiem oddaje cele, które nam przyświecają – Europa, zjednoczona Europa, ale Europa nowoczesna, Europa konkurencyjna na rynkach światowych, Europa innowacyjna. Dlatego program ten jest godny poparcia, i nie tylko w kwotach, które zaproponowała Komisja Europejska (przypomnę: ponad 84 mld euro), ale my, Parlament Europejski, wnioskujemy, żeby to był budżet w wysokości 120 mld euro.

Chciałbym wskazać na dwie zalety tego programu, chociaż jest ich mnóstwo. Po pierwsze, bardzo wyraźne podkreślenie roli małych i średnich przedsiębiorstw poprzez, chociażby, przeznaczenie aż 70% budżetu Europejskiej Rady ds. Innowacji na małe i średnie przedsiębiorstwa. I po drugie, zmniejszenie luki badawczej. To, co jest bardzo trudne do zaakceptowania w Unii Europejskiej, to to, że są kraje, które mają potężne pieniądze na innowacyjność, badania i rozwój, i te, które mają z tym problem. Teraz możemy wyeliminować tę lukę.

**Jan Zahradil (ECR).** – Pane předsedající, já jsem velmi potěšen, že ve svém posledním vystoupení na půdě tohoto Evropského parlamentu mohu být pozitivní, na rozdíl od mnoha minulých vystoupení, kdy jsem, podle mého názoru, oprávněně kritizoval různé rezoluce a legislativní akty, které Evropský parlament přijal.

Horizont je přesně tím typem programu, který bychom podporovat měli, pokud chceme udržet krok v oblasti inovací, nových technologií, vědy a výzkumu. Já jsem tedy spokojen s provizorní dohodou o tomto programu, doufám nyní v ambiciózní dohodu v oblasti jeho financování a věřím, že bude naplněna. Chtěl bych také říci, že po odchodu Spojeného království z Evropské unie si přeji, aby zůstalo Spojené království plně začleněno v tomto programu, aby programy pokračovaly bez přerušení, protože jde o našeho blízkého partnera v oblasti vědy a výzkumu.

**Jiří Pospíšil (PPE).** – Pane předsedající, já jsem také s radostí podpořil tuto dohodu, protože v dnešní době každé euro, které investujeme do inovací, výzkumu, vývoje, tak je investice, která se nám zde v Evropě vrátí.

Jsem tedy rád, že byla tato provizorní dohoda udělána, jsem rád, že se pro další finanční rámec navyšuje částka, která by měla být tímto směrem investována, a jsem také rád, že se zpřesnily toky, kterými směry by se ty peníze měly investovat. Investice do ekologie, do stavu klimatu, investice do zdravotnických technologií, vývoje v této oblasti, to jsou podle mě témata, která jsou mimořádně důležitá, a pokud Evropa chce držet krok s jinými velmocemi, které investují velké částky do inovací a výzkumu, tak nestačí jen národní peníze, ale je třeba, aby existovaly takovéto významné evropské pobídky. Takže také tuto dohodu velmi vítám.

**Nicola Caputo (S&D).** – Signor Presidente, onorevoli colleghi, il nuovo regolamento Horizon Europe rappresenta senza dubbio il programma europeo di ricerca e innovazione più ambizioso mai realizzato.

È certamente un segnale importante quello di destinare il 35 % dei finanziamenti alle tecnologie rispettose del clima: 35 miliardi di euro su 100 totali assegnati per il periodo 2021-2027. Condivido l'approccio *mission based*, incentrato su obiettivi specifici e chiaramente definiti, come la decarbonizzazione urbana che incontra la necessità riscontrata nell'attuale Horizon 2020, e di concentrare l'attenzione su specifici obiettivi tematici.

Importante anche l'istituzione di un referente unico individuato dalla Commissione per portare dal laboratorio al mercato le più promettenti tecnologie ad alto potenziale e aiutare le start-up e le imprese più innovative a sviluppare le loro idee. Un'unica nota negativa: l'accordo raggiunto non ha escluso formalmente i combustibili fossili dai finanziamenti alla ricerca, il che, in nome di tutte le future generazioni, probabilmente sarebbe stato un atto dovuto.

**Silvia Costa (S&D).** – Signor Presidente, onorevoli colleghi, credo che sia un'ottima notizia quella dell'approvazione, seppure con accordo parziale, di Horizon Europe con 120 miliardi che è la proposta del Parlamento e spero che il Consiglio ministri lo rispetterà, perché si tratta di investire davvero nella conoscenza, nell'innovazione, nella competitività dell'Europa, ma anche nell'inclusione.

Sono molto felice di due questioni in particolare. Abbiamo ottenuto che fosse inserita scienze sociali e scienze umane in tutti i poli tematici del pilastro sulle sfide globali e la competitività industriale. Sarebbe ben strano che questo aspetto non fosse presente, insieme alla ricerca scientifica e su tematiche diverse.

Secondo, abbiamo ottenuto, e questo è un grande risultato della commissione cultura, l'inserimento di un vero e proprio cluster tematico intitolato Cultura, creatività e società inclusive con un miliardo e mezzo, di cui il 45 % per ricerca nei settori culturali e creativi e 300 invece per il nuovo Cloud Cultural Heritage, che raccoglie la sfida del recente anno sul patrimonio culturale. Questo rafforza il progetto europeo.

**Daniel Hannan (ECR).** – Mr President, where do we get this idea that politicians and officials are best placed to decide where research spending should go? I was a journalist before I was elected here, and I was always getting bumf from people promoting this or that government programme, and I can't in honesty remember any of them that actually yielded results. If we think of the great tech breakthroughs that we've had, the things that have transformed people's lives – the American tech giants, the mobile phone breakthroughs, the search engines and so on – none of them depended on government grants, any more than did the people who made the Industrial Revolution in the first place. We've got locked into this rather sad circle where we ask recipients of this money whether it's a good idea. Well of course they're going to say it's a good idea: by definition, they are the beneficiaries. But is this really the best way with a limited budget to be deploying it? I'm all in favour of spending money on education – there are some things, obviously, we should do collectively – but when I hear Members of this House suggesting that success is measured by the size of the budget rather than by any real world output, I wonder whether we have our priorities right.

## 9.2. Program realizacjii programu „Horyzont Europa” (A8-0410/2018 - Christian Ehler)

### Oral explanations of vote

**Daniel Hannan (ECR).** – Mr President, this is my last speech in the session. I wanted just to take the opportunity to say thank you to you and to your staff and to the interpreters for their assistance over this session, and to record my frustration at the extraordinary fact that, three years after the Brexit referendum, two years after an election in which 85% of MPs were returned promising to uphold its result, Britain now faces the farcical absurdity of another European election.

## 9.3. Nadzór rynku i zgodność z prawodawstwem dotyczącym produktów (A8-0277/2018 - Nicola Danti)

### Oral explanations of vote

**Marlene Mizzi (S&D).** – Sur President, meta l-konsumaturi jixtru prodotti ġodda, bħal artikli elettronici, ġugarelli u kozmetiċi, huma jistennew li dawn ikunu sikuri. Sfortunatament dan mhux dejjem il-każ, u hafna mid-drabi, il-prodotti li jitqiegħdu fuq is-suq ma jkunux sikuri, iżda perikolużi u ta' hsara.

Prodotti sikuri huma l-uniku prodotti li għandhom jinbighu fuq is-suq, irrispettivament jekk jinbighux b'mod tradizzjonali jew b'mezzi online, u ma jimpurtax jekk humiex manifatturati fl-Unjoni jew le.

Għaldaqstant għandna bżonn regoli ta' sorveljanza u infurzar xieraq ta' dawn ir-regoli, flimkien ma' atteġġjament xieraq mill-manifatturi u l-kummerċjanti, li jikkonformaw mar-regoli u l-istandards li diġà jeżistu. Fuq kollox, għandna bżonn leġiżlazzjoni Ewropea li hija kapaċi ttiproteġi l-konsumaturi minn prodotti li jistgħu jkunu perikolużi.

Illum ivvotajt favur leġiżlazzjoni li ha twassal għal bosta titjib importanti għas-sorveljanza tas-suq f'dak li għandu x'jaqsam ma' prodotti u sigurtà tal-konsumaturi, sabiex ikollna Suq Uniku aktar ġust. Ir-regoli l-ġodda se jiproteġu l-interessi ta' saħħa u ambjentali, flimkien mas-sigurtà tal-konsumaturi.

#### 9.4. Lepsze egzekwowanie i unowocześnienie unijnych przepisów dotyczących ochrony konsumentów (A8-0029/2019 - Daniel Dalton)

##### Oral explanations of vote

**Rory Palmer (S&D).** – Mr President, one of the biggest issues in consumer protection today is secondary ticketing. It is simply unfair when genuine fans cannot get tickets at their face value because internet bots buy them up for resale at dramatically inflated prices. So whilst action on this at Member State level is important and welcome – and I pay tribute to campaigners in the UK who've long championed the need for new laws on this – we also need a coordinated response at European level, not least because one way that this problem must be addressed is by introducing measures which would prevent secondary ticket sites being profiled as the first result in search engines like Google.

Just this morning, searching across a number of different artists, Viagogo came up as a first result on Google every single time over the official sites selling those tickets. So I call on the European Union, through the Commission and this Parliament, to address this and ensure fans across Europe get a fairer deal.

**Jiří Pospíšil (PPE).** – Pane předsedající, já jsem nakonec po velkém váhání podpořil tento návrh, který bohužel nedokonale bojuje proti dvojí kvalitě potravin. Pozměňovací návrh, který jsem spolupodepsal a který bohužel neprošel, jasně bojoval proti dvojí kvalitě potravin a výrobků a zařazoval tyto praktiky mezi nekalé obchodní praktiky. Bohužel tento návrh předložený kolegyněmi neprošel, mě to mrzí. Písemný kompromis tedy беру jako jakousi polocestu, posun k tomu, abychom v České republice a v nových státech Evropské unie do budoucna měli pod stejnými názvy stejně kvalitní potraviny jako v západní Evropě, ale férově říkám, že ta kompromisní dohoda, podle mého názoru, není dostatečná.

Doufám tedy, že do budoucna se nový Evropský parlament, Evropská komise tímto tématem bude zabývat a pokud se opravdu potvrdí můj názor, že ta kompromisní varianta není dostatečná, se do budoucna přijme to, co jsme původně zde navrhovali jako poslanci.

#### 9.5. Przejrzystość i zrównoważony charakter unijnej oceny ryzyka w łańcuchu żywnościowym (A8-0417/2018 - Pilar Ayuso)

##### Oral explanations of vote

**Dobromir Sośnierz (NI).** – Panie Przewodniczący! Certyfikowanie bezpieczeństwa jakichś produktów ma sens tylko wtedy, kiedy organ certyfikujący ponosi odpowiedzialność za wydawane certyfikaty, czyli kiedy są to prywatne instytucje, które można pozwać, jeśli coś źle certyfikują. Nikt nie słyszał, żeby urzędy Unii Europejskiej mogły być pozywane przez konsumentów w razie błędów w ocenie ryzyka, w związku z czym taka ocena jest tak naprawdę bezwartościowa. Jest to tylko tworzenie stołków, na których wygodnie siedzą sobie jacyś ludzie, robią jakieś badania, z których niewiele wynika, pouczają innych, co mają jeść, czego nie mają jeść. Poza tym to sprawozdanie, ta dyrektywa są tak ogólnikowe, w wielu miejscach piszemy tylko o tym, że powinno być wszystko dobrze, powinno być poprawnie, na czas, adekwatnie, słusznie i tak dalej – z tego kompletnie nic nie wynika, to nie są żadne sensowne regulacje. Dlatego głosowałem przeciwko.

#### 9.6. Dodatkové svědectvo ochrone dla produktův leczniczych (A8-0039/2019 - Luis de Grandes Pascual)

##### Oral explanations of vote

**José Inácio Faria (PPE).** – Senhor Presidente, nos dias que correm, 70 % dos medicamentos no mercado da União são genéricos produzidos numa das 400 fábricas europeias e prevê-se que este mercado cresça, oferecendo mais oportunidades de acessibilidades e maiores poupanças para os sistemas de saúde.



Votei, por isso, a favor deste relatório porque acredito que esta isenção ao certificado complementar de proteção será fundamental para que o fabrico de genéricos permaneça na Europa, assegurando empregos altamente qualificados para cidadãos europeus. Com isto vamos aumentar o potencial de oferta na Europa, o que permite garantir a segurança do suprimento do mercado e reduzir a possibilidade de falhas de abastecimento. Vamos também aumentar a capacidade de exportação para Estados terceiros com produtos fabricados não só de acordo com as nossas melhores práticas, mas também com o respeito pelos valores ambientais e pelos direitos sociais europeus.

O CCP já é uma extensão à proteção da patente para que certos produtos inovadores possam ter um acrescentado retorno de investimento. É preciso que se diga que nenhum direito estabelecido sobre este retorno irá ser prejudicado com esta alteração ao regulamento. O tecido empresarial da União Europeia tem de ser mantido unido num mundo concorrencial global. Para isso acontecer é crucial defender um ecossistema farmacêutico sustentável que estimule esta indústria europeia a ser um motor de crescimento económico.

**Nicola Caputo (S&D).** – Signor Presidente, onorevoli colleghi, il nuovo regolamento sul certificato protettivo complementare per i medicinali, che abbiamo appena approvato, aiuterà le nuove aziende farmaceutiche ad avviarsi e ad espandersi in aree ad alta crescita, generando fatturato e nuovi posti di lavoro.

L'attuale disciplina non era più sostenibile con le aziende europee, esposte ad una pesante concorrenza da parte dei produttori extra-UE non soggetti ad analoghe restrizioni, e costrette a delocalizzare gli impianti stringendo accordi vincolati con i paesi ospiti. La nuova normativa consentirà ai produttori di farmaci generici e biosimilari con sede nell'Unione europea di produrre una versione generica o biosimilare di un medicinale ancora protetto dal certificato supplementare, esclusivamente allo scopo di esportare in un mercato extra-UE, dove la produzione è scaduta o non è mai esistita. A trarne beneficio l'intera economia del settore farmaceutico, che potrà quindi essere maggiormente presente in mercati dove spesso le regole di protezione dei brevetti sono ignorate.

## 10. Korekty do głosowania i zamiar głosowania: patrz protokół

*(The sitting was suspended at 13.32)*

**PREȘEDINȚIA: IOAN MIRCEA PAȘCU**

*Vicepreședinte*

## 11. Wznowienie posiedzenia

*(Ședința a fost reluată la ora 15.00)*

## 12. Przyjęcie protokołu poprzedniego posiedzenia: patrz protokół

## 13. Europejska Straż Graniczna i Przybrzeżna (debata)

**Preşedintele.** – Următorul punct de pe ordinea de zi este dezbateră privind raportul doamnei Roberta Metsola, în numele Comisiei pentru libertăți civile, justiție și afaceri interne, referitor la propunerea de regulament al Parlamentului European și al Consiliului privind poliția de frontieră și garda de coastă la nivel european și de abrogare a Acțiunii comune nr. 98/700/JAI a Consiliului, a Regulamentului (UE) nr. 1052/2013 al Parlamentului European și al Consiliului și a Regulamentului (UE) 2016/1624 al Parlamentului European și al Consiliului (COM(2018)0631 – C8-0406/2018 – 2018/0330(COD)) (A8-0076/2019).

**Roberta Metsola, Rapporteur.** – President, meta ġejt fdata biex naħdem fuq l-abbozz ta' liġi dwar il-Gwardja Ewropea tal-Fruntieri u tal-Kosta hadd ma ħaseb li stajna nkunu lkoll flimkien hawnhekk illum, f'inqas minn sitt xhur minn meta l-Kummissjoni Ewropea ppreżentat din il-proposta fuq il-mejda.

Dan il-proċess kien wiehed intensiv u hadilna hafna hin, biex niddiskutu d-dettalji tekniċi li toffri din il-liġi. Però grazzi għar-rieda tal-kollegi tiegħi, speċjalment ix-shadow rapporteurs, il-Kummissjoni Ewropea u l-Istati Membri mmexxija mill-Presidenza tal-Kunsill, qbilna fuq sistema ġdida li ahna lkoll nistgħu nkunu kburi biha.

Matul in-negożjati li kellna ahna dejjem żammejna f'moħħna li rridu nkunu ġusti ma' dawk li jixirqilhom protezzjoni, sodi ma' dawk li mhumiex eliġibbli jew li qed jippruvaw jiksru r-regoli, u horox ma' dawk li qed jinqed min-nies li huma vulnerabbli.

Jekk aktar tard illum nivvotaw biex nikkonfermaw din il-liġi, dan ifisser li kontra kull aspettattiva, ser jirnexxielna negħlbu l-aħħar ostaklu biex ikollna forza ġdida ta' għaxart elef gwardji tal-fruntiera u persunal operattiv, li se tiġi fis-seħh fi żmien qasir fis-snin li ġejjin.

Dawn huma n-numri li għandna bżonn sabiex nassiguraw is-sigurtà tal-fruntieri esterni tagħna, sabiex nagħtu l-ispinta li għandna bżonn sabiex niġġieldu l-kriminalità, li niżguraw id-drittijiet fundamentali huma mharsa f'kull attività tal-Aġenzija, u sabiex niffacilitaw l-immaniġġjar tal-immigrazzjoni.

Li niżguraw is-sigurtà tal-fruntieri esterni u li l-Istati Membri jissodisfaw ir-responsabbiltajiet tagħhom huma punti kruċjali sabiex inkunu nistgħu nindirizzaw b'mod effettiv is-sitwazzjoni preżenti tal-migrazzjoni. Din il-liġi mhijiex l-unika soluzzjoni li għandna bżonn f'dan il-qasam, iżda hija pass necessarju li jrid jittiehed, flimkien ma' oħrajn.

Fl-eventwalità li niffaccjaw krizi oħra simili bħal dik li kellna fl-2015, l-Istati Membri li jinsabu fil-fruntieri esterni, bħal Malta u Għawdex, jistgħu jitolbu li jiġu stazzjonati persunal għal interventi rapidi fil-fruntiera, sabiex jirċievu għajjnuna li tant ikollhom bżonn biex jindirizzaw is-sitwazzjoni.

Ir-regolament li ahna nnegożjajna fl-aħħar ġimghat ma jitrattax biss fuq dawn l-għaxart elef persuna. Din il-liġi tfisser li se nżidu l-effettività tal-operazzjonijiet tar-ritorn b'mod konsiderevoli, speċifikament għal dawk il-persuni li mhumiex eliġibbli għall-protezzjoni.

Ser ikun hemm aktar possibilitajiet biex l-Istati Membri jiġu meġhuna f'dan il-qasam, bħal pereżempju fl-identifikazzjoni tal-immigranti irregolari, u fl-għajjnuna li ser tingħata biex jinġiebu dokumenti tal-ivvjaġġar u assistenza oħra fir-ritorn.

Fl-aħħar nett jien partikolarment kburi li rnexxielna noholqu rwol ġdid fl-Aġenzija, dik tal-osservaturi tad-drittijiet fundamentali, li ser ikunu minn ta' quddiem biex jiżguraw li d-drittijiet ta' kull persuna jiġu rispettati.

L-għan tagħna kienet li nistabbilixxu livelli ġodda u għolja ta' protezzjoni, f'konformità mal-valuri Ewropej li tant ahna nġożżu, anke fuq kwistjoni sensitiva bħal din. Għamilna dan għaliex l-Unjoni Ewropea għandha tkun wahda li tipprotegi d-drittijiet fundamentali meta dawn hemm bżonnhom l-aktar.

**Dimitris Avramopoulos**, *Member of the Commission*. – Mr President, I don't hide from you that I consider the European Borders and Coast Guard one of my key proposals, an essential element of a comprehensive migration policy. We have not only created but also installed and strengthened the European Border and Coast Guard in record time with our joint work and efforts. Knowing very well the complexity of the legislative procedures, we all agree that it is indeed an achievement.

I would like to express my heartfelt thanks to our rapporteur, Ms Metsola, and all the shadows and the Romanian Presidency as well, for having found a well-balanced compromise on this proposal. This agreement highlights once again that, when working together, we can bring real results and show to our citizens that the Union is willing and able to act.

When the crisis, as you all remember, peaked in Europe in the summer of 2015, Europe was taken by surprise and was not prepared. Confronted with an inflow of irregular arrivals through our eastern and southern borders (the Mediterranean Sea), we knew that we had to take resolute action. There was no consolidated European borders agency, no hot spots or an operational presence on the ground at the EU level. The European asylum system proved not to be fit for purpose.

Our information systems did not talk to each other, and our approach in engaging with third countries was fragmented. We were forced to take both immediate and long-term measures and to work on all these fronts in parallel.

Now, four years later, anyone trying to cross our external borders irregularly is identified, fingerprinted and thoroughly screened. Today we have an up-and-running European Borders and Coast Guard Agency and reinforced migration, border and security information systems, which are progressively becoming interoperable.

With the new regulation that we are debating now, we will be able to achieve more. One of its key elements is a European border and coast guard standing corps, which will be gradually and swiftly established in its full capacity of 10 000 by 2027. However, we will be able to observe the first deployments already on 1 January 2021.

The other key element of this proposal, and an important game-changer, is that the agency's own statutory staff will also be team members with executive powers. This means that they will carry out border management and return tasks in their own right.

Of course, the competent authorities of the host Member State will remain responsible for, and have command and control of, the European Border and Coast Guard activities taking place on its territory. While remaining under the authority of the host Member States, some of the tasks will include the possibility to check identity documents, to authorise or refuse entry at border crossing points, to stamp travel documents, to patrol borders and stop persons who have crossed the borders irregularly, and to assist in the implementation of return procedures, notably by preparing return decisions or escorting non-EU nationals who are subject to forced return.

The operational staff of the standing corps will also receive common training to ensure that the highest professional standards are applied and respected and a common operational culture is developed among the staff.

The compromise will ensure that the agency can better and more actively support the Member States in the area of return in order to improve the European Union's response to persisting migratory challenges.

I welcome also many other developments agreed by the co-legislators as part of this regulation, such as streamlining of the monitoring of the fundamental rights within the Agency's operational activities. The respect of fundamental rights is at the heart of all Commission initiatives, including this one.

All of the activities of the European Border and Coast Guard Agency and the Member States' competent authorities will respect the fundamental rights enshrined in the Charter. The Agency will work closely with the future EU Asylum Agency to ensure effective access to asylum procedures. The Agency will also help to ensure that those that are not in need of international protection are returned in full respect, I repeat, of fundamental rights.

I hope that once the next Parliament is in place, the proposal to set up the EU's Asylum Agency will be quickly adopted. I hope so.

I also want to add that I regret that the possibility of a monthly differential payment to the statutory staff members was not retained in the final agreement. This aimed to improve the attractiveness of the Agency as an employer, to ensure timely recruitment of statutory staff. We will forward a declaration in this regard to this Parliament.

Last but not least, a new political steering for the implementation of the European integrated border management will be put in place as well. This will include a planning of capabilities for the European Border and Coast Guard as well as ensuring coherence and consistency with the European Union's overall external policy.

Indeed, with this new regulation, both the Agency and the Member States will have the tools to anticipate and respond to future crises at the EU's external borders. Ultimately this will also help preserve the long-term viability of the Schengen area of free movement. Thank you very much for your attention, and I'm looking forward to your views.

#### *Commission statements*

*(in writing)*

Acknowledging the challenges faced by the EBCG Agency in the coming years to fulfil the exceptional needs for recruiting and retaining of qualified staff from the broadest possible geographical basis in the view of building up the Agency's Standing Corps, and considering the substantial mobility of these staff members and the need to ensure equal treatment among them, the Commission proposed concrete arrangements. These proposed arrangements were of a temporary nature and subject to a review clause, in order to assess their contribution to the objectives pursued and to take account of other ongoing processes having an impact on staff remuneration, including the continuous monitoring and improvement of the statistical methodology used to calculate correction coefficients under Annex XI to the Staff Regulations.

In this context while taking note of the joint statement by the European Parliament and the Council, the Commission strongly regrets that the Co-legislators decided not to retain its proposal to allow the Agency's Management Board to temporarily grant a monthly differential payment to the statutory staff members. The Commission believes that this decision may be detrimental to the attractiveness of the Agency as employer and to create optimal conditions for the timely recruitment of statutory staff as a prerequisite for the swift establishment of the standing corps in coming years.

Moreover, in response to the joint statement by the European Parliament and the Council, the Commission notes that it has neither obligation nor intention at this stage to present any proposal for the revision of the Staff Regulations.

The Commission notes that the co-legislators recently amended the rules for updating remuneration and pensions under Annex XI to the Staff Regulations and included a clear timeline for a possible subsequent review, on the basis of a report to be submitted by the Commission in 2022. The Commission believes that the latter report should provide an opportunity to assess the existing system and notably its impact on the attractiveness of EU institutions and agencies as employers. The Commission also notes that, within the existing legislative framework, Eurostat and national statistical institutes have initiated discussions on the possibility to update the statistical methodology of correction coefficient calculation in order to take into account expenditure incurred outside the place of employment.

**Jens Geier**, *Verfasser der Stellungnahme des mitberatenden Haushaltsausschusses*. – Herr Präsident, sehr geehrter Herr Kommissar, liebe Kolleginnen und Kollegen! Zweifellos ist das neue Mandat für die Europäische Agentur für die Grenz- und Küstenwache ein wichtiger Schritt, um eine europäische Reaktion auf die Herausforderungen der Migration zu finden. Neue Kapazitäten, ein Personalpool von bis zu 10 000 Personen, erstmals eigene Schiffe und Flugzeuge – jetzt kann diese Agentur auch wirklich operativ tätig werden und – das nebenbei gesagt – auch Leben retten.

Gewaltige finanzielle Ressourcen sind dafür notwendig, und das kann meiner Meinung nach nur funktionieren, wenn wir uns auf einen ausgeweiteten mehrjährigen Finanzrahmen einigen können. Deswegen auch an dieser Stelle ein Hinweis an die Staats- und Regierungschefs – zum Beispiel aus Österreich: Wer europäischen Grenzschutz für wichtig hält, der muss dann auch bereit sein, für einen größeren europäischen Haushalt einzustehen und dafür zu bezahlen.

Das kann nur ein Teil einer europäischen kohärenten Migrationspolitik sein, aber es ist ein wichtiger. Die Bekämpfung der Fluchtursachen und eine solidarische Lösung für die Aufnahme der Flüchtlinge gehört aus meiner Sicht unbedingt dazu.

**Carlos Coelho**, em nome do Grupo PPE. – Senhor Presidente, Senhor Comissário Avramopoulos, Caras e Caros Colegas, a aprovação desta nova e reforçada Guarda Europeia de Fronteiras e Costeira é um passo histórico para uma proteção verdadeiramente partilhada das nossas fronteiras externas comuns. É um passo histórico para Schengen, para a segurança e para a livre circulação na Europa. Serão dez mil guardas de fronteira capazes de apoiar os Estados-Membros que tenham fronteiras mais frágeis ou que se encontrem perante uma emergência como vimos, recentemente, com a crise dos refugiados.

Mas, como sempre disse, este reforço não pode servir para desresponsabilizar os Estados-Membros. Metade desses dez mil guardas serão provenientes dos Estados-Membros. Estão os Estados-Membros preparados para cumprir com as suas obrigações? Portugal, o meu país, está preparado para enviar já, em 2021, 110 inspetores do Serviço de Estrangeiros e fronteiras? Receio que, uma vez mais, estejamos a prometer ao nível europeu o que os Estados não vão permitir.

Por outro lado, a agência terá um papel reforçado na gestão e execução de decisões do retorno de pessoas que não têm direito a estar no território. Hoje, incrivelmente, as decisões efetivamente executadas são menos de um terço das emitidas, excluindo Portugal, onde não se conhecem estatísticas sobre estas decisões.

Finalmente, ficaremos ainda a saber a dimensão dos movimentos secundários na Europa, isto é, quantos são realmente os requerentes de asilo que fogem do país que os acolhe. Será finalmente claro que cinco governos têm vindo a delapidar Schengen e a livre circulação por razão absolutamente nenhuma. Uma palavra final para relatora, a deputada Roberta Metsola, pelo trabalho excecional em tempo absolutamente recorde.

**Péter Niedermüller**, a S&D képviselőcsoport nevében. – Tisztelt Elnök úr! Mindenekelőtt szeretném megköszönni a jelentéstevőnek, Roberta Metsolának a konstruktív és nyitott együttműködést, ami nélkül ezt a javaslatot soha nem tudtuk volna előkészíteni. Ugyancsak köszönöm Avramopulosz biztos úrnak és munkatársainak a kitartó támogatást. Amikor 2015-ben váratlanul és drámai módon megnőtt az Európába érkező menekültek száma, fontos és sürgető feladattá vált az európai határok védelmének a biztosítása. Ennek jegyében született meg 2016-ban az új Frontex-törvényjavaslat. A mostani jelentés ennek a törvénynek a továbbfejlesztése. A jelenlegi javaslat az eddigieknél tágabb hatáskörrel ruházza fel az ügynökséget, jelentősebb anyagi támogatást, több szakembert biztosít feladatai ellátásához.

Számomra és frakción számára különösen fontos volt a tárgyalások során annak biztosítása, hogy a Frontexnek továbbra is egyik alapvető feladata marad a tengeren hánykolódó menekültek megmentése. Erről a humanitárius kötelességről az ügynökség soha, semmilyen körülmények között nem mondhat le. Nem engedhetjük meg, hogy szélsőjobboldali kormányok és miniszterek önző politikai haszonlesésből emberek életével játsszanak. Ugyanakkor a jelenlegi javaslat a korábbinál lényegesen nagyobb hatáskört biztosít az Ügynökségnek a jogerősen elutasított menekültkérelmek hazájukba való visszaszállításában. Ez azonban csak az Európai Unió területén levő menekültekre vonatkozhat, az ügynökségnek nincs sem politikai, sem jogi lehetősége részt venni olyan akciókban, amelyek harmadik országból harmadik országba szállítják vissza az elutasított menekülteket. Morális szempontból is fontos lépésnek tartom, hogy a jelentés erős mértékben megerősíti az ügynökség elkötelezettségét a menekült emberi jogai, az alapvető jogok tiszteletben tartása mellett.

Végül rendkívül sajnálatosnak tartom, hogy miközben jogos erőfeszítéseket tettünk az európai határok védelme érdekében, a Tanács képtelen volt egyezségre jutni a közös európai menekültügyi rendszer ügyében. Politikai szűklátókörűség és egoizmus akadályozta meg a dublini rendszer reformját, vagy éppen a menekültügyi ügynökség 2017 nyara óta meglévő előzetes megállapodásának az elfogadását. Bármennyire is fontos a határok védelme, ez önmagában nem elég, szükség van egy tágabb körű, a tagállamok szolidaritására épülő, a menekültek társadalmi integrációját is figyelembe vevő új rendelethez, és ez már a következő Parlament feladata lesz.

**Anders Primdahl Vistisen, for ECR-Gruppen.** – Hr. formand! Det, vi står og behandler i dag, er mere eller mindre en tilståelsessag. Det er en tilståelsessag i forhold til, at de ydre grænser, der med Schengensamarbejdet har erstattet de indre, aldrig op til i dag har været en effektiv foranstaltning, der har skullet beskytte de europæiske borgere mod udefra kommende trusler, herunder faren for ulovlig indvandring.

Derfor synes vi egentlig, at det er velkomment, at Kommissionen – her 17-18 år efter Schengenarbejdets indførelse – tog initiativ til at lave et egentligt grænseagentur.

Grunden til, at vi ikke fra ECR-Gruppens side kan støtte det kompromis, der er kommet ud af trilogforhandlingerne, er, at vi simpelthen igen er bange for, at der tale om for lidt, for sent. Vi er bekymrede over, at der er så mange safeguards i udspillet, at det ikke kommer til at have den ønskede effekt på Europas sikkerhed. Vi er stærkt bekymrede over, at man ikke kan hjælpe et tredjeland med at hjemvise til et andet tredjeland.

Så grundlæggende set er vi bange for, at det, vi i dag er ved at vedtage, er en lappeløsning, der hverken vil tilfredsstille de europæiske borgere eller gøre Schengensamarbejdet mere sikkert.

**Nathalie Griesbeck, au nom du groupe ALDE.** – Monsieur le Président, Monsieur le Commissaire, mes chers collègues, en septembre 2018, le président Juncker présentait une nouvelle réforme de l'agence Frontex et, il y a deux ans, rapporteure sur ce texte, je saluais déjà l'aboutissement à un moment important de cette première révision. Aujourd'hui, au nom de mon groupe, je fais la même chose dans le temps record dont nous avons disposé, tout en regrettant peut-être un certain nombre de points. Aujourd'hui, je suis tout de même satisfaite de la rapidité avec laquelle nous avons finalisé ce dossier en adoptant une approche équilibrée, efficace pour la protection de nos frontières et respectueuse des droits fondamentaux, comme nos concitoyens nous le demandaient.

Je note surtout – et je m'en réjouis – une véritable avancée en ce qui concerne les budgets, les capacités et les compétences, comme cela a été souligné à l'instant.

Je souhaite cependant revenir sur deux éléments. Tout d'abord, je suis heureuse que nous ayons acté la création d'un contingent permanent qui sera, à terme, constitué de 10 000 garde-côtes/garde-frontières et auquel les États membres devront contribuer. C'est bien plus crédible et tout aussi efficace et concret que la réserve de 1 500 personnes qui existe actuellement et qui ne fonctionne pas bien. C'est donc une avancée concrète et nécessaire.

Deuxième point, pour ma part, je me suis battue, de nouveau comme rapporteure sur cette révision, pour que figure dans le texte finalisé une mention à la création d'un centre de formation Frontex. En effet, si nous voulons dépasser la vision nationale de la protection des frontières de l'Union européenne – les États membres sont compétents et ils vont jouer un rôle fondamental –, si nous voulons être efficaces dans notre espace européen de libre circulation de Schengen, si nous voulons qu'il y ait le moins de failles possible, nous devons être européens, nous devons constituer un outil qui soit européen et l'agence doit pouvoir collaborer avec les autorités des États, et pas seulement les soutenir. Or, pour que cela soit pratique dans les faits, nous devons développer au fond une véritable culture européenne en matière de formation. C'est ce que le texte appelle et inscrit.

Pour conclure, je voudrais remercier une nouvelle fois Roberta Metsola, notre rapporteure, qui avec son travail, son énergie, sa détermination et son excellente coopération nous a permis d'avancer vite. Dans quelques heures, avec mon groupe je soutiendrai bien entendu par mon vote cette nouvelle réforme.

**Marina Albiol Guzmán**, *en nombre del Grupo GUE/NGL*. – Señor presidente, esta legislatura que ya acaba ha estado marcada fundamentalmente por el abandono por parte de quienes gobiernan Europa de cualquier atisbo de humanidad, al promover políticas basadas en la muerte de las personas migrantes en el mar, su esclavitud y tortura en centros de detención y las deportaciones a países donde no hay ninguna garantía de que se respeten sus derechos.

Esto es muy duro, pero es así. Esto es la Unión Europea.

No se han habilitado vías legales y seguras para su llegada; no se han facilitado visados humanitarios y no se ha creado un cuerpo de rescate en el mar. Es más, se ha prohibido a las ONG hacer estas labores de rescate.

Los responsables de estas políticas algún día deberían ser juzgados por las, al menos, 18 297 muertes que se han producido en los últimos cinco años en el mar Mediterráneo. Sus políticas de cierre de fronteras, que obligan a las personas migrantes a jugarse la vida en el mar, han asesinado a una media de diez personas por día, y el Reglamento que hoy se aprueba es el culmen de estas prácticas inhumanas.

La Guardia Europea de Fronteras y Costas es un cuerpo paramilitar con diez mil efectivos, con un presupuesto anual de casi 2 000 millones de euros para blindar las fronteras, para practicar deportaciones, para detener a los migrantes, para encerrarlos en centros de internamiento. Es el brazo armado de la Comisión Europea para que nadie ponga un pie en Europa; es el sueño de la extrema derecha, hecho realidad por socialdemócratas, conservadores y liberales.

**Ska Keller**, *on behalf of the Verts/ALE Group*. – Mr President, first of all, I would like to really thank our rapporteur for the excellent cooperation and very inclusive approach also to this work. I think we really had a very constructive position in Parliament, especially when it comes to search and rescue. We here in the House all voted to make sure that Frontex has a stronger mandate in search and rescue because of the humanitarian crisis that we see unfolding in the Mediterranean every day. So I'm really happy that there was a majority in this House for that.

But the Member States saw it very differently. They have blocked the rapporteur's attempts to put search and rescue more strongly into the text of this legislation, and that is really a problem. So Frontex can now still only rescue people within the limits of border surveillance operations and that currently means just 30 sea miles off the coast of Sicily.

That's a very small area. That is not the place where we have the problem. People are drowning in the Mediterranean Sea right now, while everyone is watching. We know where they are. Their coordinates are clear. They are known to Frontex. But no one is coming to rescue the people in need. Operation Sophia is not running any more. NGOs are being criminalised and their ships are being taken away.

Also Frontex monitors the Mediterranean only by plane and refers search and rescue cases to the Libyan coastguards, but in Libya there is a civil war going on. No one there is picking up the phone. Nobody rescues from there. With that, Europe is violating its obligation to save lives by shifting it to a non-existent Libyan rescue centre.

In the long term, we do need to have a civil sea rescue in the Mediterranean organised at European level because Member States are not willing to act. But we cannot wait until then. We have to use the means available. Otherwise, we are letting the values of Europe drown together with the people in the Mediterranean.

*(The speaker declined to take a blue-card question from Mr Etheridge)*

**Diane James**, *on behalf of the EFDD Group*. – Mr President, the European Union in its futile attempt to deal with a migration policy which is completely incoherent is just about to commit EUR 11 billion. Last month, Frans Timmermans stated here that Europe is no longer experiencing the migration crisis of 2015 and 2016. Little did he know that only this week the Libyan Prime Minister would announce that a minimum of 800 000 migrants are well placed to arrive in the European continent.

So what have we got? We have got 11 billion, we've got 10 000 border guards and yet, quite simply, the people traffickers haven't given up. Spain's got its problems and the United Kingdom's got its problems across the Channel. Now, only the 100% withdrawal of the message of open Europe instigated by Ms Merkel is going to bring a halt to this problem.

**Giancarlo Scottà**, a nome del gruppo ENF. – Signor Presidente, onorevoli colleghi, nel corso degli ultimi anni abbiamo assistito a consistenti ondate migratorie che hanno costretto l'Italia e, in generale, l'UE a correre ai ripari. L'istituzione, però, di un corpo permanente che arriverà a contare nel 2027 diecimila unità comporta, per modalità di composizione e costituzione, un sicuro e pesante depauperamento delle forze di sicurezza interna di ciascuno Stato membro, che saranno convogliate come risorse per riuscire a realizzare questo corpo.

La copertura finanziaria a carico dell'Unione, peraltro, è oltremodo insufficiente a compensare lo sforzo economico che spetterà agli Stati membri. A questo si aggiunge poi l'impossibilità in Stati membri come l'Italia, di riavviare le assunzioni nel pubblico impiego a causa dei vincoli di bilancio imposti dall'UE. La proposta sottrae di fatto, quindi, risorse nazionali necessarie agli Stati membri per la gestione delle rispettive frontiere. Tutto ciò senza considerare che un corpo permanente così costituito sarà forse efficace se utilizzato lungo le frontiere terrestri, ma non si può sicuramente dire lo stesso nel caso di frontiere marittime. Anzi, il rischio che corriamo, e che *in primis* corre l'Italia, è che una così massiccia presenza di uomini e mezzi in mare possa invece figurare da fattore di attrazione per le imbarcazioni di immigrati clandestini.

Se da una parte, quindi, sembra di poter intravedere un passo in avanti grazie al rinnovo del mandato dell'operazione Sophia e la relativa sospensione dello spiegamento delle forze navali, dall'altra, con l'approvazione di questo provvedimento, si faranno molti passi indietro. I poteri esecutivi attribuiti alle guardie di frontiera e costiera paiono poco velatamente minare la sovranità nazionale dei singoli Stati. Il disegno, allora, è cristallino se non nelle parole, nei fatti.

Se negli ultimi mesi l'Italia è riuscita, secondo dati Frontex, a ridurre gli arrivi dalle coste africane, arrivando a un calo di circa l'80 % rispetto al 2017, ciò non è avvenuto di sicuro grazie alle misure adottate a livello UE, bensì grazie alle politiche migratorie adottate nel mio paese. Siete così persuasi che questo provvedimento sarà così efficace, ma forse l'obiettivo è proprio ...

*(Il Presidente ritira la parola all'oratore)*

**Ελευθέριος Συναδινός (NI)**. – Κύριε Πρόεδρε, κάνοντας έναν σύντομο απολογισμό, έπειτα από πέντε έτη ενεργής παρουσίας, χαίρομαι που η πολιτική της Ένωσης προσαρμόζεται και αντιλαμβάνεται την πραγματικότητα και όσα οι πατριωτικές φωνές υπεύθυνα, απαρέγκλιτα και πιστά δήλωναν και δηλώνουν για τη διατήρηση της δημόσιας τάξης και για τη διασφάλιση των πολιτών μας και των ζωτικών μας συμφερόντων. Για την ανάσχεση των λαθρομεταναστευτικών εισροών απαιτούνται ισχυρά και ασφαλή σύνορα υπό εθνικό έλεγχο και απόλυτη αυτονομία δράσεων από πλευράς των κρατών μελών.

Παρά το όποιο κοινό πεπρωμένο, εθνική κυριαρχία που μοιράζεται δεν ισχυροποιείται και δεν πολλαπλασιάζεται· αντιθέτως, ασθενει και απεμπολείται. Τα σύνορα δεν ομοσπονδοποιούνται και δεν συνδιαχειρίζονται· πολύ απλά, καταλύονται. Επιπλέον, η οποιαδήποτε κατηγοριοποίηση συνόρων είναι ψευδεπίγραφη. Τα σύνορα είναι σύνορα και δεν επιδέχονται αμφισβήτησης ή παραποίησης. Η Ένωση ενδιαφέρεται, βέβαια, μόνο για την εξασφάλιση των συμφερόντων της Γερμανίας και των στενών συμμάχων της· δεν κόπτεται για την προστασία των συνόρων, αλλά για να «παρκάρει» τους λαθρομετανάστες στις χώρες της περιφέρειας, όπως είναι η Ελλάδα και η Ιταλία.

**Jeroen Lenaers (PPE)**. – Voorzitter, de buitengrenzen van Nederland liggen niet langer bij Vaals en Venlo, maar bij Lesbos en Lampedusa. Ze zijn daarmee een gezamenlijke uitdaging die we in Europa ook alleen gezamenlijk effectief kunnen aangaan. Als we ook in de toekomst willen profiteren van een Schengengebied zonder interne grenzen, als we willen weten wie Europa binnenkomt en met welk doel, als we migratie onder controle willen houden en als we ervoor willen zorgen dat uitgeprocedeerde asielzoekers ook daadwerkelijk naar hun land van herkomst terugkeren, dan is deze herziening van de Europese grens- en kustwacht absoluut noodzakelijk.

Ik noem vier belangrijke punten. Allereerst de forse uitbreiding naar een totaal van tienduizend grenswachten, zodat we onze buitengrenzen eindelijk ook intensief kunnen controleren. Ten tweede het idee om de grensbewaking te organiseren via een geïntegreerde en gezamenlijke planning in plaats van iedere keer met ad-hocmaatregelen te komen als er ergens langs de buitengrens een crisis is. Ten derde, als een land er zo'n potje van maakt dat het gehele functioneren van de Schengenzone in gevaar komt, dan kan de grens- en kustwacht alsnog orde op zaken stellen. En ten slotte meer mogelijkheden voor de grens- en kustwacht om samen te werken met derde landen en om lidstaten te helpen om illegale migratie tegen te houden en terugkeer te bevorderen.



Met andere woorden, met dit besluit zetten we een belangrijke en noodzakelijke stap om onze grensbewaking te verbeteren. Ik wil rapporteur Roberta Metsola dan ook feliciteren voor de daadkrachtige manier waarop zij dit zo doeltreffend door het Parlement gekregen heeft.

**Birgit Sippel (S&D).** – Herr Präsident! Sichere Außengrenzen sind wichtig für einen funktionierenden Schengenraum, und daher begrüßen wir die Stärkung der europäischen Grenz- und Küstenwache. Aber einige Mitgliedstaaten verwechseln sichere Grenzen mit kompletter Abschottung. Und genau diese treibt Menschen, die vor Gewalt und Verfolgung fliehen, in die Hände von Schleppern und Milizen. Die Folgen dieser Abschottungspolitik für Geflüchtete sehen wir derzeit besonders in Libyen.

Doch nicht genug damit, dass sich Mitgliedstaaten vor ihrer europäischen, internationalen und christlichen Verantwortung drücken, nein, wenn es nach Konservativen und Rechten ginge, wären europäische Beamte jetzt auch in Drittstaaten Erfüllungsgehilfe bei Rückführungen in andere Drittstaaten. Eine schwierige Situation für die Beamten und eine weitere Verlagerung eigener Verantwortung. Das haben wir erfolgreich abgelehnt.

Wann zeigt eigentlich der Rat, der heute gar nicht erst erschienen ist, auch beim Asylpaket genau den Eifer, den er in den Verhandlungen zur Grenz- und Küstenwache oder Abschottung an den Tag legt? Wann gibt es einheitliche Regeln für legale Zuwanderung? Denn nur so können wir die Herausforderungen an unseren Grenzen nachhaltig und unter Wahrung unserer gemeinsamen Werte gestalten.

*(Die Rednerin lehnt eine Frage nach dem Verfahren der „blauen Karte“ von Michaela Šojdrová ab.)*

**Bernd Kölmel (ECR).** – Herr Präsident! Es ist richtig, dass man Frontex stärken muss. Da brauchen wir auch mehr Personal. Das ist eine richtige Maßnahme. Gleichzeitig zeigt die Forderung nach 10 000 zusätzlichen Stellen ein Grundproblem auf: Wir werden die Probleme der EU nicht dadurch lösen, dass wir immer „nur“ nach mehr Geld rufen. Was wir speziell im Migrationsbereich brauchen, ist eindeutig eine gesetzliche Regelung, die umfassend ist, die der EU wieder das Steuerungsrecht zurückgibt. Wir müssen nicht nur an den Grenzen kontrollieren können, wir müssen auch dafür sorgen, dass wir entscheiden, wer in die EU kommen darf und wer nicht.

Wir haben aber hier stattdessen eine Mehrheit, die einfache Lösungen sucht, die mit Geld die Probleme überdecken will. In Wirklichkeit werden die Probleme immer schlimmer. Die EU wird wieder nicht vorbereitet sein, wenn es eine erneute Krise gibt. Und das ist nicht im Sinne und nach dem Willen der Bürger. Wenn wir eine EU wollen, die nah bei den Bürgern ist, dann müssen wir den Willen der Bürger auch ernst nehmen. Ich bitte deshalb darum, hier einmal eine grundsätzliche Debatte zu führen.

**Cecilia Wikström (ALDE).** – Mr President, first of all, warm congratulations to my colleague Roberta Metsola for her outstanding work on this. Thanks for all the good cooperation we have enjoyed throughout these years. Thanks also to the Commissioner for this excellent proposal.

When I fly over Europe, I see no borders. These words were attributed to the first president of the free Czechoslovakia, Václav Havel, and the great success of European integration: the removal of the internal borders rests on having strong external borders. Let me be very clear. It's not about building a fortress Europe. It's not about turning away people, it is primarily about exercising control over the flows of people going in and out of the Union. It's about making sure that we conduct proper screening, security checks and process in an orderly manner all those who arrive here seeking international protection.

Proper border protection is also crucial to fight the influx of counterfeit products, narcotics, weapons and other items and substances that we do not want in the European Union. The report we are adopting today does not go towards a fully federalised competence. In my view, that is the way forward, but this is a very important step in the right direction.

And allow me – I have been a Member here for 10 years and this is one of my last speeches in plenary after the 10 years – to thank every colleague and everybody that I worked with and remember that where politics ends, friendship remains and to make an end is also a chance to make a new beginning.

*(Applause)*

**Eleonora Forenza (GUE/NGL).** – Signor Presidente, onorevoli colleghi, 1 311 morti nel solo 2018, questo è il numero dei morti nel Mediterraneo. Eppure qui si continua a discutere di frontiere e di ulteriore rafforzamento delle politiche di respingimento.

Credo che l'Unione europea debba necessariamente, invece, intraprendere un'altra strada. In primo luogo, quella di dichiarare i porti libici come porti non sicuri. È vero, l'Europa lo ha già dichiarato, ma ancora alcuni Stati membri dell'Unione europea continuano a ritenere possibili i rimpatri in Libia, e parlo dell'Italia. Penso che dobbiamo decidere se vogliamo essere ricordati come quelli che hanno fatto aumentare le morti nel Mediterraneo o come quelli che hanno provato ad evitarle. E allora non si possono rimpatriare le persone in Libia perché subiscono tortura. Non si possono affidare compiti di ricerca e salvataggio alla Guardia costiera libica perché significa far tornare le persone in Libia. Occorre necessariamente interrompere qualsiasi accordo sui migranti tra Unione europea e Libia.

L'Europa deve scegliere se essere quella dei porti chiusi di Salvini e Toninelli o se essere un continente civile.

**Bodil Valero (Verts/ALE).** – Herr talman! Enligt FN:s flyktingorgan UNHCR får varje dag i genomsnitt 44 400 människor lämna sina hem till följd av krig eller förföljelse. Antalet människor på flykt år 2017 uppgick till 68,5 miljoner. Enligt samma organisation kommer det förändrade klimatet och ett ökat antal naturkatastrofer som följd av klimatförändringarna att leda till stora omflyttningar av befolkningar. Vi brukar räkna med att det år 2050 kommer att finnas 200-250 miljoner klimatflyktingar – och det är utöver de 600 miljoner som påverkas av havsnivåhöjningarna. Det är bara en ytterst liten andel av flyktingarna som hittills har tagit sin tillflykt till Europa.

Vad är då vårt svar till de få som faktiskt kommer hit? Jo, att vi är beredda att satsa stora resurser på att hålla dem härifrån och att utvidga EU:s gräns- och kustbevakningsmandat. Det är ytterligare ett exempel på hur kortsiktigt vi tänker. Det vi i stället behöver göra är att betala för massiva insatser för att förebygga den ofrivilliga migrationen, både den som relaterar till konflikter och den som relaterar till klimat eller fattigdom.

**Ignazio Corrao (EFDD).** – Signor Presidente, onorevoli colleghi, diciamolo chiaramente, la riforma del sistema europeo comune di asilo è stata un enorme fallimento.

Dopo quattro anni dall'emergenza dei rifugiati, nulla è stato fatto per cambiare le regole di Dublino, ingiuste e purtroppo sempre attuali. La Libia è di nuovo in fiamme e una nuova ondata di profughi raggiungerà presto le coste dell'Europa senza che nulla sia cambiato e senza che l'Europa sia pronta a gestire accoglienza e richieste d'asilo, esattamente come è stato nel 2015. Sigillare le frontiere esterne è diventata allora l'unica possibilità e la nuova Frontex lo strumento principale.

Quello che l'Europa è riuscita finora a fare è stato esternalizzare il problema, dare denaro ad alcuni Stati per fare il lavoro sporco e cercare allo stesso tempo di chiudere il più possibile le frontiere. La riforma di Frontex è stata l'ultima e la più eclatante di queste misure. Una riforma adottata frettolosamente dalle istituzioni, nella speranza di ottenere qualcosa da sbandierare in campagna elettorale, forse per distogliere l'attenzione dal fallimento della riforma del sistema comune di asilo, naufragato contro gli scogli dell'opposizione alla solidarietà europea, di cui alcuni Stati membri non vogliono nemmeno sentire parlare.

Ci siamo opposti a questa riforma, poiché riteniamo che la sovranità degli Stati membri in materia di gestione dei propri confini esterni venga compressa in modo eccessivo e inopportuno. Si dà infatti la possibilità alla Commissione, per mezzo dell'Agenzia, di commissariare lo Stato membro che viene ritenuto non in grado di gestire le proprie frontiere, fino a dare la possibilità agli Stati confinanti di reintrodurre i controlli alle frontiere interne, qualora le raccomandazioni dell'Agenzia non siano correttamente attuate. Un altro esempio di come in Europa il principio di solidarietà previsto dai trattati è tradotto in pratica.

**Γεώργιος Επιτήδειος (NI).** – Κύριε Πρόεδρε, παρά το γεγονός ότι έχει αποδειχθεί στην πράξη πως ο FRONTEX είναι το πλέον ανεπιτυχές πείραμα για την αντιμετώπιση της παράνομης μετανάστευσης, η Ευρωπαϊκή Ένωση επιδιώκει να τον αναβαθμίσει και να τον μετατρέψει σε οργανισμό Ευρωπαϊκής Ακτοφυλακής και Συνοριοφυλακής. Του αυξάνει την επιχειρησιακή δύναμη σε 10.000 άτομα και, σε περιόδους άγριας λιτότητας, φορολογεί τους ευρωπαίους πολίτες και σπαταλά τα χρήματά τους για να δημιουργήσει έναν αναποτελεσματικό —άρα και άχρηστο— οργανισμό.

Η εμμονή όμως —και η σκοπιμότητα— να αφαιρεθούν από τα εθνικά κράτη αρμοδιότητες ζωτικές για την επιβίωσή τους, όπως είναι η ασφάλεια των συνόρων, οδηγεί την Ευρωπαϊκή Ένωση στο να λάβει αποφάσεις που αντίκεινται στην κοινή λογική. Διότι ποιος λογικά σκεπτόμενος άνθρωπος θα διαφωνήσει με την άποψη ότι η καλύτερη προστασία των συνόρων ενός κράτους επιτυγχάνεται εάν η αποστολή αυτή δοθεί στις ένοπλες δυνάμεις και τα σώματα ασφαλείας του κράτους αυτού; Η ορθότητα αυτής της άποψης έχει αποδειχθεί στην πράξη, διότι όλα τα κράτη —τα περισσότερα κράτη της Ευρωπαϊκής Ένωσης— κλείνουν τα σύνορά τους για να αντιμετωπίσουν τα ανεξέλεγκτα κύματα των λαθρομεταναστών και έτσι μεταφέρουν το πρόβλημα στα κράτη εισόδου, όπως είναι η Ελλάδα, η οποία, εάν δε συνειδητοποιήσει ότι πρέπει μόνη της να προστατεύσει τα σύνορά της, ουδείς μαθητεύομενος μάγος της Ευρώπης θα τη βοηθήσει, με οποιαδήποτε μορφή και όνομα και αν εμφανιστεί αυτός.

**Agustín Díaz de Mera García Consuegra (PPE).** – Señor presidente, señor comisario, felicito a Roberta por un trabajo bien hecho; pero recuerden que las propuestas más relevantes del paquete de inmigración y asilo siguen estancadas en el Consejo y en los trílogos. Por eso, es bueno que hoy vayamos a votar este Reglamento, para dar mayores capacidades a la Guardia Europea de Fronteras y Costas; es fundamental para dotar a esta herramienta de las capacidades necesarias para poder garantizar una gestión integrada con vistas a gestionar la migración de manera eficaz y garantizar un alto nivel de seguridad dentro de la Unión, salvaguardando, al mismo tiempo, la libre circulación de las personas.

La creación de un cuerpo de diez mil guardias de fronteras, el apoyo a Estados miembros en materia de retorno o la intensificación de la cooperación con terceros países son capacidades operativas fundamentales para garantizar una asistencia sólida y continuada tanto a los países de acogida como a los de origen y tránsito.

En la actualidad, la Agencia constituye, junto con Europol, una de las piedras angulares para garantizar un espacio de libertad, seguridad y justicia en la Unión. Por ello, es fundamental que desde el Parlamento Europeo continuemos trabajando en dotar de mayores y mejores capacidades operativas y presupuestarias a esta Agencia. Además, hay una seguridad: que la guardia está subordinada y vinculada al Derecho del Mar, al Derecho internacional humanitario y a la Carta de los Derechos Fundamentales de la Unión Europea.

**Tanja Fajon (S&D).** – Gospod predsedujoči, strinjam se, da potrebujemo boljše varovanje zunanjih meja Evropske unije. Tudi zato, ker je to ključno za varnejše delovanje schengenskega prostora in bolj učinkovito upravljanje z migracijami.

Podpiram aprilski neuradni dogovor med državami o okrepitvi mandata Frontex in bom danes glasovala za nova pravila, po katerih bomo do leta 2027 vzpostavili stalno deset tisoč člansko enoto mejne in obalne straže ter strokovnjake za vračanje.

Pomembno je, da države članice obdržijo glavno odgovornost za upravljanje svojih meja. A moja skrb še vedno ostaja, ali smo dovolj zavarovali temeljne pravice tistih posameznikov, ki jih bo Frontex vračal v tretje države. Socialisti in demokrati smo dosegli, da je za delovanje Frontexa v tretjih državah, kot so, denimo, zahodnobalkanske, nujno sklepati dodatne sporazume v izogib kršitvam človekovih pravic.

Za konec pa vas vse še enkrat opominjam. Samo nova pravila na zunanjih mejah ne bodo ohranila svobode gibanja v Uniji, če le-teh ne bomo sprejeli tudi za Schengen.

**Ангел Джамбазки (ECR).** – Г-н Председател, ако има една агенция на Европейския съюз, която да бъде наистина полезна и чиято поддръжка и издръжка си струва усилието, това несъмнено е Frontex. Охраната на външните граници е сред най-важните въпроси, които стоят пред нас днес. За да запазим свободата на движение на стоки, хора и капитали през вътрешните граници на Европейския съюз, ние трябва да бъдем упорити и последователни в защитата на външните ни граници по суша и вода. Ето защо приветствам увеличението на правомощията на Frontex.

Също така искам да подчертая важността на постоянния корпус на европейската гранична и брегова охрана, предвидена в този доклад. От години в тази зала твърдят, че незабавно трябва да работим заедно за граничната и брегова охрана на Съюза, за нулева миграция и за недопускане на нелегални мигранти на нашата територия. Европа трябва да остане затворен дом. Нашият континент несъмнено е мястото с най-високо качество на живот и, разбира се, много хора биха искали да дойдат тук.

Да живееш в Европа обаче не е привилегия. Икономическите имигранти и нашествениците, които не приемат нашите ценности, нито нашия начин на живот, нямат място в нашите страни. Нека не забравяме също така, че каналите за мигрантите се използват от терористични организации. Затова Frontex трябва да бъде подсилена.

**Ernest Urtasun (Verts/ALE).** – Señor presidente, esta legislatura va a pasar a la historia por la vergüenza de las 18 000 muertes en el Mediterráneo, según la Organización Internacional para las Migraciones. Y creo que la terminamos de la peor manera: con la reforma del Reglamento de Dublín, la reforma del Reglamento de asilo bloqueada y, ahora, creando este nuevo Reglamento sobre la Guardia Europea de Fronteras y Costas, volcando miles de millones de euros en ella, sin tener un mecanismo de salvaguarda de los derechos fundamentales claro, y, a la vez, sin un mandato claro de búsqueda y de rescate en el Mediterráneo —como, por cierto, había pedido este Parlamento en su mandato negociador y como había pedido, en reiteradas ocasiones, en muchas votaciones—.

Al final, los Gobiernos criminalizan a las ONG, como al buque Open Arms, al que no se ha dejado zarpar del puerto de Barcelona. Hoy se le ha dejado a zarpar, pero solo para llevar asistencia humanitaria, no para ir a rescatar a gente en el Mediterráneo.

Criminalizamos a las ONG y, a la vez, no hacemos una misión específica de búsqueda y rescate pública.

Una urgencia de la próxima legislatura será terminar con esta vergüenza y cambiar radicalmente de políticas.

**Kinga Gál (PPE).** – Tisztelt Elnök úr! A Frontex elvileg hozzájárulhat az Európai Unió külső határainak védelméhez. Ugyanakkor, mivel a határvédelem elsődlegesen a tagállamok felelőssége, a Frontex mandátumát megerősítése, és annak megerősítésével nem sérülhet a tagállamok szuverenitása. Az ügynökség nem veszélyeztetheti a tagállamok határvédelmi feladatainak ellátását, és csakis az adott tagállammal együttműködve működhet. Kérdéses, hogy ez valóban tud-e majd így működni. Ugyanakkor sajnáljuk, hogy az elért megállapodás nem teszi lehetővé, hogy a Frontex segítséget nyújtson például a macedón határon, vagy más balkáni, nem uniós tagállamoknak az illegálisan ott tartózkodók kitoloncolásában. Így az az illegális migránsok visszazállításában nem vállalhat majd nagyobb szerepet.

A magyar kormány elsődleges célkitűzése mindig is a határvédelem erősítése volt. Magyarországon a külső határok védelméről oroszlanrészről vállaltunk, ezzel Európát is védve, anélkül, hogy ehhez bármilyen uniós támogatást kaptunk volna eddig. Amit leginkább elvárunk, az az, hogy végre az EU nyújtson nagyobb pénzügyi támogatást a külső határok védelmére, hiszen Magyarország még ilyen pénzt nem látott.

**Sylvie Guillaume (S&D).** – Monsieur le Président, sans doute était-il indispensable de renforcer l'agence Frontex, car nos frontières communes doivent être gérées au niveau européen. Je soutiens donc cette réforme du corps européen de garde-frontières et de garde-côtes, qui doit pour autant s'accompagner du respect des droits fondamentaux des personnes contrôlées aux frontières extérieures.

J'aimerais toutefois formuler deux regrets en cette fin de mandat, regrets qui sont également des souhaits pour l'avenir.

Premièrement, je regrette que nous n'ayons pas pu imposer de mandat actif de recherche et de sauvetage en mer à Frontex. Plus de 2 200 personnes se sont tuées en Méditerranée en 2018. Quand les ONG prennent des risques et que les États membres se renvoient la balle, une agence européenne serait la bienvenue pour accomplir ce devoir de sauvetage. La théorie de l'appel d'air ne tient pas: depuis plus de six mois, les ONG agissent en mer, les États membres ferment leurs ports, et pourtant les personnes continuent à traverser et les passeurs en profitent encore.

Deuxièmement, je regrette que nous adoptions la deuxième réforme de Frontex, alors qu'aucune réforme n'a été adoptée en ce qui concerne le régime d'asile européen. La faute en revient aux États membres qui bloquent le système européen de l'asile, alors que le Parlement a mis sur la table sa position depuis plus de deux ans.

**Ruža Tomašić (ECR).** – Poštovani predsjedavajući, Frontex treba imati ulogu u zaštiti vanjskih granica Unije, ali predloženi je smjer razvoja agencije pogrešan. Umjesto usko specijaliziranih mobilnih snaga za brzu reakciju u slučaju krize uz paralelno jačanje graničnih policija koje su najkompetentnije braniti granicu, stvara se nova, pretjerano birokratizirana služba s previše zaposlenih čija će učinkovitost biti vrlo upitna.

Problem nezakonitih migracija mora se rješavati na izvorištu, a Frontexu ovim prijedlogom nisu dane ovlasti da sudjeluje u vraćanju migranata iz trećih zemalja u treće zemlje. To znači da Frontex, primjerice, neće moći asistirati u vraćanju nezakonitih migranata iz sjevernoafričkih zemalja u države iz kojih ti migranti dolaze.

Ovakvom politikom sami sebe osuđujemo na borbu protiv nezakonitih migracija i organiziranog kriminala na svome pragu umjesto da problem rješavamo što je moguće dalje od svojih granica. Migracijska politika i politika azila traže drastičnu, a ne ovakvu kozmetičku promjenu.

**Cécile Kshetu Kyenge (S&D).** – Signor Presidente, onorevoli colleghi, con grande senso di responsabilità quest'Aula ha portato avanti la riforma del regolamento che istituisce la Guardia di frontiera e costiera europea.

Abbiamo superato le divisioni interne, abbiamo negoziato, ci siamo accordati su un testo che certo poteva essere più ambizioso, ma che di sicuro contribuirà a consolidare uno dei quattro pilastri identificati dalla Commissione nell'agenda europea per le migrazioni: la gestione delle frontiere esterne.

Ricordo tuttavia che la Commissione, nello stesso pilastro, esorta l'Europa ad intensificare le attività di ricerca e soccorso in mare. Le frontiere vanno gestite, efficacemente, è vero, ma anche e soprattutto nel rispetto dei diritti fondamentali. Il sostegno a questa riforma è proprio dovuto al fatto che siamo riusciti a mantenere il quadro di salvaguardia di questi diritti e preservare le attività di ricerca e di soccorso che restano per noi una priorità del sistema europeo comune di asilo.

Ringrazio il Commissario Avramopoulos e gli lancio un ultimo appello di fine legislatura: riconsiderare la missione Sophia e dotarla di più strumenti, quindi parlare e investire di più su ricerca e salvataggio.

**Емил Радев (PPE).** – Г-н Председател, спомням си преди пет години, когато започнах този мандат като член на Европейския парламент как идеята за създаване на европейска гранична и брегова охрана беше единствено проект, академичен анализ на плюсовете и минусите – нещо, за което всички говорехме, че е възможно да се случи към 2030 година, но не и в момента.

Колко наивни бяхме! Само година по-късно над един милион мигранти – бежанци, икономически мигранти и дори терористи, преминаха през външните европейски граници и колкото и подготвени да бяха националните гранични полици, те не успяха да овладеят колоните от хора. Тогава много бързо осъзнахме нуждата от незабавна европейска подкрепа за външните граници в случай на криза и на постоянна подкрепа за трудните граници. Осъзнахме, че силата на Шенген се дължи на силата на външните европейски граници. Осъзнахме, че за да запазим сигурността в сърцето на Европа, трябва да гарантираме сигурността по краищата ѝ.

Четири години по-късно, ето ни вече със създадена, функционираща европейска гранична и брегова охрана и дори говорим как до 2027 г. тя ще разполага с 10 000 служители. С нови правомощия за връщане на нелегални мигранти, за купуване на собствена техника и за подкрепа за националните гранични служители, тази подсилена агенция е истинска проява на солидарност между страните от вътрешността на Европейския съюз към тези по външните европейски граници.

**Michaela Šojdrová (PPE).** – Pane předsedající, kolegyně a kolegové, je potřeba připomenout, že vlastně tento návrh reaguje na velkou chybu, která se stala v letech 2015-2016, kdy nebyla chráněna schengenská hranice tak, jak by měla být. Do Evropy přišly za dobu 2015 až 2017 téměř dva miliony migrantů. Někteří to byli skutečně legální uprchlíci, kteří prchali před válečným násilím, ale byla tam také řada imigrantů, kteří nemají nárok na azyl a kteří by měli být vráceni. Proto vítám posílení pohraniční a pobřežní stráže. Evropská unie musí chránit své bezpečí, Evropská unie musí poskytovat azyl těm, kteří skutečně azyl potřebují. Problém je v tom, že jestliže sem přijdou tisíce nelegálních migrantů, tak občané Evropské unie se necítí bezpečně a odmítají potom přijímat i legální žadatele o azyl. Takže je třeba tento návrh přijmout.

**Tonino Picula (S&D).** – Poštovani predsjedavajući, gospodine povjereniče, nakon tri godine uspješnog funkcioniranja Europska obalna i granična straža postaje još djelotvornija. Nova agencija pomoći će boljoj zaštiti granica kako bi se očuvalo slobodno kretanje unutar Unije. Podržavam novi kontingent od 10 000 operativaca jer u roku od najviše pet dana mogu pomoći zemlji članici ako se suoči s povećanim priljevom migranata na granici.

Agencija nije samo podrška već i koordinator akcija na vanjskim granicama, te će uvažavajući temeljna prava aktivnije sudjelovati u procesuiranju prava na azil i povratu onih koji ne zadovoljavaju uvjete. Mislim da je bilo vrijedno razmotriti ideju procesuiranja prijave i povrata u susjednim zemljama radi ubrzanja cijelog procesa. Kako dolazim iz Hrvatske, zemlje s najduljom vanjskom kopnenom granicom u Europskoj uniji, posebno podržavam rad Agencije na vanjskim granicama Unije, ne samo šengenskog prostora od kojeg smo mi dalje, nažalost, ograđeni bodljikavom žicom.

Drago mi je što ćemo u kontroli naših i europskih granica imati snažniju potporu Europske unije.

**Helga Stevens (ECR).** – Voorzitter, collega's, we hebben Frontex steeds gesteund. Voor het eerst in 2016, toen Frontex ook de taak kreeg om mee in te staan voor de terugkeer van mensen die hier uitgeprocedeerd zijn. Frontex faciliteert de veilige terugkeer van deze mensen dan door bijvoorbeeld een vlucht te charteren.

Vandaag steunen we Frontex opnieuw. Want wat op tafel ligt, is voor ons een stap in de goede richting. Frontex heeft immers een erg belangrijke rol in het uitvoeren van ons migratiebeleid. Onze Schengenzone zonder binnengrenzen kan alleen maar bestaan als we sterke buitengrenzen hebben. Frontex zorgt daarvoor. Met meer mankracht en middelen zal het beter kunnen beantwoorden aan toekomstige uitdagingen.

Het is positief dat Frontex nu ook actief kan worden in niet-Europese landen die geen buurlanden zijn van de Unie. Maar dat Frontex niet mag helpen bij de terugkeer van individuen die uitgeprocedeerd zijn in niet-EU-landen, zoals Marokko, naar een ander niet-Europees land, zoals Niger, is een gemiste kans. Jammer.

**Bill Etheridge (EFDD).** – Mr President, may I begin by expressing my regret that on such an important issue as this, where thousands of lives and billions of euros are involved, colleagues in this, the European Union debating Chamber, have refused to debate and take questions.

But, having said that, surely the solution to this is simply the rule of law. If people seek to enter the European Union illegally there should be a very firm and stern rule saying: I'm sorry, but you must be sent back. However, on the other hand to that, there must be a defined legal route for people to claim asylum because all civilised nations accept the right to asylum for those who are being persecuted. So the rule of law is the solution to this. I question whether EUR 11 billion and extra resources, powers and red tape is necessarily going to help when simply applying the law would be far better.

**Franc Bogovič (PPE).** – Gospod predsedujoči, veseli me, da je v Evropskem parlamentu soglasje o tem, da je potrebno zunanje meje Evropske unije varovati in da je to garancija za to, da bo v Evropi mir, stabilnost, pa da bo tudi deloval schengenski režim znotraj Evropske unije.

Žal leta 2015 nismo bili vsi enotni na tem področju, v treh letih pa je prišlo do tega spoznanja, da je treba nezakonite migracije enostavno zaustaviti. Prepričan sem, da je potrebno narediti še naslednje korake: Frontexu razširiti pristojnost, da bo lahko vračal tudi iz tretjih držav nazaj v tretje države.

Prihajam iz Slovenije, kjer je bilo leta 2015 deset tisoč prehodov na dan, v tistih najhujših časih in tudi sedaj je iz dneva v dan več prehodov, tudi po nekaj deset na dan in ta problem bo velik tudi v prihodnje. Zato je potrebno zagotoviti to, da bodo tisti, ki prihajajo iz Bosne, Srbije, lahko tudi s pomočjo Frontexa vrnjeni v tretje države.

**Juan Fernando López Aguilar (S&D).** – Señor presidente, comisario Avramopoulos, soy un socialista español, europeo y europeísta. Reconozco y respeto los objetivos del espacio de libertad, justicia y seguridad. Entre ellos, una gestión integrada de las fronteras exteriores, a la que sirve la Agencia Europea de la Guardia de Fronteras y Costas con una nueva capacidad, con quince mil efectivos, con una financiación incluso exorbitante, y que los socialistas hemos contribuido a mejorar introduciendo enmiendas para impedir que participe en operaciones de retorno a terceros países y para reforzar su mandato de vinculación con los derechos fundamentales y con el Derecho internacional humanitario y la Carta de los Derechos Fundamentales de la Unión Europea que está vigente.

Pero créame que el sabor de boca al final de la legislatura es amargo también, por el desequilibrio hacia el vector securitario en perjuicio del humanitario. Por no haber visto solidaridad con la frontera sur de la Unión Europea, con España, ahora apremiada.

Y, también, porque no se ha cumplido el paquete de asilo, en la renovación del derecho de asilo, y queda pendiente el Reglamento de Dublín, bloqueado por el Consejo. Tarea pendiente para el próximo Parlamento Europeo.

**Νότης Μαριάς (ECR).** – Κύριε Πρόεδρε, θέλω, για άλλη μια φορά, να μεταφέρω την κραυγή αγωνίας των κατοίκων των νησιών του Αιγαίου για τις τεράστιες μεταναστευτικές ροές και, κυρίως, για τον μεγάλο αριθμό παράνομων μεταναστών οι οποίοι εισρέουν στην Ελλάδα. Πρόσφατα, έγινε και εκδήλωση διαμαρτυρίας στη Σάμο, γιατί πλέον οι κάτοικοι δεν αντέχουν άλλους πρόσφυγες και παράνομους μετανάστες.

Πιστεύω ότι ο ρόλος του FRONTEX πρέπει να βελτιωθεί και να μπορέσει πραγματικά να κάνει σοβαρή δουλειά στα θέματα που αφορούν τη φύλαξη των συνόρων, και όχι μόνο στα θαλάσσια σύνορα, διότι βλέπουμε πλέον μεγάλη έλλειψη και από τη μεριά των χερσαίων συνόρων, στην περιοχή του Έβρου. Επομένως, πρέπει να υπάρξει πολύ συγκεκριμένη βελτίωση της δουλειάς που κάνει ο ίδιος ο FRONTEX. Ωστόσο, και στην περιοχή της Ηπείρου —όπου υποτίθεται υπάρχει ο FRONTEX, στα σύνορα Ελλάδας-Αλβανίας, έχουμε εισροή κακοποιών οι οποίοι πραγματικά ληστεύουν τα παραμεθόρια χωριά.

**Jiří Pospíšil (PPE).** – Pane předsedající, já jsem se také chtěl zapojit do debaty, která velmi vítá návržení tohoto nařízení. Jsem přesvědčený, že ta reakce – dát jasná pravidla pro evropskou pohraniční a pobřežní stráž – je nutná. Osobně bych byl pro to, aby se tato instituce naplno rozběhla co nejdříve, ale chápu, že je tam určité přechodné časové období. Chci do té debaty ještě doplnit to, že vedle jasnějších pravidel pro vnější hranici a její ochranu do budoucna bude vhodné rozjet i další instrumenty, kterými chceme předcházet dalším migračním krizím a vlnám, které Evropě hrozí. To znamená, určitě je třeba zde mít jasnou ochranu vnější hranice, ale je třeba také mít preventivní opatření pro ty, kteří přicházejí k hranici, jaké jim nabídnout alternativy a tak dále. To znamená, byl zde speciální fond zřízený pro Afriku, který by měl investovat do míst s potenciálními možnostmi a zdroji migrace. To jsou věci, které trochu zapadly, a ty bychom stejně vedle ochrany hranice měli rozvíjet.

**Julie Ward (S&D).** – Mr President, over the past five years, I have sought to learn about the migration and refugee experience directly from those affected. I've spent time in Calais and on the streets of Paris. I've worked with NGOs and taken every opportunity to listen to people who have been forced to migrate because of conflict and unsustainable lives.

We have a tragic situation whereby people are willing to risk drowning in our seas in order to start new lives here in Europe. So there are elements of this regulation that I welcome. I'm glad that the European Border and Coast Guard Agency will conduct searches to prevent people drowning. Those who are rescued must then be treated with empathy and humanity, and I particularly welcome the commitment to fundamental rights when working with third countries.

However, more than managing borders and documenting migration, we should take responsibility for and tackle the inequality and deprivation that forces so many to abandon their homes and risk dangerous journeys. We must uphold European values, protect the vulnerable and ensure our communities welcome those who, in a different moment of history, could, indeed, be us.

**Željana Zovko (PPE).** – Mr President, I would like to thank the rapporteur for her wonderful achievement. It is without doubt that a strong and cohesive European Union can only be safeguarded with well-functioning border control at the external borders.

The importance of this issue is very clear when you look at Croatia. This country has the longest external border of the European Union. Its national forces work rigorously to maintain European internal security. With this upgrade of equipment, an increased standing corps and readiness in a crisis situation, the European Border and Coast Guard Agency can provide crucial assistance to its Member States in critical border regions.

The next step is to engage all our partners and third countries to cooperate and to provide the technical and operational support that leads to effective management of the Union's migration policy.

*(Înceierea intervențiilor la cerere)*

**Dimitris Avramopoulos, Member of the Commission.** – Mr President, I would like to express my thanks to honourable Members for this very important debate and mostly for their support.

The new European Border and Coast Guard Regulation, as I said during my introductory remarks, is a game-changer in terms of effectiveness on how the European Union collectively protects its common external borders and manages migratory flows in the coming decades. That was our ambition: for Europe to be better prepared for the future because we don't know what the future will hold for us. This is a major step forward and we – all in this room – can be proud of what we have achieved. It is part of our common legacy.

Both the agency, and of course the Member States, will have the tools to anticipate and respond to future crises at the EU's external borders. I strongly hope that you will support the final outcome of the negotiations during the votes later on. We need to show our citizens that Europe cares and works in their interests, and that they can trust Europe.

I won't say goodbye to you yet because we have one more debate in a few minutes, which will be the last one.

**Roberta Metsola, Rapporteur.** – Grazi lil kull wiehed u wahda minnkom li ppartecipajtu f'dan id-dibattitu dwar din il-liġi li ser tagħmel differenza kbira fuq kif ser jiġu mmaniġġjati l-fruntieri esterni.

Nahseb li taqblu miegħi li hawn qbil f'din il-Kamra li għandna nżommu l-fruntieri interni miftuħa halli ċ-ċittadini Ewropej jibqgħu fil-libertà li jivvjaġġaw fi hdan l-Unjoni Ewropea. Dan nistgħu niżgurawh biss jekk il-fruntieri esterni tagħna jkunu protetti bl-aħjar mod possibbli. Dan li rnexxielna naghmlu b'din il-liġi dwar il-Gwardja Ewropea tal-Fruntieri u tal-Kosta. Permezz ta' din il-liġi ahna sibna soluzzjonijiet għal hafna kwistjonijiet li kellhom jiġu indirizzati. Qed nipprovdru l-Aġenzija bir-riżorsi umani, finanzjarji u tekniċi li l-Aġenzija għandha bżonn. Qed niżguraw li l-Aġenzija tkompli tirrispetta d-drittijiet fundamentali f'kull attività tagħha biex l-Aġenzija tagħti l-ghajnuna neċessarja tagħha fil-qasam tar-ritorn, biex insaħħu l-kooperazzjoni ma' pajjiżi terzi. Qbilna wkoll fuq dikjarazzjoni sabiex il-Kummissjoni tiddel ir-regolamenti tagħha dwar il-persunal, l-istaff, sabiex inżidu l-attrazzjoni ta' din l-Aġenzija.

Biex nikkonkludi, ahna wegħidna liċ-ċittadini Ewropej li ser naghlu n-negozjati fuq din il-liġi sal-aħħar ta' din il-legiżlatura. Din il-wegħda zammejniha għaliex irnexxielna nġibu riżultati tant mixtieqa minn kulhadd. Nerġa' niringrazzja lil kull kollega tiegħi li għamlu dan kollu possibbli: mill-Kummissjoni, il-Kunsill u b'mod partikolari lix-shadow rapporteurs kollha li wasalna hawnhekk illum ukoll grazzi għar-rieda tagħkom biex naghlu l-proċess legiżlattiv aktar tard illum. Ahna kellna għan u lhaqni. Riedna naghmlu bidla pożittiva u rnexxielna. Din hija rebħa għall-Ewropa.

**Președintele.** – Dezbateră a fost încheiată.

Votul va avea loc miercuri, 17 aprilie 2019.

*Declarații scrise (articolul 162)*



**Henna Virkkunen (PPE), kirjallinen.** – Jotta Euroopan sisäinen vapaa liikkuvuus voidaan turvata, tarvitaan pitävää ulkorajaa. Muutama vuosi sitten koetussa muuttoliikekriisissä näimme, että kaikki jäsenmaat eivät kovassa tulijapaineessa pystyneet varmistamaan ulkorajansa toimintaa. EU:n raja- ja merivartiostovirasto Frontexin vahvistaminen perustamalla pysyvä 10 000 raja- ja merivartijan joukko vuoteen 2027 mennessä on olennainen askel kohti pitävää ulkorajaa. Vaikka jokainen jäsenmaa on jatkossakin vastuussa omasta ulkorajastaan, on tärkeää, että se voi tarvittaessa pyytää apuun nopean toiminnan reservistä joukon, jonka on tarkoitus avustaa mahdollisissa ongelmatilanteissa. Tämä on kotimaani Suomen kaltaisen maan kannalta olennaista, sillä meillä on vastuullamme yli tuhat kilometriä EU:n ulkorajaa. Uudistuksen myötä viraston tulisi myös pystyä tukemaan jäsenmaita kielteisten turvapaikkapäätösten saaneiden hakijoiden palautuksessa tunnistamalla laittomasti EU:ssa oleskelevia henkilöitä ja avustamalla jäsenmaita matkustusasiakirjojen hankkimisessa. Tämän kaltainen apu tulee varmasti tarpeeseen jäsenmaissa, joihin kohdistuva muuttopaine on muita suurempi. Koko EU:n kattavaa koordinaatiota tarvitaan.

## 14. Kodeks wizowy (debata)

**Președintele.** – Următorul punct de pe ordinea de zi este dezbateră privind raportul domnului Juan Fernando López Aguilar, în numele Comisiei pentru libertăți civile, justiție și afaceri interne, referitor la propunerea de regulament al Parlamentului European și al Consiliului de modificare a Regulamentului (CE) nr. 810/2009 privind instituirea unui Cod comunitar de vize (Codul de vize) (COM(2018)0252 – C8-0114/2018 – 2018/0061(COD)) (A8-0434/2018).

**Juan Fernando López Aguilar, ponente.** – Señor presidente, comisario Avramopoulos, sabe que ha sido un gran honor haber trabajado durante largos años en el expediente, en el asunto legislativo, en la ley europea... nada menos que en el Reglamento europeo de visados, el nuevo Código europeo de visados, que vuelve a este Parlamento Europeo para su debate y votación definitiva.

Hemos cumplido años de arduo trabajo, en los que tengo que agradecer, como es costumbre en este Parlamento, a los ponentes alternativos, que han colaborado eficaz y lealmente en la conducción de esta ley europea; y, por supuesto, a usted mismo, comisario Avramopoulos, por su seguimiento puntual y su dedicación a los asuntos legislativos de la Comisión de Libertades Civiles, Justicia y Asuntos de Interior.

Hemos escuchado con intensidad en distintos seminarios y audiencias —los *hearings* parlamentarios que practicamos en la comisión— a los llamados *stakeholders* —los representantes de intereses legítimos— en este gran asunto legislativo, que cumple un objetivo principal del espacio de libertad, justicia y seguridad del que hablamos hace un minuto, cuando debatíamos sobre la Guardia Europea de Fronteras y Costas: una gestión integrada de fronteras exteriores de la Unión que asegure la libre circulación de personas en el interior de la Unión Europea, pero que, al mismo tiempo, provea los instrumentos legislativos necesarios para armonizar las condiciones de autorización para entrada en la Unión Europea.

Entrada también para propósitos lícitos y legítimos: lo que llamamos los «viajeros de buena fe», las personas que llegan por unas estancias cortas —entre 90 y 180 días máximo— por motivos de turismo, de negocios, de actividades artísticas, deportivos, de estudio o de investigación.

Y todas estas situaciones han sido contempladas en este Reglamento europeo sobre visados después de un trabajo muy detallado de integración de todas las enmiendas y las posiciones que han sido escuchadas.

Hemos conseguido un equilibrio finalmente razonable para asegurar unas mismas condiciones de autorización de acceso al territorio de la Unión Europea, de tasas de visado —por tanto, de precio para la obtención de la autorización para la entrada—, de formularios de solicitud, de la relación de documentos justificativos de la entrada...

Y, por supuesto, me he esforzado, contra viento y marea, para preservar el objetivo de que se trataba: mejor facilitación, que sea más fácil el acceso a la Unión Europea para los viajeros de buena fe, para las personas que ingresan de buena fe.

Y esto es importante, particularmente teniendo en cuenta que vengo de un país al que llegan millones y millones y millones de turistas al año; vengo de una comunidad, una región ultraperiférica —Canarias— a la que vienen 18 millones de turistas al año y, por tanto, resulta enormemente importante mantener el propósito de facilitación de la entrada, del acceso al espacio Schengen.

Algunas de las enmiendas que hemos conseguido equilibrar en la ley en su texto definitivo son las relativas a la tasa del visado: entre 60 y 80 euros para adaptarlo a los costes reales, con reducción para los menores de 18 años, para los menores de 6 años, y con excepciones para estudiantes, investigadores y también artistas y deportistas.

Hemos establecido un compromiso en relación con el seguro de salud para que la Comisión lo revise en los quince meses siguientes a la entrada en vigor de la nueva ley europea, y hemos establecido también una razonable composición de intereses en lo relativo a los plazos fijados para la obtención de visados, de modo que se hace más fácil y también más barato, teniendo en cuenta que comprar billetes de avión con mucha anticipación facilita el acceso a la Unión Europea a las personas que soliciten el visado con una gran anticipación.

Pero finalmente quiero hacer referencia a la importancia que tiene preservar la facilitación frente al enfoque centrado en la seguridad, porque ha habido una contaminación del acceso de los viajeros de buena fe a la Unión Europea con la lucha contra la inmigración irregular y contra el terrorismo, que nada tiene que ver con el acceso por propósitos lícitos a la Unión Europea.

Y, finalmente, frente al intento de imponer una vinculación mecánica con el retorno de los inmigrantes irregulares, hemos conseguido un equilibrio, de modo que se ha establecido la categoría de los incentivos positivos a terceros países que cooperen en la prevención de la inmigración irregular, para que la ley europea tenga la mejor recepción por los Estados miembros posible.

**Dimitris Avramopoulos**, *Member of the Commission*. – Mr President, I welcome the agreement on this important file. I would like once again to praise our rapporteur, Mr López Aguilar, and of course the shadow rapporteurs, for their work on this new legislation. The tourism and travel industry plays, as we all know, a key role in the European economy, and not only representing around 10% of the European Union's GDP. Lengthy and cumbersome procedures can deter tourists from travelling to Europe. This would deprive us of investment and spending and affect in a negative way the European Union's economy. The agreed changes will make it easier for millions of travellers to obtain a visa to come to the European Union every year, facilitating tourism, trade and business.

Making the process easier will not mean a free pass to the European Union or more lax security checks. The new rules will actually improve and strengthen our security standards to detect those who pose a threat or have no right to enter the European Union. A new mechanism in our Visa Code will enable us to use the leverage of our visa policy, in cooperation with non-EU countries, when it comes to the return and readmission of irregular migrants.

The new rules include procedures that are more flexible for travellers coming to the Schengen area. Why? According to the current rules, the earliest date one can file an application is three months prior to their trip. The new rules extend this period to six months. The equal treatment of applicants will also be ensured. Frequent travellers with a positive visa history can receive a multiple entry visa, with a gradually-increasing validity period from one year to a maximum of five years. This will save time and decrease costs both for applicants and Member States. At the same time, the fulfilment of entry conditions by the travellers will be thoroughly and repeatedly verified in all cases.

A moderate increase of the Schengen visa fee from EUR 60 to EUR 80 is also suggested in order to secure additional resources for strengthening security. This modest increase will allow Member States to maintain adequate levels of consular staff worldwide. This will ensure stronger security screenings as well as the upgrading of ID equipment and software without representing an obstacle for the visa applicants.

To sum it all up, the new EU Visa Code will adapt the rules to evolving security concerns, challenges linked to migration and new opportunities offered by technological developments. I hope you will support this compromise reached and I am looking forward, of course, to our debate.

But now, at the end of my introductory remarks, I would like to turn to my native language to say some words.

Κύριε Πρόεδρε, αγαπητοί φίλοι, είναι η τελευταία σημερινή μας συνάντηση. Εμείς, όπως ξέρετε, ως Επιτροπή θα μείνουμε μέχρι το τέλος του Οκτωβρίου, αλλά κάποιοι από εσάς δεν θα είναι μαζί μας σε λίγο καιρό από τώρα. Θα ήθελα να σας εκφράσω τις θερμές μου ευχαριστίες, γιατί αυτά τα 4,5 χρόνια εργαστήκαμε πολύ, μέσα σε πνεύμα αλληλεγγύης, σε αυτόν τον δημοκρατικό χώρο όπου υπήρξαν θέσεις και αντιθέσεις και διαφορετικές απόψεις. Ωστόσο, σε τελευταία ανάλυση, ο κοινός μας τόπος ήταν να δώσουμε πειστικές απαντήσεις σε μεγάλες προκλήσεις και προβλήματα, όπως αυτό της μετανάστευσης και της ασφάλειας. Χωρίς τη δική σας βοήθεια δεν θα είχαμε πετύχει τίποτα και, αν σήμερα λέμε ότι αφήνουμε πίσω μας μια κληρονομιά, αυτό οφείλεται σε αυτήν τη συνεργασία.

Θέλω, λοιπόν, να σας εκφράσω την ευγνωμοσύνη μου και να ευχηθώ σε όσους από εσάς βρεθείτε στο επόμενο Κοινοβούλιο, να συνεχίσετε με το ίδιο πάθος και με βαθιά συνείδηση του καθήκοντος το έργο σας, αλλά και σε εσάς που θα βρεθείτε κάπου αλλού, να θυμάστε πάντοτε ότι αυτό το πέρασμά σας από τη ζωή ήταν κάτι χρήσιμο για την πατρίδα σας και για την Ευρώπη.

Θα ήθελα επίσης να εκφράσω τις θερμές μου ευχαριστίες σε αυτούς που βρίσκονται πίσω από τη δημόσια αυτή σκηνή. Στους διερχόμενους μας, που καμιά φορά τους κάνουμε τη ζωή δύσκολη. Εγώ φρόντιζα τουλάχιστον να μιλάω αργά, ελπίζω να το έχουν εκτιμήσει. Από την άλλη μεριά όμως, και τους huissiers, όλους αυτούς τους ωραίους ανθρώπους που καθημερινά μας συνοδεύουν στην αίθουσα και παρακολουθούν από κοντά τη δουλειά μας, προσφέροντάς μας τις όμορφες υπηρεσίες τους, αλλά και τους φωτογράφους, που αποτυπώνουν με το ταλέντο τους και την έμπνευσή τους αυτό που θα αφήσετε όλοι σε ανάμνηση του μεγάλου σας έργου στην αιωνιότητα. Εγώ θα ήθελα να σας ευχαριστήσω προσωπικά.

Έμαθα πολλά από αυτό το πέρασμά μου από το Κοινοβούλιο και νομίζω ότι φεύγοντας, όταν έρθει η ώρα να προχωρήσουμε και εμείς, θα μπορούμε να λέμε πολύ απλά ότι ήμασταν και εμείς τότε εκεί, όταν κρινόταν από τη δική μας δουλειά το μέλλον της μεγάλης μας χώρας, της Ευρώπης. Κινηθήκαμε με βάση αρχές και αξίες και πρέπει να σας πω ότι αυτός εδώ ο χώρος, αυτό το Κοινοβούλιο μπορεί να είναι υπερήφανο με όλους τους εκπροσώπους του, γιατί πράγματι αντιπροσωπεύει το βαθύτερο νόημα της δημοκρατίας και των ανώτερων και ευγενών αξιών πάνω στις οποίες χτίστηκε η Ευρώπη. Σας ευχαριστώ πολύ.

(χειροκροτήματα)

**President.** – We thank you Commissioner. We also thank you for your cooperation and, with the previous report, you can say that you were present at the creation, to invoke a title which has a certain aura around it. Thank you very much for everything you have done, and we are sure that our colleagues appreciate your activity.

**Isabella De Monte, Relatore per parere della Commissione per i trasporti e il turismo.** – Signor Presidente, onorevoli colleghi, grazie al Commissario per le Sue parole che ricambio a Lei e a tutti i suoi collaboratori e a tutto il suo staff.

Riguardo all'oggetto di oggi, esprimo la mia soddisfazione per gli sviluppi che ha fatto questa rifusione del Codice dei visti per facilitare la mobilità, come ad esempio la possibilità di presentare domande fino a sei mesi prima di un soggiorno previsto; le opzioni per tariffe ridotte per i giovani; la facilitazione per i visti di ingresso multipli per i viaggiatori frequenti e il riconoscimento specifico di professionisti della cultura e gli atleti.

È spiacevole che non si sia colta l'occasione per affrontare l'obsoleta restrizione normativa che impedisce ai viaggiatori legittimi di rimanere più a lungo nello spazio Schengen senza superare le soglie legali nei singoli Stati membri. Il Parlamento europeo ha dimostrato, due volte, il sostegno a questi soggiorni più lunghi e gli attuali 90 giorni con una limitazione di 180 giorni sono stati concepiti quando l'area di Schengen era più piccola.

**Heinz K. Becker, im Namen der PPE-Fraktion.** – Herr Präsident, Herr Kommissar! Es ist soweit: Nach mehreren Jahren stimmen wir heute über den neuen EU-Visakodex ab, wo ich als Verhandler der Europäischen Volkspartei dem Berichterstatter und den Schattenberichterstatter der anderen Fraktionen hier im Haus meinen ausdrücklichen Dank aussprechen will. Das Ergebnis kann sich sehen lassen. Ich will auch ausdrücklich der Kommission danken, deren neue Vorschläge den Weg zum heutigen Visakodex vorbereitet haben, und der rumänischen Ratspräsidentschaft für einen konstruktiven Dialog.

Wir haben erreicht, dass die Europäische Union in Zukunft den Ausbau der Beziehungen zu den Drittstaaten deutlich fördert und erleichtert. Das werden wir mit neuem Wachstum des Geschäftslebens erleben – im Tourismus, der Kultur, dem Sport usw.

Eines der Kernziele der EVP konnten wir realisieren, gegen welches dann schlussendlich unsere links-grünen Freunde auch ihren Widerstand aufgegeben haben: Es ist die Koppelung der Visavergabe an die Rücknahme irregulärer Migranten durch die Drittstaaten. Drittstaaten, die sich dabei nicht kooperativ verhalten, werden weniger bis keine Visa gewährt und/oder von ihnen werden höhere Visagebühren eingefordert. Zukünftig soll es Visavorteile nur gegen Rücknahme geben.

Leider wurde aber dieses Prinzip bei der ebenfalls heute zur Abstimmung stehenden europäischen Außengrenzschutzerneuerung nicht verwirklicht. Ich begrüße zwar ausdrücklich die Stärkung von Frontex durch Personal und Mittel für einen effektiven Küstengrenzschutz, aber zugleich bedaure ich, dass Frontex den Nicht-EU-Staaten bei Rückführungen in ihre Herkunftsländer nicht helfen kann. Außerdem ist es äußerst bedauerlich, dass Frontex immer noch die Erlaubnis des Mitgliedstaats benötigt.

Ich bedanke mich für eine faszinierende Zeit in diesem Haus und für die großartige Zusammenarbeit mit Ihnen allen!

**Tanja Fajon**, *v imenu skupine S&D*. – Gospod predsedujoči, vesela sem, da nam je po štirih letih pogajanj in že drugem predlogu Evropske komisije uspelo oblikovati nova pravila za pridobivanje vizumov. Če jih sprejmemo, bodo postopki za potnike iz tretjih držav, ki potujejo v Unijo, poenostavljeni, organi držav članic pa bodo tudi naprej obdržali odločilno vlogo.

Evropska politika dodeljevanja vizumov je izjemno pomembna, saj lajša potovanja ljudi, krepi gospodarske, turistične in kulturne stike in pomembno krepi podobo odrte, a varne Evrope. Naj spomnim le, kaj je odprava vizumov pomenila za države Zahodnega Balkana, čeprav ne govorimo o odpravi, pa vendar. Pomenila je sprejem vrste pomembnih ukrepov v boju proti trgovini z ljudmi, s potovalnimi dokumenti in z varovanjem meja na eni strani in na drugi strani odpravo dolgih in nehumanih kolon pred konzulati za potovanja posebej za mlade ljudi in turiste, ki so jim bila vrata v Evropo praktično zaprta.

Vizumska politika je ena najbolj otipljivih evropskih politik za ljudi in nujno je, da ostane verodostojna, delujoča in v korist potnikov. Z novimi pravili, ki jih sprejemamo, bo vizume mogoče pridobiti bistveno hitreje – tudi do šest mesecev prej. Bolj dostopna bo tudi cena, kar pozdravljam, in možni bodo popusti za mladoletnike, študente in raziskovalce, za otroke bo vizum celo brezplačen. Vlogo bo po novem mogoče oddati tudi elektronsko, kar je bistveno v dobi digitalizacije.

Močno pa mi je žal, kar je opozoril tudi kolega Juan López Aguilar, da nam preboja ni uspelo doseči pri humanitarnih vizumih. Ti bi – po mojem trdnem prepričanju – zmanjšali umiranje nedolžnih civilistov na migrantskih poteh. Žal nam ne uspe odpirati pravnih in varnih poti za ljudi, ki v Uniji potrebujejo zaščito, in to je sramota za Evropo.

**Helga Stevens**, *namens de ECR-Fractie*. – Voorzitter, collega's, de bedoeling van deze hervorming van de visumcode was het gemakkelijker te maken om toeristische of zakenvisums aan te vragen. Dat is belangrijk voor onze economie en ook onze toerismesector. Maar de socialisten blokkeerden lang de boel omdat ze per se de mogelijkheid wilden invoeren om humanitaire visa te kunnen uitdelen aan vluchtelingen via onze consulaten waar ook ter wereld. Nu dat obstakel eindelijk van de baan is, kunnen we op de valreep nog stemmen over dit voorstel.

Concreet kunnen aanvragen en interviews nu via internet gedaan worden. Toeristen en zakenmensen kunnen zo nog gemakkelijker afreizen naar het Schengengebied. De visumkosten zullen lager zijn en een aantal bewijsdocumenten zijn niet meer nodig. Mensen zullen ook, indien zij eerdere visums correct gebruikten, visums met een langere duurtijd kunnen aanvragen.

Tegelijkertijd kan de EU net die voordelen als stok achter de deur gebruiken. Als landen niet meewerken met het terugnemen van irreguliere migranten, zullen hun onderdanen die voordelen verliezen. Hun burgers zullen dan bijvoorbeeld langer moeten wachten op een beslissing en er meer voor moeten betalen. Dat geldt ook als die landen weigeren op praktisch vlak mee te werken, zoals bij de identificatie en het uitreiken van papieren. Ook is het belangrijk dat EU-landen aan die buitengrenzen geen dagvisums meer kunnen uitdelen aan dagjestoeristen. Achterpoortjes die onze buitengrenzen verzwakken, moeten dicht!

Beste collega's, dit was mijn laatste interventie in dit Parlement. Ik wil iedereen het beste wensen voor de toekomst. Bedankt voor de fijne samenwerking.

**Gérard Deprez**, *au nom du groupe ALDE*. – Monsieur le Président, Monsieur le Commissaire, 60 millions, ce sont près de 60 millions de personnes qui viennent chaque année de l'étranger pour visiter les pays de l'Union européenne. Certaines viennent de pays comme les États-Unis, l'Australie ou le Canada et sont exemptées de l'obligation de visas. D'autres, les ressortissants de 105 pays, principalement d'Afrique, d'Asie et d'Amérique latine, doivent disposer d'un visa pour pouvoir pénétrer dans l'espace Schengen.

La refonte du code des visas, que nous allons approuver, je l'espère, est faite pour eux. Elle a pour objectif fondamental de faciliter les voyages touristiques et d'affaires pour les personnes de bonne foi, tout en prévenant au maximum les risques pour la sécurité intérieure et le risque migratoire.

L'accord que nous avons réalisé avec le Conseil est un bon accord. Un visa pourra être obtenu en moins de 15 jours et être demandé six mois à l'avance, au lieu de trois mois actuellement. Les visas à entrées multiples pourront aller jusqu'à cinq ans et seront délivrés selon des règles communes à tous les États membres, ce qui n'est pas le cas actuellement. Les frais d'obtention des visas, qui n'ont pas évolué depuis plus de 10 ans, seront certes augmentés, sauf cas particulier, de 60 à 80 euros pour les adultes, mais ils resteront, et de loin, inférieurs aux 133 euros demandés par les États-Unis et aux 125 euros demandés par la Chine. L'Europe n'est pas seulement plus attirante, elle est aussi, il faut le répéter, moins chère.

Enfin, nous sommes parvenus à nous mettre d'accord avec le Conseil sur le point particulièrement délicat du lien à établir entre le pays d'origine et l'acceptation des visas de retour des personnes qui n'ont pas été autorisées à rester sur le territoire européen.

Pour conclure – Monsieur le Président, laissez-moi 30 secondes –, je voudrais remercier notre rapporteur, Juan Fernando López Aguilar, pour son engagement dans ce dossier. Félicitations, Juan. Je voudrais remercier nos collègues pour la qualité de nos échanges, en particulier M. Becker et M<sup>me</sup> Vergiat, avec qui les échanges ont été vifs, mais toujours cordiaux. Merci à nos collaborateurs et à nos collaboratrices pour le magnifique travail qu'ils ont fourni.

Je termine, Monsieur le Président. J'ai siégé dans cette assemblée pendant 30 ans. Ceci est ma dernière intervention et je n'ai qu'un mot à dire: il n'y a pas de plus beau projet politique que de réaliser le rêve européen. Vive l'Europe!

**Marie-Christine Vergiat**, *au nom du groupe GUE/NGL*. – Monsieur le Président, les mouvements de population n'ont jamais été aussi importants dans le monde. Un milliard de personnes, surtout du Nord, se déplacent, voyagent d'un pays à l'autre chaque année. Sachez, M. Deprez, que ce sont 500 millions de personnes qui entrent chaque année dans l'Union européenne. On compte 250 millions de migrants dans le monde, c'est-à-dire de personnes qui s'installent pour plus d'un an sur un territoire autre que le leur pour des motifs divers et variés. Parmi celles-ci, 60 millions sont nées en Europe.

Ce code, malgré tous les efforts de notre rapporteur, manque d'équilibre entre facilitation des déplacements, notamment touristiques, renforcement des garanties de procédure, migration régulière et migration dite «irrégulière». Les politiques européennes, malgré les réalités, malgré les morts, se tournent de plus en plus vers le contrôle des frontières, la lutte contre les migrations dites «irrégulières» et le retour de ceux qui n'ont pas la chance d'accéder à des voies de séjour régulier parce qu'ils ne sont pas nés au bon endroit. Ces migrations régulières sont pourtant 20 fois plus importantes que celles dite «irrégulières», environ 2,5 millions chaque année. Tant mieux! En réalité, c'est surtout aux réfugiés à qui on ferme les portes, c'est pourquoi un de mes principaux regrets au cours des deux mandats que je viens d'effectuer est le refus du Conseil, des États membres, de créer des visas humanitaires, car 90 % de ceux à qui l'Union européenne a accordé la protection internationale au cours des trois dernières années sont arrivés de façon irrégulière. On pourrait faire autrement.

Monsieur le Président, 30 secondes, si vous le permettez, parce que moi aussi, c'est ma dernière intervention. Je voudrais remercier tous ceux qui m'ont aidée au cours de ces deux mandats: mes collègues, j'en vois de nombreux avec qui j'ai eu beaucoup de plaisir à travailler, quels que soient les groupes politiques, et je m'en félicite; le personnel des groupes, mes collaborateurs, mais aussi tous les fonctionnaires de l'Assemblée, quels qu'ils soient, visibles ou invisibles, nos interprètes, mais aussi tous ceux qui nous permettent de travailler dans de très bonnes conditions, qu'on ne voit pas et qui pourtant sont là. Un grand merci à tous et à toutes, je continuerai de suivre avec intérêt et attention le travail du Parlement européen, parce que ce n'est pas un lieu inutile, comme veulent nous le faire croire beaucoup de nos concitoyens, à cause de certains discours. Pour moi, c'est un lieu où j'ai beaucoup appris.

**Bodil Valero (Verts/ALE).** – Herr talman! Visumkoden var det första ärende som jag fick ansvar för i min politiska grupp, de gröna. Det handlar nu även det sista inlägg som jag gör i plenum denna valperiod om. Det började i början av valperioden med ett väldigt bra förslag från kommissionen som inriktade sig på att man skulle göra det lättare för många att kunna komma till Europa och att det skulle vara lättare att komma flera gånger etc. Det strandade ju emellertid, som vi vet, i rådet när rådet inte ville gå med på de ändringsförslag som vi hade lagt fram från vår sida med exempelvis humanitärt visum.

När vi sedan fick tillbaka det nya förslaget var det ett helt annat förslag. Det utgick inte alls lika mycket från att göra det lättare, utan det hade också med förslag på att det skulle kopplas till återvändande. Även om vår föredragande har gjort ett jättearbete för att få in så mycket av parlamentets ståndpunkt som möjligt i det sista förslaget, så upplever vi att vi inte har lyckats få med allt. För vår del, för oss gröna, så är kopplingen till återvändandet det som gör att vi inte kommer att kunna rösta för detta betänkande, som i övrigt innehåller en hel del bra saker förstås.

En annan fråga är de höjda avgifterna. Det kommer att vara mycket svårt för familjer som vill komma hit, inte minst från fattigare länder, att faktiskt göra det med dessa väldigt höga avgifter. Då bryr jag mig inte om vad det kostar i USA eller i Kina eller någon annanstans. Det kommer att bli svårt för dessa människor, och det är vi inte för.

Tack allihopa för ett jättebra samarbete och lycka till alla som inte kommer vara kvar här.

**Tim Aker (EFDD).** – Mr President, the widely accepted definition of a state is a political entity having monopoly control over a set border and the territory within. This report on EU visas is another example where the EU desperately tries to pass itself off as a state. It does it when it legislates on fishing. With the passage of the Lisbon Treaty, it has done it on international affairs, and now it does it on border policy. A simple trading bloc it is not. Where it says 'harmonisation', it really means 'centralisation', one-size-fits-all and, sadly, there is no more subsidiarity.

The EU's track record on border mismanagement should give Member States pause for thought. What is given to the EU is seldom given back, and we in the UK are finding that out. Visa requirements should be a competence of Member States, not the European Union. This report politicises visas and attempts to bribe or threaten selected third countries to take back illegal immigrants, or their own citizens will face higher fees as a result. These, we might add, are people the EU called to Europe at the beginning of the so-called refugee crisis and the waves of illegal immigration coming to Europe's shores. The EU is trying to dig its way out of the hole it dug itself. Well, keep on digging. You'll see where it gets you.

**Gilles Lebreton, au nom du groupe ENF.** – Monsieur le Président, la modification du code européen des visas qui nous est proposée aujourd'hui est officiellement destinée, je cite, à «faciliter les voyages de ressortissants de pays tiers vers l'Union européenne». C'est donc un nouvel outil d'immigration auquel je m'oppose fermement.

L'obtention des visas de court séjour est par exemple facilitée de façon imprudente. C'est ainsi que les étrangers pourront désormais les demander à nos frontières, ce qui multipliera les risques d'erreurs et d'abus.

Le texte résiste, d'autre part, à l'idée raisonnable de refuser de délivrer des visas aux ressortissants des États qui refusent de reprendre leurs clandestins. Ce serait pourtant une mesure de bon sens qui permettrait de protéger l'Europe. Certes, le principe de cette mesure est officiellement acté, mais ses conditions de réalisation sont tellement complexes qu'elles ne vident de toute portée concrète.

Le texte envisageait enfin, dans sa première mouture, de créer une nouvelle filière d'immigration légale, en créant des visas humanitaires européens. C'était d'autant plus choquant que cela n'aurait évidemment pas provoqué la diminution de l'immigration illégale, qui était l'objectif affiché. Heureusement, cette idée délirante a été abandonnée.

Nous sommes à la veille d'une submersion migratoire de grande ampleur, liée à l'explosion démographique de l'Afrique. Ce n'est pas parce qu'on prendra quelques centaines de milliers de migrants légaux qu'on n'aura pas des millions de migrants illégaux. Le système Schengen a échoué. Il faut le remplacer par une protection beaucoup plus efficace des frontières nationales et des frontières extérieures de l'Union.

Je suis particulièrement heureux que ma dernière intervention de cette législature me donne l'occasion de le rappeler, dans cet hémicycle. Le dernier débat auquel je participe aujourd'hui ne porte pas sur l'accessoire, mais sur l'essentiel: c'est l'avenir de la civilisation européenne qui est en jeu.

**Agustín Díaz de Mera García Consuegra (PPE).** – Señor presidente, señor comisario, felicito a Juan Fernando.

El establecimiento de un régimen común de visados no solo es relevante en materia de seguridad y prevención de la inmigración irregular sino que resulta fundamental también para el correcto funcionamiento de muchos e importantes sectores económicos. Por ejemplo, el turismo, que reviste especial importancia para muchas regiones de Europa. Solo en 2017 se expidieron casi catorce millones de visados Schengen para estancias de corta duración.

Unos procedimientos más flexibles, como la tramitación electrónica, con hasta seis meses de antelación para la solicitud, la posibilidad de pedir visados para entradas múltiples con una validez prolongada, la destinación de más recursos para reforzar la seguridad o una mejora en la cooperación en materia de readmisión son algunas de las mejoras de la política de visados. Los cambios acordados potenciarán el turismo, el comercio y los negocios, reforzando al mismo tiempo la seguridad y reduciendo los riesgos de la explotación irregular.

Es imprescindible que cualquier mejora de la política común de visados se haga de acuerdo con las especificaciones exigidas por el SIS y el VIS, con el fin de facilitar la implementación de la interoperabilidad en los sistemas de información.

Señor presidente, yo también me voy. Son treinta y cinco años de vida pública que quiero resumir en una palabra: gracias. O mejor, en dos: muchas gracias. Hasta siempre. Y gracias, de todo corazón.

**Claude Moraes (S&D).** – Mr President, thank you very much for your sensitive handling of this session. It was not so much about the Visa Code as goodbye from many colleagues. But, on the Visa Code, let me thank the rapporteur for this ambitious agreement to modernise and simplify the procedure for obtaining short-term visas, on which many colleagues have commented.

May I also just do what other colleagues have done, with your indulgence. This is my last speech as Chair of the Committee on Civil Liberties, Justice and Home Affairs (LIBE). I wasn't going to do this – I promised that I wasn't – but I did notice there are many colleagues here from LIBE and, after hearing Mr Díaz de Mera García Consuegra, there is one particular thing that I wanted to say to them, which is that, if you're reading the voting list, you'll see one report after another from our committee. What you have seen in colleagues who are assembled here are experts on Schengen, visas, borders and Dublin – Ms Wikström is scribbling away – and on the asylum package, and, while you see many reports being voted on – you can thank Commissioner Avramopoulos – you will see that many of our reports are frozen and blocked. This is because we are something of an extraordinary committee, the most prolific legislative committee in Parliament at the moment, but we are dealing with some of the toughest issues because we are dealing with a very tough political climate.

I want to thank from the bottom of my heart all of the members of the LIBE Committee who I've had the privilege to work with. They have been producing high-quality legislation. It is my greatest hope that, in the next term, this legislation will be unfrozen, and that the Member States will understand what has been produced in this Parliament – the quality of the legislation, the vision that has been produced – and understand that this European Parliament is not a rubber stamp. It is full of high-quality legislators who had vision and passion. It's been my absolute privilege to work with them and to learn from them, and I will never forget this experience.

*(Applause)*

**Marek Jurek (ECR).** – Panie Przewodniczący! Ja też przez pięć lat w tej Izbie służyłem swojej ojczyźnie, ale również służyłem prawom i współpracy narodów Europy. I ma dla mnie znaczenie symboliczne, że na koniec rozmawiamy o granicach, dlatego że granice stanowią istotę państw. Granice mogą być oczywiście otwarte, i dobrze jeżeli są otwarte, ale o ich kontroli, o prawie pobytu, o wykonywaniu suwerenności na terytorium narodowym zawsze na końcu muszą decydować państwa.

Widzieliśmy rolę państw w pracy nad tym kodeksem wizowym. Próbowano wykorzystać go do przemyślenia pojęcia „nieuregulowanej imigracji”, która miała zastąpić po prostu kategoryczne stwierdzenie, że coś jest legalne albo nielegalne. Nie można mówić o rządach prawa, jeżeli łamanie prawa nazywamy „działaniem nieuregulowanym”. Europa będzie istnieć tak długo, jak długo będzie miała swoje państwa i tylko państwa, strzegąc granicy państw, będą strzec granic Europy.

**Cecilia Wikström (ALDE).** – Herr talman! Jag vill också tacka föredraganden för arbetet med den gemensamma viseringskoden. Jag uppskattar det engagemang och den beslutsamhet som har präglat processen med denna viktiga rättsakt. Jag stöder de kompromisser som parlamentet har enats om, särskilt vad gäller de sänkta kostnaderna för visum och möjligheterna att få visum för flera inresor med längre giltighetstid. De nya bestämmelserna kommer att förbättra tryggheten och göra det möjligt att upptäcka potentiella säkerhetsrisker mycket lättare.

Herr talman, kära kolleger! Detta är nu mitt allra sista anförande i kammaren. Därför vill jag ta tillfället i akt att tacka för alla debatter, allt arbete som vi har utfört tillsammans under dessa tio fina år i den europeiska demokratins tjänst. Jag vill understryka att när politiken upphör då består vänskapen. Jag vill önska alla lycka till, antingen man fortsätter här i Europaparlamentet eller på den nya resa som livet tar oss på var och en.

**Martina Anderson (GUE/NGL).** – Mr President, unfortunately, this proposal is another attack on the rights and safety of migrants and vulnerable persons. Many of the so-called progressives have bowed to the pressure of the far right, happy to castigate vulnerable persons as security threats in order to put up barbed wire, harden the borders and keep people out of fortress Europe.

Yet the EU defends the position whereby wealthy nationals of third countries purchase golden visas whilst Western military intervention creates refugees who don't have access to humanitarian visas. Worse still, refugees are horse-traded with third countries, some with shameful human rights records, in order to speed up returns, as if they were unwanted produce, not people. This is just another example of exporting the EU's humanitarian obligations to help all of those who are most vulnerable, regardless of nationality or economic status. No human being is illegal.

**Ignazio Corrao (EFDD).** – Signor Presidente, onorevoli colleghi, l'industria del turismo è importantissima per lo sviluppo economico dell'Unione europea. Nel 2018 ha portato in Europa più di 700 miliardi di euro, conta più di 2 milioni di imprese che impiegano più di 12 milioni di persone. Nel 2017, 671 milioni di turisti si sono recati in Europa e nel 2018 il settore viaggi e turismo ha contribuito direttamente al 3,9 % del PIL dell'Unione, rappresentando il 5,1 % della forza lavoro totale. Questi dati parlano da soli. L'industria del turismo è in crescita ed è importante agevolare chi ha un interesse legittimo a recarsi in Europa.

Questa riforma è il giusto passo in questa direzione, semplifica il quadro normativo di riferimento, riduce i tempi e adatta le procedure per il rilascio del visto alle nuove tecnologie. Ho fiducia che questa riforma potrà anche servire a migliorare la cooperazione con i paesi terzi per agevolare i rimpatri dei propri cittadini che si trovano in Europa in condizioni di irregolarità.

La politica dei visti è un'importante leva che l'Unione ha a propria disposizione e che si deve poter utilizzare per incentivare i paesi terzi a cooperare in materia di rimpatri.

**Carlos Coelho (PPE).** – Senhor Presidente, a revisão do código de vistos é mais um elemento na revisão da política europeia de vistos, mas com efeitos que a ultrapassam largamente. Com esta reforma estamos a facilitar e a promover o turismo, setor essencial para a União Europeia e para Portugal, e a reforçar a segurança através dos acordos de readmissão. Vamos reduzir a burocracia associada aos pedidos de visto de turismo, vamos alargar a rede de recolha de períodos e encurtar prazos, tornando assim mais rápida e simples a obtenção de um visto para turistas e viajantes frequentes.



Atendendo também às especificidades da indústria dos cruzeiros, tão relevante para as nossas regiões ultraperiféricas, como a Madeira e os Açores, harmonizamos as regras para entradas múltiplas, simplificando, assim, a vida aos passageiros que vão percorrendo a nossa costa.

Por outro lado, reforçamos também a segurança em articulação com o novo sistema de vistos da União, de que tive a honra de ser o vosso relator, e iremos recolher mais informação e conduzir mais controlos de segurança antes mesmo da emissão destes vistos. Mais ainda, ligamos de forma clara política de vistos à política de readmissão na União Europeia, podendo assim premiar os Estados mais cooperantes.

Senhor Presidente, não tenho dúvidas de que esta é uma medida necessária e concreta para uma Europa mais próspera e mais segura e, por isso, parabéns a López Aguilar, parabéns a Claude Moraes e a todos os colegas da comissão LIBE.

**Cécile Kashetu Kyenge (S&D).** – Signor Presidente, onorevoli colleghi, mi consente un secondo per spendere due parole per la commissione in cui ho lavorato, come ultimo intervento in commissione LIBE in questa legislatura.

Abbiamo fatto molto in questa legislatura per contribuire a creare un sistema europeo comune di asilo equo e solidale. Abbiamo svolto un lavoro di squadra, appianando dove è possibile le nostre divergenze e cercando di lavorare investendo sui nostri valori. Continuerò nel mio intento e continuerò a farlo sperando in una società giusta e spero che il voto dei cittadini europei mi permetterà di continuare questo percorso.

Abbiamo tanta strada da fare. Ecco, dopo quattro anni di intensi negoziati, possiamo dire con un certo orgoglio che l'Unione europea si dota di una politica comune in materia di visti. E quindi con questo intendo ringraziare la commissione in cui ho lavorato, la commissione LIBE.

Una politica che forma parte integrante della creazione di uno spazio senza frontiere interne e che rimane uno strumento essenziale per facilitare gli spostamenti, siano essi dovuti a ragioni economiche o di svago. Una politica che crea crescita e che deve essere coerente con le altre politiche dell'Unione, come quelle in materia di relazioni esterne, scambi commerciali, istruzione, cultura e turismo.

Siamo riusciti a semplificare le procedure, contenere i costi ed individuare con precisione quale sia lo Stato membro competente a esaminare una domanda, in particolare quando il richiedente intende visitare più Stati membri.

Mi concede qualche minuto in più Presidente, perché ho fatto la prima parte ringraziando la Commissione.

Abbiamo previsto la possibilità per i richiedenti di presentare online i moduli di domanda e di poterli firmare elettronicamente. E soprattutto abbiamo salvaguardato la possibilità di ricorso ai richiedenti cui sia stato rifiutato il visto. Sono stati quattro anni di lunghi negoziati, ma che hanno comunque consentito a questa riforma di rimanere all'interno di un quadro giuridico che garantisce il pieno rispetto dei diritti fondamentali.

**President.** – Colleagues, the reason why you find us still debating is that, this being the last part-session for many of our colleagues, there were also some personal additions to the speeches, and therefore I would ask for your understanding in this situation.

#### *Catch-the-eye procedure*

**Michaela Šojdrová (PPE).** – Pane předsedající, já naprosto chápu, že předposlední den plenárního zasedání v našem mandátu je ta koncentrace menší, nicméně projednáváme novelizaci vízového kodexu, a to je téma, které je velmi vážné pro všechny občany Evropské unie. Já tuto novelizaci podporuji. Myslím, že se podařilo dosáhnout dobrého kompromisu z hlediska zjednodušení vízového postupu pro legální cestovatele, kteří jsou registrovaní v systému a kteří nemusí být osobně přítomni podávání žádosti. Nebo mohou být vydávána vícenásobná víza, tedy s dlouhodobou platností, to všechno zjednodušuje ten proces.

Na druhou stranu, pro větší bezpečnost uvnitř Evropské unie se vzhledem k migračnímu tlaku zpřísňují určitá pravidla. Je to například zvýšení poplatku za víza. Nebo také pro usnadnění návratové politiky je zde opatření, které podporují.

**Νότης Μαρίας (ECR).** – Κύριε Πρόεδρε, συζητούμε τον κώδικα θεωρήσεων, που είναι βεβαίως μια σημαντική διαδικασία, διότι αποσκοπεί στο να βάλει τάξη στο ποιοι μπορούν να εισέρχονται στην Ευρωπαϊκή Ένωση. Την ίδια στιγμή όμως, κύριε Πρόεδρε, συνεχίζεται η διαδικασία καραντίνας απέναντι σε όσους ταξιδεύουν με αεροπλάνο από την Αθήνα στις Βρυξέλλες, με παράνομους ελέγχους διαβατηρίων στο αεροδρόμιο Βρυξελλών, ενώ αυτό απαγορεύεται και το έχω καταγγείλει επανειλημμένα σε αυτήν την αίθουσα. Έχω ζητήσει εξηγήσεις από την Επιτροπή και δεν παίρνουμε καμία απάντηση, και πάλι, προ ημερών, συνέβη το ίδιο.

Επομένως, το να θέλουμε να βάλουμε μία τάξη στο ποιοι έρχονται στα σύνορα και εν συνεχεία στην Ευρωπαϊκή Ένωση είναι σημαντικό, αλλά το να επιτρέπεται η επαναφορά παράνομων ελέγχων από το Βέλγιο, την Αυστρία και άλλες χώρες σε όσους ταξιδεύουν από την Ελλάδα είναι απαράδεκτο.

**Bill Etheridge (EFDD).** – Mr President, I hate to be the one, after this atmosphere of backslapping and everyone being so nice to each other as you're all leaving public service, to pop the bubble of joy and harmony, but I'm going to do it. Visas are the responsibility of nation states. They are not the responsibility of an overriding, over-powerful superstate. This is yet another example of over-centralising, too much power going to the middle, which damages the individual nation states. People in Greece need different people coming than people in Germany, in France. We're all different, thank God, and long may that remain the same.

So, I wish you all well, those of you who are leaving. I think you've given a lot of your life to this project. Sadly, much of that, I think, has been misguided and this most certainly is one of the worst ideas I've heard here.

**President.** – Well, what shall we do? We live only once.

**Ruža Tomašić (ECR).** – Poštovani predsjedavajući, najvažnija nova odredba promjene Zakonika o vizama jest povezivanje izdavanja viza sa suradnjom na ponovnom prihvatu.

U tom smislu svesrdno pozdravljam kreiranje mehanizama koji će Europskoj uniji omogućiti to da politiku viza koristi kako bi treće zemlje potaknula da surađuju u segmentu ponovnog prihvata.

Komisija je napokon odlučila uvažiti činjenicu da vizna politika ima važnu ulogu u mogućnosti boljeg utjecaja na treće zemlje u smislu ponovnog prihvata nezakonitih migranata. Iako je ovo mali korak u pozitivnom smjeru, svakako ga pozdravljam, s nadom da će novi parlamentarni sazivi i Europska komisija u novom mandatu viznu politiku i politiku migracija prilagoditi novoj političkoj realnosti.

*(Înceierea intervențiilor la cerere)*

**Miguel Arias Cañete, Member of the Commission.** – Mr President, thank you for this very important debate. The new regulation will modernise the Common Visa Policy so that security is preserved while legitimate travel is facilitated. It will ensure equal treatment for all visa applicants and promote travel to the European Union for tourism and business purposes. In that way it will contribute to the European Union's economy and growth, people-to-people contacts and cultural exchanges. But beyond that, the new rules will enhance our ability to detect threats and will provide us with a stronger framework for cooperation with non-European Union countries when it comes to the return and readmission of irregular immigrants.

I strongly hope you will support the compromise reached on the new European Union Visa Code in the vote. I can assure you that, from our side, the Commission will play its role in the implementation of these new provisions.

**Juan Fernando López Aguilar, ponente.** – Señor presidente, agradezco el tono constructivo que ha dominado la inmensa mayoría de las intervenciones que anuncian un voto favorable.

Soy consciente de que este instrumento, esta nueva ley europea va a dar respuesta a esos setenta, ochenta, noventa millones de personas que visitan por propósitos lícitos la Unión Europea con carácter regular anualmente, provenientes de más de ciento cincuenta países.

Pero es cierto que el trabajo en el Parlamento Europeo no acaba jamás. Y, por tanto, claro que sí quedan asuntos pendientes. Entre ellos, en efecto, dar respuesta a la demanda humanitaria de aquellas personas que, huyendo de la desesperación o la persecución, intentan llegar al territorio de la Unión Europea y no pueden hacerlo regularmente, de modo que arriesgan la vida en el empeño, exponiéndose a los tráfico ilícitos y de explotación de personas.

Ese es el objetivo del visado humanitario que resultó de un voto favorable en este Parlamento Europeo con mayoría cualificada y al que la Comisión tiene la obligación de responder.

Estaremos vigilantes en este Parlamento Europeo en la próxima legislatura y en el próximo mandato de la Comisión para que la Comisión dé una respuesta a esa exigencia de al menos una vía legal, una vía regular para que puedan acceder al territorio de la Unión Europea las personas desesperadas que huyen de la persecución y se exponen a los tráfico ilícitos por una simple razón: porque no tenían ninguna vía legal o regular para intentarlo sin perder la vida en el empeño, o la de sus seres queridos.

Gracias, señor presidente. Gracias a todos los compañeros y compañeras en este debate por sus aportaciones muy constructivas. Gracias, de nuevo.

**President.** – Colleagues, thank you for coming in this great number to see how I thank you, and I wish you all the best, because this is also my last appearance in an official function. All the best to you all.

*(Applause)*

The debate is closed.

**PRÉSIDENCE: SYLVIE GUILLAUME**

*Vice-présidente*

## 15. Wznowienie posiedzenia

*(La séance est reprise à 17 h 10)*

**Philippe Lamberts (Verts/ALE).** – Madame la Présidente, c'est un plaisir de vous voir présider la dernière séance de vote de ce Parlement...

*(Exclamations)*

... Ah! Non! Il y a encore demain, c'est vrai! Je serai là, rassurez-vous, je ne comptais pas sécher une séance de vote. Je pense n'en avoir séché qu'une et c'était lorsque je m'étais fait opérer du dos.

Madame la Présidente, je voudrais, si vous me le permettez, m'adresser à M. Cañete en tant que représentant de la Commission.

Il y a plusieurs mois, ce Parlement a alerté la Commission, gardienne des traités, sur une situation potentielle de conflit d'intérêts touchant un Premier ministre en exercice de l'Union européenne, en l'occurrence le Premier ministre tchèque. Ce lundi, le commissaire Oettinger a été entendu par la commission du contrôle budgétaire et ce qu'il nous a dit, fondamentalement, c'est qu'en effet, apparemment, une situation de conflit d'intérêt persistait, mais qu'il fallait encore creuser les choses, qu'on n'était pas sûr et qu'il fallait continuer le travail. Nous constatons aujourd'hui que les autorités policières de Tchéquie mettent en cause explicitement et personnellement le Premier ministre tchèque. Et la Commission européenne se pose encore et toujours des questions!

Dois-je comprendre, Monsieur Cañete, que la Commission européenne a un motif politique de reporter toujours plus le travail d'investigation que nous lui avons demandé en vertu de son rôle de gardienne des traités?

Nous estimons que, lorsque le sentiment anti-européen ne cesse de progresser, justement parce qu'on soupçonne les représentants politiques de s'enrichir illégalement, il est du devoir de la Commission européenne de lever tout soupçon le plus vite possible. Je constate que ce n'est pas le cas aujourd'hui.

**La Présidente.** – Merci Monsieur Lamberts, le plaisir de vous écouter était partagé et j'espère que nous aurons l'occasion de nous entendre encore une autre fois.

**Daniele Viotti (S&D).** – Signor Presidente, onorevoli colleghi, intervengo perché io trovo incredibile che da quest'Aula non si levi una parola per quello che sta succedendo in Libia, non tanto sulla guerra perché la Libia è un paese in guerra, ma per quello che stanno subendo circa 200 000 profughi che vengono lasciati dall'Europa là a morire nei campi di concentramento, che vengono lasciati dall'Europa là a scomparire sotto le bombe di una guerra in corso.

Chiediamo tutti insieme ai capi di Stato e di governo di riaprire le rotte per le ONG e di salvare queste vite umane. Chiediamo ai nostri capi di Stato e di governo di portare in Europa e di liberare quel paese dai profughi, dalle donne e dai bambini e dagli uomini che sono sotto una guerra. Questo deve fare questo Parlamento, è il nostro ruolo!

**Eugen Freund (S&D).** – Madam President, I need one minute. You will not regret it and I say it's a challenge for the interpreters.

I looked it up, I could not find, the paragraph you have in mind, for one last speech here in this room, before the shovel and the broom, clears out the work we left behind, it sometimes almost made us blind.

But what I actually want to say, is thank you, thank you if I may; not only to the many friends, they can be women, can be gents, but also to those working here, behind the bar, serving us beer; distributing the voting list, assisting us to find the gist; down in the basement, the garage, providing cars, driving Farage, or Brok, Valero, Regner, Danti, who always said, 'Go fast, *avanti*'; the cleaning women, those who check the badges, and they never lack the courtesy that we so cherish, it will remain, will never perish. And then at last, those who translate the speeches that we love or hate, they struggle now with all my rhymes, but I will end and then the times will change, you will agree, so *danke*, thank you and *merci*.

*(Sustained applause)*

**La Présidente.** – Merci Monsieur Freund, je ne suis pas sûre d'avoir apprécié vos rimes, mais ces remerciements étaient parfaitement bienvenus.

**Ana Miranda (Verts/ALE).** – Señora presidenta, ahora que se termina la legislatura quiero citar el artículo 7 del Reglamento de esta Cámara para que nos preocupemos por la situación de dos exdiputados al Parlamento Europeo del Grupo político Los Verdes/Alianza Libre Europea.

Ellos llevan más de quinientos días en prisión. Sus nombres son Raúl Romeva i Rueda y Oriol Junqueras. Este último es *Spitzenkandidat* a la Comisión Europea por la Alianza Libre Europea.

**Stelios Kouloglou (GUE/NGL).** – Madam President, I wanted to ask for your help and the help of my colleagues. I was a member of an official delegation twice, going to the United States. I was denied a visa to enter the United States.

*(Murmurs (of dissent))*

Wait a second, wait a second. I have nothing to do with terrorism. This is because I was a journalist. I'm a film-maker. I know you are with Trump, don't worry, I know. I know you are ...

*(Interjection by the President)*

I sent a letter to President Tajani. I had no help, so I am looking for help from you, from all my democratic colleagues. Not you, not you, I don't want any help of yours, of the extreme right.

*(The President cut off the speaker)*

## 16. Głosowanie

**La Présidente.** – L'ordre du jour appelle l'Heure des votes.

*(Pour les résultats des votes et autres détails les concernant: voir procès-verbal)*

**16.1. Dostosowanie niektórych aktów prawnych przewidujących stosowanie procedury regulacyjnej połączonej z kontrolą do art. 290 i 291 TFUE – część II (A8-0190/2019 - József Szájer) (głosowanie)**

**16.2. Dostosowanie niektórych aktów prawnych przewidujących stosowanie procedury regulacyjnej połączonej z kontrolą do art. 290 i 291 TFUE – część I (A8-0020/2018 - József Szájer) (głosowanie)**

**16.3. Dostosowanie niektórych aktów prawnych w obszarze sprawiedliwości przewidujących stosowanie procedury regulacyjnej połączonej z kontrolą do art. 290 TFUE (A8-0012/2018 - József Szájer) (głosowanie)**

**16.4. Wykonanie i finansowanie budżetu ogólnego Unii w 2019 r. w związku z wystąpieniem Zjednoczonego Królestwa z Unii (A8-0197/2019 - Jean Arthuis) (głosowanie)**

— *Avant le vote:*

**Jean Arthuis, rapporteur.** – Madame la Présidente, mes chers collègues, c'est ma dernière intervention en session plénière. Le rapport que je sou mets à votre approbation est une réglementation qui prévoit des mesures d'urgence visant à protéger le budget de l'Union européenne en cas de Brexit sans accord. Nous mesurons ici à quel point notre budget pourtant modeste – faut-il le rappeler: 1 % du produit intérieur brut européen – dépend des contributions nationales.

À la veille de quitter notre Parlement, je voudrais vous faire partager mon idéal, ma crainte et ma conviction. Mon idéal est que le budget de l'Union européenne soit celui d'une puissance mondiale. Ma crainte est que les États membres soient peu disposés à augmenter leur contribution. Ma conviction est que l'augmentation du budget de l'Union européenne devra correspondre à des allègements des budgets nationaux. Ceci suppose des transferts de crédits depuis les budgets nationaux vers le budget européen. Et donc le souhait que je formule est que la prochaine mandature puisse identifier les biens communs européens, ceux qui sont des actions publiques que manifestement, du fait de la globalisation, les États membres seuls ne peuvent plus assumer au plan national pour assurer notre avenir et nous protéger.

Mes chers collègues, je salue votre engagement et votre formidable travail et je voudrais avoir une attention particulière pour celles et ceux qui siègent à la commission des budgets. Si l'Union reste un combat et sans doute un combat quotidien, mon rêve d'Europe tel qu'il m'animait en arrivant ici, grâce à vous, est resté intact; mieux, il n'a cessé de se renforcer. Je vous exprime ma gratitude et vous souhaite le meilleur. Vive l'Europe et vive nos États membres.

*(Applaudissements)*

- 16.5. Umowa w sprawie współpracy naukowej i technologicznej między UE a Rosją (A8-0188/2019 - Christian Ehler) (głosowanie)**
- 16.6. Zmiana Statutu Europejskiego Banku Inwestycyjnego (A8-0189/2019 - Danuta Maria Hübner) (głosowanie)**
- 16.7. Sprzeciw na podstawie art. 105 ust. 3 Regulaminu: Wdrażanie i eksploatacja współpracujących inteligentnych systemów transportowych (B8-0239/2019) (głosowanie)**
- 16.8. Europejska Straż Graniczna i Przybrzeżna (A8-0076/2019 - Roberta Metsola) (głosowanie)**
- 16.9. Kodeks wizowy (A8-0434/2018 - Juan Fernando López Aguilar) (głosowanie)**
- *Avant le vote:*
- Juan Fernando López Aguilar, Rapporteur.** – Madam President, it will only be a minute, because this is the final vote of an important piece of European law – the visa code – serving the area of liberty, justice and security, and with this occasion it is customary here to take the occasion before the plenary with all of the Members sitting here to express gratitude for the good, constructive cooperation throughout the years, because it has been – wow! – quite a time. It's been four years of hard work for the shadow rapporteurs and the Committee on Civil Liberties, Justice and Home Affairs (LIBE), which pushed it forward under the leadership of our colleague and Chair of the LIBE Committee, Claude Moraes. But since this is also the last plenary session of this mandate of the European Parliament, it is also customary to express publicly how great it has been to serve the European citizens in this House, which happens to be the only democratically-elected institution of the European architecture, and of course to take the occasion to wish everybody the very best, with all of my heart, and to say publicly that it's been my honour to work with you all for the past five years. Thank you all, dear colleagues, thank you all.
- (Applause)
- 16.10. Środki ochrony zasobów i jej egzekwowania mające zastosowanie na obszarze podlegającym regulacji Organizacji Rybołówstwa Północno-Zachodniego Atlantyku (A8-0017/2019 - Ricardo Serrão Santos) (głosowanie)**
- 16.11. Zasady ułatwiające korzystanie z informacji finansowych i innych informacji (A8-0442/2018 - Emil Radev) (głosowanie)**
- 16.12. Europejskie Centrum Kompetencji w dziedzinie Cyberbezpieczeństwa w kwestiach Przemysłu, Technologii i Badań Naukowych oraz sieć krajowych ośrodków koordynacji (A8-0084/2019 - Julia Reda) (głosowanie)**
- 16.13. Instrument „Łącząc Europę” (A8-0409/2018 - Henna Virkkunen, Marian-Jean Marinescu, Pavel Telička) (głosowanie)**

## 16.14. Zapobieganie rozpowszechnianiu w internecie treści o charakterze terrorystycznym (A8-0193/2019 - Daniel Dalton) (głosowanie)

**La Présidente.** – Ceci clôt l'Heure des votes.

## 17. Wyjaśnienia dotyczące sposobu głosowania: patrz protokół

## 18. Korekty do głosowania i zamiar głosowania: patrz protokół

## 19. Normy emisji CO<sub>2</sub> dla nowych pojazdów ciężkich (debata)

**La Présidente.** – L'ordre du jour appelle le débat sur le rapport de Bas Eickhout, au nom de la commission de l'environnement, de la santé publique et de la sécurité alimentaire, sur la proposition de règlement du Parlement européen et du Conseil établissant des normes de performance en matière d'émissions de CO<sub>2</sub> pour les nouveaux véhicules lourds (COM(2018)0284 – C8-0197/2018 – 2018/0143(COD)) (A8-0354/2018).

**Bas Eickhout, Rapporteur.** – Madam President, I would like to thank my colleagues for all their interest in CO<sub>2</sub> and trucks. That should also be because this is the final climate legislation that we are adopting this term so this means that, after this, we will have to have a lot of improvements for the next term. But, on this one, we can celebrate this because it is the first time that the European Union is going to regulate CO<sub>2</sub> emissions from heavy-duty vehicles.

It was – as it was with the CO<sub>2</sub> and cars legislation – a tough fight with a lot of resistance, but I think we managed, in good cooperation with the different shadow rapporteurs and all the different groups, whom I would like to thank for their contributions. We did not always agree, but I think, in the end, we have come to a deal which everyone can support and feel that we are touching the importance of this file, which is putting a CO<sub>2</sub> reduction of 15% in place for 2025 and, by 2030, a binding target of 30%, and especially that long-term prospects will give a very clear signal to the car manufacturers and the truck manufacturers that they will need to invest in new technologies.

We also managed to close all the loopholes, mainly around the super credits, and shift that to a 2% benchmark of zero-emission vehicles, which also gives a clear signal to the manufacturers that they will not be able to stay only improving current combustion engine technologies, but that they also need to invest in new technologies for the future, which can be zero-emission, e-mobility and also hydrogen. That is still open, but this is a clear signal now to the manufacturers that this is the direction to go in.

As I said, it was a hard fight. Clearly, from a Green perspective, we would have loved to see higher targets on the table, but I think what is very important is that now manufacturers have clarity for the longer term so that they know where their investments need to go in order to make sure that the transport sector is also cleaning up and working towards decarbonisation. Because when people ask you about heavy-duty vehicles and how important it is, I would just remind you that it is 6% of the total European emissions, and of the road transport emissions, it is even 25%.

So we are talking about a very important category, which is, on top of that, even increasing, whereas we know that, by 2050, we should have decarbonised our economy. That's why it is so important to put this legislation in place. We will have reviews in place by 2022 and I can promise you that, by then, we probably will look at the targets that we agreed upon, tomorrow, and we will conclude that we can do more because of the signals we gave to the manufacturers and the investments that will go into zero-emission vehicles so that the market is also finally changing and we get new jobs and job creation also within the European Union.

Because on heavy-duty vehicles it was really high time that, as Europe, we started to regulate this because countries like the United States, Japan and Canada already regulated that before us. So we are catching up and making sure that innovation and these new technologies will be done within Europe, creating the jobs within Europe and, at the same time, delivering a decarbonisation of our transport sector, which is so badly needed if we want to achieve the Paris Agreement with that.

I think that is a good achievement and, once again, I would like to thank all the shadows and also the Commission and the Council – which is not there – for their close cooperation in getting this deal done, and I look forward to the vote tomorrow.

**Miguel Arias Cañete**, *Member of the Commission*. – Madam President, it's a pleasure to be here today for the final debate on the legislation setting the first ever CO<sub>2</sub> emission standards for new heavy-duty vehicles.

The agreement reached by the European Parliament and the Council is a very important achievement and it marks the completion of a comprehensive legislative framework on climate and clean energy for 2030. A swift agreement on this regulation has been possible thanks to the constructive efforts and spirit of compromise of the negotiators from both institutions. I would like very especially to thank the rapporteur, Mr Eickhout, and all the shadow rapporteurs and congratulate them on the very good result achieved in such a short time-frame.

The agreement reached is both ambitious and balanced. Its most important elements are that for new heavy-duty vehicles the European Union fleet-wide average CO<sub>2</sub> emissions will have to be 15% lower in 2025 and 30% lower in 2030, compared to the reference period, which covers July 2019 to June 2020. The targets cover the largest vehicles, which account for about 17% of the total CO<sub>2</sub> emissions of the heavy-duty sector, and a technology-neutral incentive system will stimulate manufacturers to deploy zero and low-emission vehicles in the next decade, starting in 2019 with super credits and followed by a benchmark system from 2025 onwards. A strong governance system will make sure that the emission reductions occur in reality and not only on paper. A comprehensive review in 2022 will evaluate the effectiveness of the legislation.

This new legislation completes the picture required to put the road transport sector on a clear pathway towards clean mobility and a broader transition to a climate-neutral economy. Let me highlight its main benefits. Without action, emissions from heavy-duty vehicles would represent almost 25% of road transport emissions, which are set to increase by almost 10% by 2030 compared to 2010. With the targets agreed and with the post-2020 targets for cars and vans, greenhouse gas emissions from road transport will be reduced by 24% by 2030 compared to 2005. This will help Member States to reach the binding targets under the Effort Sharing Regulation and the European Union to deliver its commitments under the Paris Agreement.

Transport operators will benefit from fuel savings of up to EUR 25 000 in the first five years of use of a new truck bought in 2025 and around EUR 60 000 for a new truck bought in 2030. This will help in particular 600 000 small and medium-sized enterprises that operate in the European Union freight transport sector and employ almost three million people.

The legislation will also contribute to modernising the European Union economy, and especially the automotive sector, to channel investments and strengthen innovation for clean-vehicles technologies. In particular, the incentive system for zero and low-emission heavy-duty vehicles will reward the frontrunners in developing and deploying such innovative vehicles. The legislation also provides a signal for investors in refuelling and recharging infrastructure so that the enabling conditions for the deployment of zero and low-emission vehicles are created. Finally, it is also projected to have positive impacts on economic growth and employment and to lower European Union oil imports.

Honourable Members, let me conclude by inviting you to support this ambitious and balanced agreement when voting tomorrow. This new legislation will put Europe on track towards the necessary transition towards clean mobility. I would also take the opportunity to inform the Members of this House that the Commission has tabled two statements to accompany its full support for the overall agreement. They concern the continuous development of the Vehicle Energy Consumption Calculation Tool (VECTO) simulation tool and the transposition of a specific provision related to the maximum authorised weight of zero-emission heavy-duty vehicles. Once again, I thank all honourable Members for their support.



## Commission statements

(in writing)

### Commission statement on Article 20 - amendment to Directive 96/53/EC with regard to the maximum authorised weight of alternatively fuelled or zero emission heavy-duty vehicles

The Commission notes the agreement of the co-legislators relating to Article 20 of this Regulation, which amends Directive 96/53/EC without setting an explicit time limit for its transposition.

The Commission also notes that other provisions of Directive 96/53/EC are being modified by the Decision [2018/0130(COD)], which provides for an application of those new provisions as of 1 September 2020.

Given the situation, the Commission calls upon Member States to carry out as soon as possible and at the latest by the same date, i.e. 1 September 2020, any necessary adaptation of their national legislation to Article 20 of the present Regulation and to inform the Commission thereof in accordance with Article 11 of Directive 96/53/EC. This would obviate any need for a further legislative proposal by the Commission on this issue.

**Henna Virkkunen, liikenne- ja matkailuvaliokunnan lausunnon valmistelija** – Arvoisa puhemies, haluan liikennevaliokunnan puolesta myös kiittää neuvottelijoita hyvästä lopputuloksesta. Tämä asetus vastaa hyvin pitkälle liikennevaliokunnan sille asettamia tavoitteita: autonvalmistajien on vähennettävä päästöjä 15 prosenttia vuoteen 2025 mennessä ja 30 prosenttia vuoteen 2030 mennessä. Se on erittäin kunnianhimoinen mutta kuitenkin mahdollinen tavoite.

On merkittävä asia, että nyt ensimmäistä kertaa Euroopan unionissa ollaan asettamassa enimmäispäästörajat raskaiden ajoneuvojen hiilidioksidipäästöille. Toki tähänkin asti autonvalmistajilla on ollut intressi pyrkiä mahdollisimman tehokkaisiin ajoneuvoihin, koska polttoaine on hyötyajoneuvoissa se kaikkein merkitsevin tekijä, ja tähänkin asti on ollut tarve tehdä erittäin energiatehokkaita ja vähän polttoainetta käyttäviä hyötyajoneuvoja, mutta tämä tulee entisestään varmasti lisäämään myös innovaatioita tällä alueella.

Jatkossa on tarpeellista pyrkiä edelleen kehittämään mittausten menetelmiä. Olisi tärkeää saada huomioiduksi koko käytetyn polttoaineen energiankulutus, ja jatkossa olisi päästävä myös elinkaaren mittaaviin tarkastelutapoihin. Samoin meidän pitäisi pystyä jatkossa huomioimaan paremmin teknologianeutraalius, koska on varmaa, että liikennepäästöjen vähentäminen on niin suuri haaste, että kaikki ratkaisut ovat tarpeen ja meidän ei pidä valita yksittäistä polttoainetta.

**Christofer Fjellner, för PPE-gruppen.** – Fru talman! Många års arbete med utsläpp från lastbilar går nu mot sitt slut för mig, för utskottet, för den här valperioden. De nya utsläppsregler som vi röstar om i morgon blir efter många, långa och svåra förhandlingar trots allt väldigt bra. De får oss närmare transporter utan skador på vår miljö.

Detta är faktiskt mitt sista anförande här i Europaparlamentet, och jag vill passa på att tacka för femton fantastiska år. Det är här som jag fått mina första gråa hår – av några av er samlade i denna sal. Det har dock varit en förmån att få företräda Sverige och moderaterna här i Europaparlamentet, en förmån att få göra skillnad, en förmån att göra skillnad för frihandeln som lyfter människor ur fattigdom och gör Europa rikare, en förmån att göra skillnad för miljön genom en politik som sätter människan i centrum och som får andra delar av världen att vilja följa oss – och en förmån att göra skillnad för Sverige, för Europa.

Vi har varit oense om mycket. Jag har kanske inte alltid framstått som är särskilt ”moderat” moderat, men jag har efter bästa förmåga försökt att företräda frihetens idéer och mina väljare. Europa är nämligen värt att kämpa för. Europa erbjuder ett hopp om fred, frihet och gemenskap. Till alla er som fortsätter, eller kommer efter mig i mitt ställe, vill jag bara säga: Svik aldrig det hoppet, för det är värt att kämpa för.

**Damiano Zoffoli**, a nome del gruppo S&D. – Signora Presidente, onorevoli colleghi, il regolamento in esame che sosteniamo colma una grave lacuna stabilendo per la prima volta in Europa, dopo molte resistenze, dopo oltre dieci anni di discussioni, limiti e norme comuni sulle emissioni di CO<sub>2</sub> per i veicoli pesanti, che contribuiscono al 6 % delle emissioni totali dell'Unione, emissioni peraltro destinate ad aumentare.

Oltre a target ambiziosi ma raggiungibili di riduzione delle emissioni di CO<sub>2</sub>, abbiamo introdotto un test di conformità su strada per avere dei dati sulle emissioni e sul consumo di carburanti in condizioni reali di guida. Questi dati reali sono spesso molto lontani da quelli certificati in laboratorio. Questi dati sono necessari per evitare altri scandali tipo il *diesel gate*. Questi dati potranno essere utilizzati anche da soggetti terzi per prove di verifiche indipendenti.

Fondamentale è poi la richiesta alla Commissione di una metodologia per valutare le emissioni di un mezzo pesante lungo tutto il suo ciclo di vita, dalla progettazione fino alla rottamazione. Il regolamento prevede inoltre un meccanismo per incentivare la diffusione di camion elettrici e a basse emissioni, con l'obiettivo di assicurare, a partire dal 2025, una quota minima obbligatoria di questi veicoli per costruttori pari al 2 %. Saranno incentivati gli investimenti pubblici e privati in infrastrutture di ricarica per la mobilità elettrica.

Infine, nella transizione verso la decarbonizzazione del settore dei trasporti che dipende ancora oggi per il 94 % dal petrolio, va considerato il ruolo del gas naturale, ma soprattutto è indispensabile che la Commissione europea crei un fondo per la riqualificazione e il sostegno ai lavoratori del settore, per rendere la transizione sostenibile dal punto di vista sociale oltre che ambientale. Questo regolamento rappresenta un'ulteriore tappa di un'Europa in movimento, un'Europa in movimento verso un nuovo modello di sviluppo basato sull'alleanza fra industria ed ambiente.

**Mark Demesmaeker**, namens de ECR-Fractie. – Voorzitter, morgenmiddag is het de laatste plenaire stemming van deze zittingsperiode. Opnieuw hebben we de kans om te stemmen voor concrete maatregelen in de strijd tegen klimaatverandering.

De CO<sub>2</sub>-uitstoot van zware vrachtwagens is goed voor zes procent van de totale uitstoot in de Europese Unie en een kwart van de uitstoot in het wegtransport. Deze uitstoot gaat nog altijd in stijgende lijn, ook in mijn eigen land, in Vlaanderen.

Willen we effectief onze klimaatafspraken nakomen, dan moet ook de vrachtwagenvloot vergroenen. De technologie daarvoor is beschikbaar. Het is cruciaal dat er voor het eerst een CO<sub>2</sub>-reductienorm voor vrachtwagens komt. Ook de aanmoediging van emissiearme en emissievrije vrachtwagens is belangrijk. Daarom steunt mijn partij, de N-VA, het finale akkoord over deze nieuwe wetgeving, al had het ambitieniveau ook voor ons wat hoger gemogen.

Vergroening van de vloot is ook essentieel voor een betere luchtkwaliteit. Te veel mensen lijden onder een slechte luchtkwaliteit. Te veel mensen sterven voortijdig.

De normen zorgen ook voor een besparing op brandstof. Dus ook dat levert winst op voor bedrijven en consumenten.

Ten slotte is ambitieuze productnormering ook nodig om innovatie en investeringen aan te trekken. Derde landen zoals de Verenigde Staten en China zetten hier al volop op in. De Europese Unie mag niet achterblijven.

**Nils Torvalds**, för ALDE-gruppen. – Fru talman! Jag vill gärna börja med att tacka mina medkumpaner i hela denna affär – de kumpaner mellan vilka jag pressades under hela denna förhandling, å ena sidan Bas Eikhout och å andra sidan Christoffer Fjellner, som innan han avlägsnade sig klagade över att han har fått gråa hår. Men om man tittar på mig och på kommissionären så kan han säga att han lyckades åstadkomma mycket mer gråa hår för oss än vi för honom.

Vi har några utmaningar framför oss. För det första har vi en ganska fragmenterad tillverkarsituation. Vi har alltså tillverkare som utan större svårigheter kommer att klara de målsättningar vi har slagit fast, och vi har tillverkare som kommer att ha stora svårigheter att nå upp till dessa målsättningar, vilket gör detta betydligt svårare.

Vi har också en svårighet som gäller det som vi så gärna kallar nollutsläppsbilar, eftersom en nollutsläppsbil med smutsig elektricitet är ingen nollutsläppsbil. Därför kommer en av de stora förutsättningarna för att vi ska klara det som vi lovade Greta Thunberg i går att bero på hur mycket vi i framtiden kan investera i en ren elektricitet och på det sättet gå vidare. Vi behöver alltså av den orsaken broar in i framtiden. Det måste vara alternativa bränslen som har lägre utsläpp än den elektricitet som vi för tillfället använder.

Den största utmaning som vi har inför framtiden gäller naturligtvis det som Bas Eikhout sade alldeles i början av sitt anförande. Vi ska se över denna lagstiftning under de följande åren. Det betyder att det är nästa parlamentssammansättning som kommer att ha den intressanta uppgiften att se till att detta lagförslag hamnar på rätt köl och att vi faktiskt når de ambitiösa mål som vi har satt upp för oss. Då gäller det för kommissionen att, så att säga, hålla tungan rätt i mun, och det gäller för Bas Eikhout och mig och för de andra som är med oss här att se till att vi styr denna skuta i hamn.

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

**Paul Rübzig (PPE)**, *Frage nach dem Verfahren der „blauen Karte“*. – Ich möchte mich recht herzlich beim Kollegen Torvalds bedanken, weil CO<sub>2</sub> natürlich eine Herausforderung ist und deshalb auch immer die Lebenszykluskosten für schwere Lkw eine wesentliche Rolle spielen; also die ganze Produktion und der Gebrauch der Lkw spielt hier eine große Rolle. Glauben Sie, dass zum Beispiel kontinuierliches Fahren in den Städten und intelligentes Parken auch einen wesentlichen Beitrag zur CO<sub>2</sub>-Reduktion liefern könnte?

**Nils Torvalds (ALDE)**, *svar ("blått kort")*. – Tack så mycket för en intressant fråga. Jag tror att det som vi behöver mest i städerna kanske inte är intelligenta bilar utan intelligenta chaufförer. Jag vet inte om Rübzig kan åstadkomma det. Vi behöver alltså undervisning i hur man kör. Vi behöver alla de tekniska hjälpmedel som gör det möjligt att hålla detta under kontroll. Om vi inte är rädda för teknikens möjligheter, så har vi alla förutsättningar att klara detta också i Österrike.

## PRESIDENZA DELL'ON. FABIO MASSIMO CASTALDO

*Vicepresidente*

**Stefan Eck**, *im Namen der GUE/NGL-Fraktion*. – Herr Präsident, verehrte Kolleginnen und Kollegen! Ich habe dieses Parlament, die Kommission und den Rat häufig dafür kritisiert, dass zu oft im Sinne der Konzerne und der tierfeindlichen Agrarindustrie Entscheidungen getroffen wurden – zum Nachteil der Menschen, der Natur und der Tiere. Ich bin aber sehr zufrieden mit dem Ergebnis, das der ENVI-Ausschuss, Bas Eickhout und wir Schattenberichterstatter erreicht haben. Morgen stimmen wir über die erste Verordnung zur Senkung der CO<sub>2</sub>-Emissionen von Lkw ab. Trotz des heftigen Widerstandes der Wirtschaft und einiger Regierungen, vor allem der deutschen Regierung, geht dieser Bericht weit über den ursprünglichen Kommissionsvorschlag hinaus. Dieser Bericht ist damit ein wichtiger Schritt für den Umweltschutz, aber bei weitem nicht genug. Und es liegt noch viel Arbeit in vielen Bereichen vor Ihnen.

Heute halte ich meine letzte Rede in diesem Haus. Ich werde in der nächsten Wahlperiode kein Abgeordneter mehr sein. Ich möchte Sie deshalb bitten, bei Ihren zukünftigen Entscheidungen, so wie es im Artikel 13 des Vertrages von Lissabon festgelegt wurde, endlich das Wohl der Milliarden Tiere zu berücksichtigen, die für unsere Interessen gezüchtet, ausgebeutet und getötet werden. Machen Sie zukünftig mehr Politik mit Ihrem Herzen, was nicht bedeutet, dass Sie Ihren Verstand ausschalten müssen. Es ist höchste Zeit für einen politischen Paradigmenwechsel. Nicht Wirtschaftswachstum und Vollbeschäftigung sollten die primären Ziele der EU sein, sondern das Wohlbefinden und das Glück aller Lebewesen und der Schutz dieses Planeten. Das erwarten die Bürger Europas von Ihnen.

Ich danke Ihnen. Leben Sie wohl und haben Sie eine glückliche Hand bei Ihren zukünftigen politischen Entscheidungen!

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

**Peter Liese (PPE)**, Frage nach dem Verfahren der „blauen Karte“. – Vielen Dank, verehrter Kollege Eck. Ich wünsche Ihnen natürlich persönlich alles Gute für die Zukunft. Ich habe aber doch noch mal eine Frage: Woher haben Sie die Information, dass das, was jetzt auf dem Tisch liegt, deutlich über den ursprünglichen Kommissionsvorschlag hinausgeht? Ich sehe das so, dass wir ziemlich nah dran sind, und das ist auch das, was die deutsche Bundesregierung vertreten hat. 15 % und 30 % – das ist sehr klug, sehr vernünftig, und das geht nicht über den ursprünglichen Kommissionsvorschlag hinaus.

**Stefan Eck (GUE/NGL)**, Antwort auf eine Frage nach dem Verfahren der „blauen Karte“. – Was ich damit sagen wollte: In einigen Punkten haben wir in unseren Verhandlungen Ziele erreicht, die sehr wohl über den Kommissionsvorschlag hinausgehen, und das war vor allen Dingen dem hervorragenden Kollegen Bas Eickhout zu verdanken, der mit Zähnen und Klauen dafür gekämpft hat, dass hier ein anständiger und wirklich ambitionierter Bericht auf dem Tisch liegt. Dafür möchte ich ihm ganz persönlich noch einmal danken.

**Karima Delli**, au nom du groupe Verts/ALE. – Monsieur le Président, chers collègues, cette semaine, nous avons reçu ici la jeune militante Greta Thunberg. Elle est venue nous dire: «Agissez! Agissez! Agissez maintenant! Faites en sorte, vous les décideurs politiques, de permettre que les prochaines générations puissent vivre heureuses dans un monde accueillant.»

Si nous voulons répondre aux besoins de la planète et préserver notre santé, si nous voulons réduire considérablement la pollution, nous devons prendre nos responsabilités et mettre le secteur des transports à contribution, comme les autres, comme tout le monde. Sur les routes européennes, seuls 5 % des véhicules en circulation sont des camions. Pourtant ces camions produisent environ 25 %, soit un quart, des émissions de gaz à effet de serre du transport routier dans l'Union européenne. Si l'on veut, un jour, respecter les engagements de la COP21 pour sauver le climat et la planète, il est plus que temps d'en finir avec ce déséquilibre.

Avec le texte présenté, nous faisons enfin un premier pas en matière de réduction du CO<sub>2</sub>, de moins 15 % d'ici à 2025 et de moins 30 % d'ici à 2030, pour les camions. Le règlement va plus loin que la proposition de la Commission. Il engage pour la première fois l'Europe à réduire la pollution des camions sur nos routes et donc à améliorer la qualité de l'air: c'est une victoire! Cette victoire, que montre-t-elle? Elle montre que quand nous, les élus, écoutons les demandes, notamment celles de cette jeunesse qui fait grève chaque semaine pour sauver le climat, quand nous passons des belles paroles aux actes concrets, les choses peuvent bouger et dans le bon sens. Nous pouvons être fiers.

Mais, attention: le chemin est encore long. Si nous voulons préserver les chances de nos enfants de respirer, de vivre libres, d'être heureux, de s'épanouir sur notre belle planète, alors demain, il faut voter en faveur de ce texte, parce que voter pour ce texte, c'est voter pour le climat!

**Danilo Oscar Lancini**, a nome del gruppo ENF. – Signor Presidente, onorevoli colleghi, il settore della mobilità riveste un ruolo fondamentale sia per l'economia che per la società dell'Unione dei singoli Stati membri, eppure quest'Aula sembra costantemente dimenticare questo aspetto e non ascolta le richieste degli imprenditori e dei lavoratori europei.

Le misure contenute in questa proposta sono nella migliore delle ipotesi anacronistiche e nella peggiore irrealistiche. Nel testo si parla di garantire una transizione agevole verso una mobilità a emissioni zero per incentivare lo sviluppo di nuove tecnologie, senza però fare realmente una valutazione di impatto sulle misure proposte. La misura spinge verso una sola soluzione elettrica, e chiaramente non tiene conto di tutte le possibili alternative che sono attualmente reperibili sul mercato.

Si doveva prevedere fin dall'inizio l'utilizzo di un mix di tecnologie e tempi di realizzazione più lunghi per agevolare realmente gli operatori e le aziende. Lo sviluppo di tecnologie a zero emissioni è ancora meno avanzato nel mercato dei veicoli pesanti rispetto al settore delle autovetture, soprattutto per ciò che riguarda gli autocarri per consegna a lungo raggio.

Il settore automotive verrà danneggiato, colpendo la competitività europea e dei vari Stati membri. L'Europa sarà dipendente dai paesi ricchi di materie prime per la fabbricazione delle batterie, come la Cina. Senza considerare che l'energia elettrica prodotta sul nostro continente proviene ancora in parte da centrali a carbone e lignite. Inoltre, come riportato sulla stampa, paradossalmente, sono già state utilizzate nuove colonnine mobili di ricarica elettrica ma alimentate da generatori a gasolio. Come se non bastasse, una tale misura avrebbe ricadute negative a livello di occupazione sulla filiera automotive. Questo, unito al rallentamento congiunturale del settore, ad esempio, nella sola Germania potrebbe causare una perdita di posti di lavoro nella filiera compresa tra le 75 000 e le 210 000 unità entro il 2030.

Abbiamo la responsabilità di riflettere bene su proposte come questa che, così come formulate allo stato attuale sono semplicemente incomprensibili e daranno risultati opposti rispetto agli obiettivi fissati.

**Dobromir Sośnierz (NI).** – Pani Przewodniczący! Nie ma pojazdów zeroemisyjnych, przestańcie powtarzać to kłamstwo w kolejnych dokumentach. Nie ma czegoś takiego i na pewno w dającej się przewidzieć przyszłości nie będzie. To jest tylko chwyt marketingowy producentów aut elektrycznych. Pojazdy tzw. zeroemisyjne emitują jak najbardziej zanieczyszczenia, tylko nie w tym miejscu, w którym jeżdżą. Emitują zanieczyszczenia w elektrowni, więc skończcie z tymi kłamstwami. Pani Delli może sobie krzyżeć, ile chce – tutaj już widzę, że powiedziała, co wiedziała, wykrzyżała, co chciała, i wyszła, taka to jest tutaj debata. Może sobie krzyżeć, ile chce, że chciałaby ograniczyć, bo my tu młodzi ludzie chcemy, ale jeśli nie ma technologii, która pozwala na ograniczenie takich emisji, to ona będzie tylko ukrywana, będzie przesuwana z jednego miejsca w drugie miejsce za pomocą jakichś sztuczek technologicznych, a często spowoduje globalnie zwiększenie emisji, więc to sprawozdanie jest po prostu nieodpowiedzialne.

**Peter Liese (PPE).** – Herr Präsident, liebe Kolleginnen und Kollegen! Es ist gut, dass wir morgen diese Grenzwerte erstmals auch für schwere Nutzfahrzeuge beschließen. Jeder Sektor muss einen Beitrag zum Klimaschutz leisten. Das, was auf dem Tisch liegt, ist zwar ambitioniert, aber möglich. Es ist gut, dass wir überzogene Forderungen von Grünen und Sozialdemokraten in diesem Text am Ende nicht mehr wiederfinden. Und da möchte ich auch Bas Eickhout für seinen Pragmatismus danken. Er wollte ursprünglich viel mehr, hat aber dann zugestimmt, dass im Wesentlichen das kommt, was die EVP-Fraktion wollte und die Kommission. Das war klug. Dank an Christofer Fjellner für sein Engagement nicht nur bei diesem Thema, sondern auch bei vielen anderen Themen.

Aber ich möchte die Gelegenheit ganz besonders nutzen, um mich beim Kommissar Miguel Arias Cañete zu bedanken. Er hat ja im Umfeld seiner Anhörung viel Häme und viel Kritik aushalten müssen. Aber ich glaube, auch diejenigen, die ihn damals kritisiert haben, müssen heute zugeben: Wir haben gemeinsam mit ihm viel erreicht für den Klimaschutz in Europa. Das ist die letzte Gesetzgebung, die wir in diesem Parlament annehmen. Deswegen nochmal herzlichen Dank an Kommissar Miguel Arias Cañete.

Wir müssen weitermachen, und ich glaube, ein Thema wird in der nächsten Wahlperiode sein, dass wir den Bahnverkehr stärken müssen. Saubere Lkw ist gut, aber wir sollten auch mehr Güter auf die Bahn bringen, mehr Personen auf die Bahn bringen. Da müssen wir uns nochmal die Belastung anschauen. Die Bahn ist beim Emissionshandel sehr viel stärker belastet als andere, weniger umweltfreundliche Verkehrsträger. Und an dem Thema müssen wir arbeiten, das ist etwas für die nächste Wahlperiode.

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

**Dobromir Sośnierz (NI),** pytanie zadane przez podniesienie niebieskiej kartki. – Powiedział Pan, że tak wiele zrobiliśmy dla klimatu, to proszę powiedzieć, co takiego zrobiliśmy dla klimatu, bo ja widzę tylko zadrukowane sterty papierów, które Parlament z siebie wydaje, a klimat jaki był, taki jest. Proszę powiedzieć: co konkretnego osiągnęliśmy dla klimatu?

**Peter Liese (PPE),** Antwort auf eine Frage nach dem Verfahren der „blauen Karte“. – Ich bin bewusst nicht auf Ihren Unsinn eingegangen, den Sie erzählt haben, aber wenn Sie mich fragen, werde ich sehr gerne darauf eingehen: Europa wird seine Klimaziele für 2030 erreichen. Wir haben eine Gesetzgebung beschlossen – morgen ist der letzte Teil davon –, wo wir jetzt schon gesetzgeberisch die Rahmenbedingungen geschaffen haben, dass wir unser Klimaziel von 40 % übererfüllen werden. Davon können sich andere Kontinente eine Scheibe abschneiden. Es ist auch notwendig, dass Europa ein Vorbild ist.

Gleichzeitig haben wir Regeln, die dafür sorgen, dass die energieintensive Industrie nicht aus Europa vertrieben wird. Ich glaube, wir haben da die gute Balance. Und wenn es von beiden Seiten heftig kritisiert wird, ist es ein Zeichen, dass es ein guter Mittelweg ist.

**Miriam Dalli (S&D).** – Mr President, first of all I would like to congratulate our rapporteur, Bas Eickhout, for his work to get this deal. I know that this was not an easy file, and it is very positive that we have yet another policy in place to reduce CO<sub>2</sub> emissions, because for far too long we had no standards for heavy duty vehicles, fully aware that these trucks have a major impact on global warming and that their climate impact is expected to further increase if we remain with the 'business as usual' scenario. It is high time that the EU adopts binding CO<sub>2</sub> targets for heavy duty vehicles.

Now moving from the Commission's original position, and agreeing to binding targets was a tough job, and negotiating with the Council about introducing a ZLEV benchmark was definitely an achievement. I know this far too well. Allow me also to thank our S&D shadow rapporteur, Damiano Zoffoli, for his strong contribution and for his role in ensuring a good compromise was reached.

Parliament's position set the right ambition, something that we strongly need in order to be in line with our climate commitments, and I believe that the future for cleaner vehicles, including trucks, will be driven by innovation. It is only strong incentives for the production of low-emission and zero-emission vehicles that will ultimately push this change. This is what we aim to deliver with our work and I look forward to further work in the years to come.

**Christine Revault d'Allonnes Bonnefoy (S&D).** – Monsieur le Président, enfin, l'Union européenne établit des obligations de réduction de CO<sub>2</sub> pour les poids lourds!

Chargée de représenter les socialistes et démocrates en commission des transports, j'avais défendu des objectifs bien plus ambitieux, mais les États membres, et notamment l'Allemagne et d'autres, influencés par leur industrie, ont revu à la baisse ces seuils. Je regrette le manque d'ambition du Conseil alors que les émissions de CO<sub>2</sub> n'ont cessé d'augmenter ces dernières années dans le secteur des transports routiers.

En revanche, la révision prévue en 2022, que j'avais appelée de mes vœux, sera un rendez-vous essentiel pour affiner la législation, si possible, faire qu'elle couvre plus de types de véhicules et aussi revoir nos objectifs à la hausse.

Malgré le manque de volonté politique des États, je me félicite de cette première étape: nous allons enfin disposer d'une trajectoire contraignante. Ce règlement est un pas en avant pour lutter contre le fléau de la pollution de l'air et pour respecter nos objectifs climatiques, en particulier l'accord de Paris, qui vise à endiguer ou du moins à limiter le réchauffement climatique. Il en va de notre responsabilité envers les générations futures. L'Europe agit concrètement contre la pollution et je suis fière que mon dernier discours en plénière souligne cette avancée.

*Procedura «catch-the-eye»*

**José Inácio Faria (PPE).** – Senhor Presidente, queria agradecer a Bas Eickhout e a todos os colegas que estiveram envolvidos na conclusão deste dossiê, que pretenderam impor metas ambiciosas para a redução das emissões de CO<sub>2</sub> dos veículos pesados, e queria estender, também, este agradecimento a todos os que têm trabalhado ao longo deste mandato, em dossiês diferentes, para coordenar o contributo de todos os sectores, para o cumprimento das metas de Paris, designadamente a Senhora Dali que vai a sair agora.

Gostava de pensar que as minhas propostas para apertados limites de emissões, mais até do que foram finalmente aprovados, contribuirão também para que, neste parlamento e dentro do meu grupo político partidário, o Partido Popular Europeu, se tenha posto a mão na consciência. Não podemos continuar a negar que as alterações climáticas existem. Temos de proteger os nossos ecossistemas, dos quais fazemos parte, e curvar a toxicidade da atividade humana no planeta.

Há uma coisa que estamos a fazer bem, caros Colegas, os alertas e as mensagens dos cientistas ambientais têm um enorme eco social e chegou até às camadas mais jovens que se manifestam ruidosamente, mas há outra coisa que insistimos em fazer mal, continuam a proteger-se interesses instalados que impedem a descarbonização da economia e o desenvolvimento de tecnologias verdes. Infelizmente, ainda têm que ser as crianças a dizer que o rei vai nu.

**Seán Kelly (PPE).** – Mr President, having been involved in the whole climate change agenda all during this mandate, I am delighted to take part in this debate and indeed very pleased with the progress we have made in Parliament and compliments to Commissioner Arias Cañete, who has led us from the Paris Agreement right up to here, and also people like Bas Eickhout, who has been a driving force in this whole area in the past five years.

We have, as Miriam Dalli said, another policy in place, that's very important, and I suppose this is the one area that we really need to tackle in terms of reducing emissions. I drive from my home in Killarney to Dublin airport, I drive from Strasbourg to Frankfurt, and I see more and more heavy-duty vehicles on the road, but if we bring in emission reductions it's not actually going to decrease the amount of transport on the road but it can make it energy-efficient, and especially in relation to reducing emissions.

So I think actually that we can be more ambitious over the next number of years but this is a good start. We are doing it in a sensible, progressive, step-by-step manner and that will help the industry, it will help our environment. A great job. Well done. Thanks to everybody.

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

**Miguel Arias Cañete**, *Member of the Commission*. – Mr President, I would like to thank honourable Members for this debate. I would like to start by answering a direct question that was raised by Mr Sośnierz. He raised a question about what this Parliament has done for climate change. My answer is: quite a lot. What has the European Union done for climate change? Quite a lot.

Before 2020, we established ambitious targets and, in 2017, we reduced our emissions by more than 22%, compared with 1990, while GDP grew by 58%. We have reduced emissions, we have developed renewables and we have increased energy efficiency. But this Parliament, in five years, has delivered a formidable legislative framework on energy and climate. I have been in politics for 38 years, and I have served in regional, national and European parliaments. In any period in my life, I don't recall such intense legislative activity as we have seen in these years, and I have to thank the chairmen and chairwomen of the committees – Jerzy Buzek, Adina Vălean, Giovanni La Via – and all the rapporteurs, starting with my friend, Bas Eickhout, who did impressive work, not only here, but also making my life difficult in the Renewables Directive.

It's really true, because what have we done? We have established a substantial number of pieces of legislation, which will deliver a reduction of emissions in 2030 of 45% and, if they are unchanged (but they will be changed), in 2050 will deliver a 60% reduction of emissions. So we have a substantial package. One of the most important things is the average level of political support for these proposals. In the Energy Package, 80% of the votes in each package were in favour, and on climate, without taking account of tomorrow's vote, 76%. There has been substantial political support for the legislation we have implemented for 2050, and in this House that is not so frequent. That means there has been dialogue and understanding. We have given up positions, we have negotiated and, for me, I can say it has been a formidable experience. I have participated in 71 trilogues and I have spent more than 350 hours of my life in difficult dialogues.

It has been a formidable experience, and I want to thank all of you, because this has been a wonderful job that, without the involvement of the Members of this Parliament, would have been impossible, because the Parliament has raised the level of ambition of the Commission proposals. I am happy about that. This is the gain. This is the institutional way of going forward. I think that we have a cumbersome procedure, but it has the fundamental value that the legislation will be applied in the next ten years, and we will have review clauses to increase ambition over time. And the next Parliament will have to take the responsibility and increase ambition.

But this Parliament has not finished its work. In the last opinion poll, published last Wednesday, I saw that 77% of potential voters identified global warming as an important criterion when deciding who to vote for in the May European elections, and that's a very important issue. I think when we have the European elections, climate change policy has been one of the main factors to be discussed within them. I encourage all of you to do two things. First, I want you to explain to the European people what we have done during these five years and also to say what you want to do in the next five years. I think that will bring more people to the polling stations and will give bigger support to the next Parliament. We will have the position that, in the next five years, we will complete this package, we will make further progress and we will work together towards making the European Union the first major economy to become climate neutral in 2050.

**Bas Eickhout**, *Rapporteur*. – Mr President, first of all, since we are all in a thanking mood, I would like to thank Commissioner Arias Cañete for all his work. Of course we had our moments when we didn't agree. I spent some of those hours together with you and I have to say that at all times, we had a good dialogue. We did not always agree, but there was always mutual respect and I think that's also the way forward. You're absolutely right. We achieved quite a lot on climate, on mobility, and on energy, but the work is not done, as you said. We are not on track yet for our climate-neutral economy and we need to act faster; Greta Thunberg also made that point very strongly yesterday. Indeed, that's one of the reasons why the elections in May will be about climate change. It will be a climate change election.

Just to conclude on this subject, Mr Peter Liese, thank you very much for coming back. Of course I can tell you where we, as a Parliament, improved the text and made it more ambitious, and it's on three very important issues. First of all, the 2030 target is now legally binding, which it was not in the initial proposal. That is very important because it's a very clear signal for where to go. Secondly, we closed quite a few loopholes in the proposals, the most important one being super credits, which are weakening when it comes to getting to your targets. We replaced them with a benchmark for low- and zero-emission vehicles. And thirdly, we improved the on-road in-service conformity to make sure that what we agree on paper is also going to be achieved in reality, which is very important, as you should know after dieselgate.

So those three elements are crucial. On top of that, there are a lot of technical improvements and a review clause etc., etc., but these three things give a very clear signal to investors, and to manufacturers, that the future will be about zero- and low-emission vehicles and that just continuing with your current technologies will not do. That is a crucial element. It is an improvement compared with the initial proposal, so I had to give you that answer.

Thank you very much. I'm looking forward to the vote, and let's see what we can do afterwards, especially in the run-up to the UN summit in September in New York. I expect that the European Union will increase its national determined contribution when we head off to New York. I see the Commissioner praying, so, for once, I will pray along.

**Presidente.** – La discussione è chiusa.

La votazione si svolgerà domani, giovedì 18 aprile 2019.

*Dichiarazioni scritte (articolo 162)*

**Adam Gierak (S&D), na piśmie.** – Rozporządzenie w sprawie norm emisji CO<sub>2</sub> dla pojazdów ciężkich jest częścią zintegrowanego podejścia Unii Europejskiej do celu dekarbonizacji sektora transportu. Przepisy te niewątpliwie stanowią będą w dłuższej perspektywie problem do rozwiązania zarówno dla producentów pojazdów, jak i dla sprzedawców paliw.

Zgodnie z metodologią liczenia, wartość emisji CO<sub>2</sub> przez pojazd jest mu przypisywana na podstawie zmierzonej jej ilości wydalonej z rury wydechowej pojazdu. Nie uwzględnia się przy tym jednak całkowitej emisji CO<sub>2</sub> uwzględniającej tę, której źródłem jest wcześniejsze energochłonne przetworstwo ropy naftowej jako nośnika energii pierwotnej, lub też podczas wytwarzania paliw odnawialnych, w tym biogazu.

Należy skoncentrować się także na kwestii redukcji emisji, która wynika z wykorzystania biopaliw oraz paliw alternatywnych. Istotną kwestią jest efektywność energetyczna jednostek napędowych, bowiem jej wzrost o jeden procent zmniejsza emisję CO<sub>2</sub> nawet o kilka procent. Większa efektywność silników Diesla może jednak skutkować wzrostem emisji NO<sub>x</sub>. Uwzględniając to wszystko, Komisja Europejska powinna opracować lepszą metodologię obiektywnego i kompleksowego sposobu liczenia emisji CO<sub>2</sub> i unikania emisji NO<sub>x</sub>. Nowa metodologia dla zaawansowanych i odnawialnych paliw powinna umożliwić dalszą, poważną redukcję emisji CO<sub>2</sub>. Pozwoli także firmom specjalizującym się w produkcji pojazdów ciężkich na śmielsze wykorzystanie nowych, lżejszych tworzyw oraz perspektywicznych i konkurencyjnych rozwiązań konstrukcyjnych.

## **20. Promowanie ekologicznie czystych i energooszczędnych pojazdów transportu drogowego (debata)**

**Presidente.** – L'ordine del giorno reca la relazione di Andrzej Grzyb, a nome della commissione per l'ambiente, la sanità pubblica e la sicurezza alimentare, sulla proposta di direttiva del Parlamento europeo e del Consiglio che modifica la direttiva 2009/33/CE relativa alla promozione di veicoli puliti e a basso consumo energetico nel trasporto su strada (COM(2017)0653-C8-0393/2017-2017/0291(COD)) (A8-0321/2018).

**Andrzej Grzyb, sprawozdawca.** – Panie Przewodniczący! Pani Komisarz! Podsumowujemy dzisiaj ponadroczną pracę nad dyrektywą o wspieraniu czystych niskoemisyjnych pojazdów. Pytanie dlaczego potrzebujemy tej dyrektywy znalazło się w uzasadnieniu w inicjatywie Komisji Europejskiej, bowiem blisko 60% – niektórzy mówią, że nawet dwie trzecie – emisji powodujących smog pochodzi z transportu drogowego. A sektor publiczny zaś potrzebuje czystych energooszczędnych autobusów, ciężarówek, samochodów dostawczych, ale również specjalistycznego sprzętu, który daje szansę na wykonanie dobrych usług publicznych. Przemysł europejski zaś potrzebuje długofalowego impulsu, który pozwoli na wprowadzenie nowych regulacji w zamówieniach publicznych i stanowi odpowiedź na te wyzwania.



Przyjmujemy dzisiaj zestaw ambitnych celów, zaś w pracach musieliśmy dbać o to, żeby wysokość tych celów była możliwa do wypełnienia przez przyszłych wykonawców, a więc głównie samorządy, a zarazem nie wpłynęła na ograniczenie, jeżeli chodzi o komunikację publiczną. Dlatego tak ważne jest, by za dyrektywą szło wsparcie z unijnego budżetu i europejskich instytucji finansowych, przede wszystkim na zakupy tego transportu, który będzie spełniał cele tej dyrektywy.

Cele w dyrektywie są dopasowane do możliwości gospodarczych poszczególnych państw członkowskich, choć mamy nadzieję, że kiedy czyste technologie zaczną być wprowadzane na szerszą skalę, to w wielu państwach członkowskich te cele będą przekraczane. Jednak nie obejmują one 100% zakupów, pozostawiają miejsce na zastosowanie innych, bardziej tradycyjnych technologii, np. pojazdy hybrydowe, bo standard czystego pojazdu będą spełniały tylko hybrydy *plug-in*.

Samorządy zgłaszały nam, że rozwiązania hybrydowe to dobry pomost od tradycyjnych do niskoemisyjnych i zeroemisyjnych rozwiązań, który pozwala między innymi przeszkolić kadry, zdobyć potrzebne *know-how* do dalszych zmian, zbudować infrastrukturę.

W ramach tych celów dbaliśmy, aby zapewnić jak największą elastyczność w zastosowaniu technologii niskoemisyjnych. Powiązanie definicji „czystego pojazdu” z dyrektywą o rozmieszczeniu infrastruktury paliw alternatywnych, bo to jest istniejąca legislacja. Tu dziękuję za otwartość Pani Komisarz we wprowadzeniu tej definicji.

Cele w dyrektywie dotyczą zarówno pojazdów ciężkich, jak i lekkich. Jesteśmy świadomi, że dyrektywa główny efekt będzie miała na rynku autobusów i w ich zastosowaniu w transporcie publicznym. Znakomita większość zakupów podlega bowiem przetargom publicznym, więc będzie objęta dyrektywą. I to właśnie autobusów dotyczą najwyższe cele zakupowe nakładane przez dyrektywę, ale równocześnie to właśnie producenci autobusów mają najbardziej rozwinięte technologie niskoemisyjne. I również w Unii mamy takich producentów, których można uznać za czempionów, którzy rozwinęli technologie, z powodzeniem konkurują swoimi produktami na europejskim i światowym rynku. Przykładem może być chociażby firma Solaris z regionu wielkopolskiego, z którego pochodzę, która produkuje zarówno zeroemisyjne elektryczne, jak i wodorowe autobusy, które znajdują nabywców w Europie, ale również i poza Europą.

Liczymy na to, że zastosowanie technologii niskoemisyjnych, w tym również gazomobilności, w tym gazu ziemnego, biometanu czy gazu płynnego, pozwoli na szybkie zmniejszenie emisji z transportu publicznego przez emisję takich zanieczyszczeń jak np. tlenki azotu. Także pozwoli lepiej wykorzystać np. biogaz, który będziemy pozyskiwać w przyszłości w dużej ilości z odpadów organicznych, co zapisaliśmy – m.in. po mojej propozycji – w europejskiej gospodarce o obiegu zamkniętym.

Wiemy, że przyszłością transportu są rozwiązania zeroemisyjne, bateryjne czy wodorowe, wiemy, że doskonalą się te technologie. Ale nowe technologie to również wyzwania nie tylko techniczne, ale również społeczne i środowiskowe. Musimy pamiętać, że produkcja baterii również obciąża środowisko i prowadzi do negatywnych skutków również tam, gdzie pozyskujemy m.in. minerały do ich produkcji. Dlatego musimy przyspieszyć prace nad zrównoważoną produkcją baterii i nad bateriami, które będą mogły zostać użyte w większym zakresie, poddane najpierw ponownemu użyciu poprzez wydłużenie ich życia, a później recyklingowi. Bateriami, do których produkcji będziemy używać mniej surowców krytycznych, również pierwiastków ziem rzadkich

Dyrektywa ma stanowić długofalowy impuls rozwojowy dla europejskiego przemysłu, m.in. właśnie w rozwój technologii bateryjnych, w tym również czystych baterii. Unia musi rozwijać technologie, by nasz przemysł mógł oferować konkurencyjne cenowo i technologicznie pojazdy na świecie, by miejsca pracy, badania, technologie pozostały w Europie, a również pieniądze publiczne, aby były wydawane na wsparcie rozwoju europejskiego przemysłu.

Dziękuję wszystkim koleżankom i kolegom kontrsprawozdawcom, z którymi w trakcie prac często się różniliśmy, ale udało nam się, wydaje się, osiągnąć dobre porozumienie. Dziękuję Komisji Europejskiej, która w kluczowych momentach pomagała uzyskać dobry kompromis, również prezydencji rumuńskiej, bo dzięki jej decyzji udało się akurat tę regulację zakończyć w obecnej kadencji.

**Violeta Bulc**, *Member of the Commission*. – Mr President, the Commission welcomes the opportunity to discuss Mr Grzyb's report today and would like to thank him and the shadow rapporteurs for the excellent work done, not only on this file but also in the entire process. As you said the cooperation was not always easy, but it was open, very dedicated and we delivered. Thanks to the commitment and the determination of all three legislators really, we got a successful conclusion on this file.

The clean mobility package. The public sector through that got an important role to play in the overall decarbonisation of European transport, especially in the bus segment where public procurement represents 70% of the market.

By mobilising public procurement to accelerate the deployment of clean vehicles, the directive will help us to take an important step towards zero-emission mobility. In our view, the text that was agreed at the trilogue on 11 February 2019 represents a good compromise between the different positions and requirements. It ensures a good level of ambition, while leaving sufficient flexibility in the implementation so that the directive's objective can be achieved without creating substantial administrative burdens for public authorities.

With the adoption of this revised directive we will introduce a clean vehicle definition and set minimum national targets for their public procurement, including specific targets for zero-emission buses. I'm confident that the agreement reached in the trilogue sets a stringent enough definition and realistic, yet ambitious, national targets.

The text also leaves full flexibility in the way the effort is shared within a Member State, thus allowing for a cost-effective implementation that will not create excessive burdens on individual public authorities.

Many of our cities – I can mention Amsterdam, Berlin, Paris, Warsaw, Barcelona, Hamburg, Milan, Ljubljana and Munich, among others, but there are many more – have already made voluntary commitments, going even beyond what will be required by the directive and we will now help other cities follow their example.

The revision will also expand the scope of the directive to cover public procurement through practices such as lease-hire purchase and rentals. This will ensure that the directive better reflects current practices in public procurement and it will help to achieve the expected impact on the market.

Together, these measures will help provide clear, long-term market signals and will allow public authorities, manufacturers and investors to better plan for the transition towards zero-emission mobility by mid-century. The adoption of this directive would therefore represent an important step towards the decarbonisation of our mobility and towards our clearly defined vision zero by 2050.

**Markus Pieper, im Namen der PPE-Fraktion.** – Herr Präsident, Frau Kommissarin! Umweltschutz macht man europäisch. Schadstoffe reduziert man am besten europäisch mit verbindlichen Vorgaben für die Nationalstaaten zum Ausbau der Erneuerbaren, zur CO<sub>2</sub>-Reduzierung, zur Energieeinsparung. Und auch mit konkreter Gesetzgebung arbeiten wir grenzüberschreitend beim Emissionshandel, im Ökodesign, beim Energielabel und vielen anderen. Wenn Energiekosten im Griff bleiben, wenn Versorgungssicherheit gewährleistet ist, dann sind wir für europäische Vorgaben. Wir dürfen aber nicht zu sehr ins Detail gehen, schon gar nicht in die Städte, Kreise und Gemeinden hineinregieren.

Mit dieser Vorgabe haben wir unseren Regionen ein faules Osterei ins Nest gelegt. Europäische Öko-Vorgaben für kommunale Ausschreibungen – das geht wirklich zu weit! Wie weit ist diese Europäische Union von der Lebensrealität in den Mitgliedstaaten entfernt? Beschaffungsquoten für Elektrobusse machen den öffentlichen Personennahverkehr unnötig teuer. Wie man die Menschen in Bus und Bahn bringt, sollten wir den Kreisen, Städten und Gemeinden überlassen und nicht zentralen Vorgaben aus Brüssel. Zu Hause wird man sich zurecht darüber ärgern, dass die EU wieder zu sehr ins Detail reinregiert hat, anstatt sich auf den Rahmen für Gesetzgebung zu beschränken. Ein Großteil der EVP-Fraktion wird diese Richtlinie deshalb ablehnen müssen.

**Seb Dance, on behalf of the S&D Group.** – Mr President, I'd like to extend my gratitude to Mr Grzyb and to the Commissioner and to the Council team, who regrettably are not here, on the excellent work we've done together. Mr Grzyb, you are a very fair rapporteur, and I mean that most sincerely. You have conducted the negotiations between the different groups very well, and I congratulate you on having done so.

This file is a really good example of the kind of things that we were elected here to do – to up the ambition when it comes to tackling climate change, to increase the action that we take when it comes to cleaning up the vehicles that are on our roads, which are the single leading contributor not only to CO<sub>2</sub> emissions but to the poor quality air that we see in far too many of our cities, and that is affecting far too many of our citizens.

Public procurement alone accounts for some 14% of the GDP of the Union and 75% of new bus registrations. It is a great and noble thing that we will be coming together here to provide money for clean vehicles that will deliver public goods and help Member States achieve the climate and energy targets. By 2030, 65% of buses will have to be clean as defined under the directive. It is now up to the Commission and Member State governments to ensure that local authorities are given the sufficient means.

But I have to say, in response to my colleagues in the EPP, we need this ambition. We cannot simply sit back and hope that things will somehow evolve over time and that we will get there in the end. We have to take the tough decisions now. We are seeing protests, not just in some Member States, but in all Member States, by young people, by concerned citizens. We have to take that action now and that's why I'm very proud that we have done so.

But I must also say it is Parliament and it is the cities that always want the more ambition and it is the Member States that always push back. This is the lesson of my five years in this Parliament, I very much hope I will return to this Parliament, being a Brit, that's a slightly precarious situation. Who knows?

But let me just say thank you to everyone that I've worked with here. If this is my last speech in this plenary, you are all wonderful and you come here to do the right thing and I'm very, very pleased to have learned so much from you and I hope to come back to learn even more.

**Mark Demesmaeker**, *namens de ECR-Fractie*. – Voorzitter, mevrouw de commissaris, collega's, we hebben daarnet gedebatteerd over de allereerste CO<sub>2</sub>-reductienormen voor zware vrachtwagens. Nu gaat het over een dossier om schone en energiezuinige wegvoertuigen te bevorderen.

Het is een mooi resultaat en ook een zeer belangrijk signaal. Want morgen, tijdens de laatste plenaire stemming van deze zittingsperiode, hebben we dus twee keer de kans om te kiezen voor heel concrete maatregelen in de strijd tegen klimaatverandering en luchtvervuiling.

Openbare aanbestedingen vormen inderdaad een belangrijke hefboom voor de omschakeling naar een emissiearme mobiliteit. Overheden hebben een voorbeeldfunctie. Ook mijn eigen regering, de Vlaamse overheid, zet zich mee in voor een duurzaam aankoopbeleid.

Die omschakeling is nodig in het licht van de strijd tegen klimaatverandering, maar ook om de luchtkwaliteit in onze steden en gemeenten te verbeteren, zeker ook in mijn eigen land.

Wat voor mijn partij, de N-VA, ook heel belangrijk is, is dat in het akkoord wordt gekozen voor technologie-neutrale oplossingen: niet alleen elektrische voertuigen met batterij, maar ook andere oplossingen, zoals hybride voertuigen, LNG of waterstoftechnologie. Al die technologieën moeten worden benut. We hebben alle opties nodig om de omslag naar een emissiearme mobiliteit te maken.

**Izaskun Bilbao Barandica**, *en nombre del Grupo ALDE*. – Señor presidente, señora comisaria, quiero empezar felicitando al ponente y a todos los ponentes alternativos por el trabajo realizado.

Esta propuesta debe aportar al objetivo compartido de reducir las emisiones de transporte en un 20 % para 2025 dos virtudes fundamentales: realismo y claridad. Ambas son necesarias para relativizar un discurso sobre el diésel que produce dos efectos perversos: nos impide ir reduciendo emisiones mientras se ponen a punto vehículos realmente eficientes de cero emisiones. Y lo hace lo hace generando un enorme coste social. Porque la crisis de ventas que sufre hoy la automoción está originando ya recortes en el empleo. Y porque propicia que no se renueve un parque móvil mucho más contaminante que el que hoy ya puede sustituirlo. Y que debe protagonizar una transición ordenada y posible hacia una movilidad con cero emisiones.

Previsibilidad y realismo es también reconocer que no podemos dejar de fijar objetivos claros de reducción de emisiones. Otros países, en los que venden nuestros fabricantes, lo están haciendo. Previsión y realismo deben así ayudar tanto a particulares como a profesionales y empresas a planificar con certeza sus inversiones y a asegurarse de que las podrán amortizar adecuadamente.

Por eso esta regulación, además de combatir esta crisis de ventas, debe estimular la política industrial que necesitamos para acelerar la transición hacia vehículos con cero emisiones. También una intermodalidad inteligente que permita a cada modo de transporte ofrecer su mejor aportación, en términos de eficiencia energética, ambiental y social, a la movilidad de la Unión.

Y, finalmente, la aparición de nuevas fórmulas de acceso al uso de vehículos. Porque en algunos Estados miembros, como el mío, la edad media de los automóviles ha pasado de los 8 años en el año 2007 a los 12,4 años en el año 2017 (un 62 % con más de 10 años), y roza los 13 años en el caso de las furgonetas. Bloquear su renovación esperando dar el salto de cien a cero, además de imposible, es una terrible noticia tanto para el medio ambiente como para la seguridad vial.

**Kateřina Konečná**, *za skupinu GUE/NGL*. – Pane předsedající, jak jistě víte, nebyla jsem s výsledkem meziinstitucionálního jednání o revizi vůbec nadšená. Co je doopravdy výsledkem celého balíčku čisté mobility? Na výrobce jsme přenesli přehnané nároky na snižování emisí, na vývoj nové technologie jak u osobních, tak těžkých vozidel a tím to v podstatě skončilo.

Znění směrnice o podpoře čistých a energicky účinných silničních vozidel, které mělo nastartovat trh s čistými vozidly, je málo ambiciózní, nákupy veřejného sektoru přijdou příliš pozdě a povinnosti z ní vyplývající obsahují spoustu mezer. Komu budou výrobci nově vyvinutá auta, jejichž vývoj a výroba budou stát miliardy eur, prodávat, když ani veřejný sektor není ochoten je kupovat?

Členské státy si nad řešením čisté mobility alibisticky umyly ruce. A veškerou zátěž nechávají pouze na výrobcích. Místo posílení nákupu čistých vozidel se řešila revize a nesmyslné nákupy stavebních strojů, které žádnou reálnou úsporu emisí nepřinesou. Otázka biopaliv první generace a palmového oleje nebyla taktéž vyřešena uspokojivě. Lhůta pro transpozici je příliš krátká a náběh cílů je až nesmyslně dlouhý. Přitom, aby se něco reálně změnilo, tak čistá vozidla potřebujeme na ulicích okamžitě. Evropský parlament svoji pozici prodal příliš lacino a dokument je jen stínem toho, čím mohl být. Proto ho stejně jako nařízení na limity CO<sub>2</sub> neplánujeme podpořit.

**Presidente**. – Prima di dare la parola al prossimo oratore, siccome è l'ultima volta, almeno per questo mandato, che ho l'onore e il piacere di presiedere questa plenaria, permettetemi di ringraziare tutti quanti voi, anche se oggi in questo momento sono ben pochi i presenti, per la grande possibilità che mi avete dato un anno e mezzo fa di poter essere vicepresidente all'interno di questo emiciclo.

Ho cercato di onorarla con tutto l'impegno, con tutta la mia partecipazione e soprattutto con tutta la volontà di tenere fede a quegli impegni che vi avevo scritto quando ho avanzato la mia candidatura e quando ho cercato di ristabilire il pluralismo all'interno dell'Ufficio di presidenza.

Quindi grazie di vero cuore a ognuno di voi e ovviamente auguri a tutti coloro che si presenteranno alle prossime elezioni europee per continuare a lavorare insieme per un'Europa migliore di cui tutti i cittadini potranno essere fieri ed orgogliosi. Thank you very much.

**Florent Marcellesi**, *en nombre del Grupo Verts/ALE*. – Señor presidente, como nos decía ayer Greta Thunberg aquí, en el Parlamento Europeo, nuestra casa está en llamas. Esto es una emergencia climática y es el momento de pasar a la acción ambiciosa ya.

El sector del transporte todavía es uno de los sectores más contaminantes y con más emisiones. Hoy acordamos mejorar este sector, obligando a todos los Estados miembros a que casi el 20 % de sus flotas de vehículos públicos -ya sean los autobuses, por ejemplo, o los camiones de la basura- sea más limpio.

Esto supone un claro avance, sin duda, pero —como también nos recordó ayer Greta Thunberg— ante la emergencia climática no se trata de hacer lo mejor, se trata de hacer todo lo posible. Lo que necesitamos es una verdadera revolución en el sector del transporte y de la movilidad, es decir, una revolución a favor de la salud y del clima.

Sigamos el ejemplo de las ciudades que, como Valencia o Madrid, están liderando una transición hacia una movilidad sostenible, sin combustibles fósiles. Madrid, por ejemplo, tendrá una flota de autobuses cien por cien ecológica ya el año que viene. Y ha conseguido mejorar la calidad del aire que respiran todos sus vecinos y todas sus vecinas con el plan «Madrid Central».

Este es el camino para toda Europa. Es posible.

## ELNÖKÖL: LÍVIA JÁRÓKA

*alelnök*

**Tiemo Wölken (S&D).** – Frau Präsidentin! Der öffentliche Nahverkehr in Europa muss sauberer werden. Umweltfreundliche Busse und Bahnen fahren besonders weite Strecken, und sie sind daher die Lösung für Staus und schlechte Luft. Ich finde es richtig, dass wir mit dieser Richtlinie sicherstellen, dass die öffentliche Hand mit gutem Beispiel vorangeht. Das ist gerade in Bezug auf Busse wichtig, denn der öffentliche Kauf macht hier 75 % des Marktes aus.

Wir sind ja hierbei auch schon weiter als bei Pkw. 2018 waren schon 9 % der in einem Jahr gekauften Busse elektrisch betrieben. In Deutschland haben wir viele gute Beispiele: Berlin will bis 2030 emissionsfrei sein, in meiner Heimatstadt Osnabrück fährt bereits heute die längste elektrisch betriebene Buslinie Deutschlands. Das zeigt: Die Quoten sind machbar, und wir sind einen richtigen Weg gegangen.

Es ist wichtig, dass wir auch biogasbetriebene Busse anerkennen für Busbetriebe, die große Flächen abdecken. Damit ist diese Richtlinie passgenau für städtische Betriebe und für Flächenländer. Ich glaube, wir gehen hiermit einen wichtigen, guten Schritt.

**Christel Schaldemose (S&D).** – Fru formand! Vi står med en lang række klimaproblemer, det tror jeg er blevet tydeligt for enhver, der har fulgt udviklingen, og vi havde besøg af Greta Thunberg i går, som også sagde det til os.

Derudover står vi også med et kæmpe problem med rigtig dårlig luftkvalitet i mange af vores europæiske byer. Dette forslag om et direktiv om renere køretøjer er faktisk en del af løsningen på det. Ja, vi kunne godt have sat barren højere, vi kunne godt have været mere ambitiøse, men trods alt gør vi nu det, at vi går ind og sætter nogle bindende mål for vores kommuner og det offentlige, når de skal indkøbe transportkøretøjer, og det er rigtig vigtigt. Det løser ikke vores luftforurening alene, det løser ikke vores klimaproblemer alene, men det bidrager til det. Så det er faktisk et meget vigtigt direktiv, som bringer os i den rigtige retning. Jeg håber selvfølgelig på, at det næste Parlament kan være endnu mere ambitiøst, end vi har været i dette Parlament, men trods alt skal vi glæde os over det, der går godt. Dette her bringer os et skridt i den rigtige retning.

**Violeta Bulc, Member of the Commission.** – Madam President, thank you for this debate and I'm really happy to note continued, strong support in the European Parliament for this proposal.

I would like to once again thank the rapporteur and all the shadow rapporteurs for what has been a very constructive negotiation. This has allowed us to complete the process in time for this Parliament to adopt the text before the recess.

Together with other elements of the mobility package 1, 2 and 3, the revised directive will play an important role in helping us achieve the substantive emission reductions in the transport sector that are required in order to comply with our obligations under the Paris COP 21 agreement and beyond. Adopting it under this Parliament will ensure a timely contribution to these objectives by as early as 2025.

But before I conclude, allow me a couple of comments based on your comments. First regarding the level of ambitions. Yes, this package, this proposal is an ambitious one. That's exactly what we need. At the same time it is a very realistic one and it is in line with the market forecasts.

I think it is important to recall that major city networks, Eurocity, then local governments for sustainability, the Council of European Municipalities and Regions, have recently written to the European Parliament and to the Romanian Presidency expressing full support for the Commission's proposal.

So yes, local levels are ready to engage. The purchase cost of zero-emission electric vehicles, whether with batteries or fuel cells, is currently high, that is true as well. But total lifecycle costs are already close to those of conventional vehicles and are expected to become even lower within the time frame of the proposal's targets and with the growing demand. Economies of volumes and scale will bring the costs down.

Where financial support is needed we are ready to use existing instruments such as EFSI, ESIF, CEF, as well as similar future instruments to help facilitate the transition to low- and zero-emission mobility.

Let me just recall the instrument for electrical buses that is being used by many of the European cities already. So having clear targets on public procurement in clean vehicles will really facilitate this.

Just a quick note also on some additional information regarding the industry. Last June, in 2018, a group of leading industry representatives, ABB, ALSTOM, EDF, Skoda, Solaris, Ursus and others, sent an open letter to the Council asking for higher ambition than that proposed by the Commission, and confirming that they are ready to deliver. So we have encouragement on both sides: on the demand and on the supply side.

Last but not least, let me just confirm what was also mentioned by you. Many leading cities are indeed already going beyond the requirements and many have committed to using only zero-emission buses already in the next five to ten years. The aim of the directive is to encourage other cities to follow this example, while recognising that many small and medium-sized cities might not yet have the resources and expertise of Amsterdam or Paris. But we are ready to engage and pool orders, and they can then together negotiate a better price with the industry.

Therefore I am very much looking forward to the adoption of Mr Grzyb's report in plenary tomorrow. I think that this file again proves that if we recognise a clear need and join our forces, we can deliver very concrete benefits for European citizens.

**Andrzej Grzyb**, *sprawozdawca*. – Pani Przewodnicząca! Wszyscy wiemy, że napęd elektryczny jest jednym z bardziej efektywnych napędów, jeżeli chodzi o pojazdy. Wykorzystanie energii pierwotnej jest tutaj dużo wyższe. Po drugie, doskonale też wiemy, że wsparcie rozwoju tego sektora, tak jak mówimy czystych, niskoemisyjnych pojazdów, to też wywołanie pewnego ruchu również w samym sektorze produkcji, a z drugiej strony to jest pomoc tym miastom, a mamy ich przecież wiele w Europie, które mają kłopoty z czystym powietrzem, z jakością powietrza, z obniżeniem emisji. Ten transport może im pomóc w tym, żeby uzyskać lepsze w tej materii rezultaty, a tego domagają się obywatele, mieszkańcy.

Ja mam taki przykład, tylko jeden podam, że jeden z bardzo lubiących biegać profesorów w jednym z polskich miast po kilkunastu latach biegania właśnie po terenach zielonych tego miasta powiedział „teraz wiem, że robiłem źle, ponieważ nabawiłem się choroby płuc”. Ja myślę, że te liczby mówiące jak wielu obywateli naszych państw członkowskich choruje na choroby układu oddechowego, ilu również przedwcześnie umiera, też powinny wywoływać u nas refleksję, co w tej materii powinniśmy zrobić. Coraz więcej jest miast, w których chce się decyzją zarządów tych miast, prezydentów, burmistrzów ograniczać wjazd pojazdów spalinowych do ich centrów, zezwalając tam tylko na wjazd pojazdom, które są napędzane elektrycznie. Oczywiście ja sobie zdaję z tego sprawę, co powiedział pan poseł Pieper, że to jest nałożenie obowiązków poprzez wdrożenie dyrektywy przez państwo członkowskie głównie na samorządy, ale wydaje mi się, że po licznych kontaktach i rozmowach z tymi samorządami, zarówno z miastami, powiatami, jak i również regionami, w trakcie konsultacji poprzedzającej naszą finalną pracę, zauważyłem, że one są w stanie zaakceptować właśnie ten fakt, że rozszerzyliśmy definicję pojazdów zero i niskoemisyjnych, właśnie o wodór, o paliwa gazowe, biometan, jak i również o możliwość retrofitingu czyli przebudowy aktualnie funkcjonujących pojazdów. Ja myślę, że to są bardzo ważne elementy, które uzyskaliśmy w trakcie właśnie konsultacji społecznych zarówno z producentami tychże pojazdów, jak również interesariuszami, głównie samorządami, które powiedziały nam, czego by oczekiwały, żeby ta regulacja była możliwa do akceptacji. Choć zdajemy sobie sprawę, że jest to przecież tylko efekt kompromisu pomiędzy trzema instytucjami, Parlamentem, Radą, która wyraziła swoją opinię (*general approach*), oraz Komisją Europejską.

Chciałbym bardzo serdecznie jeszcze raz podziękować. Myślę, że ważną informacją jest to, że fundusze europejskie po roku 2020 mają wspierać cele tej dyrektywy, i to jest też forma zachęty dla tych interesariuszy, którzy chcą przyłączyć się do wdrożenia akurat tej dyrektywy. Chciałbym bardzo serdecznie podziękować za wspólną pracę w tej kadencji, nie tylko nad tą dyrektywą, ale również za wszystko to co, Pani Przewodnicząca, byliśmy tu w stanie przeżyć wspólnie na tej sali, czasami się spierając, ale myślę też mając takie przekonanie, że robimy to w dobrym celu, robimy to dla obywateli Europy.

**Elnök asszony.** – A vitát lezárom.

A szavazásra 2019. április 18-án, csütörtökön kerül sor.

*Írásos nyilatkozatok (162. cikk)*

**Janusz Zemke (S&D), na piśmie.** – Transport odpowiada dzisiaj za prawie ¼ emisji gazów cieplarnianych w UE i jest główną przyczyną zanieczyszczenia powietrza w miastach. Słuszne jest zatem dążenie do mobilności niskoemisyjnej, gdyż jest to podstawowy warunek przechodzenia na gospodarkę niskoemisyjną sprzyjającą poprawie jakości środowiska. Konieczna jest optymalizacja systemu transportowego i zwiększenie jego efektywności m.in. poprzez propagowanie multimodalności i promowanie zaawansowanych biopaliw. Pamiętajmy jednak, że ważne znaczenie ma jakość infrastruktury i rozbudowa takich systemów komunikacji jak komunikacja publiczna, transport kolejowy i transport śródlądowy. Istotna jest ponadto nowa definicja ekologicznie czystych pojazdów i przyjęcie okresu przejściowego do 2025 roku, po którym będą egzekwowane znacznie bardziej rygorystycznie wymogi wobec pojazdów w Unii Europejskiej. Przeszkodą w modernizacji transportu jest słabe wsparcie finansowe.

Wydaje się, że Komisja Europejska powinna w ramach funduszy strukturalnych oraz programu Łącząc Europę przewidzieć znacznie większe wsparcie finansowe dla ekologicznie czystych pojazdów. Jest to jedyna droga do poprawy stanu środowiska w Europie.

## 21. Stosowanie narzędzi i procesów cyfrowych w prawie spółek (debata)

**Elnök asszony.** – A következő napirendi pont a Tadeusz Zwiefka által a Jogi Bizottság nevében készített, az (EU) 2017/1132 irányelvnek a digitális eszközök és folyamatok társasági jog terén történő használatát tekintetében történő módosításáról szóló európai parlamenti és tanácsi irányelvre irányuló javaslatról szóló jelentésről folytatott vita (COM(2018)0239 – C8-0166/2018 – 2018/0113(COD)) (A8-0422/2018).

**Tadeusz Zwiefka, sprawozdawca.** – Szanowna Pani Przewodnicząca! Bardzo dziękuję za udzielenie mi głosu. Szanowna pani komisarz Jourová! Już czujemy, że to koniec kadencji, a przed nami jeszcze przyjmowanie niezwykle ważnych dokumentów, takich, na które rzeczywiście rynek europejski i europejscy przedsiębiorcy czekają.

Na początku chciałem bardzo serdecznie podziękować pani komisarz Jourovej i na jej ręce złożyć podziękowanie całemu zespołowi, który przygotował znakomity projekt dyrektywy, co w znaczący sposób skróciło czas pracy, zarówno w Parlamencie, jak i w Radzie, i umożliwiło naprawdę spokojne przeprowadzenie negocjacji podczas rozmów trójstronnych. Bardzo serdecznie dziękuję także wszystkim koleżankom i kolegom sprawozdawcom-cieniom, którzy aktywnie włączyli się w prace nad projektem.

Czego on dotyczy? Mówimy o prawie spółek, prawie szalenie istotnym, jeśli mówimy o funkcjonowaniu wspólnego europejskiego rynku i o czymś, co jest istotą współczesności, czyli o cyfryzacji. Tak naprawdę dyrektywa ta otwiera nowe możliwości dotyczące rejestracji spółek przy wykorzystaniu właśnie technologii cyfrowej i internetu. Aż dziwi bierze, że dopiero pod koniec tej kadencji, kadencji naznaczonej tak naprawdę cyfryzacją, jej różnego rodzaju aspektami i społeczeństwem informacyjnym, dochodzimy do regulacji, których oczekują przedsiębiorcy i europejskie firmy.

Szanowni Państwo! Chcę bardzo wyraźnie podkreślić, że celem, który nam przyświecał, było poprawienie i ułatwienie funkcjonowania przedsiębiorcom i firmom w skromnym kontekście, jakim jest rejestracja firmy. Dotychczasowy brak tego rodzaju przepisów dotyczących rejestracji, publikacji dokumentów bądź brak koordynacji pomiędzy różnorodnymi systemami obowiązującymi w niektórych krajach członkowskich, gdzie taka możliwość już istniała, powodowały zwiększenie kosztów, wydłużenie czasu dotyczącego tych właśnie procedur, również pewnego rodzaju niepewność prawną, jeśli mówimy o rejestracji w innym kraju członkowskim, co w sumie prowadziło czasami do utraty możliwości rynkowych. Wówczas, być może, taka firma nie powstała albo musiała rezygnować z różnego rodzaju kontraktów, ponieważ wydłużał się czas niezbędny do dokonania rejestracji.

Dokument, który mamy przed sobą, ten czas zdecydowanie skraca. Powoduje, że będzie można dokonać takiej rejestracji drogą cyfrową w terminie od pięciu do maksymalnie dziesięciu dni roboczych. Oczywiście zakładając, że zostaną spełnione wszelkie wymogi, które obowiązują w państwie rejestracji: muszą zostać złożone wszystkie wymagane dokumenty i spełnione także zastrzeżenia, które przewidzieliśmy w dyrektywie, a które mają sprzyjać walce z ewentualnymi oszustwami bądź wręcz im zapobiegać. To niezwykle ważna kwestia.

Proszę Państwa! Ilu firm to może dotyczyć? Otóż według danych, które posiadam, w Unii Europejskiej działają około 24 miliony spółek, z czego około 80% to spółki kapitałowe i prawie wszystkie z nich są małymi i średnimi przedsiębiorstwami, czyli firmami, które generują największą liczbę miejsc pracy. Ułatwienie działania tych firm poprzez zaoszczędzenie czasu, pieniędzy, obciążeń personalnych jest więc naszą powinnością. To czynimy, przedkładając właśnie to sprawozdanie.

Jak powiedziałem, na razie przepisy będą dotyczyły spółek kapitałowych, ale mam nadzieję – i tutaj zwracam się do pani komisarz Jourové – że kiedy zostanie dokonany przegląd, który założyliśmy za około sześć lat, po jego przeprowadzeniu przepisy zostaną rozszerzone na wszystkie rodzaje spółek.

Proszę Państwa! Chciałbym jeszcze podkreślić jeden element, a mianowicie konieczność współpracy pomiędzy państwami członkowskimi przy wykonywaniu niektórych aspektów dyrektywy dotyczących na przykład obejmowania stanowisk kierowniczych czy stwierdzenia, że dana osoba może objąć stanowisko kierownicze w spółce. Ponieważ jest to dosyć skomplikowany element, nieco nawet wydłużyliśmy czas wdrożenia tej dyrektywy.

Oczywiście można powiedzieć, że przynosi ona pewnego rodzaju komplikacje, ale ostatecznie może ona przynieść tylko i wyłącznie korzyści i każde państwo członkowskie, które przeprowadzi w sposób oczekiwany przez nas wdrożenie przepisów, w krótkim czasie będzie mogło się o tym przekonać, a na pewno przekonają się o tym nasi europejscy przedsiębiorcy. Dlatego bardzo proszę, abyśmy jutro zagłosowali za zamknięciem pierwszego czytania.

**Věra Jourová, Member of the Commission.** – Madam President, tomorrow we will move one step closer to bringing the digital single market to companies, and, indeed, as Mr Zwiefka has just said, it is the last moment for us to do that. The new rules will help entrepreneurs create and run companies more easily and cheaply. Online procedures will now be available in all EU Member States. Companies will be able to fully use digital tools and processes not only at national level, but also cross-border. Companies will save time and money when they launch a new business or branch and update information available on business registers. And all this with strong security standards.

I would like to warmly thank the rapporteur, Mr Tadeusz Zwiefka, and the Council presidencies for the fast work on the proposal and for the excellent cooperation. The Commission is pleased with the result. In particular, the political agreement on the directive on digital tools and processes further clarifies that Member States can maintain their existing national systems, procedures and requirements, while making possible online procedures for formation of companies, registration of branches and filing of documents. As an important safeguard against fraud, the directive will specify in which exceptional cases Member States can require physical presence in the procedures.

I am also delighted that the co-legislators have agreed on the rules concerning the exchange of information about disqualified directors. It is a very important step towards a more transparent business environment and the prevention of fraud.

Finally, more information from business registers will be available for free to stakeholders, especially on who can legally represent a company. This will help to bring more trust to business transactions. The Commission therefore fully supports the compromise reached by the co-legislators and is looking forward to tomorrow's vote.

**Емил Радев, от илето на групата PPE.** – Г-жо Председател, Бих искал да поздравя моя колега Тадеуш за постигнатото споразумение и за окончателния текст на тази директива.

Искам да подчертая, че тази директива ще е от изключителна полза най-вече за малките и средните предприятия. Липсата на правила за онлайн регистрация на дружествата или разминаването на тези правила в държавите членки пораждаше ненужни разходи и тежести за предприемачите, желаещи да създадат ново предприятие или да разширят дейността си чрез регистриране на дъщерни дружества или клонове в друга държава.



С новите правила това вече ще бъде по-лесно и те ще могат да регистрират дружества с ограничена отговорност, да създават нови клонове и да подават документи в търговския регистър изцяло онлайн.

Процедурите в държавите, въвели онлайн регистрация, каквато е и моята страна България, обикновено са по-евтини и водят до по-бързо обработване на документите от тези, при които заявленията се подават лично и на хартиен носител. С новата директива регистрацията на дружества ще става онлайн, което ще намали значително разходите. Затова допринася и принципът на еднократност, според който на дадено дружество се налага да представя една и съща информация на публичните органи само веднъж.

Използването на цифрови решения в дружественото право следва да предвижда високи стандарти за защита от измами и злоупотреби. В тази връзка осъществяването на контрол на самоличността и правоспособността на лицата, които учредяват дружества, както и възможността да се изисква физическо явяване пред компетентен орган, са изключително важни.

От голяма полза за гражданите ще бъде и предоставянето безплатно от търговските регистри на повече информация за дружествата на всички заинтересовани страни.

**Evelyn Regner**, *im Namen der S&D-Fraktion*. – Frau Präsidentin, sehr geehrte Frau Kommissarin, sehr geehrter Herr Berichterstatter! Mit der Digitalisierung des EU-Gesellschaftsrechts werden Unternehmen künftig online gegründet werden können, ihre Dokumente online einreichen und jeder Verfahrensschritt kann online erledigt werden. Die jeweiligen Voraussetzungen und Anforderungen dafür bleiben nationale Kompetenz.

Die Zustimmung meiner Fraktion war nicht von Anfang an so gesichert. Warum? Für uns Sozialdemokraten ist es besonders wichtig, höchste Sicherheitsvorkehrungen gegen Missbrauch und gegen Betrug vorzusehen, wenn Unternehmen per Mausklick in anderen EU-Staaten entstehen. Wir wollen weder EU-Briefkastenfirmen à la carte schaffen noch Geschäftsmodelle von Mitgliedstaaten fördern, die sich selbst zum Delaware Europas deklarieren wollen. Deshalb auch ein ausdrücklicher Dank an Tadeusz Zwiefka als Berichterstatter, an die Kommissarin, Gratulation an das Verhandlungsteam, an die Schattenberichterstatterin Jytte Guteland, in deren Namen ich heute unter anderem auch sprechen darf.

Das Ergebnis sieht die verpflichtende Überprüfung der Identität und Rechtsfähigkeit der Personen, die die Firma gründen wollen, vor, und vor allem können die Mitgliedstaaten trotz voller Digitalisierung aus Gründen des öffentlichen Interesses ein persönliches Vorsprechen vor der zuständigen Stelle verlangen. Das ist uns so wichtig, damit die Onlineregistrierung nicht zu einem Briefkastenregistrierungstool wird.

Neue hohe Transparenzanforderungen und mehr Informationen werden künftig in den Firmenbüchern bereitgestellt und damit das BRIS weiter belebt und zum Funktionieren gebracht.

Wichtig und neu ist auch, dass künftig in allen EU-Mitgliedstaaten Regeln einzuführen sind, um Mitglieder und Leitungsgremien von Unternehmen auszuschließen. Betrüger sollen nicht in anderen Ländern weiter betrügen können. Unternehmen sollen die Vorteile der Digitalisierung nutzen dürfen, aber Europa darf kein Onlineshop für Unternehmen werden, in denen Missbrauch Tür und Tor geöffnet wird. Mit den hohen *safeguards* und der Identitätskontrolle müssen die Mitgliedstaaten darauf achten, dass Unternehmensrecht nicht missbraucht wird.

Also, insofern Gratulation für den Sprint, der bei diesem Thema gerade jetzt am Ende der Legislaturperiode noch geglückt ist – ein ausdrückliches Dankeschön.

**Ralph Packet**, *namens de ECR-Fractie*. – Voorzitter, in Vlaanderen zijn kmo's – kleine en middelgrote ondernemingen – de sterkhouders van de economie. Ze zorgen voor werk en welvaart voor vele duizenden gezinnen. Ze verdienen dan ook ondersteund te worden in doorgedreven digitalisering.

De lidstaten moeten dus inzetten op het digitaliseren van het vennootschapsrecht, zeker gezien de concurrentiestrijd in de EU door de vrijheid van vestiging. Omdat vennootschappen zo kostbaar zijn, heerst er een gezonde concurrentiestrijd tussen de lidstaten om die oprichting zo eenvoudig mogelijk te maken. Digitalisering is daar een belangrijk onderdeel van.

Sommige zijn hier echter heel terughoudend in, omdat de mogelijkheid om een vennootschap online op te richten, misbruikt zou kunnen worden voor fraude. Maar dat blijkt niet te kloppen. Want vandaag de dag volstaat de fysieke identiteitscontrole al lang niet meer om witwassen tegen te gaan of om oprichtersaansprakelijkheid te waarborgen. Er bestaan wel meer dan voldoende andere middelen om de veiligheid van de oprichting te garanderen. Denk maar aan elektronische identificatiemiddelen of aan posteriori-controle via het aandelenregister.

De oprichting van een vennootschap moet sneller en eenvoudiger kunnen. Dat zou niet alleen een pak minder geld en tijd kosten voor de vennootschappen zelf, maar het zou ook het aantal oprichtingen gevoelig kunnen doen stijgen. Dat kan alleen maar in het voordeel zijn van de economie waar die registratie plaatsvindt.

**Věra Jourová**, *Member of the Commission*. – Madam President, I would like to thank the honourable Members for their speeches and, of course, at the same time, I'd like to encourage you all to vote in favour of the compromise text of the proposal.

With this piece of legislation we are truly inviting European companies to the 21st century. This, I think, is a step in the right direction and we are doing something very useful. Now we can also start concentrating our efforts on ensuring that the implementation will make online procedures available in practice as soon as possible.

**Tadeusz Zwiefka**, *sprawozdawca*. – Dziękuję Pani Przewodnicząca! Dziękuję Pani Komisarz, Koleżankom i Kolegom za te słowa podsumowujące naszą współpracę i ten proces legislacyjny. Chciałbym tylko powiedzieć, że dla legislatora, dla nas, dla Parlamentu Europejskiego jest rzeczą oczywistą, że zdecydowana większość europejskich przedsiębiorców to są ludzie niezwykle uczciwi i my im ufamy, dlatego proponujemy takie rozwiązania, które mają im ułatwić życie i funkcjonowanie w normalnej naszej rzeczywistości, a ta rzeczywistość jest już dzisiaj rzeczywistością cyfrową. Oszuści zdarzali się także przy tradycyjnej formie rejestracji spółek, a zatem trudno zakładać, że będzie ich zdecydowanie więcej, czy w ogóle więcej przy formie rejestracji za pomocą internetu. Bardzo raz jeszcze serdecznie dziękuję wszystkim, którzy włożyli swój ogromny wkład pracy w przygotowanie finalnego tego dokumentu. Zwracam się z apelem do Rady, aby państwa członkowskie nie zwlekały z implementacją tej dyrektywy. Przedsiębiorcy europejscy rzeczywiście na takie nowoczesne przepisy z niecierpliwością czekają. Głęboko wierzę, że otrzymają je jak najszybciej.

**Elnök asszony**. – A vitát lezárom.

A szavazásra 2019. április 18-án, csütörtökön kerül sor.

*Írásos nyilatkozatok (162. cikk)*

**Lidia Joanna Geringer de Oedenberg (S&D)**, *na piśmie*. – Będąc posłem w Parlamencie Europejskim od 15 lat, z satysfakcją obserwuję jak nasza praca nad harmonizacją różnych przepisów krajowych przekłada się na wymierne efekty gospodarcze i integrację rynku unijnego, ostatnio także tego cyfrowego. Dzięki przyjętym dziś przepisom procedury dotyczące zakładania firm za granicą, czyli w innych krajach UE, staną się prostsze, czas ich rejestracji będzie znacznie krótszy i bez wymogu osobistego stawiania się w urzędach.

Rejestracja przez internet oraz możliwość elektronicznego składania potrzebnych dokumentów jest obecnie koniecznością i gwarantuje nowoczesną i przejrzystą przestrzeń dla rozwoju unijnych firm. Proponowane przepisy nie zmieniają obowiązujących w państwach członkowskich warunków rejestracji, czyli nie wpłyną negatywnie na przeciwdziałanie oszustwom finansowym czy uczestnictwo notariuszy podczas rejestracji. Po złożeniu wszystkich potrzebnych dokumentów cała procedura powinna trwać nie dłużej niż 5-10 dni, w zależności od rodzaju spółki i tego, czy wnioskodawca jest osobą fizyczną czy prawną. Projekt dyrektywy zakłada także stosowanie zasady jednorazowości, która oznacza, że dokumenty i informacje będą składane przez przedsiębiorcę tylko raz.

To ostatnia sesja plenarna VIII kadencji Parlamentu Europejskiego. Przez ostatnie trzy kadencje byłam na wszystkich sesjach plenarnych i teraz, kończąc już moją pracę w Parlamencie Europejskim, cieszę się, że mogłam współtworzyć wiele nowatorskich rozwiązań ułatwiających życie obywateli i działalność przedsiębiorców naszej Wspólnoty. Dziękuję za wspólną pracę.

## 22. Transgraniczne przekształcanie, łączenie i podział spółek (debata)

**Elnök asszony**. – A következő napirendi pont az Evelyn Regner által a Jogi Bizottság nevében készített, a határokon átnyúló átalakításokra, egyesülésekre és szétválásokra irányuló javaslatról szóló jelentésről folytatott vita (COM(2018)0241 – C8-0167/2018 – 2018/0114(COD)) (A8-0002/2019).

**Evelyn Regner, Berichterstatterin.** – Frau Präsidentin, sehr geehrte Frau Kommissarin, sehr geehrte Kolleginnen und Kollegen! Was wir hier geschafft haben, ist ein Meilenstein, im Umfang und der Komplexität der Richtlinie mit der Datenschutzverordnung oder der Dienstleistungsrichtlinie vergleichbar. In nur fünfeinhalb Wochen konnten wir in 110 anberaumten Nettoverhandlungsstunden die Mandate der zwei Institutionen zusammenbringen und einen gemeinsamen Richtlinientext ausarbeiten. Dafür möchte ich ganz ausdrücklich allen Beteiligten danken: der Kommission, der Kommissarin, den Schattenberichterstattern, dem Team, aber auch dem Rat.

Wir haben ein neues EU-weites Gesetz vor uns, das erstmals die Mobilität der Unternehmen umfassend reguliert und ein einheitliches Verfahren einführt für grenzüberschreitende Umwandlungen, Verschmelzungen und Spaltungen von Unternehmen. Ja, alle Unternehmen haben das Recht, sich in einen anderen Mitgliedstaat zu begeben und dort niederzulassen. Ja, ich bin Gewerkschafterin und ermögliche mit dieser Richtlinie den Unternehmen den Schritt über die Grenze.

Unternehmen haben das Recht, in der EU umzuziehen – und das seit Gründung der Europäischen Union. Nur, dieses Recht bekam nie einen Rahmen und wurde nie weiter reguliert. Deshalb geschah über Jahrzehnte die Verselbständigung der EuGH-Rechtsprechung – immer in Abwesenheit von Regeln –, die den Gang über die nationale Grenze bestätigte und die Entstehung von Briefkastenfirmen ermöglichte. Mir ging es deshalb immer um eine ausgewogene Balance: Unternehmen dürfen ihr Recht wahrnehmen, aber alle *stakeholder*, vor allem die Arbeitnehmerinnen und die Arbeitnehmer müssen hohen Schutz genießen. Wir konnten nun den besten gemeinsamen Nenner finden.

Die wesentlichen Forderungen des Europäischen Parlaments spiegeln sich im neuen Richtlinientext wider: besserer Schutz der Beschäftigten, der Arbeitnehmer und Arbeitnehmerinnen, wenn Unternehmer in einen anderen Mitgliedstaat ziehen, wird gewährleistet und eine verpflichtende Antimissbrauchsklausel, um Umgehungstatbestände zu vermeiden, wie etwa die Entstehung von Briefkastenfirmen.

Die Belegschaft der Unternehmen ist mir ein großes Anliegen. Arbeitnehmer müssen gehört und informiert werden, wenn es um ihre Existenz und wenn es um ihre Jobs geht. Ein neuer Artikel über Information und Konsultation der Arbeitnehmer gewährleistet künftig die Einhaltung der Informations- und Konsultationsrechte der Belegschaft. Ausdrückliche *reminder* sichern die rechtzeitige Information und Konsultation in allen Verfahrensschritten.

Zusätzlich werden fünf neue Rechte für Arbeitnehmer eingeführt, wenn ein Unternehmen in ein anderes EU-Land zieht. Schluss damit, aus den Nachrichten vom Wegzug der Firma zu erfahren! Arbeitnehmer bekommen künftig einen ausführlichen Bericht über die Zukunft ihrer Beschäftigung, sie werden zum Verlegungsplan und zum Bericht gefragt, können rechtzeitig dazu Stellung nehmen und kommentieren, und erstmals bekommen sie das Recht, auch eine begründete Antwort von Management zu bekommen.

Klargestellt wird auch, dass neben den nationalen Betriebsräten auch die europäischen Betriebsräte und die SE-Betriebsräte in die Konsultation einbezogen sind und dass den Betriebsräten ausreichend Ressourcen zur Verfügung gestellt werden, um ihre Rechte wahrzunehmen. Der Schutz der Arbeitnehmermitbestimmung konnte zum Kommissionsvorschlag verbessert werden. Gleichauf auch hier in allen grenzüberschreitenden Operationen vier Jahre Schutzfrist und Verhandlungen starten bereits bei vier Fünftel der nationalen Schwelle, die die Einrichtung von Mitbestimmung vorsieht.

Der zweite große Bereich, für den ich mich ins Zeug gelegt habe, rührt von meinen Arbeiten in den Ausschüssen dieses Hauses zu den Steuerskandalen – LuxLeaks, Panama Papers & Co – aber auch im Bereich der Beschäftigung. Denken wir an die Entsendungen von Arbeitnehmern – gerade im Transport- und Bausektor – finden wir oft Missbrauch mittels Briefkastenfirmen.

Gesellschaftsrecht wird systematisch missbraucht, um sich die günstigste Rechtsordnung zu ergattern, und das meist auf dem Rücken der Arbeitnehmer und Arbeitnehmerinnen und der Steuerzahler und Steuerzahlerinnen. Deshalb bin ich ganz besonders stolz, dass nun eine verpflichtende Antimissbrauchsklausel eingeführt wird. Hat die zuständige Behörde oder das Gericht, bei der künftig eine Verlegung beantragt werden muss, ernste Zweifel und befürchtet, dass Missbrauch vorliegt, muss sie künftig bei allen drei grenzüberschreitenden Verlegungsverfahren prüfen, ob durch den Gang über die Grenze nationale oder EU-Gesetze, wie etwa Arbeitnehmerrechte oder die Zahlung von Steuern oder Sozialabgaben, missbräuchlich umgangen werden oder ob betrügerische oder kriminelle Zwecke verfolgt werden. Ist das der Fall, dürfen sie für den grenzüberschreitenden Umzug keine Genehmigung ausstellen. Das bedeutet: Will ein Unternehmen, sein Recht umzuziehen, missbrauchen, um Arbeits- oder Steuerrecht zu umgehen oder um kriminelle Handlungen durch Briefkastenfirmen zu verschleiern, ist der Weg- oder Umzug verboten.

Diese Antimissbrauchsklausel, die sowohl für Umwandlung, Verschmelzungen und Spaltungen gilt, bekommt durch die nachträgliche Kontrolle nach der Restrukturierung auch Zähne. Wenn missbräuchliche oder betrügerische Unternehmensstrukturen erst nach der Umstrukturierung entdeckt werden, können die Behörden effektiv, proportional und abschreckend Strafen setzen. Durch Unternehmensmobilität darf keine missbräuchliche Briefkastenfirma mehr entstehen.

Sie sehen also, ein umfassendes Paket, und deshalb ein ganz ausdrücklicher Dank an alle Schattenberichterstatter – Luis de Grandes Pascual – auch an alle anderen – Pascal Durand –, die sich hier so eingesetzt haben, ein umfassendes Paket nun endlich beschlussfähig zu machen.

**Věra Jourová**, *Member of the Commission*. – Madam President, I will start this speech with a bit of sentiment because this is the last plenary for me in this term. I have had so many over the five years. Working on many different topics, with Ms Evelyn Regner, Mr Pascual de Grandes, and many others, I always felt the necessary, useful and so vitally important portion of synergy and political will: synergy of expertise and common sense and a synergy in understanding what it is necessary to do. This company law package is, I think, a very good example. It is very complex and, according to what I heard from knowledgeable people, many of them didn't believe that we would come up with it and push it through. So at this moment we are at the end of a very difficult but – I believe – successful road.

The EU's single market offers many opportunities for companies to move and grow. However, often companies cannot make use of them in practice. The Commission proposal responded to long-standing calls from the European Parliament, trade unions and business organisations for rules in this area. And, of course, I have to very warmly thank the rapporteur, Ms Evelyn Regner, and the Council presidencies for their constructive approach and efficient work on this very important and complex proposal.

I am very pleased that the European Parliament and the Council found a good and pragmatic compromise which can considerably improve the situation for both companies and their employees. The directive will enable companies to move and reorganise in the EU single market while providing necessary safeguards for employees and other stakeholders. The Commission welcomes the mandatory character of the anti-abuse measures, an important issue for the European Parliament and many stakeholders.

The Commission also welcomes the agreed provisions on employees' rights, which include many of the issues raised in the European Parliament's position. The four-fifths threshold for starting negotiations in all three cross-border operations, the mandatory character of such negotiations and the provisions to protect the negotiated solution in the event of subsequent operations provide a very complete and comprehensive package of safeguards.

In addition, the new article on information and consultation emphasises and specifies the employees' rights to have a say in a cross-border operation, which was also essential for this House.

Remembering the divergent positions when the negotiations started, the Commission would like to congratulate the co-legislators on the solutions found. The compromise strikes a good balance and represents a huge step forward compared with the current situation. It provides solid and fair rules for all parties involved in cross-border operations, while not making the procedure too cumbersome in practice. Therefore, the Commission can fully support the compromise and is looking forward to tomorrow's vote.

(Applause)

**Olle Ludvigsson**, *föredragande av yttrande från utskottet för ekonomi och valutafrågor*. – Fru talman! Som föredragande för ekonomiutskottets yttrande var min utgångspunkt följande: Det är bra och viktigt med nya rättssäkra regler som främjar gränsöverskridande företagsmöjligheter på den inre marknaden för seriösa företag, men regelverket måste också innehålla säkerhetsåtgärder och motverka dumpning av skatter och sociala villkor och får inte underlätta för företag som vill flytta eller sammanslås enbart med syfte att undvika arbetstagares rättigheter och inflytande, socialt skydd och skatter.

Utifrån detta vill jag verkligen tacka föredragande Evelyn Regner och alla skuggföredragande för ett mycket väl utfört arbete i förhandlingarna med ministerrådet.

Överenskommelsen är ett stort steg i rätt riktning. De nya reglerna säkerställer fler möjligheter för företag att flytta och växa på EU:s inre marknad. Samtidigt erbjuder de nya reglerna starkt skydd och insyn för anställda, aktieägare och borgenärer.

Med detta sagt hoppas jag att vi i morgon kan anta överenskommelsen. Rättvisa bolagsregler på den inre marknaden är en nödvändighet. Att de nya reglerna innehåller tillräckligt skydd mot missbruk och bedrägeri är också viktigt för att återfå medborgarnas förtroende för den inre marknaden och ett stort steg i kampen för en rättvis inre marknad med ordning och reda på arbetsmarknaden och bekämpning av brevlådeföretag.

### **Puhetta johti HEIDI HAUTALA**

*varapuhemies*

**Luis de Grandes Pascual**, *en nombre del Grupo PPE*. – Señora presidenta, comisaria Jourová, señorías, yo quiero empezar por agradecer el trabajo riguroso del Consejo y el trabajo riguroso, empeñado y difícil que ha desempeñado mi amiga, aunque adversaria, Evelyn Regner.

Desde el Grupo Popular hemos apoyado a la Comisión con esta Directiva, ya que su objetivo principal es facilitar a las empresas, principalmente pymes, el desarrollo de la libertad de establecimiento. Se pretende dar un marco jurídico predecible, en un mundo cada vez más globalizado, sin poner en peligro ni en riesgo los derechos de los trabajadores, acreedores y accionistas. Por eso, en los nuevos procedimientos armonizados también se incluyen las salvaguardias necesarias para la defensa de los derechos de todos.

Esta Directiva trae causa, señorías, de la necesidad de dar una respuesta a la evolución de la jurisprudencia del Tribunal Europeo sobre la libertad de establecimiento, consagrada en el artículo 49 del Tratado de Funcionamiento de la Unión Europea. Nosotros siempre hemos defendido que las empresas que estuvieran establecidas en un Estado miembro tuvieran el derecho y la libertad de transferir su sede a otro sin perder su personalidad jurídica. Este derecho, señorías, se puede ejercer aunque la sociedad no ejerza actividad económica en el Estado receptor.

Sin embargo, también consideramos oportuno, al igual que la ponente y el Consejo, incluir una cláusula antiabuso como límite para que se lleve a cabo la operación transfronteriza y así, evitar comportamientos fraudulentos sin otro objetivo más que el de abusar del sistema y de nuestra unidad de mercado.

Por ello, yo personalmente hice mucho hincapié, como sabe la señora ponente, en que las empresas tuvieran que justificar, entre otras cosas, si habían recibido ayudas públicas, ya que vemos todos los días casos de empresas que, tras recibir un incentivo económico, deciden abandonar el país, aprovechándose así del sistema y dejando a los trabajadores en la indefensión. De eso sabemos algo en España.

Del mismo modo, también conseguimos incluir un fuerte control *ex post* al movimiento, que permite verificar que no existe ningún fraude y dar validez a la operación a través de un procedimiento exhaustivo que, además, garantiza a las partes una protección adecuada en el mercado único.

El resultado, señorías, es positivo, teniendo en cuenta que no merma la libertad de establecimiento, que siempre ha sido nuestra prioridad, pues queremos una Europa unida, sin fronteras, y es nuestra responsabilidad velar por ella.

**Michael Detjen**, *im Namen der S&D-Fraktion*. – Frau Präsidentin, verehrte Frau Kommissarin! Mit der morgigen Abstimmung beenden wir eine unhaltbare Situation – eine Situation, in der Firmen ihren Registersitz von einem Land ins andere verlegen konnten, ohne sich dabei an Regeln zu halten. Ohne Regeln war es möglich, dem kurzfristigen Profitstreben nachzugeben und sich das Land mit den niedrigsten Löhnen, Arbeitnehmerrechten, Steuern und Umweltauflagen auszusuchen. Darum brauchen wir Regeln, die die Interessen der Beschäftigten bei Umstrukturierungen schützen. Der Schutz ihrer Informations- und Konsultationsrechte hat eine herausragende Bedeutung und gibt Vertrauen.

Ich bin meiner Kollegin Evelyn Regner sehr dankbar für diese wichtigen Erfolge, die sie trotz schwerer Umstände erreicht hat. Der größte Erfolg ist, dass man von einem unregelmäßigen Zustand tatsächlich in einen geregelten Zustand kommt. Das Management ist damit erstmals verpflichtet, den Belegschaften einen detaillierten Bericht über die Auswirkungen der Umstrukturierungen auf ihre Beschäftigungsverhältnisse zu geben. Gut so! Eine Anti-Missbrauchsklausel soll es den Behörden ermöglichen, eine Überprüfung der Gründe für die Umstrukturierung zu veranlassen. Gut so! So können die schlimmsten Auswüchse von Briefkastenfirmen verhindert werden.

Die Nationalstaaten waren nicht bereit, einen größeren Schritt nach vorne mitzugehen. Sie haben eine Chance verpasst. Dabei war es nicht Europa, es war nicht dieses Parlament, es waren die Regierungen der Nationalstaaten, die einen weiteren Schutz für Arbeitnehmerinnen und Arbeitnehmer verhindert haben. Unser Haus, das Parlament, hat parteiübergreifend gute Kompromisse gefunden, Vorschläge unterbreitet, wie wir zu gesetzlichen Mindeststandards bei Unterrichtung, Anhörung und Mitbestimmung kommen können. Wir sehen hier ein krasses Ungleichgewicht zwischen wirtschaftlichen Freiheiten von Unternehmen und sozialen Rechten von Bürgerinnen und Bürgern.

Der Text, über den wir morgen abstimmen werden, ist ein erster Einstieg – ein guter Einstieg – in ein System von Regeln. Ich werde dem Text zustimmen. Wir werden dabei aber nicht vergessen, dass es dringend nötig ist, eine Rahmenrichtlinie für die Mitbestimmung in Europa zu haben.

Im Übrigen: Da dies meine letzte Rede hier im Haus ist, danke ich allen Europäerinnen und Europäern, den Kolleginnen und Kollegen, dass ich bis heute hier im Parlament mitarbeiten durfte.

**Martin Schirdewan**, *im Namen der GUE/NGL-Fraktion*. – Frau Präsidentin, verehrte Kolleginnen und Kollegen! Zunächst auch Dank an die Berichterstatterin und den Berichterstatter für ihren Einsatz im Kampf gegen Steuerhinterziehung und für Rechte von Arbeitnehmerinnen und Arbeitnehmern. Leider muss ich allerdings konstatieren, dass wieder einmal ein guter Text des Parlaments in den Trilogverhandlungen stark verwässert worden ist. Diesmal haben wir es dem Rat zu verdanken – der hier auch gerade nicht anwesend ist –, dass im Zuge der Neuregelung der Niederlassungsfreiheit von Unternehmen in der EU den Arbeitnehmerinnen und Arbeitnehmern der Zugang zu den ihnen zustehenden Informations-, Konsultations- und Partizipationsrechten erschwert wurde. Es wäre auch dringend an der Zeit gewesen, eindeutigere und klarere Regelungen zu schaffen, um Briefkastenfirmen und der damit einhergehenden Steuervermeidung einen Riegel vorzuschieben.

Diese Politik billigt Unternehmen in der EU immer mehr Mobilität zu, aber Arbeitnehmerinnen und Arbeitnehmer werden in ihren Rechten geschwächt. Steuer- und Sozialdumping werden so auch nicht beendet. Deshalb werden wir als Linke – ebenso wie der Kollege, der gerade gesprochen hat – eine Rahmenrichtlinie für Mitbestimmung fordern, mit der die Rechte der Arbeitnehmerinnen und Arbeitnehmer in der EU gesichert werden.

**Емил Радев (PPE)**. – Г-жо Председател, радвам се, че днес обсъждаме този законодателен акт от пакета за дружественото право в Европейския съюз. Поздравявам г-жа Регнер за доклада. Приветствам и Европейската комисия, която се вслуша в нашия призив и предложи хармонизирани правила относно трансграничните преобразувания и разделения.

Не трябва да забравяме, че основните цели на хармонизираните правила са да се позволи на предприятията, особено на малките предприятия, да се преобразуват, сливат или разделят през граница по организиран, ефикасен и ефективен начин. С приемането на тази директива ще улесним значително мобилността и ефикасността на европейския бизнес.

Вярвам, че процедурите за проверка на законосъобразността на трансграничните операции в рамките на всички засегнати национални правни уредби и задължителната процедура за борба със злоупотребите ще позволят на националните органи да блокират трансгранична операция, когато тя се извършва с цел злоупотреба или измама.

Постигнахме баланс между свободата на установяване на предприятията и защитата на законните интереси на акционерите, кредиторите и служителите в тези предприятия. Служителите трябва да бъдат подходящо информирани за очакваните последици от операцията, а правата на миноритарните акционери и на акционерите без право на глас ще бъдат по-добре защитени. В същото време кредиторите на съответното дружество ще разполагат с по-ясни и по-надеждни гаранции за своите вземания.

**Věra Jourová**, *Member of the Commission*. – Madam President, I'd like to thank you for your speeches, for your positive comments, and for emphasising the rules needed for better mobility of companies within the EU and for better and stronger legal certainty for companies. Indeed, this is what we wanted. We wanted to come up with enabling legislation combining safeguards against abuse with safeguards to guarantee the rights of employees and shareholders, and guaranteeing that no letter-box companies and no tax avoidance or tax evasion will be allowed by means of this legislation. This was complex work. It required a lot of our expertise and a lot of our, as I said at the beginning, political will. I also appreciate the fact that we not only worked together in a spirit of good compromise, but also worked under – let's say – time pressure at the end of our terms and we managed. So thank you very much for the cooperation. I think that we are together presenting a very good and balanced proposal and I do hope that tomorrow it will be rubber-stamped by a positive vote in this House.

**Evelyn Regner**, *Berichterstatterin*. – Frau Präsidentin! Wer sich mit dem europäischen Gesellschaftsrecht befasst, muss Marathonläufer sein – mit Sprinterqualitäten. Warum? Seit so vielen Jahren beschäftigen wir uns mit dem europäischen Gesellschaftsrecht, um hier endlich gute Standards für ganz Europa auf die Beine zu stellen. Und die Sprinterqualitäten deshalb, weil wir wirklich Tag und Nacht bis zum Schluss, bis zum letzten Plenartag, wie wir sehen, in dieser Wahlperiode gekämpft haben, um dieses Paket durchzubringen. Und deshalb kann ich nur nochmals meinen ausdrücklichen Dank an die Kommissarin aussprechen, an die Verhandlerin von der rumänischen Ratspräsidentschaft, an Gabriela Fierbinteanu, an die Schattenberichterstatter, die hier so konstruktiv gewesen sind, und auch an die Mitarbeiter, vor allem an Emilie Apell und Sabrina Winter.

Ich möchte diese letzte Minute noch nutzen und auch den Aufruf tätigen: Ja, wir haben jetzt wirklich Großes auf die Beine gestellt, aber der nächste Schritt sollte diese Rahmenrichtlinie sein. Wir brauchen ein horizontales Instrument für die Beschäftigten, zur Information und Konsultation auf europäischer Ebene, und den berühmten *escalator*, damit man sich auch flexibel an geänderte Unternehmenssituationen entsprechend anpassen und entsprechend Regeln finden kann.

**Puhemies**. – Keskustelu on päättynyt.

Äänestys toimitetaan huomenna torstaina 18.4.2019.

## 23. Europejski Fundusz Obrony (debata)

**Puhemies**. – Esityslistalla on seuraavana Zdzisław Krasnodębskin teollisuus-, tutkimus- ja energiavaliokunnan puolesta laatima mietintö ehdotuksesta Euroopan parlamentin ja neuvoston asetukseksi Euroopan puolustusrahastosta (COM(2018)0476 - C8-0268/2018 - 2018/0254(COD)) (A8-0412/2018).

**Zdzisław Krasnodębski**, *sprawozdawca*. – Pani Przewodnicząca! Przede wszystkim chciałbym wyrazić zadowolenie, że osiągnęliśmy wspólnie, po wielogodzinnych negocjacjach i trzech rozmowach trójstronnych porozumienie częściowe, które będzie głosowane jutro. To nie było łatwe, było wiele obaw związanych z tym funduszem, obaw, które wydawały mi się zupełnie nieuzasadnione. Te obawy zresztą i kontrowersje trwają nadal, co mnie trochę dziwi, bo akurat grupy kolegów, których postulaty starałem się bardzo sumiennie uwzględnić w czasie negocjacji trójstronnych (kolegów kontrsprawozdawców z ramienia Partii Zielonych, pana Bütikofera, pana Martin) i wydawało mi się, że są dosyć zadowolone z osiągniętego kompromisu i że osiągnęliśmy bardzo dużo, dzisiaj go kwestionują. Istnieją dwa problemy: przede wszystkim kwestie etyczne oraz kwestia aktu delegowanego, o której tu za chwilę powiem.

Z drugiej strony były też i są obawy, czy Europejski Fundusz Obronny nie naruszy naszych zobowiązań i naszych relacji transatlantyckich, naszych relacji z NATO, który jest podstawowym sojuszem obronnym gwarantującym nam wszystkim bezpieczeństwo. Wydaje mi się, że zarówno obawy zgłaszane z lewej strony sceny politycznej, jak i ze środka lub z prawej strony są nieuzasadnione, i uważam, że osiągnięte porozumienie częściowe, które też zostało potwierdzone pisemnie przez Radę (Rada czuje się zobowiązana tym, co wynegocjowaliśmy, co też było postulatem przedstawicieli socjalistów i zielonych) potwierdza, że obie strony, a także – mam nadzieję Komisja i pani komisarz – są zadowolone z osiągniętego porozumienia.

Może tylko wyliczę w skrócie te wszystkie rzeczy, które osiągnęliśmy, które były ważne dla Parlamentu: bezpośrednie zarządzanie funduszem przez Komisję Europejską, następnie uwzględnienie osobnego budżetu dla technologii przełomowych, brak limitu dla naliczeń kosztów pośrednich, preferencyjne uczestnictwa w funduszu dla MŚP i mid-capsów. Wiele uwagi i czasu w negocjacjach poświęciliśmy kwestii kontroli etycznej w finansowaniu projektów, no i tutaj Rada poszła na daleko idące ustępstwa, uwzględniając wiele postulatów Parlamentu, co można porównać z EDIDP.

Dla mnie ważne jest też to, że pojawił się zapis w motywach wykluczający udział podmiotów kontrolowanych przez państwa trzecie obłożone unijnymi sankcjami. To jest niezwykle istotne w sytuacji, w której się znajdujemy. Istotne było też to, że osłabiliśmy obawy niektórych kolegów dotyczące wspierania handlu wytworami europejskiego przemysłu obronnego – wiele tego rodzaju sformułowań, które mogłyby nasuwać takie błędne skojarzenia, zostało wyeliminowanych.

Celem funduszu nie jest militaryzacja Unii, ani inne cele, lecz wspieranie wspólnych europejskich projektów w fazie badań i rozwoju. Celem nie jest też produkcja broni, ale właśnie faza badań i rozwoju. Myślę, że pozwoli to uniknąć zbędnych duplikacji, a fundusz działał będzie na rzecz projektowania technologii i produktów obronnych najwyższej jakości. Wydaje mi się, że jest to niezwykle ważne, natomiast nie udało nam się – i rozumiem oczywiście, że jest to kontrowersyjne, ale wynika z charakteru tego funduszu – zrezygnować z aktu delegowanego, ale są też precedensy: zgodziliśmy się na niego ze względu na charakter funduszu i założenie operacyjne.

Kilka kwestii pozostaje otwartych, ale – już kończę Pani Przewodnicząca – wydaje mi się, że zachowaliśmy te wszystkie elementy, które były ważne zarówno dla krytyków z lewej, jak i z prawej strony tego funduszu.

**David McAllister**, *Verfasser der Stellungnahme des mitberatenden Ausschusses für auswärtige Angelegenheiten*. – Frau Präsidentin, sehr verehrte Frau Kommissarin Bieńkowska! Mit dem Europäischen Verteidigungsfonds gehen wir einen großen Schritt, um mehr Gemeinsamkeit in der Forschung und in der Beschaffung von militärischem Gerät zu erzielen und somit unsere Verteidigung effektiver zu organisieren.

Als Berichterstatter des Ausschusses für auswärtige Angelegenheiten für diesen Bericht ist mir ein Punkt besonders wichtig: Der Europäische Verteidigungsfonds legt ein industriepolitisches Fundament für mehr Zusammenarbeit. Darauf gilt es nun, sicherheitspolitisch weiter aufzubauen und die Abstimmung und Vernetzung der nationalen Streitkräfte zu verbessern. Nur so können wir die Zahl der unterschiedlichen Waffensysteme reduzieren, die Entwicklung gemeinsamer militärischer Fähigkeiten vorantreiben und letztlich Steuergelder effektiver einsetzen.

Mit dem Europäischen Verteidigungsfonds verbessern wir unsere Verteidigungsfähigkeiten und damit den Schutz unserer Bürgerinnen und Bürger. Deshalb appelliere ich an alle Kolleginnen und Kollegen, morgen Mittag für diese Verordnung zu stimmen.

**Elżbieta Bieńkowska**, *Member of the Commission*. – Madam President, I welcome the chance again to discuss the European Defence Fund (EDF) as I'm very much sure about it. It will be a game-changer for a much-lacking defence cooperation in Europe. Since the proposal of the Commission in June last year, the work has been very intense, both in the Committee on Industry, Research and Energy (ITRE) and then in the trilogue. Today we have a partial agreement at first reading for which I hope the Chamber will vote tomorrow. Agreeing on the main parameters of the fund is really a key milestone towards defence union.

I would like to sincerely thank at the very beginning, the negotiating team of ITRE. All of you were very dedicated negotiators; so the rapporteur Mr Krasnodębski, Ms Grossetête, Mr Riquet, Mr Martin, Mr Bütikofer, and of course not forgetting Mr McAllister. Thanks very much all of you.



The EDF will on one side enhance Europe's strategic autonomy in supporting the development of key defence capabilities, but on the other it will help increase the efficiency of public spending on defence by increasing cooperation. With the EDF we are using the EU budget to co-finance defence industrial projects, incentivising cooperation in defence, increasing the competitiveness and innovative potential of the European defence industry, enhancing Europe's technological autonomy and, ultimately, positioning Europe as a true security provider, of course not in contradiction with NATO but in complementarity with it.

EDF, as partially agreed, will include many features for which this Parliament has fought hard. Let me just name a few, they were mentioned by the rapporteur, but let me look at this from the Commission perspective.

So first, EU rules will apply; no (*inaudible*) based on competition with a clear EU-based governance. This was an important element for the Commission as, of course, the EU budget is involved here. As supported by Parliament, the Commission will directly implement the fund.

Second, we collectively maintained and even strengthened the question of the eligibility of the fund, and here the rule is very clear: we will only finance EU-based companies, companies which respect clear security conditions, so the security of supply, security of information and no transfer of knowledge from Europe.

We are not excluding anybody from our alliance; however, we are just setting the conditions for participation to make sure that Europe's interests are preserved. These conditions, as I keep repeating, are similar if not identical to the ones EU companies are facing when doing R&D in third countries.

Third point, cooperation, which is of course at the core of the fund. We are incentivising it by specific rules, also promoting the participation of small and medium-sized enterprises and mid-caps. The EDF is not only for the big defence industrial groups, it is also for the smaller actors across Europe. With specific bonuses we hope to open up the defence supply chain.

Fourth point: it has been made clear in the legal text that actions have to comply with relevant national, Union and international law, as well as with the ethical principles reflected in there.

As asked by Parliament, the Commission will issue guidance on the ethics to applicants and to the independent experts that will carry out the ethics screenings and assessment. The fund also clearly excludes actions for the development of lethal autonomous weapons without human control.

Fifth point: the EDF will support disruptive innovation, as up to 8% of the budget will be allocated to disruptive technologies and both the Commission and Parliament are on the very same page here.

I believe that the compromise text offers a satisfactory solution, while the annual work programme, as was mentioned by the rapporteur, shall be adopted by the implementing act. The list of priority fields was introduced to frame the content of the work programme and the Commission is ready to come to Parliament each year to discuss the content of the work programme.

This approach, as you know, is not specific or unique to defence. There are other funding programmes, programme proposals, which make use of implementing acts and they were accepted by Parliament and I wanted to underline that.

**Alain Lamassoure**, *rapporteur pour avis de la commission des budgets*. – Madame la Présidente, Madame la Commissaire, chers Collègues, je voudrais, au nom de la commission des budgets, féliciter toutes celles et tous ceux grâce à qui nous avons obtenu cet accord partiel, et en particulier l'équipe du Parlement dont les membres ont été cités par M<sup>me</sup> la Commissaire.

Pour la commission des budgets, cet accord est un des projets les plus novateurs du prochain cadre financier pluriannuel. Nous nous sommes battus à quelques-uns, pendant des années, pour que la défense puisse bénéficier de fonds budgétaires de l'Union. Je me réjouis en particulier que cet accord donne au programme tous les moyens de ses ambitions, en lui donnant notamment accès aux instruments d'InvestEU. Il faudra s'assurer que la plénière le confirme demain.

Je me réjouis enfin du signal politique très fort envoyé par ce projet dans un domaine qui est au cœur de l'exercice de la souveraineté des États membres. Ce fonds illustre que le transfert à l'Union de certaines compétences permettra d'avoir plus de sécurité pour un coût budgétaire global inférieur.

**Françoise Grossetête**, *au nom du groupe PPE*. – Madame la Présidente, Madame la Commissaire, chers Collègues, c'est ma dernière intervention au sein de cet hémicycle après 25 ans de présence et je suis heureuse que ce soit pour parler du Fonds européen de défense, car ce nouveau Fonds sera, je l'espère, un outil supplémentaire d'intégration européenne, par le développement des coopérations. C'est en tout cas un moment historique.

J'en profite pour remercier notre rapporteur, M. Krasnodebski, ainsi que, plus particulièrement, la commissaire, M<sup>me</sup> Bieńkowska, qui nous a permis d'obtenir un accord assez rapidement. Pendant trop longtemps, certains ont freiné les avancées visant à développer une vraie politique industrielle européenne en matière de défense. Or, nous venons d'accomplir en moins de trois ans ce que personne n'imaginait possible. Je compte donc sur toutes les forces européennes constructives pour adopter ce très bon accord issu des négociations et sur le prochain Parlement pour sanctuariser le budget de 13 milliards d'euros pour la période 2021-2027. Il faut se donner les moyens d'attirer les meilleurs projets, les plus innovants, des industriels et des États membres.

Ce Fonds est une réponse directe aux préoccupations de nos concitoyens. Que ce soit sur l'éthique, sur l'interdiction des robots tueurs ou sur le contrôle budgétaire du Parlement, nous avons de solides arguments face à certaines idéologies pacifistes qui hypothèquent l'avenir de notre industrie et la sécurité des Européens.

Enfin, ce Fonds est un moyen pour l'Europe de se prendre en main, de renforcer son autonomie technologique et stratégique. Nous donnons ainsi à l'Union européenne une nouvelle capacité d'indépendance avec des financements qui seront dirigés vers les entreprises européennes. Ce principe d'autonomie stratégique est également crucial dans beaucoup d'autres domaines: le spatial, la santé, l'énergie, l'alimentation et bien sûr la sécurité et la défense. Car dans un monde toujours plus instable, nous devons d'abord compter sur l'union de nos propres forces. C'est ainsi que nous aurons une Union européenne forte qui permettra de mieux défendre et de mieux assurer la sécurité de nos États dans le contexte de la mondialisation.

**Edouard Martin**, *au nom du groupe S&D*. – Madame la Présidente, je comprends évidemment que la Commission et le Conseil aient la banane avec ce projet d'accord, étant donné qu'ils ont obtenu ce qu'ils souhaitent, et notamment le fait qu'il n'y ait pas d'acte délégué. Cela peut paraître un problème technique pour certains, mais pour moi, ce n'est pas un problème technique: il y va du pouvoir de contrôle du Parlement européen, et donc des citoyens, sur ce programme de 13 milliards portant sur un sujet aussi sensible.

D'autres points sont aussi considérés comme des détails par certains. Je soutiens effectivement les amendements qui seront mis au vote demain, en particulier en ce qui concerne l'éthique (article 7) et certaines prohibitions d'armes (article 11), par exemple. En effet, on ne peut pas s'en tenir à une simple référence au droit international, car celui-ci est ambigu. Prenons le cas du phosphore blanc: son usage pour les munitions traçantes à des fins de dissimulation est autorisé, mais s'il en est fait usage de façon indiscriminée et incendiaire, c'est condamnable au titre des conventions de Genève. Il y a déjà eu des cas d'usage condamnés par la communauté internationale contre des civils, notamment à Gaza. L'autre cas est celui de l'uranium appauvri. Sa production, son utilisation, son commerce en tant que munition sont pénalement réprimés en Belgique, mais ne sont pas forcément réglementés ailleurs et ils ne le sont pas non plus dans le droit international. Bref, puisque tout ce qui n'est pas interdit est autorisé, il est nécessaire de lister formellement les armements dans lesquels on ne souhaite pas que l'Union européenne investisse.

Enfin, sur les questions d'exportations d'armes, il n'est pas acceptable que le Parlement valide l'approche voulue par le Conseil d'une discrétion totale des États membres. En effet, une telle interprétation est à rebours des fameux huit critères de la position commune de 2008 et ne prend pas en compte le fait que tous les États européens ont ratifié le traité sur le commerce des armes. Si pour vous ce sont des détails, pour moi ils revêtent une haute importance.

**Dominique Riquet**, *au nom du groupe ALDE*. – Madame la Présidente, Madame la Commissaire, mes chers collègues, je tiens tout d'abord à remercier notre rapporteur, M. Krasnodębski, pour le travail qu'il a mené avec beaucoup de patience.

Je ne reviens pas sur le contenu technique de cette très importante proposition qui a été détaillé par le rapporteur et par la Commissaire. Je voudrais plus politiquement souligner l'importance de cette avancée pour l'Union européenne, dont l'histoire se rappellera. Nous attendons depuis 1954, année où l'échec de la communauté de défense a marqué l'histoire européenne. En 2019, nous revenons sur cet échec et nous commençons à reconstruire les premiers éléments de cette communauté.

Sur un sujet hautement souverain comme celui-ci, c'est un véritable signe de confiance et de solidarité entre États européens que de mettre en place par voie communautaire un fonds pour éviter les doublons en matière de recherche et de développement dans le domaine de la défense, réduire les coûts et réaliser des économies d'échelle qui soient conséquentes.

Le fait est que l'environnement est de plus en plus incertain à nos propres frontières, que nos alliés sont parfois instables, et que nous avons besoin de mieux assurer et de renforcer notre sécurité. Pour cela, précisément, le cadre européen est pertinent. Ce fonds nous permettra une meilleure intégration des outils de défense. Ce n'est, bien sûr, pas un simple dispositif technique ou budgétaire, c'est un important pas politique en avant en matière d'intégration.

Je regrette que des amendements soient présentés dans le but exclusif de compromettre l'accord obtenu en trilogie. Les assurances qui ont été obtenues dans le cadre de cet accord étaient largement pertinentes et l'on peut s'étonner qu'un sujet de cette importance suscite de si médiocres moyens.

Ce soir, je vais faire appel à tous mes collègues qui croient en l'Europe, qui croient en une intégration plus forte, dont la défense est un symbole hautement évocateur. Mobilisons-nous pour une Europe plus sûre qui protège ses citoyens. Soutenons ce nouveau fonds de défense. Demain, posons la première pierre de l'édifice de l'Europe de la défense, avec pour buts ultimes de mieux assurer notre autonomie industrielle et stratégique dans les industries de la défense et de mieux assurer la sécurité de nos citoyens.

**Marisa Matias**, *em nome do Grupo GUE/NGL*. – Senhora Presidente, esta é, de facto, uma questão muito complexa e pode tentar dar-se a vestimenta que se quiser, mas investir 13 mil milhões de euros do orçamento europeu no Fundo Europeu de Defesa é desinvestir 13 mil milhões de euros no projeto europeu. O Fundo Europeu de Defesa significa trocar solidariedade, coesão, medidas que protejam a qualidade de vida dos cidadãos e das cidadãs, por investimento em equipamentos militares mais eficazes.

As soluções técnicas encontradas para a venda de armas não são mais do que um branqueamento da venda de armas. Os cidadãos europeus precisam, sim, de segurança, mas segurança no emprego, emprego com direitos, segurança nos serviços públicos, segurança no futuro sustentável.

Não há nada que impeça os Estados-Membros da União Europeia de cooperarem na área de defesa. Da mesma forma não há nada que justifique criar uma nova linha orçamental, uma linha que nem sequer consta dos objetivos inscritos nos tratados. Esta é uma escolha cara e é muito mais cara que os 13 mil milhões de euros inscritos.

**Reinhard Bütikofer**, *im Namen der Verts/ALE-Fraktion*. – Frau Präsidentin, Frau Kommissarin, werte Kolleginnen und Kollegen! Dass wir gemeinsam in Europa für die gemeinsame Sicherheit mehr tun müssen, ist der Ausgangspunkt meiner Argumentation. Deswegen kann ein Verteidigungsfonds eine positive Rolle spielen.

Aber wir haben in diesen Verhandlungen nicht erreicht, was möglich gewesen wäre. Die Duplizierung und Ineffizienz bei der Rüstungsbeschaffung wird weitergehen. Dass die Chance verspielt wurde, liegt nicht in erster Linie am Berichterstatter, den ich loben will, weil er ein streitbarer Geist war, und manchmal hat es mir geradezu Spaß gemacht, mit ihm zusammen für die Realität der NATO einzutreten. Aber von Herrn Riquet und Frau Grossetête habe ich die blanke Interessenvertretung des französischen Rüstungslobbyismus erlebt – und militaristische Ideologie obendrein.

Was wir jetzt haben, ist ein Verteidigungsfonds, dessen Ethikvorschriften nur bloße Fassade sind. Ein Verteidigungsfonds, der, wie Herr Martin schon zurecht sagte, völlig ohne parlamentarische Kontrolle 13 Milliarden auf sieben Jahre ausgeben soll. Ein Verteidigungsfonds, der darauf hinausläuft, dass wir mehr Rüstungsexporte haben werden. Eine solche Selbstkastration des Europäischen Parlaments ist eine Schande.

Immerhin gab es einen wichtigen Erfolg: Dass es kein Geld geben soll für Killerroboter. Aber das ist nicht genug deswegen werden wir nicht zustimmen. Und im Übrigen möchte ich noch einmal vor der Ideologie der strategischen Autonomie warnen. Wer so versucht, europäische Verteidigungspolitik zu definieren, der redet an den Realitäten vorbei. Das ist reine Traumtänzeri.

**Jonathan Bullock**, *on behalf of the EFDD Group*. – Madam President, in order to protect and defend so-called European citizens, the Juncker Commission is willing to finance defence projects worth over EUR 13 billion: drone technology, satellite communication, early warning systems, maritime surveillance. The EU keeps evolving towards a totalitarian union and eventually towards a military one. The EU Commission is trying to present this evolving project under a peace perspective, but it is clear that the EU and its supporters have in mind an EU army.

French President Emmanuel Macron recently encouraged the creation of a European army to defend Europe. How can anyone think to create a federal military project that involves 27 nations and 24 languages? Like our great former Prime Minister Margaret Thatcher used to say, you have no source of money other than the money people themselves earn. In a moment when the euro is in crisis and there need to be tax cuts to encourage growth, Europe should worry about major citizens' concerns, such as industry's lack of competitiveness, carbon leakage and unemployment. A pan-European army would be the ultimate EU disaster. Unlike Russia or the US, Europe is not a unitary actor. Also recent historical events, such as, of course, the vote for Brexit and the elected anti-EU Government in Italy, would discourage federalist integration.

I find it utterly unreal how a bunch of unelected bureaucrats are making decisions about defence, about war and peace. My colleagues and I are strongly against the creation of an EU army and we hope that Member States will soon realise that giving more power to the unelected EU Commission in Brussels in the defence field is a mistake. In conclusion, as my final speech in this parliamentary session, I implore you to move away from creating this European superstate, including an EU army. No good will ever come of it and I hope the MEPs elected for the new Parliament will start to reverse this and respect the nation state and democracy.

**Jerzy Buzek (PPE)**. – Pani Przewodnicząca! Stawiamy na wzmocnienie filaru obronnego Unii Europejskiej w ramach systemu Sojuszu Północnoatlantyckiego, co warto podkreślić. A przemysł obronny to nie tylko klucz do bezpieczeństwa, ale także rozwój przemysłu w całej Unii Europejskiej.

Jako przewodniczący Komisji Przemysłu, Badań i Energii bardzo się cieszę, że rozwijamy zdolności obronne, ale przede wszystkim własny, silny i konkurencyjny przemysł. O co chodzi w tym funduszu? O trzy rzeczy, moim zdaniem: najszerszy z możliwych udział wszystkich europejskich firm, duże środki na badania nad obronnością i zachętę dla państw członkowskich do wspólnego rozwijania zakupów, innowacji technologicznych, przemysłu.

Takie były między innymi wnioski z konferencji o przyszłości przemysłu zbrojeniowego w Siemianowicach Śląskich, u mnie, w moim regionie, i udało się to dzisiaj osiągnąć – dzisiaj, dzięki takiej decyzji dotyczącej Europejskiego Funduszu Obronnego. Już niedługo Europa korzystać będzie z najbardziej nowoczesnych rozwiązań zaprojektowanych i powstałych w naszych dużych, średnich i małych firmach.

Chciałem pogratulować pani komisarz Bieńkowskiej propozycji Europejskiego Funduszu Obronnego. Panu Krasnodębskiemu, naszemu sprawozdawcy, chciałem pogratulować bardzo dobrego prowadzenia negocjacji, bo były to bardzo trudne negocjacje. Gratuluję wszystkim koleżankom i kolegom sprawozdawcom-cieniom, a także pani Françoise Grossetête, która była sprawozdawczynią wcześniejszego programu dotyczącego podobnej sprawy. Dziękuję Państwu! Jest to dobry krok w dobrym kierunku.

**Victor Boștinăru (S&D)**. – Doamnă președintă, doamnă comisar, domnule raportor, încep cu dumneavoastră, *dziękuję bardzo* pentru maniera excelentă în care ați negociat. Într-o lume volatilă, multipolară, care se confruntă cu multiple amenințări noi și hibride, este esențial ca Uniunea Europeană să-și consolideze rolul de actor global, influent și eficient.

În prezent, politica Uniunii Europene de securitate și apărare reprezintă o prioritate majoră pentru toți cetățenii noștri și, de aceea, și-a găsit ecoul în recent adoptata politică. Dezvoltarea politicii noastre comune de apărare este, fără îndoială, una dintre principalele contribuții la implementarea strategiei globale a Uniunii Europene.

Scopul propunerii legislative, negociate just și eficient cu Consiliul, este de a înființa Fondul european de apărare în cadrul cadrului financiar multianual 2021-2027, astfel încât să răspundă priorității crescânde pe care o reprezintă apărarea și securitatea în Uniunea noastră, să rezolve începutul sau să înceapă rezolvarea fragmentării mare a sectorului de apărare și să evite dublarea și ineficiența, să încurajeze achiziționarea în colaborare a echipamentelor de apărare.

În plus, obiectivele generale ale Fondului de apărare – așa cum au fost ele anunțate – au reprezentat priorități-cheie ale grupului meu politic, care militează – citez - „pentru o mai mare eficiență în industria de apărare și promovează o piață internă integrată a mijloacelor de apărare și sprijin UE pentru cercetare și dezvoltare”.

Dragi colegi, subliniez încă o dată nevoia de a continua procesul de promovare a unei ordini multilaterale bazate pe reguli, așa cum este consacrată în Carta ONU, și de a consolida cooperarea cu NATO, singura garanție a securității colective pe continentul nostru.

În condițiile în care am avut privilegiul să lucrez asupra acestui dosar în ultimii ani, permiteți-mi să vă recomand să-l votați cu încredere mâine. Și, fiind ultimul meu discurs în Parlament, dați-mi voie să vă spun tuturor – mulțumesc din suflet pentru acești 12 ani în care am lucrat pentru proiectul european. *Et, Madame Grossetête, restons pacifiques mais jamais naïfs.*

**João Ferreira (GUE/NGL).** – Senhora Presidente, Senhora Comissária, 13 mil milhões de euros é quanto a União Europeia quer despejar em cima do complexo militar industrial das grandes potências europeias, em sete anos. Recursos públicos que faltam no combate à pobreza, no investimento em serviços públicos, na promoção da coesão económica e social são recursos que vão agora diretos à promoção da guerra, ao financiamento da indústria de armamento, alimentando uma deriva militarista que não pode senão inquietar todos os amantes da paz. Como se já não bastasse abrirem a porta do Programa Quadro de Investigação a fins não exclusivamente civis e pacíficos! Como se já não bastasse orientarem as redes transeuropeias de transportes para a mobilidade militar!

A União Europeia, com esta proposta, expõe à evidência que quem promove a guerra, quem alimenta a indústria da guerra não quer nem pode defender a paz, e também por isto esta é uma integração contrária ao interesse dos povos. Saibamos derrotá-la, saibamos erguer um projeto alternativo de cooperação assente nos valores da paz.

**Reinhard Bütikofer (Verts/ALE), Frage nach dem Verfahren der „blauen Karte“.** – Herr Ferreira, ich fand es sehr interessant, wie Sie jetzt gegen den sogenannten Militarismus der EU gewettert haben. Wie können Sie eigentlich erklären, dass von Ihrer Fraktion, der GUE-Fraktion, in den ganzen monatelangen Verhandlungen niemals ein einziger Abgeordneter oder eine einzige Abgeordnete vorbeigekommen ist, um mitzudiskutieren? Wie können Sie sich trauen, hier gegen Militarismus zu wettern, und haben Ihre Hausaufgaben nicht gemacht?

**João Ferreira (GUE/NGL), Resposta segundo o procedimento «cartão azul».** – Senhor Bütikofer, vai poder confirmar, amanhã, que não será com o apoio deste grupo que este Fundo Europeu de Defesa, que quer despejar 13 mil milhões de euros em cima da indústria de armamento, será aprovado. Eventualmente com alguns votos da sua bancada, não sei, veremos. Seguramente com os votos da social-democracia e de toda a direita. Não ignoro, como o senhor também não ignora, a composição desta Casa.

Sabe muito bem que as nossas posições são ainda minoritárias. Digo são ainda, porque felizmente, mais tarde ou mais cedo, mais cedo que tarde, hão de ser posições maioritárias e havemos de derrotar esta escalada militarista na União Europeia. Bem sei que os Verdes alemães têm um histórico algo complacente com estas aventuras militaristas, mas isso, as contradições ficam consigo e com o seu partido.

**Indrek Tarand (Verts/ALE).** – Madam President, I generally support my colleague Reinhard Bütikofer and I'm impressed about his far sightedness, be it in matters relating to China or the United States. However, today I must say that, even though his criticism towards the proposal is valid and sharply precise, he could agree with me that EDF is actually too little too late, because we are long overdue to legislate on the common European Defence Force. And I mean it. As a European pillar of NATO, this force should be used to defend the European Union in times of threats and direct attacks, hence I do support Mr Krasnodębski's report on the conditionality that further steps towards this force will be taken. And to Mr Bullock, I would like to say, yes, the European defence force will emerge and it will speak in

English; unfortunately due to Brexit adventures it will not have a British commander, but it will emerge. And to Mr Ferreira, I would say three billion is peanuts – even the Estonian budget is bigger.

**Fabio Massimo Castaldo (EFDD).** – Signora Presidente, onorevoli colleghi, il voto di domani sul Fondo europeo per la difesa arriva alla fine di un percorso lungo e complicato, per il quale devo ringraziare il collega Krasnodębski. Non ripeto i passaggi che ci hanno portato fin qui, io sono stato uno dei relatori ombra, che ha seguito attentamente questo dossier, ma chiedo che il Parlamento europeo continui a monitorare, in stretto contatto con la Commissione e l'EDA, lo sviluppo dell'EDF.

Il voto di domani non è la fine ma l'inizio di una nuova fase industriale per la sicurezza e la difesa europea, il Parlamento dovrà continuare ad esserne attore e non spettatore. Lo dico con cognizione di causa, essendo stato a favore degli atti delegati piuttosto che degli atti di implementazione. Lo testimoniano il tempo che abbiamo utilizzato per arrivare a questo accordo finale e alcuni emendamenti passati in plenaria a dicembre.

Il Parlamento dovrà continuare a far sentire la sua voce a favore di uno sviluppo e una visione veramente europea dell'EDF, che permetta almeno a tre Stati e a tre imprese di partecipare ad una call, con spirito competitivo e finalizzato a migliorare ricerca, sviluppo e tecnologie. Auspichiamo gare aperte e partecipate senza assegnazioni dirette, come votato proprio da questa Camera a dicembre. Come gruppo abbiamo espresso alcuni dubbi per alcuni criteri, ma speriamo che vengano applicati senza intenti punitivi nei confronti dei partecipanti.

Vorrei ricordare, però, ancora una volta, quello che non vogliamo che l'EDF diventi. Non vogliamo uno strumento che finanzia con i fondi europei cooperazioni bilaterali che non hanno un vero valore aggiunto europeo. Non vogliamo che l'EDF limiti o renda difficile la cooperazione industriale con soggetti extra UE, soprattutto se necessari e strategici in materia di produzione, ricerca e sviluppo per le nostre capacità. Non vogliamo che imprese comunque basate sul suolo europeo con know-how europeo e integrate nelle catene di produzione, per quanto non di proprietà di paesi UE, vengano escluse.

In linea con quanto già votato in questo Parlamento non vogliamo che con l'EDF si vadano a finanziare armi di distruzione di massa o armi micidiali senza il controllo umano siano esse terrestri, aeree o navali, non vogliamo che sotto le vesti della cooperazione industriale, in sé positiva, si voglia aprire la porta a un possibile esercito europeo di qualsiasi sorta, anche perché non è negli scopi dell'EDF, né in linea con i trattati, e ribadiamo la necessità di rispettare i criteri della posizione comune sull'esportazione.

Inquadriamo l'EDF per quello che è: un fondo che faciliti la cooperazione fra soggetti europei, incluse le piccole e medie imprese, che agevoli il mercato della sicurezza e della difesa, che punti alla riduzione di sprechi e duplicazioni oggi presenti e che non sia un fondo fatto contro altri soggetti o per proteggere ambiti o mercati specifici, ma che rinforzando la nostra industria rimanga aperto a sinergie con altri attori, e infine, che l'EDF possa portare a superare quei gap capacitivi ancora oggi presenti nelle nostre difese, senza dimenticare che gli utilizzatori finali saranno i nostri uomini e le nostre donne in divisa sia in teatri che in operazioni di guerra.

**Michael Gahler (PPE).** – Frau Präsidentin! Ich bin froh, dass wir endlich auch von der EU-Ebene aus einen signifikanten Beitrag leisten, um unsere Bürger besser vor externen Bedrohungen zu schützen. Denn das ist für mich die Begründung für den Fonds: die Bewertung der Sicherheitslage und die daraus folgende Notwendigkeit, mehr gemeinsam zu unternehmen.

Umso bedauerlicher finde ich es, dass Teile dieses Hauses von links und rechts unseren Bürgern diesen besseren Schutz vorenthalten möchten. Das ist grob fahrlässig – fahrlässig gegenüber unseren Bürgern, die die beste Verteidigung verdient haben, fahrlässig aber auch gegenüber unseren Soldaten, die derzeit unsere Sicherheit unter EU-Flagge zum Beispiel in Mali, vor der Küste Somalias oder im Mittelmeerraum verteidigen. Sie haben das Recht auf bestes Verteidigungsmaterial, damit sie als Staatsbürger in Uniform die Aufträge erfüllen und gesund zu ihren Familien heimkehren können.

Schließlich richte ich mich auch an den Rat, die einzelnen Mitgliedstaaten und die Kommission: Es liegt in Zukunft an Ihnen zu beweisen, dass die vorgesehenen 13 Milliarden Euro für den Verteidigungsfonds tatsächlich zu gemeinsamen Forschungsvorhaben, Rüstungsprojekten, Beschaffungen und gemeinsamen Fähigkeiten führen. Sie müssen jetzt den Nachweis erbringen, dass die aufaddierten nationalen Verteidigungshaushalte, 210 Milliarden Euro, in Zukunft besser und koordiniert ausgegeben werden.

Auf diesem Wege müssen sich die Hauptstädte und die Kommission noch weiter bewegen, um nicht nur große Projekte, wie das zukünftige Flugverteidigungssystem FCAS oder den Hauptkampfpanzer ins Auge zu fassen. Vielmehr müssen sie unseren Bürgern in einem EU-Weißbuch für Sicherheit und Verteidigung erklären, wozu das Ganze überhaupt dient. Sie müssen aus dem Schlagwort „strategische Autonomie“ eine kohärente EU-Fähigkeiten- und Rüstungspolitik formen, damit unsere Bürger und unsere Industrie verstehen, wohin die Reise zukünftig geht. Der morgen zur Abstimmung vorliegende Verteidigungsfonds ist hier nur der erste Schritt.

Im Übrigen würde ich mich freuen zu sehen, wie mein hessischer Landsmann Udo Bullmann in der Sache abstimmt. Vom Vorsitzenden der zweitgrößten Fraktion kann man in so einer wichtigen Frage sicher auch eine persönliche Positionierung erwarten.

**Dariusz Rosati (PPE).** – Pani Przewodnicząca! Szanowna Pani Komisarz! Dyskutujemy dziś na temat, który ma kluczowe znaczenie dla bezpieczeństwa Europy. Rynek zamówień publicznych na rozwój i zakupy nowych rodzajów uzbrojenia jest w Europie posegmentowany według granic narodowych. Zaledwie 16% zamówień i 7% wydatków na badania i rozwój przeznaczają się na projekty realizowane wspólnie przez dwa lub więcej państw członkowskich. W rezultacie, mimo że łączne wydatki na obronę w Unii Europejskiej są ponad dwukrotnie wyższe niż na przykład w Federacji Rosyjskiej, to jednak współdziałanie państw członkowskich Unii Europejskiej, w szczególności w obszarze interoperacyjności naszych armii, pozostawia wiele do życzenia.

Bezpieczeństwo jest naszym priorytetem i w świetle nowych wyzwań, takich jak agresywna polityka Federacji Rosyjskiej czy radykalny fundamentalizm muzułmański, wymaga, abyśmy te zdolności obronne Europy wzmocnili, a Europejski Fundusz Obronny jest instrumentem, który ma pomóc nam zrealizować ten cel.

Kluczowe znaczenie ma w tym kontekście współpraca przemysłów obronnych i ośrodków badawczo-rozwojowych w poszczególnych państwach członkowskich. Zgodnie z propozycją Komisji Europejskiej fundusz ma mieć do dyspozycji 13 miliardów euro i jest to z całą pewnością kwota która pozwoli na wzmocnienie potencjału rozwojowego i badawczego naszego przemysłu. Chcę jednak podkreślić, że powinniśmy zachować równowagę w przeznaczaniu tych środków, tak aby wykorzystać potencjał wszystkich krajów, w tym np. duży potencjał obronny przemysłu zbrojeniowego w Polsce, w tym potencjał zakładów zbrojeniowych w Radomiu i Pionkach.

*Pyynnöstä myönnettävät puheenvuorot*

**Jiří Pospíšil (PPE).** – Paní předsedající, já jsem se zájmem poslouchal celou debatu. Podpořím tento materiál, považuji jej za velmi dobrý. Už to zde bylo řečeno, investice do tohoto obranného fondu povede k větší obranyschopnosti Evropy, posílí evropský průmysl, bude to mít dopad i na evropské ekonomiky, to jsou další výhody.

Na druhou stranu zde jasně říkám, že do budoucna rozvoj těchto aktivit nesmí ohrozit naši spolupráci v rámci NATO. Tento projekt nesmí být do budoucna konkurencí vůči NATO, které my v České republice považujeme za základ evropské kolektivní bezpečnosti. To znamená, je-li to doplněk, který je takto postaven, pak je to určitě správná cesta, ale základnou pro evropskou bezpečnost musí být spolupráce v rámci NATO.

**Nότης Μαρίας (ECR).** – Κυρία Πρόεδρε, 13 δισεκατομμύρια ευρώ στο Ευρωπαϊκό Ταμείο Άμυνας σημαίνει λιγότερα χρήματα στον προϋπολογισμό της Ευρωπαϊκής Ένωσης για την υγεία, την παιδεία, τις υποδομές, την εκπαίδευση, την κατάρτιση και την αντιμετώπιση της φτώχειας. Θεωρώ ότι αυτό το ποσό, επί της ουσίας, θα μπει στην υπηρεσία των μεγάλων πολεμικών βιομηχανιών της Ευρωπαϊκής Ένωσης που, ως γνωστόν, πουλάνε όπλα ακόμη και στην Τουρκία, ακόμη και στη Σαουδική Αραβία.

Στην πράξη, αυτό που γίνεται είναι ότι ζήτησε ο Trump να βάλει η Ευρωπαϊκή Ένωση το χέρι στην τσέπη για τα θέματα της άμυνας. Αυτό είναι το θέμα και, πλέον, ερχόμαστε να υπηρετήσουμε αυτήν την πολιτική, καθιστώντας όλο και πιο στρατιωτικοποιημένη την ίδια την Ευρωπαϊκή Ένωση. Έτσι, αυτό που θα συμβεί στην πράξη είναι να γίνονται όλο και πιο πολλές στρατιωτικές επιχειρήσεις από πλευράς Ευρωπαϊκής Ένωσης στον Τρίτο Κόσμο. Θεωρώ ότι τα κονδύλια αυτά πρέπει να πάνε κυρίως για τη στήριξη της ανάπτυξης και της απασχόλησης.

**Dobromir Sośnierz (NI).** – Panie Przewodniczący! Wbrew temu, co mówi profesor Krasnodębski, to jest kolejny krok w kierunku budowy armii europejskiej i słusznie powiedział tutaj pan Tarrand, niech pan posłucha, co mówili posłowie Grossetête czy Riquet, to jest krok w kierunku pogłębionej integracji. Ja rozumiem, co chcą osiągnąć dzięki temu Niemcy. Niemcy po przegranej wojnie podpadły pod nadzór amerykański i próbują się za pomocą budowy armii europejskiej wymanewrować się spod tego nadzoru i odzyskać swobodę ruchów w Europie. Ale nie rozumiem, jaki zysk ma z tego mieć Polska. To jest oddanie suwerenności nad naszą armią, utrata pełnej kontroli nad naszą armią. Koordynacja zamówień, wspólne zamówienia, wspólne badania oznaczają utratę samodzielnej zdolności operacyjnej. Jest to dla nas śmiertelne zagrożenie. Przecież już w zeszłym roku Komisja Europejska wytłumaczyła Pana rządowi, że nie jesteśmy już krajem niepodległym, bez jednego żołnierza. Co będą mogli zrobić, jeśli będą mieli armię? Po prostu sprzedajecie naszą niepodległość i pomagacie w budowie Czwartej Rzeszy Niemieckiej.

*(Pyynnöstä myönnettävät puheenvuorot päättyvät)*

**Elżbieta Bieńkowska, Member of the Commission.** – Madam President, I want to thank the Members for all your comments and all of your observations. What I want to say is that by no means was this an easy file to be agreed upon by all of us, by all three European institutions, and again, I would like to thank all of you who really, with great devotion, tried to find a good solution to different, difficult aspects of this file.

Let me refer only to two of them. First, on cooperation, because many of you referred to the amount of money. Let me say it again: the lack of cooperation in the defence industry sector has its cost, and this is something between EUR 25 billion and 100 billion annually. This is the cost of no cooperation in the defence industrial sector.

The second point concerns the export of weapons, because it was raised by some of you. The Treaty here is very clear: we discussed it a lot. It is a very unique competence of the Member States, and we will not change it in any way through this regulation. We are not increasing weapons exports; what we want and what our intention is, is to decrease our technological dependence on third countries, and the cooperation and this decreasing technological dependence are some of the most important features of the fund.

I'm very sure that defence will become one of the engines of European integration. We are still talking about defence industrial cooperation – nothing more, nothing less than this – and again, I would like to stress that the Commission very much welcomes the agreement reached during the trilogues. I hope for a positive vote tomorrow, and again, let me thank all of you – the rapporteur, shadow rapporteurs and the Chair of the Committee on Industry, Research and Energy (ITRE), Mr Buzek (because I have not mentioned him before) – thank you very much for all your hard work on this file. Again, I know it was not easy, but the agreement is, I think, satisfactory.

*(Applause)*

**Zdzisław Krasnodębski, sprawozdawca.** – Pani Przewodnicząca! Dziękuję kolegom za bardzo interesującą dyskusję. Pokazała ona też, że nie jesteśmy jednolitego zdania nawet w grupach politycznych, bo wyraźnie dwa głosy z frakcji socjalistycznej różniły się od siebie, podobnie jak w grupie zielonych. Myślę, że ujawnia się w tym podziale stanowisk różnica między państwami, które dawno nie przeżyły żadnej inwazji, opresji i zniewolenia, a tymi, które dzisiaj, tak jak kraje bałtyckie czy niektóre kraje Europy Środkowo-Wschodniej, ciągle czują się zagrożone i wiedzą, że ważne są wszystkie programy socjalne, ale jeżeli nie obronimy naszej wolności, to również nasza pomyślność jest bardzo zagrożona.

Chciałbym też podziękować prezydencji austriackiej i szczególnie prezydencji rumuńskiej, która wykazała się wielką pracą i umiejętnością negocjacji. Chciałbym zapewnić wszystkich, którzy wyrażali tu obawy o nasze relacje z NATO. Myślę, że właśnie ci wszyscy, którzy popierają, szczególnie z mojego regionu, ten fundusz, zdają sobie sprawę z tego, co Państwo podkreślali: to NATO jest gwarantem naszego bezpieczeństwa, tu się nic nie zmieni. Chcielibyśmy jednak, żeby również inne państwa, w tym Francja, jeszcze bardziej włączyły się np. w obronę flanki wschodniej NATO.



Chciałbym jeszcze powiedzieć jedno, mianowicie padło pytanie: a co z tego będzie miała Polska (rozumiem że również inne kraje naszego regionu)? Otóż uważam, że jest to szansa na unowocześnienie naszego przemysłu obronnego we współpracy z przodującymi firmami w tej dziedzinie w Europie i na rozwinięcie badań. Mam nadzieję, że będzie temu służył również ten fundusz, tzn. rzeczywiste wykorzystanie potencjału całej Europy, a nie tylko jej części.

Proszę Państwa o zagłosowanie za tekstem, jaki wynegocjowaliśmy, tzn. za odrzuceniem wszystkich poprawek plenarnych. Należy głosować za punktem 31 CP, odrzucić 1 CP i wszystkie poprawki plenarne, gdyż w innym wypadku nasze porozumienie upadnie. Bardzo proszę o takie stanowisko ze strony tych wszystkich, dla których ta sprawa jest ważna. Jak mówię, jest ona szansą i dla przemysłu, i dla całej Unii, dla wzmocnienia NATO i naszych zdolności obronnych, które są ważne, aby chronić nasz sposób życia czy naszą cywilizację.

**Puhemies.** – Keskustelu on päättynyt.

Äänestys toimitetaan huomenna torstaina 18.4.2019.

## 24. Ekspozycje w postaci obligacji zabezpieczonych – Obligacje zabezpieczone i nadzór publiczny nad obligacjami zabezpieczonymi (debata)

**Puhemies.** – Esityslistalla on seuraavana yhteiskeskustelu

— Bernd Lucken talous- ja raha-asioiden valiokunnan puolesta laatimasta mietinnöstä ehdotuksesta Euroopan parlamentin ja neuvoston asetukseksi asetuksen (EU) N:o 575/2013 muuttamisesta katettujen joukkolainojen osalta (COM(2018)0093 - C8-0112/2018 - 2018/0042(COD)) (A8-0384/2018) ja

— Bernd Lucken talous- ja raha-asioiden valiokunnan puolesta laatimasta mietinnöstä ehdotuksesta Euroopan parlamentin ja neuvoston direktiiviksi katettujen joukkolainojen liikeseenlaskusta ja katettujen joukkolainojen julkisesta valvonasta sekä direktiivin 2009/65/EY ja direktiivin 2014/59/EU muuttamisesta (COM(2018)0094 - C8-0113/2018 - 2018/0043(COD)) (A8-0390/2018).

**Bernd Lucke, Berichterstatter.** – Frau Präsidentin, liebe Kollegen, meine Damen und Herren! Für jeden Kapitalmarkt ist es wichtig, dass es sichere Wertpapiere gibt. Wir wissen, dass sichere Wertpapiere leider selten sind. Wir wissen, dass Verbriefungen kein ausreichendes Maß an Sicherheit gewährleisten. Spätestens seit der Finanzkrise ist das jedem bewusst geworden. Wir wissen, dass Staatsanleihen kein ausreichendes Maß an Sicherheit gewährleisten. Selbst Staatsanleihen der Eurozone gewährleisten kein ausreichendes Maß an Sicherheiten, wie es jedem von uns spätestens in der Euro- und Staatsschuldenkrise bewusst geworden ist. Aber wir wissen, dass wir den Pfandbrief haben. Wir wissen, dass der Pfandbrief ein sicheres Wertpapier ist, dass der Pfandbrief steht wie eine Eins, dass der Pfandbrief seit mehr als 250 Jahren wie eine Eins steht, und er hat keinen Bankrott erlitten.

Das ist ein Wertpapier, wie wir es in der Eurozone brauchen und wie wir es in der Kapitalmarktunion brauchen. Vor diesem Hintergrund ist es erstaunlich, dass die Pfandbriefe oder gedeckten Schuldverschreibungen relativ schlecht entwickelt sind in der Europäischen Union, dass es nur eine überschaubare Anzahl von Ländern gibt, die eine ausgeprägte Pfandbrieftradition haben und dieses Instrument seit Jahrzehnten und zum Teil seit Jahrhunderten sehr erfolgreich nutzen, während andere Länder der Europäischen Union wenig Erfahrung damit haben und zum Teil noch nicht mal eine entwickelte Pfandbrief-Gesetzgebung haben.

Dem leisten wir jetzt Abhilfe dadurch, dass wir Richtlinie und Verordnung in diesem Parlament verabschieden. Es ist insbesondere die Richtlinie, die ich hier würdigen möchte, weil die Richtlinie gleichzeitig Richtschnur ist für die sich entwickelnden Märkte in der Europäischen Union, die mit dem Pfandbrief ein wertvolles Finanzierungsinstrument schaffen können und die sozusagen diese Richtschnur nutzen können, um genau das in ihre eigenen Gesetze zu übertragen, was sich seit langer Zeit bewährt hat, was die beste Praktik im Bereich der Pfandbriefe bzw. gedeckten Schuldverschreibungen ist.

Wir haben uns viel Mühe gegeben, in dieser Gesetzgebung diese besten Praktiken umzusetzen, indem wir ausführlich über die Qualität der besichernden Wertgegenstände gesprochen und verhandelt haben. Und ich glaube, wir sind zu einem guten Ergebnis dabei gekommen. Wir haben die Pfandbrief-Richtlinie jetzt so gestaltet, dass wir zwei verschiedene Klassen von Pfandbriefen unterscheiden, nämlich einmal den bewährten Pfandbrief, die Werteschuldverschreibung, so wie sie auch in der Kapitaladäquanz-Verordnung definiert wird – das Produkt, das 97 % des Marktes nutzen und das ein großes Vertrauen von Investoren nach sich gezogen hat. Und dann ein neues Marktsegment – ein Marktsegment für Innovation, ein Marktsegment für Wachstum, das wachsen soll und neue Finanzierungsmöglichkeiten, aber auch neue besichernde Wertgegenstände erforschen, testen und zur Marktreife führen soll.

Das sind gute Rahmenbedingungen dafür, dass sich die Pfandbriefe als Finanzierungsinstrument in der Europäischen Union durchsetzen, und auch gute Rahmenbedingungen dafür, dass diese Art von Wertpapieren von außerhalb der Europäischen Union angenommen wird, dass wir international Standards setzen für dieses Finanzierungsinstrument. Wir werden das Vertrauen der Investoren dadurch erringen können, dass die Standards, die wir hier gesetzt haben, gut und hoch und belastbar sind. Wir werden aber hoffentlich auch Emittenten anziehen können, jedenfalls dann, wenn die Kommission hoffentlich bald auch eine Äquivalenzentscheidung verabschiedet, sodass unser Markt geöffnet wird und nicht abgeschlossen wird gegenüber denjenigen, die ebenfalls interessiert daran sind, dieses Instrument zu nutzen.

Ich glaube, wir haben hier einen großen Schritt in die richtige Richtung gemacht. Ich freue mich auf die Debatte mit den Kollegen. Ich hoffe auf eine breite Zustimmung morgen im Plenum, und insbesondere hoffe ich natürlich auf große Akzeptanz des Instruments in der Kapitalmarktunion der Europäischen Union.

**Elżbieta Bieńkowska**, *Member of the Commission*. – Madam President, (inaudible) covered bonds are a stable and cost effective source of financing. They fared well during the crisis, while other sources of funding dried up. They are very popular in some Member States and in others they are barely news. So the Commission proposal seeks to develop this market further by drawing on the high standards and good practices of national systems. It is a key building block of the Capital Markets Union to encourage investment and lending in the EU.

The new rules will establish a pan-European covered bond market that supports lending to the real economy without disturbing already established and well-functioning national markets. They will boost the issuance of covered bonds also in Member States where markets are less developed. These rules will help banks access a broad range of safe and efficient funding tools which in turn will allow them to finance companies and households. We estimate that the potential saving for borrowers will be around EUR 1.5 billion a year. The new rules also set out to harmonise prudential rules for these instruments in order to contribute to financial stability.

The new framework is based on two pillars. So, first the directive provides a common definition of covered bonds. It outlines the features of the instruments and it identifies the high-quality assets that can be eligible to back a covered bond.

The directive establishes sound supervision for covered bonds as well, and sets out the rules allowing the use of the 'European Covered Bonds' labels.

And the second, a regulation, strengthens the conditions for granting preferential capital treatment to covered bonds purchased by banks. As promised during the trilogues and set out in the Commission's statement accompanying today's acts, the Commission is willing to amend the liquidity coverage ratio, delegated act, in order to cater for the specific situation of covered bonds.

This amendment will address the overlap between the cover pool liquidity buffer set out in the directive and the liquidity buffer foreseen in a liquidity coverage ratio. For this purpose, a declaration from the Commission will be transmitted to the Parliament before voting tomorrow.

I wish here to thank the Parliament for this successful outcome, in particular the rapporteur, Mr Lucke, and all shadow rapporteurs.

The objectives of the Commission proposals are largely maintained thanks to the effective approach of the Parliament negotiating team and the good cooperation with the Council. The transposition and implementation of the new rules on covered bonds should now proceed rapidly. This will ensure that this important source of funding can be used in all Member States, thereby promoting jobs and growth throughout the EU.

## PRZEWODNICTWO: ZDZISŁAW KRASNODEŃSKI

*Wiceprzewodniczący*

**Dariusz Rosati**, w imieniu grupy PPE. – Panie Przewodniczący! Pani Komisarz! Debatujemy dziś nad dwoma aktami legislacyjnymi, które ustanawiają ramy prawne funkcjonowania rynku bankowych obligacji zabezpieczonych aktywami. Na użytek tłumaczenia chcę powiedzieć, że według polskiej terminologii te papiery wartościowe noszą nazwę bankowych listów zastawnych. Rynek bankowych obligacji zabezpieczonych jest ważnym elementem budowanej przez nas unii kapitałowej. Cieszę się, że negocjacje pomiędzy Parlamentem i Radą zakończyły się przyjęciem dobrego kompromisu. Omawiana dyrektywa wprowadza jednolitą definicję europejskich obligacji zabezpieczonych aktywami, precyzyjnie określa rodzaje aktywów, które mogą być wykorzystane jako zabezpieczenie, określa obowiązki nadzoru bankowego oraz sposób wyliczania bieżących wartości aktywów. Dyrektywa wprowadza także dwie kategorie obligacji: obligacje europejskie, które spełniają wymogi tej dyrektywy, oraz obligacje europejskie premium, które dodatkowo spełniają wymogi rozporządzenia CRR.

Dyrektywa umożliwi państwom członkowskim samodzielne kształtowanie struktury puli aktywów, w tym wielkość udziałów aktywów płynnych. Dodatkowo w rozporządzeniu – był to bardzo sporny punkt – osiągnęliśmy kompromis na poziomie ośmiu procent limitu na aktywa zabezpieczające (collaterals) w postaci aktywów trzeciego stopnia jakości kredytowej. Dzięki tej ramowej harmonizacji obligacje bankowe stają się bardzo bezpiecznym papierem wartościowym o bardzo wysokiej jakości, bardzo atrakcyjnym dla potencjalnych inwestorów. Stanowią również bardzo dogodne źródło finansowania działalności banków.

Gratuluję panu posłowi Berndowi Luckemu doskonałego sprawozdania i dziękuję za współpracę, jaką mieliśmy okazję realizować przy tym sprawozdaniu. Dziękuję Komisji Europejskiej i składam na ręce pani komisarz podziękowania za konstruktywny udział w pracach nad sprawozdaniem, a do wszystkich kolegów posłów apeluję o przyjęcie sprawozdania bez poprawek.

**Alfred Sant**, *fisem il-grupp S&D*. – Il-vot ta' għada jimmarka t-tmiem tal-proċess legiżlattiv mahsub biex iwaqqaf suq Ewropew għal covered bonds, kif inhuma magħrufa ċ-ċedoli ta' self koperti.

F'din il-Kamra bdejna l-proċess fis-sena 2017 b'riżoluzzjoni li nediet il-baži tal-hidma tagħna fuq il-pakkett li għandna quddiemna llum. Ma kinitx haġa faċli biex jinsab ftehim għax fkull pajjiż dawn iċ-ċedoli ta' self żviluppaw b'mod differenti. Huma jikkostitwixxu għodda finanzjarja li matul is-sekli wriet is-siwi tagħha fis-swieq ta' pajjiżi Ewropej. Għalkemm infirxu fil-qafas tas-swieq nazzjonali, il-kummerċ internazzjonali f'dawn iċ-ċedoli għandu importanza. Fis-swieq bħal tal-Ġermanja u d-Danimarka huma mitqiesa bir-raġun bħala vitali għall-investment. F'pajjiżi oħra bħal Malta ma jintużaw xejn. Xorta wahda, l-isfida politika biex jitwaqqaf qafas Ewropew għal dawn iċ-ċedoli li jiġi parti mit-twaqqif ta' Unjoni Ewropea fis-swieq kapitali kienet din. Għandna nlibbsu l-istess żarbun lil kulhadd – kif ta' spiss tkun it-tentazzjoni li nagħmlu meta l-affarijiet jiġu deċiżi fi Strasburgu u Brussell – jew għandna nadottaw mudell li jippermetti t-tkomplija shiħa ta' arranġamenti li ddahhlu b'suċċess fis-swieq nazzjonali?

Mill-bidu nett, jien appoġġajt sal-aħhar din it-triq. Ma kellniex għalfejn nibdlu metodi li s-swieq nazzjonali kienu haddmu għal għexieren ta' snin għal sekli. U xorta stajna nwaqqfu qafas Ewropew. Dan kellu jimmira biex progressivament, ir-regoli u l-prattiċi fis-swieq nazzjonali joqorbu lejn xulxin. Il-kompromess milhuq fid-dokumenti quddiemna jirrispondi bis-shiħ għal din l-isfida. Jinkludi hafna elementi bir-rapport approvat fl-2018 minn din il-Kamra u jikkoreġi għal aspetti li kienu se johlqu problemi għall-Grupp tas-Socjalisti u d-Demokratiċi. Waqt li jippromwovi qrubija fuq livell Ewropew u jsaħħah it-trasparenza u l-harsien tal-investituri, il-pakkett quddiemna jevita kull sognu ta' disturbi fis-swieq nazzjonali fejn jiġu nnegożjati l-covered bonds.

Jien sodisfatt bil-mod kif ilhaqna dawn il-prijoritajiet u l-parir tiegħi hu biex din il-Kamra tappoġġa bil-kbir il-proposta li tinsab quddiemna.

**Νότης Μαρίας**, εξ ονόματος της ομάδας ECR. – Κύριε Πρόεδρε, στην Ελλάδα, αλλά και στην Ευρώπη, υπάρχει έντονος σκεπτικισμός για τα ομόλογα αυτού του είδους τη στιγμή που έχουν δει όλοι ότι ακόμη και κρατικά ομόλογα έχουν καταρρεύσει. Ιδίως στην πατρίδα μου, όπου οι Έλληνες πολίτες —πέρα πολλοί μικρομεσαίοι και συνταξιούχοι— εμπιστεύτηκαν τα ελληνικά κρατικά ομόλογα, επένδυσαν τους κόπους μιας ζωής στα ελληνικά ομόλογα και μετά ήρθε το περίφημο PSI, με απόφαση του Eurogroup, και κουρεύτηκαν τα ομόλογα αυτά κατά 53%. Υπάρχουν σήμερα άνθρωποι στην Ελλάδα που είχαν εμπιστευθεί τα ελληνικά κρατικά ομόλογα και δεν έχουν πλέον χρήματα να πληρώσουν τα φάρμακά τους, να μπορέσουν να πάνε σε ένα νοσοκομείο.

Αντιλαμβάνεστε, λοιπόν, ότι όταν έχουν καταρρεύσει τα κρατικά ομόλογα υπάρχει δυσπιστία απέναντι σε αυτήν τη μορφή ομολόγου και φυσικά, όπως αναφέρει στην εισήγησή του ο κύριος Lucke, κάνει προσπάθεια η εισήγηση —αλλά και ο κανονισμός— ώστε να υπάρξουν οι μέγιστες εγγυήσεις, προκειμένου αυτά τα ομόλογα να θεωρηθούν ασφαλή, να έχουν πολλούς επενδυτές και έτσι να μπορέσουν να λειτουργήσουν ως ένα εργαλείο που θα διαμορφώσει μια συνολική αγορά και, ταυτόχρονα, θα πάρει κοντά του και αρκετούς επενδυτές. Όμως, θα πρέπει να προσέξουμε πώς θα γίνουν αυτές οι διασφαλίσεις, ούτως ώστε πραγματικά να μη φτάσουμε σε σημείο κατάρρευσης ακόμη και αυτών των ομολόγων. Όλα φυσικά κρίνονται από το πώς θα λειτουργήσει η αγορά· εάν υπάρχει μεγάλη κρίση, τότε πολλοί διερωτώνται κατά πόσον θα αντέξουν και αυτά τα ομόλογα.

**Stefan Gehrold (PPE)**. – Monsieur le Président, Madame la Commissaire, Monsieur le rapporteur, cher Bernd, j'aimerais tout d'abord féliciter les rapporteurs d'avoir trouvé une approche équilibrée et pragmatique.

L'accord sur les règles concernant les obligations garanties s'intègre dans une logique qui vise à renforcer l'union des marchés des capitaux. Il est essentiel de ne pas perdre de vue les objectifs ultimes des lois que nous adoptons dans ce cadre. En l'occurrence, il s'agit essentiellement de soutenir l'économie réelle. Certes, nous cherchons à apporter aux banques une source de financement à long terme pour réaliser cet objectif. Nous devons néanmoins faire très attention à ne pas assouplir le cadre réglementaire des banques si cela ne se traduit pas par une amélioration de l'accès des entreprises et des individus au financement, premièrement, ou si cela entraîne des risques de compromettre la réussite à long terme, deuxièmement.

Le résultat des négociations est remarquable, car il permettra notamment aux pays où ces marchés n'existent pas encore de favoriser l'essor d'un instrument qui s'est avéré fiable et stable, même en période de crise, comme nous l'a expliqué M. Lucke. D'autres instruments, comme la création d'un billet garanti européen, seront examinés plus en détail.

C'était ma dernière intervention, je vous remercie tous pour votre bonne coopération. Je vous souhaite à tous une belle fête de Pâques.

**Pervenche Berès (S&D)**. – Monsieur le Président, Madame la Commissaire, le cadre d'harmonisation minimale des régimes nationaux que créera le corpus législatif européen est le bienvenu. Il permettra de développer un outil de refinancement bancaire utile et contribuera à l'approfondissement de l'union des marchés des capitaux. Il faut en effet se souvenir que les obligations sécurisées, peu risquées, ont permis aux banques de continuer à émettre dans des conditions de marché difficiles, par exemple en 2008 au plus fort de la crise financière.

Les textes prendront bien sûr en compte les caractéristiques propres de chaque marché national d'obligations sécurisées. Par exemple, il est possible de mélanger les actifs de couverture différents dans le panier de couverture comme des expositions sur personnes publiques et prêts immobiliers en France, mais aussi en Allemagne, au Danemark, en Suède, en Espagne, en Italie ou en Pologne. De ce fait, elles ont été conçues comme un socle commun inspiré des meilleures pratiques avec la possibilité, dorénavant, de bénéficier de ce label européen. Il reste désormais aux acteurs des places financières de s'emparer de ce label pour assurer un développement sain de ce marché qui permette une meilleure allocation transfrontière des capitaux, tout en maintenant un haut niveau de protection des investisseurs comme des capacités d'émission, y compris en période de turbulences financières pour les banques.

**Elżbieta Bieńkowska**, *Member of the Commission*. – Mr President, dear Members, thank you very much for all comments and interventions, which show that there is broad agreement about the new rules. Investors both within and outside the EU will know that those financial instruments, which are labelled EU covered bonds or premium covered bonds, are subject to robust standards set out in EU law and to specific supervision. The new rules are based on a prudentially sound and balanced approach, with the possibility to review key provisions in the coming years. I count on the continued support of the Parliament to ensure that covered bonds become an even more important source of funding for the European economy in the future. Thank you very much to the rapporteur and shadow rapporteurs.

**Bernd Lucke**, *Berichterstatter*. – Herr Präsident! Vielen Dank, meine Damen und Herren, liebe Kollegen, für die Diskussion, vielen Dank an alle Schattenberichterstatter, insbesondere aber auch an die Mitarbeiter der Kommission für die gute Zusammenarbeit während dieses Gesetzgebungsverfahrens.

Es ist das Wesentliche, glaube ich, in dieser Debatte bereits gesagt worden, deshalb möchte ich mich eigentlich nur auf zwei Anmerkungen beschränken. Das erste ist ein kleiner Kommentar, den ich machen möchte zu dem Beitrag meines Fraktionskollegen Notis Marias. Natürlich muss man immer sicherstellen, dass Bonds auch tatsächlich zurückgezahlt werden, und das Beispiel griechischer Staatsanleihen ist ein Beispiel dafür, dass manche Bonds nicht zurückgezahlt werden. Hier aber reden wir über Bonds, die von Banken ausgegeben werden und die eben gerade deshalb, weil man auch an der Bonität von Banken Zweifel haben kann, durch Wertgegenstände in einem Deckungspool besichert sind, der vor dem Zugriff anderer Gläubiger geschützt ist. Insofern wäre es vielleicht meine Empfehlung, dass die griechische Regierung – da Zweifel an der Bonität ihrer eigenen Anleihen existieren – künftig auch zu diesem Verfahren greift und Staatsanleihen durch Realwerte oder durch sonstige marktfähige Forderungen besichert. Das wäre sicherlich ein wegweisender Schritt, um die Kreditwürdigkeit der griechischen Regierung zu verbessern.

Zweitens ein kurzer Kommentar zu meinem Kollegen Alfred Sant: Der hat hervorgehoben, dass es wichtig war, keine gut funktionierenden Märkte zu stören. Das war unser aller Bestreben. Aber gleichzeitig war es auch unser Bestreben, die besten Praktiken in diese Richtlinie einfließen zu lassen. Und beides zusammen geht natürlich nicht. Denn wenn man keinen Markt in irgendeiner Form stört, dann muss man alle Praktiken zulassen, und damit würde man die schlechtesten Praktiken ebenfalls weiter fortschreiben und gewährenlassen. Das war gerade nicht das Ziel der Harmonisierung, die wir hier angestrebt haben.

Ich glaube, es ist uns gut gelungen, diesen Irrweg zu vermeiden, indem wir tatsächlich die Qualität in den Gesetzgebungswerken bestimmter Mitgliedstaaten hervorgehoben haben, und für andere Staaten eben einen gewissen Druck geschaffen haben, sich an diese Anforderungen anzupassen. Das hebt insgesamt das Niveau der Cabot-Bond-Gesetzgebung innerhalb der Europäischen Union und weist dem Produkt, glaube ich, einen guten Weg in die Zukunft.

**Przewodniczący**. – Zamykam debatę.

Głosowanie odbędzie się w czwartek 18 kwietnia 2019 r.

## **25. Negocjacje z Radą i Komisją w sprawie wniosku ustawodawczego dotyczącego uprawnień śledczych Parlamentu Europejskiego (debata)**

**Przewodniczący**. – Kolejnym punktem porządku dziennego jest debata nad:

— pytaniem wymagającym odpowiedzi ustnej skierowanym do Rady przez Danutę Marię Hübner w imieniu Komisji Spraw Konstytucyjnych w sprawie negocjacji z Radą i Komisją w sprawie wniosku ustawodawczego dotyczącego uprawnień śledczych Parlamentu Europejskiego (O-000003/2019 - B8-0019/2019) (2019/2536(RSP)) oraz

— pytaniem wymagającym odpowiedzi ustnej skierowanym do Komisji przez Danutę Marię Hübner w imieniu Komisji Spraw Konstytucyjnych w sprawie negocjacji z Radą i Komisją w sprawie wniosku ustawodawczego dotyczącego uprawnień śledczych Parlamentu Europejskiego (O-000004/2019 - B8-0020/2019) (2019/2536(RSP)).

**Ramón Jáuregui Atondo**, *autor*. – Señor presidente, quiero empezar por decir que no se trata tanto de una pregunta oral al final de la legislatura como de una queja política que este Parlamento quiere expresar ante el Consejo y la Comisión. Y es una queja política por lo que consideramos una falta de cooperación leal, una falta de cooperación institucional entre el Consejo, la Comisión y el Parlamento, algo en mi opinión muy grave.

Para empezar por recordar los hechos, tengo que decir que ya el artículo 226 del Tratado de Funcionamiento de la Unión Europea otorgó en el año 2009, cuando se aprobó el Tratado de Lisboa, al Parlamento Europeo la iniciativa legislativa para regular cuáles son los poderes de las comisiones de investigación. Les recuerdo que solamente hay iniciativa legislativa del Parlamento Europeo en dos materias: en la ley electoral europea y en la regulación de las comisiones de investigación.

El texto ya fue aprobado en el año 2012 —tres años después— siendo ponente David Martin, que empezó a negociar con el Consejo y la Comisión en la anterior legislatura; no se llegó a ningún acuerdo y en 2014 se aprobó en primera lectura ese texto; cierto, sin el acuerdo de la Comisión y del Consejo.

Cuando yo fui nombrado ponente al comienzo de esta legislatura, en el año 2015, empecé a intentar negociar con el Consejo y la Comisión un texto que fuera aprobado por las tres instituciones. Y lo cierto, señorías —y aquí empieza mi queja política—, es que no hemos sido capaces de conseguir que el Consejo y la Comisión se reúnan con el Parlamento en un trío institucional, en un diálogo político razonable para establecer un texto que permita tener un Reglamento que regule los poderes de esta Cámara en materia de comisiones de investigación.

Esta es mi denuncia; y han sido muchos documentos de trabajo, muchas manifestaciones de flexibilidad que hemos mostrado al Consejo y a la Comisión.

Estos siempre nos han pedido: «Hagan ustedes un nuevo texto». Y, por fin, lo hicimos. Después de nueve meses de reuniones entre los Servicios Jurídicos de la Comisión, del Consejo y del Parlamento Europeo, finalmente, sobre la base de esos trabajos técnicos, hicimos un nuevo texto —lo llamamos un «*non-paper*»—, se lo presentamos al Consejo y la respuesta fue, como siempre, una carta en la que se nos expresaban objeciones jurídicas, objeciones legales, preocupaciones...

En el fondo hubo siempre una respuesta procedimental con un contenido político de renuncia o de no aceptación de esta negociación.

Y esta es la razón de la queja. La queja está en que el Consejo y la Comisión no han trabajado con nosotros, no han querido dialogar, no han querido negociar y han despreciado al Parlamento; lo han humillado, señorías.

Esta es mi sincera reflexión, junto a la profunda decepción que mantengo por haber trabajado cuatro años junto con la Comisión AFCO, junto con los ponentes alternativos, junto con la presidenta Hübner para intentar esa negociación. Y no ha sido posible.

Y el problema, señorías, no es solo un problema procedimental, no es solamente una queja política porque no se han conseguido las negociaciones. El problema de fondo es que la Comisión y el Consejo no aceptan que haya comisiones de investigación que realicen investigaciones molestas o incómodas para los Estados miembros, para los miembros de la Comisión, para los miembros de los Gobiernos de los Estados nacionales, etcétera, etcétera.

En el fondo, lo que yo percibo es que se teme que se llame a testigos, que se llame a comisarios, que se llame a ministros de los Estados miembros... Y se teme porque —y este es el problema— no se acepta que el Parlamento ejerza un poder tan importante como el de las comisiones de investigación, absolutamente imprescindible en el parlamentarismo moderno, en el parlamentarismo del siglo XXI.

No es razonable que a este Parlamento se le niegue una facultad que le dio el Tratado de Lisboa y que en el siglo XXI —en el que hay un montón de temas de alarma social que provocan mala administración o problemas de vulneración del Estado de Derecho, etcétera— este Parlamento no pueda investigar, cuando somos los representantes directos del pueblo, para poder responder a la alarma social que producen determinados acontecimientos.

Por eso, mañana, señorías, aprobaremos una Resolución que sí, es muy dura, pero es muy justa. Es una Resolución muy crítica con el Consejo y la Comisión, pero es muy necesaria, señorías.

Esto es lo que yo quiero decirles: vamos a trasladar esta queja al presidente del Parlamento para que se dirija a los presidentes de los Estados miembros en las reuniones del Consejo, trasladamos a los *Spitzenkandidaten* de las familias políticas para que sepan que aquí hay una queja política; pedimos a la nueva Presidencia que venga dentro de unos meses que aborde este problema, porque este problema está sobre la mesa y es imprescindible abordarlo para que el Parlamento Europeo sea lo que debe ser, un Parlamento que representa al pueblo europeo.

**Danuta Maria Hübner, author.** – Mr President, the right of inquiry is a fundamental weapon for any modern parliament to make the executive accountable for their actions. If we think about mad cow disease, tax fraud on cigarettes, dieselgate or the Panama Papers, we understand that it is fundamental that Parliament has a solid and sharp power of inquiry. Ramón Jáuregui said that the Council and the Member States systematically refused to sit at the table and have a real discussion on the content of the European Parliament's proposal. Their argument was that the proposal of the Parliament did not take into consideration their fundamental concerns. But this actually means ignoring the nature of the special legislative procedure established by Article 226 TFEU. This procedure implies that the institutions exchange views and search for a compromise acceptable for all of them. The Council demanded that the initial proposal of the European Parliament should already contain the text acceptable for the Council. This is not the way the consent procedure functions. How would the Council or the Commission react if the European Parliament refused even to discuss possible ways to reach an agreement on, let's say, the MFF, using the pretext that it does not like the proposal of the Commission? Moreover, this attitude is not compatible with the principle of sincere cooperation between the institutions that we all should respect and cherish. At stake here is a fundamental question of respect for the prerogatives of the Parliament and for the institutional balance. It is fundamental that the Council and the Commission understand it. At the end of the day, we do not have an obligation to agree with each other, but we have the duty to try. Sadly, Member States have not lived up to their duty.

**George Ciamba, President-in-Office of the Council.** – Mr President, as we approach the end of the term, it is indeed an appropriate moment to discuss the important issue of the exercise, of its inquiry powers by the European Parliament, and take stock of recent events.

Let me start by assuring you that the Council has always shared the view that committees of inquiry are an important instrument, allowing the European Parliament to exercise political control in a Union founded on the values of respect for democracy and the rule of law, as required by the Treaty.

Since the Martin report in 2011, the Council has been examining a series of proposals in a very constructive spirit and in the respect of its duty of sincere cooperation. However, as is well known, the Martin report raised serious legal and institutional concerns in the Council and in the Commission with regard to the limits imposed by Article 226 of the Treaty.

Indeed, this proposal for so far-reaching an extension of the rights of committees of inquiry was considered contrary to Article 226. Despite subsequent efforts to reconcile the diverse positions, such as the more recent work by the experts of the three legal services at technical level which held so many meetings, the progress made on some less problematic provisions resulting from this work did not match and did not solve the most complex issues of a legal and political nature. As was stated in a letter sent to Ms Hübner on 25 October last year by the Austrian Presidency, the Council therefore welcomed the non-paper prepared by the rapporteur, Mr Jáuregui Atondo, representing a new attempt to revive the political dialogue among the three institutions.

The non-paper indeed contains a number of improvements compared to the proposal of 2014. It meets some of the concerns expressed by the Council on previous occasions and takes up some of the solutions which are jointly suggested by the legal experts of the three institutions.

However, the non-paper still contains a number of provisions which give rise to serious legal and political concerns for the Council, which were raised on many past occasions. In substance, the Council's position on these fundamental issues has not changed since the Martin report, and to be more specific, let me mention, among the most problematic issues, this power to summon individuals who are not officials as witnesses and to enforce such a measure by sanctions; the hearing of officials and other servants of the Union as witnesses; the power to request documents from natural or legal persons who have no role in the implementation of Union law; and the imposition of sanctions in the event of non-compliance.

And finally, the provisions on sanctions. Let me recall that criminal law in the rules on criminal procedure are matters for which the Member States are responsible. The competences of the Union in that field are very limited. I will not go into more detail here, as you are, I hope, very familiar with the Council's concerns, which I explained in a detailed manner in the letter I have already mentioned.

Since the beginning of its term, the Romanian Presidency has been ready to continue to clarify the respective positions, also in the Commission, building upon the Austrian Presidency's engagement in the many informal contacts between our predecessors and Mr Jáuregui and Mrs Hübner.

I can assure you that the Council continues to be open to a constructive dialogue with the European Parliament in order to explore ways forward on this legally and politically-complex file. Should the new Parliament wish to carry on the work based on the progress made so far, the Council stands ready to do so in full respect of its duty of sincere cooperation.

**Elżbieta Bieńkowska**, *Member of the Commission*. – Mr President, let me first welcome this occasion offered by this oral question to set out the Commission's positions regarding the proposal for the regulation on the European Parliament's right of inquiry. While it is of course for the Parliament to make a proposal, the procedure also requires the consent of the Council and of the Commission. Since the entry into force of the Lisbon Treaty, the European Parliament has made several proposals for such a regulation.

The latest informal proposal, in the form of a non-paper proposal, was politically endorsed by the Committee on Constitutional Affairs in April last year and transmitted to the Commission and to the Council in May last year. The Commission acknowledges that the new informal proposal is drafted in more precise legal terms and incorporates several improvements: for instance, as regards the rules on the setting-up of the committee of inquiry, the procedural rules applying to its investigation or the introduction of a central contact point for inquiry.

The new informal proposal also contains references to the regulation on the protection of natural persons with regard to the processing of personal data by EU institutions, and to the framework agreement between the European Parliament and the European Commission. However, the non-paper proposal still contains a number of legal and institutional concerns that have been at the heart of this discussion with the Parliament and the Council since 2012.

The most important concerns are: sanctions for non-compliance with the provisions of the regulations; certain aspects of the investigative means which would be in the hands of the committee, such as on-the-spot investigations, hearings of Commissioners and former Commissioners, hearings of officials and former officials, as well as hearings of natural persons; the newly introduced rule regarding remedies in the case of violation of the provisions of the regulation by a committee of inquiry, its members and officials and other servants of the European Parliament; and last, provisions which seem to grant discretionary power to the Parliament with regard to the suspension of the committee proceedings during the related court procedure.

Notwithstanding these concerns, I would like to stress the Commission's continued willingness and commitment to engage in a constructive trilateral discussion, with a view to finding appropriate solutions to the divergences that still exist between the three institutions.

The future regulation of the right of inquiry should provide the European Parliament with the appropriate instrument to fully respect institutional prerogatives and the relevant legal frameworks of the Member States.

**Maite Pagazaurtundúa Ruiz**, *en nombre del Grupo ALDE*. – Señor presidente, señor Ciamba, creo que no nos ha escuchado. Les hemos dicho, una y otra vez durante estos años, a los que han representado el mismo papel que usted —y como le acaba de decir el señor Jáuregui— que hablamos de falta de cooperación leal. Nada de que haya habido cooperación leal.



Vamos a empezar por colocar las cosas en su sitio. En este Parlamento nos han faltado capacidades durante esta legislatura para poder trabajar mejor en los papeles de Panamá, incluso en el *dieselgate* o en la Comisión Especial sobre Terrorismo. Porque ustedes han querido bloquear esta posibilidad. Si el señor Jáuregui, que tiene en el ADN la capacidad de negociación pura y de llegar a consensos, no lo ha podido hacer, es por falta de cooperación de ustedes. Así que vamos a empezar a decir las cosas como son.

Hace veinticinco años que funcionamos con una Decisión que se ha quedado vieja y pequeña. Este no es el Parlamento de 1995, y necesitamos esas prerrogativas que ustedes, argumentando las razones más variadas, no quieren conceder a este Parlamento. Y se equivocan. Porque perdemos credibilidad. Porque necesitamos poder desarrollar ese derecho de investigación.

No es justo, no es decente que instituciones hermanas como son el Consejo y la Comisión Europea atenen las manos del Parlamento Europeo —que representa a quinientos millones de europeos que eligen directamente a sus representantes en esta Cámara— cuando ejerce las funciones que le son otorgadas. Y esta es una de las que nosotros tenemos derecho a desarrollar.

No es justo que el señor Jáuregui haya trabajado durante cinco años, como lo ha hecho también la presidenta de la Comisión de Asuntos Constitucionales, la señora Danuta Hübner, y la Secretaría de la Comisión AFCO. No es justo. Nos han dado con la puerta en las narices.

Así que yo lo único que puedo decir es que no ha habido la diligencia debida por su parte y que agradezco al señor Jáuregui, en el último debate en esta Cámara, su trabajo.

Es un honor haber trabajado con usted y conocerle desde hace treinta años.

**Diane James, on behalf of the EFDD Group.** – Mr President, well if proof was ever needed that the EU parliament is merely window-dressing for the so-called EU democracy, we have it here. If democracy is going to be meaningful then the elected representatives, the MEPs, my colleagues here in the Chamber must be allowed to call into question anything that reasonably affects those they represent. The right of inquiry should have legal standing, or else what is the point?

It demonstrates that this Chamber is nothing more than a puppet for those unelected officials in the Commission and the Council if that legal standing is not recognised and allowed to happen. It disturbs me but does not surprise me that the Council and the Commission are acting in an obstructive manner when it comes to transparency here in the European Parliament. Now if the European Union wonders why populace and Eurosceptics flourish, you have your answer before you. This is a major failing in democratic process.

**Jiří Pospíšil (PPE).** – Pane předsedající, já musím říci, že jsem z postojů Rady a Komise velmi smutný. Je to fakticky pohrdání Evropským parlamentem. Primární evropské právo dává našemu parlamentu jasnou pravomoc provádět vyšetřování. Na tom se členské státy při přípravě primárního práva shodly. A to, že k tomuto základnímu právu není dosud schválen prováděcí dokument, prováděcí nařízení, je opravdu velká ostuda a musím říci, že mě velmi znepokojuje chování zvláště Rady.

Dopis z října minulého roku, který je plný alibistických výmluv, proč takovýto prováděcí předpis nejde, mě rozesmutňuje a musím říci, že bych čekal od zástupců demokratických států, které cítí principy právního státu, že se budou lépe snažit naplnit pravomoci klíčového orgánu Evropské unie, a tím je Evropský parlament. My zde zastupujeme občany, jsme přímo voleni, máme pravomoci dané primárním právem a zvláště Rada nám bohužel takto odkrojuje a omezuje výkon kompetencí. To je situace. Kdyby se toto dělo v nějaké jiné zemi mimo evropský prostor, mimo hodnoty práva a právního státu, tak bych to chápal. Často o tom hovoříme, jak je právo v třetích zemích potlačováno, a často to Evropský parlament kritizuje, ale tady bohužel pohrdáme právem, vlastním evropským právem, přímo na úrovni Evropské unie.

Trošku se prosím, dámy a pánové v Radě a Komisi, chytněte za nos, je to mimořádně špatná vizitka postojů k základní hodnotě Evropské unie, a to je respektování práva a právního státu.

Zgłoszenia z sali

**Νότης Μαριάς (ECR).** – Κύριε Πρόεδρε, ποιες είναι οι βασικές λειτουργίες ενός Κοινοβουλίου; Η νομοθετική λειτουργία, ο κοινοβουλευτικός έλεγχος και οι εξεταστικές επιτροπές. Αυτά κάνουν τα δημοκρατικά κοινοβούλια και το δικαίωμα του Ευρωπαϊκού Κοινοβουλίου να προχωρεί στην εξέταση πραγμάτων, δηλαδή να κάνει εξεταστική επιτροπή, προβλέπεται αυτοτελώς από το πρωτογενές δίκαιο. Επομένως, πρέπει να έχει τη δυνατότητα να εξασκεί αυτά τα καθήκοντά του. Διότι, όταν δεν προχωρά σε εξεταστικές επιτροπές, όταν έχουμε σκάνδαλα, όπως τα LuxLeaks, τα Panama Papers, το ντίζελ σκάνδαλο, και δεν κάνει τίποτε το Ευρωπαϊκό Κοινοβούλιο, τότε μειώνεται η αξιοπιστία του και δημιουργούνται προβλήματα στις σχέσεις του με τους πολίτες. Αυτό το δικαίωμα θέλουμε να εξασκούμε αυτοτελώς, αυτό διεκδικούμε και νομίζω ότι η τοποθέτηση του Συμβουλίου δεν συμβάλλει προς αυτήν την κατεύθυνση.

(Koniec zgłoszeń z sali)

**Helmut Scholz, im Namen der GUE/NGL-Fraktion.** – Herr Präsident, Frau Kommissarin! Ich sage es Ihnen gleich vorweg: Ich bin dafür, dass wir als Europäisches Parlament nun vor den Europäischen Gerichtshof ziehen. Wir müssen unser Recht offensichtlich einklagen. Nach meiner Rechtsauffassung sind wir sogar dazu verpflichtet, denn wir sind das Parlament der Bürgerinnen und Bürger der Europäischen Union. Und es ist deren Recht, dass sie ein starkes Parlament haben, das seine Befugnisse voll wahrnehmen kann.

Die Verschleppungstaktik im Rat macht sichtbar, dass einflussreiche Personen in großen politischen Parteien Angst vor dem Europäischen Parlament haben. Was würde zu hören sein, wenn das Europäische Parlament einzelne Mitglieder der Regierungen von Mitgliedstaaten oder bestimmte Zeugen vorladen und anhören könnte? Wie sehr wäre der Untersuchungsausschuss gestärkt, wenn er Sanktionen gegen diejenigen verhängen könnte, die der Vorladung des Europäischen Parlaments nicht Folge leisten?

Und die Kommission hütet sich, nicht nur davor, die Verträge durchzusetzen, sondern macht mit dem Rat auch noch gemeinsame Sache. Auch Sie sind dagegen, dass der Ausschuss im Rahmen einer Untersuchung in einem Mitgliedstaat Nachforschungen betreiben kann. Glauben wir eigentlich, dass es sich für die Bürgerinnen und Bürger deutlicher danach anhört, dass demokratisches Recht umgesetzt wird, wenn Sie auch dem parlamentarischen Untersuchungsausschuss nicht sämtliche Dokumente zeigen wollen? Was haben Sie zu verbergen? Was sollen die Leute denken, wenn es der Kommission Sorge bereitet, dass ihre Beamten bei einer Aussage vor dem Untersuchungsausschuss an die Wahrheit gebunden sind? Was käme denn dann ans Licht?

**Elżbieta Bienkowska, Member of the Commission.** – Mr President, I would like to thank honourable Members for all their comments and remarks. Let me reiterate again that the Commission attaches great importance to Parliament's role of scrutiny and political control, of which the ultimate aim is to guarantee that citizens' concerns regarding the implementation of Union law are properly addressed.

The Commission again recognises the work done by the institutions so far and acknowledges that the non-paper represents certain progress compared to the earlier proposals. At the same time, as I mentioned earlier, the Commission still finds that the latest informal proposal contains a number of legal and institutional concerns, such as sanctions, investigative means and legal remedies.

The Commission acknowledges the need to have an adequate instrument which fully respects institutional prerogatives and the relevant legal frameworks of the Member States. The Commission is willing to engage in a constructive trilateral discussion with a view to finding appropriate solutions to the concerns that still exist. We hope that progress can be made on this politically sensitive, but very important, file.

**George Ciamba, President-in-Office of the Council.** – Mr President, to conclude I would like to thank you all for this open and frank exchange of views. It has allowed us to clarify further our respective positions. Let me assure you that both the Austrian and the Romanian Presidencies and the preceding ones have been equally willing to engage in an open and constructive exchange of views with a view to sounding out whether an agreement can be reached between our institutions on this file. The file has been discussed in depth in so many meetings of the Working Party on General Affairs.

Unfortunately, under the given circumstances it is clear that it is not possible anymore to conclude the file under this Parliament legislator. But let me once again reaffirm the Council's willingness and commitment to engaging with the European Parliament, be it in another setting, after the May elections. After all, it is in our common interest to have clear and up-to-date rules governing the exercise of the European Parliament's right of inquiry so that all actors know precisely what are their rights and obligations.

Let me also thank Mr Jáuregui Atondo for the great work he has done as the rapporteur on the file and in trying to do his best in order to improve on what was the previous report on this so important file.

Thank you all so much once again for your attention. This is the last time the Romanian Presidency is going to intervene in the plenary and thank you all for all the good spirit of cooperation we had in these three months that we've been here and trying to ensure sincere cooperation between the institutions of Europe.

**President.** – It was a pleasure to work together with the Romanian Presidency.

Otrzymałem jeden projekt rezolucji złożony zgodnie z art. 128 ust. 5 Regulaminu.

Zamykam debatę.

Głosowanie odbędzie się w czwartek 18 kwietnia 2019 r.

*Oświadczenia pisemne (art. 162)*

**Alfred Sant (S&D), in writing.** – This House has recently been making increasing use of its investigative rights with special and inquiry committees following major scandals. The TAXE committee, established after LuxLeaks, or the EMIS committee focusing on emission measurements in the automotive sector, showed the Parliament's ability to contribute significantly to the European public debate. Exercises have been carried to understand how and why such maladministration and breaches of EU law have been happening and subsequent policy options to tackle them have been proposed. The first TAXE Committee set out ideas for transparent taxation across the EU and called for a legislative proposal on country-by-country reporting of companies' profits, tax and subsidies, about which the Commission announced its plans a few months later. One would have expected this Parliament, especially with regard to the recent TAXE 3 committee, to deploy the best available methodologies and proceedings in its evaluation of taxation policies and financial services. Rather, it has given in to facile stigmatisation of certain countries, notably my country Malta, business sectors and professions. In such a case, the limits of this House's investigative rights were quickly reached as soon as tax populism and generalised statements replaced objective proceedings. Unfortunately this deeply questions the credibility and effectiveness of the Parliament's right of inquiry.

## 26. Program InvestEU (debata)

**Przewodniczący.** – Kolejnym punktem porządku dziennego jest sprawozdanie sporządzone przez José Manuela Fernandesa w imieniu Komisji Budżetowej i Roberto Gualtieriego w imieniu Komisji Gospodarczej i Monetarnej w sprawie wniosku dotyczącego rozporządzenia Parlamentu Europejskiego i Rady ustanawiającego Program InvestEU (COM(2018)0439 - C8-0257/2018 - 2018/0229(COD)) (A8-0482/2018).

**José Manuel Fernandes, Relator.** – Senhor Presidente, queria falar à Comissão, queria também dar uma palavra de agradecimento a todos aqueles que trabalharam neste importante plano de investimentos para 2021-2027, agradecer ao colega Roberto Gualtieri, que é correlator comigo, um agradecimento também muito forte ao Otmar Karas, que já trabalhou no EFSI, o plano de investimentos para a União Europeia até 2020, o plano Juncker, como é conhecido, um agradecimento a todos os relatores-sombra, a todos os colaboradores e, obviamente, ao *staff* do Partido Popular Europeu e também do secretariado da Comissão dos Orçamentos.

De 2021 a 2027 teremos um novo plano de investimentos que junta os 14 instrumentos financeiros que temos neste momento. Isto significa simplificação, mas também tem de, ao mesmo tempo, significar ambição. Por isso, o Parlamento Europeu quer que os 14 instrumentos financeiros que se juntam num só tenham o mesmo nível de garantia. Por isso, propomos uma garantia de 40.8 mil milhões de euros para mobilizar 700 mil milhões de euros, e há aqui uma pequena diferença com o Conselho e com a Comissão que defende 650 mil milhões.

Tudo está acordado, com exceção desta parte e das partes ligadas ao quadro financeiro plurianual, mas quero congratular-me com este acordo provisório, só agora dependente das próximas negociações, que eu espero que sejam breves, para o quadro financeiro plurianual. Neste InvestEU, neste plano de investimentos para a União Europeia, temos quatro janelas principais, temos uma janela para as infraestruturas sustentáveis, uma outra janela para as pequenas e médias empresas, para a investigação e inovação e, finalmente também, para o objetivo social.

A União Europeia precisa que as diferenças entre regiões e entre países em termos de investimento, as dificuldades de acesso de alguns países aos mercados financeiros deixem de existir e, portanto, que haja uma redução das dificuldades de financiamento. Com este instrumento é necessário que os Estados-Membros se preparem para uma novidade que é o compartimento para os Estados-Membros, um compartimento que é adicional, que é numa base voluntária, mas que permitirá ajudar os Estados-Membros que tenham, por exemplo, instituições financeiras de desenvolvimento ou bancos de promoção nacional que tenham algumas debilidades.

É necessário que cada Estado-Membro faça, obviamente, o trabalho de casa. É importante também que as instituições financeiras de desenvolvimento se preparem. O Parlamento teve aqui uma postura muito positiva que contribui para a competitividade da União Europeia, para o crescimento económico, para um emprego de qualidade. Também, em boa hora, melhorámos a governança deste instrumento financeiro.

Para além disso, naquilo que é o Advisory Board, nós incluímos também o Comité Económico e Social e o Comité das Regiões, a reforçar o aspeto social, mas também a reforçar a importância das regiões. A União Europeia tem que ser a União Europeia dos cidadãos e também a União Europeia das regiões.

Felizmente, também conseguimos melhorar a governança no que diz respeito a evitar possíveis conflitos de interesse. É que no InvestEU, para além dos 75 % para o BEI, os outros 25 da garantia são para os bancos de promoção nacional e o que nós queremos é que esta garantia seja executada a 100 %.

**Elżbieta Bieńkowska**, *Member of the Commission*. – Mr President, tonight's debate on the InvestEU programme in the last plenary session is emblematic of the continued backing this House has given to the Commission's initiatives in support of investment throughout its mandate. On behalf of the Commission, let me thank you for your support.

The partial agreement you have reached with the Council on InvestEU, in a record time, will allow for preparatory work to proceed quickly. This will ensure a smooth and timely implementation on day one of the next Multiannual Financial Framework (MFF), allowing for a seamless continuation of investment support. InvestEU will simplify our existing set of financial instruments and, under a single guarantee, rule book and brand, cater for sectors that are experiencing investment gaps and sub-optimal investments situations. Digitisation, social housing, research, energy efficiency and urban transport are just some of the key areas that today don't find adequate financing on the market. The InvestEU guarantee will unlock such financing and crowd-in private money for the public good.

To deliver its objectives, the fund will be supported by InvestEU's advisory hub that this House wants to strengthen. The Commission welcomes this emphasis. The Commission also highly values the fact that the co-legislators have upheld its proposal for an opening of access to the EU budgetary guarantee.

While the European Investment Bank's strategic role is now enshrined in the regulation and its expertise is better recognised, other actors such as international financial institutions like the EBRD or the Council of Europe bank, but also national promotional banks and institutions, will have the opportunity to become implementing partners. This will ensure we are using all available expertise in a complementary manner, improving their geographical outreach and taking into account local needs. The preparation of the InvestEU programme and its implementation will bring those actors together, require them to set up the system, but also give them the opportunity to take ownership and co-shape the Union investment programme. This will result in a community of strong, long-term investors supporting the EU's policy objectives.

During the negotiations, the Parliament has had a key role in maintaining the focus of this instrument on policy steer, in strengthening the accountability and transparency provisions, and in raising ambitions for the climate targets. The Commission believes that all of these points improve InvestEU.

Let me conclude by expressing our appreciation for the tremendous effort of the rapporteurs, their shadows and all associated committees in reaching a position within a very ambitious timeline, with a view to enabling an agreement before the European elections. I would also like to take this opportunity to extend this appreciation to the Romanian Presidency for their dedication and effort.

**Elena Gentile**, *relatrice per parere della commissione per lo sviluppo regionale*. – Signor Presidente, onorevoli colleghi consegniamo dunque agli europei e alle europee il paradigma dell'Europa che sta già cambiando.

Strada facendo la nuova Europa ha preso il largo allontanandosi dalla riva dell'austerità riorientando la sua rotta. Il nuovo approdo è la cifra del lavoro di questi anni. È l'Europa delle persone che cresce nell'orizzonte della sostenibilità e dell'inclusione sociale.

InvestEU è sostegno alle imprese innovative e accesso al credito delle piccole e medie imprese. InvestEU è sostegno all'economia circolare, all'infrastrutturazione ambientale. InvestEU è finalmente scuola, università, formazione per le nuove competenze. InvestEU è salute, ospedali, cure mediche. InvestEU è innovazione a sostegno dell'economia sociale per la promozione delle persone più fragili. InvestEU è finalmente nuova edilizia popolare, il dividendo, la qualità della vita dei territori e il benessere delle persone, la lotta senza quartiere alla povertà.

**Roberto Gualtieri**, *Relatore*. – Signor Presidente, onorevoli colleghi, è davvero un piacere presentare in quest'Aula il risultato di un lavoro lungo e di un negoziato intenso che però ha portato risultati positivi.

Vorrei ringraziare il collega correlatore José Manuel Fernandes, tutti i relatori ombra e tutti i colleghi che hanno contribuito ad approvare questo testo con cui si prosegue un percorso iniziato cinque anni fa. La crisi finanziaria, le politiche di austerità avevano prodotto una caduta senza precedenti degli investimenti pubblici e privati in tutta l'Unione europea e una delle nostre priorità è stata quella di rilanciarli. Più investimenti come condizione per la crescita e l'occupazione.

Grazie a un'interpretazione flessibile del Patto di stabilità e poi a nuove iniziative come quella del Fondo europeo per gli investimenti strategici, abbiamo avviato una correzione dell'indirizzo di politica economica, ma nuovi importanti gap di investimenti si sono aperti nei settori legati all'innovazione, alle infrastrutture materiali, immateriali e sociali e ai cambiamenti climatici. Si tratta di sfide decisive che intendiamo affrontare con il programma InvestEU. Oltre a rafforzare ulteriormente il sostegno alle piccole e medie imprese, alla ricerca, all'innovazione, alle infrastrutture sostenibili, con questo programma andremo ad affrontare l'enorme gap di infrastrutture sociali, garantendo la reale realizzabilità di progetti nel campo dell'educazione, della salute e dell'edilizia sociale.

L'accordo che abbiamo raggiunto con il Consiglio apporta una serie di modifiche migliorative al testo della Commissione. In primo luogo, abbiamo stabilito che il costo della garanzia per i promotori dell'investimento dovrà essere esclusivamente legato alle caratteristiche e al profilo di rischio delle operazioni sottostanti e che condizioni più favorevoli potranno essere applicate per promuovere la costruzione di piattaforme di investimento, per favorire gli investimenti nelle aree dove il gap di investimenti è più elevato o per incoraggiare interventi in quei settori dove la necessità di investimenti è più pronunciata.

In secondo luogo, pur riconoscendo una partnership particolare, un ruolo centrale alla Banca europea degli investimenti, abbiamo valorizzato l'importante ruolo delle banche di promozione nazionale nel finanziamento dei progetti di investimento. Le banche di promozione nazionale potranno avere accesso diretto alla garanzia europea e questo consentirà una maggiore flessibilità e quindi maggiori possibilità di finanziamento dei progetti, con positive ricadute sul livello di investimenti e sulla creazione di nuovi posti di lavoro.

Infine, abbiamo stabilito che gli Stati membri avranno non soltanto la possibilità di convogliare parte delle loro risorse assegnate nel quadro dei fondi per la politica di coesione in InvestEU nel comparto nazionale, ma potranno anche contribuire con risorse aggiuntive che andranno, in linea di principio, considerate come contributi *one-off* e quindi non calcolate nel conto del deficit strutturale nel quadro del patto di stabilità.

Il testo che voteremo domani è quindi un testo complessivamente equilibrato, compresa la parte importante che richiede almeno il 55 % degli investimenti nel quadro della finestra delle infrastrutture sostenibili che contribuiscono a raggiungere gli obiettivi previsti dagli accordi di Parigi sul clima e l'ambiente. Naturalmente è fondamentale un quadro di certezza di risorse e quindi il nostro impegno nella prossima legislatura sarà quello di negoziare un quadro finanziario pluriennale che sia all'altezza di questo progetto, delle ambizioni di InvestEU ma anche complessivamente della necessità di avere un bilancio europeo forte.

Noi sappiamo che InvestEU sarà un tassello importante, necessario ma non sufficiente di quella che nella prossima legislatura sarà una nostra priorità politica: realizzare un programma straordinario di investimenti con i quali sostenere la conversione, la riconversione ecologica dell'economia, la sostenibilità sociale, il rilancio della crescita, dell'innovazione e dell'occupazione.

**Othmar Karas**, *im Namen der PPE-Fraktion*. – Herr Präsident, Frau Kommissarin, meine Herren Berichterstatter Fernandes und Gualtieri! Ich darf in meinen Dank an Sie alle aber auch Udo Bullmann einschließen, der ja am Beginn mit mir diesen „Investitionskampf“ geführt hat.

Investitionen zu mobilisieren, ist kein Sprint, sondern ein nie endender Marathon. Wir haben am Beginn dieser Wahlperiode mit dem Juncker-Plan die erste Initiative gesetzt, haben diesen mit EFSI 2 verbessert und auf 2020 verlängert, sind dann in die Nachbarschaft gegangen, vor allem nach Afrika, und schlagen jetzt am Ende der Wahlperiode mit der Initiative InvestEU ein weiteres Kapitel bis 2027 auf. 1 200 Milliarden Euro an neuen Investitionen konnten damit gepusht werden, 945 000 kleine und mittelständische Unternehmen unterstützt werden; rund 400 Milliarden Euro sind bis jetzt mobilisiert und 1,4 Millionen neue Arbeitsplätze geschaffen.

Wir erhöhen mit InvestEU die Effizienz und reduzieren die Bürokratie, indem 14 verschiedene Finanzinstrumente unter einem einzigen Dach zusammengelegt werden, und wir stärken die Umsetzung der Klima- und Umweltziele, indem künftig mindestens 55 % der Infrastrukturinvestitionen dazu beitragen müssen. Wir verbessern die Beratung und Unterstützung vor allem bei kleinen Projekten, wir steigern die Schlagfertigkeit, indem die Direktvergabe der EU-Garantie an lokale Förderinstitute erweitert wird, und wir sichern die politische Unabhängigkeit und Transparenz von Investitionsentscheidungen.

InvestEU ist nicht der Abschluss, sondern die vierte Ausbaustufe verstärkter öffentlicher und privater Institutionen im Interesse Europas, von Wachstum und Beschäftigung in die richtige Richtung. Wir hoffen, dass dieser Weg in der neuen Wahlperiode fortgesetzt werden kann.

**Karine Gloanec Maurin**, *au nom du groupe S&D*. – Monsieur le Président, Madame la Commissaire, chers collègues, je salue aussi, bien sûr, Messieurs les rapporteurs.

Cet accord partiel et provisoire sur le programme InvestEU, qui s'inscrit dans le cadre financier pluriannuel 2021-2027, est un message fort et positif que le Parlement européen est fier d'envoyer au Conseil en vue de multiplier – au vu du succès du premier plan d'investissement, dit «plan Juncker» – les investissements pour l'emploi et la croissance durable en Europe, et ce dès janvier 2021.

Cela permettra le financement – cela a déjà été dit – de projets locaux dans le domaine de la recherche, l'infrastructure durable, l'innovation, la numérisation, le soutien aux PME, ce qui est très important, mais cela apportera aussi des garanties qui permettront d'introduire un caractère éthique et durable de la finance, ce qui est aussi important. Il s'agit bien ici d'un partenariat clé entre la Commission européenne, la Banque européenne d'investissement et les banques d'investissement nationales et locales pour propulser les projets environnementaux et sociaux choisis, en phase avec nos engagements pour le respect des accords de Paris et des objectifs de développement durable des Nations unies.

Je fais une remarque au sujet du quatrième volet d'action – dont parlait tout à l'heure le rapporteur, José Manuel Fernandes – qui indique qu'on peut faire aujourd'hui des investissements sociaux et en faveur des compétences. C'est le soutien aujourd'hui disponible pour les secteurs culturels et créatifs. Je pense qu'un lien étroit est maintenant établi entre l'investissement public et l'agenda européen pour la culture. L'art et la culture, vous le savez, ne pouvaient plus rester hors des grands débats. L'Europe peut s'inventer autrement, tournée vers les femmes et les hommes. Une Europe qui a une histoire, une Europe des histoires, une Europe de la culture.

Enfin, ici, plus qu'un simple investissement ou un outil financier, InvestEU devra incarner ce tremplin vers une Union européenne qui accompagne les mutations et participe aussi au changement de paradigme que nos sociétés sont en train d'opérer. L'Europe aujourd'hui doit se construire aussi de manière progressiste et c'est une Europe qui doit s'adresser à nos concitoyens. Aussi est-ce à nous de concrétiser leur espoir, un espoir européen ambitieux.

**Ralph Packet**, *namens de ECR-Fractie*. – Voorzitter, beste collega's, met InvestEU kan Europa investeren in duurzame en innovatieve projecten en ondernemingen. Met ongeveer 40 miljard euro aan Europese garanties (en dus geen subsidies) zullen naar schatting 650 miljard euro aan investeringen aangetrokken worden in die belangrijke sectoren. Europese bedrijven worden zo ondersteund om zelf innovatieve producten te ontwikkelen, zonder afhankelijk te moeten worden van grote, niet-Europese financiers.

Met dit vernieuwde programma worden alle bestaande financiële instrumenten efficiënt samengevoegd tot één gestroomlijnd programma. Ook de beheersstructuren worden sterk vereenvoudigd. De klemtoon ligt nu op de nationale investeringsbanken. Onze Vlaamse participatiemaatschappij kan nu dus zelf volledig verantwoordelijk zijn voor de uitvoering van de investeringen.

Onze inbreng werd dus ruimschoots opgenomen in het eindresultaat. Zo hebben we met de N-VA en de ECR een duidelijk verschil gemaakt. Dat InvestEU nu wordt aangenomen tijdens de allerlaatste plenaire vergadering van deze zittingsperiode, is voor mij een mooie afsluiter van een heel boeiende politieke periode.

**Lieve Wierinck**, *namens de ALDE-Fractie*. – Voorzitter, commissaris, beste collega's, als opvolger van het EFSI zal InvestEU ook de volgende zittingsperiode een cruciale rol spelen, een rol met een duidelijke richting. Een van de lessen die we hebben getrokken uit de crisis van 2008, is dat een stabiele economie een investeringseconomie is. De belofte van 650 miljard euro aan bijkomende investeringen dankzij dit programma is een belofte voor de toekomst. Voornamelijk investeringen in onderzoek, innovatie en digitalisering zullen ervoor zorgen dat onze Unie in de komende jaren een van de meest aantrekkelijke bestemmingen ter wereld blijft voor investeerders, bedrijven, creatieve geesten en werkkrachten.

Beste collega's, laten we samen een einde maken aan de investeringskloof.

**Δημήτριος Παπαδημούλης**, *εξ ονόματος της ομάδας GUE/NGL*. – Κύριε Πρόεδρε, η πρόταση που μας καταθέτουν οι δύο συνεισηγητές είναι βελτιωμένη σε σχέση με την αρχική πρόταση της Επιτροπής, αλλά απέχει από αυτό που χρειαζόμαστε. Χρειαζόμαστε περισσότερες επενδύσεις και ένα σφαιρικό επενδυτικό πρόγραμμα από την πλευρά της Ευρωπαϊκής Ένωσης. Και είναι και στον αέρα, γιατί ακόμη δεν έχουμε το νέο πολυετές δημοσιονομικό πλαίσιο, καθώς στο Συμβούλιο υπάρχουν πιέσεις για να περικοπούν τα κονδύλια που προτείνει η Επιτροπή και όχι να αυξηθούν, όπως ζητάει το Ευρωπαϊκό Κοινοβούλιο.

Ως σκιώδης εισηγητής εκ μέρους της ομάδας της Αριστεράς συνέβαλα με τις τροπολογίες μας στο να βελτιωθεί η πρόταση της Επιτροπής, με μείωση της γραφειοκρατίας, καλύτερη γεωγραφική κάλυψη, ουσιαστικότερη συμμετοχή των μικρομεσαίων επιχειρήσεων, ισχυρότερο ρόλο στις αναπτυξιακές τράπεζες και περισσότερα χρήματα για την αντιμετώπιση της κλιματικής αλλαγής και μέσω των επενδύσεων. Πιστεύω, όμως, ότι συνεχίζει να υπάρχει ανάγκη για ακόμη πιο φιλόδοξες προτάσεις, γι' αυτό και στην ψηφοφορία θα καταθέσουμε τροπολογίες προς αυτή την κατεύθυνση.

**Jordi Solé**, *on behalf of the Verts/ALE Group*. – Mr President, for us, InvestEU should be first and foremost an instrument to achieve progress towards a sustainable economy. In that sense, we celebrate the increase of the climate spending targets for the sustainable infrastructure window and the need for climate proofing. We definitely have to be determined to accomplish the Paris Agreement and SDGs.

We expect InvestEU to abide by the principle of sustainable investments. With this in mind, this Parliament has made it clear that coal, nuclear and gas infrastructure cannot be considered sustainable investments. It's therefore imperative that we find the political will to encourage the financial sector to help finance projects that are key to the transition towards a green economy. Moreover, we strongly oppose the funding of defence projects using InvestEU. There are far more pressing, immediate social and environmental concerns that require our attention. But coming back to the positive, I welcome a stronger participation of national and regional promotional banks, as these are a key factor for a better earmarking of projects due to their knowledge of their local markets, economic and social agents, and their needs. Finally, I thank the rapporteurs for their good work.

**Jonathan Arnott**, *on behalf of the EFDD Group*. – Mr President, this will be the last time that I ever speak in the European Parliament; I'm not seeking re-election. I was elected in 2014 on a Brexit mandate and we won the 2014 European elections. I've tried my best to remain true to that mandate. The 2015 general election in the UK mandated a referendum on Brexit. The 2016 referendum mandated Brexit, and the 2017 general election confirmed it. Four times the British people have made their views crystal clear.

So I find it somewhat surreal that three years on we are discussing the InvestEU project, another EUR 40 billion in taxpayers' money and another EUR 500 million on top for the technical side, and yet we still do not know whether or not the UK will end up being part of the next MMF, the next seven-year financial plan for the European Union. It can't be guaranteed – 29 March, 12 April, 30 June, 31 October? – and for that, frankly, I do blame the intransigence of the British Government.

And so tomorrow this House will rise for the European elections. The British people have told their politicians four times already to leave the European Union, and on 23 May they'll tell them a fifth time. That's why the Brexit party is surging in the polls.

I'll finish with Frank Sinatra's famous words: 'And now, the end is near. And so I face the final curtain'. But as that curtain draws, we need only to be able to say this: that we didn't do it 'our way', I didn't do it 'my way', but that we did it the way that our constituents told us to, and that is what future politicians must, and should, do.

**Ivana Maletić (PPE)**. – Poštovani predsjedavajući, čestitam kolegama izvjestiteljima Fernandesu i Gualtieriju na postignutom izvrsnom dogovoru o ključnim elementima novog InvestEU programa, što je, kako je povjerenica isto posebno istaknula, jako važan vjetar u leđa za buduće pregovore koji bi trebali biti brži i jednostavniji u novom sazivu Parlamenta upravo za ovaj program.

Treći put u Europskom parlamentu govorim o InvestEU programu zato što mislim da je jako važno da se uključimo ne samo u zakonodavno oblikovanje ovog programa nego i kasnije u pomoći u kvalitetnoj provedbi programa u državama članicama, a posebno u povećanju njegove vidljivosti.

Jako je važno da InvestEU programom financiramo projekte koji ne mogu dobiti izvore financiranja iz klasičnih komercijalnih kredita ili, recimo, iz kohezijske politike, nego da uložimo sredstva u projekte inovatora, poduzetnika, *startupova*, *startupova* koji trebaju prerasti što brže u *scaleupove* ili poduzetnika u poteškoćama koji zaslužuju drugu šansu. Dakle, treba ih usmjeriti na projekte s potencijalima, ali koji ne mogu inače realizirati uobičajene izvore financiranja komercijalnih banaka. Ono na što bih htjela upozoriti je geografska raspodjela. Dakle, dosadašnji EFSI je bio uložen više u više razvijene države članice, a sad moramo pripaziti i pomoći više manje razvijenim državama članicama da imaju koristi od ovog novog programa.

**Pervenche Berès (S&D)**. – Monsieur le Président, Madame la Commissaire, l'adoption de ce texte portant sur la création du programme InvestEU s'inscrit dans la droite lignée de ce qui a été engagé par cette Commission européenne, sous l'impulsion du groupe socialiste et démocrate, avec le «plan Juncker», à savoir le Fonds européen pour l'investissement stratégique en 2015, renouvelé en 2017.

Bien que partiel, puisque nous attendons les dispositions financières et l'accord-cadre pluriannuel financier pour la période 2021-2027, cet accord mérite d'être salué.



En effet, le volet consacré à la gouvernance permet d'assurer un meilleur équilibre, puisqu'il prévoit la mise en place d'un comité de pilotage stratégique associant des représentants de la Commission et de la BEI, et d'autres partenaires de mise en œuvre, notamment les banques nationales de développement, ainsi qu'un expert indépendant nommé par le Parlement européen.

Surtout, comme l'a souligné le rapporteur, ce programme interviendra dans des domaines d'investissement clés au regard des impératifs écologiques et sociaux. L'Union européenne doit notamment s'approprier la question des infrastructures durables et celui des investissements sociaux dans lesquels seront incluses les activités culturelles et créatives.

Deux points de vigilance, cependant. Premièrement, la question du calibrage des ambitions en matière d'environnement, qui doit être absolument à la hauteur de nos engagements, c'est-à-dire en phase avec les 40 % des dépenses du cadre financier pluriannuel dédiés au verdissement de l'économie européenne.

Deuxièmement, la question des statuts de la BEI, puisque la Commission a choisi à nouveau d'en faire son partenaire privilégié. Il faudra que notre prochain Parlement se penche sur cette question de la gouvernance de la BEI, car elle n'est pas optimum, y compris au regard des droits et des pouvoirs de ce Parlement.

**Tilly Metz (Verts/ALE).** – Monsieur le Président, InvestEU, destiné plus particulièrement aux petites et moyennes entreprises, va dans le bon sens, malgré quelques «mais» que je développerai dans quelques instants.

Ce qui va dans le bon sens, c'est la garantie d'objectifs clairs pour lutter contre le changement climatique, l'augmentation des dépenses pour les plateformes de conseil, ce qui permettra – du moins je l'espère – une meilleure information et une meilleure répartition géographique, l'idée de résilience au changement climatique pour tous les projets, l'évaluation des projets avec des indicateurs relatifs aux objectifs climatiques atteints.

Quant aux regrets, il reste malheureusement possible, à travers InvestEU, d'investir dans des projets liés à la défense ainsi que dans des projets qui ne sont pas réellement liés aux objectifs climatiques à atteindre, comme des aéroports ou des réseaux d'énergie fossile.

Je m'adresse donc aux électeurs et aux électrices: si vous ne voulez plus que l'Union européenne soutienne des projets qui nuisent à la planète et à notre avenir, votez pour les Verts au mois de mai.

**Jiří Pospíšil (PPE).** – Pane předsedající, moji kolegové už zde řekli mnohé k tomuto návrhu, k tomuto investičnímu plánu. Já se k tomu připojuji, považuji projekt InvestEU za mimořádně důležitý. Zkušenosti z Junckerova plánu jasně ukazují, že takovéto formy pobídek mají svůj smysl a že jsou-li dobře nasměrovány, zvláště do oblastí, kde je obtížnější získat klasické komerční úvěry, mají velký veřejný smysl.

Velmi vítám nasměrování tohoto projektu do oblastí, jako jsou malé a střední podniky, do oblastí, kde řešíme ekologické inovace, ekologická témata, nebo do oblastí, které se týkají obecně výzkumu. Myslím si, že do budoucna může tento projekt velmi výrazně přispět k evropské ekonomice, hovoří se o velkém multiplikačním efektu, který tyto veřejné pobídky a veřejné garance za soukromé úvěry mohou mít.

Jsem rád, že po zkušenostech z Junckerova plánu nekončíme tím, že po Junckerově plánu nepřichází nic jiného, ale že tento plán vyhodnocujeme, navazujeme další variantou pro období 2021 až 2027, pro další finanční rámec a že jsme se poučili z toho, jaké slabiny Junckerův plán má a snažíme se je v novém projektu vylepšit. Vítám tento projekt a doufám, že se podaří dokončit jeho vyjednávání v rámci příštího Evropského parlamentu a že bude potom následně od roku 2021 úspěšně spuštěn.

**Jonás Fernández (S&D).** – Señor presidente, comisaria, hace cinco años, los socialistas nos presentábamos a las elecciones europeas exigiendo el fin de la austeridad, de las políticas de ajuste y reclamando la necesidad de impulsar la demanda, de impulsar la inversión para resolver aquella crisis.

Logramos —y agradecemos— el apoyo de la Comisión, obviamente, y el resto de grupos que participaron en el lanzamiento del Plan Juncker, que ha sido fundamental para luchar, como decía, contra la crisis en los últimos años.

Y yo creo que es importante reconocer el paso que en estos momentos estamos dando para crear un instrumento permanente —este nuevo *Invest Europe*, InvestEU— que pretende mantener e impulsar la inversión en el conjunto de la Unión de manera permanente, que es importante en estos momentos donde debatimos ese posible estancamiento secular.

Pero no podemos olvidar, no podemos dejar de recordar que el Plan Juncker nació para hacer una política anticíclica contra la recesión, y que Europa sigue necesitando un instrumento para hacer exactamente esa política, una política anticíclica.

**Daniel Buda (PPE).** – Domnule președinte, aș dori și eu să îi felicit pe cei doi raportori pentru munca depusă. InvestEU reprezintă una dintre politicile principale ale Uniunii Europene, având ca scop, printre altele, atragerea investițiilor private ce vor fi garantate la nivelul Uniunii, astfel încât să fie oferită o siguranță sporită a investitorilor. Consecința firească a unei astfel de abordări o reprezintă un lucru simplu, și anume, o viață mai bună pentru toți cetățenii europeni, realizată prin atingerea obiectivelor de convergență economică și socială, creșterea competitivității, încurajarea inovării, a digitalizării și utilizarea responsabilă a resurselor.

Pornind de la experiența actuală, care ne arată că investițiile s-au concentrat, însă, în anumite state membre, selectarea proiectelor finanțate prin InvestEU trebuie să țină cont de o repartizare geografică cât mai uniformă la nivelul tuturor statelor membre, pentru a evita riscul accentuării discrepanțelor de dezvoltare dintre regiuni.

IMM-urile au valoare economică importantă la nivelul Uniunii, însă acestea se confruntă cu proceduri complicate privind accesul la finanțare pentru investiții. InvestEU trebuie să le ofere un sprijin prin simplificarea procedurilor pentru finanțare, evitând birocrăția excesivă, atât la nivel european, cât și la nivel național, în vederea încurajării competitivității.

În același timp, este nevoie de creșterea atractivității proiectelor mai mici sau a celor de la nivel local, care au ca obiectiv maximizarea resurselor pe teren, prin crearea și sprijinirea extinderii clusterelor pentru inovare și dezvoltarea de produse inovative, competitive pe piețele internaționale.

Autoritățile publice trebuie să aibă acces facil la soluții de finanțare pentru programe de încurajare a industriilor creative, a transportului alternativ nepoluant sau facilitarea spațiilor de lucru comun.

**Paul Rübzig (PPE).** – Herr Präsident! Ich möchte mich beim Präsidenten Karas von der SME-Intergroup sehr herzlich bedanken, dass er jetzt seit vielen Jahren diese SME-Politik unterstützt. Kleine und mittlere Betriebe sind eine strategische, wichtige Entscheidung für die Bevölkerung, weil hier Wohlstand geschaffen wird.

Ich beobachte die Szene jetzt auch seit fast 25 Jahren, und ich kann mich noch gut erinnern, wie von 2001 bis 2005 das *multiannual* Programm für kleine und mittlere Betriebe geschaffen wurde. Da hatten wir noch 450 Millionen zur Verfügung. Im CIP-Programm von 2007 bis 2013, das ich federführend mitverhandeln durfte haben wir das *Entrepreneurship-and-Innovation*-Programm mit über zwei Milliarden gefördert, und letztlich war COSME in der Nähe von drei Milliarden und EFSI bei circa 500 Milliarden und jetzt über 1 000 Milliarden. Man sieht, dass die SME-Politik auf europäischer Ebene ernst genommen wird. Und wenn wir sehen, dass jetzt 55 % dieses Betrages für Klimainvestitionen vorgesehen sind und im *Horizon Europe* 35 %, dann sehen wir, dass Europa eine sehr fortschrittliche Politik macht und dass damit natürlich international für uns eine Vormachtstellung dementsprechend zu gestalten ist.

Ich bedanke mich auch bei der Kommissarin Bienkowska, weil ich weiß, dass es nicht einfach ist, für kleine und mittlere Betriebe einzutreten. Aber wir haben bewiesen, dass es möglich ist. Recht herzlichen Dank und alles Gute!

Zgłoszenia z sali

**Νότης Μαρίας (ECR).** – Κύριε Πρόεδρε, το πρόγραμμα InvestEU θα μπορούσε να αποδώσει και να συμβάλει πραγματικά στην ανάπτυξη, στη δημιουργία θέσεων εργασίας, να στηρίξει την κατάρτιση, να στηρίξει τις δεξιότητες. Αυτό σημαίνει ότι πρέπει να αποφύγει τα προβλήματα που παρουσιάστηκαν με το σχέδιο Juncker, διότι η εμπειρία από το Ευρωπαϊκό Ταμείο Στρατηγικών Επενδύσεων, ιδίως για την Ελλάδα, απέδειξε ότι τον πακτωλό χρημάτων τον πήρανε οι ευρωπαϊκές πολυεθνικές, οι οποίες στην πράξη χρηματοδοτήθηκαν για να αρπάξουν τα περιφερειακά αεροδρόμια της χώρας. Κλασική περίπτωση αποτελεί η Fraport, η οποία υποτίθεται ότι θα έκανε επενδύσεις στο πλαίσιο μιας δήθεν αποκρατικοποίησης που επέβαλε η τρόικα, και έχουμε μια κρατική γερμανική εταιρεία η οποία παίρνει δάνειο 280 εκατομμύρια ευρώ από την Ευρωπαϊκή Τράπεζα Επενδύσεων και άλλα τόσα από ελληνική τράπεζα και αρπάζει τα περιφερειακά αεροδρόμια. Τέτοιου είδους επενδύσεις δεν νομίζω ότι συμβάλλουν στην ανάπτυξη της τοπικής οικονομίας, απλά χρηματοδοτούνται οι δήθεν ιδιωτικοποιήσεις. Άρα, λοιπόν, το πρόγραμμα πρέπει να πάει σε μια κατεύθυνση στήριξης των μικρομεσαίων επιχειρήσεων με αυξημένη προστιθέμενη τοπική αξία.

(Koniec zgłoszeń z sali)

**Elżbieta Bieńkowska, Member of the Commission.** – Mr President, I would like to thank the honourable Members very much for this discussion. Thank you very much for your positive comments on the programme. The main conclusion I'm drawing from this debate is the really overwhelming support expressed for the InvestEU programme, but I have also heard and taken good note of the very high expectations and the vigilant recommendations to the programme. I want to tell you that I will bring them back and ensure that they will fit into the programme's preparation in the Commission.

Thank you very much for your attention again. Thank you very much to the rapporteurs and shadow rapporteurs, and all of you, for your support.

**José Manuel Fernandes, Relator.** – O investimento público é importantíssimo, o investimento privado também é essencial e promover a iniciativa privada, reforçar a competitividade da União Europeia, promover o empreendedorismo, as *startups*, reforçar também a competitividade e produtividade, em simultâneo, da União Europeia, é uma forma de termos melhores salários para todos, melhores salários na iniciativa pública, melhores salários também na iniciativa privada.

Em termos públicos, em termos do investimento público, é essencial que os governos façam a sua parte. Infelizmente, no meu país, em Portugal, no Plano de Investimento atual, o Governo, e sobretudo o responsável, o ex-ministro Pedro Marques, não utilizou um único euro para o investimento. O plano Juncker, tal como o InvestEU, poderá ser usado e deverá ser usado também para o investimento público. É essencial que cada um faça a sua parte.

Aqui, no Parlamento Europeu, aprovámos este programa para mobilizar 700 mil milhões de euros. Queremos uma boa repartição geográfica, reforçámos, por isso, aquilo que se chama o Advisory Hub, a plataforma de aconselhamento ao investidor. Mas é essencial que em cada Estado-Membro também existam plataformas nacionais de apoio ao investidor. Plataformas que também podem ser regionais, com o objetivo de ajudar a estruturar plataformas de investimento, a estruturar candidaturas. Dessa forma podemos ter uma boa utilização do InvestEU que, estou certo, cumprirá os seus objetivos: melhor emprego mais investimento, mais crescimento económico, uma União Europeia mais competitiva e simultaneamente mais inclusiva.

**Przewodniczący.** – Zamykam debatę.

Głosowanie odbędzie się w czwartek 18 kwietnia 2019 r.

*Oświadczenia pisemne (art. 162)*

**Dominique Bilde (ENF), par écrit.** – Simplifier le maquis des programmes européens est évidemment une bonne idée tant soutenir l'investissement privé doit rester une priorité au sein de l'Union européenne. Les PME représentent 99 % de l'ensemble des entreprises, et il est regrettable que tant d'entre elles, notamment les start-ups, soient encore en butte à des difficultés de financement.

Ceci étant dit, le succès d'InvestEU dépendra non seulement de son budget total, mais aussi de sa capacité à remédier efficacement à de véritables défaillances de marché, en ciblant donc des opérations présentant un profil de risque adéquat. Force est de constater que cela n'a pas été toujours le cas par le passé.

En effet, en ce qui concerne par exemple les programmes COSME et InnovFin, la Cour des comptes européenne avait déjà souligné qu'ils avaient surtout, in fine, provoqué des effets d'aubaine en soutenant bien des projets qui n'auraient eu aucune difficulté à trouver des financements privés appropriés.

S'agissant d'InvestEU, l'avenir dira si l'Union européenne s'apprête à répéter plutôt qu'à apprendre de ses erreurs. Il est toutefois préoccupant que son prédécesseur, le plan Juncker, soit invoqué comme un modèle, tant son succès a été mitigé. Je vous remercie.

**Antanas Guoga (PPE), in writing.** – I fully support the Commission's vision to establish the new investment fund for the period 2021-2027. The InvestEU fund will replace the current Juncker's fund or EFSI which was a great success in Europe. Around 1 million of European SMEs are set to benefit from the fund. Almost 400 billion euros is the amount which is expected to be triggered from the current investments from EFSI. It is a great success for Europe. It does not mean, however that, we should stop. We should think about particular areas of investment which would benefit Europe in the future. I am talking about projects related to high computing, AI and other future technologies which are yet to come. The InvestEU program aims to trigger 650 billion euros in additional investment. The most important factor here depends on us, EP decision makers, as well as local governments to promote this fund in our Member States, to talk about the possibilities it can bring to European companies and projects, so the money would be invested.

**Paul Rübiger (PPE).** – Herr Präsident! Ich möchte mich im Namen des Plenums auch bei Ihnen sehr herzlich bedanken. Ihre Vorsitzführung war vorbildlich. Ich wünsche Ihnen alles Gute!

**Der Präsident.** – Vielen Dank! Ich hoffe, dass wir uns dann auch unter anderen Umständen treffen, auch wenn wir im Privaten eine andere Diskussion, vielleicht auch in einem anderen Land, führen.

## 27. Przesunięcia środków i decyzje budżetowe: patrz protokół

## 28. Porządek obrad następnego posiedzenia: patrz protokół

## 29. Zamknięcie posiedzenia

(Posiedzenie zostało zamknięte o godz. 22.19)

—

*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