



PEŁNE SPRAWOZDANIE Z OBRAD 18 WRZEŚNIA 2019 R.

(C/2024/3954)

PARLAMENT EUROPEJSKI

SESJA 2019-2020

Posiedzenia od 16 do 19 września 2019 r.

STRASBURG

Spis treści	Strona
1. Otwarcie posiedzenia	3
2. Debata nad przypadkami łamania praw człowieka, zasad demokracji i państwa prawa (ogłoszenie o złożonych projektach rezolucji): patrz protokół	3
3. Akty delegowane (art. 111 ust. 2 Regulaminu): patrz protokół	3
4. Środki wykonawcze (art. 112 Regulaminu): patrz protokół	3
5. Składanie dokumentów: patrz protokół	3
6. Przesunięcia środków i decyzje budżetowe: patrz protokół	3
7. Wystąpienie Zjednoczonego Królestwa z UE (debata)	3
8. Skład komisji i delegacji: Patrz protokół	40
9. Głosowanie	40
9.1. Projekt budżetu korygującego nr 1/2019 — nadwyżka z roku 2018 (A9-0005/2019 - John Howarth) (głosowanie)	40
9.2. Projekt budżetu korygującego nr 2/2019 do budżetu ogólnego – Zasilenie kluczowych programów na rzecz konkurencyjności UE: „Horyzont 2020” i Erasmus+ (A9-0004/2019 - John Howarth) (głosowanie)	40
9.3. Uruchomienie środków z Funduszu Solidarności Unii Europejskiej w celu udzielenia pomocy Rumunii, Włochom i Austrii (A9-0002/2019 - Siegfried Mureşan) (głosowanie)	40

Spis treści	Strona
9.4. Projekt budżetu korygującego nr 3/2019: wniosek o uruchomienie środków z Funduszu Solidarności Unii Europejskiej w celu udzielenia pomocy Rumunii, Włochom i Austrii (A9-0006/2019 - John Howarth) (głosowanie)	40
9.5. Uruchomienie Europejskiego Funduszu Dostosowania do Globalizacji – EGF/2019/000 TA 2019 — Pomoc techniczna z inicjatywy Komisji (A9-0001/2019 - Bogdan Rzońca) (głosowanie)	40
9.6. Wystąpienie Zjednoczonego Królestwa z UE (B9-0038/2019, B9-0039/2019) (głosowanie)	41
10. Wyjaśnienia dotyczące sposobu głosowania	41
10.1. Wystąpienie Zjednoczonego Królestwa z UE (B9-0038/2019, B9-0039/2019)	41
11. Korekty do głosowania i zamiar głosowania: Patrz protokół	46
12. Wznowienie posiedzenia	47
13. Przyjęcie protokołu poprzedniego posiedzenia: patrz protokół	47
14. Skład komisji i delegacji: patrz protokół	47
15. Walka z rakiem (debata na aktualny temat)	47
16. Przedstawienie przez Radę stanowiska w sprawie projektu budżetu ogólnego na rok budżetowy 2020 (debata)	65
17. Znaczenie pamięci o przeszłości Europy dla jej przyszłości (debata)	84
18. Skład komisji i delegacji: Patrz protokół	101
19. Stan wdrażania przepisów dotyczących przeciwdziałania praniu pieniędzy (debata)	101
20. Porządek obrad następnego posiedzenia: Patrz protokół	114
21. Zamknięcie posiedzenia	114

PEŁNE SPRAWOZDANIE Z OBRAD 18 WRZEŚNIA 2019 R.

PRESIDENZA DELL'ON. DAVID MARIA SASSOLI

Presidente

1. Otwarcie posiedzenia

(La seduta è aperta alle 9.01)

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

3. Akty delegowane (art. 111 ust. 2 Regulaminu): patrz protokół

4. Środki wykonawcze (art. 112 Regulaminu): patrz protokół

5. Składanie dokumentów: patrz protokół

6. Przesunięcia środków i decyzje budżetowe: patrz protokół

7. Wystąpienie Zjednoczonego Królestwa z UE (debata)

Presidente. – L'ordine del giorno reca la discussione sulle dichiarazioni del Consiglio e della Commissione sul recesso del Regno Unito dall'UE (2019/2817(RSP)).

Tytti Tuppurainen, *President-in-Office of the Council.* – Mr President, we have once more gathered to discuss the UK's withdrawal from the European Union. It is an unfortunate situation and many citizens and businesses continue to suffer from the uncertainty caused by Brexit.

In July, the UK got a new government and a new prime minister. Unfortunately, it is increasingly clear that this has not helped to clarify the situation or the UK's negotiation position. When it comes to the most difficult questions such as the Irish border, the UK has not tabled any new concrete proposals yet. Furthermore, opinions in the parliament in London remain divided. Only the firm rejection of a no-deal Brexit has been able to attract the majority. Still, the UK Government is insisting on its red lines. As the deadline of 31 October is fast approaching, we are faced with more, rather than less, uncertainty.

This rather bleak situation should, however, not distract us from our priority, which remains an orderly withdrawal to put an end to the uncertainty caused by Brexit. I hope that we can still achieve an orderly Brexit. This is why we have asked the UK to put forward concrete details and operational ideas regarding what appears to be the main stumbling block, namely how to ensure the absence of a hard border on the island of Ireland, while respecting the Good Friday Agreement and protecting the integrity of the single market.

The latest developments in Westminster and the call for a further extension make it very difficult to predict how things will unfold. We have to acknowledge that currently, a no-deal on 31 October is a quite likely outcome, not least because the UK Government...

(Cheers from certain quarters)

keeps on repeating they are ready to leave without a deal. Therefore, preparedness efforts have to be stepped up and measures finalised quickly at EU and national level in close cooperation among Member States and with the Commission, building on the last package of measures tabled by the Commission and on those already adopted. These new legislative activities at this early stage of the new institutional cycle will add to an already heavy agenda.

We are confident that by working together we can deliver. I'm encouraged in this respect by the speed at which our two institutions were able to reach agreement on the previous Brexit-related proposals. The Presidency, with your cooperation, is determined to facilitate the adoption of the last batch of contingency measures in good time.

While the point of departure for the future relationship will largely depend on whether the UK decides to leave with or without a deal, we will in any scenario need to address our fundamental priorities with the UK: safeguarding citizens' rights, honouring the UK's financial obligations resulting from its membership of the EU, and providing an insurance to preserve the integrity of the single market, the level playing field and the stability on the island of Ireland.

In the meantime, this uncertainty and the tensions it generates are further testing our unity and resolve. It is therefore all the more necessary, on the one hand, to resist the temptation of bilateral deals at sectoral or national level and, on the other hand, to reflect our common purpose in the swift adoption of the necessary contingency measures.

Let me conclude by noting the large degree of convergence that exists between your draft resolution and the priorities of the Council. This is a clear illustration of the commonality of purpose of our two institutions as regards Brexit. So thank you very much for your attention and I look forward to this discussion.

Jean-Claude Juncker, *président de la Commission*. – Monsieur le Président, Mesdames et Messieurs les députés, je vous remercie de votre invitation, c'est toujours un plaisir pour moi que de pouvoir m'adresser à vous, de parler devant le Parlement et de parler avec le Parlement.

Au cours des cinq dernières années, la Commission européenne a toujours pu compter sur la clairvoyance, la coopération et le soutien de votre assemblée. Cela vaut également pour le travail que nous avons accompli ensemble sur la question du retrait du Royaume-Uni. Cette assemblée reste, je le sais, ouverte. Elle reste au travail.

Michel Barnier et moi-même avons déjeuné lundi avec le premier ministre Johnson. Vous ne serez pas surpris d'apprendre que le premier ministre nous a dit que le Royaume-Uni continue de vouloir un accord, mais aussi qu'en tout état de cause, le Royaume-Uni quittera l'Union européenne le 31 octobre, avec ou sans accord. *Nihil novum sub sole*.

Cela veut dire que le risque d'un *no deal* reste très réel.

(Applause and cheers from certain quarters)

These are my best friends and groupies – don't be surprised that they are shouting!

Cela veut dire, disais-je, que le risque d'un *no deal* reste très réel. Ce sera peut-être le choix du gouvernement du Royaume-Uni, mais ce ne sera jamais le choix de l'Union européenne. C'est pourquoi je préfère me concentrer sur ce que nous pouvons faire pour parvenir à un accord – accord que je crois toujours souhaitable et toujours possible.

(S'adressant aux députés qui ont manifesté précédemment)

You have to applaud, no?

Vous ne serez pas surpris non plus que la question principale soit celle du filet de sécurité, le *backstop*. Tout le monde en a entendu parler, mais tout le monde ne se souvient pas des raisons pour lesquelles il a été agréé entre les 27 et le gouvernement du Royaume-Uni.

Le filet de sécurité, le *backstop*, est une solution opérationnelle à un problème pratique, le problème causé par le Brexit pour l'île d'Irlande. Ce problème, d'ailleurs, ne se poserait pas si le gouvernement du Royaume-Uni n'avait pas décidé de quitter l'Union européenne.

Le *backstop* vise trois objectifs: éviter une frontière physique sur l'île d'Irlande, préserver l'intégrité du marché unique et surtout la place de l'Irlande dans ce marché, et protéger la coopération Nord-Sud et l'économie insulaire – *the all-island economy* –, un élément essentiel pour la paix et la stabilité en Irlande, consacré dans l'accord du Vendredi saint.

J'ai dit au premier ministre Johnson que je ne nourris aucun attachement émotionnel à l'égard du filet de sécurité. Mais j'ai clairement indiqué que je reste profondément attaché aux objectifs qu'il sert. C'est pourquoi j'ai invité le premier ministre britannique à faire des propositions concrètes, opérationnelles et par écrit sur les voies alternatives qui nous permettraient d'atteindre ces objectifs.

Tant que de telles propositions ne seront pas présentées, je ne pourrai pas vous dire en vous regardant droit dans les yeux que de réels progrès ont été réalisés. Mais ce que je peux dire, prenant le contre-pied de beaucoup d'articles, notamment dans la presse britannique, c'est que les entretiens que nous avons eu furent amicaux, constructifs et en partie positifs.

La Commission est prête à travailler tous les jours, du matin au soir – avec quelques interruptions tout de même – pour trouver des solutions au niveau technique et politique. Je ne suis pas sûr que nous réussirons, il nous reste très peu de temps, mais je suis sûr que nous devons essayer.

J'ai demandé au premier ministre britannique de préciser les arrangements alternatifs qu'il pouvait envisager et j'ai proposé de politiser, au sens noble du terme, les négociations entre l'Union européenne et le Royaume-Uni, en chargeant mon ami Michel Barnier, le premier ministre britannique et le ministre compétent pour le Brexit de prendre en main eux-mêmes les négociations, pour qu'elles ne restent pas au seul niveau technique.

En juillet 2016, les 27 ont convenu que ce serait une erreur de concentrer toute notre énergie sur le Brexit. Nous nous sommes mis d'accord pour forger une Union plus forte à 27, en nous concentrant sur les moyens d'améliorer la vie quotidienne de nos concitoyens. Deux mois plus tard, j'ai pris la parole devant ce Parlement pour prononcer mon discours sur l'état de l'Union et présenter mes idées et propositions pour l'avenir. Ce discours, chose exceptionnelle, a été salué par tous les dirigeants de l'Union européenne réunis à Bratislava et a inspiré le programme des dirigeants.

That means the 27 members of the European Union have spent two-and-a-half years negotiating with the UK looking for ways to organise our divorce. During this time, the European Union has shown great unity of purpose and solidarity with the Member States most affected. This unity is our most precious resource and our greatest asset. It will continue to guide me over the next weeks, and I'm sure it will continue to guide this House also in the future.

(Applause)

Michel Barnier, *négociateur en chef*. – Monsieur le Président, bonjour à chacune et chacun d'entre vous, Madame la Ministre, merci de me permettre aux côtés du président Juncker et en complément de ce qu'il a dit très clairement de revenir dans cette brève intervention sur les 2 points clés de nos discussions actuelles avec les Britanniques, la question de l'Irlande et de l'Irlande du Nord, et aussi celle de la relation future, qui est au moins aussi importante puisqu'il faudra reconstruire d'une autre manière un partenariat avec ce grand pays ami, allié, voisin que restera le Royaume-Uni.

Le président Juncker a rappelé que la demande fondamentale du gouvernement britannique Johnson, c'est la suppression du *backstop*, ou à tout le moins son remplacement. Vous le savez, le Royaume-Uni et l'Union européenne, l'Union européenne et le Royaume-Uni se sont mis d'accord en novembre 2018, il y a presque un an de cela, sur ce *backstop*. Il a donc été agréé par les 28 chefs d'État et de gouvernement et a reçu l'appui très fort de votre Parlement.

Et pourquoi, Mesdames et Messieurs les députés, ce sujet est-il aussi fondamental pour nous tous? Simplement et gravement parce que c'est en Irlande que le Brexit crée le plus de problèmes. C'est en Irlande que le Brexit comporte le plus de risques. C'est le seul endroit où le Royaume-Uni a une frontière terrestre avec l'Union européenne.

Il existe une situation politique spécifique que nous savons bien, liée à une histoire souvent tragique, une situation spécifique aujourd'hui avec le *Good Friday Agreement*, dont le Royaume-Uni et l'Irlande, notamment, sont les garants. La raison de notre insistance sur ce point, comme l'a dit Jean-Claude Juncker, elle n'est pas idéologique, elle ne l'a jamais été. Elle est totalement pragmatique: il s'agit, à travers ce qu'on appelle le *backstop*, d'avoir un filet de sécurité, une sorte d'assurance qui nous permette de préserver en toutes circonstances ces trois exigences rappelées par le président de la commission. Nous ne voulons pas du retour d'une frontière physique en Irlande, nous voulons protéger le *Good Friday Agreement*, le *Belfast Agreement*, dans toutes ses dimensions.

Nous devons préserver l'intégrité du marché unique, de notre marché unique, et enfin, nous voulons maintenir le *all-island economy*, la coopération Nord-Sud, encadrée dans le *Good Friday Agreement*. Je rappelle d'ailleurs que l'exercice de *mapping* que nous avons fait avec les autorités britanniques montre combien cette coopération Nord-Sud est encadrée par le droit, soutenue par les politiques et par les budgets européens depuis le début.

Le nouveau gouvernement du Royaume-Uni nous a donc, et encore ce lundi à Luxembourg, expliqué les dispositions du *backstop* qu'il n'aime pas. Ça ne suffit pas de nous expliquer pourquoi il faudrait supprimer le *backstop*. Nous de notre côté, simplement et sérieusement, nous avons besoin de solutions juridiquement opérationnelles dans l'accord de retrait pour répondre précisément à chacun des problèmes, pour prévenir chacun des risques que crée le Brexit.

Et c'est sur ces objectifs que nous nous étions mis d'accord clairement avec le gouvernement de Theresa May. Je prends juste un exemple concret, que je peux connaître assez bien pour avoir été il y a quelques années ministre de l'Agriculture et de la pêche. Mesdames et Messieurs les députés, tout animal vivant, tout produit, notamment tout aliment, qui arrive en Irlande du Nord en provenance de Grande-Bretagne entre non seulement sur l'île d'Irlande, sur le marché irlandais, mais entre dans le marché polonais, luxembourgeois, allemand ou danois, mécaniquement, immédiatement. Et nous devons exercer un contrôle, pour protéger les consommateurs, préserver la sécurité alimentaire, prévenir tout risque de maladie animale. Nous n'avons pas la mémoire courte et c'est l'intérêt aussi des citoyens et des consommateurs d'Irlande du Nord, comme ceux de toute l'île, aussi bien que des consommateurs du reste du Royaume-Uni.

Il y a donc derrière ce *backstop*, je le dis calmement et à nouveau, des garanties très concrètes dont nous avons besoin et dont tous les citoyens, sur l'île d'Irlande, ont besoin pour la paix et la stabilité, pour la vie et la relation économique quotidienne sur l'île et naturellement, je le redis, pour la santé et la sécurité des consommateurs des 27, la sécurité des produits, la protection des budgets nationaux. Voilà à quoi servent aussi les contrôles à chacune des frontières extérieures du marché unique et que nous devons assurer en toute hypothèse.

J'entends bien, nous entendons bien aussi les questions, les remarques du premier ministre britannique sur le caractère démocratique ou non démocratique du *backstop*. C'est évidemment au gouvernement britannique lui-même, de s'assurer du soutien des institutions nord-irlandaises sur l'accord de retrait qu'il signerait au nom de tout le Royaume-Uni. Nous avons déjà prévu plusieurs dispositions dans l'accord de retrait, notamment sur l'implication de ses institutions et des différents comités dans la mise en oeuvre du *backstop* si un jour il devait être activé. Sur cette question comme sur les autres, je redis, après le président Juncker, que nous restons disponibles pour écouter toute proposition britannique, y travailler jour et nuit, dès l'instant où cette proposition apporterait du progrès.

L'autre sujet clé, et je termine sur ce point, Monsieur le Président, Mesdames et Messieurs, c'est celui de notre ambition commune pour la relation future de ce que nous avons appelé le partenariat stratégique que nous devons construire ou reconstruire avec le Royaume-Uni, après le Brexit. C'est l'objet du deuxième document à côté du traité sur le retrait, qu'on appelle la déclaration politique, qui a été agréé avec le Royaume-Uni en novembre dernier et qui ouvre la voie à ce partenariat très large en matière de coopération économique, coopération sectorielle, coopération judiciaire et policière, coopération en matière de défense, de politique étrangère.

Dans son volet économique, ce partenariat prend comme point de départ un accord de libre-échange mais il laisse dans le texte actuel la porte ouverte à davantage d'ambition s'il y a une volonté commune. Et nous avons évidemment cette volonté d'être le plus ambitieux possible avec le Royaume-Uni dans notre relation économique future, par exemple à travers une union douanière.

Cette relation économique doit évidemment être accompagnée par des garanties de *level playing field*. Là aussi, Mesdames et Messieurs les députés, je reconnais que c'est une expression assez technique que celle de *level playing field*. Il y a derrière cette expression des réalités humaines, sociales, territoriales et un choix de société que le Royaume-Uni devra faire sur l'équilibre nécessaire entre le bon niveau de régulation et le marché économique.

Or, le gouvernement britannique, c'est le point sur lequel je veux insister, souhaite aujourd'hui revenir sur les engagements pris par Theresa May dans ce domaine du *level playing field*. Mesdames et Messieurs, avec un grand pays si proche, important comme le Royaume-Uni, qui réalise un peu plus de la moitié de son commerce avec nous, avec le marché unique, un partenariat économique ambitieux exige un socle de règles du jeu communes.

Dès lors, je veux le dire pour que les choses soient claires pour tout le monde, Mesdames et Messieurs les députés, pour tout le monde, le niveau d'ambition d'un futur accord de libre-échange que nous devons négocier en toute hypothèse et conclure avec le Royaume-Uni, ce niveau d'ambition dépendra clairement des garanties que nous aurons ensemble mises sur le papier en matière sociale, environnementale, en matière de concurrence ou en matière d'aides d'État.

Mesdames et Messieurs les députés, j'ai voulu parler de ces deux sujets qui sont actuellement en discussion avec le gouvernement de Boris Johnson. Cela dit, nous ne perdons pas la vue d'ensemble. Je veux rappeler simplement pour conclure pourquoi nous avons voulu depuis le départ un retrait ordonné du Royaume-Uni, qui vaut beaucoup mieux qu'un *no deal*, et nous savons de quoi il est question quand on parle de *no deal*, et je recommande que chacun ne sous-estime pas les conséquences pour le Royaume-Uni, évidemment d'abord, et aussi pour nous, d'une absence d'accord.

Nous voulons cet accord pour protéger les droits de 4 millions et demi de citoyens européens au Royaume-Uni et de Britanniques dans chacun de nos 27 États-membres, et ce projet de retrait sécurise ces droits, tous ces droits. Nous voulons sécuriser l'avenir pour les porteurs de projets qui bénéficient de fonds européens sur les territoires. Voilà pourquoi nous avons obtenu avec le Royaume-Uni que tout ce qui a été décidé à 28 soit bien payé jusqu'au bout à 28. Nous voulons garantir, je l'ai dit, la paix et la stabilité en Irlande et, au bout de la route, une route qui est assez longue, comme vous le voyez, nous voulons créer les conditions de confiance nécessaires pour bâtir notre relation future telle qu'elle était esquissée dans la déclaration politique.

Si le Royaume-Uni sort sans accord, Mesdames et Messieurs les députés, je veux rappeler que toutes ces questions ne disparaissent pas. Nous les avons réglées dans l'accord de retrait, mais s'il n'y a pas d'accord de retrait, toutes ces questions sont là. La question de la sécurité des citoyens, de la paix en Irlande, de la protection du marché intérieur en Irlande, comme celle du budget et nous devons les régler en toute hypothèse, préalablement à un futur partenariat avec le Royaume-Uni.

Les conséquences du Brexit ne sont pas théoriques. Vous m'avez souvent entendu dire ici dans cet hémicycle qu'elles étaient innombrables et souvent sous-estimées sur le plan humain et social, sur le plan financier et budgétaire, sur le plan juridique et technique. Elles sont considérables, et vous l'avez souvent rappelé, comme vous le faites à nouveau dans votre résolution aujourd'hui.

Près de 3 ans après le référendum britannique, Mesdames et Messieurs, il ne s'agit certainement pas de faire semblant de négocier. Il est de notre responsabilité de poursuivre ce processus avec de la détermination, avec de la sincérité. Nous continuerons de le faire en concertation permanente, en toute transparence avec les 27 gouvernements au nom desquels nous négocions, Madame la Ministre, et je remercie la Présidence actuelle. Nous continuerons de le faire en dialogue et en toute transparence avec votre *Brexit steering group*, que je remercie, et avec l'ensemble des groupes et des commissions de votre Parlement. Ce sera toujours, ça a toujours été, ça restera notre attitude dans cette extraordinaire et complexe négociation.

Manfred Weber, *on behalf of the PPE Group*. – Mr President, after the Brexit referendum three years ago, the Brexiteers claimed, 'the EU is finished. The EU doesn't work'. Over three years later, the EU is strong, is alive, is united. It knows exactly what it wants. At the moment, it is not Britain that is leaving the EU, but jobs and business leaving the UK.

(Heckling)

One-third of British businesses are planning to leave, or are already leaving, Britain. Everybody here regrets – well, not everybody, but mainly we regret here in the plenary – the Brexit outcome, but I must tell you, during the election campaign it was a powerful argument to tell the Europeans that it's stupid and it creates a lot of uncertainty if you call the European Union into question. That's why you helped us a lot to convince Europeans that this is a stupid approach.

(Applause)

Monday's meeting with Michel Barnier, Jean-Claude Juncker and Prime Minister Johnson was again a missed opportunity to clarify things, and to bring new proposals to the table. And the Parliament where we can discuss the current state of play is the European Parliament, not the Commons, unfortunately. Brexiteers claimed that Westminster would 'take back control', and now they've shut it down. Is this the idea of democracy, of tomorrow in Great Britain, I have to ask the Brexiteers?

Ladies and Gentlemen, meine sehr verehrten Damen und Herren! Eine grundsätzliche Überlegung geht mir durch den Kopf, die mich bewegt, und zwar die Überlegung, dass das Volk durch den Premierminister vertreten wird und dass der Volkswille umgesetzt werden muss. 51 % – das ist die Mehrheit, und das ist zu respektieren, aber 51 % bei einem Referendumsausgang ist nicht das gesamte Volk. Das gesamte Volk wird vertreten in einem Parlament, in einem Plenum des Parlaments, wo Interessen ausgeglichen werden. Dort wird das Volk vertreten. Und wenn dann auch noch zusätzlich gesagt wird: 'Ich muss Volkes Meinung durchsetzen gegen das Parlament', dann werden Grundsatzfragen gestellt, ob das der richtige Ansatz ist, in der heutigen Welt unsere Gesellschaften zu führen. Führung heißt nicht Spaltung, sondern Führung heißt zusammenführen in den heutigen Gesellschaften. Das macht mich schon sehr nachdenklich, die Entwicklung in Großbritannien.

Für die Europäische Volkspartei ist klar: Wir werden die heutige Entschließung mit unterstützen. Ich möchte mich bei Michel Barnier für seine Arbeit bedanken, ich möchte mich bei Guy Verhofstadt, bei allen Kollegen der Brexit Steering Group für die Arbeit bedanken. Wir haben als Parlament wieder mal gezeigt, dass wir geschlossen unsere Positionen vertreten, dass wir die Verlängerung nur akzeptieren, wenn sie gut begründet ist, dass wir zu den Verabredungen stehen, die im bisherigen Austrittsvertrag fixiert sind, dass dahinter gute Argumente stehen und dass wir auch für neue Vorschläge offen sind.

Aber eines möchte ich als Warnung aussprechen: Bei allen Diskussionen über neue Vorschläge, die jetzt diskutiert werden, muss klar sein, dass die Europäische Union nicht zulassen darf, dass vor unserer Haustüre mit den Standards Europas – Sozial- und Umweltstandards – Dumping betrieben wird. Das dürfen wir nicht zulassen bei allen Diskussionen, die auf uns zukommen.

Der Brexit ist unkalkulierbar geworden, und deswegen müssen wir uns auch auf das *worst-case*-Szenario vorbereiten. Und eines ist klar: Wenn die britische Politik nicht aus ihrem *deadlock* rauskommt, dann ist es wohl das Beste, die anstehende Frage wieder an die Menschen zurückzugeben. Die Bürger in Großbritannien sollten über die Zukunft entscheiden.

Iratxe García Pérez, en nombre del Grupo S&D. – Señor presidente, un *Brexit* sin acuerdo sería una mala noticia para todos, pero sobre todo supondría un desastre para el Reino Unido.

No se trata solo de nuestra opinión. La reciente publicación del informe *Yellowhammer* por parte del Gobierno británico alerta de los peores escenarios de un *Brexit* sin acuerdo y derrumba la utopía inventada por Boris Johnson. Interrupciones en los pasos del Canal de la Mancha, incremento notable de los precios de la electricidad, reducción del suministro de alimentos y medicinas con un grave impacto para las poblaciones más vulnerables e incertidumbre jurídica para los cientos de miles de ciudadanos británicos que viven en la Unión Europea y para los ciudadanos europeos que viven en el Reino Unido.

No voy a pretender que determinados diputados cambien su actitud con respecto a esta situación. Lo único que pido es respeto. No soy ingenua. No pido que respeten a esta Cámara a la que llevan mucho tiempo sin respetar. Pido que respeten al pueblo que dicen representar, porque sus risas se convierten en angustias, en incertidumbres y en preocupaciones de millones de personas que están atentos a este debate.

(Aplausos)

En este contexto, las principales fuerzas proeuropeas de esta Cámara manifestamos en esta propuesta de Resolución nuestro firme apoyo a una prórroga del artículo 50 para evitar un escenario catastrófico, sin acuerdo, si el Reino Unido necesita más tiempo para celebrar elecciones generales o un nuevo referéndum. Podrán contar con nuestro apoyo. El responsable del actual caos solo tiene un nombre. El actual responsable del caos tiene un nombre: Boris Johnson.

«El carácter de un hombre es su destino», decían los griegos. «Y yo coincidí con ellos», afirmó el primer ministro en *El factor Churchill*, su libro de 2014 sobre el estadista británico. A raíz de los últimos episodios, el destino parece reservar a Boris Johnson la destrucción del hermanamiento histórico entre el Reino Unido y el resto de Europa.

Nuestro grupo ha trabajado de manera responsable para mitigar las peores consecuencias del *Brexit*. Desde esta Cámara los socialdemócratas exigimos a Boris Johnson y a su Gobierno que garanticen los derechos adquiridos de los ciudadanos de la Unión Europea que residen en el Reino Unido. Para nosotros es una cuestión fundamental.

Estamos profundamente preocupados por las declaraciones confusas, contradictorias, del ministro del Interior británico sobre el fin de la circulación después del 31 de octubre. La ciudadanía nunca debe pagar el precio de los errores de sus representantes. Tengámoslo muy claro.

Nuestra prioridad sigue siendo una salida ordenada. Y, para ello, el Acuerdo de Retirada es el mejor instrumento. Protege los derechos de la ciudadanía, evita una frontera entre la República de Irlanda e Irlanda del Norte, estipula las obligaciones financieras del Reino Unido y protege la integridad del mercado interior.

Los socialdemócratas siempre hemos visto el *Brexit* como un error histórico y estamos dispuestos a apoyar al pueblo británico si decide revertir esta decisión.

Bien haría el primer ministro británico en recordar las palabras pronunciadas en Bruselas por el que fuera el héroe de su infancia, Winston Churchill, ante una sesión conjunta del Parlamento belga el 16 de noviembre de 1945: «No veo razón por la que no puedan surgir los Estados Unidos de Europa, los cuales unificarán este continente de un modo nunca conocido desde la caída del Imperio romano y en el que todos sus pueblos puedan vivir juntos en prosperidad y en paz».

Guy Verhofstadt, *on behalf of the Renew Group*. – Mr President, I think it's important to recall that the British Parliament may be shut down but we are clearly showing today, with this debate, that the European Union is not.

(Applause)

It's fantastic that the Brexit Party and Mr Farage are making so much noise because they can't do it in Westminster anymore, so they have to do it here.

(Applause)

By the way, they are not even elected in Westminster.

(Applause and heckling)

As you know, colleagues, Eurosceptics like something: they like bashing Europe by saying that the European Union is undemocratic. And you can be sure that in a few moments they are going to repeat that. Well, I can tell you that Jean-Claude Juncker and President Tusk can do a lot of things, but at least they cannot close the doors of this House. That is not possible. So if the Eurosceptics, in the coming hours or the coming minutes, again want to make a ridiculous comparison with the Soviet Union, from now on they can point the finger at Westminster instead of at Strasbourg or Brussels. That seems to me to be a good way forward for them now.

My hope is that, with the vote and the resolution today, we will reiterate our unity about Brexit: a unity that means Parliament, that means the Commission, that means the Council and that means the 27 Member States. There is no discussion about this. Brexit is bad. It's a bad idea, but it has at least one positive effect, and that is to reunite Europeans and to make the European project, since Brexit, more popular again. That is what we have seen in all the public opinion inside the European Union.

(Applause)

In fact, the message of the people during the elections was very clear: reform Europe, don't destroy Europe, don't leave Europe. That was the case in all our Member States and it was also the case in Britain because nearly 40 of the 73 elected British MEPs are Remainers today.

(Applause)

That brings me to the main point, namely the outcome, the deal that I think is still possible. We, as Parliament, set three conditions in our resolution and I want to recall those three conditions. The first is to safeguard the rights of our citizens, for the Europeans and the British alike. Today I have to tell you that this has not been achieved. Every day in the British press there are examples of people who have already been living in Britain for a decade – even two decades – and who cannot have this so-called settled status.

So I think we need a fundamental shift in the way the UK Government applies at least that part of the Withdrawal Agreement. What we don't need is the bureaucratic application that we have now. What we need from the British Government is automatic registration of all our EU citizens. I know – and you know – that Boris Johnson, the Prime Minister, very much likes to compare himself to movie characters. Well, concerning citizens' rights, instead of playing the angry Hulk, I think he should be inspired by another character, the caring nanny in the film *Mrs Doubtfire*, with the late Robin Williams.

Secondly, I want to come back to the other problem, the Irish backstop – or maybe, Michel, let's call it something else: if they have a problem with 'backstop', we'll call it a safety net. I think that is something we can certainly agree on. We need such a safety net and not only for economic reasons. The main reason why we need the safety net is to make sure that violence does not return on the island of Ireland. That is the main reason.

(Applause)

And I have to tell you that I find it completely irresponsible of a number of British MPs, especially hardline Tories, not to accept this. I have to say that, as we speak – and I ask Michel Barnier and Jean-Claude Juncker if they can confirm this during the debate – there has not been one legally feasible and practical alternative put on the table by the UK at this moment. So, clearly, I have to tell you that the idea in the British press today to limit the backstop to agricultural products is not enough because they represent only 30% or 35%, I think, of the total imports of goods and services across the border.

Also, a backstop cannot be ended unilaterally by Stormont because that is not a safety net: it would be a permanent instrument for blackmail during the coming negotiations. A safety net needs to be a safety net in the hands of both parties, not only of Northern Ireland but also of the European Union.

My final remark is on the future relationship. I think it's good to repeat this because we are a new Parliament. More than 60% of our Members are new so it's important that we recall this. It's good to repeat that this Parliament will never accept an agreement with the UK whereby Britain can have all the advantages of free trade and zero tariffs and not be aligned with our ecological, health and social standards in the future. That will not happen.

(Applause)

I can tell you one thing. I know that there are some people in Britain who think that these Europeans, at the end of the negotiations, will give in. Well, that may be possible, but we are not stupid. That means that we will not kill our own companies. We will defend our own companies, we will defend our own economy, we will defend our single market and we will never accept what people call a 'Singapore by the North Sea'. That will not happen.

(Applause)

Finally, we all know how Brexit started. It was an attempt by David Cameron to heal the divisions in the Conservative Party and the consequence has been enormous divisions in British society. What we will not allow, as Europeans, is for this Brexit to create turmoil and divisions in our European Union and in our European project.

(Applause)

Philippe Lamberts, *au nom du groupe Verts/ALE*. – Monsieur le Président, chers collègues, nous n'avons pas choisi le Brexit, mais nous respectons le choix d'une majorité d'électeurs britanniques et la meilleure preuve en est que nous avons, de bonne foi, négocié un accord qui permet la séparation — que nous regrettons — entre le Royaume-Uni et l'Union européenne.

Mais je voudrais préciser que la décision prise par le Royaume-Uni de quitter l'Union européenne ne le libère pas des obligations juridiquement contraignantes qu'il a contractées pendant 45 ans comme membre de l'Union européenne et au titre des accords de paix dit du Vendredi saint, qui ont quand même mis fin à un conflit ayant coûté la vie à 3 000 personnes et ruiné celle de tant d'autres.

Nous regrettons que le premier ministre britannique, ainsi qu'un nombre important de représentants au parlement britannique ignorent ou feignent d'ignorer l'existence de ces obligations.

La position affirmée par le premier ministre britannique consiste, pour résumer, à dire aux Européens: je vous demande d'ouvrir une brèche de 500 kilomètres dans le marché intérieur. Cela tout en affirmant la volonté déterminée d'engager à l'égard de l'Union européenne une politique de dumping fiscal, social et environnemental intolérable. Vous comprendrez que cette attitude n'est pas de nature à créer dans le chef des 27 États de l'Union et de nous-mêmes, ici au Parlement européen, la confiance nécessaire pour trouver une issue négociée à l'impasse actuelle.

C'est dire si la perspective d'une sortie sans accord reste d'une actualité brûlante et est donc loin d'être écartée. Je veux dire à toutes celles et ceux, en particulier au Royaume-Uni, qui se réjouissent d'une telle perspective ou qui s'imaginent que, face à une telle perspective, les 27 plieraient l'échine, je voudrais simplement leur dire ceci: c'est qu'entre deux maux, celui que constituerait indéniablement une sortie sans accord et celui, bien pire, d'une atteinte irréversible à l'intégrité du marché intérieur, les 27 choisiront toujours le moindre de ces maux.

Mais je ne voudrais pas terminer sur cette note et le pire n'est jamais sûr. J'ai l'honneur et le bonheur de compter au sein de mon groupe politique 11 eurodéputés britanniques. Ils font partie de ces millions de Britanniques qui savent où se trouve l'intérêt de leur pays, c'est-à-dire au cœur de l'Union européenne. Je le dis clairement ici: si le Royaume-Uni, que ce soit par la voix de son premier ministre ou par toute autre autorité constituée, devait demander à l'Union européenne une extension du délai prévu à l'article 50, nous devons accéder à cette demande. Tant qu'il existe une possibilité pour que la raison prévale, nous devons tout faire pour saisir cette possibilité.

Marco Zanni, *a nome del gruppo ID*. – Signor Presidente, onorevoli colleghi, rimango allibito ogni volta di più dall'avversione verso la democrazia che quest'Aula e i rappresentanti di quest'Aula dimostrano.

Ci si permette di dare lezioni di democrazia a una delle democrazie più antiche del mondo, a uno dei parlamenti più antichi del mondo, quando questo Parlamento e queste istituzioni hanno dimostrato, negli anni e anche ultimamente, di avere un'avversione ai principi democratici, di escludere le minoranze dalla rappresentanza o di avere un processo decisionale che molto spesso non è portato avanti dai rappresentanti eletti di quest'Aula ma da burocrati non eletti da nessuno.

Lo specchio di quest'arroganza si percepisce dall'incipit della risoluzione che la maggioranza dei gruppi parlamentari di quest'Aula ha scritto e che ci apprestiamo a votare. L'incipit di questa risoluzione recita: «considera la Brexit un evento deplorabile...». Per voi l'esercizio democratico, il massimo esercizio democratico, il referendum, è un evento deplorabile. Vi permettete di dare lezioni di democrazia al parlamento inglese: questo è vergognoso.

La cosa estremamente preoccupante è che questa avversione non è relativa solo a quello che stiamo vivendo sulla Brexit: nella storia recente, o meno recente, dell'Unione europea ci sono un sacco di esempi di come queste istituzioni, le istituzioni dell'Unione europea, siano state avverse alle decisioni dei cittadini: c'è l'esempio dell'Irlanda, c'è l'esempio della Francia, c'è l'esempio dei cittadini olandesi e l'esempio dei cittadini greci, che hanno detto no a ingerenze forti di Bruxelles ma, purtroppo, sappiamo che le cose sono andate in maniera diversa.

Più che preoccuparmi della chiusura del parlamento inglese, che è una pratica prevista dalla legge inglese, mi preoccuperei dell'avversione che questo Parlamento ha per i risultati elettorali e soprattutto per i referendum: passa il principio che le decisioni prese liberamente dai popoli che non piacciono a queste istituzioni devono essere in qualche modo, e in modi anche magari non proprio ortodossi, cambiate.

Io credo che il vero punto della Brexit sia la paura che le istituzioni europee hanno, la paura che qualcuno possa mostrare un'altra via e la paura che il Regno Unito fuori dall'Unione europea possa dimostrare che forse questa istituzione non è perfetta, forse questa istituzione ha commesso degli errori e forse qualcuno può liberamente decidere di prendere un'altra strada e di dimostrare che si sta meglio, o si può stare meglio, anche al di fuori dell'Unione europea.

Questa è una libera scelta dei cittadini britannici e noi abbiamo l'obbligo di rispettarla. Andare a uno scontro e voler punire, come qualcuno in quest'Aula e in queste istituzioni vorrebbe, i cittadini del Regno Unito solo perché hanno deciso liberamente di prendere un'altra strada non rende onore al progetto che volete sostenere.

In questi tre anni non ho ancora visto un serio esame di coscienza da parte di queste istituzioni e da parte di quest'Aula, un esame di coscienza per andare a capire le radici profonde del perché uno Stato membro ha deciso di abbandonare l'Unione europea, del perché uno Stato membro ha detto basta a questo progetto che voi considerate infallibile ed ineluttabile ma che ha evidenti difetti.

Piuttosto che guardare quello che accade nel Regno Unito, mi preoccuperei della grave crisi istituzionale, economica e politica che oggi affligge l'Unione europea, una crisi interistituzionale tra il Parlamento, il Consiglio e gli Stati membri, una crisi interna anche al Parlamento, con i gruppi politici estremamente spaccati e divisi che sono riusciti a eleggere e a confermare sul filo di lana il Presidente della Commissione e un futuro politico che ancora non si vede.

Non date lezioni a chi ha scelto liberamente di prendere un'altra strada ma riflettete più profondamente sui problemi profondi che queste istituzioni hanno, altrimenti l'Unione europea non avrà alcun futuro.

Geoffrey Van Orden, *on behalf of the ECR Group*. – Mr President, may I first of all thank Jean Claude Juncker and Michel Barnier for their broadly helpful and positive remarks this morning. The British Government wants a deal, not any old deal but one that is acceptable to the British Parliament and the British people, and we need to get it over with quickly. So we must leave on 31 October: we should have left on 29 March, then on 12 April, now on 31 October. What's the point of further delay? Some of you may think that if we drag this out a bit more then there'll be a change of regime in Britain, maybe a change of heart, but I believe this is total delusion.

(Applause)

What sort of relationship do you want to see with Britain in the future: a positive one based on friendship and goodwill and mutual interest, or one based on anger and bitterness and exclusion? Everyone engaged in the process who genuinely seeks agreement must redouble their efforts to get a deal. This requires goodwill and flexibility on both sides. Remember that, in the EU, nothing is possible and everything is possible if there is political will.

On EU citizens, the British Government has been very clear, they are welcome to stay, and it is committed to protecting their rights. More than a million applicants have already been given settled status under the British scheme and there is lots of time for the rest to apply. The European Union needs to adopt a similarly generous approach towards British nationals.

(Applause)

The outstanding problem is, of course, the border between Northern Ireland and the Republic of Ireland. No one has a greater interest in peace than the people of Northern Ireland and the British Government. For all its failings, we are committed to the Belfast Agreement, the so-called Good Friday Agreement. This agreement, by the way, does not mention the border. It is, however, based on parity of esteem between the two communities, the two traditions in Northern Ireland. And please don't forget that the majority of people in Northern Ireland are Unionists, they're proud to be both Northern Irish and British and they wish to remain so. Some in this House seem to have forgotten this.

So both the EU and the UK must apply some creative thinking to find alternative arrangements to the safety net, as I much prefer to call it. I don't think the Verhofstadt resolution, by the way, contributes anything useful at this stage. We would like to see a Brexit steering group that is truly democratic, fully representative and a real source of wisdom and ideas, not just repeating tired mantras.

(Applause)

After all, the final deal needs the approval not only of the British Houses of Parliament but of our European Parliament as well.

And colleagues, I say to all of you who represent parties of government: it's time to get cracking. Pick up your phones, I know Mr Barnier needs no instruction, but he needs to do a deal and the Council must urge him to get on with it before it meets on 17 October.

Let's not lose the opportunity for that fresh and exciting partnership between the European Union and the United Kingdom to serve all our people well in the years ahead.

Martin Schirdewan, *im Namen der GUE/NGL-Fraktion*. – Herr Präsident! Als ich neu hier im Parlament war, hörte ich mal, wie ein Brexiteer sagte: Ich muss ein Imperium zerstören. Was er natürlich meinte und worauf er sich bezog, war die Europäische Union, aber erreicht haben die Brexiteers mit ihrer Politik lediglich, dass sich das Vereinigte Königreich in der größten politischen Krise seit Jahrzehnten befindet. Eine Krise, für die die Arbeitnehmerinnen und Arbeitnehmer, die Rentnerinnen und Rentner und auch die kleinen und mittelständischen Unternehmen die Zeche zu zahlen haben werden.

Diese Politik ist weder im Interesse der britischen noch im Interesse der europäischen Bevölkerung. Die Regierung von Boris Johnson weiß das auch ganz genau – Stichwort *Operation Yellowhammer*. Was wie ein schlechter Titel eines James-Bond-Films klingt, dahinter verbirgt sich eine Lageanalyse der britischen Regierung, die davon ausgeht, dass es zu Versorgungsengpässen bei Medikamenten, bei Nahrungsmitteln kommt, dass soziale Unruhen aufkommen, dass der Konflikt in Nordirland wieder entsteht. Aber die Regierung scheint genau diese politische Strategie zu verfolgen. Ich sage Ihnen: Das ist ein absoluter Irrweg.

Wir reden hier auch nicht über abstrakte Dinge, wenn wir über einen Brexit mit oder ohne Abkommen reden. Wir reden hier darüber, dass zum Beispiel ein deutscher oder ein polnischer Krankenpfleger nicht weiß, ob er noch eine Aufenthaltsgenehmigung in Großbritannien haben wird, um dort im Gesundheitssystem zu arbeiten. Gleiches gilt für die Arbeitsgenehmigung. Wir reden darüber, dass eine britische Rentnerin nicht weiß, wie es mit ihren Rentenzahlungen weitergeht, wenn sie in der EU lebt. Und wir reden auch darüber, dass eine Familie in Belfast, die ihre Kinder morgens in die Schule schicken möchte, vielleicht in Zukunft wieder Angst haben muss, dass auf der Straße etwas passiert, so wie es früher in den Jahren des Bürgerkriegs gewesen ist, wenn Sie diese Politik fortsetzen. Darüber sprechen wir, wenn wir von einem harten Brexit sprechen, und dagegen muss auch die britische Politik endlich etwas unternehmen und den Willen dazu zeigen.

Wenn ich an Großbritannien denke, dann fällt mir ja vieles ein, zum Beispiel eine wehrhafte Demokratie, die dem Faschismus widerstanden hat. Ich denke an ein Kolonialreich mit all den Schattenseiten einer Kolonialgeschichte. Ich denke an ein Land, das Denker wie Thomas Hobbes und John Maynard Keynes hervorgebracht hat. Und als Sozialist erinnere ich mich, dass Karl Marx in London Asyl gefunden hat.

Aber woran ich ganz bestimmt nicht denke – und da geht es mir ähnlich wie dem Kollegen Verhofstadt –, ist die Comicfigur Hulk. Ich sage Ihnen, eine Comicfigur wird weder den Friedensprozess in Nordirland bewahren noch die sozialen und zivilen Rechte der Bürgerinnen und Bürger schützen. Das kann nur eine kluge Politik erreichen – dafür stehen wir als Linke hier im Europäischen Parlament, und deshalb unterstützen wir die vorliegende Entschließung.

Ivan Vilibor Sinčić (NI). – Poštovani predsjedniče, danas govorimo ovdje o Brexitu. Ima nekoliko pokušaja da se opstruira britanski referendum, rezultati britanskog referenduma. To je apsolutno krivo.

Što je logika opstruiranja britanskog referenduma? Ponavljati referendum dvaput, triput, četiri puta dok odgovor ne bude drugačiji. Je li to logika referenduma? To je svodenje demokracije na apsurd. Htio bih se za početak osvrnuti na jedan citat, odnosno parafrazirat ću Edwarda Greya, britanskog ministra vanjskih poslova, negdje s početka Prvog svjetskog rata, koji je rekao ovako nekako: „Odnosi, dogovori, riječ, to mora nešto vrijediti. Ako ne vrijedi, ostaje nam samo top, ostaje nam samo da navalimo jedni na druge.”

Ovaj referendum mora nešto vrijediti. To što je britanski narod rekao, to mora nešto vrijediti i to se mora ispoštovati. Za vam ne govori, također, nešto o volji britanskog naroda, što je ovdje meni s lijeve strane 29 zastupnika iz stranke Brexit, najjače stranke u ovom Parlamentu. Merkeličin CDU ima 23, Brexit ima 29. Meni to nešto govori o volji britanskoga naroda.

Htio bih također reći da je to ono što je prošlost. Međutim, pogledajmo u budućnost. Neki, prije nekoliko tjedana ovdje, gospođa Von der Leyen govorila je o zajedničkoj vanjskoj politici kao nečem što tek treba napraviti, što će se donositi preglasavanjem. Smatram to vrlo opasnim, ne može Von der Leyen definirati mojoj Hrvatskoj što će misliti, kakav će stav imati prema Bosni i Hercegovini, Srbiji, Iranu, SAD-u, Malti ili bilo kome drugome. To je put u još gore narušavanje odnosa. Dosta je više integracije i federalizacije. Sve ovo navedeno jača euroskepticizam, neki će ovdje reći opasan je euroskepticizam. Može biti, kako za koga. Ja bih htio reći opasan je eurofundamentalizam. Ili Merkeličin način ili nikakav način. Ne dozvoljava se redefiniranje odnosa, ne dozvoljava se redefiniranje politika. I ako se redefiniranje ne dozvoli, Brexit će biti tek početak. Zalažem se za izmjenu članka 50. Ugovora o funkcioniranju Europske unije, da se ubrza i pojednostavi izlaženje onih zemalja čiji narodi tako odluče.

IN THE CHAIR: MAIREAD McGUINNESS*Vice-President*

Danuta Maria Hübner (PPE). – Madam President, we are having this debate and will vote today on this Parliament's fifth resolution on Brexit on a day when the British Parliament is under suspension. What a paradox, one might say. Yes, I am convinced that most of us here continue to regret that Brexit takes place and we continue to be committed to Brexit in an orderly fashion.

The withdrawal agreement to which this House has contributed by working very closely with Michel Barnier – thank you, Michel – this agreement provides legal certainty to all those affected by Brexit, on both sides, but in particular citizens and small businesses and citizens' rights remain the major concern of this House. This agreement facilitates this, the unprecedented – and I must say impossible to understand – withdrawal of a modern state from a preferential trade area and the disentanglement of links created during 45 years of British membership in the Union, with the least amount of disruption.

This agreement creates also a good foundation, also political, upon which to build future relations between the EU and the UK. Once it is finally approved, it will open the door for a status quo transition, giving time to negotiate alternative arrangements and a future relationship. The backstop, a temporary insurance policy tool, which is a measure of last resort, in principle never to be used, is an important part of this agreement.

I regret that the UK has not, so far, put forward legally viable and operative alternative arrangements that could replace the backstop, delivering on all its objectives. We are patiently waiting for this to be done. There is still a chance for agreement and I believe that we must be clear that a no-deal solution would be entirely the responsibility of the British Government. We know that even with the best preparedness, no deal is only a mitigating mechanism. No deal does not provide for a transition with a potential extension, it does not solve the issue of citizens' rights, the Irish border, the budgetary settlement, and let me say that in spite of everything that was said by the Prime Minister, I still hope for a deep, broad and close relationship based on regulatory convergence and respect for a level playing field.

Pedro Silva Pereira (S&D). – Madam President, we are here once again to discuss Brexit democratically, freely and openly, as any parliament should be able to do at such a crucial moment. In fact, this European Parliament is the only fully operational parliament representing British citizens today. The joint resolution tabled by the Socialists, together with other major political groups, shows how united we are in asserting our position on this regrettable process of withdrawal of the UK from the EU.

We fully respect the will of the British people. But if Brexit is to happen, it should be done in an orderly way, as no-deal is for sure the worst way to do it. Of course, we heard Mr Boris Johnson saying that he wants to reach an agreement with the EU without the Irish backstop. If not, the UK will leave the EU by the end of next month anyhow, even without a deal. But if Mr Johnson was really serious about the willingness to reach an agreement in the next few days, he would, by now, have made a very simple gesture: to put forward a written proposal on workable and legally operative alternative arrangements.

He has failed to do so, and so he has failed to give evidence that he is serious about the willingness to avoid no-deal.

So let me make it crystal clear: should the UK crash out of the EU without a deal, this would be entirely the responsibility of the UK Government, no one else. Both the House of Commons and the House of Lords approved an act obliging the UK Government to ask for an extension of Article 50 if an agreement has not been reached. There was never a mandate for no-deal given by the British people. There is now no mandate for no-deal given by the British Parliament. Therefore, we welcome the fact that this resolution makes clear that the European Parliament would support an extension of Article 50 to avoid a no-deal scenario.

The way we see it, an extension of Article 50 is also important for the UK to find a political solution and, when the time comes, to give control back to the people so that people can have a final say on Brexit.

(Applause)

Barbara Ann Gibson (Renew). – Madam President, today we are in danger, grave danger, danger as perilous to the European Union as it is to the United Kingdom – the danger of allowing our fatigue with the almighty debacle that is Brexit to make us too anxious to move on just to end it. The danger is to democracy, to stability, to the rule of law, to the sovereignty of parliaments everywhere and to the rights of citizens. I urge this Parliament to support the motion, to overcome your Brexit fatigue, to support an extension of Article 50 to allow the UK Parliament the time needed to defeat the would-be dictator who has lied and cheated and silenced the mother of all parliaments. The danger is real.

(Applause and heckling)

Brexit in any form is bad, bad for all of us, and a no-deal Brexit is a disaster. It is worth taking the time needed to allow us to fight to stop it.

(Applause)

Alyn Smith (Verts/ALE). – Madam President, Brexit has been a matter of frustration from the very start, a thing to be regretted, a thing of sadness, and from a Scottish perspective it has also been a thing of grave injustice. We voted to remain within our family of nations, the people in Northern Ireland voted to remain within our family of nations, the peace process there is sacred and must be protected.

Scotland's argument is not with you, I assure you, it is with a dysfunctional broken Westminster that's not fit for the modern world, not fit for the interconnected, interdependent world we live in. I don't ask you to solve our domestic problems – you must deal with the interlocutors you're dealt, I'm sorry for that – I'm trying today to avoid a terrible mistake for all of us, for Scotland, for the UK and for the European Union.

I hear the argument every day back home that we need to get Brexit delivered, we need to get Brexit done, we need to get Brexit past us. I hear the argument here also that you're sick of British nonsense. Me too, if it's any consolation! I appreciate you want an orderly process to mitigate the damage of Brexit, and I'm sorry, colleagues, I have news for you: there is no good Brexit. There is no sustainable answer to this.

The people that you are dealing with, the empty vessels of the Conservative Party, have even now exited the Chamber and their tormentors have absolutely no plan for a durable, sustainable future relationship. If Brexit happens with or without a deal, they will use that as a pretext to slash and burn at home in the UK, in Scotland, Wales, Northern Ireland and in England. Social dumping, environmental dumping, economic dumping, right off your shores ...

(Loud protests from certain quarters)

There is no such thing as a good Brexit. There is no such thing as a good outcome to this.

I cannot support the resolution today despite your best efforts and your good faith. I do not believe this Withdrawal Agreement will deliver because of your interlocutors. Scotland has other chances in this. We need more time to reverse Brexit. Please give us that time.

(Applause)

(Hubbub)

Gunnar Beck (ID). – Frau Präsidentin! „Großbritannien vor dem Chaos“ unken die britischen und spotten die deutschen Medien, ähnlich wie bei der Hysterie vor dem Brexit-Referendum. Ernste Folgen drohen dennoch. Großbritannien ist der drittgrößte deutsche Exportmarkt und mit den USA zusammen der profitabelste. Für die Rest-EU ist es der zweitgrößte Absatzmarkt. Bei einem harten Brexit droht der Verlust zehntausender deutscher Arbeitsplätze, vor allem in der Automobilbranche. Hinzu kommt der Wegfall des britischen Nettobeitrages von 10 bis 12 Mrd. Euro. Die Kosten träfen vor allem das allzeit willfährige Deutschland.

Now why then is the EU resisting an amicable divorce? The UK has negotiated in good faith, perhaps rather too much faith when it agreed to all the EU's initial demands over the negotiation timetable, EU citizens' rights and the divorce bill. The EU responded by concocting the issue of the Irish backstop.

But who seriously believes that sporadic or electronic customs checks will lead to the resurgence of violent terror in Ireland. Not even Michel Barnier, who is trying to use the backstop to keep Britain in a permanent customs union or to force a referendum. Against the entire financial and political establishment, and against all received politically correct opinion, the British people voted to leave the EU by a majority of 52% to 48%, exactly the majority by which this Parliament confirmed EU Commission President von der Leyen.

Seventeen point four million British citizens voted for Brexit. The largest number of British people who ever voted for anything! Now Michel Barnier is a shrewd and skilful negotiator, but he's trying to reduce the UK to a vassel state or alternatively is risking massive job losses in the EU. Either, or – either outcome is unacceptable.

(Applause from certain quarters)

Peter Lundgren (ECR). – Fru talman! Brexit präglas i dag av ett ställningskrig mellan Storbritannien och EU där båda sidor har svårt att komma med konkreta lösningar. Observera att vi bara för ett halvt sekel sedan hade en helt annan situation. Storbritannien avstod då från att gå med i Europeiska gemenskapens kol- och stålunion i början på 50-talet av liknande skäl som i dagens brexitsituation.

Samma sak 1957 när brittena menade att en tullunion av EG-typ med enhetliga, ofta protektionistiska utvärtes tullar skulle bli alltför mycket av en tvångströja för det frihandelsinriktade Storbritannien. Varpå man genast som konkurrens skapade det öppnare och politiskt bindande European Free Trade Association, EFTA, tillsammans med bland annat Sverige, som – vill jag tillägga – klarar sig med ett hundratal anställda jämfört med EU:s närmare 50 000 anställda totalt i alla olika institutioner.

De brittiska väljarna har gjort sitt val och de valde att lämna EU. Det måste respekteras. Nu måste vi politiker leverera både här och i Storbritannien.

Martina Anderson (GUE/NGL). – Madam President, my Irish passport says that it is the entitlement and birth right of everyone born on the island of Ireland to be part of the Irish nation. As this resolution clearly states, we Irish in the north of Ireland are therefore entitled to EU citizenship where we reside.

Whilst the backstop is essential to prevent a hardening of the border partition in Ireland to protect the all-Ireland economy and North-South cooperation, it takes us out of the EU against our will. We in the north of Ireland voted to remain. It is important that this Parliament recognises, as stated in the resolution, the legitimacy of whatever choice is freely exercised by the majority of the people in the north of Ireland as to our right to change its status, our right to self-determination as recognised in the Good Friday Agreement in British and Irish law.

The European Council statement stated that in the event of Irish reunification all 32 counties would remain in the EU. French President Macron stated that the solution to the Brexit problem is Irish reunification. Lord Ashcroft's opinion poll, like others, shows a majority in favour of Irish reunification. The Good Friday Agreement provides a peaceful, democratic pathway back into the EU for the people of the north of Ireland and that should be respected by all.

Nigel Farage (NI). – Madam President, well, one thing is clear and that is, from the emollient tone we have heard this morning from Juncker and Barnier, that we are actually very close to the deal on the backstop being agreed at the summit on 17 October.

Of course, both sides will try and present this as a negotiating victory. It may be worth reminding ourselves that this treaty even without the backstop is a very bad deal for Britain. It will leave us trapped inside European Union rules, it will leave us under the auspices of the European Court and, having given everything away in the Withdrawal Agreement, the worst part is that any future relationship relies on good faith.

We put ourselves entirely in your hands. We put ourselves indeed at your mercy, and I would suggest that events that we've seen across Europe this week do not indicate that good faith exists. I am, of course, referring to the pipsqueak Prime Minister of Luxembourg, who set out to ritually humiliate a British Prime Minister in the most astonishing way, only to be greeted like a hero by President Macron at the Elysée Palace yesterday.

And it's very clear to me that keeping us trapped inside this was Barnier's objective from the start, to keep us inside the Customs Union. We've heard from other speakers today that the fear is that the UK breaks out of the Customs Union, breaks out of single market rules and that we become more competitive and we become much wealthier outside the European Union than within it.

Mr Verhofstadt, we want no part of your European empire. The only way forward now, to deliver on the referendum, is for a clean-break Brexit. Once we've done that we will have a grown-up conversation about trade and about the way forward.

(Applause from certain quarters)

Esteban González Pons (PPE). – Madam President, when I was a young student and started to get involved in politics, I looked at Great Britain as the highest example of what a democracy should be. Not any more. Today, British democracy is a shadow of what it was because of politicians like Nigel Farage. Today, when Great Britain is living its darkest hours since the war, its parliament has been shut down. This parliament, in the very last moments of the negotiations, is open; the British Parliament is closed. That's the reason why we must all speak English here today, because we are representing not only the European people, but also the British people. This is today the British House of democracy as well.

(Applause)

Today, Great Britain has been taken over by nationalist politicians, unable to see beyond their own physical and mental borders. We have been negotiating in the fairest possible way. We have always acted in good faith. We never lied. Jean-Claude Juncker and Michel Barnier are good negotiators, but they are gentlemen as well. I'm wondering if the current British Prime Minister can say the same.

We will not oppose an extension if it is required, but we want to know until when and why, because we have no more time to waste. I urge the Prime Minister to respect the British Parliament, and I urge him to respect democracy in Europe because Brexit now is not only a disaster but also the biggest mistake of current times.

Richard Corbett (S&D). – Madam President, we have a chaotic political situation in Britain at the moment, but colleagues should not for one moment think that this Prime Minister, nor that lot over there, represent the entire British nation. They do not.

(Applause)

Although Mr Johnson claims that he is seeking a deal, he has not put any actual proposal on the table, and the ideas he sometimes floats for a solution are ones that would not be acceptable either here or to the British Parliament. He is, in fact, heading towards a no-deal Brexit. But the British Parliament has legislated to prevent such an outcome and to require him to ask for an extension rather than have a no-deal Brexit. A majority in the British Parliament – remember he is now a minority government; he has lost ministers and has expelled members from his party – and every single opposition party, namely Labour, the Liberal Democrats, the Greens, the Scottish Nationalists and the Welsh Nationalists, now wants a new referendum. In such a referendum, faced with a Boris Johnson deal or a no deal, they would campaign to remain in the European Union. It is important for colleagues to remember that. No matter how frustrated you are with the British Government and its Prime Minister, bear with the British people.

Public opinion is shifting on this. A new referendum is justified because Brexit bears no resemblance whatsoever to what that lot said during the referendum campaign. They said it would be easy. It's difficult. They said it would save lots of money that would all go to the NHS. It's costing a fortune. They said it would be good for the British economy and jobs. The opposite is proving true. That is why leave voters are entitled to say, 'this is not what I was promised; this is not what I voted for'. It is also right to give the British people another chance to look at this. Please bear with us. Please give us that necessary extension. Ask your Prime Ministers to give us the extension necessary for us to sort this out.

(Applause)

Naomi Long (Renew). – Madam President, I was elected as a cross-community, pro-European voice for the people of Northern Ireland, a majority of whom voted to remain in the EU referendum, and for Remain parties in the European elections. Membership of the European Union matters to us. Our European citizenship is a shared identity uniting our people, both unionist and nationalist and the growing number of us who identify as neither.

The Good Friday Agreement was founded on European principles of interdependence and cooperation. It must be protected. Yet our government, propped up by the DUP, refused to hear us. The DUP did not speak for a majority in 1998 when they opposed the Good Friday Agreement. They do not speak for the majority in Northern Ireland now, either on Brexit or on the backstop.

There can be no good or sensible Brexit, but a no-deal Brexit would be catastrophic in Northern Ireland. Ignore those who say that no-deal is no problem. Listen to those who live and work across the border. They know differently. The UK Parliament is working to try to avoid a no-deal Brexit. We now need EU leaders and this Parliament to give them the time they need to succeed and we appreciate your patience. Brexit will affect all of our futures. It is important to get it right, not just get it done.

(Applause)

Molly Scott Cato (Verts/ALE). – Madam President, from the start, Brexit has been about control, but far from taking back control from Europe, Johnson and Cummings have lost control of the country. The nationwide protests about the prorogation of Parliament, an outrageous usurpation of power unmatched since the 17th century, have meant the British Prime Minister is unable to appear in public anywhere in the UK, or even, as we see recently, in Luxembourg. We now know what 'take back control' really meant; it means taking control away from our representatives in Parliament, taking control away from the civil servants, taking power away from those who are upholding the rule of law.

Brexit has not given control to the people, or to Parliament, but to wealthy oligarchs who want to avoid paying tax and to global corporations which want to tear up the laws that protect people and planet. This is why the commitment to an equal playing field on environmental standards, employment rights and consumer protections in Parliament's resolution is so important. We cannot allow a race to the bottom, where the UK ends up as a tax haven, a sweatshop or goes back to being the 'dirty man of Europe'.

Tragically, five million EU citizens have lost control of their lives and been shamefully turned into bargaining chips, as they struggle to keep their families together and their lives on track. I deeply regret that this Parliament has failed to suggest that their rights should be ring-fenced in our resolution. Although the situation in my country is chaotic, and democratic institutions are being tested to breaking point, both our MPs and our courts are taking positive action to protect democracy. The clear message of our resolution today is that we look to the European Council to grant the UK the extension we need to enable the democratic forces in Britain to regain control and end the political crisis. Only we, the people, can resist the tyranny of Johnson and his cabal. We depend on our friends in Parliament, and in the Council, to give us the time we need to take back control from the moneymen and the oligarchs.

Only a people's vote can guarantee that the majority who now wish to remain at the heart of Europe can stop the Brexit nightmare.

(Applause from certain quarters)

Jaak Madison (ID). – Madam President, on 23 June 2016 the European Union membership referendum was held in the United Kingdom. On that historic day, a 51.89% majority chose to leave the European Union. There have been more than 1000 days since the referendum took place, and every single day since then political elitists – both in the UK and in the EU – have held the people of Great Britain and Northern Ireland hostage. The decision of the UK voters to leave the European Union is binding, and those in power have a legal duty to give effect to the results of the referendum.

Certain politicians may think they possess superior wisdom by preventing Brexit, but they should be reminded that even though the people may not be the ones who govern, legislate or interpret the law, they are the source of that power. This is something the political elitists of our time conveniently tend to forget. The EU is quick to preach to third countries about democracy and the rule of law, but in its own backyard democratic results are only respected when they correspond with the ideology of the EU federalists.

The possibility to join the EU was always accompanied by the corresponding possibility to leave. However, what has become clear is that politicians are doing everything in their power to prevent the UK from leaving the EU. Even the Guy Verhofstadts of this world can be seen in a video drinking to the fact that they have succeeded in keeping the UK hostage for at least five years.

Boris Johnson brought new hopes that Brexit might finally be delivered. However, the House of Commons constantly undermines him, most recently by voting in favour of rendering a no-deal Brexit unlawful and effectively taking away hope.

The Council could block a third extension. Johnson could negotiate a different deal or leave without a deal. The people of Europe will not be silenced and will not be held hostage. By ignoring the will of the people, the EU is becoming the architect of its own downfall, unfortunately.

(Applause)

It is time for the EU to listen to the people and to respect democracy and the sovereignty of nations, and it is time for the EU to practice what it preaches.

Jan Zahradil (ECR). – Madam President, we have six weeks to Brexit and, if nothing happens, the UK leaves on 31 October without a deal. But still many people in this House make the mistake of thinking and believing that we have a deal and that there are only some troublemakers on the UK side that are blocking it and they have to be brought to their senses. But all this is not true. We do not have a deal. We have just a draft that was dismissed three times in the House of Commons and which the current UK Government – a pretty legitimate government – doesn't accept.

There's a saying that 'it takes two to tango'. But unfortunately, it seems that we are dancing pretty much alone. So a sensible option, I feel, has to be for the EP to ask the European Council to mandate the European Commission to renegotiate the deal. Otherwise, we will end up in six weeks with no deal, with very damaging consequences for our economies.

Luke Ming Flanagan (GUE/NGL). – Madam President, the number one thing we've got to do here is respect people's positions and respect that the people of the UK voted to leave. Those that voted to leave need to respect that this causes massive problems for people in the border areas. At the moment, the best solution available is the backstop. We must, however, be prepared for a crash-out. If this happens, then the principle of EU solidarity will be truly tested. Up until now, this solidarity has come in the form of words. Yet again today we hear from Jean-Claude Juncker about solidarity.

Ireland exports a quarter of a million tonnes of beef to the UK every year. If we lose this market, then we will need to find other markets immediately. Who better than our European neighbours? Do we have the capacity? The answer is yes. If the UK crashes out, then Ireland needs a new market. We imported, in the EU, over 300 000 tonnes of beef from the Mercosur countries last year. In the case of no deal, we need the new Commissioner for Trade, Phil Hogan, to turn this off to a trickle if he really means solidarity.

Diane Dodds (NI). – Madam President, firstly I would like to reaffirm my strong belief that an orderly withdrawal process is the best and preferred way forward for the European Union, for the United Kingdom and, to be specific, for our neighbours in the Republic of Ireland.

I have always believed that this is in our interests and will work to achieve this end. However that withdrawal agreement must not damage the constitutional and economic integrity of the United Kingdom and Northern Ireland's place within it. The agreement must also meet basic democratic tests. The backstop endangers these fundamental principles. This House has confirmed on a number of occasions its adherence to the Belfast Agreement. Indeed it was referenced this morning by President Juncker and Mr Barnier. One of the core principles of that agreement is parity of esteem between the two traditions in Northern Ireland, meaning that citizens from both the Unionist and nationalist traditions are treated and heard equally.

Just last week the former Irish Prime Minister, Bertie Ahern, himself an architect of the Belfast Agreement, spoke out on the importance of parity of esteem, and is quoted as saying 'any solution has to include the Unionist people, because parity of esteem in the Good Friday Agreement is both sides.' Let's be clear, the letter sent to the European Institutions and which gives rise to the statement in paragraph 5 of the resolution was not signed or supported by a single member of the Northern Ireland Assembly from the Unionist tradition. Every Unionist party which stood in the European elections did so on a platform of rejecting the backstop. A recent opinion poll says that 81% of Unionists are against the backstop. There is a democratic problem with the backstop, Mr Barnier, and you cannot wash your hands of it. Not only would Northern Ireland be subject to swathes of legislation with no control or representation, the Union ...

(The President cut off the speaker)

Antonio Tajani (PPE). – Signora Presidente, onorevoli colleghi, la commissione per gli affari costituzionali, che ho l'onore di presiedere, ha deciso di dar voce alle organizzazioni dei cittadini europei che vivono nel Regno Unito, ivi compresi gli irlandesi. Abbiamo deciso di ascoltare anche le rappresentanze dei cittadini britannici che vivono in Europa.

Questo Parlamento ha il dovere di dare voce agli europei. Ci sono 600 mila miei compatrioti che vivono nel Regno Unito, dobbiamo dare voce agli irlandesi del Nord, agli irlandesi della Repubblica d'Irlanda, dobbiamo dare voce ai britannici che vivono in Europa. Questo è il luogo della democrazia, questo è il luogo dove i cittadini devono sentirsi difesi. Lo dobbiamo fare anche per ridurre la distanza che c'è tra queste istituzioni e le popolazioni europee.

Abbiamo chiesto anche l'autorizzazione ad andare come commissione AFCO al confine tra Irlanda del Nord e Repubblica d'Irlanda, per andare a dare un segnale di attenzione, per far capire – perché lì è il nodo del problema – cosa bisogna fare per rinforzare la pace. È fondamentale il *backstop*, perché i segnali che stanno arrivando – anche ai servizi segreti britannici – sono molto preoccupanti, ed è anche fondamentale tutelare laggiù, visto che ci sarà una frontiera flessibile, le nostre imprese e la nostra agricoltura: ricordiamo la vicenda della mucca pazza.

Con una frontiera flessibile e senza una difesa del mercato interno l'Europa economica corre molti rischi e questo Parlamento ha il dovere di difendere cittadini e imprese.

Brando Benifei (S&D). – Signora Presidente, onorevoli colleghi, siamo vicini al 31 ottobre senza che il premier britannico Johnson abbia messo sul tavolo una proposta politica che possa essere discussa credibilmente dai leader europei. Aumenta quindi il rischio di un'uscita senza accordo e aumenta l'impressione che questa sia oggi l'opzione preferita dalla leadership del partito conservatore, mentre l'opposizione guidata da Corbyn ha portato avanti con successo iniziative per bloccare questa prospettiva disastrosa.

Il Partito Democratico italiano, che rappresento in questo dibattito, vuole difendere i 3 milioni di cittadini europei che vivono e lavorano nel Regno Unito, tra cui figurano oltre 700 mila cittadini italiani, così come anche moltissime nostre imprese che con il Regno Unito commerciano da sempre, contribuendo attivamente alla ricchezza dei nostri paesi.

Se il Regno Unito lo richiederà saremo pronti a sostenere un'estensione della scadenza dell'articolo 50, ma solo come strumento chiaro per scongiurare un'uscita senza accordo, con una chiara prospettiva.

Billy Kelleher (Renew). – Madam President, I wish to support the resolution and, in doing that, I also want to say that I accept the decision of the United Kingdom in terms of leaving the European Union. But, equally, there's an obligation on the United Kingdom to accept that a great democratic process took place on the island of Ireland in 1998, where people, North and South, overwhelmingly supported the Good Friday Agreement. In that Agreement, we talk about an all-Ireland economy and we talk about parity of esteem. Just to put it in context: day in, day out, people cross an invisible border. They go about their daily lives. A crash-out Brexit will have implications for that freedom – the freedom to go about commercial life, social life, cultural life and sporting life.

So, in the context of this debate, I support the resolution and I ask the United Kingdom, in particular, to accept that it has duty-bound responsibilities to uphold the integrity of the Good Friday Agreement, bearing in mind that it is also a peace process. So when I accept the fact that the United Kingdom wishes to leave the European Union, I expect the United Kingdom to do its duty and honour the Good Friday Agreement.

(Applause)

Jill Evans (Verts/ALE). – Madam President, I have represented Wales in this European Parliament for 20 years. It has been my greatest privilege and my greatest challenge, but now we face the most challenging times of all. Westminster has failed Wales. It does not work for the people. It is a parliament in turmoil. But I ask you to look beyond that at other things that are happening.

Over recent months, I have marched with many thousands of people all over Wales in support of independence, and that support is growing. Forty percent of people now saying they would support Welsh independence if it meant that Wales could remain in the European Union. We have the right to determine our own future. To resolve the current crisis, we must put the whole thing back to the people in a referendum, and we need the time to do that. I will continue to work for that and for Wales's future in Europe.

Harald Vilimsky (ID). – Frau Präsidentin, meine sehr geehrten Damen und Herren! Erlauben Sie mir, zunächst mein großes Unverständnis dafür zum Ausdruck zu bringen, dass zwei große Verhandler – die Europäische Union, aber auch das Vereinigte Königreich, die ja beide an sich selbst postulieren, in der westlichen Welt große Einflussträger zu sein – nicht und nicht in der Lage sind, einen direkt demokratischen Volksentscheid entsprechend umzusetzen.

Schauen Sie, wie es in diesem Haus aussieht: Es gibt zwei große Lager. Die einen sagen: Brexit ist etwas Gutes; die anderen sagen: Brexit ist etwas Schlechtes. Meine Meinung dazu: Es ist völlig unerheblich, was sie dazu sagen. Es ist auch unerheblich, was ich sage. Einzig und allein maßgeblich ist, was eine Mehrheit der britischen Bevölkerung sagt. Und es ist unsere heilige Pflicht, Respekt zu zeigen vor einer Mehrheit einer britischen Bevölkerung, die klar entschieden hat.

Daher: Nutzen Sie bitte die Zeit bis zum 31. Oktober, um aufeinander zuzugehen, ein Ergebnis herbeizuverhandeln, das effizient, professionell, fair und herzeigbar ist, und hören Sie auf mit diesem Kasperltheater!

Geert Bourgeois (ECR). – Voorzitter, onze fractie mag geen deel uitmaken van de werkzaamheden van de stuurgroep. Dat is een smet op het democratisch blazoën van dit Parlement, maar toch zal de NVA-delegatie uit Vlaanderen de resolutie goedkeuren. Wij willen immers alles doen om het tot een *deal* te laten komen. *No deal is a bad deal!* Wij hopen dat onze onderhandelaars verder constructief en – nu er een kleine opening gemaakt schijnt te worden – met de nodige flexibiliteit onderhandelen, met respect voor de principes van de backstop en met respect voor de integriteit van de interne markt.

Wat de toekomstige relatie betreft, heeft mijnheer Barnier terecht beklemtoond dat er meer is dan handel. Ik wil er ook op wijzen dat er naast defensie, veiligheid enzovoort nog onderzoek en ontwikkeling is, universitaire samenwerking, de *blue economy* enzovoort. Wat de steunmaatregelen van het globalisatiefonds betreft, wil ik erop wijzen dat slechts enkele procenten van onze uitvoerende bedrijven meer dan 49 werknemers hebben.

Clare Daly (GUE/NGL). – Madam President, it's all so easy to pretend, as many people have here, that Brexit is all about the crazy Brits. If Brexit is about anything, it's about the failure of the neoliberal ideology entrenched in EU institutions, thanks to Lisbon and Nice, and, ironically, also entrenched in the ideology of the ruling classes in Britain. It's about soaring rents, declining wages, privatisation and undermining of public services, conditions that exist in many countries throughout the European Union.

Let's not lie about it – it is about democracy. You know what: the UK might not be doing too well in the democracy stakes, but neither is the European Union. So, while I don't care about the establishment in Britain cannibalising itself, the people on the island of Ireland have to live our lives and we cannot have a hard border. We have to have our human rights respected and not sacrificed. If people here really believe in solidarity and a peaceful and socially just Europe, as I do, we have to abandon the road that this European Union is on and abandon neoliberalism.

Martin Edward Daubney (NI). – Madam President, we've heard a lot today about Emperor Verhofstadt's plan to build a new European empire. Today he compared Boris Johnson to Mrs Doubtfire. Let's face it, Mr Verhofstadt is the Darth Vader of Europe and this place is his Death Star, where national democracy comes to die. As for the Empire, I'm here for the 17.4 million to strike back.

75 years ago, my forefathers fought and died on European soil fighting fascism. Today, we are here to liberate the United Kingdom from the European Union. For the past three years, despite paying GBP 1 billion a month for membership, we have been treated with nothing but contempt, and today it got worse. As for the so-called level playing field, I'd hate to play football against you, Mr Barnier, as the match would be rigged. Brexit has shown that the European Union does not believe in democracy. Today, we are expected to vote to call Brexit a regrettable event. Well, let me put it into language you understand: *'je ne regrette rien'*. We are leaving the European Union and we have no regrets.

(Applause)

Seán Kelly (PPE). – Madam President, in time historians might describe Brexit as the incredible sulk by the self-styled Incredible Hulk and his allies, who want to leave the European Union, come hell or high water, on 31 October, regardless of the consequences for people, for prosperity or for peace on the island of Ireland. For that reason, we are so grateful in Ireland for the solidarity of the EU26, articulated so well by President Juncker and Mr Barnier here this morning. Mr Juncker said that they are standing in solidarity with the most affected states and showing unity of purpose. It couldn't be stronger or clearer. Mr Barnier also outlined very clearly the necessity for the backstop.

There is another consequence of Brexit, and that is that after the Good Friday Agreement, the relationship between Ireland and the United Kingdom grew and became friendlier, culminating with the Queen's visit to Ireland in Croke Park a few years ago. That now has been replaced, unfortunately, by tension and suspicion. I hope, however, that if the United Kingdom asks for an extension of Article 50, and I'm encouraged by what I heard here today, it will be granted. If only, number one, to give Mr Johnson the time to come forward with the abundance of solutions he told our Prime Minister he had for the backstop, and maybe also to give time to the good people of Great Britain to take back control from the Brexit buccaners who want to leave, regardless of deal or no deal.

Katarina Barley (S&D). – Madam President, being a British as well as a German citizen, Brexit is quite an emotional topic for me, as for many others I guess, and the most emotional part is obviously the backstop. What is hardly ever mentioned though is that the backstop is only a temporary solution until a final agreement is signed. So why is it such a problem? It is because there is a lack of mutual trust and we see that today very clearly. Some British people fear that they will be bound to the EU forever and, at the same time, the EU wants guarantees that there will be no hard border between Ireland and Northern Ireland, and that is exactly the point. It is not only about the UK. It is also about Ireland and we have every right to discuss this here because Ireland is going to stay in the European Union.

So what can we do? Exactly the opposite of what some politicians in Britain and here in this House are doing, which is to become more and more aggressive and to use war metaphors – and I say this explicitly as a German and British citizen. We will stay neighbours anyway and we should stay good neighbours, in peace.

(Applause)

Nathalie Loiseau (Renew). – Madame la Présidente, je voudrais remercier Jean-Claude Juncker et Michel Barnier d'être devant notre Parlement, un Parlement qui possède le privilège de vous entendre et de débattre du Brexit, sans que personne ne songe à le suspendre.

Notre Parlement prendra ses responsabilités. Jamais nous n'accepterons de porter préjudice à l'île d'Irlande, ni par un mur, ni par le retour de la violence. Jamais nous n'accepterons de porter préjudice à l'intégrité et à la solidité de l'Union européenne. Jamais nous ne transigerons sur la paix, sur les droits des citoyens, ni sur les intérêts de l'Union européenne.

Notre Parlement sait dire ce qu'il ne veut pas. Il sait aussi dire ce qu'il veut. Notre attitude a toujours été et reste dictée par l'amitié et le respect que nous portons au peuple britannique, mais nous ignorons à ce jour ce que veut le gouvernement britannique. Nous ignorons par exemple si le Royaume-Uni demandera un nouveau report du Brexit et s'il a une raison valable pour le faire. Le gouvernement britannique ne nous dit ni quand, ni comment, ni vers où il veut quitter l'Union européenne.

Cette situation ne peut pas durer. Nous avons besoin de savoir si le Royaume-Uni nous respecte autant que nous le respectons, et se respecter implique de se dire la vérité.

Ciarán Cuffe (Verts/ALE). – Madam President, yesterday I heard Mr Barnier speak about a fragile peace. He talked about meeting women in Ireland who cross the border every day for work. They said to him 'We don't want it to start up again.' I appeal to Mr Farage, and indeed to Mr Johnson, visit the border, hear their stories, they are heartfelt and they are real.

In Northern Ireland the tensions are always present. Violence is never far away. My Irish colleagues Clare Bailey and Vincent Martin have first-hand experience of this. They proposed a confirmatory vote for those who live in Northern Ireland: let the UK exit the backstop whenever it wants but first put a question to the people of Northern Ireland – best of both worlds in a free-trade area or the UK only? Let them decide.

The poet Seamus Heaney once wrote 'Believe that a further shore is reachable from here. Believe in miracles ...'. Like Heaney, we have to believe in miracles, but we must not lose hope that a solution can be found.

President. – Thank you, Mr Cuffe, and I approve of your choice of poet. I have quoted him in this Chair.

Antonio Maria Rinaldi (ID). – Signora Presidente, onorevoli colleghi, sentendo i colleghi in Aula ho capito che la preoccupazione maggiore è quella di chiedere la ripetizione del referendum nel Regno Unito, magari finché il risultato è quello gradito. La democrazia funziona in un'altra maniera. D'altronde in Aula, quando la signora Ursula von der Leyen è stata eletta soltanto per nove voti, nessuno ha chiesto la ripetizione, anche se la metà di questo Parlamento non era d'accordo.

Vorrei semplicemente ricordare che il Regno Unito è acquirente netto di beni e servizi da parte dell'Unione. Cosa significa penalizzare il Regno Unito? Dopo a chi venderemo le nostre automobili, a chi venderemo le nostre derrate alimentari e i nostri macchinari?

Allora cerchiamo di metterci d'accordo ma soprattutto cerchiamo di riunirci in modo propositivo. Quando si è voluto sostenere il sistema bancario ci sono state delle riunioni anche di notte e immediatamente si è trovata una soluzione. Perché non si vuole arrivare a una soluzione nei confronti del Regno Unito? Io propongo a tutti i colleghi...

(La Presidente toglie la parola all'oratore)

Ангел Джамбазки (ЕСР). – Уважаема г-жо Председател, все по-ясно очертаващата се перспектива за излизане на Великобритания от Съюза без сделка, така нареченият „твърд Брексит“, застрашава интересите на всички. За Европа това развитие на ситуацията би означавало затруднен внос-износ на стоки в посока Великобритания, а в самото Обединено кралство – икономическа несигурност и заплаха за мира в Северна Ирландия.

Обединеното кралство ще напусне Европейския съюз, но няма да напусне Европа. Страната ще остане един от най-големите икономически партньори и сигурен съюзник в НАТО. Партньорството в сферата на сигурността е особено важно за тези от нас, които ще останат в Съюза. Необходимо е да се намери решение на проблема с границата с Ирландия, което да задоволява настоящите възражения на Обединеното кралство по въпроса.

Лидерите на Европейския съюз трябва да разберат, че в настоящия си вид решението за ирландската граница, предложено от г-н Барниер, би застрашило конституционната цялост на Обединеното кралство и е неприемливо за британските ни партньори. Можем да очакваме бързо и ефективно решение на кризата около излизането на Великобритания от Съюза единствено след постигането на съгласие по този въпрос. В противен случай ще допринесем за излагането на риск не само на икономическото развитие на Европа, но и нейната сила. Наред с това можем да загубим доверието на един от най-важните си партньори.

Eugenia Rodríguez Palop (GUE/NGL). – Señora presidenta, para España el *Brexit* es un estado transitorio que no augura nada bueno. En nuestro país, la comarca de Gibraltar se enfrenta a un escenario probablemente catastrófico. El caso del *Brexit* amenaza a la frontera entre Gibraltar y España; hoy una herida abierta por la que pasan más de 28 000 personas diariamente, entre 13 000 y 15 000 trabajadores transfronterizos, personas para las que no tenemos ningún plan de contingencia fiable, acordado y financiado.

No sabemos todavía cómo vamos a evitar que sus permisos de trabajo no se modifiquen negativamente, que no disminuyan sus retribuciones ni sus pensiones o que no se deteriore la atención sanitaria a la que tienen derecho. Si el Reino Unido sale abruptamente de la Unión Europea, habrá colas de más de cuatro horas en la frontera, se ralentizará el suministro de alimentos y medicinas, el abastecimiento de las empresas, las importaciones y exportaciones y la afluencia de turistas.

El camino de rosas con el que fantaseó Johnson se ha convertido ya en un lodazal intransitable, con un Parlamento amordazado y millones de personas en la estacada. Ojalá les dejen elegir libremente, pero, si se marchan, háganlo asumiendo sus responsabilidades. Dejen ya de jugar al póquer con la vida de la gente.

Lance Forman (NI). – Madam President, this is my first speech in this august Chamber, and hopefully my last. As I entered this building for the first time I saw a huge billboard with a quotation about free and fair elections. But I ask you all, what is the point of free and fair elections if the result is dishonoured? What is the point of free and fair elections if the losers refuse to accept defeat? What is the point of free and fair elections if freedom and fairness is sacrificed, because the elite think that they know best?

The EU holds itself out as the torch bearer of global democracy, giving hope to oppressed people, but what is the point when it resents the democratic vote of its own people?

In a few weeks, our Prime Minister Boris Johnson, my friend, may be forced to ask for an extension to the Brexit negotiation deadline. If the EU truly believes in democracy, it has to reject that request, even if it doesn't like the outcome. If you believe in democracy you have to stand with the British people. Our exit is long overdue.

(Applause from certain quarters)

François-Xavier Bellamy (PPE). – Madame la Présidente, derrière les éclats de voix de ce matin, il y a des réalités très concrètes et des risques très concrets pour l'avenir de nos pays.

Le peuple britannique a fait le choix de quitter l'Union européenne et ce choix doit être respecté, mais notre dialogue de ce matin n'aura aucune utilité s'il s'agit seulement de commenter la vie politique britannique. Il s'agit d'abord pour nous, comme vous l'avez rappelé, Monsieur le négociateur, de rester vigilants et concentrés sur l'essentiel: la protection de l'intérêt de tous les citoyens. En cas de sortie sans accord du Royaume-Uni, nous deviendrons tous plus vulnérables face aux menaces qui pèsent sur notre sécurité, et plus fragiles dans nos capacités de défense.

La coopération avec nos voisins britanniques est un élément essentiel pour nos forces de renseignements, nos forces de police et nos forces armées. Demain, nous pourrions nous trouver moins efficaces ensemble pour faire face à la menace terroriste ou pour protéger nos intérêts stratégiques.

Notre économie, elle aussi, serait durement impactée dans un contexte déjà difficile et je voudrais attirer votre attention, en particulier, sur le coût important que représenterait une sortie sans accord pour les pays proches des îles britanniques. Vous me permettez de citer la France, en particulier, qui générerait en cas de *no deal* le poids que représenterait la gestion d'une frontière terrestre rétablie avec la Grande-Bretagne. Dans ce désastre économique, il faut évoquer un secteur en particulier, celui de la pêche, parce que la fermeture des eaux britanniques serait une double peine que nos amis britanniques et nous-mêmes nous infligerions les uns aux autres.

Bref, des milliers de personnes nous regardent et attendent de nous une seule chose. Soyons responsables. Avec le regard d'un nouvel élu, je suis surpris par le tour que prennent nos débats. Nous ne sommes pas là pour refaire un match ou pour recommencer un référendum tranché par les électeurs, mais pour préparer un accord et nous comptons sur vous, cher Michel, pour continuer à travailler dans ce sens.

Sylvie Guillaume (S&D). – Madame la Présidente, au milieu de l'incertitude sur les options de sortie de l'Union européenne du Royaume-Uni et de l'incompréhension soulevée par le comportement du premier ministre britannique, la position du Parlement européen arrive à point nommé.

Au travers de la résolution, notre message destiné à la classe politique et aux citoyens britanniques est d'ailleurs particulièrement limpide. Les Européens privilégient une sortie ordonnée, qui garantisse la paix civile en Irlande, qui respecte les droits des citoyens européens résidant au Royaume-Uni et ceux des citoyens britanniques installés dans l'Union, soit une sortie ordonnée conforme aux règles européennes et dans le respect des engagements financiers du divorce.

Notre message est également clair sur une extension du délai à laquelle nous nous résoudrions si les élections devaient intervenir.

Maintenant, nous attendons avec impatience que le premier ministre britannique fasse des propositions intelligibles et prenne ses responsabilités. Et puisque j'en suis à parler d'un premier ministre qui prenne ses responsabilités, je voudrais qu'on ait une pensée attristée à l'égard de quelqu'un dont nous lisons qu'il souffre silencieusement depuis trois ans et s'interroge tous les jours sur le sens de tout cela, David Cameron, qui, pour des raisons tactiques, a déclenché ce chaos bien peu conforme à la grande tradition démocratique britannique.

Luis Garicano (Renew). – Madam President, more than 150 000 Spaniards live in the UK and, in turn, 300 000 Brits live in Spain. For all those citizens, what Mr Farage called a clean break Brexit is a very, very dirty Brexit indeed. Their situation is truly dramatic.

Just last week, I was in the UK talking to Spanish citizens. Their concern has to do with the so-called 'settled' status, which is anything but settled. It is just a PDF number they get on their email that actually confers no rights if Mr Johnson and Mr Farage proceed with their no-deal charades. We need to put ourselves in the skin of those citizens who, after possibly decades living in the UK, have no certainty about whether their lives there can continue.

The EU is doing what it must to protect its citizens. The UK is not. We must stand with these proposals, and we must avoid a no-deal Brexit that would be catastrophic for all European citizens.

(Applause)

Terry Reintke (Verts/ALE). – Madam President, let's be honest. A lot of people are tired; a lot of people are exhausted. They want to move on. They think that, if we do not grant the extension, then we can go about other business and we can actually get rid of all this drag that we have been seeing in the last month and in the last years.

But, let us make no mistake. If we do not grant this extension and if there is a no-deal Brexit, none of this nightmare would be over. The question of the border between Northern Ireland and the Republic of Ireland would not be solved, the budgetary questions would not be solved, and the question of the EU and UK citizens and what their future is going to be would not be solved. So now is not the moment for short-sightedness. Now is the moment for solidarity with the hundreds of thousands of British citizens who are marching in the streets. They are calling on us and counting on us to grant this extension in order to give them time to get out of this deadlock and find a solution to this mess that we are in.

(Applause)

President. – I think you get the prize for sticking exactly to your time. Well done!

Zdzisław Krasnodębski (ECR). – Szanowna Pani Przewodnicząca! Przysłuchując się tej debacie, zadaję sobie pytanie: jaki wniosek można z niej wyciągnąć? Na co powinniśmy się przygotować? Otóż wniosek jest następujący: powinniśmy się przygotować na jak najgorszy scenariusz, czyli brak porozumienia. Rzekomo nikt tego nie chce, ale prawdopodobnie jest to scenariusz, który nas czeka.

Chciałem podkreślić tylko jedną rzecz: odpowiedzialność, odpowiedzialność za ten historyczny moment i za tę katastrofę, której rozmiarów nie możemy jeszcze przewidzieć, spadnie na obie strony. I mam nadzieję, że pan Jean-Claude Juncker i pan Barnier, nasz główny negocjator, również sobie zdają z tego sprawę.

Ja uważam, że negocjacje powinny zostać jak najszybciej wznowione i przeprowadzone, żeby uniknąć tej konsekwencji, która nam grozi. A odkładanie terminu brexitu w nieskończoność również prowadzi donikąd, do jeszcze większego chaosu i do niepewności prawnej, więc proszę Panów, żeby podjęli odpowiednie działania.

Paulo Rangel (PPE). – Madam President, it is evident that we didn't want the exit of the United Kingdom and, even if we regret it, we fully respect the choice of British people. All the negotiations were carried out in a true spirit of cooperation and good faith, finding the best solutions for both sides. All this time, very much due to the stolidity, serenity and true British phlegm of Michel Barnier, we have shown goodwill, good faith and respect.

If any European politician or leader has not respected, on any occasion, the British position or institutions, that is regrettable. Please read our lips: we are open to consider your proposals, if you present them. We are open to an extension, if that is justified. You can believe us; we want to make your life easier, but we expect reciprocity. It is time to urge Prime Minister Johnson. It is unfortunate that you decided to turn to American superheroes to express the inclination of the British Government when you have much better sources of inspiration in modern and popular British literature.

Mr Johnson, do you really believe that what we need here now are the hard skills of the Incredible Hulk? Wouldn't the skills of the very British, much smarter and magical Harry Potter serve you better, Mr Johnson?

(The President cut off the speaker)

(The speaker agreed to take a blue-card question under Rule 171(8))

Ben Habib (NI), blue-card question. – For three years we've heard that the EU is a rules-based system. Mr Rangel mentioned the preparedness of the EU to negotiate with us a new form of withdrawal agreement, perhaps some alteration to the backstop. But I just want to remind this Chamber that, by its own volition, clause 12 of the agreement which gives effect to the extension until 31 October prohibits any opening of the Withdrawal Agreement and any further renegotiation of that agreement. So how is it that this rules-based system can take that approach?

President. – I am not going to ask you to even answer that because the question came after the 30 seconds. The rest was a statement.

Javier Moreno Sánchez (S&D). – Señora presidenta, el Reino Unido quedará sumido en el caos si acaba produciéndose un *Brexit* duro que nace —recordémoslo— de las mentiras de unos dirigentes políticos irresponsables que engañaron a sus ciudadanos y que han llevado al actual Gobierno a vulnerar los pilares de su propia democracia, cerrando el Parlamento británico.

Ante este contrasentido histórico, que perjudicará tremendamente a todos los ciudadanos europeos, y especialmente a los británicos, la posición de la delegación socialista española es clara y contundente, en línea con la propuesta de Resolución que vamos a votar hoy: «No» a un *Brexit* duro. «Sí» a una salida ordenada, basada en el Acuerdo de Retirada sellado por los Veintisiete.

Un acuerdo no negociable que garantiza, ante todo, la salvaguardia de los derechos y la protección de nuestros ciudadanos. Un acuerdo que preserva la paz en Irlanda mediante el *backstop* para evitar el restablecimiento de una frontera física con Irlanda del Norte y garantizar la integridad del mercado interior de la Unión.

Señorías, el tiempo apremia. Por eso, apelo a la responsabilidad y al sentido de Estado del Gobierno británico para enderezar el timón. Aún estamos a tiempo. Puede haber marcha atrás.

(La presidenta retira la palabra al orador).

Nicola Beer (Renew). – Madam President, the scenario of a no-deal Brexit is real. Among the relevant political groups of this House we all agree on the catastrophic consequences of a hard Brexit, in particular for the citizens of Ireland and the British overseas territories, not forgetting, of course, the United Kingdom itself.

The work on contingency measures is in full swing and I particularly appreciate the Commission's recent proposals to provide support to small and medium-sized enterprises. This should be done comprehensively.

But, above all, I sincerely congratulate our colleagues in the British Parliament on their determination to put their Prime Minister in his place. This move gives hope – hope for an orderly withdrawal agreement or even for a second chance for them to remain as a part of the European Union. We all, together, should take this chance, and God save the United Kingdom.

(Applause)

Benoît Biteau (Verts/ALE). – Madame la Présidente, chers collègues, l'hypothèse d'une sortie du Royaume-Uni sans accord n'est plus à écarter. Dès le 1^{er} novembre, les conséquences pour l'agriculture européenne et la pêche seront considérables. Elles sont pourtant très mal évaluées. Ce qui est certain, c'est que les secteurs de la viande bovine, des produits laitiers et des vins et spiritueux seront les plus fortement touchés.

Le Brexit risque d'être une crise sans précédent, et nous avançons dans le brouillard et sans boussole.

Les producteurs irlandais de viande bovine sont au bord du gouffre, comme l'a relevé notre collègue Flanagan tout à l'heure. Le commissaire à l'agriculture Phil Hogan en a d'ailleurs parfaitement conscience. Il a déjà pesé de tout son poids pour arracher une aide de 50 millions d'euros sur le budget agricole en 2020 pour amortir ce choc. Les inquiétudes de M. Hogan sont légitimes. La Commission européenne doit donc d'urgence présenter devant ce Parlement un projet global pour soutenir tous les paysans européens touchés par ce Brexit.

Veronika Vrecionová (ECR). – Paní předsedající, za necelý měsíc a půl dojde k brexitu. Tento fakt je znám a měli by se s tím smířit i ti, kteří si brexit nepřejí. Rada poslanců v tomto sále prosazuje přímou demokracii. Zdůrazňuji, že já mezi ně nepatřím. Referendum je jejím nejčistším prostředkem, a pokud k němu sáhneme, je potřeba respektovat jeho výsledek. Evropská komise a Rada by měly využít zbývající čas k nalezení dohody, která zabrání tomu tzv. tvrdému brexitu. Ten poškodí nejen Velkou Británii, ale také zbývající státy Evropské unie, jejich občany – naše občany a firmy. Aby byla dohoda uzavřena, musí s ní souhlasit obě strany. Je evidentní, že se stávajícím návrhem Velká Británie nesouhlasí. Tato dohoda se proto musí změnit. Považuji za nebezpečné stále trvat na něčem, co nefunguje.

Esther de Lange (PPE). – Madam President, as you know, the reason I went into politics was called foot-and-mouth disease, an animal disease which, as they do, does not stop at borders and which touched my country, the Netherlands, yours, Ireland and also France and the United Kingdom at the beginning of this century. Hundreds of thousands, even millions, of farm animals were killed on account of a disease against which they could have been easily vaccinated, and the outcry that this created in rural areas was not heard in London because the British Government at the time did not want to change the so-called non-vaccination policy. So it was this House which represented the interests of both Europeans and British in order to change that policy, and which worked together with places like Northumberland and the Scottish Borders.

Fast-forward 20 years, and the constructive, pro-European Tories I worked with at the time have been purged from their party by people who can't even be bothered to attend this full debate. Westminster is closed for business and it is once more this Parliament that is representing the interests of both British and European citizens. And, like a majority – a majority – of British citizens, this House doesn't want a no-deal Brexit either.

But let me also be very clear: we will not accept access into our European market for products with lax financial oversight, in the case of the financial sector, or low environmental standards and low animal-health standards. And if you want to know why, go and ask the farmers in Friesland and Northumberland alike.

(Applause)

Miapetra Kumpula-Natri (S&D). – Madam President, membership or not, the British remain among us and we live together. We are the representatives of citizens from the different Member States, we take this seriously and we cooperate with our British colleagues here deeply and in a warm way. Parliamentarianism needs to be protected. It is the core of democracy. In Parliament, different ideas meet and then we look at a way forward. In a western democracy, governments represent the will of the majority of the parliament.

In the UK, a law designed to stop a no-deal Brexit passed in both Houses of the UK Parliament. So, in principle, we should not worry, but now it seems that Prime Minister Johnson is trying to take control away from his parliament, to take control away from the British. The new UK leadership is still flirting with the idea of a no-deal Brexit and they appear to have become more hard line. The EU should remain calm, principled, united and reasonable. We cannot decide on behalf of the Brits, but we will give them time if they want to clear this mess up.

Dita Charanzová (Renew). – Paní předsedající, nebudu opakovat řečené. Myslím si, že naprostá většina z nás si brexit nepřeje. Někteří stále doufáme, že k němu možná vůbec nedojde. Obávám se ale, že britský ministerský předseda je připraven hodit Spojené království přes palubu. Odejít bez dohody. Nic horšího by se nemohlo stát. Komise proto musí pokračovat v přípravě i na tento scénář. Ale nejen to. Komise a členské státy musí mít krizový plán pro evropský byznys. Nenechat ho padat spolu s brexitem. Musíme trvat na právech více než tří milionů občanů EU, kteří dnes žijí na ostrovech ve velké existenční nejistotě. Neví, do jaké Británie se 1. listopadu probudí. Britská politika brexitu připomíná hledání jednorožce. Nic neplatí. Mění se termíny, odvolává se dohodnuté, řeší schválené. Čas utíká velmi rychle a nelze se divit, že EU dochází trpělivost.

Zbigniew Kuźmiuk (ECR). – Pani Przewodnicząca! Zabierając głos w tej debacie, chciałbym zwrócić uwagę na trzy moim zdaniem najważniejsze negatywne konsekwencje wyjścia Wielkiej Brytanii bez umowy.

Po pierwsze, niepewność co do praw obywateli Unii mieszkających na terenie Wielkiej Brytanii. W umowie były one zagwarantowane na tym samym poziomie co obecnie. Prawdopodobny brak w kolejnych unijnych budżetach kwoty ok. 50 miliardów euro, które Wielka Brytania zgodziła się zapłacić jako zobowiązania za lata 2019-2020, a także części zobowiązań po roku 2020.

Problemy w handlu z Wielką Brytanią. Unia Europejska ma ogromną nadwyżkę w tym handlu. W 2017 roku wynosiła ona ok. 100 miliardów funtów. Brak porozumienia oznacza, że będzie on musiał być prowadzony w oparciu o reguły WTO, a więc z wprowadzeniem ceł, kontyngentów wwozowych czy innych ograniczeń pozataryfowych. Wydaje się, że choćby z tych trzech powodów należałoby także ze strony Unii dążyć do tego, aby wyjście Wielkiej Brytanii odbywało się jednak na podstawie wynegocjowanej umowy ze zmienioną deklaracją polityczną, w której znajdują się gesty dobrej woli adresowane do Wielkiej Brytanii.

Luděk Niedermayer (PPE). – Madam President, I guess everything important about Brexit has been said. The position of the EU 27, the Council, Parliament and the Commission is clear and transparent and stable. Still, we should not miss the opportunity to reach an agreement – an agreement that will reduce the cost of Brexit for all Europeans. By this I mean also Europeans from the UK as well as from the continent. If an extension would increase the chance of such a result, we should grant it.

Still, I guess there are things that we should learn from our friends from London that can make our society better and avoid the crisis that is ongoing in London.

First of all, I believe that politicians should sometimes admit that personal interest and power – even victory in elections – are less important than the future of the country and society.

Second, I believe – and this is not just for politicians – we should talk to each other more, at least in situations where our views are not so different. We should construct bridges rather than build walls.

Last but not least, we should promote a culture that prefers the facts and truth over lies. This is very important. We should, together with civil society, schools, experts and other parts of society, make sure that the current alarming trend where lies are rewarded over the truth will not continue and will be changed, and that the biggest liars will not become presidents or prime ministers.

Bogusław Liberadzki (S&D). – Pani Przewodnicząca! Nie kwestionuję prawa Zjednoczonego Królestwa do wyjścia z Unii Europejskiej, natomiast zwracam uwagę na coś takiego jak odpowiedzialność polityczna za losy Europy. I tą odpowiedzialnością polityczną za losy Europy Komisja Europejska, Parlament i Rada się kierują. Czyli bronimy naszych obywateli (chcę powiedzieć, że prawie milion Polaków mieszka na Wyspach Brytyjskich), chronimy nasz przemysł, handel, transport, nasze interesy gospodarcze.

Natomiast ten brak odpowiedzialności jest cechą charakterystyczną dla rządu Wielkiej Brytanii. Odnoszę wrażenie, że rząd brytyjski sądzi, iż pokój czy wojna w Irlandii to jest nasza powinność, nasz problem, że to nie jest problem brytyjski. Brytyjczycy chcą zachować korzyści, nie chcą natomiast podzielić się odpowiedzialnością. Nie mamy konstruktywnych projektów rozwiązań. Po brexicie życie się będzie toczyć. Podstawowa rzecz to zaufanie. I starajcie się, rządzie brytyjski, takie zaufanie u nas wzbudzać, bo bez tego zaufania nie będzie dobrego rozwiązania.

Ilhan Kyuchyuk (Renew). – Madam President, three years after the referendum, British citizens are sending us a strong signal that Mr Nigel Farage is not the voice of British society. Every day, they are expressing vocal opposition to Brexit, and the presence of so many pro-European British MEPs in this Parliament is the real proof of the fact. A change is much needed now, because Brexit continues to be pursued for Tory advantage, but without a plan on how to deliver it.

By insisting that the backstop be removed from the Withdrawal Agreement, but without proposing a working solution, the UK Government refuses to secure an orderly withdrawal. Families, children, students and all our citizens want to have certainty. More than three million non-British EU citizens – of whom a quarter of a million are from my home country of Bulgaria – have been living in legal limbo, but also in frustration, anxiety and disappointment, since the referendum. As we all see, Brexit is a bad idea and it should be stopped.

Kris Peeters (PPE). – Voorzitter, er is al veel gezegd, maar één ding is duidelijk, en wel dat de brexit ons voor een grote uitdaging stelt. Een *no deal* zet 1,2 miljoen jobs op de tocht in de Europese Unie en voor België alleen wijst een schatting op een banenverlies van 42 000, waarvan 28 000 in Vlaanderen. Vooral de kmo's zullen het zwaar te verduren hebben. Wij merken allemaal dat de Britse regering geen uitweg meer ziet in hun zelfgekozen brexit. En nu de onvoorspelbaarheid groter is dan ooit moeten wij Europa voorbereiden op een *no deal* in het belang van de bedrijven en de Europeanen.

De Europese Commissie heeft op 4 september een aantal voorstellen gedaan inzake het Fonds voor de globalisering en het Solidariteitsfonds, om daar geld voor vrij te maken. Maar het is heel belangrijk dat ook kleine en middelgrote ondernemingen hiervan kunnen genieten. In punt 14 van de ontwerp-resolutie die voorligt en die ik volledig onderschrijf, is heel duidelijk omschreven en wordt ervoor gepleit dat dit Parlement de financiële ondersteuning van kleine en middelgrote ondernemingen in geval van een *no deal* snel mogelijk moet maken, waarbij wij er wel van uitgaan dat die de volgende dagen en weken nog afgewend kan worden.

Tonino Picula (S&D). – Poštovana predsjedavajuća, prošle su tri godine od referenduma o Brexitu. Vjerujem da je većina u ovom Domu bila iznenađena rezultatom jer su željeli drugačiji rezultat. No, dogodila se podrška onima koji dugo vremena u Bruxellesu vide dežurnog krivca za domaće konflikte. Ali ni nakon tri godine od referenduma Ujedinjena Kraljevina nije spremna preuzeti odgovornost za Brexit ili odgovornost za odustajanje od istog. Pregovori su zaključeni, čestitke gospodinu Barnieru na obavljenom poslu, Europska unija je svoje pozicije utvrdila.

S druge strane Kanala vladaju potpuno drugačije prilike, politički kaos i neizvjesnost, i to u zemlji koja je u velikoj mjeri udarila temelje parlamentarnom sustavu i demokratskom odlučivanju, u zemlji čiji je Parlament danas suspendiran. Danas je tamo teško razlikovati što je smisljena strategija, a što tek politički blef u bijegu od odgovornosti. Jedno je sigurno: što god da se dogodi s Brexitom, rezultat ne smije ugroziti koheziju Europske unije koju smo uspješno postigli u ovom pitanju.

Vladimír Bilčík (PPE). – Madam President, European citizens are in the core DNA of this Parliament and it is our essential duty to protect them whenever we can. This Parliament has always supported the united EU approach to dealing with Brexit and its negative consequences for the lives of Europeans, and I am glad that the proposed parliamentary declaration maintains the emphasis on the unity of the EU27.

However, I do feel it is even more important to maintain the unified European approach to Brexit especially now, in order to protect citizens from all EU Member States, smaller and larger, who are residing in Britain. In particular, we have to be strongly united in our insistence that the UK Government exert the utmost effort to offer the settled status to all qualified EU citizens without any unnecessary technical hurdles and political delays.

At the same time, we in the EU must be united in facing the potential consequences of a hard Brexit for the rights of all European citizens in the UK. However much we strive to avoid a hard Brexit, we must be ready to face it together in unity for the sake of equal protection of all EU citizens, should we be confronted with a worst-case scenario of the UK's departure from the Union.

Let's remember that the unity of the EU27 has been at the core of our successful negotiations with London and we must, therefore, reinforce it in the run-up to the most difficult decisions on Brexit.

Evelyn Regner (S&D). – Frau Präsidentin! Seit drei Jahren haben die Brexit-Hardliner keinen Plan, wie sie die Europäische Union verlassen wollen. Wir warnen hier in diesem Haus: Ein *no-deal* wird alle treffen. Die Europäische Union garantiert im Arbeitsrecht die Gleichheit von Mann und Frau, Arbeitnehmerrechte, Mutterschutz, Teilzeit, Elternzeit, Gewerkschaftsrechte. Mit einem harten Brexit wird diese Garantie wegfallen.

Zu den größten Verlierern des *no-deal* werden vor allem Frauen in Großbritannien gehören. Sie sind nicht so mobil wie Männer, sie sind häufiger in sozialen Berufen, sie sind häufiger im Gesundheitsbereich, im Handel beschäftigt, und sie beziehen häufiger Sozialleistungen für sich und ihre Familienangehörigen.

Deshalb: Solange wir eine Hand ausstrecken können, sollten wir dies tun. Eine ausgestreckte Hand ist immer besser als die zynische, selbstzerstörerische *come-what-may-come*-Mentalität.

Γεώργιος Κύρτσος (PPE). – Κυρία Πρόεδρε, νομίζω ότι το θρίλερ του Brexit έχει κοινά σημεία με το θρίλερ του Grexit το 2015 και ο Boris Johnson, αν και είναι τελείως διαφορετικός από πολιτική άποψη, έχει κοινά σημεία στην τακτική του με τον Αλέξη Τσίπρα. Και οι δύο έβαλαν το κομματικό συμφέρον πάνω από το εθνικό συμφέρον. Και οι δύο για ένα διάστημα υποκρίθηκαν ότι διαπραγματεύονταν, ενώ, ουσιαστικά, πηγαινοέρχονταν στις πρωτεύουσες. Και οι δύο υποκρίθηκαν ότι δεν τους ενδιέφεραν οι συνέπειες των πράξεών τους και ότι δεν είχαν αίσθηση του ρίσκου.

Ο Τσίπρας όμως προς τιμήν του έκανε την τελευταία, έστω, στιγμή μια στροφή 180 μοιρών, πιεζόμενος από εμάς, πιεζόμενος από τη σκληρή πραγματικότητα και βοηθούμενος από τον Πρόεδρο Juncker. Δυστυχώς, δεν νομίζω ότι ο κύριος Johnson θα ακολουθήσει το καλό παράδειγμα του κυρίου Τσίπρα και πιστεύω ότι δεν θα βελτιώσει την πολιτική του. Θεωρώ λοιπόν ότι πρέπει να παρακολουθούμε το βρετανικό Κοινοβούλιο, τον βρετανικό λαό και τη βρετανική νεολαία και να τους στείλουμε το μήνυμα ότι είμαστε μαζί τους.

Christel Schaldemose (S&D). – Fru Formand! Tak for det. Storbritannien vil forlade EU. Det synes jeg personligt er rigtig ærgerligt, men det er Briternes beslutning, og det skal vi selvfølgelig respektere. Men hvor er det både ærgerligt – ja det er nærmest utilgiveligt – hvis den udmeldelse skal finde sted på en måde, hvor det bliver et hårdt brexit. Det får kæmpestore konsekvenser for utrolig mange mennesker på begge sider af kanalen. Det kommer til at koste jobs, det kommer til at berøre familier og studerende, det kommer til at gå ud over vores forskning. Jeg beder indtrængende om, at vi kan give det lidt mere tid, så vi kan finde en løsning på brexit, så det ikke behøver være et hårdt brexit, men at vi kan håndtere det på en måde, som ikke går ud over vores borgere og vores erhvervsliv. Jeg vil derfor stemme for den beslutning, der betyder, at vi opfordrer til, at vi får lidt mere tid til at få forhandlet en aftale på plads. Lad os nu ikke få et hårdt brexit, det er ikke til fordel for nogen som helst. Tak.

Jörgen Warborn (PPE). – Fru talman! Det finns mycket att säga om brexit men jag ska begränsa mig till två punkter. Min första punkt gäller handelsrelationerna. Storbritannien är Sveriges femte största handelspartner och den här handeln skapar naturligtvis jobb och välbefinnande i hela Europa. Men om redan 43 dagar och cirka 13 och en halv timma riskerar vi att få en hård brexit och detta skulle naturligtvis slå mot jobben och minska vårt välbefinnande.

Vidare så är jag glad att det finns skrivningar i resolutionen om att man kan förlänga tidsfristen. Samtidigt är det ju bra att det finns villkor till den här förlängningen, men jag tycker att vi ska tolka förlängningsvillkoren så generöst som möjligt när vi nu får en begäran från britterna. Helst ser jag att britterna stannar kvar i unionen, men oavsett vilken relation EU och Storbritannien kommer att ha i framtiden så kommer jag att kämpa för att handelsrelationerna ska vara så goda som möjligt.

Heléne Fritzon (S&D). – Fru talman! Läget i Storbritannien är allvarligt. Om några veckor kan Brexit innebära att Storbritannien faktiskt kraschar ur EU. Ett brexit utan avtal kommer allvarligt att skada både brittiska och europeiska intressen, men också mina svenska intressen.

Konsekvenserna vet vi. För både människor och företag blir följderna av en hård brexit mycket stora. I mitt land har vi till exempel 100 000 svenskar som befinner sig i Storbritannien för att arbeta eller studera och som varje dag är oroliga för sin framtid. För alla briter är det också en mycket osäker framtid. Europaparlamentets resolution är mycket balanserad och den betonar de viktiga krav som vi tidigare har ställt för ett utträde. Avtalet finns där och med en öppenhet om den politiska deklARATIONEN så kan vi värna vår framtid.

Jag vill uppmana Boris Johnson: ta det ansvar som man gör när man sitter i en regering! Se till landets bästa!

David McAllister (PPE). – Madam President, I would like to underline a lot of things that have been said by colleagues this morning, but I would like to add mention of one dimension to a no-deal Brexit when it comes to foreign policy.

Michel Barnier was referring to the political declaration and, yes, in the political declaration the EU and the UK have agreed on a broad future relationship with a free-trade area, police and judicial cooperation, and close cooperation on foreign policy, external security and defence. Following a no-deal Brexit, the United Kingdom could no longer collaborate in existing and future projects of the European Defence Agency or in military projects under Permanent Structured Cooperation (PESCO). Moreover, it would be difficult for UK defence companies to participate in projects under the European Defence Fund.

These are additional arguments, dear colleagues from the far right, why it is so important to avoid a no-deal under all circumstances. I would like to welcome this motion for a resolution and I would like to thank our colleagues in the Brexit Steering Group for once again doing a great job.

(Applause)

Seb Dance (S&D). – Madam President, let's be clear about where the blame for this mess lies. You start with impossible promises, saying we can keep the existing trade relationship with Europe, but rip up the rulebook. You then say we can negotiate from a position of strength despite leaving the world's largest economic bloc. You then decry all opponents of this fantasy as traitors, and you move on to say the British people voted for medicine and food shortages. They did not. The country I love is better than Johnson, it's better than them.

Mr Barnier, you wish to move on, we all wish to move on, and I know many of my colleagues are fed up with this debacle. I get it, I understand it. But let's not pretend that the Withdrawal Agreement would be sustainable without public sign-off. The British people need to put the reality of Brexit up against remaining in the European Union. Give us the time and give us the options. That's the only sustainable way forward.

Radosław Sikorski (PPE). – Madam President, I'd like to start by congratulating Mr Barnier for the professional way in which he has conducted these negotiations. The authors of Brexit said that they would be cutting themselves off from a corpse. We've proven to be a very lively corpse. Well done! It looks to me like a deal is within reach. The point at which British red lines and our red lines are coinciding is the wish for no hard border in Ireland, and therefore the solution is for there to be a Northern Ireland-only backstop by whatever name. I understand that we would be willing to go along with that, so a deal depends on whether or not the British political process can accede to that. I hope it does.

The Brexiteers, the English nationalists, cheer for a no-deal Brexit. Your own government says it will be a disaster. I only have one statement for Mr Farage and his accomplices: if you get your way, and the British Government proves to be correct in its assessment of a no deal Brexit, don't blame us for the consequences. I support the motion.

Domènec Ruiz Devesa (S&D). – Madam President, almost 70 years ago we Europeans decided to establish our political union, and we did so because we knew this was the best way to preserve peace in Europe and also to tackle transnational challenges that now are very obvious to us, like climate change. Unfortunately, in 2016, in the Brexit referendum, a narrow majority in the UK voted for leave. At the time it was said that this was an existential crisis of the European Union. But now, three years afterwards we see that the existential crisis indeed is in the United Kingdom. The Union is as strong as ever, as others have said before me, and now the question is: is Boris Johnson ready to fulfil the legal obligation deriving from the bill approved in the House of Commons?

We certainly hope so, because a no-deal Brexit will be catastrophic.

Frances Fitzgerald (PPE). – Madam President, what many forget and others choose to ignore is that beneath the soundbites and the strong-man politics, there are real people, women and men, families, whose livelihoods and business – and indeed very safety – are at risk, as well as the peace on which these livelihoods are built.

This European Union, this democracy, has been clear from day one that it is determined to do all it can, deal or no deal, to avoid the need for a border and to protect the peace process. Remember, an international treaty underpins this peace process, and co-guarantors. We can never forget that. We know that any additional ideas put forward by the UK will be strongly welcomed and examined by the European Commission. However, this European Parliament will not give its consent to any withdrawal agreement that does not contain the safeguards outlined in the backstop. To date, the backstop is the only solution on the table that avoids any physical infrastructure. As the great Mr John Hume, a former office holder both of this parliament and Westminster, once said: 'when people are divided, the only solution is agreement.'

Catch-the-eye procedure

Michaela Šojdrová (PPE). – Paní předsedající, víme všichni, že odchod Británie znamená oslabení pro EU a znamená také oslabení pro Spojené království. Nechápu, jak může pan Farage tvrdit, že Spojené království bude silnější, že to pro něj bude výhodné. Ano, možná vůči malým evropským zemím, ale určitě nebude ve výhodnějším postavení vůči Spojeným státům, Číně či Rusku. Nebude, bude slabší Spojené království. Proto mě velmi mrzí tento přístup. A já jsem si jistá, že občané, když rozhodovali v referendu, tak nerozhodovali pro tento chaos, pro neřízený odchod, který znamená obrovskou nejistotu. A odejde-li Británie skutečně bez dohody, pak stejně bude muset jednat o nové dohodě, aby naplnila podmínky, které jsou zásadní, tzn. finanční vyrovnání, vyřešila postavení milionů občanů EU, kteří jsou v Británii. Takže odchod bez dohody je katastrofou pro obě strany.

Julie Ward (S&D). – Madam President, under the Johnson premiership we are witnessing the decline of decency in the age of populism. Johnson is a most disreputable Prime Minister, and an embarrassment both to his party and to country. A misogynist, a homophobe, an Islamophobe, a dangerous clown – a dangerous clown chosen by less than 2% of our population. He plays fast and loose with people's lives. His no-deal Brexit threatens shortages of food and life-saving drugs, threatens peaceful coexistence. Yes, Brexit will cost lives, as well as livelihoods – and it already has.

We have a government policy decided by an unelected advisor, Dominic Cummings, who is a man in contempt of our parliament. Is this taking back control? We have a government that is eroding trust in our institutions, from the civil servants to the courts, judges, our democratic foundations ...

(The President cut off the speaker)

Bill Newton Dunn (Renew). – Madam President, I have a question for Commissioner Barnier. I'm not sure if he's got an opportunity to reply in this debate, but quite simply: if there is no deal, is it correct to say that exchange of information between Europol, our policing centre, and all UK police forces, would stop, and therefore that the opportunities for organised crime in the UK would be much, much greater?

Ellie Chowns (Verts/ALE). – Madam President, I want to start by apologising for the behaviour of a small minority of my compatriots, both in this Chamber and in my country. They do not represent the decent, polite and pro-European majority of my people.

(Applause from certain quarters)

Brexit is a mess created entirely by leavers because they've never been able to agree on what type of Brexit they wanted. It's a mess that has laid bare the broken nature of UK politics. We need a people's vote so that the British people can finally choose between one clear leave option and remain, which is by far the best deal for us. We therefore need more time. No deal, crashing out, cannot be an option. It would be an act of catastrophic self-harm. So I urge colleagues to do everything possible, whatever their role, to help us avoid such an outcome. Just as we in the UK are doing on the streets...

(The President cut off the speaker)

Hermann Tertsch (ECR). – Señora presidenta, yo quería advertir sobre los intentos de presentar la Unión Europea como una unidad que es vigilada por unos savonarolas como el señor Verhofstadt, porque eso podría asustar a otros que nos sentimos cómodos todavía en la Unión Europea y queremos reformarla. Queremos reformarla, queremos que evolucione, pero queremos estar dentro. Desde luego, si oímos el tono de algunos y la falta de respeto hacia la voluntad de los británicos, que ya ha sido expresada y que debe respetarse, asusta un poquito.

Por eso creo que es importante que se llegue a un acuerdo. Es verdad que va a ser difícil, pero tiene que haber un esfuerzo de buena voluntad, porque vamos a tener que coexistir con los británicos, que son una pieza fundamental de la defensa occidental, del mundo occidental, y con ellos vamos a tener que compartir muchísimas cosas, no solo el mercado, no solo el comercio, no solo la defensa, sino el futuro. No rompamos tantas lanzas en este momento. Es importante la convivencia y el respeto.

José Gusmão (GUE/NGL). – Senhora Presidente, os britânicos pronunciaram-se, em referendo, sobre o Brexit e, portanto, este Parlamento não tem o direito de exercer pressão ou de dar opiniões sobre o resultado desse referendo.

Este Parlamento tem a obrigação de respeitar esse resultado, porque é de respeito pela democracia de que estamos a falar. E as intervenções que não vão nesse sentido não são um bom contributo para podermos ter uma solução amigável e negociada para o Brexit.

No entanto, não é obrigação nem do nosso ponto de vista de direito deste Parlamento, associar-se à irresponsabilidade do Primeiro-Ministro britânico em querer provocar uma saída sem acordo que põe em causa o Acordo da Sexta-feira Santa – que, convém recordar, é um acordo de paz – e põe em causa os direitos dos imigrantes europeus no Reino Unido e dos imigrantes britânicos na União Europeia.

Esses direitos têm que ser defendidos e as instituições europeias, a começar pelo Parlamento Europeu, têm a responsabilidade de defender todos esses cidadãos mesmo com uma saída sem acordo.

Francisco José Millán Mon (PPE). – Señora presidenta, se ha mencionado la importancia de las consecuencias negativas que el *Brexit* tendrá para las dos partes en muchos ámbitos. Yo quisiera detenerme en las relaciones pesqueras entre la Unión Europea y el Reino Unido, que tan bien conoce el negociador principal, el señor Barnier.

Si finalmente el *Brexit* tiene lugar sin que entre en vigor el Acuerdo de Retirada y la transición prevista, debemos minimizar los daños para la flota pesquera que faena en aguas del Reino Unido. Me gustaría que, a través de las medidas de contingencia que tomemos una y otra parte, pueda asegurarse el acceso, mantenerse el acceso a estas aguas, al menos de forma temporal, mientras se negocian los acuerdos de la relación futura entre unos y otros. Sí, ya sé que no les gusta, pero a nosotros sí.

Y aquí voy a detenerme un momento. Quiero enfatizar que uno de los objetivos de la Unión Europea debe ser alcanzar un acuerdo que mantenga ese acceso recíproco entre aguas y a los recursos pesqueros. Este acuerdo tendría ventajas para los pescadores y también permitiría ...

(La presidenta retira la palabra al orador).

James Wells (NI). – Madam President, the defence of any country and the means to conduct that defence are a central attribute of sovereignty and are the first responsibility of any government. I am therefore very concerned that the May government collaborated with the Commission – after the UK voted to leave – to lock Britain’s defence and intelligence capabilities into the various EU structures. That is intended to subordinate Britain’s intelligence and defence capabilities under the control of an unaccountable Commission. This is crystal clear in the political declaration, Clauses 104 to 106, which is an integral part of the binding law of the Withdrawal Agreement under Article 184.

I am extremely concerned that UK MPs have failed by a dereliction of their duty to understand this threat, and I would therefore urge our MPs in the UK in the strongest terms to reject any attempt to bring back this awful deal and deliver a clean Brexit.

Jude Kirton-Darling (S&D). – Madam President, this week we saw the British Prime Minister hide from British citizens in Luxembourg, who will be acutely affected by his bombast and ego. He’s hiding from parliamentary debate in Westminster. So it’s reassuring that European democracy is alive and well in this House, with all views expressed, those that I agree with and those that I don’t agree with.

There are those who campaigned for a deal in 2016 — the best and quickest deal in history – who today are arguing for a so-called clean-break Brexit. There is no such thing. There will be nothing clean in the economic and social devastation this would bring, from the north-east of England to the Falkland Islands. Nothing clean for citizens’ rights, which should be ring-fenced now to protect people; and there will be nothing clean in the complete chaos in our health service and elsewhere.

Those people have no mandate and the British public should decide what happens next with Brexit.

(Applause)

(End of the catch-the-eye procedure)

PRESIDENZA DELL'ON. DAVID MARIA SASSOLI

Presidente

Michel Barnier, *négociateur en chef*. – Monsieur le Président, je peux être bref, mais néanmoins prendre une minute pour vous remercier, Mesdames et Messieurs les députés, au nom du président Juncker et au nom de toute l'équipe de négociation que j'ai l'honneur d'animer depuis trois ans.

Ce débat est important. Il se situe, on le comprend bien chacun, avec nos opinions différentes, quelques fois, comme un moment de vérité. Trois ans après le référendum, nous sommes dans un moment de vérité dans cette négociation. C'est un moment grave, où il nous faut rester extrêmement calmes et respectueux les uns des autres. Je continuerai à travailler comme cela.

Je voudrais, cependant, vous remercier pour vos interventions. Nous avons écouté attentivement toutes celles et tous ceux qui se sont exprimés, en particulier les parlementaires issus d'Irlande et d'Irlande du Nord, sur la question la plus grave, celle où il y a le plus de risques, je l'ai dit tout à l'heure, provoqués par le Brexit et puis la question des citoyens et la question sur laquelle nous ne transigerons jamais, celle de l'intégrité du marché unique et des quatre libertés qui vont ensemble. Merci pour vos interventions.

J'ai écouté aussi toutes celles et tous ceux qui se sont exprimés dans l'autre sens. Il y a une accusation à laquelle je veux répondre pour que les choses, une fois de plus, soient claires. Je le dis à M. Zanni qui n'est pas là, M. Farage, M. Madison et d'autres: personne ne cherche à contourner le choix d'une majorité des citoyens britanniques de quitter l'Union. Personne. Personne ne cherche à voler le Brexit. Personne ne cherche à maintenir contre son gré le Royaume-Uni dans l'Union européenne, dans l'union douanière ou dans le marché unique. C'est votre responsabilité de quitter. Nous le regrettons, on l'a dit des dizaines de fois, nous sommes très nombreux à regretter ce choix — je n'en ai jamais vu la valeur ajoutée -, mais nous le respectons.

Il faut que les choses soient claires et le mandat qui m'a été fixé par le Conseil européen avec le Parlement, et que j'assume, au nom de la Commission, avec la confiance du président Juncker et bientôt celle d'Ursula von der Leyen, c'est de trouver un accord. Mais cela exige deux choses, Mesdames et Messieurs les députés. Premièrement, de dire la vérité — ici, au Parlement, et aux citoyens — sur les conséquences du Brexit. Vous devez dire la vérité.

Vous parliez du respect des citoyens britanniques: les citoyens britanniques comme les autres citoyens européens ont droit à la vérité sur les conséquences du Brexit. Toutes les conséquences, qui sont beaucoup plus graves, beaucoup plus nombreuses que vous voulez bien le dire. Vous devez cette vérité et vous devrez rendre des comptes.

Après le Brexit, vous devrez rendre des comptes aux citoyens, comme nous devons en rendre compte. Alors nous nous préparons à dire cette vérité, nous l'avons toujours dite, sur les conséquences d'un Brexit avec un accord — auquel nous travaillons — et, évidemment avec des conséquences plus graves, d'un Brexit sans accord. Néanmoins, je réponds notamment à la question de M. Newton Dunn, comme à d'autres, nous avons préparé l'hypothèse d'un Brexit sans accord, y compris sur les questions de sécurité et de coopération avec Europol.

Évidemment le no deal n'est pas une destination, c'est un état temporaire et il faudra bien ensuite reprendre la discussion pour bâtir un partenariat.

J'ai donc travaillé depuis trois ans avec cette première exigence: dire, toujours et à tout le monde, la vérité. La seconde exigence est très simple: c'est de trouver des solutions juridiques. Car nous faisons un traité, on ne fait pas un discours, on ne fait pas une déclaration, nous faisons un traité. Il faut trouver des réponses juridiques sérieuses à toutes les questions provoquées par la séparation que vous avez choisie, qui est le Brexit, aussi bien en Irlande que dans tous les autres domaines, la pêche et bien d'autres, voilà et trouver des solutions concrètes et opérationnelles. Non pas des intentions, ni des vœux, mais des solutions concrètes et opérationnelles. C'est cela que nous attendons du premier ministre Boris Johnson et de son équipe: des propositions alternatives, comme l'a dit le président Juncker, pour que, si l'on conteste le backstop ou d'autres sujets, nous puissions répondre aux questions que provoque le Brexit. Telle est la seconde exigence avec laquelle je travaille.

Nous sommes prêts à continuer jour et nuit, personne ne doit douter de notre disponibilité. Et pour ce qui me concerne, aussi longtemps qu'on me fera confiance, je continuerai à travailler au nom de l'Union, avec cette responsabilité, cette sincérité et cette détermination.

Tytti Tuppurainen, *President-in-Office of the Council*. – Mr President, in spite of all the current uncertainty on the UK side, we have to remain open to new ideas, should they lead to a breakthrough consistent with our principles. Achieving an orderly withdrawal of the UK has to remain our priority until the very last moment, given the negative consequences of a hard Brexit. Until then, we have to continue our preparation for all eventualities, including through targeted measures at EU level, in order to reduce the potential impact on citizens and businesses.

However, we must also be ready to consider the extension of the Article 50 period if we receive a duly motivated request from the UK Government.

May I remind you that patience is a virtue. We will count on your cooperation at all the stages of these processes. Thank you very much for your opinions and remarks and for your attention.

Presidente. – Comunico di aver ricevuto due proposte di risoluzione conformemente all'articolo 132, paragrafo 2, del regolamento.

La discussione è chiusa.

La votazione si svolgerà mercoledì 18 settembre 2019.

Dichiarazioni scritte (articolo 171)

Attila Ara-Kovács (S&D), *írásban*. – A brexit állásáról lezajlott mai vita megmutatta: az fog előnyösebben kikerülni a brexit okozta konfliktusból, akit nem az érzelmek, hanem a megfontolt és tudatos döntések irányítanak. Az unió vezetői ehhez tartják magukat, miközben a Brexit Párt legfeljebb csak hangoskodással nyilvánít véleményt. Az is egyértelművé vált: Nagy-Britannia távozása iszonyú módon meggyengíti az Európai Parlamenten belüli szélsőjobbot, s ennyiben nem csekély a hozzáadéka.

Mindez egyszerre két egyértelmű vereséget jelent most Orbán Viktornak. Egyrészt sok szövetségest veszít azzal, hogy a brexiterék távoznak. Oda a lehetőség, ami a Fideszt az év elején olyannyira eltökélttette: képtelen lesz Matteo Salvini és Marine Le Pen módjára „átalakítani” az uniót laza szélsőjobbos nemzetállami kormányok klubjává. Ugyanakkor sejthető, hogy az Európai Néppártban betöltött tagság megőrzéséért cserébe, Orbán kénytelen beállni az unió brexit-politikája mögé.

Ez nagyon sokáig nem volt ennyire egyértelmű. Mit jelent ez? Azt, hogy tavasszal Salvinit árulta el, ősszel pedig most elárulja a brexitereket. Nehéz helyzet ez, s egyben kilátástalan a Fidesz számára, mely hónapokkal korábban még arról álmodott, hogy vezetőjéből, Orbán Viktorból nemsokára az uniós politikát meghatározó kulcsfigura válik.

Carmen Avram (S&D), *in writing*. – I supported and voted in favour of this resolution on Brexit. At the heart of my preoccupations and at the heart of all politicians' responsibilities both in the UK and in Europe there should be the rights and lives of citizens that will be affected by Brexit: whether a no-deal Brexit or a Brexit with a deal. Politicians should keep this as priority number one. This resolution recalls that safeguarding the rights and life choices, including the employment status and social entitlements, of EU citizens resident in the UK and British citizens resident in the EU27 remains its first priority and that all endeavours should be undertaken to try to ensure that those citizens are not affected by the UK's withdrawal from the EU. It encourages the UK and the EU27 to adopt measures that provide legal certainty for EU citizens resident in the UK and British citizens resident in the EU27, and recalls its position that the EU27 should pursue a consistent and generous approach in protecting the rights of British citizens resident in the Member States.

Vilija Blinkevičiūtė (S&D), raštu. – Iš Jūsų pasisakymo, gerbiamas Komisijos Pirmininke, nepanašu, jog nuo naujojo Jungtinės Karalystės premjero paskyrimo būtų padaryta daugiau pažangos ir suteikta daugiau aiškumo dėl išstojimo detalių. Artėjant Jungtinės Karalystės pasitraukimo laikui iš Europos Sąjungos situacija išlieka itin įtempta ir neaiški. Visiškai sutinku su Jumis, jog daugiau nei dvejus metus tebesitęsianti situacija kelia daug įtampos verslui bei mūsų piliečiams. Europos Sąjunga iš tiesų demonstruoja didelį solidarumą ir deda labai daug pastangų siekiant užtikrinti, kad „Brexit’as“ turėtų kuo mažesnę neigiamą poveikį tiek Jungtinei Karalystei, tiek ir pačiai Europos Sąjungai, tačiau to paties požiūrio pasigendame iš Jungtinės Karalystės pusės. Komisija atliko didžiulį darbą pateikdama pasiūlymus dėl „Brexit’o“. Aš pati esu pranešėja dėl Europos Globalizacijos Fondo, kuris bus pasiruošęs teikti pagalbą dėl „Brexit’o“ darbo netekusiems ES piliečiams. Labai tikiuosi, jog likus net labai mažai laiko racionalus sprendimas yra įmanomas, ir kad išvengsime Jungtinės Karalystės išstojimo be sutarties.

Josianne Cutajar (S&D), in writing. – Brexit is an unprecedented and regrettable event, which unfortunately, due to a sequence of wrong decisions by the UK Government, is turning into a negative epoch for the British political system. However, as a Socialist I must prioritise the needs of the millions of EU citizens working and studying in the UK, whose rights and well-being this Parliament is duty-bound to protect, with or without a deal. In this light and despite the fact that politically the ball is in the UK Government's court, I firmly believe that our intentions and efforts should be directed to break the deadlock and not allow a no-deal Brexit. We ought to provide legal certainties to our people instead of leaving our businesses importing/exporting to UK with questions on customs and our expats with unresolved status, whilst inducing the risks of a hard Irish border. If this Parliament intends to follow reason in this case, especially following the UK Parliament's Act on 9th September 2019, an extension of talks is the reasonable path we ought to take to safeguard the well-being of millions of persons along with the smooth continuation of European enterprises' operations.

Maria Grapini (S&D), în scris. – Sunt de acord cu declarația Consiliului, care este clară și fermă privind Brexitul. Clară a fost și poziția Comisiei și a Parlamentului. Instituțiile europene nu au dorit Brexitul și, cu atât mai mult, nu-și doresc o ieșire dezordonată. Cu toții suntem și cetățeni europeni, pe lângă cetățenia națională pe care o avem. Avem responsabilitatea să reprezentăm interesul cetățenilor. De aceea, cer Comisiei, negociatorului desemnat pentru Brexit și Consiliului să asigure protejarea cetățenilor europeni ce trăiesc în Marea Britanie, precum și a cetățenilor Marii Britanii ce trăiesc în țările UE. Trebuie asigurată integritatea pieței interne.

Marea Britanie trebuie să semneze un acord comercial cu UE prin care va trebui să respecte condițiile și standardele de produs din UE. Responsabilitatea efectelor negative asupra cetățenilor Marii Britanii, și trebuie să o spunem clar și explicit cetățenilor, este a acelor politicieni care au manipulat cu informații înșelătoare, spunând că Marea Britanie va avea acces liber la piață, că vor rămâne cu aceleași drepturi, dar vor câștiga pentru că nu vor mai cotiza la bugetul UE. Ca român, știu că România are schimburi comerciale considerabile și acestea vor avea de suferit. UE pierde un membru important al UE, dar este obligată să respecte tratatul.

Robert Hajšel (S&D), písomne – Mnohí si myslíme, že pre všetkých by bolo lepšie, keby Spojené kráľovstvo ostalo v EÚ aj naďalej, ale ak britská vláda opierajúca sa o výsledky slobodného referenda chce doviest' brexit do konca, tak túto vôľu musíme demokraticky rešpektovať. Zároveň musíme urobiť všetko preto, aby naši občania pracujúci a študujúci na britských ostrovoch boli týmto brexitom čo najmenej postihnutí. Musíme zabezpečiť, aby nedošlo k narušeniu fungovania jednotného trhu a aby si Londýn splnil svoje finančné záväzky voči Únii. My môžeme sympatizovať s tými, ktorí chcú zvrátiť brexit, ale nemôžeme nútiť Spojené kráľovstvo, aby svoju žiadosť o vystúpenie z Únie stiahlo. Veľká Británia je a ostane dôležitým partnerom a spojencom Európskej únie aj po vystúpení z nej. Brexit nie je žiadna tragédia, aj keď ide o smutnú epochu v histórii našej Európskej únie. Prosím, nestrašme katastrofickými scenármi o nedostatku potravín alebo liekov. Zvládnutý brexit môže byť dobrým štartom k dobrým vzťahom. Tak, ako to bolo, hoci v inom kontexte, aj v prípade rozdelenia bývalého Česko-Slovenska, keď po rozdelení dosiahli tieto dva nové štáty najlepšie možné vzťahy. Dnes ale ani nevieme, či a za akých podmienok k brexitu príde, a preto musíme byť pripravení na všetky možné scenáre, aj na tvrdý brexit.

Pierre Karleskind (Renew), *par écrit*. – Cela fait maintenant trois ans que les britanniques ont voté pour sortir de l'Union. Et des mois que le gouvernement demande de reculer cette date fatidique. Nous ne sommes d'ailleurs pas à l'abri d'un nouveau report. À un moment, «enough is enough». L'incertitude liée au Brexit plonge les Européens mais également les Britanniques dans l'obscurité la plus totale. Tous les secteurs d'activités mais aussi les citoyens souffrent de cette situation.

Le secteur de la pêche sera particulièrement touché par le Brexit. Et je ne parle pas seulement des pêcheurs. Je parle également de ces femmes et de ces hommes qui découpent du poisson le matin dans nos criées. Ces mareyeurs, ces transformateurs et tous ces métiers qui vivent de la pêche. C'est toute la filière qui sera touchée. Ce sont des territoires entiers qui seront impactés. L'accès aux eaux britanniques pour les pêcheurs du continent et l'accès aux eaux européennes pour les pêcheurs britanniques relèvent de droits et coutumes qui remontent à des temps que personne ici ne peut prétendre connaître et que le Brexit ne saurait détruire! Il est urgent d'engager la suite et de donner des perspectives à la pêche, comme à toute l'Europe d'ailleurs.

Ilhan Kyuchyuk (Renew), *in writing*. – Eighty years since the start of WWII, which devastated our continent, we once again allowed the obscure forces of populism and extreme nationalism to return to our societies. How quickly we forgot the post-war state of Europe and what the totalitarian regimes and violence brought us. From Bulgaria to the Netherlands, from the North to the South of Europe extremist and xenophobic political forces want to demolish our shared home and we need to fight every day for democracy, freedom and tolerance in Europe. Therefore, I completely support the proposal to commemorate 23 August as the European Day of Remembrance for the victims of totalitarian regimes at both EU and governmental level. It is our duty to raise the younger generation's awareness of these issues by including the history and analysis of the consequences of totalitarian regimes in the textbooks of all schools in the EU. The memories of Europe's tragic past must be kept alive. Only then can we teach our children not to repeat the mistakes of the past

Ivan Štefanec (PPE), *písomne* – Opustiť EÚ môže každý jej členský štát. Stačí, ak ústavným spôsobom aktivuje článok 50 Zmluvy o EÚ a nasleduje dvojročné obdobie na prípravu. Problémom však je, že členské štáty sú z podstaty fungovania EÚ medzi sebou tak silne hospodársky previazané, že odchod z EÚ by mal byť výsledkom zrelej úvahy zodpovedných politikov, ktorí najprv zväžia všetky klady a zápory tohto kroku. Napríklad Grónsko ako autonómna súčasť Dánska v roku 1985 opustilo po referende Európske spoločenstvá. Nevyhovovalo mu nastavenie rybárskej politiky. Nikto vtedy nerobil problémy a Grónsko má s EÚ uzatvorených množstvo dohôd a vzťahy fungujú bezproblémovo. Tvrdý brexit by oslabil ako Britániu, tak aj EÚ. Zdá sa však, že EÚ viac. Viaceré banky a poisťovacie domy už avizovali, že by v takom prípade presunuli svoje centrály z Londýna do Frankfurtu, či inde do EÚ. Británia by stratila prístup k európskym trhom a aj k pracovnej sile. Z bezpečnostného hľadiska by sa už nemohla podieľať na spoločných európskych obranných projektoch a stratila by aj prístup k projektom ako energetická únia, či jednotný digitálny trh. Hoci prezident Trump avizoval, že chce Británii poskytnúť výhodnú obchodnú dohodu, sotva bude založená na princípe rovnosti, respektíve s toľkými výhodami, aké poskytuje členstvo v EÚ.

Carlos Zorrinho (S&D), *por escrito*. – A União Europeia (UE) tem mantido uma estratégia negocial de respeito pelo povo britânico e pelas suas decisões, salvaguardando, ao mesmo tempo, os interesses dos cidadãos europeus no Reino Unido e permanecendo unida na definição de um acordo de saída justo e que constitua um fator de estabilidade e de referência.

Na resolução subscrita pelos maiores grupos políticos, hoje em apreciação e aprovação neste Parlamento, são salientadas as virtualidades do acordo de saída assinado entre as partes, designadamente no que diz respeito aos passos a dar e às normas de transição, para garantir uma saída ordenada do Reino Unido da UE, que não inviabilize um futuro bom relacionamento político, económico e social entre as partes. Definem-se ainda as salvaguardas a adotar no caso de saída sem acordo e as circunstâncias que poderão justificar mais uma prorrogação do prazo previsto de aplicação do artigo 50.º.

Como eurodeputado e como cidadão gostaria que o Reino Unido permanecesse na UE, mas respeito a vontade soberana do seu povo. Neste contexto, tudo farei para garantir, com ou sem acordo, os direitos dos cidadãos e das empresas europeias e por isso me revejo na resolução em debate na sessão plenária de hoje.

(La seduta è sospesa per pochi istanti)

8. Skład komisji i delegacji: Patrz protokół

9. Głosowanie

Presidente. – L'ordine del giorno reca il turno di votazioni.

(Per i risultati delle votazioni e altri dettagli che le riguardano: vedasi processo verbale)

9.1. Projekt budżetu korygującego nr 1/2019 — nadwyżka z roku 2018 (A9-0005/2019 - John Howarth) (głosowanie)

9.2. Projekt budżetu korygującego nr 2/2019 do budżetu ogólnego – Zasilenie kluczowych programów na rzecz konkurencyjności UE: „Horyzont 2020” i Erasmus+ (A9-0004/2019 - John Howarth) (głosowanie)

— *Prima della votazione:*

John Howarth, Rapporteur. – Mr President, first I would thank the shadow rapporteurs and the secretariat for their work on this file. I will be brief but it's important that these points are put on the record. This draft amending budget No 2 is somewhat different to the norm. It is in fact the final element of the 2019 budget settlement, negotiated last December in the second conciliation between Parliament and the Member States in Council.

The agreement with the Council was that the final element would be presented as an amending budget during 2019, so today we complete that agreement by reinforcing two programmes which, more than any others, reflect in their outcomes the economies of scale and added value of the Union budget, Erasmus+ and Horizon 2020. The heavily oversubscribed student programme will receive an additional EUR 20 million and Horizon will receive EUR 80 million, which will fund research into technologies that will help address the climate emergency.

This investment budget reflects the truth that our collective endeavours as a Union enable us to achieve more than any Member State in or out of the Union would achieve alone. I thank the House for its indulgence and recommend your support.

(Applause)

9.3. Uruchomienie środków z Funduszu Solidarności Unii Europejskiej w celu udzielenia pomocy Rumunii, Włochom i Austrii (A9-0002/2019 - Siegfried Mureşan) (głosowanie)

9.4. Projekt budżetu korygującego nr 3/2019: wniosek o uruchomienie środków z Funduszu Solidarności Unii Europejskiej w celu udzielenia pomocy Rumunii, Włochom i Austrii (A9-0006/2019 - John Howarth) (głosowanie)

9.5. Uruchomienie Europejskiego Funduszu Dostosowania do Globalizacji – EGF/2019/000 TA 2019 — Pomoc techniczna z inicjatywy Komisji (A9-0001/2019 - Bogdan Rzońca) (głosowanie)

9.6. Wystąpienie Zjednoczonego Królestwa z UE (B9-0038/2019, B9-0039/2019) (głosowanie)

Presidente. – Con questo si conclude il turno di votazioni.

(La seduta è sospesa per pochi istanti pochi istanti in attesa delle dichiarazioni di voto)

PRESIDENZA DELL'ON. FABIO MASSIMO CASTALDO

Vicepresidente

10. Wyjaśnienia dotyczące sposobu głosowania

10.1. Wystąpienie Zjednoczonego Królestwa z UE (B9-0038/2019, B9-0039/2019)

Dichiarazioni di voto orali

Alexandr Vondra (ECR). – Mr President, I voted against on the British resolution because it's a divorce and I think that we should keep in mind the future relationship, which should not result in a conflict. We are trying to force the British Parliament into consenting to the agreement which has already been rejected three times.

I remember when we had a divorce in Czechoslovakia. To have a successful divorce, there must be a kind of generosity. If we had professed the same kind of a generosity as the European Parliament has done, the Czechoslovak split would have resulted in a conflict or even a war. Is that something that we are really seeking?

Michaela Šojdřová (PPE). – Pane předsedající, kolegyně a kolegové, jsem ze stejné země jako kolega Alexandr Vondra, přesto jsem hlasovala pro toto usnesení. Právě proto, že respektuji usnesení britského parlamentu, které říká, že Velká Británie nesmí odejít bez dohody. Právě proto se domnívám, že Evropský parlament zareagoval správně, když navrhuje případné odložení pro případ, že dohoda nebude uzavřena. My nevnučujeme Velké Británii naši dohodu, je to dohoda, kterou podepsala jejich premiérka. Velká Británie může k této dohodě dát pozměňovací návrhy, může jednat o změně, ale ona žádnou změnu nepředložila. Evropský parlament projevuje velkou trpělivost a ochotu, stejně jako vyjednávač pan Michel Barnier projevuje ochotu ke změnám této dohody, pokud nějaké změny Velká Británie navrhne.

Luisa Porritt (Renew). – Mr President, I have voted in support of this resolution today, not because I want to see the Withdrawal Agreement implemented, since any form of Brexit would be damaging and regrettable for all, but because the text acknowledges an extension is possible in order to avoid no-deal and for the UK to hold a democratic event, such as a referendum or general election, as well as to revoke Article 50 outright.

I want to thank the pro-Europeans across this House, who continue to show solidarity with us in the face of the dangerous nationalist populist drive begun by a man in that part of the Chamber, who only turns up here to stamp his feet and collect his allowance. The same desire to put personal ambition over our common and national interests unfortunately now emanates from Number 10 Downing Street. However, there is also a strong, and growing, pro-European movement happening in the UK. It is indeed, perhaps, now the strongest in Europe, as Guy Verhofstadt has previously said. To my pro-European colleagues, who make up the majority in this House, I say we must continue to work together to defeat the forces of nationalism and populism and not let them win.

Matthew Patten (NI). – Mr President, I voted against Mr Verhofstadt's empire resolution. I believe in a clean -break Brexit. Why do I believe that? 58 % of people in the East Midlands voted to leave. 62 % in coastal communities like Folkestone and Hythe voted to leave. 17.4 million people in the UK – the democratic majority – voted to leave.

For the past three hours here, in the European Parliament, I've listened to all sorts of MEPs telling those people they didn't know what they were doing. Telling those people that they have to listen to the EU and only when they agree with this institution can they even begin to have some sense of democracy. Mr Barnier made it absolutely clear that, whatever the backstop deal may or may not be, there will be no escape from the Customs Union for the 17.4 million people who voted to leave. British democracy must be respected. It's time to leave. It's time for a clean-break Brexit.

Antony Hook (Renew). – Mr President, I supported the resolution today because it recognises the prospect of Britain revoking Article 50 to stop Brexit. I believe that this will happen, because Boris Johnson has no majority in the UK Parliament. That is why he has tried to shut Parliament down and is blocking a people's vote on the specific Withdrawal Agreement. The 2016 referendum was vague and with much misinformation: lies about money and lies that Turkey would join this European Union. I see No Turkish MEPs here. Boris Johnson said it would be easy and make us better off. He no longer pretends that is true.

The 2016 decision is old and stale. Britain in 2019 is a different place, and young people want the European Union. No one voted for food or medicine shortages, for blocked ports or motorways, which our government admits are real risks. We can do so much better than Brexit, we are a great country and we will put this behind us.

Catherine Bearder (Renew). – Mr President, today I voted in favour of Parliament's Brexit motion. I don't like May's deal and I don't like Brexit – I hate it – but any deal should go in front of the people. It's their future, but Boris is playing with it for his own party's sake. What voters want is for Brexit to stop.

My party, of Jo Swinson and the Liberal Democrats, are committed to the EU and its citizens. When we become the Government, we will revoke Article 50 to stop Brexit altogether. Our aim is to stay inside the European Union. This motion recognises our responsibility to Brexit's citizens. They chose to build lives somewhere else, as is their right. Their lives have been in turmoil. EU governments must now all work to sort this out quickly. Citizenship is a right. We are setting up another Windrush scandal and it must not happen. I and the Lib Dems are – and always will be – committed to doing what is best for the UK and the EU. We need time to vote on the deal or to choose to stay with all the benefits of full membership.

Barbara Ann Gibson (Renew). – Mr President, I voted in support of this resolution and urged Parliament's support. I would like to make clear that I do not support any Brexit deal. Whether deal or no-deal, I believe with all my heart that any Brexit is bad for the UK and for the European Union, and I will continue to campaign to stop Brexit. But this motion is important because it specifically recognises that the UK Parliament enacted a law to require the Prime Minister to ask for an extension, and it supports an extension being granted to avoid a no-deal exit, hold an election or referendum, or revoke Brexit altogether.

Boris Johnson is not acting in the interests of UK citizens. He has shut down Parliament. He states that he will break the law to bring about Brexit, no matter the consequences. He is acting as a dictator and we need time to defeat him through the democratic process.

John Howarth (S&D). – Mr President, well, this wasn't the plan, was it? Instead of sunlit uplands, the best we are offered is survival. Instead of the easiest trade deal in history, we face negotiating from the weakest position possible, of no deal at all. Instead of the restoration of the sovereignty that we never in fact lost, we face the harsh reality of a powerful neighbour making rules in which we will have no say but which market reality will dictate that we have little option but to follow.

Entire industries sacrificed, market shares squandered, world leadership trashed, the rights and freedoms of every British citizen diminished: that's the reality of this Brexit. Not at all what was said on the tin!

What on earth has been won? Britain outside the European Union will discover soon enough that national sovereignty in the modern world has serious limitations. We hear a lot about democracy, but without accountability democracy withers. Take your false promises and your reality back to the British people and let them decide the reality of Brexit.

(Applause)

Michael Heaver (NI). – Mr President, dear oh dear, well, after that delusional guff, let me reassure everyone in the Chamber that Nigel Farage does indeed still speak for the pro-Brexit majority in my country. And, as for this resolution, dear oh dear, a 'regrettable event' is what you're calling Brexit. Well, maybe for you, with the UK cash cow out the door, but the British people clearly don't agree with you. Look around: the biggest party in this Chamber, the Brexiteers, we're standing up and we're making sure that the pro-Leave majority are represented.

As for the Withdrawal Agreement being fair and balanced: as they say in my country, you must be having a laugh. We've seen straight through it. The Brexit Party is highlighting why it's wrong for our country, why it's the worst deal in history and we are fighting hard now for a clean-break Brexit. And you need to face up to the fact that, in our country, support for no-deal is rising. We've got the establishment on the run. We beat you in 2016 and we'll do it again. The Brexit Party is here to stay and we will leave the European Union.

(Applause)

Lucy Nethsingha (Renew). – Mr President, first, I would like to thank this wonderful democratic institution for your support for the UK and your patience in backing a further extension of Article 50. A no-deal Brexit would be utterly terrifying for many UK and EU citizens. The risks are highest for the most vulnerable. One such group are those living in the UK who depend upon medicines imported from Europe. There are large numbers of people whose health depends on the smooth and reliable importation of medicines which have a short shelf-life and require refrigeration. No one can guarantee that these medicines will be able to get through in the transport chaos that would follow a no-deal Brexit.

That any government is even contemplating putting such vulnerable citizens deliberately at risk is a truly shocking situation. It is the need to prevent this risk that has led Members from across the House of Commons and in this House bitterly to oppose a no-deal Brexit. There is no mandate for a no-deal Brexit and no one voted to deny themselves or their neighbours crucial medicines. The risks of a no-deal Brexit are very real but, in the longer term, any Brexit deal puts the UK citizens in a worse position.

Martin Edward Daubney (NI). – Mr President, first of all like I'd like to say it's wonderful to see a few of the British MEPs turning up for the vote earlier. Where were they for the entire debate? They were probably in the bar having croissants. The rest of it has been a blizzard of lies, smears, half-truths and blatant misrepresentations. And, as for the ludicrous assumption that Britain operates under a dictator, dictators don't offer general elections, do they?

(Cheers from certain quarters)

And when they do offer general elections you do not accept them because you know that Corbyn and Labour will be obliterated across the Midlands, North and Wales, especially in Ashfield where I intend to stand and help destroy Jeremy Corbyn and the ruthless mess he's left, where he has abandoned the working classes. Seventy percent of people in Ashfield, my local constituency, voted to leave. Corbyn doesn't care about them, this House doesn't care about the British voice. This Parliament does not understand the British people. It does not represent the British people and it will not stop 17.4 million voices from being heard. We're leaving. *Auf Wiedersehen*. Bye. *Au revoir*.

(Applause from certain quarters)

Rory Palmer (S&D). – Mr President, let me say it as it is, because the wording of this resolution in places is mealy-mouthed. On the issue of citizens' rights and the protection of EU nationals in the UK, that is not just a cause of concern. The treatment of those people has been a total disgrace and it brings shame on my country, the country that I love, the country equally loved by those EU nationals who have made their homes, set up businesses, worked in our public services and paid taxes in the UK for decades. They deserve better than this shambolic 'settled status' scheme.

So my message to those EU nationals in the UK who I'm proud to represent in the East Midlands, and to friends from across the other Member States here, is: my country is better than this. Those EU nationals deserve better than this.

Jane Brophy (Renew). – Mr President, I voted in favour of this resolution but I do not want Brexit at all. One of the most crucial points in this resolution for me, as a UK health professional for over two decades, concerns the employment status and social entitlements of EU and UK citizens.

The ability of staff from the EU to work for the UK health service – the NHS – remains severely threatened by Brexit. Three years ago, 11% of staff employed by the NHS were from other EU Member States. That figure has now halved to just over 5.5%. This huge reduction in numbers is due to people being fearful about the right to remain in the UK if Brexit were to happen, and uncertainty about social entitlements in the event of a no-deal Brexit.

So, this resolution is welcome. It will offer assurance to EU workers living and working in the UK that their rights will remain the number one priority in the EU.

Judith Bunting (Renew). – Mr President, this is the hardest vote that I have ever cast. I wholeheartedly welcome Parliament's commitment to an extension of Article 50, but any withdrawal agreement must go back to the British people. In a referendum, if it was put to the people now with the option to remain, I am confident that we would now win the vote to stop Brexit. Why? Because this time, young people will come out to vote. Youngsters in Britain are angry. Around three-quarters of kids who were too young to vote back in 2016 and have now reached that voting age, say that they back remain. So, wherever you come from, other Europeans, please go back to your leaders and ask them in Council to support any bid for an extension. Please give British youngsters a chance to decide their own future.

Phil Bennion (Renew). – Mr President, I'd like to explain why I voted in favour of a resolution which supports the Brexit agreement already negotiated between the UK and the EU, but remains stuck in the UK Parliament. It is because this resolution also keeps open the possibility of the UK reviewing its position through a people's vote, or indeed a change of government. It does this by supporting a further extension of Article 50 for the UK to consider its position.

A no-deal Brexit would be a disaster for the British farming industry and for British farmers. Ninety-seven percent of our lamb exports are to the EU27, and we also export considerable levels of beef, cereals and other foodstuffs. Losing this marketplace would not be in the interest of my constituents. My first duty, therefore, is to prevent a no-deal Brexit. Then, to go on to secure continued UK membership of the European Union.

Chris Davies (Renew). – Mr President, I don't want a managed Brexit: I want to stop Brexit. In this House we stand for European values that I regard also as British and liberal values. We stand for an economy that benefits all. We stand for environmental measures that protect all. I don't want my country to be shut out of the rooms where decisions about the future of our continent will be made. I don't want my country to run away from the issues facing our continent. I want us to be at the heart of the European Union. I want us to be a leader, not a leaver. My view is simple and blunt: bollocks to Brexit!

(Hubbub)

Alex Agius Saliba (S&D). – Mr President, as the Brexit deadline looms over our heads, concerns and risks of having a disorderly no-deal exit of the UK are becoming a sad and lousy reality. No agreement would be a recipe for disaster – a catastrophe that should be avoided. Unfortunately, the uncertainties and political instabilities are growing by the hour. Our first priority in this situation remains to safeguard the rights and choices of the EU citizens resident in the UK and the British citizens resident in the EU. A hard Brexit would economically be highly damaging to business, threatening thousands of jobs, both in the UK and in the Union.

Our second priority must be to assist business and workers to ensure that burdens and costs are kept at a minimum. Finally, the highly damaging implications that a no-deal exit would have for the border between Northern Ireland and Ireland should be kept to a minimum. Working together to undertake all reasonable efforts and engage in constructive dialogue to avoid a no-deal scenario must always come before petty party politics.

Dinesh Dhamija (Renew). – Mr President, as a businessman, I cannot understand why any entrepreneur would want to give up a market of 512 million people for a 65 million market. The low-hanging fruit is so great with 500 million people, with seasonality and everything else. As the founder of eBookers.com, I saw my sales go up to a billion dollars in five years, and the reason is that we had a market of 300 million people. None of my competitors who were just selling to 60 million people in the UK could keep up. What will most entrepreneurs do if we Brexit? Open an office in Dublin or Amsterdam or Frankfurt or Paris and move jobs to these cities. Talk about shooting ourselves in the foot!

Caroline Voaden (Renew). – Mr President, Mr Patten over there clearly doesn't understand that 62% of voters is not the same as 62% of people – lying once again.

As we saw in the Windrush scandal, our government knows a thing or two about cruelly splitting families and this is exactly what they plan to do again. Europe is a family of nations and peoples and allowing the Tories to wrench us out of this family will cause untold harm, both to the UK and to our European friends and partners. Just as Brexit will divide the European family of nations, I fear it will be the death knell of the British family of nations.

Born in England, raised in Scotland, I consider myself a child of two nations, of two unions: British and European. Our United Kingdom is 218 years old and Johnson, Farage and their braying lackeys are about to sabotage it. These saboteurs have betrayed the people of Northern Ireland and ridden roughshod over the rights of Scotland and I have a warning for them – the English have tried many times to infringe the rights of Scotland and we risk seeing a generation of William Wallaces if Johnson is allowed to continue.

Sheila Ritchie (Renew). – Mr President, I voted for this. On 2 December, the Belfast Agreement – the last peace agreement made inside Europe – will have its 20th birthday. It's guaranteed by this European Union. Saturday is International Peace Day. I fear for that peace if we are thrown out as a consequence of the lies, self interest and distortion of the Leave campaign and the ever absent Nigel Farage – a man who simply doesn't care.

Stanislav Polčák (PPE). – Pane předsedající, já bych se rád vyjádřil k hlasování, které již proběhlo. Já samozřejmě respektuji rozhodnutí britských občanů v rámci brexitu, na druhou stranu jsem zároveň rád, že toto usnesení, proto jsem je také podpořil, umožňuje odklad brexitu, pokud se k tomu samozřejmě Spojené království rozhodne. Je třeba zde i respektovat rozhodnutí, ke kterému dospěl Evropský soudní dvůr, že aktivaci článku 50 je možné jednostranně stáhnout. Pro mě je důležité, abychom chránili práva občanů EU žijících na britských ostrovech, a samozřejmě nechceme žádnou tvrdou hranici, která by ohrozila mírové soužití na irském ostrově. To jsou asi dva limity, které toto usnesení rovněž obsahuje, a já jsem je proto rád podpořil. Na druhou stranu k tomu, co zde říkají kolegové z levé části spektra, z Brexit Party: já jim chci připomenout, že oni získali své poslanecké mandáty jenom díky evropskému volebnímu systému, protože podle národních pravidel téměř nikdo, žádný poslanec Brexit Party by nebyl zvolen.

Seán Kelly (PPE). – A Uachtaráin, bhí mé an-sásta leis an díospóireacht a bhí againn anseo ar maidin maidir leis an Ríocht Aontaithe ag fágáil an Aontais. Thaispeáin na Feisirí go dtuigeann siad cad atá i gceist leis, go dtuigeann siad an tábhacht a bhaineann leis an gcúlstad mar a mhínigh an tUasal Barnier dóibh é, agus go dtuigeann siad an tábhacht a bhaineann le Comhaontú Aoine an Chéasta agus go gcaithfidimid é sin a chosaint. Agus an vóta a bhí anseo againn ó chianaibh - 544 i bhfabhar, 126 i gcoinne – is móramh mór é sin.

Freisin, bhí mé an-sásta gur éist na Feisirí liom agus go bhfuil siad sásta síneadh ama a thabhairt don Phríomh-Aire, Boris Johnson, má lorgáinn sé é sin. Dá bhrí sin, ní fhéadfaimis níos mó a dhéanamh ag an tráth seo. Is féidir a rá gur lá maith é don Aontas – drochlá, b'fhéidir, don Bhreathimeacht – agus is maith sin.

Daniel Hannan (ECR). – Mr President, they may not have intended to, but colleagues in this House have just made an orderly Brexit with a deal much less likely. The UK has accepted in the Withdrawal Agreement a number of disagreeable and difficult concessions – a continuing role for the ECJ, asymmetric arbitration mechanism, a GBP 39 billion bill that no international tribunal would uphold. The only thing which it wouldn't accept is replacing a status that has an exit mechanism, i.e. EU membership, with one that doesn't, i.e. the backstop, and by insisting on that point in this declaration, this House has made it almost impossible to see a way that the two sides could have orderly and amicable withdrawal resolutions.

I have to say, this idea that we're suffering a Brexit crisis is based on something that you all fail to notice – that Brexit hasn't happened! What we're seeing is the opposite of the Brexit crisis. We're seeing an un-Brexit crisis. We're seeing a crisis caused by the refusal of our opposition parliamentarians to do what they promised when they sought election. There will be a reckoning for them when the election comes. I just hope that the legitimacy and authority of our parliamentary institutions isn't collateral damage.

Romana Tomc (PPE). – Spoštovani predsednik, zelo mi je žal, da britanski politiki tekmujejo z brexitom. Brexit je postal sredstvo in ne cilj, in to je slabo. Tukaj ne bo nihče zmagal in zdi se, kot da se vsi, razen izjem, trudimo, da bi bila škoda čim manjša.

Lahko je, da podaljšamo datum za izstop, vendar le v primeru, ko je to utemeljeno, v primeru konkretnega razloga, kot so npr. volitve, referendum ali potreben čas za ratifikacijo sporazuma. Poleg tega pa se moramo ob vsem tem procesu tudi zavedati, da je treba narediti vse, da zaščitimo naše interese, naše državljane, naše vrednote. Na Otoku si zelo prizadevajo, da bi črno piko nalepili evropskim politikom. A bi si jo pravzaprav morali prilepiti sami sebi.

In če pride do izhoda brez dogovora, bodo namreč oni edini tisti, ki bodo morali odgovarjati svojim državljanom.

Irina Von Wiese (Renew). – Mr President, when I moved to the UK from Germany over 20 years ago, I came to a global Britain that welcomed me with open arms. Britain's EU membership has afforded me rights and guarantees and allowed me to build a life in the country I love. But today three million EU citizens in the UK face a climate of fear and uncertainty. Boris Johnson promised that they would not be disadvantaged by Brexit. He has broken this promise like so many others.

The settlement scheme is not fit for purpose. It has been marred with technical problems and has left many, particularly the most vulnerable, unable to prove their eligibility. We must have a system that is easy to use, a system whereby people can simply register – not one where they have to find dozens of documents dating back many years – otherwise we risk another Windrush scandal on a much greater scale. This is why I voted for the resolution. But let's face the fact: the only way to guarantee citizens' rights in Britain is to stop Brexit.

11. Korekty do głosowania i zamiar głosowania: Patrz protokół

(La seduta è sospesa alle 12.46)

IN THE CHAIR: DITA CHARANZOVÁ

Vice-President

12. Wznowienie posiedzenia

(The sitting resumed at 15.01)

13. Przyjęcie protokołu poprzedniego posiedzenia: patrz protokół

14. Skład komisji i delegacji: patrz protokół

15. Walka z rakiem (debata na aktualny temat)

President. – The next item is the topical debate (Rule 162) on the fight against cancer (2019/2818(RSP)).

I would like to inform Members that for this debate there is no catch-the-eye procedure and that no blue cards will be accepted.

Manfred Weber, im Namen der PPE-Fraktion. – Frau Präsidentin, Herr Kommissar, sehr geehrte Vertreter des Rates! Mehr als 40 % der Europäer – auch der Menschen in diesem Plenarsaal – werden in ihrem Leben an Krebs erkranken. Wir alle kennen das Gefühl, das damit verbunden ist: Hilflosigkeit, man will es nicht wahrhaben. Du hörst den Ärzten zu, du verweigerst die Realität, und du weißt trotzdem: Jeder zweite Krebspatient wird daran sterben. Du fühlst dich machtlos. Das sind die Gefühle, die hinter dieser existentiellen Frage „Krebs“ stehen, und deswegen ist diese Frage unsere Frage, unsere politische Frage auf europäischer Ebene.

Drei von vier Europäern – das ergaben Umfragen – haben gefordert, dass die Krebsbekämpfung ein Topthema Europas werden muss. Wir als Europäische Volkspartei, wir wollen genau dieses: dieser Forderung der Europäer nachkommen. Europäische Forscher haben uns ja bereits gezeigt, was medizinischer Fortschritt alles erreichen kann. Bei Brustkrebs beispielsweise werden acht von zehn Patienten mittlerweile geheilt. Gemeinsam mit 15 führenden Krebsforschern, von Finnland bis Portugal, von Frankreich bis Rumänien, haben wir als EVP – habe ich auch als Spitzenkandidat – in diesem Frühjahr einen Masterplan vorgelegt, der Europa im Kampf gegen Krebs wirkungsvoller machen kann.

Warum Europa? Meine sehr verehrten Damen und Herren, Krebs ist ziemlich komplex und tritt in schier unzähligen Formen auf. Beispielsweise bei Kindern werden jedes Jahr 40 000 Fälle von extrem seltenen Krebskrankheiten diagnostiziert. Hier kann Europa – wenn wir zusammenarbeiten – allein schon wegen der schieren Größe der Fälle und der Daten, die dahinterstehen, viel mehr wissenschaftliche Erfolge erreichen, wenn wir kooperieren und zusammenarbeiten. 18 000 Onkologen, 15 000 Krankenhäuser, 107 Krebsforschungseinrichtungen in Europa, 179 Hochschulen, die sich damit beschäftigen. Wenn es uns gelingt, diese Daten zusammenzubinden, wenn uns gelingt, einen gemeinsamen Plan im Kampf gegen Krebs zu entwickeln, dann werden wir erfolgreicher sein.

Professor Angelika Eggert von der Berliner Charité schrieb mir beispielsweise: Mit einem ambitionierten, europäischen Ansatz können wir in zehn Jahren neun von zehn Kinderkrebspatienten erfolgreich heilen. Professor Thierry Philip aus Paris ergänzte: In der Kombination von Prävention und Früherkennung, mit Hilfe von personalisierter Medizin könnten wir die Überlebensraten der Patienten mit bösartigen Tumoren schlicht verdoppeln.

Das ist machbar, und dem müssen wir uns jetzt zuwenden.

Was ist konkret zu tun? Wir brauchen zunächst eine gemeinsame Krebspräventionsstrategie. Lasst uns gemeinsam Krebs von vornherein vermeiden! Wir müssen als Zweites alle unsere bisherigen nationalen Krebsdatenbanken endlich zusammenschalten, ein *European Digital Datacentre* für diese Krebsdateien schaffen, damit wir Krebs früher bekämpfen können. Wir brauchen eine gemeinsame Früherkennungsstrategie: Lasst uns erfolgreich Krebs rechtzeitig heilen! Und als Viertes: Wir dürfen niemanden zurücklassen. Gerade in mittel- und osteuropäischen Ländern haben Krebspatienten heute um 30 % weniger Chancen, geheilt zu werden, als in westeuropäischen Ländern. Dieser Zustand ist in Europa inakzeptabel, und deswegen: Mit modernen Formen der Telemedizin können wir in Mittel- und Osteuropa viel an Standards erhöhen. Zu guter Letzt: Lassen Sie uns auch an die Angehörigen denken, die von diesen Krebsfällen betroffen sind. Eine Krebspatienteninitiative, die die Sorgen der Angehörigen in den Blick nimmt, sollte unser gemeinsames Ziel sein.

Uns als Europäische Volkspartei ist es wichtig, jetzt zu starten. Wir haben ein neues Mandat von den Bürgern Europas bekommen, jetzt liegt es an uns, Fortschritte zu machen. Deswegen beantragen wir als Europäische Volkspartei nicht nur, dass es heute die Debatte gibt; wir beantragen nicht nur, dass wir weitere Schwerpunkte bei diesem Masterplan brauchen, basierend auf den bisherigen Arbeiten der Kommission, sondern wir wollen als Europäische Volkspartei auch, dass es zukünftig einen Sonderausschuss des Europäischen Parlaments gibt, der sich als Ausschuss mit dieser Krebsstrategie beschäftigt. Es ist unser Anliegen – wir wollen es aufgreifen.

Tytti Tuppurainen, *President-in-Office of the Council*. – Madam President, it's an honour to address this Assembly today to discuss the fight against cancer as part of this topical debate. It comes at the right point in time. Recently published research shows that cancer is already on course to become the leading cause of death in most EU countries, as mortality due to cardiovascular diseases is decreasing. The same research shows that for cancer the high mortality is not mainly related to risk factors but might be correlated to access to healthcare.

As we know, cancer is a disease that more often strikes older people. We Europeans who live longer than in other parts of the world are therefore more prone to get cancer. So how do we tackle the increasing challenge that cancer poses to our societies? Do we resign in the face of fate or do we fight back? I think we have chosen as the EU to fight back.

The Finnish Presidency firmly believes that the EU needs to put people at the centre of policymaking. We propose to start by embracing a new concept, the 'economy of well-being'. The economy of well-being is a holistic, multi-sectoral approach that highlights the need to invest in people and their health. We think health and access to healthcare are fundamental for well-being and see health as an investment. We propose to invest in prevention and health promotion.

All EU citizens should have the possibility to lead a healthy life and acquire good health habits as those are cornerstones in the prevention of cancer: They should also have equal access to healthcare, which is one of the principles of the European Pillar of Social Rights and supports the implementation of the Sustainable Development Goals.

With such high goals set, there is a need for close collaboration between different institutions, stakeholders and sectors. More specifically, in the EU there seems to be agreement that cancer should be a priority. That requires action through different means such as research, access to treatment, and screening.

In April this year, Parliament and the Council provisionally agreed to include a cancer mission in the future Horizon Europe, the next research and innovation framework programme. More research will allow us to better understand cancer, put in place better prevention and diagnostic methods, and allow for better treatment options, as well as allowing Member States to better tailor public health interventions.

Many of you have on several occasions asked the Commission for strong actions against cancer in general, but also for actions targeted against specific types of cancer. You notably established a cancer group. Political groups have taken action and you have adopted resolutions asking the Commission and the Member States to intensify their efforts to fight cancer.

On the Council side, Member States are also very concerned about cancer. The Council dedicated several sets of conclusions, as well as a Council recommendation on cancer screening, to this important challenge.

At Member State level, action was taken to strengthen the means of healthcare systems to face this challenge. The Commission has also reacted to our calls and cancer is one of the main priorities in the incoming Commission. The European plan to fight cancer that we expect the Commission to propose should have strong links to the Horizon Europe cancer mission.

We welcome efforts aiming at strengthening EU cooperation on cancer prevention. In our view, it is important that Member States learn from each other and that good practices are disseminated and promoted. This would contribute to ensuring that all EU citizens are given equal opportunities to lead a healthy life with minimal risk of developing cancer.

We are looking forward to the new plan to be proposed by the Commission. We count on the Commission to involve Member States, wherever appropriate, in the development of that plan. We also stand ready to cooperate with Parliament in raising awareness on cancer as one of the main killers in Europe.

Thank you very much for this discussion and for your attention.

Vytenis Povilas Andriukaitis, *Member of the Commission*. – Madam President, this is probably my last speech before this Chamber, so allow me to be a little bit personal. Anyway, I believe I have full legitimacy to get personal when speaking about cancer. I know first-hand the emotional and physical consequences of this disease, having lost three beloved brothers. I know how it feels when you are face to face with a diagnosis and you know it is too late.

Therefore, let me be clear. If we want to get serious about beating cancer, we need to start putting our money into the remedies that cannot be prescribed only by a doctor or health commissioner. It is a political question. I agree with you, Mr Weber: these remedies are in the hands of those who make policies on risk factors and determinants – commercial, social and political determinants – which facilitate risk factors. These remedies are in our own hands as well, when we smoke, eat junk food or abuse alcohol. And it is about the economy of well-being – I agree with Madam Minister.

In 2014, when I took up my position as Commissioner for Health and Food Safety, I announced that one of my major priorities was the promotion and protection of health and the prevention of diseases. I preached for this but the paradigm shift is yet to come. However, we have worked hard and we have achieved some tangible results. Tobacco consumption fell, through legislation and anti-smoking campaigns. European Union legislation on chemicals, pesticides and exposure to carcinogens, including at work, was upgraded. We have spread the word on prevention, particularly thanks to the improvement of the European Code Against Cancer. The European Cancer Information System (ECIS) is now up and running and accessible – it monitors geographic patterns and cancer trends – along with national cancer plans to be adopted.

In recent years we have seen continuous improvement in the coverage and quality of national screening programmes for breast, cervical, and colorectal cancer. As you know, October is a month dedicated to breast cancer and I have my ribbon especially for that occasion.

Better vaccination coverage will impact on infections and cancers caused by the human papillomavirus (HPV) and hepatitis B. In this context, I am proud to inform you that last week the Commission, together with the World Health Organisation (WHO), organised the first global vaccination summit, where immunisation against HPV was placed high on the agenda. Also, since March 2017, we have established 24 European reference networks, of which four are dealing specifically with rare and complex cancers, especially in children. This is across the European Union.

We took a major step forward in terms of alcohol nutrition labelling and finally came to a consensus. I have cooperated fully with the European Cancer Organisation to help increase awareness. The new Regulations on Medical Devices entered into force on 25 May 2017. Furthermore, we have taken the ambitious decision to evaluate jointly the EU Orphan Regulation and the EU Regulation on Medicines for Children because cancer treatment for children is a very challenging issue. This work is not finished: we will continue to add to it.

I wish I could have done more, as we are facing important societal challenges, such as an aging population with multimorbidity. There is a growing cost of non-communicable diseases and new treatments, and unfortunately we are still only spending about three percent of our resources on prevention. This is a drop in the ocean. We need to increase this amount and make sure that what we spend is spent effectively.

One way to achieve this is by sharing best practices between Member States. The European Union Steering Group on Health Promotion, Disease Prevention and Management of Non-Communicable Diseases is very valuable in this respect as it identifies Member States' priorities and highlights best practices that can be transferred, scaled up and implemented with European Union support. The Commission's Best Practice Portal has proved to be a powerful tool as it picks up top-quality practices that can be adapted and reproduced across Europe. The interactive EU Health Policy Platform also helps civil society, including patients' organisations and health professionals, to promote debate about public health concerns and especially concerns related to cancer.

We also deliver the State of Health in the EU cycle that will help Member States to create better health care policies for those who suffer from cancer. Communicating risks to citizens and enabling healthy choices are vital parts of any prevention strategy. We have put a lot of effort, including in relation to healthy food, into the common agricultural policy, and so on.

Technological and scientific developments offer immense potential when it comes to cancer prevention, treatment and care. For example, we can expect a future where we will have much more precise treatments based upon the genomic signature of the patient. I am very glad that we have already started the European '1+ Million Genomes' Initiative.

Investment in research and innovation has been a long-standing priority for the Commission. Through its Framework Programme for Research, the Commission has invested some EUR 2.8 billion since 2007 on prevention, diagnostics, therapeutics, cost-effectiveness and the quality of life of patients and cancer survivors.

From 2021 onwards, Horizon Europe will promote open science and maximize the potential for innovation. In the proposal for Horizon Europe, the Commission has introduced the mission approach, which would help to build coalitions to address the most pressing global European challenges including cancer. One of the first mission areas identified for Horizon Europe is action on cancer to mobilise a broad spectrum of stakeholders, including citizens, patients and all those who care for them.

I also believe that the work that began with the European reference networks for rare diseases can pave the way to a better ecosystem for patients, with big data, artificial intelligence, universities and industry working together building big ecosystems, or maybe some health 'collider', especially addressing cancer. I will be more than happy to see that in the future.

I want to say a few words on an ongoing initiative that plays a key role in the discussions about innovation. The Commission's proposal for a regulation to strengthen European Union cooperation on health technology assessment (HTL) aims to facilitate access to innovative health technology, and access to treatment is a major issue today. The proposal has already passed the European Parliament scrutiny process. I count on your continued support to make this initiative a success and I would like the Finnish Presidency to finalise the work on this issue.

All these are important steps in the right direction, but it is essential that this progress, this innovation and these developments reach the patients who need them the most. I am pleased to see that the Commissioner-designate's mission letter focuses on ways to help ensure that Europe has a supply of affordable medicines to meet its needs. I am also delighted that the Commission's new President-elect has included the Europe's Beating Cancer Plan in her political priorities. This is a very important message.

Cancer is a relentless disease. Let's not give up. I thank this House for its support during my time in office. I also seize the opportunity to encourage the Council of the European Union and all the institutions to renew our common determination and political will in the fight against cancer, as was done back in the 1990s when François Mitterrand gave impetus to the Europe against Cancer initiative and it helped us very much for a long time. We must continue to work together to prevent cancer, promote health and improve treatment and care. I look forward to hearing your views.

(Applause)

Ewa Kopacz, *w imieniu grupy PPE*. – Pani Przewodnicząca! Co roku na świecie z powodu raka umiera ponad dziewięć milionów ludzi. Każdy z krajów europejskich w zależności od zamożności wydaje kilka, kilkadziesiąt miliardów euro na walkę z tą chorobą. Czy w związku z tym możemy powiedzieć, że zwyciężyliśmy z tym największym zabójcą XXI wieku? Zdecydowanie nie. Czy możemy zrobić coś więcej? Zdecydowanie tak. W ramach europejskiej solidarności połączmy nasze siły, stwórzmy europejski plan skutecznego leczenia raka. Stwórzmy europejską strategię profilaktyki onkologicznej oraz europejską strategię wczesnego wykrywania raka. Dajmy nowy impuls do badań onkologicznych. Stwórzmy europejski program partnerski oparty na współpracy ośrodków akademickich i szpitali specjalistycznych. Współpracujmy ze sobą, wymieniając najlepsze praktyki i doświadczenia wynikające z badań klinicznych. Dajmy jednokowe szanse pacjentowi na wschodzie i zachodzie Europy. Nowotwory nie mają granic ani nie mają narodowości. Dzisiaj proszę Was, Koleżanki i Koledzy parlamentarzyści, abyście ponadpartyjnie zdecydowali o powołaniu specjalnej komisji do spraw walki z rakiem. To zależy tylko i wyłącznie od nas. Przewodniczący grup politycznych, to do Was kieruje tę prośbę. Macie taką możliwość zapisaną w artykule 207 Regulaminu Parlamentu Europejskiego.

I na koniec, jestem pewna, że chorzy na raka mogą liczyć na nas, a my, eurodeputowani, ich nie zawiedzimy.

Sara Cerdas, *em nome do Grupo S&D*. – Senhora Presidente, sabemos que atualmente o cancro é a segunda causa de morte na União Europeia e que em 2018 ocorreram 3 milhões de novos diagnósticos.

O cancro representa, assim, um grande impacto para os sistemas de saúde, mas também para a economia europeia. 30 a 50% destes casos poderiam ser evitados através da redução dos fatores de risco e da implementação de estratégias preventivas baseadas na evidência.

O investimento atual da União Europeia é insuficiente para atingirmos os objetivos a que nos propusemos. É necessário aumentar o investimento na prevenção primordial e primária através de políticas que favoreçam melhores estilos de vida e ambientes saudáveis, bem como na deteção precoce do cancro.

Para isto é essencial apoiar a investigação científica com estudos sólidos, tais como os estudos de coorte, de forma a podermos basear as nossas decisões na melhor evidência científica possível.

Véronique Trillet-Lenoir, *au nom du groupe Renew*. – Madame la Présidente, exerçant comme cancérologue depuis 40 ans, je vous remercie vivement d'avoir proposé ce débat.

Les 4 millions de personnes touchées en Europe ont besoin d'un plan européen contre le cancer. Nous avons besoin de l'échelle européenne pour garantir l'accès aux médicaments les plus innovants, sans rupture de stock et à leur juste prix. Nous avons besoin de l'échelle européenne pour mobiliser davantage d'équipes de recherche, grâce aux moyens ambitieux de la mission cancer Horizon Europe. Nous avons besoin de l'échelle européenne pour maintenir des réseaux des cancers rares et en particulier des cancers pédiatriques, qui tuent encore 6 000 enfants par an.

Le cancer est une maladie du corps, mais c'est aussi une maladie de l'injustice sociale. Car nous sommes inégaux face à la prévention, inégalement protégés contre les carcinogènes de l'environnement, inégalement informés des comportements à risque que sont le tabagisme, la mauvaise alimentation et le manque d'activité physique. Nous sommes inégalement armés contre la désinformation sur le vaccin qui protège des cancers du col de l'utérus. D'un pays à l'autre de l'Europe, nous sommes inégaux face à un accès rapide à des soins de qualité. Enfin, dans la phase qui suit la maladie, nous sommes inégaux quant à notre capacité de retour à l'emploi et à une vie sociale et affective harmonieuse.

Voilà pourquoi, Madame la Présidente, vouloir un plan européen de lutte contre le cancer, c'est bien sûr faire reculer la première cause de mortalité en Europe, mais c'est aussi initier la réduction des inégalités et avancer ainsi vers une Europe de la santé plus solidaire et plus juste.

Michèle Rivasi, *au nom du groupe Verts/ALE*. – Madame la Présidente, Monsieur le Commissaire Andriukaitis, chers collègues, un Européen sur trois est atteint d'un cancer au cours de sa vie. Chaque année, environ 1,3 million de personnes décèdent d'un cancer dans l'Union européenne. Ces chiffres sont dramatiques et ils vont augmenter. Nous sommes confrontés à une explosion des maladies chroniques et certains experts prévoient que le nombre de cas de cancers doublera en Europe d'ici 2035. C'est donc vraiment une urgence et une priorité.

C'est dire si le nouveau plan européen de lutte contre le cancer est attendu: prévention — vous en avez parlé, Monsieur le Commissaire -, diagnostic, traitement, accompagnement et soins palliatifs... On peut et on doit améliorer les choses dans chacune des étapes de la maladie, c'est évident.

Mais le cancer est aussi une maladie souvent multifactorielle, pouvant prendre de nombreux visages. Un code européen contre le cancer existe depuis 1987 et il comprend depuis 2014 douze recommandations de bon sens. On l'a dit: ne fumez pas, faites du sport, privilégiez une alimentation saine, faites attention au soleil, faites attention au radon. Malgré toutes ces recommandations, les cancers augmentent toujours. Pourquoi? Peut-être parce qu'on ne regarde pas dans la bonne direction.

Il faut vraiment oser un plan d' action multifactoriel. Un plan qui dirait stop au travail de nuit des femmes, qui augmente de 30 % le risque de faire un cancer du sein. un plan qui interdirait l'emploi des pesticides pour éviter aux agriculteurs et aux ouvriers agricoles d'être parmi ceux avec les taux les plus élevés de cancer de la prostate. Un plan de sortie, Monsieur le Commissaire, des perturbateurs endocriniens et des substances préoccupantes pour protéger la santé des consommateurs et diminuer leur exposition globale à ces résidus chimiques qui s'amoncellent dans nos organes. Un plan de sortie des pollutions de l'air que nous respirons et qui nous rend malade.

Il faut vraiment augmenter la prévention. Bien sûr, il y a l'accès pour tous aux médicaments. Bien sûr, il faut lutter contre la pénurie des médicaments qui se fait jour. Mais il faut être hyper audacieux et innovant justement pour lutter contre le cancer.

Simona Baldassarre, *a nome del gruppo ID*. – Signora Presidente, onorevoli colleghi, mi ha molto delusa il programma della Presidente von der Leyen che, seppur medico, come me, non ha accennato a qualsivoglia impegno su temi come la revisione del pacchetto farmaceutico, il destino dell'HTA e la direttiva sulle cure transfrontaliere. Eppure la stella polare di noi medici dovrebbe essere il benessere dei nostri cittadini.

Spero almeno che il suo annuncio sulla lotta contro il cancro abbia un seguito. È una sfida da cui dipende la speranza di vita di tante persone e richiede il massimo impegno nella prevenzione, nella diagnostica e nelle cure.

Vorrei porre oggi l'attenzione su un tema che coinvolge un quarto dei pazienti oncologici in Europa: i tumori rari. Penso, ad esempio, ai tumori rari dall'età pediatrica, per cui le conoscenze mediche sono recenti e poco condivise e la diagnosi è complicata. In Europa gli strumenti per far fronte a questa sfida esistono. Lo IARC ha emanato in questi giorni le raccomandazioni per gli Stati membri.

A nome dei cittadini e dei pazienti italiani voglio chiedere alla Commissione di recepire al più presto tali raccomandazioni e al governo del mio paese di implementarle e di rendere operative le reti ERN. Se vogliamo salvare vite, diamoci da fare!

Joanna Kopcińska, *w imieniu grupy ECR*. – Pani Przewodnicząca! Panie Komisarzy! Światowa Organizacja Zdrowia ostrzega, że nowotwory są drugą główną przyczyną zgonów na świecie, w tym zwłaszcza nowotwór płuc i piersi. W zeszłym roku nowotwory doprowadziły – była już o tym dzisiaj mowa – do 9 milionów 600 tysięcy zgonów na świecie, co oznacza, że co szósty przypadek śmierci spowodowany jest właśnie przez nowotwór.

Pomimo faktu, że Unia Europejska, w tym Parlament Europejski, podjął sporo środków zaradczych w ramach zwalczania raka w krajach członkowskich, wciąż zmagamy się z niedostatecznymi przedsięwzięciami finansowymi i logistycznymi. I zwłaszcza teraz, kiedy dziesięć państw członkowskich Unii Europejskiej, w tym mój kraj, uczestniczy w wydarzeniu Europejskiego Tygodnia Profilaktyki Nowotworów Głowy i Szyi, chciałabym wezwać Radę Europejską i Komisję Europejską do wzmocnienia pozycji negocjacyjnej państw członkowskich, aby zagwarantować dostępność leków po przystępnych cenach w całej Unii Europejskiej, w tym zwłaszcza leków przeciwnowotworowych.

Nie tylko jako poseł do Parlamentu Europejskiego, ale również lekarz z wykształcenia uważam, że pacjenci w Unii Europejskiej powinni mieć równy dostęp do najnowszych terapii bez względu na miejsce urodzenia, ponieważ w obliczu choroby wszyscy możemy stać się pacjentami, których wyzwaniem jest walka z chorobą.

Kateřina Konečná, za skupinu GUE/NGL. – Paní pŕedsedající, na začátek bych ráda řekla, že velice vítám to, že si jak nová paní pŕedsedkyně Komise, tak frakce PPE ve svém programu boj s rakovinou vytknuly jako jednu z priorit do nového období. Bohužel, zejména u paní pŕedsedkyně není jasné, na jaké úrovni chce s tímto rozsáhlým problémem bojovat. Řekněme si to na rovinu, současná Komise se k boji s rakovinou stavěla velmi rozporuplně. Na jednu stranu proklamovala, jak je důležitá prevence, a na tu druhou ostentativně a protiprávně ignorovala svoji povinnost upravit používání tzv. endokrinních disruptorů, které jsou jedním z důvodů toho, že je rakovina ve všech svých formách ve společnosti v současné době tak rozšířena. Vrcholem tohoto snažení Evropské komise pak bylo opětovná autorizace glyfosátu, proti které protestovala jak laická, tak odborná lékařská veřejnost.

Včasné rozpoznání a screening populace, které chce nová prezidentka posílit, jsou zajisté chvályhodné činnosti. Nicméně pokud nezačneme řešit příčiny, které tkví v látkách, které přijímáme v potravě i vodě, změní se jen málo a akorát přelijeme prostředky, které by mohly pomáhat lékařům, patientským organizacím, pacientům, do chřtánu farmaceutických společností a pojišŕoven. Za sebe vidím větší potenciál v posílení práce s pacienty a jejich rodinami, protože netrpí pouze pacienti postižení rakovinou, ale taktéž i jejich okolí, rodina a pŕátele. Doufám tedy, že nejenom my všichni tady, ale pŕedevším Evropská komise konečně začne konat.

David Bull (NI). – Madam President, being given a diagnosis of cancer is a truly life-changing event. It creates a climate of fear and uncertainty. I know that as a medical doctor and because my father, Richard, died of prostate cancer. However, thankfully due to earlier diagnosis, prompt intervention, dedicated specialists and advances in pharmaceutical medicines, the prognosis for many has now improved.

However, opportunists have purposely created a climate of fear in the United Kingdom. Patients are now being told that if Britain leaves without a deal, then there will be a significant shortage of cancer medicines, which will profoundly affect their clinical outcomes. So it is vital that we work together to reassure people that this is not the case. In my capacity as a medical doctor, I have spoken to people in the pharmaceutical industry. It is now very clear there has been a huge amount of no-deal planning and workarounds are now in place, such as batch testing and mutual recognition of standards. Three separate pharmaceutical companies based in France have also told me that the UK remains an extremely important trading partner and they will ensure that trade continues as today. It is worth remembering we import 37 million packs of medicine a month from the EU, and we export 45 million packs, so trade is reciprocal.

I want to close by saying I hope everyone here in the European Parliament will join me in supporting everyone touched by cancer, ensuring that we cooperate. I'm sure that you will also agree with me that playing political games with people's lives is never acceptable.

Dubravka Šuica (PPE). – Poštovana pŕedsjedavajuća, drago mi je da je danas ova točka došla na dnevni red baš na početku ovog zasjedanja, što znači da će to biti jedan od naših prioriteta. Vjerujem da ovdje nema političkih razlika i da Brexit ne bi trebao imati veze s ovom temom danas.

Ono što želim reći je, čuli smo i od više govornika, da je nažalost rak postao jedan od vodećih uzroka smrtnosti u Europskoj uniji, a posebice u zemljama središnje i istočne Europe koje imaju manji bruto društveni proizvod i mislim da to trebamo ispraviti. Dakle, kad govorimo o jednakosti, onda se jednakost odnosi i na ovo područje: mora biti jednak pristup lijekovima svakom bolesniku, neovisno iz koje zemlje dolazi i stoga pohvaljujem rad aktualne Komisije i nadam se da će i nova Komisija nastaviti, kao što je i najavila naša nova pŕedsjednica u svojim prioritetima, voditi o tome računa, uložiti puno novaca u istraživanje. Vrlo je važno uložiti u istraživanje, a, kao što sam rekla, i omogućiti svim pacijentima jednaki pristup, posebno danas pametnim lijekovima.

Kad se radi o plastici, stilu života, pesticidima, naravno da i tu trebamo napraviti balans i ja sam uvjeren da ćemo to činiti i u budućem razdoblju. Dakle, očekujem da će i nova Komisija voditi računa o ovom aspektu, da ćemo donijeti novi europski plan, masterplan, za borbu protiv raka. Ja sam imala cijeli niz konferencija u prošlom sazivu, fight and win diljem Hrvatske i ovdje u Bruxellesu. Vjerujem da ću, neovisno o svom budućem portfelju, moći doprinosti i unutar Komisije ovoj borbi protiv raka jer to je borba svih nas, neovisno lijevi, desni, srednji, a i zahvaljujem gospodinu Weberu što je vodio ovo kroz svoju kampanju i što je danas ovu točku stavio kao glavnu debatu na dnevni red ovog Parlamenta.

Agnes Jongerius (S&D). – Voorzitter, kanker is een verschrikkelijke ziekte die heel veel leed en verdriet veroorzaakt. In Europa krijgt een op de tien mensen die kanker krijgen, deze ziekte door het werk. De commissaris wees er al op dat wij in de afgelopen vijf jaar drie pakketten van grenswaarden op kankerverwekkende stoffen hebben ingevoerd. In Europa is dieseldamp voor het eerst erkend als kankerverwekkende stof. Daar ben ik eerlijk gezegd best trots op.

Maar onze ambitie moet natuurlijk hier niet stoppen. Wij moeten naar mijn idee de lat hoger leggen. Ik vind dat wij ervoor moeten vechten dat niemand kanker krijgt door het werk. Daarom roep ik de commissaris en zijn opvolger op om strengere normen te maken voor alle schadelijke stoffen die kanker veroorzaken. Want, laten wij eerlijk zijn, ziek worden van je werk is toch niet meer van deze tijd!

Frédérique Ries (Renew). – Madame la Présidente, je voudrais vous demander quelques secondes de latitude sur mon temps de parole pour remercier M. le commissaire, qui s'en va vers d'autres horizons, il nous l'a précisé. Ce fut un plaisir, Monsieur Andriukaitis, de travailler avec vous ces cinq dernières années pour faire avancer ensemble l'Europe de la santé.

Vous vous en souvenez peut-être, il y a trois ans, je m'adressais à vous en plénière pour vous lire l'e-mail de M^{me} Heinen, maman, comme des milliers d'autres mamans en Europe, d'un enfant atteint du cancer. Elle nous appelait à plus de courage pour lutter contre ce fléau, la maladie qui tue le plus d'enfants en Europe. Le Parlement, dans la foulée, adoptait à l'unanimité ma résolution pour développer les médicaments pédiatriques, et exigeait notamment que ceux-ci fassent l'objet d'une évaluation spécifique. Pour la moitié d'entre eux, en effet, on se borne à diviser les doses de médicaments pour adultes!

On attend donc pour cette année l'évaluation du règlement sur les médicaments pédiatriques, et il y a urgence. Savez-vous que, depuis 2006, seulement six nouveaux traitements contre les cancers infantiles ont été mis sur le marché. Ma question est simple, Monsieur le commissaire: qu'allons-nous répondre à M^{me} Heinen et à ces milliers de parents en Europe? Quelles mesures ont été prises sur le plan de la recherche, de l'innovation, des besoins pédiatriques et des effets secondaires, de la survie chez les petits? Avons-nous avancé et comment nous assurons-nous que ces enseignements-là seront coulés dans le plan anticancer de Madame von der Leyen?

Joëlle Mélin (ID). – Madame la Présidente, le cancer étant la seconde cause de mortalité en Europe, il y a nécessité d'accélérer la recherche, sachant que les causes quotidiennes de cancer se multiplient, qu'elles soient environnementales ou psychologiques, et que les cancers sont de plus en plus multifactoriels. Dès lors, la recherche, qu'elle soit préventive ou curative, déjà en retard, doit s'adapter en permanence à ces nouveaux aspects et renforcer la coopération tant européenne qu'internationale.

Toutefois, cela suppose que le puissant lobby des laboratoires pharmaceutiques, qui réalise une très grosse part de son chiffre d'affaires en oncologie, soit très largement contrôlé. Il faut que les molécules déjà découvertes soient rapidement mises sur le marché à des prix accessibles pour tous. Il faut permettre de renforcer, comme on vient d'en parler, la recherche en oncologie pédiatrique, qui est au point mort en Europe. Il faut ouvrir la voie à des thérapeutiques alternatives et complémentaires, comme la thérapie cellulaire ou la phagothérapie, par exemple. Mais il faut aussi faire tomber tous les tabous commerciaux à l'origine, en particulier, de criminelles ruptures de stock actuellement en Europe. À ce prix, la coopération européenne sera efficace.

Jadwiga Wiśniewska (ECR). – Pani Przewodnicząca! Zgadzam się z tym ostatnim postulatem mówiącym o tym, że powinniśmy jednak mocniej kontrolować lobby farmaceutyczne, które naprawdę zbiera bogate żniwo na tragediach ludzkich. Rzeczywiście państwo przytaczacie tutaj szereg liczb, które są przerażające, bo za każdą z tych liczb stoi ludzkie życie, życie człowieka, który dowiaduje się, że jest chory na raka, bardzo często nieuleczalnie. W 2015 roku milion trzysta tysięcy ludzi w Unii Europejskiej zmarło właśnie na raka, co stanowi ponad jedną czwartą ogólnej liczby zgonów. Nowotwór złośliwy rozpoznaje się rocznie u 35 tysięcy dzieci. W każdym roku 6 tysięcy dzieci umiera. Często rodzice tych dzieci żebrzą, proszą o pieniądze na leczenie swoich chorych dzieci. Tak więc potrzebujemy kompleksowych działań, które pozwolą nam w sposób skuteczny walczyć z chorobami nowotworowymi. Należy stworzyć sprzyjające temu rozwiązania legislacyjne, a na poziomie unijnym wspierać współpracę w ramach badań transgranicznych i transfer wiedzy w celu lepszego wykorzystania potencjału intelektualnego naukowców we wszystkich państwach członkowskich. Możemy obniżyć wskaźniki zachorowalności i umieralności poprzez to, że będziemy wymieniać się dobrymi praktykami, promować prozdrowotne zachowania i przede wszystkim należy również poprawić jakość kształcenia kadr medycznych.

Έλενα Κουντουρά (GUE/NGL). – Κυρία Πρόεδρε, κύριοι συνάδελφοι, κάθε χρόνο 1.300.000 Ευρωπαίοι χάνουν τη ζωή τους από καρκίνο, αριθμός που αντιστοιχεί στο 26% όλων των θανάτων.

Θέλω να σταθώ στον καρκίνο του μαστού, που έχει την υψηλότερη θνησιμότητα στις γυναίκες από οποιαδήποτε άλλη μορφή καρκίνου παγκοσμίως. Μόνο το 2018 στην Ευρώπη είχαμε 522.000 νέα κρούσματα και 138.000 θανάτους. Αν όμως διαγνωστεί έγκαιρα, είναι 100% ιάσιμος. Για αυτό πιέζουμε, ώστε να τεθεί στην κορυφή της ατζέντας υγείας όλων των κρατών μελών, να βρίσκεται στην πρώτη γραμμή των πολιτικών και των δράσεων για την πρόληψη και την ενημέρωση, με εκστρατείες ευαισθητοποίησης και με προγράμματα εκπαίδευσης. Πρέπει να διασφαλίσουμε ότι οι ασθενείς έχουν καθολική πρόσβαση σε όλα τα πρωτόκολλα θεραπείας. Οφείλουμε να ξεπεράσουμε τις προκαταλήψεις και τα κοινωνικά ταμπού, ώστε η ενημέρωση και ο προληπτικός έλεγχος να γίνουν υπόθεση όλων των γυναικών!

Χαίρομαι, ιδιαίτερα, γιατί η προτεινόμενη Επιτροπος από την Κύπρο, κυρία Κυριακίδου, γνωρίζει σε βάθος το πρόβλημα και είναι αποφασισμένη να δημιουργήσει την πρώτη ευρωπαϊκή στρατηγική για την αντιμετώπιση του καρκίνου.

Peter Liese (PPE). – Frau Präsidentin, Herr Kommissar, liebe Kolleginnen und Kollegen! Das Thema Krebs ist für viele ein sehr persönliches Thema, und so auch für mich. Vor einiger Zeit habe ich einen meiner besten Freunde im Alter von nur 46 Jahren an Krebs verloren. Das ist auch einer der Gründe, warum ich mit Manfred Weber und vielen anderen schon seit langem daran arbeite, dass wir uns dieses Themas mehr annehmen.

Wir als EVP haben uns schon vor zwei Jahren verpflichtet, unseren Beitrag zu leisten, damit es möglich ist, dass in 20 Jahren niemand mehr an Krebs sterben wird. Das schaffen wir nicht alleine; auch die Mitgliedstaaten haben eine große Verantwortung, unter dem Subsidiaritätsprinzip aber ist vieles möglich.

Zum Beispiel können wir dafür sorgen, dass die Daten besser verbunden werden. Wir haben viele Krebsregister, die aber nicht zusammenpassen. So können wir den Patienten nicht bestmöglich helfen. Da brauchen wir mehr europäische Zusammenarbeit.

Wir brauchen mehr Forschung. Und da appelliere ich an den Rat: Die Kürzungspläne bei Horizon sind das Gegenteil von dem, was wir gebrauchen können.

Aber ich möchte auch auf den britischen Kollegen von der Brexit-Partei eingehen, der leider jetzt den Saal verlassen hat. Die Experten, zum Beispiel die British Medical Association, sagen: Es gibt ein Problem mit der medizinischen Versorgung beim Brexit und insbesondere bei einem harten Brexit. Das kann man nicht ignorieren. Die Brexit-Partei benimmt sich wie jemand, der Feuer legt und anschließend diejenigen beschimpft, die sagen, dass es brennt und dass man doch löschen muss. Sie spielen mit dem Leben von Patienten; dessen müssen sie sich bewusst sein, und das werden wir auch aussprechen.

Nicolás González Casares (S&D). – Señora presidenta, celebro este debate en la Cámara y celebro que en la carta de admisión de la nueva comisaria de Salud se ponga la lucha contra el cáncer en primera línea de las prioridades.

El pilar fundamental de la lucha contra el cáncer es la prevención. Debemos avanzar en educación para la salud, es decir, informar claramente a nuestra ciudadanía sobre los factores de riesgo, pero también legislar. Estamos viendo, por ejemplo, que, en la lucha contra el tabaco, productos nuevos, como los vapeadores, pueden dar una imagen falsa de benignidad, y creo que nuestro marco legislativo no está actualmente preparado.

En cuanto a fomentar la investigación para el diagnóstico y tratamiento a través de Horizonte 2020, aquí quería remarcar la importancia de apoyar aquellas iniciativas que trabajen en la innovación de la biopsia líquida, que es una de las alternativas que puede ayudar a un diagnóstico precoz y rápido.

Señorías, a pesar de todos los esfuerzos, seguirá muriendo gente en Europa por cáncer. Por ello, no debemos olvidar la dimensión familiar que tiene esta enfermedad, cuidar de quien cuida —yo soy enfermero— y, desde luego, la importancia de garantizar a esos pacientes una posibilidad de muerte digna.

Susana Solís Pérez (Renew). – Señora presidenta, la investigación y la innovación son esenciales si queremos ganarle la batalla al cáncer. Y es precisamente en este ámbito donde este Parlamento puede jugar un papel fundamental. Porque es este Parlamento el que puede exigir, por ejemplo, que el programa Horizonte Europa contenga los fondos suficientes para que nuestros investigadores puedan trabajar.

También necesitamos una mejor coordinación entre los centros de investigación, los hospitales, los pacientes y las empresas, para que se puedan desarrollar nuevos medicamentos, y que estos lleguen al mercado en el menor tiempo posible y no dejen a nadie atrás. Y es aquí, también, donde tenemos que legislar para permitir la aplicación de nuevas tecnologías, como puede ser el uso de la inteligencia artificial en los datos de los pacientes, eso sí, asegurándonos de que se van a respetar escrupulosamente sus derechos.

En definitiva, yo quería dar un mensaje a la ciudadanía de que, desde las instituciones europeas, vamos a trabajar juntos para asegurarnos de que los investigadores van a contar con todos los recursos suficientes para luchar contra esta terrible enfermedad.

Luisa Regimenti (ID). – Signora Presidente, onorevoli colleghi, la discussione che oggi ci interessa è di particolare importanza per la salute di tutti gli europei e necessita di una risposta forte e di un'azione coesa fra i gruppi.

È infatti scientificamente provato che il sopravvenire di patologie tumorali dipende in larga parte dalla diretta correlazione tra ambiente, alimentazione e uomo. Di conseguenza non possiamo più ignorare gli effetti devastanti delle sostanze presenti nei cibi e nell'aria che respiriamo.

Solo con una battaglia sostanziale, non solo formale, per la salvaguardia dell'ambiente è possibile affrontare la lotta contro il cancro, oltre ad assicurare un instancabile sostegno alla ricerca sulle terapie mirate, come i farmaci biologici, il cui uso è stato dimostrato essere efficace e meno tossico di farmaci chemioterapici usati talvolta in maniera inadeguata, come ho spesso visto nella mia esperienza di medico.

Ci è stato demandato dai nostri cittadini il compito di proteggerli e di garantire il loro diritto fondamentale alla salute: è dunque necessario fare quanto è in nostro potere in questa sede e nella commissione per l'ambiente, la sanità pubblica e la sicurezza alimentare, di cui faccio parte, per affrontare insieme questa importante sfida.

Lucia Ďuriš Nicholsonová (ECR). – Madam President, according to data, enormous inequalities in access to the best available diagnosis and treatment for young cancer patients lead to differences in survival of up to 20%. This affects mostly children and adolescents in the central and eastern Europe region. Sadly it is my country, Slovakia, that, according to the WHO, has the second highest mortality results in Europe, with 259 people per 100 000 inhabitants affected.

We have tremendous problems with early diagnosis, quality therapy and specialist comprehensive care for small patients, as well as extremely long waiting periods for oncological surgeries and lack of post-treatment care. Therefore I call on the Commission and Member States to facilitate access to the best possible diagnostic and treatment modalities for all young cancer patients within the European Union. And last but not least, I kindly ask all my colleagues to support awareness about childhood cancer by wearing the gold ribbon that I sent to you all last week.

Dolors Montserrat (PPE). – Señora presidenta, Europa afronta muchos desafíos por todos conocidos, como el *Brexit*, pero miles de ciudadanos europeos afrontan una terrible realidad que tiene menos impacto mediático pero una gran importancia: el cáncer, que azota a Europa.

Todos hemos sufrido de cerca el cáncer. La realidad de las cifras es incontestable: 1,4 millones de europeos perderán la vida este año por el cáncer; el 40 % de los ciudadanos europeos afrontaremos el cáncer en algún momento de nuestras vidas. A pesar de esta dura realidad, hay motivos para la esperanza. La mortalidad por cáncer ha bajado un 10 %. Entre el 30 % y el 50 % de los cánceres son evitables. ¿Cómo?

Transformando nuestros hábitos de vida, de nuestros hijos, de todos. Debemos promover una dieta saludable, cuidar el aire que respiramos. Debemos alejarnos del sedentarismo y del tabaquismo. Pero también debemos cuidar la salud mental de nuestra sociedad: el estrés, la depresión, la ansiedad. En definitiva, el ritmo trepidante de nuestras vidas.

Para lograr todos estos objetivos debemos tener un enfoque europeo, mejorar alianzas, mejorar la prevención y la detección precoz, aumentar la inversión en investigación, la equidad en el acceso a los tratamientos en todos los rincones de Europa y mejorar la humanización de la atención a los pacientes para que sea holística y abarque desde la parte médica a la ayuda social a los pacientes.

El cáncer tiene muchas caras y debemos ocuparnos de todas ellas. Este es el objetivo del plan de lucha contra el cáncer que lidera el Partido Popular Europeo, un plan que ayudará a derrotar la enfermedad, que llenará de vida y esperanza a miles de europeos. Por ello, pedimos a la presidencia von der Leyen que luche contra el cáncer y que sea una de las grandes prioridades de esta Comisión.

Rory Palmer (S&D). – Madam President, it's my honour in this debate to mention my constituent Jacci Woodcock, who has been diagnosed with breast cancer, but is also the inspiration and the driving force behind the Dying to Work campaign which is seeking to secure stronger legal rights and protections in the workplace for people with a terminal illness.

Working with her trade union, the GMB, now with the Trades Union Congress, and now with the European Trade Union Confederation (ETUC) and the European Cancer Patient Coalition (ECPC), we are now pushing the Commission as part of any European cancer plan to include specific protections to support people with terminal illness to stay in the workplace, to continue to have the dignity of employment for as long as they can and as long as they so wish. So I press the Commission to take action on that point and I encourage MEPs from across the House to support the Dying to Work campaign group here in Parliament which I launched during the last mandate.

Chrysoula Zacharopoulou (Renew). – Madame la Présidente, Mesdames et Messieurs, je soutiens totalement l'initiative de M^{me} Ursula von der Leyen de lancer un plan européen contre le cancer. Mais je suis convaincue qu'on peut et doit aller plus loin.

Prenons un exemple concret: le cancer du col de l'utérus est l'une des formes de cancer le plus mortel au monde chez les femmes. Plus de 300 000 femmes meurent chaque année, dont 90 % dans les pays en développement. Or, grâce au dépistage et à la vaccination, nous avons les moyens de les sauver.

Alors, en cohérence avec les objectifs du développement durable, en cohérence avec l'appel mondial du directeur général de l'OMS, le Dr Tedros, en cohérence avec nos valeurs et nos engagements pour la santé mondiale, Monsieur le Commissaire, Madame la Ministre, nous devons impérativement intégrer dans ce plan européen un volet «action extérieure», car nous ne pouvons pas accepter de voir des femmes mourir d'une maladie que l'on peut prévenir et soigner, ni en Europe ni dans le monde.

Aurelia Beigneux (ID). – Madame la Présidente, mes chers collègues, je suis intervenue lors de la dernière commission Environnement sur la pénurie de médicaments que traverse l'Europe. Cette intervention étant restée sans réponse ni réaction, je voulais y revenir.

L'été a connu de nouvelles pénuries de médicaments en France. La délocalisation de nos productions cause des retards dans l'acheminement des produits. De plus, des laboratoires rechignent à en fabriquer suffisamment pour la France, jugée peu rentable. C'est un véritable scandale.

En juin, 2 318 médicaments étaient en tension. En dix ans, le nombre de ruptures a été multiplié par 20 et près d'un Français sur quatre y a été confronté. Au niveau européen, cette pénurie est inquiétante: 80 % des principes actifs sont fabriqués hors d'Europe, contre 20 % il y a 30 ans. Il y a donc urgence. Un patient atteint d'un cancer ne peut voir son traitement retardé parce que certains groupes pharmaceutiques ne se préoccupent que de la rentabilité. Les soins doivent être accessibles à tous. Il y a urgence à étudier les moyens de relocaliser les productions de médicaments et de développer les réserves stratégiques.

Beata Mazurek (ECR). – Pani Przewodnicząca! Obchodzimy Europejski Tydzień Profilaktyki Nowotworów Głowy i Szyi, zatem we właściwym czasie zajmujemy się problemem, który dotyka miliony osób w Europie. Parlament powinien wspierać wysiłki wszystkich państw członkowskich, aby każdy obywatel Wspólnoty miał równy dostęp do najnowocześniejszych metod leczenia nowotworów. Nigdy nie powinno zabraknąć funduszy na specjalistyczne leczenie, a także profilaktykę. W Polsce weszła w życie narodowa strategia onkologiczna zakładająca szereg działań, między innymi wczesnego wykrywania i diagnostyki, leczenia chorób nowotworowych. Wymiana doświadczeń na poziomie lekarzy i naukowców zebranego w ramach tego i innych programów państw członkowskich powinna być aktywnie wspierana przez instytucje europejskie. Wspólnie zadbajmy o to, aby osoba, która dowiaduje się o swojej chorobie, nie czuła, że zapada na nią wyrok, ale ma szansę na szybką i profesjonalną pomoc tak w bogatszych, jak i biedniejszych regionach Unii. Wspólnie podejmujmy działania, by dostarczyć krajom członkowskim Unii Europejskiej narzędzi ułatwiających poprawę jakości krajowych programów walki z rakiem, by były bardziej skuteczne. Proszę Państwa, mamy świadomość tego, że życie ma taką samą wartość we wszystkich krajach naszej Wspólnoty i o to życie wszyscy powinniśmy zadbać.

Cindy Franssen (PPE). – Voorzitter, op het vlak van gezondheid is kanker wellicht een van de belangrijkste uitdagingen in Europa. Een masterplan tegen kanker – en dat is toch wel onze ambitie – moet inzetten op een veelheid van factoren. Europa moet in de cockpit zitten inzake onderzoek en de ontwikkeling van nieuwe technologieën. Ik denk aan artificiële intelligentie en aan medisch 3D-printen, maar ook aan de correlatie tussen omgevingsfactoren en de epigenetica.

Ons plan mag nog zo'n technisch en innovatief hoogstandje zijn, toch zal het niets betekenen als we de patiënt niet centraal stellen. De patiënt centraal stellen betekent de toegang tot betaalbare geneesmiddelen verzekeren. Hierover zal de discussie met de farmasector geopend moeten worden. We willen geen gezondheidszorg met twee snelheden. De patiënt centraal stellen betekent de kloof inzake preventie wegwerken. En, mijnheer de commissaris, u heeft gelijk als u zegt dat we meer moeten inzetten op preventie, maar we weten allemaal dat een gezonde levensstijl en gezonde voeding nog steeds de duurdere *way of life* zijn.

Inzetten op de patiënt en deze centraal plaatsen betekent ook dat we, naast de terechte aandacht voor zeer jonge kinderen, ook de AYA's niet mogen vergeten, de groep van jongeren en jongvolwassenen die geconfronteerd worden met kanker. Zij komen op een *rollercoaster* terecht en moeten zich existentiële vragen stellen op een leeftijd die eigenlijk zorgeloos zou moeten verlopen. Dit is de reden waarom ik in dit Parlement zit. Dit zijn de Europese waarden die ik wil verdedigen: solidariteit, verdraagzaamheid en betrouwbaarheid voor diegenen die op de pechstrook van het leven staan.

Christel Schaldemose (S&D). – Fru Formand! Kampen mod kræft står i dag som en af de allervigtigste kampe på det sundhedspolitiske område. Rundt omkring på sygehusene i Europa kæmper læger, patienter, sygeplejersker og pårørende hver evig eneste dag med at redde liv og også hjælpe de patienter, der har haft kræft, til at få et bedre liv, efter de er færdigbehandlet. Det er utrolig vigtigt. Men vi skal også gøre mere, og vi skal gøre mere på europæisk plan, for vi kan faktisk gøre noget. Vi skal have flere ressourcer til forskning, vi skal gøre meget mere for forebyggelse, og særligt her tænker jeg, at det europæiske niveau er vigtigt. Vi kan for eksempel sørge for, at eksponeringen af kræftfremkaldende stoffer bliver mindre, og vi skal hurtigere kunne forbyde farlige stoffer. Vi skal også blive væsentligt bedre til at lære af hinandens gode erfaringer. I dag er der stadig flere mennesker, der overlever kræft. Og derfor er det også vigtigt, at vi lærer, for eksempel i forhold til efterfølgende genoptræning. Vi skal gøre meget mere sammen, fordi sammen kan vi faktisk få taget et ordenligt skridt fremad i kampen mod kræft. Det er vigtigt.

Judith Bunting (Renew). – Madam President, what makes cancer so dangerous is that it is such a complex disease. Tumours that come under the same umbrella are often quite different. There are many different kinds of breast cancer, but they're still called breast cancer. Hodgkin's lymphoma attacks young lives, not old, and it is 95% curable, which is wonderful. But other cancers are still an automatic death sentence. In addition, genetic instability means that tumours go through an evolutionary process which means they can quickly become resistant to treatments that were working. But we know that one in three cancers might be curable, so we need to do more.

Advancements in genomic research are allowing research on tumour mutations to move quickly. Further studies in epigenetics are allowing researchers to look deeper, beyond DNA, and to combine the medical data with critical information about the kind of external and environmental factors that have been mentioned here today.

We must seize the opportunities created by these advancements in biomedicine, bioinformatics, big data and artificial intelligence to help us in this fight. So I call on Ursula van der Leyen to make the fight against cancer an absolute priority of the next Commission, in scientific research as well as in the medical area.

Annalisa Tardino (ID). – Signora Presidente, onorevoli colleghi, il cancro rappresenta la prima causa di morte in un numero crescente di paesi europei e solo per il tumore al seno in Italia si registrano oltre 48 mila nuovi casi ogni anno. Nonostante i notevoli progressi raggiunti grazie alla ricerca, ancora oggi la prevenzione è veramente l'unica arma efficace di cui disponiamo per sconfiggere il cancro.

Abbiamo appreso i programmi della Presidente von der Leyen e adesso aspettiamo i fatti. L'Europa deve continuare a promuovere lo sviluppo della collaborazione tra reti specializzate e di eccellenza per migliorare la qualità della diagnosi, i servizi di cura e facilitare la cooperazione multidisciplinare. Ma soprattutto bisogna intensificare il coordinamento tra gli Stati membri, perché sono ancora troppe le differenze per l'accesso agli screening e alle cure, sia tra i diversi Stati nonché talvolta tra regione e regione di un singolo paese.

Bisogna inoltre intervenire sulle cause che originano la malattia: in Sicilia, nei poli industriali di Gela, Milazzo e Priolo, i dati scientifici sono infatti ben oltre il livello d'allarme e sono soglie che non possiamo più accettare.

Dobbiamo poi investire nella formazione degli operatori sanitari e realizzare in ogni presidio urbano un centro non solo per la prevenzione e l'informazione ma anche per il sostegno psicologico di chi è stato colpito dal male. Accanto alla ricerca, infatti, il ruolo centrale deve essere giocato dall'umanizzazione delle cure.

Ruža Tomašić (ECR). – Poštovana predsjedavajuća, borba protiv raka traži stalna financijska ulaganja, ne samo u zdravstvenu njegu, nego i u znanstvena istraživanja te odgojno-obrazovni sustav. Dio europskih zemalja, uključujući Hrvatsku, sve teže u tome prati najrazvijenije države. Troškovi novih lijekova i dijagnostičkih metoda u stalnom su porastu, a ne prati ih gospodarski rast i rast životnog standarda, što ih naravno čini manje dostupnima.

Prema najnovijim podacima, Hrvatska je na 10. mjestu po smrtnosti od raka, a u Europskoj uniji od naše države lošije stoji samo susjedna Mađarska. U Hrvatskoj su 2016. od raka umrle 344 osobe na 100 tisuća stanovnika, dok je europski prosjek 262 osobe, a američki 164.

Samo taj podatak dovoljno govori o potrebi za većim ulaganjima koja neće biti moguća bez jačanja poduzetničke klime i privatnog sektora te rezova u nekim drugim dijelovima nabujalog javnog sektora.

Nathalie Colin-Oesterlé (PPE). – Madame la Présidente, selon les dernières prévisions, le cancer va tuer 1 400 000 personnes en Europe en 2019. Chacun de nous est concerné par cette grande cause prioritaire qu'est la lutte contre le cancer. Nous avons donc besoin d'un grand plan européen pour renforcer et mutualiser les moyens dédiés à la recherche et à l'innovation. Nous devons également harmoniser les politiques en matière de santé publique car c'est ensemble que nous travaillerons efficacement et avancerons en matière de recherche et de lutte contre le cancer.

Je souhaite à cet égard évoquer la problématique d'approvisionnement et de rupture de stock de médicaments dans différents États membres. Ces pénuries concernent notamment certains médicaments voués au traitement de pathologies sévères comme les cancers. Les causes de ces pénuries doivent être connues et analysées. Il nous faut aussi responsabiliser tous les acteurs, harmoniser les réglementations au niveau européen et faciliter l'acheminement de médicaments entre États membres. L'accès aux soins pour tous les citoyens européens doit être garanti, avec une véritable transparence en matière de disponibilité des traitements au sein de l'Union européenne. Enfin, bien sûr, nous devons garantir un espace économique viable aux entreprises et laboratoires, ce qui est indispensable pour maintenir les investissements en matière de recherche et d'innovation en Europe. En même temps, ces acteurs doivent jouer le jeu, dans l'intérêt général.

Aujourd'hui, 60 % des composants essentiels aux médicaments sont fabriqués hors d'Europe, en Chine ou en Inde, afin de réduire le coût de la main d'œuvre et de profiter de réglementations moins strictes. Or, la délocalisation de la production est source de multiplication des cas de pénurie lorsque ces médicaments ne sont pas en conformité avec les règles sanitaires du pays où ils doivent être commercialisés. C'est donc au niveau européen que nous devons agir à cette grande cause mondiale. À nous d'apporter des réponses européennes.

Miriam Dalli (S&D). – Sinjura President, llum xtaqt niffoka b'mod partikolari fuq it-tfal għaliex kull każ ta' kanċer fit-tfal huwa ta' qsim ta' qalb. Imma fil-pajjiżi tal-Unjoni Ewropea, il-kanċer huwa l-aktar marda li qed tikkawża mwiet fost it-tfal tagħna.

Issa, minkejja l-iżviluppi pożittivi li saru b'mod ġenerali, sfortunatament ftit li xejn sar progress biex ma jintilfux haġġiet f'każijiet li jkunu aktar diffiċli biex tittratta. Qegħdin nitilfu wisq haġġiet ta' tfal u adolexxenti minhabba din il-marda.

Qed ngħixu f'Unjoni Ewropea fejn hemm inugwaljanzi sostanzjali bejn l-Istati Membri fejn jidhol aċċess għall-aqwa kura u anki għall-aqwa "expertise". U dan id-distakk tant huwa kbir li għad għandna differenza ta' għoxrin fil-mija fir-rati ta' min jirnexxielu jegħleb il-marda bejn il-pajjiżi differenti tal-Unjoni Ewropea. Għalhekk li nehtieġu koperazzjoni Ewropea fuq ir-riċerka u l-innovazzjoni fil-qasam tas-saħħa; programm Ewropew li jista' jgħin pjattaformi ta' riċerka internazzjonali li jistgħu jwasslu għal trasformazzjonijiet kbar.

U jekk marda hija meqjusa rari f'pajjiż wiehed, jista' jkollha ċ-ċans ferm akbar biex tkun indirizzata kif suppost fuq il-livell Ewropew biex ma nkomplux nitilfu aktar persuni u aktar tfal għalxejn.

Maximilian Krah (ID). – Frau Präsidentin! Die Frage des Krebses betrifft mich auch deshalb persönlich, weil ich meine Frau vor fünf Jahren an den Krebs verloren habe. Ich denke, jeder im Raum kann hierzu ähnliche Geschichten aus seinem Umfeld erzählen, sodass an der Dringlichkeit der Krebsforschung keine Zweifel bestehen werden. Es sind aber die Fragen, ob wir Krebs dadurch lösen werden, dass wir die Programme auf EU-Ebene holen, oder ob es nicht dazu dienen würde, wenn wir die Rahmenbedingungen, unter denen Forschungseinrichtungen und Pharmaindustrie arbeiten, verbessern.

Das Gegenteil von gut ist immer gut gemeint, und gut kann es auch sein, wenn man durch Forschungserleichterung, durch Steuerprivilegien den dezentralen Forschungseinrichtungen und Unternehmen, die forschen, es ermöglicht, leichter zu arbeiten. Die Unterschiede der Lebenserwartung zwischen den jüngeren und den älteren EU-Ländern muss man nicht zwingend durch eine bürokratische Arbeit anpassen, sondern etwa, wenn man sich darum kümmert zu verhindern, dass so viele junge Ärzte aus den osteuropäischen Ländern in den Westen gehen. Es gibt also oft Alternativen zu noch mehr zentralen Programmen und zu noch mehr zentralen Initiativen – so gut sie gemeint sind. Bei aller Einigkeit hinsichtlich der Dringlichkeit der Krebsforschung möchte ich darauf hinweisen, dass daraus keine Alternativlosigkeit von zentralen Projekten der medizinischen Forschung folgt.

Liudas Mažylis (PPE). – Madam President, in the face of illness and loss of life, a simple question is raised: why did it happen? If the Europe-wide measures are still insufficient, then why? The European Union started its action on cancer in 1985. Since then, we've spent billions on research, but how do we assess the results? The EU's aim was to reduce cancer incidence by 15 % by 2020. Unfortunately, this will not be the case. Systemic analysis has to be done to find out why.

I am sure that combating cancer is an important political priority of the President-elect of the Commission, Ursula von der Leyen. I hope the work of the new Commission will start on the critical assessment of previous efforts in such spheres as detecting environmental influences, other risk factors, screening and enabling more effective and earlier diagnosis.

I hope that comprehensive plans on action on cancer will be drafted. As the early detection and prevention programmes are crucially important, we particularly stress the need for a harmonised cancer information system.

Mairead McGuinness (PPE). – Madam President, I want to begin first of all by thanking the Commissioner for his passionate work in the area of health and well-being, and those of us who have worked with you, Commissioner, know that to be absolutely true, right to the end.

This debate is very timely and it's been quite sad in many respects to listen to colleagues who have spoken of their own experience of a loved one that has died from cancer. It's timely because on Saturday of this week, I will be speaking at a conference in my own constituency organised by the North East Cancer Research and Education Trust (Necret), and this is the sixth annual gathering, giving information and support to families and individuals who are undergoing cancer treatment. This Necret, as it is called, is involved in fundraising and supporting the unit in the local hospital so that they will have the necessary facilities and equipment to treat people.

I think when it comes to cancer we know that many Member States run checks, breast checks, checks for colon cancer, for cervical cancer, and we need to make sure that best practice prevails in all Member States. And the beauty of the European Union is that we can compare one with the other and help each other to raise the standards.

But I want to mention, as I started with, this day on Saturday, this North East Cancer Research and Education Trust which my neighbour and friend Elizabeth Summersby, who is an Advanced Nurse Practitioner in the Oncology Unit in Our Lady of Lourdes Hospital, is the heart and soul of and to really salute those people who look after those who suffer from cancer and go beyond what they're required to do and work to make sure that their lives are made better and that they're looked after well.

Vytėnas Povilas Andriukaitis, Member of the Commission. – Madam President, I have listened with great interest to these discussions. I am grateful for your valuable insights and engagement. I am very happy to hear so many of you using the words solidarity, fairness, justice and social equality. These are important remedies for all of us. Also, prevention is better than cure, and it will be good to know that we need to do more at EU level and it will be good to see more pan-European flags and fewer national flags in this room because we need solidarity, unity and understanding.

I would like to thank Ms Ries and Ms McGuinness for their kind words. The pleasure was mine. As I mentioned, we are evaluating the Orphan Regulation and the EU Regulation on Medicines for Children. We are aiming for publication at the beginning of 2020. Mr González mentioned e-cigarettes and vaping. We see this story in the United States. I remember our discussions when we discussed issues about tobacco product directives and we proposed to regulate e-cigarettes much more strongly. Now we see evidence and of course it is clear that these products are a threat to citizens' health. We will need to work on it.

I have heard the words endocrine disruptors, pesticides and carcinogens. These are all part of the solution and I am happy to see them in both the mission letters for the Health and the Environment Commissioners. This means that the next Commission will do more in this field.

Finally, even the Brexit Party seems to understand the damage that can be done to patients if we do not fight disease together, uniting our forces, which means that Brexit really creates damage. Thank you very much indeed for understanding. Don't leave your patients in limbo!

There was a comment on breast cancer. The European Breast Cancer Guidelines and a Quality Assurance Scheme for Breast Cancer Services are part of a European initiative. This initiative is person-centred and provides various recommendations, and of course genomic and epigenomic research, as Ms Bunting mentioned, is indeed very important. I am a medical doctor and I could not agree more. As I mentioned in my introduction, we are working on 1+ Million Genomes and of course we need to do more.

Europe is committed to implementing the United Nations Sustainable Development Goals. This includes reducing premature mortality from chronic diseases such as cancer by one third by 2030. To do that we need prevention measures which are common to all the EU countries. They can impact on individual citizens and society in a way that isolated national initiatives could not achieve. Many cancers are challenging the medical community with their complexity and many cancers are rare diseases for which pooling data at EU level has a clear benefit and the European Reference Network now shows very positive results. This is a good way and we are going in the right direction.

I believe that the EU is best placed to disseminate knowledge and to identify and scale up best practices across Member States. The proposal for new cancer plans for the EU, as envisaged by the new President, Ursula von der Leyen, offers a major opportunity to take the next big step forward towards beating cancer in Europe. Therefore, I have no doubt that the Commission will continue its efforts in cancer prevention and control, of course assessing the situation based on what was done by the previous Commission.

I am very happy to hear that we have a lot of like-minded friends around. Together our work will benefit patients, their families and health services across Europe and that is a worthy goal.

Tytti Tuppurainen, *President-in-Office of the Council*. – Madam President, to conclude, I wish to thank the honourable Members for this very useful and timely debate on fighting cancer.

Cancer is a tragedy at a personal level: a fight you could lose in spite of your own strong will and the best help of professionals. In this fight against cancer, as politicians and as institutions of the EU, we should use all the EU tools available.

Let me reiterate that the Finnish Presidency stands ready to cooperate with the European Parliament to raise awareness of the challenges that cancer represents for Europe and for Europeans. Our own initiative, the concept of the economy of well-being, is something which also delivers in the fight against cancer.

It is important to support research. From that point of view, the provisional agreement on including a cancer mission in the future Horizon Europe is essential and the Presidency firmly supports that.

So thank you again for this very important discussion and thank you for your engagement.

President. – The debate is closed.

Written statements (Rule 171)

Alex Agius Saliba (S&D), *in writing*. – Cancer is the second leading cause of mortality in Europe after cardiovascular diseases. Each year, more than 3 million people are diagnosed with cancer. Cancer does not discriminate ... it affects any gender, young or old alike. Much has been achieved in health policy at EU level, but not enough! There is an urgent need to reduce inequalities for fast, safe and affordable access to surgery, radiotherapy and medicines. Cross-border collaboration is a key issue to ensure increased access to innovative treatment for cancer patients, regardless of where they reside. We have to promote survivorship programmes as an essential part of cancer care at all levels. It is essential to promote healthy lifestyles and reduce exposure to risk factors, in order to prevent as many cancers as possible. We need a European plan to beat cancer together in order to reduce health gaps in the prevention and control areas between and within EU Member States and to increase the benefits for cancer patients and their families!

Caterina Chinnici (S&D), *per iscritto*. – La lotta per sconfiggere il cancro deve rappresentare una priorità della nuova Commissione.

Ad oggi, infatti, il cancro rappresenta ancora la seconda causa di decessi nel mondo dopo le malattie cardiovascolari, ma l'*International agency for research on cancer* (IARC) - l'Agenzia per la ricerca sul cancro dell'OMS – stima che nei prossimi anni il cancro diventerà la principale causa di morte nel mondo. Anche in Europa, dove l'aspettativa di vita risulta in crescita, si constata questa tendenza.

I progressi della scienza hanno permesso nuovi trattamenti e nuove cure e, grazie al moltiplicarsi di campagne di prevenzione, stiamo ottenendo sempre migliori risultati, in particolare in pediatria: oggi arriviamo a curare un malato su due.

Ma non basta: dobbiamo e possiamo fare di più! La lotta al cancro è un flagello che accomuna tutti i cittadini europei, contro cui dobbiamo unire le nostre forze e le nostre risorse. È necessario sostenere finanziariamente i programmi di ricerca per individuare le cause della malattia nelle sue diverse forme ed è altresì necessario investire nella prevenzione, con l'obiettivo di ridurre il numero di persone che si ammalano, di fornire cure sempre più efficaci e di migliorare la qualità di vita degli ammalati.

Krzysztof Hetman (PPE), *na piśmie*. – Co roku w Unii Europejskiej 1,5 miliona naszych obywateli traci życie z powodu nowotworów, a w wielu krajach unijnych rak stał się pierwszą przyczyną zgonów. Już chyba każdy z nas musiał zostać skonfrontowany z tą straszną chorobą – jeżeli nie bezpośrednio, to w gronie swoich najbliższych. Pomimo podejmowanych do tej pory działań, również na szczeblu europejskim, statystyki są coraz bardziej przerażające, dlatego nie ulega wątpliwości, że musimy robić więcej i działać skuteczniej.

Uważam zatem, że walka z rakiem powinna stać się jednym z priorytetów Komisji Europejskiej, zaś w wojnie z nowotworami musimy zastosować równoległe działania na wielu frontach – zarówno na poziomie zwiększenia działań profilaktycznych, wczesnego wykrywania, lepszej diagnozy jak i leczenia.

Niedopuszczalne jest też, że szanse na wyleczenie uzależnione są obecnie od miejsca zamieszkania – obywatele z Europy Zachodniej i z dużych ośrodków miejskich mają o ok 30% większe prawdopodobieństwo na wyleczenie niż ci z Europy wschodniej czy regionów wiejskich. Wierzę, że uruchomienie Europejskiego Planu Generalnego w walce z rakiem pomoże nam przełamać te negatywne trendy i sprawić, że rak stanie się chorobą w pełni uleczalną.

Elżbieta Katarzyna Łukacijewska (PPE), *na piśmie*. – Statystyki dotyczące zachorowalności i umieralności na nowotwory w Europie są zatrważające. Co roku z powodu raka z powierzchni Ziemi znika dwumilionowe miasto. Dlatego potrzebne jest skoordynowane działanie i współpraca państw członkowskich na rzecz opracowania wspólnego europejskiego planu walki z rakiem.

Z badań wynika, że od 30 do 50% wszystkich przypadków raka można uniknąć. Dlatego tak istotne jest wdrożenie szeroko zakrojonej polityki unijnej, mającej na celu przede wszystkim zwiększenie świadomości społeczeństwa, zmniejszenie narażenia na czynniki ryzyka zachorowania na nowotwór, promocję badań profilaktycznych oraz zapewnienie ludziom dostępu do informacji i wsparcia potrzebnego do prowadzenia zdrowego stylu życia.

Kolejną kwestią jest zniwelowanie różnic pomiędzy państwami członkowskimi, jeżeli chodzi o dostęp do nowoczesnych leków. Problemów jest wiele, np. refundowanie starych leków powoduje, że brakuje pieniędzy na te nowsze. Ponadto statystyki pokazują, że wydatki niektórych państw członkowskich na badania i leki onkologiczne utrzymują się na bardzo niskim poziomie. Tymczasem szacuje się, że straty z powodu przedwczesnej śmierci w wyniku nowotworów tylko w ciągu jednego roku są nieporównywalnie wyższe. Oznacza to, że w wielu przypadkach wydatki na innowacyjne leki onkologiczne to zaledwie jedna czwarta kwoty, którą gospodarka traci co roku w wyniku przedwczesnej śmierci pacjentów onkologicznych. Powyższe przykłady świadczą o tym, że Europa pilnie potrzebuje skutecznego planu, który w krótkim czasie zintensyfikuje działania na rzecz walki z rakiem.

Marian-Jean Marinescu (PPE), *în scris*. – Viitorul Program-cadru pentru cercetare și inovare trebuie să transpună în fapte concrete obiectivul major al domeniului Sănătate, și anume lupta împotriva cancerului și, în special, împotriva cancerului pediatric. În Europa, cancerul pediatric este principala cauză a mortalității infantile, cu mai mult de 35 000 de cazuri noi anual și mai mult de 6 000 de decese pe an.

Parlamentul European trebuie să își asume pași concreți pentru combaterea cancerului pediatric prin adoptarea modificărilor legislative care să încurajeze descoperirea și producerea mai rapidă și mai eficientă a medicamentelor inovatoare accesibile pacienților și prin alocarea de resurse financiare considerabile pentru a sprijini cercetarea în domeniul cancerului pediatric.

Lupta împotriva acestei boli nu poate fi câștigată fără ca PE să combată accesul inegal al pacienților la cel mai bun tratament cu putință și la cea mai bună expertiză medicală sau fără să pună accentul pe sprijinirea cercetării transfrontaliere. Astăzi avem aproximativ o jumătate de milion de copii supraviețuitori ai cancerului, iar acest număr poate crește și prin implicarea, fără ezitare, a Parlamentului European.

Janina Ochojska (PPE), na piśmie. – Co czwarty Polak umiera z powodu choroby nowotworowej. „Polska to chory kraj”, alarmuje Okręgowa Izba Lekarska w Warszawie. Rak jest wyzwaniem dla wszystkich społeczeństw europejskich. Jednak niektóre kraje pozostają w tyle za średnią europejską. Po województwie świętokrzyskim największa zachorowalność na raka dotyczy mojego regionu wyborczego – Dolnego Śląska. Przewidywany wzrost zachorowań sięga nawet 10%. Uleczalność raka w Polsce osiąga 45% i odbiega od średniej w Unii. Leczenie raka w Polsce jest w stanie zapaści. Obserwuję to z bliska, bo właśnie walczę z rakiem piersi. Specjaliści podkreślają, że poprawy wymaga każdy etap dbania o pacjenta: zarówno profilaktyka, diagnostyka na poziomie lekarzy pierwszego kontaktu, dostępność badań, opieka pozalekarska podczas leczenia, jak i dostępność odpowiednich leków. Ważna jest też prewencja w postaci edukacji w zakresie zdrowego trybu życia. Polska potrzebuje wsparcia na poziomie edukacji lekarzy, poszerzenia oferty badań, budowy siatki placówek leczenia w całym kraju, aby jak największa liczba pacjentów mogła je odbywać w domu, nie porzucając całkowicie życia zawodowego i rodziny.

Cieszę się z zapowiedzi Ursuli von der Leyen w sprawie europejskiego planu walki z rakiem. PE powinien wspierać programy zmierzające do zwiększenia funduszy na rzecz walki z rakiem, jak i nowych regulacji wspierających pacjentów na każdym etapie leczenia.

Manuel Pizarro (S&D), por escrito. – O cancro é uma das principais causas de sofrimento e de morte na Europa. Nas últimas décadas ocorreram, no entanto, importantes avanços científicos no que diz respeito à capacidade de curar uma parte significativa das doenças neoplásicas e na possibilidade de tratamento da generalidade dos doentes, minimizando o impacto do cancro e promovendo a melhoria da qualidade de vida e do tempo de sobrevivência.

Ao mesmo tempo foram disponibilizados tratamentos que aliviam o sofrimento e generalizou-se o reconhecimento da importância dos cuidados paliativos, permitindo que aqueles que são atingidos por formas mais agressivas e extremas de cancro possam viver a doença com dignidade. Face ao impacto da doença e ao aumento das possibilidades de resposta, os cidadãos europeus têm razão para esperar mais da União Europeia.

Há três prioridades que devem ser perseguidas. Em primeiro lugar, o combate às causas evitáveis do cancro, à cabeça das quais continua a figurar o fumo do tabaco. Depois, a criação de um sistema que facilite o acesso de todos aos tratamentos mais modernos e eficazes. Finalmente, o apoio à investigação, a todos os níveis, que nos permita saber mais e lutar melhor contra esta patologia.

Alfred Sant (S&D), in writing. – As a cancer survivor (up to now), I support all measures that can be taken from a political perspective which help to fight the disease in all its forms. The allocation of more research and more quality care for all patients is obviously a priority. But beyond this, I agree that two other goals should be actively pursued on a European basis. One is raising awareness across the population concerning the incidence of cancer, how it arises, how to watch for it. More and more educational programmes are needed which carry out this task in well-designed formats to ensure they communicate knowledge, not fright. The second goal is to promote ever-wider screening programmes, firstly for population strata that stand the highest risk, but also wider. All data show that such programmes, by identifying the disease when it is in an early stage, are succeeding to cut down mortality rates. There are NGOs active on a European basis to promote these aims. The European Commission would be wise if in its anti-cancer initiatives it reserve a substantive role for such NGOs, for they have a good outreach.

Valdemar Tomaševski (ECR), raštu. – Pone Pirmininke, šiandien kalbame labai svarbia mūsų piliečiams tema. Kaip rodo dabartiniai sergamumo rodikliai Europos Sąjungoje, per pirmuosius 75 gyvenimo metus vėžiu gali susirgti kas trečias vyras ir viena iš keturių moterų. Vėžys yra antra dažniausia mirties priežastis Europos Sąjungoje. Kasmet nuo vėžio miršta daugiau kaip 1,5 milijono žmonių. Susiduriame su dideliu iššūkiu, todėl turime labiau remti kovą su šia liga. Viena vertus, skatindami tyrimus ir bendradarbiavimą galime užtikrinti, kad vėžiu sergantys pacientai būtų efektyviai gydomi visoje ES. Kita vertus, tikimės, kad didinant informuotumą apie vėžio prevenciją naujų vėžio atvejų skaičius iki 2020 m. sumažės 15 %. Mums reikalinga kompleksinė strategija, kuri apims ne tik gydymą ir medicininę veiklą. Mums taip pat reikalinga prevencinė veikla, įskaitant švietimą, mokslinius tyrimus ir mokslinę veiklą. Taip pat turėtume atsiminti, kad vėžio gydymas dažnai susijęs su daugybe šalutinių sveikatai poveikių, todėl, be to, kad pagerėtų terapijos veiksmingumas, reikėtų daugiau dėmesio skirti tam, kaip tai veikia pacientų gyvenimo kokybę. Turime padidinti investicijas į kovą su vėžiu, jei norime sėkmingai sustabdyti šį mūsų laikų marą.

VORSITZ: KATARINA BARLEY*Vizepräsidentin***16. Przedstawienie przez Radę stanowiska w sprawie projektu budżetu ogólnego na rok budżetowy 2020 (debata)**

Die Präsidentin. – Als nächster Punkt der Tagesordnung folgt die Aussprache über die Erläuterung des Standpunkts des Rates zum Entwurf des Gesamthaushaltsplans für das Haushaltsjahr 2020 (2019/2710(RSP)).

Kimmo Tiilikainen, *President-in-Office of the Council.* – Madam President, honourable Members, Commissioner, I'm honoured to present the Council's position on the draft budget of the European Union for the financial year 2020. I would like to start by underlining that this Council position was adopted with the overwhelming support of the Member States.

After careful reflection and analysis, the Council proposes for next year a budget of EUR 167 billion in commitment appropriations. This is an increase of 0.6% compared to the budget voted in 2019. In the Council's view, next year's budget is about continuity. Next year is the last year of the Multiannual Financial Framework 2014-2020, the year when many important European programmes will gradually come to their completion.

The Council wants the EU budget to continue to focus on our common priorities: strengthening the European economy, boosting its competitiveness, ensuring sufficient funding for migration and the protection of our external borders, and tackling environmental challenges and climate change. In these turbulent times we are fully aware of our responsibility as a budgetary authority. Europe has to fight battles on many fronts to safeguard its achievements and competitiveness. With the Union, we are faced with no lesser challenges: the complex discussion on the UK's withdrawal, defining clear priorities for the next programming period, as well as ensuring this year's smooth institutional transition, which will have a direct impact on our work in the autumn.

In this overall context, we must remember that the budget is not just about numbers and figures. It is a powerful tool that sets the direction in which EU policies will evolve. That is why we must ensure that it is focused on European added value and delivers tangible results for our citizens. At the same time, as co-legislator, we need to be very careful how EU taxpayers' contributions are spent. That is why the Council acted, as always, with prudence and financial discipline in full consciousness of the budgetary constraints we face. We need to have sufficient leeway to meet the yet-unknown challenges and risks that await us next year.

Now let me go into more detail on the Council position. The Council proposes an adjustment of the commitment appropriations as presented by the Commission in a draft budget for 2020 of EUR 1.5 billion. This is not a cut in the budget but a reduction in the increase. Compared to 2019, the EU budget will increase by EUR 1 billion. On payments, no significant adjustments were considered necessary or appropriate. The Council continues to support the reinforcement of the programmes under the competitiveness for growth and jobs sub-heading, which will receive EUR 24 billion or +2.72% compared to this year.

In addition, the resources dedicated to economic, social and territorial cohesion will increase by 2.23% in 2020, totalling EUR 58.5 billion. In the field of migration and security, the EU budget will continue to support Member States and the EU measures that were put in place in the last few years. Additional resources are foreseen for Frontex, the European Border and Coast Guard Agency – more than 30% compared to this year – in order to set up the standing corps of 10 000 border guards by 2027.

I would like to stress the fact that a great number of key programmes across all headings have been accepted at the level of the Commission's draft budget. Those are Europe's satellite navigation systems, EGNOS and Galileo, the energy strand of the Connecting Europe Facility, the European defence industrial development programme, the large infrastructure projects, Copernicus and ITER, Erasmus Plus – which I know is one of the programmes we all cherish most – The LIFE Programme for the Environment and Climate Action, the Union Civil Protection Mechanism, and the European Public Prosecutor's Office, for example.

I also want to underline the Council position on some specific issues. First, the Council rejects the proposal from the Commission to use Article 15.3 of the Financial Regulation. Moreover, the Council has also chosen to transfer in the reserve a certain amount of appropriations in the area of migration in order for the budgetary authority to be able to tailor its response to the actual needs on the ground in the coming year.

As regards administration expenditure, the Council's approach is based on prudent budgeting and follows the line applied in Member States' national civil services. Following a thorough assessment of real and justified needs in each institution and per budget line, the Council has reduced this heading by EUR 55 million. In addition, in a statement attached to the Council's position, we have asked the Commission, like last year, to take into account the level of assigned revenues in heading 5 in view of our negotiations in November.

Let me conclude by saying that today's debate, in my view, will mark the beginning of a series of constructive and open exchanges, which will allow us to reach a balanced and meaningful compromise. Without deviating from our common goals, we will have to prioritise and demonstrate our strong commitment to Europe. I am convinced we will be able to find a common position with an equally acceptable outcome within the agreed timeframe.

Günther Oettinger, *Mitglied der Kommission*. – Verehrte Frau Präsidentin, verehrter Herr Ratspräsident, Damen und Herren Abgeordnete, meine Damen und Herren! Mit der Position des Rates und der heutigen Beratung bleiben wir im Zeitplan. Alle Verantwortlichen – das Parlament, der Rat, die Kommission – sind darum besorgt, zu erreichen, dass der Haushalt 2020 in schwieriger Zeit bis Mitte November verabschiedet und damit Klarheit für Programme, Projekte und die Menschen für das nächste Jahr geschaffen werden kann. Wir in der Kommission gehen davon aus, dass auch wir die Kontinuität wahren und mein möglicher Nachfolger, Herr Kommissar Johannes Hahn, unmittelbar ab 1. November die Aufgabe hier als Dienstleister für Sie wahrnehmen kann.

Es gibt neben den normalen Themen und Fragen die außergewöhnliche und offene Entwicklung des Austritts des Königreichs aus der Europäischen Union. Wenn es zu einem Austritt, einem Ausscheiden Ende Oktober kommt und es keinerlei Regelung gibt, dann haben wir im nächsten Jahr eine Lücke, über die wir hier zu gegebener Zeit kollegial sprechen müssen. Noch gehen wir davon aus, dass das Königreich alle Rechte und Pflichten des Haushaltsrahmens, der bis Ende 2020 reicht, auch im letzten Jahr des Haushaltsrahmens für den Haushalt 2020 akzeptiert.

Nur einmal vorausgedacht: Wenn es zu keinem Abkommen kommt und das Königreich automatisch ausscheiden würde, ohne Verlängerung, dann entsteht eine Lücke im nächsten Jahr von netto etwa elf Milliarden Euro. Und da die Europäische Union im Gegensatz zu allen anderen Organen – Mitgliedstaaten, Regionen, Kommunen – ein umfassendes Schuldenverbot hat, müssten wir unmittelbar gemeinsam die Lücke schließen. Dafür würde die Kommission dann vor der Vermittlungsphase, die Ende Oktober beginnt, einen Vorschlag machen. Der könnte lauten, dass man die elf Milliarden umfassend durch Kürzungen erbringt. Er könnte lauten, dass man die elf Milliarden umfassend durch höhere Einzahlungen erbringt. Vermutlich wird ein Mittelweg zwischen vertretbaren Kürzungen, die uns keinen großen Schaden zufügen, und etwas höheren Einzahlungen der kluge Weg sein. Wir kommen darauf in drei Wochen bei Bedarf zurück.

Wir sehen es als wichtig an, dass Rat und Parlament und die Kommission die Prioritäten im Grundsatz teilen: Beschäftigung, Stabilisierung des Wachstums, Stärkung unserer Wettbewerbsfähigkeit, Innovation, die möglichen Maßnahmen für Klimaschutz auf europäischer Ebene, die neben Emissionsreduktionspfaden, neben Standardsetzung eben auch Investitionen bedeuten, und die Stärkung unserer inneren und äußeren Sicherheit. Bei einigen erfolgreichen Programmen teilt der Rat den Vorschlag der Kommission: Erasmus+, Copernicus und andere Infrastrukturprojekte; beim Projekt zur industriellen Entwicklung im Bereich der Verteidigung sehen wir uns im Ratsvorschlag und der Position des Rates sehr gut wieder.

Wir machen uns bei einigen Kürzungen Sorgen, und ich werde auch in den Beratungen vertieft über die Sorgen oder die Schäden, die Kürzungen verursachen würden, mit Ihnen sprechen wollen. Seit vielen, vielen Jahren reden wir von 3 % unseres GDP für Forschung, liegen bei 2 %. Horizon 2020 ist nur ein Teil der Forschungsinvestition, aber ein wichtiger Teil, weil wir im digitalen Zeitalter in vielen Bereichen am besten europäisch forschen. Deswegen halten wir die Kürzung um 410 Millionen für nicht begründbar. Und ich glaube, dass dies auch der Rat in der Öffentlichkeit schwer vertreten kann, weil es konkrete Beispiele sind. Wir müssten bei Schlüsseltechnologien der Zukunft wie Nano, Micro, Laser und Biotech um 20 % kürzen – in Bereichen, wo wir Amerika und China jetzt schon nicht mehr genügend folgen können. Ist dies wirklich klug, frage ich. Beim Thema der künstlichen Intelligenz, bei Technologien für die Digitalisierung der europäischen Wirtschaft müssten nennenswert Kürzungen erfolgen oder aber 118 Millionen weniger für den Europäischen Forschungsrat.

Das heißt konkret: 80 Forschungsprojekte fallen aus, werden nicht gemacht, obwohl wir jetzt schon eine übergroße Zahl von sinnvollen Forschungsprojekten nicht ko-finanzieren können, da unsere Mittel eben begrenzt sind. Wir glauben, dass auch in der Gesundheitsforschung, in der digitalen Transformation von Gesundheit und Pflege, bei der Entwicklung von künstlicher Intelligenz im Gesundheitswesen gute Gründe für jeden Euro auf europäischer Ebene bestehen.

Wir haben Joint Undertakings im Bereich der Verkehrsforschung, und die sollen jetzt um 80 % gekürzt werden: Shift2Rail, Single European Sky, Air Traffic Management Research und andere mehr. Und dies würde zum Teil dazu führen, dass wir Programme und Projekte schlichtweg beenden müssten. Wir sollten darüber ergebnisoffen in den nächsten Wochen sprechen. Denn alle Projekte machen Sinn – besser europäisch als in 28 fragmentierten Silos –, und alle Projekte wären gefährdet, wenn die Kürzungen so umgesetzt werden müssten, wie sie vom Rat vorgeschlagen sind.

Connecting Europe, die grenzüberschreitende Infrastruktur: 200 Millionen Kürzungen. Das heißt konkret, dass wir einige Projekte im nächsten Jahr nicht angehen können, unter anderem Safe Action – Österreich, Finnland, Frankreich, Deutschland, Niederlande. Hier wollen wir den kostenfreien Notrufdienst e-call einführen. Dies müsste wegfallen. Oder aber das Seine-Schelde-Projekt, ein Wasserstraßenprojekt, mit dem das französische Binnenwasserstraßennetz mit dem belgischen, dem niederländischen und dem deutschen verbunden werden soll – eine tragfähige Alternative zur Straße und zum Frachtverkehr auf der Straße. Oder aber der *Eastern Baltic Hub* – die Verbesserung der Hafenanbindung und der Hinterlandanbindung des Hafens Hamina-Kotka im Scan-Med-Korridor.

Und klar ist: Wenn wir diese Programme nicht angehen, die Projekte nicht durchführen, ist dies keine Einsparung – wir starten dann eben ein Jahr später –, sondern eine Vertagung, eine Verlagerung der sinnvollen Investitionen. Ich werde um jedes Projekt im Rat kämpfen und bitte beide Haushaltsbehörden – Rat und Parlament –, am Ende diesen guten Argumenten zu folgen. Bei CEF sind dies, wie gesagt, Maßnahmen für Wettbewerbsfähigkeit und für umweltfreundlichen Verkehr, und alles wäre deswegen, glaube ich, richtungweisend, wenn es im nächsten Jahr begonnen werden kann. Dasselbe gilt für Maßnahmen im Bereich COSME für kleine und mittlere Unternehmen. Die Kürzungen würden dazu führen, dass Europa für viele Startups und kleine Unternehmen nicht Ansprechpartner und nicht Förderpartner werden kann.

Die Kürzung um 25 Millionen im Bereich der Bekämpfung der grenzüberschreitenden organisierten Kriminalität, Terrorismus, Internetkriminalität – hier haben wir gute Argumente, um die Kürzungen nicht mitzutragen, und die Bürger stehen bei den Themen hinter uns.

Europa und die Welt – Rubrik vier: Hier ist eine Kürzung von 200 Millionen vorgeschlagen; 70 betreffen die Entwicklungshilfeszusammenarbeit, 50 die humanitäre Hilfe. Schon jetzt wird Europa, wenn man es ganz ehrlich nimmt, seinen Verpflichtungen gegenüber Nachbarn und der Welt nicht genügend gerecht. Wir müssen doch mehr tun, damit in diesen Regionen – in der Sahel-, Maghreb-, Subsahelzone – Menschenwürde entsteht, damit bei Katastrophen geholfen werden kann. Mit den Kürzungen wird Europa in vielen Bereichen nicht der Partner für Menschenwürde und für Katastrophenschutz sein.

Bei den Agenturen werden Kürzungen vorgeschlagen – Frontex, das Europäische Zentrum für die Förderung der Berufsbildung, die Arzneimittelagentur, das Büro für Asylfragen. Die Kürzungen bedeuten, dass unsere Dienstleistung schlechter wird. Auch hier will ich Ihnen die Bedenken hier offen sagen und in den Beratungen dann darauf zurückkommen.

Und trotz der schwierigen Zeit mit dem Austritt des Königreichs sollten wir alles tun, um die Rituale, die wir immer durchführen, nicht zu steigern. Bei gutem Willen aller drei Beteiligten müsste eine Einigung innerhalb von wenigen Tagen eigentlich vor Ende der Vermittlungsphase möglich sein. Wir wollen als Kommission alles tun, um dies zu erreichen. In schwieriger Zeit wäre *good governance* für einen Haushalt eine klare Botschaft, dass Europa handlungsfähig ist und für unsere Mitbürger ein Dienstleister bleiben will.

Monika Hohlmeier, Berichterstatterin. – Frau Präsidentin, Herr Kommissar! Ich begrüße Sie ganz herzlich, Herr Minister und die Ratspräsidentschaft, liebe Kolleginnen und Kollegen! An den Anfang will ich ein herzliches Dankeschön an meine Schattenberichterstatter stellen, für die, mit denen ich schon intensiv persönlich reden konnte, aber auch für die, die willens sind, mit mir morgen noch einmal durch den ganzen Haushalt und im Laufe der nächsten Wochen mich zu begleiten, damit wir als Parlament möglichst geschlossen und klar in einer Richtung auch eine Antwort auf den Ratsbeschluss geben, wie dies aus Sicht des Parlaments aussieht.

Zunächst einmal, lieber Herr Kommissar, bedanke ich mich ganz herzlich bei Ihnen dafür, dass schlicht und einfach ich das nicht mehr wiederholen möchte, was der Kommissar gerade eben ausgeführt hat. Ich könnte es nicht trefflicher formulieren. Es geht nicht um eine traditionelle Rollenaufteilung, dass wir, das Parlament, einfach viel wollen und der Rat grundsätzlich kürzt, sondern es geht darum, dass der Rat sich selbst Zukunftsthemen gesetzt hat, die er als Schwerpunkte sieht, aber dann in seiner Antwort im Rahmen der Finanzen genau eine gegenteilige Antwort gibt.

Wenn man einen Schwerpunkt setzen möchte darauf, dass wir in Fragen des Klimas, in Fragen der Digitalisierung, künstlicher Intelligenz, in Fragen Krebsvermeidung, Krebsbekämpfung, Bekämpfung von schwersten Erkrankungen und ähnlichem, wenn wir dabei Schwerpunkte setzen wollen, dann kann die Antwort eigentlich nicht sein: Wir kürzen anschließend den Kommissionsvorschlag. Dann müsste es zumindest eine Unterstützung für den Kommissionsvorschlag geben.

Wenn ich sehe, dass Sie bei Wissenschaft und Forschung im Bereich 1a, der 15 % des EU-Haushalts ausmacht, über 50 % der Kürzungen vornehmen, dann ist das für mich nicht mehr verständlich angesichts der Prioritäten, die Sie sich selbst gesetzt haben. Wenn wir mit an der Spitze gehen wollen, wenn wir nicht nur Vorbild sein, sondern auch zeigen wollen, dass wir Arbeitsplätze und Klima sinnvoll zueinander bringen, wirtschaftliche Wettbewerbsfähigkeit, und gleichzeitig Antworten geben auf Klimafragen, dann ist Innovation und Forschung die Antwort darauf, dann ist Schwerpunktsetzung in dem Bereich die Antwort darauf.

Sie sagen, im gesamten Haushalt haben Sie noch 0,6 % Steigerung; das ist, ehrlich gesagt, nicht einmal die Inflation, das ist real eigentlich Minus, wenn ich jetzt ganz ehrlich bin – da kommt nichts mehr raus. Bei Innovation und Forschung bleibt zwar eigentlich nominal eine Steigerung, wenn ich aber die Projekte sehe, die laufen, dann kann ich fast nichts Neues mehr machen. Diejenigen, die bei uns Projekte einreichen – und zwar hervorragend, die exzellent vorbereitet, sehr gut dann analysiert und evaluiert wurden, ein bestes Zeugnis haben – da gibt es Bereiche, da müssen wir 90 %, 93 % ablehnen, einfach weil kein Geld da ist. Das sind Bereiche, die zukunftssträchtig sind – Nanotechnologien sind angesprochen, Biotechnologien, *Future and Emerging Technologies* – das sind verschiedenste Bereiche.

Darum habe ich inständig die Bitte an Sie: Lassen Sie uns als Berichterstatter nicht wieder bis zum letzten Tag auflaufen und seien Sie stolz darauf, dass Sie mit uns eigentlich nicht über den Inhalt reden! Ich bin bereit, wie der Herr Kommissar gesagt hat, mit Ihnen gemeinsam schon im Vorfeld möglichst viel zu lösen, nicht weil wir stur sind, sondern weil wir glauben, dass wir für die Zukunft der Europäischen Union und das, was *European Added Value* ist, im Bereich Klima, im Bereich Entwicklungshilfe, im Bereich von Zukunftstechnologien, dass wir da mehr wollen; und, lieber Herr Kommissar, wir werden da im letzten Jahr deutlich darüber hinausgehen, denn wir brauchen im allerletzten Jahr nicht mehr die Riesenmargen im Bereich der Verwaltung – da wollen wir nicht mehr ausgeben, alles in Ordnung.

Deshalb aber auch ein Kompliment an die Kommission: Sie hat sich an die Restriktionen gehalten, und da muss ich nüchtern sagen: Ich möchte einen Mitgliedstaat sehen, der administrativ so vorsichtig ist, wie wir dies in der Europäischen Union bei den administrativen Ausgaben sind.

Lieber Rat, bitte geben Sie uns Antworten, reden Sie mit uns inhaltlich! Wir können nicht am letzten Abend irgendwie versuchen, dann alles zu managen, wir sollten vorher miteinander reden.

Eider Gardiazabal Rubial, *ponente*. – Señora presidenta, señor ministro, señor comisario, cuando empezamos a negociar el actual marco financiero, allá por 2011, la verdad es que la situación en la que nos encontrábamos era totalmente diferente. Hablábamos de luchar contra el cambio climático y era una prioridad, pero no teníamos esa sensación de urgencia. Ni siquiera sabíamos que íbamos a tener que afrontar una crisis de refugiados, ni tampoco el impacto final que la crisis económica iba a tener en nuestras vidas, ni existía el Brexit, por ejemplo. Así que la situación ha cambiado mucho.

Pero pusimos en marcha, por ejemplo, una Garantía Juvenil para luchar contra el desempleo. Nos comprometimos a invertir el 20 %, a gastar el 20 % del presupuesto en la lucha contra el cambio climático. Incluso aceptamos un presupuesto inferior a lo que este Parlamento quería, siempre con el compromiso de ejecutarlo al cien por cien, y fue un compromiso de este Parlamento, de la Comisión y también del Consejo. Así que, en realidad, lo que pedimos, o lo que nos queda para el 2020, es simplemente cumplir con lo que nos comprometimos en ese momento. Y se puede hacer.

Se puede hacer porque tenemos margen suficiente para que el programa de desempleo juvenil vuelva a estar en 2020 en el presupuesto. Se puede hacer porque tenemos fondos disponibles para seguir aumentando las becas Erasmus. Porque tenemos —y se han comentado mucho aquí y los ha detallado el comisario Oettinger— proyectos de investigación excelentes para los que solo se está deseando que haya más dinero para poder llevarlos adelante.

Tenemos que seguir ayudando financieramente a los países que siguen recibiendo refugiados y, por supuesto, tenemos no solo la posibilidad, sino también la obligación de, al menos, cumplir ese 20 % en lucha contra el cambio climático, 20 % que ya está evidentemente desfasado.

Por eso es tan importante que seamos ambiciosos en el proyecto de presupuesto de 2020 y, sobre todo, porque tiene que servir de transición para el próximo marco financiero. Porque, si queremos dar un salto en el pilar social, en la política medioambiental, si no queremos perder el tren de la digitalización o si queremos hacer una transición justa para que no paguen los de siempre, tenemos que empezar ya.

Acabamos de tener un debate sobre el cáncer; todo el mundo ha reclamado más fondos desde el presupuesto europeo. Lo tenemos que cumplir. Y, además, es que la presidenta electa, la señora von der Leyen, en su discurso ante esta Cámara hizo una especie de hoja de ruta de prioridades para los próximos cinco años, y el presupuesto que aprobemos para 2020 va a ser determinante para saber si vamos o no por el buen camino.

Y de nosotros va a depender que haya recursos o no para que se puedan poner en marcha todas esas políticas. De nosotros, Parlamento, pero también del Consejo. ¿Y el Consejo, qué nos propone? Pues nos propone, como siempre, más recortes. Da igual los compromisos, las urgencias, las necesidades; da igual que la situación haya cambiado radicalmente: al final solo tenemos recortes. Recortes que van contra las políticas, que van contra su propio discurso y sus compromisos, y que incluso van contra la buena gestión financiera, porque incluso se niegan a dotar de recursos necesarios a instituciones que son las que tienen que aplicar esas políticas —que las tienen que aplicar, que las tienen que controlar—, o instituciones que defienden los derechos de los ciudadanos: Tribunal de Justicia, Tribunal de Cuentas, el Defensor del Pueblo o el Comité de las Regiones o el Comité Económico y Social.

Y acabo, presidenta. Con esta actitud no solo no vamos a cumplir lo que hemos prometido, sino que además vamos a perder la oportunidad de preparar a la Unión Europea para liderar el cambio global que este mundo necesita.

Johan Van Overtveldt, *voorzitter van de Commissie BUDG*. – Voorzitter, eerder dit jaar, in maart namelijk, keurde het vorige Parlement de richtsnoeren voor de begroting 2020 goed. Daarin werden ook de prioriteiten opgelijst en werd de begroting voor 2020 opgevat als een brug naar het toekomstig Europa. Vier grote accenten: investeren in innovatie, duurzame ontwikkeling, de bescherming van de burgers en veiligheid. Het Parlement wees toen ook op de bijzondere rol van de nieuwe begroting. 2020 is immers het laatste jaar van de huidige programmeringsperiode en de onderhandelingen voor de begroting 2020 vallen samen met het begin van de gesprekken rond het nieuwe MFK.

We geloven dat een sterke, verantwoorde en toekomstgerichte begroting 2020 een akkoord over en de overgang naar het volgende MFK zal vergemakkelijken. Voor het Parlement is het hierbij cruciaal dat ten volle gebruik kan worden gemaakt van de bestaande flexibiliteit en andere bepalingen van de MFK-verordening en van het Financieel Reglement. In het licht van het voorgaande heeft de Begrotingscommissie de positie van de Raad over de begroting 2020 besproken en daarbij is een aantal bezorgdheden gerezen, die ook door voorgaande sprekers zijn aangehaald, maar die ik toch graag wil herhalen omdat ze zo belangrijk zijn.

Zo beweert de Raad bijvoorbeeld dat hij zich baseert op absorptiecapaciteit en implementatiegraad om de uitgaven voor sommige programma's te verminderen. Maar in vele gevallen lijkt het snoeiwerk eerder arbitrair en niet onderbouwd. Wat te denken van bijvoorbeeld de voorgestelde bezuinigingen in Horizon 2020 en Cosme? Verder is het ook opmerkelijk dat de door de Raad voorgestelde begroting 2020 in tegenspraak is met wat het Finse voorzitterschap als prioriteit naar voren schuift. Ik denk aan de digitalisering, innovatie, technologische ontwikkeling, integratie van het klimaatbeleid in alle sectoren en speciale aandacht voor de verbetering van de digitale vaardigheden van jongeren. Hierover vinden we eigenlijk weinig terug.

Dit brengt mij automatisch bij het volgende punt. Nu zowel het Parlement als straks de Commissie vernieuwd zijn, lijkt het mij een uitstekende gelegenheid om de samenwerking tussen de instellingen tijdens de onderhandelingen van de komende begrotingsbesprekingen alsook de gesprekken over het volgende MFK een nieuw elan te geven. Ik ben ervan overtuigd dat er ruimte is om de kwaliteit van de ontmoetingen tussen de twee begrotingsautoriteiten en de Commissie te verbeteren. Dit begint volgens mij al door beter naar elkaar te luisteren en argumenten beter te formuleren.

Verder wil ik ook opmerken dat het weinig productief is dat gesloten akkoorden nadien door verschillende partijen, al dan niet moedwillig, anders worden geïnterpreteerd. Tenslotte werken alle instellingen samen met één enkel doel en dat is een kwalitatieve, financieel verantwoorde begroting afleveren voor Europa en haar burgers.

Die Präsidentin. – Wir kommen nun zu den Vertreterinnen und Vertretern der Fraktionen. Ich werde jetzt die Einhaltung der Redezeit deutlich strikter handhaben, und bitte da um Verständnis. Das ist nur fair, auch gegenüber denen, die später kommen.

José Manuel Fernandes, *em nome do Grupo PPE.* – Senhora Presidente, caro Comissário, Senhor Representante do Conselho, caras e caros Colegas, este, é, efetivamente, o último orçamento de 2020 do quadro financeiro plurianual para 2014-2020. Seria tempo de balanço. Seria tempo de o Conselho aprender com o passado e tirar lições. Não se esqueça que este quadro financeiro plurianual foi guiado pela estratégia Europa 2020 onde o Conselho, a Comissão, o Parlamento e os Estados-Membros se comprometeram a objetivos. Ora o objetivo do clima não vai ser respeitado. O objetivo de combate à pobreza não vai ser respeitado. O objetivo da investigação e inovação não vai ser respeitado. E o que é que faz o Conselho? Corta na investigação, corta nos programas do clima, não ajuda as pequenas e médias empresas e corta também os programas que lhes estão destinados.

Acha bem cortar algo que é importante para a competitividade da União Europeia? Cortar em 413 milhões de euros o programa de investigação, o Horizonte 2020? O Conselho é contra as suas próprias proclamações e não respeita sequer a legislação que adota e com a qual concorda, onde o Parlamento também esteve envolvido. Então vocês não aceitam que o artigo 15.º, ponto 3, que significa que aquilo que não foi utilizado possa vir a sê-lo, não aceitam respeitar sequer esse artigo?

Não executar o quadro financeiro plurianual, não ter recursos financeiros para a solidariedade, para as migrações, para a competitividade, é um custo enorme que nós não podemos aceitar.

Pierre Larrourou, *au nom du groupe S&D.* – Madame la Présidente, chers amis, lundi, nous avons commencé nos travaux avec une minute de silence pour rendre hommage à tous ceux qui étaient morts en Espagne à cause des pluies dramatiques. En Europe aussi, maintenant, le dérèglement climatique fait chaque année des milliers de familles qui pleurent et qui ont vu leur vie brisée.

Lundi, nous étions tous très émus. Mais au-delà de l'émotion, la question est de savoir si nous sommes capables de passer à l'action. Si nous voulons éviter le chaos climatique, nous savons ce qu'il faut faire: il faut isoler toutes nos maisons, toutes nos usines, il faut développer des transports en commun, les renouvelables, changer de modèle agricole.

Pour financer ce gigantesque chantier, la Cour des comptes européenne dit qu'il faut chaque année 1 100 milliards d'euros. Secteurs privé et public confondus, il faut trouver 1 100 milliards d'euros chaque année, nous dit la Cour des comptes européenne. Hélas! Le budget qui nous est proposé aujourd'hui augmente seulement de 0,6 milliard le budget climat. Si l'on tient compte de l'inflation, le budget climat recule de 1,3 %. Je trouve sinistre de le dire, mais le budget climat va reculer de 1,3 %. Au moins, le message est clair: l'Amazonie qui brûle, on n'en a rien à faire. L'avenir de nos enfants, on n'en a rien à faire. Mais nos enfants seront dans la rue samedi et vont nous demander d'agir avec force pour le bien commun.

Mais l'argent est là, si on le veut. La Banque centrale européenne vient d'annoncer qu'elle allait créer 240 milliards d'euros en un an. 240 milliards d'euros. Nous savons tous combien on pourrait isoler de maisons, combien on pourrait créer d'emplois sur tous nos territoires, avec 240 milliards d'euros en un an. Et nous savons tous aussi que depuis quatre ans, 90 % de l'argent créé par la Banque centrale européenne est allé à la spéculation. Est-ce que quelqu'un peut m'expliquer, aujourd'hui, pourquoi on ne met pas la totalité de ces 240 milliards pour isoler nos maisons, transformer notre agriculture, investir dans les renouvelables et créer des millions d'emplois sur tous nos territoires? Qui peut me l'expliquer? Qui peut expliquer à ces enfants pourquoi ces 240 milliards ne seront pas utilisés pour le bien commun?

Nous sommes face à une crise inédite, une crise nouvelle par son ampleur, par sa gravité. Nous devons, s'il vous plaît, apporter des réponses nouvelles. C'est pour cela qu'il faut vraiment muscler notre ambition. Eider l'a dit, le groupe social-démocrate refuse toutes les coupes faites par le Conseil. Il n'y a aucune cohérence dans ces coupes. Le groupe social-démocrate veut utiliser tous les moyens disponibles pour muscler notre action. Il y a à peu près 3,4 milliards pour muscler notre action pour l'insertion, pour l'emploi des jeunes, pour l'accueil des réfugiés, pour le climat. Tout cela est important, mais ce sera tout à fait insuffisant. Voilà pourquoi, au-delà de ces 3,4 milliards, le groupe social-démocrate ne votera le budget que si nous avons des garanties de la Commission et du Conseil pour avancer très vite sur de nouvelles ressources.

Il ne suffit pas, par exemple, de dire qu'on veut une banque du climat. Tout le monde, maintenant, est d'accord pour la banque du climat. Très bien, c'était une des demandes de notre groupe. Mais il faut dire combien on met de milliards de capitaux propres pour que, sur tous nos territoires, on sache que de l'argent va arriver vraiment pour créer des emplois. De même, si on peut trouver des ressources nouvelles et limiter les vols en avion, il faut en finir avec l'exonération fiscale sur le kérosène. Toutes ces ressources seront prêtes pour nourrir le prochain budget pluriannuel.

Mes amis, il est temps de déclarer la guerre au dérèglement climatique, il est temps d'arrêter les petits pas. C'est la seule guerre qui ne fera aucune victime et qui va éviter des millions de morts. C'est la seule guerre qui va rassembler les peuples et c'est à l'Europe de déclarer la guerre. Le nerf de la guerre, c'est l'argent, et le groupe socialiste veut un budget à la hauteur de ces défis.

Clotilde Armand, în numele grupului Renew. – Doamna președintă, stimați colegi și onorați reprezentanți ai Comisiei Europene, astăzi discutăm despre bugetul alocat pentru 2020, ultimul an din cadrul financiar multianual început în 2014. Înaintea începerii unui nou cadru financiar este necesar să facem un bilanț referitor la angajamentele europene, la eficacitatea acțiunii bugetare, să marcăm ca parlament recent ales orientările pe care le dorim pentru următorii șapte ani. Vreau să folosim toate marjele financiare pe care le avem pentru a demonstra că Europa are o strategie în domenii de interes pentru cetățenii europeni.

Este momentul să înțelegem preocupările europenilor care ne-au ales și să semnalăm că putem oferi o viziune de societate. Europenii sunt tot mai preocupați de protejarea mediului și așteaptă de la noi măsuri în acest sens. Răspunsul nostru trebuie să asigure o direcție strategică spre o dezvoltare tehnologică inovativă respectând mediul. Spre această direcție trebuie să angajăm economia europeană, mereu însă atenți să menținem economia competitivă, să pregătim pe etape tranziția energetică, atenți și la criteriile de repartizare a fondurilor.

Nu putem să admitem un deziderat de acțiune urgentă și, în același timp, să limităm programele în principal la un criteriu de excelență. Se pot număra pe degete proiectele care s-au încadrat, de exemplu, în România, la criteriul de excelență. Totuși, în materie de mediu, sunt mari urgențe în România. Avem o fractură economică, în mijlocul continentului, dublată de o fractură ecologică pe care trebuie să o corectăm. Este important pentru prosperitatea întregii Europe. Trebuie să construim dispozitivele financiare cu responsabilitate, generând echilibrul continental și nu riscând noi dezechilibre.

Insist cu această ocazie să întărim liniile bugetare de asistență tehnică, linii care și-au dovedit eficiența, pentru care am depus amendamente. Trebuie să constatăm că expertiza este în cea mai mare parte localizată în centrele mari europene, că avem un fenomen de *brain drain* de la est spre vest și trebuie să compensăm la nivel european incapacitatea de a implementa proiecte în țările Europei Centrale și de Est. Aș mai adăuga, în încheiere, că tot mai mulți cetățeni europeni își doresc ca Europa să fie intransigentă în materie de cheltuire a banilor publici. Există mari așteptări de la noi: instituția Parchetului European. Vă propun, așa cum am menționat într-un amendament, să acordăm mijloace financiare rezonabile pentru ca această instituție să devină funcțională încă de anul viitor. Să nu creăm o structură fără să îi acordăm suficiente forțe pentru a acționa.

Rasmus Andresen, *im Namen der Verts/ALE-Fraktion*. – Frau Präsidentin! Waldbrände, Orkane und Überschwemmungen – die Klimakrise zerstört unsere Lebensgrundlagen. Sie zerstört die Lebensgrundlagen von vielen jungen Menschen, die, wie wir finden, zu Recht am Freitag auf die Straße gehen und für das Klima streiken. Sie zerstört aber auch die Lebensgrundlage für viele Landwirte – beispielsweise in Südeuropa –, deren Existenz zerstört wird. Und deshalb glauben wir, dass wir alle in einem Boot sitzen und dass wir dringend mehr tun müssen. Deshalb diskutieren wir hier über den Haushalt nicht über langweilige Zahlen, sondern wir reden über die Zukunft unseres Kontinents. Wir reden beim Haushalt darüber, wie wir gemeinsam in unsere Zukunft investieren können.

Wir Grüne wollen die Klimakrise stoppen und Armut bekämpfen, und wir wollen allen Menschen in der Europäischen Union eine Perspektive geben. Das bedeutet für uns beispielsweise auch, sich für die vielen jungen arbeitslosen Menschen in Spanien, Italien und Griechenland einzusetzen, die nach wie vor keine Arbeit gefunden haben, und wo die Krise nach wie vor nicht überstanden ist. Wir Grüne glauben, dass wir einen echten *Green New Deal* brauchen, mit Investitionen in Klimaschutz und gegen Jugendarbeitslosigkeit.

Während Merkel, Macron und andere im Europawahlkampf noch vollmundig mehr Investitionen, mehr gemeinsame europäische Investitionen gefordert haben, tun sie jetzt das Gegenteil: Sie schlagen uns Kürzungen beim Klimaschutz, bei der Jugendarbeitslosigkeit, aber eben auch bei Forschung vor. Das kann doch nicht wahr sein!

Wir Grüne beantragen deshalb, dass wir 3,5 Milliarden mehr in einem ersten Schritt in die Hand nehmen, um in Klima zu investieren. Wir beantragen 350 Millionen Euro mehr für den Kampf gegen Jugendarbeitslosigkeit, und wir nehmen Menschenrechte ernst. Wir beantragen ein europäisches Seenotrettungsprogramm im Volumen von 48 Millionen Euro, um das Sterben im Mittelmeer zu beenden. Es ist unsere Pflicht, da nicht weiter wegzuschauen, sondern aktiv zu werden.

Die Vorschläge des Rates sind aus unserer Sicht inakzeptabel. Wir Grüne sind gerne bereit, Teil einer konstruktiven Mehrheit in diesem Parlament auch für den Haushalt zu sein – das ist unser Ziel: Wir wollen Europa verändern und gestalten. Wir müssen das aber tun, indem wir Sachen umsetzen und indem wir gemeinsam in unsere Zukunft investieren. Deshalb ist meine Hoffnung, dass wir dazu hier im Parlament kommen und dass wir hier Mehrheiten für diese Themen finden und uns dann im Endeffekt gegen die Staats- und Regierungschefs durchsetzen – für Europa und für unsere gemeinsame Zukunft.

Hélène Laporte, *au nom du groupe ID*. – Madame la Présidente, mes chers collègues, la semaine dernière le président Erdogan a de nouveau menacé l'Union européenne d'ouvrir les portes de l'émigration vers l'Europe. Quelque peu habitué au renoncement et à la soumission nos dirigeants européens, il pointe à nouveau l'arme du chantage de la submersion migratoire.

Rappelons quand même que la Commission européenne a déjà versé 5,6 milliards d'euros à la Turquie et qu'elle s'apprête à verser 400 millions d'euros supplémentaires d'ici les prochaines semaines. Quand on connaît le budget dérisoire alloué à Frontex, à savoir 420 millions d'euros dans le budget 2020, on est en droit de se demander quel est le bon sens de ces accords et de ces choix budgétaires.

L'Union européenne démontre à nouveau son incapacité à protéger ses frontières. Il est urgent de rendre aux nations leur souveraineté territoriale pour qu'elles puissent enfin reprendre en main la protection de leurs frontières nationales. Quant à Frontex, nous pourrions envisager de la transformer en une agence de coopération libre entre nations européennes accrédités à la défense de nos frontières extérieures et non pas, comme c'est le cas aujourd'hui, un accueil non contrôlé des migrants.

Bogdan Rzońca, *w imieniu grupy ECR*. – Pani Przewodnicząca! Dyskusja o budżecie zawsze jest trudna, ale zawsze powinna być oparta o rzeczywistość. Tu, w Parlamencie Europejskim, odpowiadamy za dobry budżet przed mieszkańcami Europy i naszymi wyborcami. Wspólnotowe rozwiązywanie problemów europejskich to szlachetne i piękne zadanie, dlatego nasze postępowanie musi być w tym zakresie bardzo prawdziwe. Jeśli w dokumentach Unii Europejskiej napisano, że trzeba dbać o rolnictwo, to nie możemy zgodzić się na propozycję Rady, by zmniejszyć zobowiązania i płatności w dziale drugim – „Zrównoważony wzrost i zasoby naturalne”. Nie możemy po prostu tego zrobić. Dobra żywność produkowana w grupach producenckich zasługuje na wsparcie. EKR zgłosił właśnie taką poprawkę. Nasze wnuki nie mogą jeść plastiku, muszą jeść naturalną zdrową żywność.

Jeśli chcemy czuć się bezpiecznie na dworcach kolejowych, lotniskach i w metrze, to chronimy granice Unii Europejskiej, dlatego właśnie EKR złożył poprawkę by wzmocnić Frontex i Europol.

Fatalnie brzmią informacje, że Rada zmniejsza środki na program Horyzont 2020 o 413 milionów euro. Uniwersytety i naukowcy muszą mieć pieniądze na badania i bezpieczne technologie, aby nowoczesnie kształcić i przeciwdziałać bezrobociu, także bezrobociu wśród młodych ludzi.

Bądźmy zatem realistami, rozwiązujemy realnie problemy, proponujemy bardzo racjonalne rozwiązania, które dotyczą Unii Europejskiej, które dotyczą mieszkańców Wspólnoty, i wspólnie stawiamy czoła tym problemom.

Younous Omarjee, *au nom du groupe GUE/NGL*. – Madame la Présidente, je suis en accord total avec l'appréciation très critique qui a été faite par le commissaire Oettinger de la proposition du Conseil et je suis en accord total avec le réquisitoire qui a été fait par l'ensemble des groupes politiques de votre proposition.

Vous devez voir qu'il y a une unanimité de ce Parlement contre la proposition du Conseil, qui est une proposition qui fait le deuil des ambitions européennes. Vous avez dit que vous ne voulez pas parler de chiffres. Je peux comprendre, mais moi je veux vous parler de chiffres, parce que votre proposition, ce ne sont que des coupes et découpes injustifiées, des coupes incroyables pour la recherche, moins 413 millions, des coupes contre les jeunes, moins 11,67 millions pour l'initiative emploi des jeunes, des coupes également pour le Fonds asile et migration, lorsqu'il faut aujourd'hui répondre à ce défi de l'insertion des réfugiés, et puis aussi des coupes sur le programme Cosme, 36,5 millions qui vont se traduire par des aides en moins pour les entreprises.

Alors je vous dis qu'avec ce budget, c'est vous qui sacrifiez l'Europe et, avec ce budget, ce sera moins d'Europe en 2020 et c'est bien triste.

Michael Heaver (NI). – Madam President, 17.4 million Brits who voted to leave the European Union in 2016 will be bewildered and angry to find out that they're on the hook for billions of pounds towards the EU's 2020 budget. We heard the word 'continuity' earlier. The British people did not vote for continuity, they voted for independence, and that is why the Brexit Party will now fight for a clean break from the European Union.

As a House of Lords report has previously stated in my country, if agreement is not reached, all EU law, including provisions concerning ongoing financial contributions and machinery for adjudication, will cease to apply, and the UK would be subject to no enforceable obligation to make any financial contribution at all. In other words, no-deal means No UK money for the European Union. Sounds pretty good to me.

It is no wonder, therefore, you're so desperately trying to cling on to Theresa May's surrender treaty, a treaty that has been rejected repeatedly in my country. And that is why the Brexit Party is putting Boris Johnson, our Prime Minister, on notice that he must not simply try to rebrand and resell that treaty, because we don't want it, and the Brexit Party will fight him every step of the way.

On behalf of the people of the East of England and Essex where I live, let me tell you what we think about the prospect of handing over GBP 30 billion plus through another European treaty: no thanks, no deal, you can do one.

Siegfried Mureşan (PPE). – Madam President, we are debating now the budget of the European Union for the year 2020. This has two particularities: firstly, it is the last year of the current MFF, and secondly, it is the first year after the European elections. Being the last year of the current MFF means that money is finally flowing to Member States. It means that we need to pay many bills, and this is why my kind request to the Council is we have to make sure that the Union is equipped with enough resources that we are able to pay our bills.

There is no worse signal that we can give to the beneficiaries, to the people, to the cities, to the villages, to the SMEs of Europe, than being a union not capable of paying its bills. It's not possible that, at the beginning of the MFF, we need to put pressure on you to finally absorb the money which you deserve. In the end, we need to put pressure on you to finally pay the bills.

Secondly, being the first year after the European elections means that we need to hear the voice of the people who were voting. The participation rate was higher than it was five years ago and young people went to vote. We cannot tell young people that we have less money to tackle youth unemployment as the Council proposes to cut by EUR 116 million the amounts allocated to preventing youth unemployment. We cannot tell young people that there is less money for tackling climate change, because they care about the future of their planet. We cannot tell them that we cannot finance Erasmus properly. We cannot tell farmers who went out to vote that there is less money. Let's work together, Members of Parliament, Commission and Council, to make sure that we identify the right priorities, allocate enough resources and make sure that the money is well spent.

Elisabetta Gualmini (S&D). – Madam President, budget decisions are the core of political action. The allocation of financial resources is not a technical and bureaucratic exercise, but it is the way the European Union answers the needs and requirements of the 500 million EU citizens.

We, as the European Parliament, have to be very ambitious. We do not have to be afraid, in a period of crisis, of flying high – the more the economic crises throw us down, the more we have to be high-flyers. We do not only have to ask to restore the budget initially proposed by the Commission, but we have to increase it. The proposal made by the S&D Group of EUR 3.4 billion is absolutely acceptable. In particular, all the financial targets related to climate change have to be strongly defended and promoted in the 2020 budget. Secondly, the Youth Guarantee has to be strengthened and permanently included in the European Social Fund Plus (ESF+). Thirdly, neighbourhood policies, especially in the Mediterranean area, are fundamental and have to be reaffirmed in order to keep on with our values of solidarity and inclusion.

As shadow rapporteur, I have dealt with the European agencies, and it is important to increase both the funding and the staff of the agencies whose action positively affects environmental policies, labour policies and migration policies. We are facing a crossroads. Europe must be a green and social Europe, or nothing at all. Please do not let us miss this opportunity.

Valerie Hayer (Renew). – Madame la Présidente, Monsieur le Secrétaire d'État, Monsieur le Commissaire, chers collègues, l'année 2020 va clôturer le cadre financier actuel, et par conséquent sonnera l'heure du bilan. Fin 2013, les institutions européennes se sont engagées à allouer 20 pour cent des dépenses pour la protection du climat. Or, cet engagement est en passe de ne pas être respecté. Cet échec s'inscrirait dans un contexte où les catastrophes se multiplient.

Nos concitoyens eux-mêmes ont envoyé un message clair en mai dernier. Ils attendent de l'Union qu'elle agisse, qu'elle protège. Notre devoir est de répondre à leurs préoccupations. Les institutions doivent respecter et honorer leurs engagements. Pour notre groupe, Renew Europe, il est primordial d'atteindre les 20 pour cent. Il y va de la protection de la planète et du lien de confiance entre les citoyens et leurs institutions.

Monsieur le Secrétaire d'État, Monsieur le Commissaire, chers collègues, nous prenons acte de la position du Conseil et de sa quête annuelle pour plus d'économies et ce, en totale contradiction avec l'ambition climatique affichée par la Présidence finlandaise. Néanmoins, nous attendons de l'ensemble des institutions qu'elles tiennent leurs promesses. De nouveaux engagements accompagneront le prochain cadre financier. Assurons-nous que ce budget 2020 soit un trait d'union cohérent.

Damian Boeselager (Verts/ALE). – Madam President, I support my Group's initiative to honour the Barroso Commission's promise of committing at least 20% of the budget to climate within the old multiannual financial framework (MFF). Let me remind you that this promise was given even before the Paris Agreement. As it stands, we are falling short of this promise by EUR 3.5 billion. I also strongly support the initiative for using the entire financial flexibility towards young Europeans in Erasmus and the Youth Unemployment Initiative.

But this discussion is also about something bigger. It's about demonstrating Parliament's ambition for the next budget. In the European elections EU citizens have shown us that they expect us to be more ambitious to provide European solutions to the challenges that affect their lives. We need a budget that increases, rather than decreases, the EU's capacity to act when it comes to climate change, migration, asylum and youth unemployment. For that we need a budget that serves European people across all Member States. We should also increase the financial resources that the EU raises itself, which the Treaties demand we do.

We need to explain and convince European citizens and our friends in the Council that giving more money to the EU is worth it and that the additional investment is worth it. Let us be confident and ambitious, as the European people have demanded we be, within this budget and the next.

Jaak Madison (ID). – Austatud istungi juhataja! Paar kommentaari. Ma saan aru, et ambitsioonid on kõik olulised ja raha tahaks panna kõikjale rohkem ja rohkem, kuid kui ma kuulasin enne ka härra Oettingeri ülevaadet, siis fakt on see, et kui Suurbritannia läheb ilma lepinguta Euroopa Liidust, on oht 11 miljardi eurosele augule. See raha tuleb kuskilt leida. Raha tuleb liikmesriikidest, kui ei ole konsensust, et juurde panna, siis pole raha, mida ka suunata. Teine asi, mul on ka küsimus eelkõige just härra Oettingerile kui kõige vast kompetentsemale inimesele selles küsimuses. Me räägime kliimaprobleemidest, me räägime rändeprobleemidest, me räägime noorte tööpuudusest, aga kas peaks äkki rääkima ka demograafilistest probleemidest. Euroopa Liidus on keskmine sündivus 1,59 last, võrreldes maailmaga me oleme taga-reas. Selleks et Euroopa säiliks ja meil oleks mõtet ehitada üles kliimat ja jätkusuutlikku Euroopat, on meil vaja tagada ka meie laste tulevik. Kas selles on arvestatud ka eelarves?

Zbigniew Kuźmiuk (ECR). – Pani Przewodnicząca! Panie Komisarzy! Panie Ministrze! Zabierając głos w tej debacie, chcę wyrazić zaniepokojenie zbyt małym wzrostem środków na płatności. Wprawdzie rosła ona o 5,1 miliarda w stosunku do obecnego roku, ale w związku z tym, że budżet roku 2020 jest ostatnim rokiem realizacji ram finansowych, to zapewne przyspieszy realizacja projektów, zarówno w ramach polityki spójności, jak i rozwoju obszarów wiejskich.

Natomiast projekt budżetu został oparty o konserwatywne założenia, w szczególności w zakresie tempa wdrażania projektów w ramach obydwu funduszy, co tym dziwniejsze, że margines wolnych środków w płatnościach wynosi aż 20 miliardów euro. Może to spowodować powtórzenie się problemu zaległości w płatnościach, którego doświadczyliśmy w latach 2012-2015, ze szczytowym rokiem 2014, kiedy zaległości wyniosły 30 miliardów euro.

Natomiast dobrym rozwiązaniem jest oparcie projektu budżetu o projekt umowy wyjścia Wielkiej Brytanii z Unii. Jeśli dojdzie do wyjścia bez umowy, a Wielka Brytania nie będzie wywiązywała się ze zobowiązań finansowych, to zmiany w budżecie na 2020 rok powinny być dokonane przez budżet korygujący.

Δημήτριος Παπαδημούλης (GUE/NGL). – Κυρία Πρόεδρε, κύριε Tiilikainen, μέχρι τώρα δεν έχει βρεθεί ένας ομιλητής από οποιαδήποτε πολιτική ομάδα που να στηρίζει έστω και εμμέσως τις περικοπές που προτείνει το Συμβούλιο και η Προεδρία σας. Τις απέρριψαν με τεκμηρίωση και ο Επίτροπος Oettinger και οι εκπρόσωποι όλων των πολιτικών ομάδων. Είναι αδύνατον με τις περικοπές που προτείνετε να υλοποιηθούν οι στόχοι, όχι οι στόχοι που ζητάει το Ευρωκοινοβούλιο, όχι εκείνοι που θέτει η Επιτροπή αλλά οι στόχοι που θέτει το ίδιο το Συμβούλιο.

Και είναι πάρα πολύ κακό σήμα αυτό και για το νέο Πολυετές Δημοσιονομικό Πλαίσιο που ετοιμάζεται από το Συμβούλιο για την επόμενη επταετία. Έτσι θα υλοποιήσουμε τους στόχους για την κλιματική αλλαγή, για την καταπολέμηση της ανεργίας των νέων, για τη συνοχή, για την καινοτομία, για την εκπαίδευση; Πρέπει να αλλάξετε ρότα. Με λιγότερα χρήματα δεν γίνονται περισσότερα πράγματα. Αυτά τα έκανε μόνο ο Ιησούς Χριστός!

Mario Furore (NI). – Signora Presidente, onorevoli colleghi, come ogni anno il Consiglio ha presentato una serie di tagli al bilancio proposto dalla Commissione con un criterio che, francamente, ci risulta difficile da comprendere. I tagli non dovrebbero penalizzare i programmi che apportano un valore aggiunto all'Unione in termini economici, sociali e ambientali. Al contrario, il Consiglio dovrebbe supportare economicamente le scelte politiche di cui è promotore, come l'innovazione e la lotta alla disoccupazione.

Invece, come sempre, vengono tagliati programmi centrali per il futuro dell'Unione europea: mi riferisco ad esempio al taglio che avete proposto alla PAC, quindi al mondo agricolo, o alla riduzione dei 60 milioni di euro dei fondi per la revisione del regolamento di Dublino o all'azzeramento del rifinanziamento dello strumento a supporto della disoccupazione giovanile.

Vedete, più che di meri tagli lineari abbiamo bisogno di una vera razionalizzazione delle risorse per concentrare la spesa nei settori cruciali e rilanciare quindi l'economia reale. Per questo abbiamo invece accolto con favore il taglio dei 55 milioni di euro alle spese amministrative, sempre proposto dal Consiglio, perché è lì che si annidano gli sprechi. Questa è la linea che intendiamo portare avanti e tramite i nostri emendamenti al bilancio 2020 abbiamo chiesto all'Unione di tagliare gli sprechi e i maxi stipendi.

Vogliamo un'Europa più efficiente, senza sprechi e con più crescita.

Angelika Winzig (PPE). – Frau Präsidentin, geschätzte Kolleginnen und Kollegen! *Protecting the European Way of Life* bedeutet für unsere Arbeit auch, dass wir in großen technischen Bereichen Aufholbedarf im Vergleich zu anderen Wirtschaftsräumen wie Asien oder USA haben. Mit Horizont 2020 investieren wir in wichtige Zukunftsthemen für unsere Wettbewerbsfähigkeit, für unseren Wirtschaftsstandort und somit auch für unsere Beschäftigung. Als Unternehmerin freut es mich, dass dieses Programm auch den KMU zugutekommt, die ja letztendlich auch das Rückgrat unserer Gesellschaft und unserer Wirtschaft sind.

24 % des Gesamtbudgets der zweiten und dritten Säule gehen ja in diese Unternehmensgruppe. Viele europäische Länder zeichnet es aus, dass es eine sehr gute Zusammenarbeit zwischen KMU und Industrie gibt – eine Win-win-Situation für beide. Unsere Industriebetriebe stehen vor großen Herausforderungen. Nur sie können mit Forschung und Entwicklung im Bereich erneuerbare Energie Lösungen gegen den Klimawandel entwickeln, die eine entsprechende Breitenwirkung in der beziehungsweise für die Bevölkerung erzielen. Vor diesem Hintergrund ist es mir wirklich unverständlich, dass der Rat gerade in diesem Programm Horizont Kürzungen vornehmen will.

Fabienne Keller (Renew). – Madame la Présidente, Monsieur le Commissaire Günther Oettinger, Monsieur le Ministre, le Conseil – cela a déjà été dit – prévoit des coupes conséquentes pour 2020. Plus de 27 millions. C'est un budget, dirait-on en français, taillé à la serpe. C'est pourquoi mon collègue Olivier Chastel a proposé plusieurs amendements visant à revenir sur ces baisses.

Les enjeux de LIBE – je vais me concentrer sur ce sujet, en tant que rapporteure pour mon groupe. Le Conseil prévoit une baisse de 20 millions du budget du Service européen pour l'action extérieure. Nous savons combien la réalité de sa mission est importante et que, notamment sur les questions de migration, le développement des accords de réadmission nécessite des moyens.

Nous voudrions aussi soutenir les moyens alloués aux agences telles que Frontex, Europol et Eurojust. Si les États membres veulent donner une réponse efficace, ce sont bien ces agences qui pourront fortement contribuer à cette coopération renforcée.

Benoît Biteau (Verts/ALE). – Madame la Présidente, chers collègues, l'Amazonie est en feu, la sécheresse frappe dans les pays de l'Union européenne. Le climat peut-il enfin devenir une priorité dans ce budget européen?

Ces dernières semaines, j'ai entendu de belles déclarations pour que des mesures d'urgence soient prises, j'ai entendu des discours pour soutenir les paysans dans cette phase difficile, j'ai entendu des promesses pour les accompagner vers des systèmes de production résilients à l'égard de la sécheresse.

Les amendements que j'avais déposés en commission de l'agriculture pour soutenir l'agroécologie et aider les paysans dès 2020 n'ont pas été retenus. Nous avons raté une première occasion et je le regrette.

Les citoyens européens ne se satisferont pas de belles paroles. Lorsque nous voterons le budget pluriannuel, le Parlement devra mobiliser les fonds pour que la prochaine politique agricole commune prenne à bras le corps la question du changement climatique. Et désormais, quand vous verrez des amendements pour l'agroécologie, un conseil: appuyez sur le bouton vert, vous serez ainsi certains d'avoir fait le bon choix.

Francesca Donato (ID). – Signora Presidente, onorevoli colleghi, nell'ambito del bilancio generale dell'Unione europea la politica di coesione è una delle voci più importanti, insieme alla PAC. La politica di coesione si fonda direttamente sui trattati e mira a ridurre il divario fra le diverse regioni e il ritardo di quelle meno favorite. Ad oggi, unitamente alla PAC, è l'unico strumento concreto dell'Unione europea in grado di ottenere risultati effettivi in termini di aumento dell'occupazione, crescita e competitività.

Tuttavia, sempre più spesso la Commissione e il Consiglio propongono tagli su queste parti del bilancio o per traslare i fondi ad altro impiego o, oggi, per l'ammancio in caso di Brexit con no deal.

Ciò che il Parlamento invece chiede da tempo è che non vi siano tagli in quest'ambito e che si lavori per garantire e migliorare l'efficienza, l'effettività e la qualità dei programmi e dei progetti. Personalmente auspico che si ponga fine all'introduzione, anche in questo settore, di sempre più stringenti strumenti di condizionalità, un puro pretesto per esercitare indebite pressioni sui governi dei paesi membri e imporre agli stessi politiche fiscali contrarie alla volontà dei cittadini, con risultati controproducenti rispetto ai fini di coesione economica e sociale.

Chiedo a tutti quindi di lavorare insieme per garantire un bilancio 2020 adeguato a perseguire i fini economici e sociali di questa Unione.

Eugen Jurzyca (ECR). – Madam President, since everyone considers their area of interest to be the most essential, it is common practice to focus only on how much money is spent on what budgetary items. We are less eager to look back and assess what European projects were truly useful and which ones were just a waste of money. We must clearly define the specific objectives to be financed by the European budget and the outcomes expected. For example, the efficiency of the education projects should not be measured by the number of its participants, but by their success after it. Let us not be afraid to abolish ineffective programmes so that we have more resources for better programmes.

Yesterday I exceeded the time limit, hopefully today I compensated for it.

João Ferreira (GUE/NGL). – Senhora Presidente, esta proposta de orçamento é marcada por uma insuficiência global de recursos, por prioridades erradas, por uma insuficiência de recursos nas áreas social e ambiental, na coesão, pelo aumento das despesas associadas a uma deriva intervencionista no plano externo, deriva militarista, securitária. Apesar disso, não abdicamos de intervir, até onde nos for possível, com propostas concretas que possam melhorar a proposta que agora temos em mãos.

Apresentámos mais de 80 alterações à proposta da Comissão com objetivos claros: promover o investimento público, apoiar os setores produtivos e estratégicos, os serviços públicos, promover o emprego com direitos, a luta contra a pobreza e as desigualdades, promover os direitos das mulheres, a proteção do ambiente e da biodiversidade, o pleno uso do potencial de cada país e de cada região. Algumas destas alterações foram aprovadas nas comissões especializadas, aspeto que muito valorizamos.

Iremos agora bater-nos para que estas propostas possam constar no orçamento final a ser aprovado aqui pelo Parlamento. Tal não vai apagar os seus aspetos mais negativos, mas será importante e, por isso, pedimos o vosso apoio.

Robert Rowland (NI). – Madam President, when I look at the EU budget I see political flaws and the usual accounting chicanery. The political flaws are once again seen in the anti-democratic agenda and the creation of nebulous new departments that purport to promote the European way of life. The historic accounting flaws and wasteful spending are legendary, but my personal favourite is the Committee of the Regions, which spent EUR 725 000 on gifts, trophies and medals, presumably to reward mediocrities like the Chair of the Committee on Fisheries (PECH) for destroying the fishing industry.

I'm astonished that the EU arrogantly assumes the UK will still be contributing EUR 18 billion to the EU budget next year, but how on earth are you going to pay for budget increases when we leave? It cannot be out of assumed growth because a recession is now widely expected, and it cannot be from fiscal stimulus because such supply-side pro-growth policies are denied to euro area economies.

The purpose of the Stability and Growth Pact is not to allow economic stimulus. It is there purely for economic patronage so the Commission can grant leniency to countries which they see as EU favourites, which is why France can act with impunity and Italy cannot. Mario Draghi was right in his plea for fiscal stimulus, but it's all in vain when the euro area remains in the suffocating straitjacket of the Stability and Growth Pact and locked into the euro, which was designed as an instrument of convergence but, as we saw in the last financial crisis, ruined the lives of Greeks, Italians and Spaniards at the altar of European integration.

(Applause from certain quarters)

Karlo Ressler (PPE). – Poštovana predsjedavajuća, Europa se danas suočava s izazovima koja niti jedna država članica zasebno ne može riješiti. Živimo u vremenu velikih demografskih, tehnoloških, ali isto tako i klimatskih promjena. Zato je ovaj posljednji budget u proračunskom razdoblju s ključnim proračunskim politikama iznimno važan.

Ovdje u Europskom parlamentu moramo nastaviti inzistirati na politikama usmjerenima prema mladim generacijama, politikama koje će približiti kvalitetno obrazovanje, kvalitetno radno mjesto te također olakšati zasnivanje obitelji u svim dijelovima Europe. Moramo podržati i ulaganja u investicije, u inovacije i istraživanje kojima omogućujemo globalnu konkurentnost, ali istodobno moramo nastaviti s politikama smanjivanja razlika između država članica. Srednja i istočna Europa, a osobito Hrvatska kao najmlađa država članica, još uvijek trebaju osjetiti punu korist od europskog članstva.

Prioriteti svake organizacije, pa tako i Europske unije, najbolje se vide prema tome kako koristi svoja ograničena sredstva. Stoga i proračun za 2020. godinu treba opravdati povjerenje koje su nam naši građani dali na europskim izborima. To znači orijentiranost na budućnost, ali isto tako i smanjivanje geografskih i generacijskih razlika.

Olivier Chastel (Renew). – Madame la Présidente, chers collègues, disons-le d'emblée, les coupures budgétaires opérées par le Conseil dans le budget de l'Union ne reflètent ni les priorités de la Présidence finlandaise, ni celles de la nouvelle présidente de la Commission et encore moins celles exprimées par nos concitoyens.

Nous devons concrétiser l'opportunité de ce moment pour transformer le défi climatique en opportunité économique et assurer une prospérité durable et partagée par tous, en investissant dans la recherche et développement et dans l'innovation.

Par ailleurs, au nom du groupe Renew, j'ai introduit différents amendements reflétant nos priorités politiques: l'entrepreneuriat social et la microfinance, pour un soutien adapté aux personnes vulnérables dans leur volonté de créer ou de dynamiser leur propre micro-entreprise; la promotion de l'esprit d'entreprise et l'amélioration de la compétitivité par un soutien ferme aux PME; le soutien à l'innovation dans les PME et l'accès à leur financement; des moyens financiers accrus au Centre européen pour le développement de la formation professionnelle. Autant d'engagements pour la croissance et pour l'emploi.

Gina Dowding (Verts/ALE). – Madam President, our societies and our communities are facing huge challenges. Climate change, social injustice, economic inequality – all require determined political and practical action. Today, as a Green, I welcome in particular the decision to top up the Horizon and Erasmus programmes. Today's vote was one small step in the right direction, but we need an even greater commitment to research and development on climate-related activities in the future.

I therefore call on Member States to commit to funding our future and to follow this Parliament's proposal to increase the funding of the EU's next research programme, Horizon Europe. Innovation will play a huge role in solving issues such as the climate crisis, although it cannot be our only answer. We must also commit to immediate and decisive climate action in other areas as well.

But today, let's celebrate investing in our future and ensure that we act decisively on climate change.

Nicolaus Fest (ID). – Frau Präsidentin! Verehrte Abgeordnete, Sie tun so, als ginge es hier um Ihr Geld. Tatsächlich geht es vor allem um die Interessen des europäischen Steuerzahlers, denn er hat das Budget erwirtschaftet, mit seiner Arbeit und mit seinen Steuern. Das EU-Budget beträgt 2020 circa 160 Milliarden Euro, das ist eine Steigerung gegenüber 2019 um rund 10 Milliarden, aber hier im Plenum wird das Ende Europas ausgerufen und die Verarmung großer Bevölkerungsteile prognostiziert, und das alles, weil der Rat die Steigerung marginal gekürzt hat. Man fragt sich wirklich, in welcher Welt manche Abgeordnete leben.

In Wirklichkeit ist das Budget weit überzogen. Alle tun so, als gäbe es keinen Brexit und keine Rezession, keinen drohenden Handelskrieg zwischen China und den USA, keine Ölkrise durch den Angriff auf Saudi-Arabien. Was wir haben, ist ein dummes Budget, weil es keine Risiken kennt. Es ist ein verlogenes Budget, weil es die Steigerungen als Kürzungen verkauft. Und es ist eine unverfrorenes Budget, weil es die Selbstbedienung der EU auf Kosten der europäischen Steuerzahler fortsetzt.

Λευτέρης Χριστοφόρου (PPE). – Κυρία Πρόεδρε, αγαπητέ κύριε Επίτροπε, για μένα ο προϋπολογισμός της Ευρωπαϊκής Ένωσης πρέπει να είναι ένας ισχυρός αναπτυξιακός και κοινωνικός προϋπολογισμός. Ένας προϋπολογισμός που να ανταποκρίνεται στις απαιτήσεις και στις προσδοκίες των Ευρωπαίων πολιτών. Για να επιτύχουμε έναν τέτοιο προϋπολογισμό, απαιτείται να θέσουμε ως προτεραιότητά μας και να ενισχύσουμε τα κονδύλια για τους νέους μας και την απασχόληση, τα κονδύλια για την καινοτομία και την έρευνα, για τους αγρότες μας, για τις μικρομεσαίες επιχειρήσεις, για την άμυνα και την ασφάλειά μας, που είναι ιδιαίτερα σημαντική για την Ευρωπαϊκή Ένωση και τις χώρες μέλη. Πρέπει επίσης να ενισχύσουμε την ψηφιακή οικονομία.

Ταυτόχρονα όμως οφείλουμε να τον καταστήσουμε έναν προϋπολογισμό που να συνδέεται με το κράτος δικαίου, τον σεβασμό των ανθρωπίνων δικαιωμάτων και την εφαρμογή των διεθνών και ευρωπαϊκών αρχών και αξιών. Δεν πιστεύω ότι υπάρχει Ευρωπαίος πολίτης που επιθυμεί να παραχωρούνται χρήματα σε χώρες που παραβιάζουν όλες αυτές τις αρχές και τις αξίες της Ευρωπαϊκής Ένωσης.

Ιδιαίτερα, είναι απαράδεκτη η συνέχιση της προενταξιακής βοήθειας προς μια χώρα η οποία ουσιαστικά παραβιάζει το διεθνές και ευρωπαϊκό δίκαιο και το κράτος δικαίου και δεν σέβεται τα ανθρώπινα δικαιώματα, όπως είναι η Τουρκία. Πιστεύω ότι, εάν ρωτήσουμε σήμερα τους Ευρωπαίους πολίτες αν θέλουν να χρηματοδοτείται έστω και με ένα ευρώ η Τουρκία, ουδείς θα ψηφίσει «υπέρ». Είναι αδιανόητο η Τουρκία να παραβιάζει την Αποκλειστική Οικονομική Ζώνη της Κύπρου, να απειλεί και να εκβιάζει για την Αμμόχωστο, να απειλεί και να εκβιάζει για το μεταναστευτικό, να δημιουργεί χίλια προβλήματα στην περιοχή με τον κίνδυνο αστάθειας και διατάραξης της ειρήνης και η Ευρωπαϊκή Ένωση να συνεχίζει την προενταξιακή βοήθεια.

Πιστεύω, κύριε Επίτροπε, ότι είναι η ώρα να παγώσουμε τα κονδύλια για την προενταξιακή βοήθεια της Τουρκίας και να δώσουμε ένα σαφές μήνυμα ότι η Ευρωπαϊκή Ένωση είναι Ένωση αρχών και αξιών που καλεί αυτούς που λαμβάνουν βοήθεια και κονδύλια από την Ευρωπαϊκή Ένωση να σέβονται αυτές τις αρχές και αξίες.

Paolo De Castro (S&D). – Signora Presidente, signor Commissario, onorevoli colleghi, i nostri cittadini ci chiedono un'Europa più vicina, che sappia rispondere efficacemente alle loro richieste, ma le posizioni del Consiglio sulla proposta di bilancio per il 2020 sembrano volersi allontanare da questo obiettivo, con passi indietro significativi rispetto alla proposta della Commissione che, come Parlamento, avevamo giudicato poco ambiziosa.

Vogliamo invece continuare a investire in un settore, quello agroalimentare, che rappresenta la prima industria europea e la cui strategicità viene troppo spesso messa in secondo piano. I tagli previsti per il 2020 non tengono conto dell'attuale situazione geopolitica e degli effetti sui nostri prodotti già provocati dall'embargo russo e che si manifesteranno nel caso di una Brexit senza accordo.

C'è in gioco, signor Commissario, il futuro dei nostri giovani e dell'intero settore agroalimentare. Dimostriamoci all'altezza di questa sfida ed evitiamo passi indietro, che rappresenterebbero un segnale negativo in vista del negoziato sulla prossima programmazione finanziaria.

Nico Semsrott (Verts/ALE). – Frau Präsidentin! Sehr geehrter Hochadel! Euer Finanzplan ist zeitgemäß fürs Mittelalter. Unser Bund der Fürstentümer ist bedroht, allerdings nicht durch Fremde, sondern durch euch, denn ihr, die Schatzmeister, handelt in Torheit. Weil euch eure Furcht so in Beschlag nimmt, errichtet ihr Bollwerke um unsere Ländereien, hört nicht auf die Gelehrten und seid blind für die wahren Gefahren unserer Zeit. Wir erleben einen ewigen Sommer. Tiere sterben aus, Feuer verschlingen die Wälder, und das Meer raubt das Land.

Deshalb versammeln wir uns am zwanzigsten Tag des Septembers mit den Aufständischen der Freitage für morgen auf den Marktplätzen, um eurem teuflischen Plan Einhalt zu gebieten. Schon allein aus Trotz – wir geben nicht auf. Wir, die Mittellosen, Hoffnungslosen und Aussichtslosen, stehen zusammen gegen euch, die Ahnungslosen.

Paolo Borchia (ID). – Signora Presidente, onorevoli colleghi, io ritengo strategiche le dotazioni dei programmi a sostegno di infrastrutture, imprese, ricerca e innovazione. Tuttavia ammetto di essere sorpreso nell'osservare come la proposta della Commissione per il 2020 preveda numerosi aumenti che, verosimilmente, metterebbero in ulteriore difficoltà le finanze dei paesi contributori netti, come l'Italia.

Siamo quasi alla fine del periodo di programmazione finanziaria e la performance finora registrata da questi strumenti presenta ancora troppi punti interrogativi. Gli stanziamenti non devono essere soltanto faraonici, ma affrontare con metodo i problemi che affliggono le nostre realtà produttive.

Parliamo delle procedure di accesso ai bandi della Commissione, fuori dalla portata delle entità più piccole, nonostante siano proprio queste ad averne più bisogno. In Italia e in Europa ci sono esempi di eccellenza che si scontrano con requisiti spesso impossibili da soddisfare, quindi gradirei che la Commissione tenesse conto di queste criticità, a meno che l'intenzione non sia quella di escludere in partenza le realtà più piccole per destinare le risorse esclusivamente ai soliti colossi, come troppo spesso succede.

Niclas Herbst (PPE). – Frau Präsidentin, meine sehr geehrten Damen und Herren! Wir haben gerade im vorangegangenen Punkt über das Thema Kampf gegen den Krebs geredet, waren uns alle einig, dass das Thema Horizon da eine besondere Rolle spielt. Und jetzt – einen Tagesordnungspunkt später – sehen wir, zumindest in Zahlen gegossen, das Gegenteil. Wir haben hier einfach eine Diskrepanz zwischen dem, was wir in Sonntagsreden fordern, und dem, was wir hier umsetzen. Das dürfen wir nicht zulassen!

Der Kommissar hat sehr deutlich dargestellt: Wir reden hier eigentlich über Verzögerung; Sie stoppen es ja nicht. Und diese Verzögerung bedeutet Zeit, die wir nicht haben – beim Kampf gegen Krebs nicht, beim Kampf gegen Jugendarbeitslosigkeit nicht – je länger junge Menschen Jugendarbeitslosigkeit erfahren, desto eher ist die Gefahr, dass sie sich radikaliseren –, und wir haben sie auch nicht beim Thema Forschungsförderung: Der Rest der Welt schläft ja auch nicht.

Natürlich reden wir über Steuerzahlergeld, aber wenn man manche Überschriften liest, dann sieht man ja, dass Sie fast schon zielgerichtet die Programme angreifen, die besonders gut laufen, die einen besonderen europäischen Mehrwert darstellen. Das ist keine gute Idee, lieber Rat.

Insofern müssen wir uns hier – auch als fast zwei Drittel neue Abgeordnete – an gewisse Rituale gewöhnen. Zum Ritual gehört offensichtlich, dass Sie im Rat erst mit dem Rasenmäher vorgehen. Auch das ist keine gute Idee. Dieses Ritual erfordert es ja quasi, dass wir Ihnen widersprechen. Ich würde mir mal gerade vorstellen, was passiert, wenn wir Ihnen hier zustimmen. Dann wären Sie wahrscheinlich nicht nur überrascht, sondern auch sehr erschrocken. In diesem Sinne: Fordern Sie diesen Widerspruch vom Parlament, und im Sinne einer guten Zusammenarbeit werden Sie den auch bekommen.

Monika Beňová (S&D) – Vážená pani predsedníčka, Európsky parlament je vo svojich politikách veľmi ambiciózný a ako spravodajkyňa pre rozpočet pre výbor ENVI viem, že budeme potrebovať oveľa viac finančných zdrojov, ktoré zatiaľ v rozpočte nemáme.

Klimatické zmeny kladú pred nás výzvy, ktoré budú vyžadovať ďalších tri a pol miliardy eur. Zároveň nás čakajú úlohy, ktoré povedú k naplneniu očakávaní našich občanov a zlepšia kvalitu ich života. Preto prechod na udržateľnú ekonomiku, implementáciu európskeho piliera sociálnych práv a ako aj na európsku minimálnu mzdu, či už spomínaný boj proti klimatickým zmenám, musí byť adekvátne doplnený vytvorením systému, ktorý bude v dostatočnej miere tieto ambiciózne politiky financovať.

Takéto podporné systémy by mohli byť napríklad digitálna daň alebo progresívne zdaňovanie veľkých korporácií, o ktorých sme už v tejto miestnosti veľakrát hovorili. Zároveň by sme mali hľadať efektívnejšie nástroje na zabránenie úniku z európskeho rozpočtu a z rozpočtov členských štátov Európskej únie prostredníctvom rôznych schránkových firiem a schránkových schém.

Tonino Picula (S&D). – Poštovana predsjedavajuća, na ovom dokumentu radim u odboru REGI pa ću komentirati proračun za sljedeću godinu iz perspektive regionalnog razvoja. Kohezijska politika je glavni investicijski alat u mnogim zemljama članicama. Zato i mora ostati jedan od temelja proračuna, kako ovog za sljedeću godinu tako i sljedećeg višegodišnjeg proračunskog okvira. Razloga za to je mnogo, od obveza koje propisuje Lisabonski sporazum člankom 174. da nijedna regija, otok, planinski teritorij ni udaljeno područje Unije ne smiju ostati zapostavljeni, do činjenice da svaki euro uložen u kohezijsku politiku vraća 2,74 eura dodane vrijednosti za razvoj i otvaranje poslova.

Žao mi je što predloženi proračun Vijeća izostavlja ili umanjuje sredstva za područja ključna za budućnost Europe, poput klimatskih promjena, migracija, inicijative za zapošljavanje mladih, instrumenta za susjedstvo. Ovo nije prijedlog koji kvalitetno odgovara na te izazove niti predstavlja dobar temelj za novu Komisiju jer u velikoj mjeri ne prati prioritete predstavljene u njenom najavljenom programu.

Neena Gill (S&D). – Madam President, I rise in this debate to speak as shadow rapporteur in the Committee on Foreign Affairs and to express my concern on the Council's proposals that foresee a decrease of over EUR 1 billion in the commitment appropriations for heading 4, which could result in budget for external actions at the lowest amount of the preceding three years. Does the Council really believe that, in this current international context where human rights, democracy and the rule of law are facing roll-backs across different continents, this is what we should be doing? Is this really responsible: to reduce the EU's capacity to act, and to abandon people in the greatest need?

What really concerns me is that the EU seems to be following in the footsteps of the USA, while China is out there and is offering easy money – with heavy penalties, though, strings attached!

I'd really like to see the EU taking responsibility and doing more human rights and more democracy, so I call on the Council and the Commission to review their proposals and to make sure they put their money where their mouth is.

Jens Geier (S&D). – Frau Präsidentin, Herr Minister, lieber Herr Oettinger, liebe Kolleginnen und Kollegen! Das ist das elfte Haushaltsverfahren, das ich jetzt verfolge, und ich erlebe es als hochgradig institutionalisiert, ritualisiert und – wenn ich es so sagen darf – todlangweilig. Wir haben immer wieder dieselbe Situation auf der Ratsseite: Die alles andere als originelle Erklärung für Ihre Kürzungen ist die vorsichtige und realistische Finanzplanung und ausreichende Margen. Wenn ich mir die Zahlen dann genau angucke, gehen wir inflationsbereinigt in den Ausgaben zurück, mit all den Konsequenzen, die die Kolleginnen und Kollegen hier schon dargelegt haben.

Ich greife mal die Idee vom Kollegen Herbst auf – ich finde die charmant. Was würden Sie eigentlich machen, wenn wir Ihren Vorschlag akzeptieren würden? Wären Sie, Herr Minister, in der Lage, ihren Wählerinnen und Wählern zu erklären, warum die finnische Ratspräsidentschaft mehr Geld einsetzen will beim digitalen Wandel, in der Forschung, in der Klimapolitik, in allen Bereichen, auch in der Verkehrsinfrastruktur, und den eigenen Haushaltsentwurf kürzen Sie? Ich glaube, das schaffen Sie gar nicht. Meine Bitte ist: Nehmen Sie die Vorschläge der Berichterstatterin an!

Maria Grapini (S&D). – Doamna președintă, domnule comisar, domnule ministru, stimați colegi, s-a dezbătut foarte mult pe marginea raportului și e normal să fie așa. De la bun început vreau să apreciez precizarea făcută de domnul comisar. Ne-a explicat foarte bine de ce nu este bine să se opereze aceste tăieri. Noi știm la fel de bine. Eu sunt raportor din umbră la TRAN, la Comisia pentru transport și turism, și constat că se taie aproape tot: de la cercetare, de la conectivitate, de la absolut tot.

Domnule ministru, am o întrebare: în discursul dumneavoastră ați spus că bugetul este un instrument important pentru politicile Uniunii Europene. Bugetul pe care îl prezentați dumneavoastră, cu tăieri la toate capitolele, cum o să vină ca suport pentru politicile Uniunii Europene? Pentru că vorbim de coeziune, vorbim de start-upuri, vorbim de cercetare, vorbim de sănătate, vorbim de siguranța cetățenilor. Asta așteaptă cetățenii: bunăstare, creșterea nivelului de trai și siguranță. Or dumneavoastră vă contraziceți în ceea ce spuneți. Spuneți că bugetul trebuie să meargă în sensul politicilor europene și, prin ceea ce tăiați, merge în sens opus.

Petra Kammerevert (S&D). – Frau Präsidentin! „Geiz ist geil“ – das war nicht nur der Slogan einer der erfolgreichsten und umstrittensten Werbekampagnen in Deutschland, nein, das scheint offensichtlich auch die Haltung des Rates zu sein, wenn es um den Haushalt für das kommende Jahr geht. Es ist wie immer: weniger Geld, Sie kürzen. Weniger Geld für Kultur, weniger Geld für bürgerschaftliches Engagement, ja sogar das bekannteste und erfolgreichste Programm, Erasmus+, wird mit Kürzungen belegt. Immer wieder wird auf die Bedeutung von Kultur und Bildung für gesellschaftlichen Zusammenhalt innerhalb der Union und die persönliche Entfaltung eines jeden hingewiesen. Darin zu investieren, fällt Ihnen aber offenbar im Traum nicht ein.

Die vom Rat vorgeschlagenen Kürzungen in diesen Bereichen sind schlichtweg inakzeptabel. Kreatives Europa, Europa für Bürgerinnen und Bürger leiden seit jeher unter chronischer Unterfinanzierung. Für den Ausschuss für Kultur und Bildung ist die Sache klar: Wir brauchen mehr Geld! Zehn Prozent mehr fordern wir für Erasmus+, Kreatives Europa und das Europa der Bürgerinnen und Bürger. Wir müssen in die Bereiche Jugend, Kultur und Bildung mehr investieren und nicht weniger. Ich glaube, das sind wir unseren Bürgerinnen und Bürgern schuldig.

VORSITZ: NICOLA BEER

Vizepräsidentin

Brando Benifei (S&D). – Signora Presidente, onorevoli colleghi, credo che la discussione sul bilancio 2020 sia un'opportunità per ribadire la necessità di misure di sostegno all'occupazione. Per questo, come membro della commissione per l'occupazione e gli affari sociali, ho presentato con i colleghi del gruppo S&D degli emendamenti che mirano a rinforzare questo aspetto nel testo, in particolare l'iniziativa per l'occupazione giovanile, che è uno strumento fondamentale in questa sfida.

I livelli di disoccupazione tra i giovani rimangono infatti troppo alti in molti Stati membri e per questo chiediamo, con le nostre modifiche, lo stanziamento di altri 600 milioni di euro per questa iniziativa.

Abbiamo inoltre espresso la necessità di allineare sempre più le nostre politiche per l'occupazione agli obiettivi di sviluppo sostenibile e al pilastro europeo dei diritti sociali creando sinergie per ridurre le disuguaglianze e favorendo il dialogo sociale, per migliorare la produttività e le condizioni dei lavoratori, anche aumentando i fondi stanziati per la formazione permanente e la formazione professionale.

Il lavoro è uno dei quei campi dove l'Europa deve far sentire la sua azione con una forza straordinaria per i cittadini, soprattutto intervenendo nei contesti più problematici.

Evin Incir (S&D). – Fru talman! Världen brinner, klyftorna är stora och mänskliga rättigheter hotas på många håll. Jag är stolt över min socialdemokratiskt ledda regering i Sverige som håller fast vid sitt enprocentsmål på biståndsområdet. Men det är hög tid att alla EU länder följer vad de lovat, 0,7 procent. Som skuggrapportör i utvecklingsutskottet kommer här några punkter som jag hoppas kan prioriteras mer på utrikesområdet, inom ramen för en modern ansvarsfull och balanserad budget.

Vi måste samarbeta mer för mänskliga rättigheter och tackla det krympande demokratiska utrymme som civilsamhället utsätts för. Vi måste satsa mer på kvinnors rättigheter och på sexuell och reproduktiv hälsa och dessa rättigheter. Det behövs mer fokus på klimatet, som är vår tids gemensamma ödesfråga och vi kan inte backa som humanitär aktör när världens kriser ökar och kan tvinga ännu fler människor på flykt.

Och slutligen: det är bara 10 år kvar tills vi alla måste ha nått FN:s hållbarhetsmål. Vad vi gör och prioriterar här, nu, under vår mandatperiod, kan vara avgörande.

John Howarth (S&D). – Madam President, two of the priorities for the 2020 budget on this side of the House are the climate emergency and the future of Europe's young people. I firmly believe that it's not politicians, but scientists and engineers who will enable the shift to a low-carbon economy. If they are to deliver these advances, it is essential that we give them the tools to do the job. Our investments in science and research are our tools and we should be sharpening them through this budget.

And at a time when the changes to the economy affect young people acutely, it is folly to reduce our programmes to mitigate youth unemployment.

These structural problems remain a serious issue in many parts of the Union. Yet the Council's approach thus far is woefully incoherent: indiscriminate flat-rate reductions that fly in the face of its own priorities. The Union budget represents a small fraction of public spending overall, but the big numbers it adds up to enable Europe to respond to the big challenges, and that's not limited by any border.

Spontane Wortmeldungen

Κώστας Μαυρίδης (S&D). – Κυρία Πρόεδρε, σήμερα το πρωί στο Ευρωπαϊκό Δικαστήριο Ανθρωπίνων Δικαιωμάτων, η Επιτροπή Ανθρωπίνων Δικαιωμάτων του Συμβουλίου της Ευρώπης κατέθεσε στις διαπιστώσεις της το εξής για την Τουρκία: συστηματική αποτυχία για ανεξάρτητη και αμερόληπτη απονομή δικαιοσύνης, η οποία πλέον έγινε εργαλείο του κυβερνώντος καθεστώτος Ερντογάν.

Χθες, εδώ σε αυτό το Ευρωκοινοβούλιο, μιλούσαμε για τις εξωτερικές παρεμβάσεις. Το ίδιο λοιπόν αυτό καθεστώς, στο οποίο αναφέρεται η διαπίστωση της Επιτροπής Ανθρωπίνων Δικαιωμάτων του Συμβουλίου της Ευρώπης, συγκαλύπτει τις παρεμβάσεις του σε κράτη μέλη της Ευρωπαϊκής Ένωσης υπό τον μανδύα της θρησκευτικής ελευθερίας, όπως στη Βουλγαρία, αλλά και με τη συστηματική ισλαμοποίηση της βόρειας κατεχόμενης Κύπρου.

Αυτό το καθεστώς χρηματοδοτούμε με πολλά εκατομμύρια από τον προϋπολογισμό της Ευρωπαϊκής Ένωσης. Και είμαι βέβαιος ότι, αν οι Ευρωπαίοι πολίτες είχαν τη δυνατότητα να εκφράσουν την άποψή τους, θα αρνούνταν αυτή τη χρηματοδότηση με απόλυτη βεβαιότητα.

Ruža Tomašić (ECR). – Poštovana predsjedavajuća, u predrecijsko vrijeme važno je biti jako oprezan s javnom potrošnjom i koristiti novac poreznih obveznika kako bismo se pripremili za razdoblje krize koje je neminovno pred nama, o čemu svjedoči usporavanje gospodarskog rasta diljem kontinenta.

Dolijevanje, dodjeljivanje 21% ukupnog predloženog proračuna za 2020. za borbu protiv klimatskih promjena, čime će se dominantno financirati skupe javne politike, pokazatelj je da ništa nismo naučili iz prethodne krize koja je devastirala Europu i stvorila ogroman jaz između sjevera i juga kontinenta.

Planet moramo čuvati, to je neosporno, ali prvenstveno u partnerstvu s privatnim sektorom i stvaranjem pozitivne klime za poduzetništvo i inovacije, umjesto skupim javno financiranim programima s upitnim učincima.

Ben Habib (NI). – Madam President, this continent has a great debt of gratitude to the United States and NATO in particular, and I've heard a lot about the budget allocations for 2020 and, indeed, 2021 to 2027. Within those budget allocations, there is a figure of EUR 21 billion to create a new 10 000-strong border force for the European Union. I find this unfathomable at a time when virtually every country in the European Union – with the notable exceptions of the United Kingdom, Greece, and perhaps one or two others – is not meeting their NATO budget commitments. Something has to be done within this institution to make sure that we uphold our NATO contributions ahead of creating an independent fighting force in the European Union, which is, frankly, something we should not be doing anyway.

(Ende der spontanen Wortmeldungen)

Kimmo Tiilikainen, President-in-Office of the Council. – Madam President, I would like to thank the House for this interesting and fruitful exchange of views. I made several pages of notes on the honourable Members' comments, and today's debate has shown that we have some different views on specific points but most of us share the common goal of establishing a robust budget for 2020.

I will now await Parliament's position on the budget for 2020, as the basis for developing the position on which we will negotiate to reach a final agreement in November. We know that we can count on the Commission to act as an honest broker to bridge the gap between our positions and to propose balanced compromise solutions for us to consider.

Europe as a whole requires a budget which meets the needs of its citizens. This means providing for expenditure that is necessary and, at the same time, taking into account that the burden for taxpayers should be as low as possible.

I am confident that, with the full dedication of Parliament and the Commission, as well as our own, we will be able to reach an agreement in due time. Thank you for your attention and comments.

Die Präsidentin. – Die Aussprache ist geschlossen.

Schriftliche Erklärungen (Artikel 171)

Tamás Deutsch (PPE), írásban. – Az Európai Unió 2020. évi költségvetésének 6 milliárd eurós emelésére tettem javaslatot, amelyet frakcióm, az Európai Néppárt is támogat. A jelenlegi hét éves költségvetési ciklus utolsó évében különösen fontos, hogy a regionális és vidékfejlesztésben megfelelő összeg álljon rendelkezésre a tagállami számlák kifizetésére, amelyek a már megvalósult projektek költségeit fedezik. Hazám élen jár a fejlesztési programok végrehajtásában, a források lehívásában, ezek hatékony, a gazdasági növekedést és munkahelyteremtést, a magyar emberek érdekét szolgáló felhasználásában. A jelenlegi ciklus utolsó évéhez kapcsolódva fontos kiemelni, hogy a következő, 2021-2027 közötti pénzügyi keretterv javaslata jelenlegi formájában elfogadhatatlan.

Az Európai Bizottság tervezete kettős mércét alkalmaz, valamint a regionális fejlesztési és agrárforrásokat is jelentősen csökkenti. Ez Magyarország számára elfogadhatatlan. Az uniós fejlesztési pénzek nem könyöradományok. A magyar régiók objektív feltételek alapján jogosultak ezekre a forrásokra. Elutasítjuk a közösségi források úgynevezett jogállamisági feltételekhez kötését, és hogy a gazdaságilag, munkahelyteremtés szempontjából kiválóan teljesítő régiókat koholt vádak alapján büntessék. Semmilyen normatív, semmilyen jogállami javaslat erre vonatkozóan nincsen, ez egy politikai eszköz, amivel az Európai Bizottság azokat a tagállamokat bünteti, amely tagállamoknak a politikája, kormányainak a döntése, az adott ország polgárainak az akaratnyilvánítása nem tetszik az Európai Bizottságnak. Egy ilyen, a jogállamiság minimumát sem betartó javaslatot elképzelhetetlen, hogy Magyarország támogasson.

17. Znaczenie pamięci o przeszłości Europy dla jej przyszłości (debata)

Die Präsidentin. – Als nächster Punkt der Tagesordnung folgt die Aussprache über die Erklärungen des Rates und der Kommission zur Bedeutung der Erinnerung an die europäische Vergangenheit für die Zukunft Europas (2019/2819(RSP)).

Tytti Tuppurainen, President-in-Office of the Council. – Madam President, the topic of today's discussion induces reflection on how we can learn from history. The authoritarian and totalitarian regimes across Europe in the last century remain a dark chapter in our continent's history. Remembrance is not just remembering. Remembrance is about keeping a memory alive so as not to allow ourselves to overlook horrors that have happened in the past.

If we are fully to understand the present and shape a better future, an awareness and understanding of the past is crucial. To quote the Spanish philosopher George Santayana, 'Those who cannot remember the past are condemned to repeat it.'

The European Union is based on our common values: respect for human dignity, freedom, democracy, equality, the rule of law and respect for human rights. These values are the cornerstone of democratic societies and the very foundation of our European project. Our common value base has enabled the longest period of peace in Europe. Fortunately, younger generations have not suffered under totalitarian regimes, yet there is now a risk that we are taking these common values and principles for granted.

As you know, nurturing and strengthening our common values, and the rule of law in particular, is among the top priorities of our Presidency. The respect for democracy, fundamental rights and the rule of law has a strong symbolic value. It is also crucial for the proper functioning of our societies and the policies of the Union. These common values belong to everybody and benefit us all.

My feeling is that we should better involve citizens and civil society to create a union of values for all. Here I think of a garden: beautiful flowers and trees in perfect shape. As an American historian, Robert Kagan writes, 'an organized society, based on rule of law, is like a garden'. The natural order, according to him, is the jungle. And, like a garden, the rule of law needs constant care and protection, otherwise the jungle grows back.

A lack of knowledge about the origins of the Union and about its core principles increases the risk of disinformation and manipulation. It also prevents citizens from developing informed opinions on the actions that the Union takes. On the other hand, knowledge about the diversity, heritage and traditions within the Union and its Member States promotes respect, understanding and cooperation, which in turn strengthens the common sense of belonging.

Last week the Presidency organised in Helsinki a conference on how to ensure the resilience of our societies in a changing European landscape – the interaction between democracy, the rule of law and fundamental rights. And there was a broad consensus among the participants that shortcomings in respecting our common values make our societies and the Union more vulnerable, both internally and externally.

Today we face a number of challenges that put our open societies at risk, be it through xenophobia, nationalism, disinformation or violent radicalisation, to name just a few. We must remember – in order not to get caught in the catchy and attractive-sounding populist voices which promise simple solutions for complex issues. Not only can these promises not be fulfilled, they also discredit our democratic institutions and authorities.

The damage of populism to our societies can grow when populists follow the ‘divide and rule’ strategy. They divide our societies into good and bad citizens, us and them, friends and enemies. This undermines a democratic and open political debate, and radicalisation and extremism gain ground. We all need to step up our efforts in preventing intolerance, racism and xenophobia. Europe has already paid a heavy price for this phenomenon in the past. The experience of the two World Wars taught us not to focus on differences but to create a common space in which to live, study and work.

Our societies have now been learning over several generations the value of inclusiveness and tolerance. And of course we should not forget the important role of education and the need to teach our children democratic resilience, media literacy, tolerance, critical thinking and conflict-resolution skills.

I'd like to conclude by stressing that Europeans need to remember their own history in order to learn from the past and not repeat our mistakes when shaping tomorrow's Europe. By playing our part in a joint effort of protecting the common value base, we are protecting the foundations of our societies and of European integration, peace, security, stability, democracy and prosperity. At the same time we are contributing to a more resilient and sustainable Union. As our Presidency motto puts it, ‘Sustainable Europe – Sustainable Future’. This is the kind of Union that we want to leave for future generations.

Thank you very much for this topical discussion and for your attention.

Dimitris Avramopoulos, *Member of the Commission*. – Madam President, I'm very glad that this debate has been scheduled because there is no better time to discuss the importance of our collective history in order to build our shared future.

In the run-up to, and in the aftermath of, the European elections there has been a lot of debate about what the European Union is and what this concept means to our citizens. The thing is, the European Union is not just a concept. It is the largest and most tangible political, legal, economic and social project that defines our lives on a daily basis. If you can travel freely today across borders, if you can call abroad for the same price as at home, if you study at a university in another Member State and have those credentials recognised, that is because the European Union makes this happen.

In order truly to appreciate these freedoms and these opportunities, we need to understand where they come from. We need to keep remembering. You see, these accomplishments did not fall from the sky. They were hard fought and hard earned. This year, we commemorate 30 years since the fall of the Berlin Wall and more than 60 years since the establishment of the very foundations of our Common Market and Union. This Union was built on the ashes that fell over our continent in the aftermath of what happened 80 years ago, and which opened a dark chapter in European history: the signature of the Molotov-Ribbentrop Pact between Nazi Germany and the Soviet Union on 23 August 1939, dividing our continent and creating suffering for so many Europeans under totalitarian regimes.

Today we enjoy many different freedoms: to travel without barriers, to speak, to write, to protest, to follow any profession and to live or visit wherever we desire. These rights and freedoms were earned and imparted to us by the huge endeavours of a generation that witnessed at first hand the ravages of two catastrophic wars and suffered their dreadful consequences. We should not forget that we, living and growing up in the European Union as we know it today, are the only generation that has not experienced a war. We need to continue paying tribute to the struggles of our predecessors. It is vital to appreciate fully the meaning of the fundamental values on which the European Union and European democracy are built, and never to take these for granted.

In recent years, several challenges have cast a shadow over Europe: the financial crisis, migration, terrorism, disinformation campaigns against our elections, Brexit, to name just a few. Our citizens are rightly worried. Unfortunately, these challenges become a pretext for populists and nationalists to gain more ground, claiming that it is by closing ourselves off that we can overcome them.

What a naive, irresponsible, dangerous approach! If we have learned one thing from the past – both the distant and the near past – it is that we can only face them together, in trust. The European Union was not built on adulation, on us against them or on the idea of the survival of the fittest. It was built on the basis of solidarity, of working together, of sharing responsibilities and of caring for and protecting the more vulnerable and weaker.

More than ever, we need to remember these lessons from the past because if we ignore history we are at risk of repeating past mistakes. This is why we need to stimulate activities that keep the memories of the past alive as a means of moving beyond the past and towards building the future together. This should never come at the cost of one's own country or community: we can be both the Europeans and patriots at the same time. That is why we should always strive to reach out to others and make diversity an asset. It is only through collective European actions that we can address citizens' concerns and meet current challenges and, most importantly, maintain, uphold and strengthen our common European house.

This should not necessarily always come from the governments: we want to empower our citizens and civil society too to get involved. The Commission has been in the vanguard with its Europe for Citizens programme, which promotes peace, EU values and the well-being of all. It was set up in the year 2004 with the aim of bringing citizens closer to the European Union. It offers funding for projects on the ground, in which the citizens can reflect on the past, participate in shaping the future and engage.

Remembrance, as one of the strands of the programme, supports initiatives to reflect on the causes of totalitarian regimes and to commemorate reference points in Europe's modern history. Raising awareness of remembrance, the common history and our own EU values is critical. Projects encourage tolerance, mutual understanding, intercultural dialogue and reconciliation as a means of moving beyond the past and building the future.

Around 100 000 citizens are directly involved every year in European remembrance projects. In the year 2019, 45 - European remembrance projects were selected for financial support for a total amount of EUR 3 million. The selected projects will address priorities such as civil society and civic participation under totalitarian regimes, anti-Semitism, anti-Gypsyism, xenophobia, homophobia and other forms of intolerance, as well as democratic transition and accession to the European Union. They will also commemorate major historical turning points in recent European history, such as the 1919 Peace Treaties, bringing the First World War to an end.

An example is the Mémorial de la Shoah, a project from 2018. Thanks to a Europe for Citizens grant it has evolved into a truly European reference network on the Holocaust and other genocides. The Mémorial receives more than 250 000 visitors per year.

The essence of our programme is to connect citizens. For instance, in early April this year we held, under my auspices, the high-level event 'Europe for Citizens – History Defines our Future'. More than 300 participants from both the general public and the programme attended. Together with my colleagues Commissioners Jourová and Crețu, we debated with them a range of topics that are crucial for citizens in engaging with Europe. One of them was the diversity of memories in the European Union. Some countries have gone through specific experiences with colonialism or totalitarian regimes: while there are the facts, there is no single truth in the experience of an individual or a community. The question is: how can we reconcile differing memories, how can we build on this diversity and make it an asset for strengthening the European Union? I have trust that supporting remembrance will remain a priority for the new Commission.

In May 2018, the Commission proposed a new instrument – the Justice, Rights and Values Fund. This fund will include the Justice programme and a new Citizens, Equality, Rights and Values programme whereby funding is made available to continue supporting work on remembrance. The new programme will guarantee the continuation of the activities of the current Europe for Citizens programme.

I will also increase the European Union's potential to promote and protect rights in the European Union and the European values by encouraging the engagement of all citizens in all aspects of their lives, enabling them to participate in the construction and consolidation of an even closer Europe and union.

We, the Commission and I personally, remain consistently committed to a policy of values and historical responsibility. This is the only way for all Europeans, leaders, political parties and citizens, in the future for our common future. Thank you for your attention and I look forward to what promises to be a very interesting discussion.

Rasa Juknevičienė, PPE frakcijos vardu. – Gerbiama Pirmininke, Molotovo-Ribentropo paktas ir jo slaptieji protokolai, kuriais naciai ir komunistai pasidalino Europą, atvedė į Antrąjį Pasaulinį karą. Karas atnešė neregėto masto kančias – Holokausto tragedija, okupacijos, gulagai, tremtys – tai patyrė nesuskaičiuojama daugybė žmonių.

Gimusi okupuotoje Lietuvoje, nebūčiau patikėjusi, kad kada nors stovėsiu šioje salėje kaip Europos Parlamento narė. Esu gyvas pavyzdys, kad Europos Sąjungos ir NATO plėtra geriausiai trina skiriamąsias tironų nubrėžtas linijas.

Vis dėlto, net praėjus 80 metų nuo Pakto, jo pasekmes vis dar jaučiame, nes:

— skiriamosios linijos išlieka Europos rytuose. Kremlius ir toliau siekia išlaikyti savo įtakoje šalis, norinčias prisijungti prie mūsų – Ukrainą, Moldovą ir Sakartvelą;

— nes Rusija yra didžiausia Pakto auka. Molotovo dvasia gyvenantis Kremlius skatina stalinizmo garbinimą ir skleidžia melą.

— nes Europa tapo informacinių karų taikiniu. Istorija taip pat naudojama kaip melo įrankis.

Europos Sąjunga gimė kaip atsakas į tironų sukeltą žmonijos tragediją.

Todėl ir rezoliucija, kurią siūlome priimti rytoj, yra ne tik apie praeitį. Ji skirta ateičiai, jaunajai kartai, kad ši istorija niekada nepasikartotų, o išlikusios Europos padalijimo linijos išnyktų galutinai. *Never again.*

Vilija Blinkievičiūtė, S&D frakcijos vardu. – Gerbiama Pirmininke, gerbiama Ministre, gerbiamas Komisare, mieli kolegos, istorinė atmintis yra mūsų bendros stiprios Europos pagrindas. Nors mes visi turime savo unikalią istoriją, tačiau kaip europiečiai esame sujungti bendroje istorijoje. Istorijoje, kuri pažymėta didžiausiais žmonijos karais, milijonais aukų, brutaliais nacistiniais, komunistiniais ir fašistiniais režimais. Visų laikų okupantai iš okupuotų tautų stengdavosi ištrinti istorinę atmintį, tautinę savimonę, tautiškumą. Aš pati esu iš šalies, iš Lietuvos, kurios istorija yra skausmingai paženklinta prievartine okupacija, masiniais trėmimais, Sibiro gulagais ir sulaužytais žmonių likimais.

Šiandieninė diskusija yra dar viena proga priminti, jog neturime palikti istorijos užribyje. Privalome priešintis bandymams šlovinti komunistinių, fašistinių ir totalitarinių režimų veiksmus bei bet kokiems bandymams sumenkinti šių itin brutalių režimų nusikaltimus.

Turime kovoti su augančia propaganda ir visomis neapykantos ir netolerancijos apraiškomis. Europos atminties diena, kurią minime kasmet, privalo būti labiau matoma ir girdima, kad niekadoms nepamirštume kokią kainą teko sumokėti už laisvę, taiką ir demokratiją.

Gerbiami kolegos, mes esame stiprūs tik būdami vieningi. Istorinės atminties išsaugojimas ir jos perdavimas ateities kartoms yra mūsų pareiga.

Michal Šimečka, *on behalf of the Renew Group*. – Madam President, I would like to thank the Commissioner for being here.

There is, indeed, no future for Europe without remembering and being aware of our darkest hours. The Molotov-Ribbentrop Pact with its secret protocols is definitely one of those darkest hours. It may indeed have been the single most brutal and cynical act that Europe has ever witnessed, concluded by two of the most repressive totalitarian regimes in our history.

Obviously, we must never forget the victims and we must never forget the heroes who fought and stood up to tyranny. But we must also never forget that the Europe of today came about as a response to the Europe of 1939, and that this union of peace, democracy and shared sovereignty was built as a direct counterpoint to totalitarian atrocities and the partitioning of countries by the raw power of tyrants.

This very contrast speaks to the core of our identity and who we are as citizens of the EU, because the EU is perhaps the only political body that defines itself not in opposition to other countries, cultures or organisations but in opposition to its own tragic past. What is crucial here is that this is a common history, because the painful experiences of totalitarianism are shared by both Western and Eastern Europeans and by both new and old Member States, and this provides a crucial common reference despite the 40 years of division in the Cold War.

So this is why the European Day of Remembrance on 23 August is so important for pan-European solidarity. Obviously, the main message of that declaration and the resolution we will adopt tomorrow is one of solemn remembrance, but it's also a message of vigilance against the return of past demons, because what we see today is a dangerous rise in xenophobia and extremism in our societies and Member States. This includes anti-Semitism and the scapegoating of sexual and other minorities as well as migrants, and the silencing of journalists and critics. It is obviously our responsibility to protect the values of tolerance, openness and democracy. If not for anything else, we owe it to the victims whom we honour today.

Bronis Ropė, *Verts/ALE frakcijos vardu*. – Gerbiama Pirmininke, Komisare, Ministre, kolegos. Daugiau niekada – šiuos žodžius norisi ištarti prisimenant prieš aštuoniasdešimt metų rugpjūčio dvidešimt trečią dieną komunistinės Rusijos ir nacistinės Vokietijos pasirašytą Molotovo-Ribentropo paktą.

Dviejų nusikalstamų ideologijų atstovai tuomet nusprendė, kokia bus suverenių valstybių ateitis ir atvėrė kelius masinėms žūtims, genocidui, deportacijoms. Galiausiai daliai Europos valstybių tai reiškė dešimtmečius trukusią okupaciją. Norint, kad istorija nesikartotų, reikia ne tik atminties. Būtina aktyviai veikti ir demaskuoti pastangas dominuoti, paveržti kitų laisvą valią, suvaržyti laisves. Europos Sąjunga ilgą laiką buvo stabilumo garantas. Tikiuosi, tokia ir išliks. Sukurti taiką pavyko dėl glaudaus bendradarbiavimo ir galimybės kiekvienai valstybei narei lygiaverčiai dalyvauti sprendimų priėmimo procese. Molotovo-Ribentropo paktas nebus pakartotas, jei mes sprendimus ir toliau priiminėsime visi, o ne uždaruose kabinetuose, slaptuose pasitarimuose, bandydami pasiekti naudos tik konkrečiai grupei ar vienai valstybei. Paktas nebus pakartotas, jei nebūsime atlidūs, kai vykdoma agresija, kurstomas separatizmas ir terorizmas ar skleidžiama dezinformacija, siekiant sukelti masinius neramumus. Ačiū.

Gilles Lebreton, *au nom du groupe ID*. – Madame la Présidente, il y a 80 ans, l'Union soviétique et l'Allemagne nazie signaient, le 23 août 1939, le pacte Molotov-Ribbentrop qui ouvrait la voie au déclenchement de la Seconde Guerre mondiale. Il ne faut jamais oublier les atrocités commises par ces deux systèmes totalitaires que furent le communisme et le nazisme.

Ce devoir de mémoire pèse particulièrement sur l'Europe, le continent qui les a enfantés. Il faut transmettre le souvenir des horreurs passées pour éviter qu'elles ne se reproduisent.

Je mets toutefois en garde le Parlement européen contre la tentation qui consisterait à les instrumentaliser pour attaquer la Russie d'aujourd'hui. La Russie a coupé les ponts avec l'Union soviétique depuis 1991 et est devenue un État respectable, qui mérite d'être traité en partenaire plutôt qu'en ennemi.

Je mets enfin en garde le Parlement européen contre une autre tentation qui consisterait à opérer un amalgame odieux entre les nazis d'hier et les populistes d'aujourd'hui. Les eurodéputés du Rassemblement national dénoncent avec force ce misérable stratagème probablement inspiré par de puissants lobbies, dont l'un des buts est de diaboliser la lutte contre la submersion migratoire. Mais nous ne faiblirons pas, nous continuerons à nous battre contre la propagande immigrationniste, notamment lorsqu'elle s'incarne, comme en France, dans un livret de 32 pages distribué aux enfants des écoles.

Anna Fotyga, w imieniu grupy ECR. – Pani Przewodnicząca! Zamyśl dzisiejszej debaty i rezolucji powstał dokładnie w 80. rocznicę szalonego paktu, strasznego paktu Ribbentrop-Mołotow zawartego między hitlerowskimi Niemcami i sowiecką Rosją. Powstał w Wilnie w czasie konferencji zorganizowanej pod auspicjami byłego prezydenta Litwy Valdasas Adamkusa. Dzisiaj po dwóch godzinach niełatwych negocjacji byliśmy w stanie ponad podziałami politycznymi uzgodnić wspólny projekt rezolucji. To jest światło nadziei, że Parlament Europejski, że Europa jest zdolna do wspólnej pamięci, do opisanie wydarzeń historycznych, do wyciągania wniosków, do oddania czci wszystkim ofiarom wielkich totalitaryzmów i innych dyktatur, ale również do szczególnego uhonorowania tych bohaterów, którzy występowali przeciwko strasliwym reżimom, również tym, którzy w naszej części świata, w Europie Środkowej i Wschodniej, występowali przeciwko dwóm reżimom, i w świetle tych faktów chcielibyśmy postulować ustanowienie święta 25 maja, w rocznicę egzekucji jednego z takich bohaterów, rotmistrza Witolda Pileckiego.

Γιώργος Γεωργίου, εξ ονόματος της ομάδας GUE/NGL. – Κυρία Πρόεδρε, μετά από τα όσα ακούγονται, διερωτώμαι «αν πράγματι είναι στραβός ο γιαλός ή αν στραβά αρμενίζουμε». Διότι ακόμα και από τον έντιμο Επίτροπο, Έλληνα στην καταγωγή, θα ανέμενα να ακούσω ότι οι Έλληνες κομμουνιστές ήταν εκείνοι που συνεισέφεραν τα μάλα για να είναι σήμερα η χώρα ελεύθερη. Κάποιοι άλλοι, κάποιες άλλες πολιτικές παρατάξεις συνεργάστηκαν με τους εχθρούς.

Θέλετε να σας πω αλήθειες; Η πρώτη αλήθεια είναι ότι ο σοβιετικός στρατός ήταν εκείνος που απελευθέρωσε τους ευρωπαϊκούς λαούς για να μπορούμε σήμερα να είμαστε εδώ. Η δεύτερη αλήθεια είναι ότι είκοσι εκατομμύρια κομμουνιστές έδωσαν τη ζωή τους για να είμαστε σήμερα ελεύθεροι. Η τρίτη αλήθεια είναι ότι όσοι σήμερα προσπαθούν με διάφορους τρόπους να ενοχοποιήσουν τους κομμουνιστές ή να βγάλουν στην παρανομία τα κομμουνιστικά κόμματα το κάνουν από ιδιοτέλεια για συγκεκριμένους λόγους. Δηλαδή, να εξοντώσουν κάθε δύναμη αντίστασης απέναντι στον αυταρχισμό του κατεστημένου. Ένα κατεστημένο το οποίο ξεβράζει παιδιά – όπως ο Αϊλάν – από τα παγωμένα νεκροταφεία της Μεσογείου. Ένας κατεστημένο όπως αυτό της Ευρώπης που παράγει στρατιές ανέργων, που γονατίζει απέναντι στις αγορές, που ξεπουλάει συνεχώς στις μεγάλες βιομηχανίες τα κονδύλια για να παράγουν όπλα. Όντως, πρέπει να μιλήσουμε για την αλήθεια. Η αλήθεια είναι ότι απέναντι στον φασισμό υψώνουμε ανάστημα ακριβώς για να ελπίζουν οι άνθρωποι, για να έχουν μέλλον οι λαοί.

Miroslav Radačovský (NI) – Vážená pani predsedajúca, historické povedomie pre budúcnosť Európy je veľmi dôležité. Avšak musí byť hodnotené objektívne, nestranne. Viacerí tu spomenuli pakt Molotov – Ribbentrop z 23. 8. 1939. Akosi zabúdame, že 29. až 30. 9. 1938 bola Mníchovská dohoda, kde Francúzsko, Veľká Británia, Nemecko, Taliansko uzavreli s Hitlerom dohodu a predali svoju vlasť, pôvodnú, Československo.

V dôsledku tejto dohody, ktorá bola príčinou vojny a príčinou zmluvy, bolo Československo obsadené zo severu poľskými vojskami, z juhu maďarskými vojskami a na západe vojskami nemeckými, a to všetci, Poliaci, Maďari i ďalší, bolo to po tejto dohode s Hitlerom. Ale my sa za to nehneváme, my nebudeme spomínať minulosť, pretože to je cesta do pekla. My ako Slováci a hrdý slovenský národ nepodľahneme ani dezinformáciám. Ja som hrdý na to, že jediný národ, ako sú Slováci, nepotrebujú žiaden boj proti dezinformáciám, pretože môj národ je tak múdry, tak šikovný a tak inteligentný, že nepodľahne dezinformáciám ani z východu, ani zo západu, ani z Ameriky, ani z Číny.

Hodnoťme objektívne históriu, nedeformujme ju, nevyvolávajme nepriateľstvo, nevyvolávajme nepriateľstvo medzi Ruskom a zvyškom sveta, pretože toto nepriateľstvo môže, práve takýto postoj Európskej únie a niektorých, aj mojich kolegov zo Slovenska, viesť k tomu, že bude ďalších 6 miliónov mŕtvych Židov, 25 miliónov Slovanov a kopa mŕtvych chudákov Nemcov v zbúraných Drážďanoch a podobne. Budme k sebe úctiví. Najlepšie porazíš nepriateľa, vtedy keď sa s ním staneš priateľom. To je všetko, čo som chcel povedať.

Michael Gahler (PPE). – Frau Präsidentin, liebe Kolleginnen und Kollegen! Was unsere Vorfahren am 23. August 1939 erleben mussten, war der politische Tiefpunkt in der jüngeren europäischen Geschichte, wo zwei Diktatoren mit eigentlich entgegengesetzten Ideologien sich mit einem Strich auf der Landkarte zu Lasten aller anderen Völker in Europa einigten. Wir kennen die unmittelbare Folge: Acht Tage später überfiel das Deutsche Reich Polen, und gestern vor 80 Jahren tat die Sowjetunion das Gleiche. Was folgte, ist bekannt.

Der Wille „Nie wieder“ konnte sich in Frieden und Freiheit mit Demokratie und Versöhnung zunächst nur im Westteil Europas entfalten. Ich bin dankbar, als Angehöriger einer der beiden Vertragsstaaten von damals, dass die anderen europäischen Völker uns wieder in ihre Gemeinschaft aufgenommen haben – deshalb, denke ich, weil wir glaubwürdig umgekehrt sind. Vor diesem Deutschland, eingebettet in EU und NATO, braucht niemand mehr Angst zu haben.

Die Menschen in Russland, die Opfer ihrer eigenen Diktatur und des deutschen Angriffs waren, hätten es verdient, dass die anderen Völker Europas heute keine Angst mehr vor dem heutigen Russland haben müssten. Leider gibt die aktuelle russische Politik und ihre Führung keinen Anlass zur Hoffnung, dass wir das bald erwarten können. Deswegen müssen wir als Demokratien in Europa – auch in Erinnerung an das, wozu es einmal gekommen ist und wie es dazu kommen konnte – zusammenstehen.

Sven Mikser (S&D). – Madam President, earlier this month, we commemorated the 80th anniversary of the beginning of the Second World War. It is important not to forget the millions who perished in that great tragedy, and to honour those who fought to defeat the evil of Nazism. It is also important to remember that it was the pact signed just a week earlier by Nazi Germany and Communist Soviet Union that allowed Hitler to invade Poland and Stalin to occupy and annex the three Baltic countries. It is important to remember that by the time arms fell silent in Europe, almost six years later, a big part of our continent had not been liberated at all, but continued to suffer under authoritarian regimes and external domination for another half century.

If we forget about the darkest chapters of our history, or allow our memory to become selective, we risk being again vulnerable to threats to our democracy that arise from authoritarianism and illiberalism. These threats may come from the outside, in the form of illegal attempts to interfere in our democratic processes, but they may also come from the inside in the form of extremist political movements preaching homophobic, xenophobic and illiberal ideas and ideologies. Only if we remember are we able to avoid repeating the tragic mistakes of the past and protect the European ideas and ideals.

Charles Goerens (Renew). – Madame la Présidente, la mémoire est importante pour l'avenir de l'Europe. Les auteurs de la présente résolution dont nous sommes en train de discuter ont eu raison de le souligner.

Il s'agit en effet de tirer les leçons des drames qui ont secoué notre continent au cours du XXe siècle. Le meilleur moyen pour ce faire est d'agir de sorte qu'on puisse disposer de faits historiquement établis, de faits irréfutables qui ont pu être inscrits dans l'Histoire. L'Histoire est importante, il va falloir remplacer progressivement le devoir de mémoire par le devoir d'Histoire.

Ceci m'amène à renouveler une requête que j'ai eu l'occasion d'exprimer maintes fois, y compris au sein de ce Parlement: quand arrivera-t-on enfin à traduire les actes de Nuremberg dans toutes les langues de travail de l'Union européenne? Cela permettra d'alimenter les cours d'histoire et des cours d'instruction civique dans nos écoles, permettant par là l'accès des jeunes aux atrocités qui ont pu se produire par le passé.

Sergey Lagodinsky (Verts/ALE). – Madam President, how can we build a common future if we don't remember our common past? Nobody is immune to amnesia; in my country of Germany, every second German does not want to deal with the history of the totalitarian GDR. We must continue commemorating the victims of the Holocaust – the Jews, the Sinti and Roma, and the homosexuals – but coming from Berlin, I also insist we also must talk about the fate of our Eastern European friends, of the Balts and of the Poles. This is something we owe to those countries as someone who was on the other side in the war.

This is something that we need to bring to life, talking to the young people sitting over there, bringing it to their schools, bringing it to the internet and awakening the history. But we need to do more; we need to start listening and hearing the concerns of our Eastern European friends. Yes, their security concerns and their energy concerns are all rooted in their tragic past, and we have to start hearing them in order to build a common, a truly common, European foreign policy. This will be the answer to the tragic past and to the future.

(Applause)

Maximilian Krah (ID). – Frau Präsidentin, meine Damen und Herren! Das Problem dieser Erinnerungskulturpapiere ist immer, dass sie sich auf die negativen Seiten der europäischen Geschichte beziehen. Das ist notwendig, aber es ist zu einseitig, wenn der Bezug fehlt auf griechische Philosophie, römisches Recht, auf christliches Mittelalter, Renaissance und Aufklärung. Wir dürfen nicht nur ein negatives Bild dessen vermitteln, was unsere Identität prägt. Aber auch dann, wenn wir uns demjenigen widmen, was schiefgelaufen ist, was Verbrechen hervorgerufen hat, stellt sich doch die Frage, warum wir uns nicht den geistigen Grundlagen widmen. Es ist doch absurd, wenn diejenigen, die gerade hinsichtlich des kommunistischen Terrors mitgeholfen haben, ihn ins Werk zu setzen, und ihre heutigen Nachfolger, die sich immer noch auf diese Anreihe beziehen, meinen, sie müssten Erinnerungskultur diktieren.

Dasjenige, was die Identität einer Region und eines Kontinents ausmacht, das ist das Positive und das sind die Lehren aus der Vergangenheit. Entweder wir betrachten es insgesamt und ideologiefrei oder es wird nichts anderes als ein aufgesetztes Belehrungsprojekt, das wir hier in Straßburg und Brüssel ersinnen können, aber das an den Herzen und dem Verstand der Menschen vorbeigeht – und dieses Papier verdient auch nichts anderes.

Ruža Tomašić (ECR). – Gospa predsjednica, poštovana predsjedavajuća, htjela sam govoriti o komunizmu, fašizmu i nacizmu, ali nisam mogla prijeći preko toga, gospođo Tuppurainen i gospodine Avramopoulos, kada tvrdite da smo mi jedina generacija koja nije iskusila rat.

Gospodo, Hrvatska nije bila članica Europske unije 1991., ali je bila i ostala dio Europe. Vrijeda me da zaboravljate srbočetničku agresiju na Hrvatsku, uz pomoć jugovojске, tada treće vojne sile u Europi.

Gospodo, braneći svoju slobodu i neovisnost, u Hrvatskoj je poginulo 8257 hrvatskih branitelja, 5657 civila, među njima puno djece. Još uvijek tragamo negdje za oko 1200 nestalih, a da ne spominjem milijarde i milijarde eura štete počinjene u ratu. Za jednu malu Hrvatsku od 4,3 milijuna stanovnika to je velika tragedija za koju je dijelom kriva i inertnost Europske unije, pa sam očekivala da ćete spomenuti ovaj rat nametnut Hrvatskoj 1991., makar usputno.

Sira Rego (GUE/NGL). – Señora presidenta, yo vengo del sur, del segundo país del mundo con más fosas comunes como consecuencia de una dictadura fascista. Vengo del país plagado de plazas y calles con nombres de asesinos franquistas. Del país sin memoria que ha borrado de su vida pública lo sucedido en su historia reciente.

Llama la atención que este Parlamento, a través de esta Resolución, instrumentalice la historia y no haga ni una sola mención a lo que sucede aún en España. No hablamos solo del pasado, hablamos también del presente. Sería muy deseable que, cuando debatamos sobre memoria, también habláramos del papel que jugaron los combatientes republicanos españoles para parar al fascismo en Europa. O del ejemplo de solidaridad de las Brigadas Internacionales.

Por eso, aprovechamos la ocasión para exigir una directiva de memoria y reparación que ponga en valor la lucha antifascista, así como los fondos adecuados para la exhumación de fosas del franquismo en España. La memoria imprescindible en la Europa de hoy, plagada de nuevos fascismos, es que reconozcamos el papel de quienes se dejaron la vida para combatirlo.

Λευτέρης Νικολάου-Αλαβάνος (NI). – Κυρία Πρόεδρε, η σημερινή συνεδρίαση, όπως είναι φανερό, δεν αφορά τη συζήτηση ούτε για τη μνήμη ούτε για το μέλλον. Είναι ένα πραγματικό ντελίριο χυδαίου αντικομμουνισμού. Αυτό είναι! Τα αντικομμουνιστικά ψηφίσματα που κατατέθηκαν είναι κατ'άπυστα, είναι προκλητικά ανιστόρητα. Πρέπει να αποσυρθούν. Πρέπει να καταψηφιστούν γιατί οι λαοί στη συνέχεια θα κρίνουν πολύ αυστηρά αυτούς που θα τους δώσουν ψήφο. Ο στόχος που κρύβεται πίσω από αυτά τα κατασκευάσματα σκοπιμότητας που νομιμοποιούν την απαγόρευση της δράσης των κομμουνιστικών κομμάτων, των κομμουνιστικών συμβόλων, της κομμουνιστικής ιδεολογίας, που γενικεύουν τις διώξεις ενάντια στους κομμουνιστές και τις λαϊκές δυνάμεις που αγωνίζονται είναι ακριβώς οι λαοί της Ευρώπης και οι αγώνες που διεξάγουν.

Σε αυτά τα ψηφίσματα πρωτοστατούν αντιδραστικές σκοταδιστικές δυνάμεις χωρών του Βίζεγκραντ και της Βαλτικής, χωρών που ηρωοποιούν τον ναζισμό ξεπλύνοντάς τον, που σπέρνουν το ρατσιστικό δηλητήριο. Η καθοριστική συνεισφορά της Σοβιετικής Ένωσης στη συντριβή του φασισμού και του ναζισμού και στην αιώνια καταδίκη των εγκλημάτων τους είναι ποτισμένη με το αίμα εκατομμυρίων νεκρών, εκατομμυρίων τραυματιών, ανυπολόγιστων θυσιών του αντιφασιστικού αγώνα των λαών της Ευρώπης. Εκείνους που αγωνίστηκαν ενάντια στον φασισμό και στον ναζισμό με θράσος τους αποκαλείτε συνεργάτες του Χίτλερ. Όμως όσο βρώμικο μελάνι και αν χυθεί, η ιστορική αλήθεια θα λάμψει. Ο καπιταλισμός προκαλεί τεράστια βάσανα στους λαούς. Ο σοσιαλισμός, ένας κόσμος χωρίς εκμετάλλευση, πολέμους, φτώχεια και ανεργία είναι η διέξοδος, είναι το μέλλον. Την ιστορία την γράψανε οι λαοί και δεν ξαναγράφεται με ψηφίσματα. Ο αντικομμουνισμός δεν θα περάσει!

Radosław Sikorski (PPE). – Pani Przewodnicząca! Ta debata udowadnia, dlaczego potrzebujemy tej rezolucji. Koledzy ze skrajnej lewicy mówią, że Armia Czerwona pokonała Hitlera, i to prawda. Ale nie chcą pamiętać, że Związek Radziecki przez dwa lata był sojusznikiem faszystowskich Niemiec, i nie chcą pamiętać, że reżimy komunistyczne są odpowiedzialne za śmierć około stu milionów ich własnych obywateli.

Z kolei kolega z francuskiej skrajnej prawicy mówi, że współczesna Rosja odcięła się od spuścizny Związku Radzieckiego. Niestety, to nieprawda. Dosłownie w ostatnich dniach mieliśmy oficjalne stwierdzenia władz rosyjskich, ministerstw, ambasad zaprzeczające faktom paktu z Hitlerem i inwazji Polski. A więc potrzebujemy tego dnia pamięci.

I chciałbym się zgodzić z moją poprzedniczką panią minister Anną Fotygą, że bardzo dobrym patronem takiego dnia byłby Witold Pilecki, polski oficer, który zgłosił się na ochotnika do Oświęcimia. Pomyślcie o tym. Byłby bardzo dobrym patronem takiego dnia, gdyż zamiast nagrody za swoje bezprzykładne bohaterstwo został przez władze komunistyczne zamordowany w sflingowanym procesie. A więc Pani Przewodnicząca, chciałbym poprzeć tę rezolucję.

Petra Kammerevert (S&D). – Frau Präsidentin! Um der jungen Generation erklären zu können, wie das Heute entstanden ist, und ihnen das Rüstzeug für die Gestaltung des Morgen an die Hand zu geben, müssen wir an das Gestern erinnern. Ohne Kenntnis über die grausamen Weltkriege, die Tod, Elend und Zerstörung über uns alle gebracht haben, über die Teilung Europas durch den Eisernen Vorhang, aber auch ohne das Verständnis über die Gemeinsamkeiten zwischen den europäischen Völkern, die wir in der Kultur wiederfinden, ist es unmöglich, den Sinn unserer Staatengemeinschaft zu verstehen.

Erinnern ist aber nur dann möglich, wenn wir unser Kulturerbe schützen, Gedenkstätten fördern, wenn es Ausstellungen gibt, die Erinnern zulassen, und wir Geschichts-, Kultur-, und Musik- und Kunstunterricht an unseren Schulen in hoher Qualität anbieten. Erinnern kann ohne die nötigen Anstrengungen in der Kultur- und Bildungspolitik nicht funktionieren. Die Kürzungen, die der Rat leider in diesen Bereichen vorgenommen hat, sprechen eine andere Sprache.

Es ist für mich auch inakzeptabel, dass die designierte Kommissionspräsidentin die Begriffe Kultur und Bildung in keinem der Titel der zukünftigen Kommissare erwähnt – im Übrigen zum ersten Mal seit 20 Jahren. Das muss dringend geändert werden. Ich erwarte, dass die neue Kommission diesen Politikbereichen mehr und nicht weniger Bedeutung schenkt.

Kultur und Bildung dürfen nicht länger ein Schattendasein führen, denn ohne sie ist am Ende Erinnern nicht möglich.

Romeo Franz (Verts/ALE). – Frau Präsidentin, liebe Kolleginnen und Kollegen! Am 1. September 1939 begann die wohl schrecklichste und unmenschlichste Zeit in Europa, die in den Grausamkeiten des Holocaust gipfelte, in dem Millionen unschuldiger Menschen – Sinti, Juden, Roma, behinderte Menschen, Zeugen Jehovas, Homosexuelle – bestialisch von den Nazis ermordet wurden.

Ein Datum in dieser Zeit, in der nationalsozialistische Bestien unsere Menschen bestialisch ermordeten, ist den Opfern und ihren Hinterbliebenen besonders im Gedächtnis: der 16. Mai 1944. An diesem Tag sollten die letzten Sinti und Roma in Auschwitz ermordet werden. Doch die Frauen und Kinder wehrten sich verzweifelt gegen die Nazis und bewaffneten sich mit Schaufeln und Stöcken und verteidigten ihr Leben. Sie erkämpften mit ihrem Aufstand einen kurzen Aufschub ihrer Ermordung, die dann am 2. August aber dennoch stattfand. Der 16. Mai soll an diesen Aufstand gegen den Rassenwahn und Nationalsozialismus erinnern, damit so etwas nie wieder passiert.

Danilo Oscar Lancini (ID). – Signora Presidente, onorevoli colleghi, il tema di una memoria europea condivisa – specialmente oggi, a 80 anni dalla firma del patto Molotov-Ribbentrop e a 30 anni dalla caduta della «cortina di ferro» – è un valore fondamentale perché i giovani non scordino mai le tragiche conseguenze dei totalitarismi del Novecento e siano in grado di dare forma al presente, giorno dopo giorno, con una piena consapevolezza delle nostre libertà.

Tuttavia il giusto impegno a trasmettere valori e prospettive comuni non può e non deve diventare lo strumento di una propaganda finalizzata alla creazione di una grigia umanità globalizzata e standardizzata.

La vera grandezza dell'Europa si trova nelle sue identità, nei suoi campanili e nel pieno rispetto tra istituzioni, enti locali e famiglie.

«Dovere della memoria» è innanzitutto quello di difendere le nostre radici cristiane e di affermare che costituiscono il principale fondamento della nostra tolleranza e non certamente un ostacolo a essa. «Dovere della memoria» è soprattutto quello di difendere i confini della nostra Europa da scellerate politiche immigrazioniste, tese allo sfruttamento degli individui e non alla loro tutela. «Dovere della memoria» è, per il mio paese, anche quello di rendere finalmente piena giustizia ai caduti delle foibe.

Kosma Złotowski (ECR). – Pani Przewodnicząca! Chciałbym zwrócić uwagę, że spotykamy się jeden dzień po 80. rocznicy dnia, w którym pakt Ribbentrop-Mołotow wszedł w życie. Wtedy to właśnie Związek Radziecki zaatakował Polskę, która wcześniej zaatakowana została przez hitlerowskie Niemcy. Związek Radziecki mówił, że chroni ludność białoruską, ukraińską. Ta ochrona polegała na milionowych wywózkach do obozów koncentracyjnych na Syberię, ta ochrona polegała na terrorze. Szanowni Państwo. Nazizm się skończył. Związek Radziecki się skończył, ale te praktyki pozostały. Popatrzcie Państwo na Gruzję. Popatrzcie Państwo na Krym. Popatrzcie Państwo na wschód Ukrainy. Tam dzisiaj wciąż świszczą kule. Z tych wydarzeń musimy wyciągnąć wnioski dla przyszłości Europy.

Αλέξης Γεωργούλης (GUE/NGL). – Κυρία Πρόεδρε, η μνήμη είναι ένα από τα σημαντικότερα αγαθά της ανθρώπινης κοινωνίας και για αυτό είναι συμφέρον και πρέπει να δημιουργούμε χώρους, μουσεία και μνημεία που κρατούν τη μνήμη ζωντανή και διατηρούν την ενότητα και τις ανθρώπινες αξίες ψηλά. Πρέπει όμως να προσέχουμε τι περνάει στην αιωνιότητα και τι κόσμο δημιουργούμε για τις επόμενες γενιές. Ιστορικά η οικοδόμηση της συλλογικής μνήμης έχει αποδειχθεί ότι είναι ιδιαίτερα δύσκολη. Και αυτό γιατί η ψευδοεπιστημονική φόρτιση της Ιστορίας, με σκοπό τον συναισθηματικό εκβιασμό της μνήμης, θρέφει το μίσος αντί να καλλιεργεί τον πολιτισμό. Άλλωστε η επανάκτηση της μνήμης μπορεί να είναι λυτρωτική μόνο όταν μεταλαμπαδεύεται μέσω των έργων της τέχνης και του πολιτισμού. Είναι λυπηρό, λοιπόν, να βλέπουμε να απαλείφεται η λέξη «πολιτισμός» από τα χαρτοφυλάκια των Επιτρόπων. Τι μήνυμα στέλνει αυτό στην πολιτιστική μας βιομηχανία και στους πολίτες μας που στέκονται ενωμένοι στην πολυμορφία; Αν θέλουμε να κρατήσουμε τον πολιτισμό μας ζωντανό, πρέπει να τον δημιουργούμε.

Fabio Massimo Castaldo (NI). – Signora Presidente, onorevoli colleghi, noto con rammarico che alcuni vorrebbero utilizzare questa discussione per trasformarla in una inutile bagarre su quale regime autoritario sia stato più feroce o più totalitario.

Il giorno della memoria non può e non deve essere strumentalizzato, colleghi, per dividerci sulla condanna del passato: deve sempre unirici nel proteggere il futuro. Ricordare la memoria di milioni di vittime dei totalitarismi è un antidoto per le nuove generazioni che non hanno impressi nella mente o incisi sulla pelle gli orrori del secolo scorso.

Perdersi in uno sterile scontro su quale regime sia stato più atroce non solo non è utile ma è assolutamente dannoso e deleterio per i giovani, che vengono solo confusi e distratti dal vero pericolo: l'indifferenza o peggio la condiscendenza verso personaggi autoritari che, pur di ottenere consenso popolare a buon mercato, sfruttano la via dell'odio, della rabbia, dell'ignoranza, del pregiudizio e dell'intolleranza. Con un unico fine: ottenere il potere assoluto, costi quello che costi, anche eliminare chi non si vuole conformare alla loro idea di società. Quel che prepara così bene gli uomini moderni al dominio totalitario è l'estraniamento, diceva la filosofa Hannah Arendt, mai citata abbastanza.

Per mettere in salvo le nuove generazioni di europei dalla violenza, dalla guerra e dalle ingiustizie dobbiamo preservare a tutti i costi la memoria di chi è sopravvissuto. Ma non basta ricordare: servono azioni e scelte politiche concrete veramente rispettose dei nostri valori, se vogliamo impedire la disperazione e l'estraneazione, senza incoerenze e senza tentennamenti. Perché il giorno in cui esiteremo, cari colleghi, avremo già perso.

Traian Bănescu (PPE). – *(inceputul intervenției nu a fost făcut la microfon)* ... Pactul Ribbentrop-Molotov este unul din cele mai ticăloase acte politice din ultimele secole care au avut efecte pe teritoriul Europei.

Foarte mulți spun: „A trecut, a fost acum 80 de ani”. Vă pot spune că astăzi România trăiește încă după voința lui Hitler și Stalin. Poporul român a fost împărțit în două: o parte în România și altă parte în Republica Moldova. Vă mai pot spune că urmările Pactului Ribbentrop-Molotov au fost sferele de influență, care pentru țările din estul Europei au însemnat instaurarea comunismului. Aceste lucruri trebuie să ni le amintim și să înțelegem că Uniunea Europeană este răspunsul de astăzi care garantează democrație pentru toată Europa la ticăloșia Pactului Ribbentrop-Molotov.

Pierfrancesco Majorino (S&D). – Signora Presidente, onorevoli colleghi, il confronto sul valore della memoria è essenziale per rafforzare il progetto europeo e per scommettere sul futuro dell'Europa, soprattutto in un tempo come questo, segnato oggi da nuove spinte neonazionaliste e pure da tentativi – come si è discusso proprio ieri in quest'Aula – di mettere in discussione la democrazia europea attraverso azioni e ingerenze provenienti da forze esterne.

Discutere della memoria, infatti, in una sede straordinariamente rilevante per la democrazia mondiale come questa vuole dire riflettere sulla sua attualità. Per questo voglio che qui vengano pronunciate le parole di una donna straordinaria, Liliana Segre, superstita dell'Olocausto, sopravvissuta ad Auschwitz e oggi senatrice a vita italiana, impegnata con ostinazione a contrastare il razzismo e la deriva neonazionalista e a difendere la nostra casa comune: «Coltivare la memoria – dice Segre – ancora oggi è un vaccino prezioso contro l'indifferenza e ci aiuta, in un mondo così pieno di ingiustizie e di sofferenze, a ricordare che ciascuno di noi ha una coscienza e la può usare».

Christophe Grudler (Renew). – Madame la Présidente, chers collègues, le devoir de mémoire est, comme son nom l'indique, un devoir pour nous, députés européens. Cela donne du sens au travail que l'on fait, et cela permet de comprendre où nous voulons aller. Les racines, c'est ce qui permet à un arbre de pousser haut et fort. Pour cela, nous devons nous donner des moyens financiers.

Le précédent programme, «L'Europe pour les citoyens», a démontré son efficacité et sa valeur ajoutée, avec 200 millions d'euros consacrés aux actions de terrain liées à la mémoire. Si la Commission européenne veut vraiment promouvoir le devoir de mémoire, Monsieur le Commissaire, elle doit s'en donner les moyens financiers. Dans le prochain cadre budgétaire pluriannuel, la Commission doit soutenir les montants proposés par le Parlement pour le nouveau programme mémoriel «Droits et valeurs».

À ce jour, le compte n'y est pas. La Commission a divisé par deux le budget «mémoire» proposé par le Parlement. Il faut réagir!

Nicolaus Fest (ID). – Frau Präsidentin! Die europäische Erinnerungskultur ist ein wichtiges Thema, auch wenn man das an der Anwesenheit der Abgeordneten heute nicht bemerkt. Aber ohne wahre Schilderung dessen, was war, ist kein richtiges Erinnern möglich. Deshalb ist der Antrag wichtig, und er enthält auch viel Richtiges, wenn auch einige fragwürdige Behauptungen.

Vor allem aber: In den 22 Empfehlungen zur europäischen Erinnerungskultur kommt nicht einmal das Wort Jude vor. So, als seien die Juden nicht Teil der europäischen Geschichte und als seien sie nicht die Hauptopfer des nationalsozialistischen Massenmords. Selbst Auschwitz wird nur im Zusammenhang mit einem polnischen Widerstandskämpfer erwähnt.

Man begreift die Absicht, die dahintersteht, denn die Erwähnung des einzigartigen Leidens der Juden würde sofort die Frage nach der Verantwortung Europas für die Existenz Israels aufwerfen und auch nach der Politik der EU und ihrer skandalösen Unterstützung des tief korrupten Palästinenserhilfswerks der UN.

Sie wollen einen Tag der Erinnerung, um – wie Sie schreiben – der Verdrehung von Fakten entgegenzuwirken. Sie selbst verdrehen die Fakten, und zwar in Ihrer geradezu zwanghaften Weigerung, die Juden auch nur einmal zu erwähnen. Da ist der Antrag, so wie er ist, falsch, denn er verletzt die jüdischen Opfer noch einmal, indem man sie ausblendet, verschweigt und vergisst.

Zdzisław Krasnodębski (ECR). – Pani Przewodnicząca! „Fałszywa historia jest mistrzynią błędnej polityki” – to znane powiedzenie wybitnego polskiego historyka XIX w. można odnieść też do historii II wojny światowej. To jak była i jest ona przedstawiana, miało polityczne konsekwencje (przekonujemy się też w tej debacie) i odwrotnie – to motywy polityczne prowadziły do zniekształconego obrazu przeszłości. Dlaczego tak długo wypierano z pamięci układ Hitler-Stalin? Czy nie dlatego, żeby nie przyznać, że nie byłoby II wojny światowej, gdyby nie sojusz tych dwóch ohydnych, krwawych reżimów. By nie trzeba tłumaczyć się z późniejszego sojuszu zachodnich aliantów ze Stalinem mimo wiedzy o zbrodniach takich, jak na przykład zbrodnia w Katyniu, by podtrzymać trwający ciągle mit Armii Czerwonej jako wyzwolicielki Europy, by nie tłumaczyć się z Jałty itd. To, że dziś zaczynamy mówić o tym pakcie, budzi nadzieję, że może będziemy z historii wyciągać właściwe wnioski.

Claire Fox (NI). – Madam President, historical remembrance matters. It is too important therefore to be manipulated for political ends. This motion and the amendments seem less concerned with genuine commemoration, and more with a cynical abuse of the Second World War to fight factional battles and push contemporary agendas. We've got the EPP shamefully using remembrance to push an EU expansionist agenda today. We've got Renew promoting national educational curricula to propagandise EU federalism to young people in the here and now. Then there's the S&D piggy backing on a historic fight for freedom against authoritarianism, to propose illiberal, authoritarian and censorious regulations to silence opponents and delegitimise them with the label 'extremist'.

What a gross insult to the memories of real anti-Fascists, the French and Jewish resistance, the heroes of the Warsaw ghetto, the leftists who fought Franco in Spain, and the soldiers on the Russian front and on D-Day. I salute my fellow Europeans for that historic fight and note that cross-European acts of bravery are proof that cross-national solidarity existed before and is not dependent on institutionalised EU unity.

Meanwhile, the EU's revisionist history seems highly selective in what is remembered. Lest we forget, World War II was partly a fight against expansionist empire building trampling over national borders. Let's remember it was a World War in which millions of non-Europeans fought for freedom and democracy and went on to fight for their own self-determination and national sovereignty – two Enlightenment principles that this Parliament seems to want us to forget, and contemptuously write out of history.

While I'm forced to be here, not on my watch, I'll remind you every time, national sovereignty it is.

(Applause)

Андрей Ковачев (PPE). – Г-жо Председател, преди 80 години двама мракобесни диктатори подписаха документалното начало на Втората световна война и започнаха да си поделят злодейски Европа. Макар и да имат своите идеологически различия, националсоциалистическият и комунистическият режим са две лица на едно и също зло – тоталитаризма.

През 20-и век това зло донесе на нашия континент несъизмерими страдания, разрушения и милиони невинни жертви. Към края на Втората световна война донесе разгрома на единия от режимите, но другият беше оставен от световните демокрации тогава да пороби за десетилетия половин Европа. Ние сме в дълг към младите поколения да им предадем паметта за ужасите, през които е минал нашият континент.

Искам да поздравя българското правителство и Министерството на образованието за приемането на новите учебни програми в България, които най-накрая обективно отразяват събитията от 20-и век. Призовавам Комисията да предвиди адекватно финансиране за проекти, свързани със съхраняването на паметта на жертвите на всички тоталитарни режими и проучването на архивите. Нека пазим паметта и никога повече не допускаме националсоциализъм, комунизъм, фашизъм или която и да била друга тоталитарна идеология да отрови сърцата и душите на европейците.

И към колегката от Испания, която с право се притеснява, че има имена на улици на диктатори в нейната страна. Но знаете ли, че в България почти всяко второ име е на диктатор или на някой от техните поддръжници, които са довели до стотици, десетки хиляди жертви. Нека заедно да почетем паметта на всички, не само на едните – и на комунистическите жертви, и на националсоциалистическите жертви, и на фашистките жертви, всичките – и комунистическите жертви. Вие забравяте много често за това – както от екстремното ляво, така и от екстремното дясно.

Tanja Fajon (S&D). – Hvala, predsedujoča. Strinjam se, da je pomembno spominjati se preteklosti, da bi lahko izboljšali prihodnost. A še bolj pomembno je, da teh napak v sedanosti ne ponavljamo, saj s tem ponavljamo našo zgodovino.

Nobena od te in podobnih resolucij, ki jih je Evropski parlament sprejel že zelo veliko, ne more biti zares koristna, če sočasno dopuščamo dejanja, ki jih ta resolucija obsoja, in to so zatiranje demokracije, nespoštovanje pravne države, odrekanje pravic manjšinam in drugačnim, avtokracija, nacionalizem.

V slovenščini imamo pregovor: pometaj pred svojim pragom. Opozarjanje na napake drugih je smiselno in učinkovito le, če sami ne delamo teh istih napak.

V Evropski uniji že dolgo ne gre zgolj za lapsuse ali nevedne napake: ne, nespoštovanje dogovorjenih pravil očitno postaja sprejemljiva praksa, ki ostaja nekaznovana.

Od nove predsednice Evropske komisije in od nas zato v oktobru med zaslisanji pričakujem temeljito razpravo o vsebini, poimenovanjih in nosilcih resorjev – od tega bo namreč odvisno naše delo in prihodnost naših državljanov.

Petras Auštrevičius (Renew). – Madam President, I strongly believe that the European Union is a project of the future. It brings democratic European nations together. However, while looking into the future, we need to draw comprehensive conclusions from our common past. Our past was often about wars, destruction, totalitarianism and atrocities which destroyed lives irreversibly. Post-war reconciliation enabled us to achieve stability, confidence and cooperation.

But let's be sincere. The process is not over yet. Such examples as the recent statement by Russian senior official, Sergei Ivanov, denying Soviet occupation of the Baltic States is a great reminder of the surviving approach of denial and unacceptable attempts to rewrite history. Grounds for the future cooperation of European nations are laid today in the history classes of our schools and cross-border cooperation initiatives. That's why I am calling for greater investment in European remembrance based on mutual understanding, studying, teaching our joint history and nurturing our European way of life.

Patryk Jaki (ECR). – Pani Przewodnicząca! Mamy za sobą 80. rocznicę wybuchu drugiej wojny światowej, kiedy Polska została zaatakowana przez Niemcy i Związek Sowiecki, i o czym wiele osób nie chce pamiętać, zdradzona również przez państwa, z którymi miała podpisaną umowę. Polacy za to, że byli honorowi i nie kolaborowali z Hitlerem, jak wiele państw, ponieśli straszliwe straty. Zniszczone miasta, spalona stolica, rzeź Woli, o której jeszcze wielokrotnie tutaj w tej Izbie będę przypominał. Zniszczono i zrabowano ok. 50% dóbr kultury. Zniszczono nam 75% zasobów kolei, 65% zasobów energetyki, 70% przemysłu chemicznego, poligraficznego i innego. Straty majątkowe polskiego narodu wynosiły prawie 38% zasobów z 1939 roku. Dla porównania Francja czy Wielka Brytania to były straty na poziomie 1%, nie prawie 40%. Wymordowano nam 35% lekarzy, naukowców, prawników, nasza elita została wymordowana w Katyniu, w Miednoje. Straciliśmy prawie 6 milionów obywateli, w tym 3 miliony obywateli pochodzenia żydowskiego. W zamian za to Polska została zdradzona i oddana Związkowi Sowieckiemu na długi czas. Taki los, który spotkał Polskę za to, że zachowała się honorowo, będzie jeszcze długo wyrzutem sumienia dla wielu, którzy dzisiaj chcą zwracać Polsce uwagę, jest to szczególnie, jeżeli chodzi o postępowanie historyczne.

Kinga Gál (PPE). – Elnök Asszony, Biztos Úr! A mai vitával a kommunista és a nemzeti szocialista diktatúrák áldozataira emlékezünk. Mi, magyarok és a közép-kelet-európai nemzetek jól ismerjük mindkét szégyenletes diktatúra által elkövetett galádságokat. Mégis sajnálattal tapasztaljuk, hogy az egységes Európában a kommunizmus tetteiről aránytalanul kevés szó esik. Pedig a kommunisták nagyszüleim generációjának egész életét tönkretették, jelenét ellopták. Egyvalamit mégsem tudtak elvenni tőlük: a tartást, a mindent túlélő hitet a jövőben.

Ez teszi igazán erőssé Közép-Kelet-Európa nemzeteit. Meg kell ismerni a közép-kelet-európai történelem ezen korszakát és ébren kell tartani emlékét ahhoz, hogy meg lehessen érteni a posztkommunista nemzetek mai valóságát. Ahhoz, hogy Európa egysége valóban megvalósuljon, a kommunizmus gaztetteinek valóságát ugyanilyen szinten el kell ismerni és el kell ítélni. Ez az empátia még mindig hiányzik Európa azon szerencsésebb feléből, ahol nem kellett végigszenvedni a kommunizmus zsarnokságát is. Elkésérítő, hogy a kommunizmus elítélése még mindig elkenhető és megosztó lehet, itt, a Parlamentben is, és a hangsúlyt igyekeznek elterelni a probléma lényegéről. Pedig Európa nem lehet egységes addig, amíg nem lesz konszenzus ebben a kérdésben.

Laurence Farreng (Renew). – Madame la Présidente, cette résolution sur la mémoire européenne soulève la question du Patrimoine européen et des lieux de mémoire.

Nous voulons célébrer la mémoire européenne, et pour cela, nous avons besoin de lieux. Les musées, les monuments aux morts, les mémoriaux sont autant de sites qui font la géographie de notre mémoire. Notre Union a le devoir de les entretenir, de les protéger, de les valoriser, afin que les citoyens puissent se référer à des lieux et des sites concrets, afin aussi que ceux-ci continuent d'inspirer notre action et d'être transmis aux jeunes générations, par des moyens de communication adaptés, modernes et intégrés à nos programmes éducatifs nationaux.

Les initiatives existent, comme le Label du patrimoine européen ou les Journées européennes du patrimoine, qui ont lieu ce week-end. Mais il nous faut plus de volontarisme dans la protection de ces monuments qui, en rappelant les tragédies du passé, fondent nos droits et nos valeurs. À l'heure où l'on constate une inquiétante résurgence des mouvements extrémistes, les mémoires européennes doivent inspirer l'avenir de l'Europe, de manière visible et vivante.

Beata Kempa (ECR). – Pani Przewodnicząca! Ta rezolucja będzie moim zdaniem jednym zawołaniem: „Nigdy więcej paktów Ribbentrop-Mołotow, nigdy więcej Katynia, nigdy więcej obozów śmierci, zagłady milionów ludzi! Słowem: nigdy więcej wojny!” I to powinniśmy mieć w sercach, i dzisiaj też podczas tej debaty: szacunek, partnerstwo i zrozumienie.

Mój kraj dzisiaj jest w Unii Europejskiej, ale wtedy był krwawą ofiarą dwóch najpotworniejszych totalitaryzmów w dziejach świata. Takie kraje jak Polska wciąż odczuwają skutki wojny i półwiecznej sowieckiej dominacji. Nie wszystko jeszcze zreformowaliśmy, niestety podejmowane przez nas próby nie zawsze są akceptowane. Dlatego dzisiaj wartości, których kiedyś zabrakło, te wartości powodowały niepotrzebne i groźne konflikty.

Ale Europa to nie tylko Unia. I trzeba dzisiaj jasno i wyraźnie powiedzieć, że zbrojny konflikt na Ukrainie powinien być przedmiotem naszej troski. Polska gościła dzieci, sieroty. W XXI wieku w Europie są sieroty wojenne! Do takich sytuacji nigdy nie powinno dojść i też powinniśmy o tym rozmawiać.

Sandra Kalniete (PPE). – Priekšsēdētājas kundze, komisāra kungs, kolēģi! Ribentropa – Molotova pakts miljoniem eiropiešu, arī man ir dziļi personīgs stāsts. Jo pēc asiņainā Otrā pasaules kara tautām, kuras bija ieslodzītas aiz dzelzs priekšvara, nāve un represijas turpinājās vēl gadu desmitiem.

Trīs mani vecvecāki ir aprakti padomju gulagā. Mana māte Sibīrijā ir nomocījusi septiņpadsmit gadus, bet tēvs astoneš, un es tur esmu dzimusi. Tādu likteņu Baltijas valstīs ir daudz. Tomēr Baltijas valstu tautas ir pratušas savas ciešanas un zaudējumus pārvērst uzvarā.

Pirms trīsdesmit gadiem 23. augustā 2 miljoni baltiešu sadevās rokās un izveidoja 650 kilometrus garu Baltijas ceļu. Tā mēs atgādinājām pasaulei savas tiesības atgūt mums atņemtās valstis un brīvību. Tā Baltijas ceļš kļuva par mūsu tautu atgriešanās ceļu Eiropā. Tāpēc vēsture ir jāzina, lai nepadotos un ticētu nākotnei un taisnīgumam. Tāpēc es cieši ticu, ka reiz Ukraina atgūs nelikumīgi anektēto Krimu. Paldies!

Željana Zovko (PPE). – Poštovana predsjedavajuća, 80 godina je prošlo otkad su se dvije totalitarne ideologije složile u zajedničkom tajnom paktu Molotov-Ribbentrop dijeleći Europu u sferu interesa i time otvarajući put za početak jednog od najkrvavijih ratova koje je Europa doživjela. I ove godine smo 23. kolovoza obilježili ukupajući žrtve dosada neistraženih grobnica. Šezdeset godina nakon rata one ostaju kao opomena na ono što pomračenje svijesti i jednoumlje može donijeti Europi. Slom fašizma, nacizma i komunizma donio je slobodu i demokraciju koju danas neki u Europi uzimaju zdravo za gotovo.

Rad na istini i rasvjetljenju svega onoga što je ostalo iza ovih jednoumlja je jedini način na koji možemo doći do pomirbe, individualne i slijedom nje kolektivne. Užas i nasilje koje su ove mračne ideologije ostavile iza sebe započevši savez pod okriljem mraka i tajnih dogovora mora biti rasvijetljen za sve generacije kako bi se spoznale posljedice tiranije i jednoumlja.

Michaela Šojdrová (PPE). – Paní předsedající, dámy a pánové, je naší povinností připomínat si smutné události právě proto, aby nebyly zapomenuty, aby se v budoucnosti nemohly opakovat lidské tragédie celých národů. 1. září byla zahájena druhá světová válka napadením Polska. Následně Polsko bylo napadeno Sovětským svazem. A trvalo dlouhých šest let, než se podařilo druhou světovou válku ukončit. Ale pak začala další diktatura a další země trpěly 45 let pod diktaturou komunistickou. Velké dědictví nenávisť, utrpení, smrti, zmařených životů si neseme dodnes. A tak, jak tady řekli předřečníci, je potřeba to připomínat tam, kde nezažili tuto formu diktatury.... (předsedající řečníci přerušila)

President. – Just a second, we have no interpretation for the moment, we will try to arrange this. Maybe you can carry on a little bit and we will see if it works?

Michaela Šojdrová (PPE). – Paní předsedající, já tedy zopakuji, že obě diktatury byly stejně strašné. Pro udržení naší jednoty a rozmanitosti musíme připomínat, jaké události k tomu vedly, a musíme také připomínat to, že je zde Ukrajina, která je okupována, trpí dezinformacemi ze strany Moskvy a okupací, a proto je naší morální povinností podpořit a přiblížit Evropské unii Ukrajinu, právě vzhledem k té strašné historii, kterou si dnes připomínáme.

Isabel Wiseler-Lima (PPE). – Madame la Présidente, chers collègues, une Europe divisée en deux, où, d'un côté du mur, les peuples étaient libres et, de l'autre, les gens étaient empêchés de s'exprimer et de se déplacer librement, telle était ma jeunesse. Ce n'était pas de l'histoire, mais une réalité quotidienne qui, de part et d'autre du rideau de fer, marquait les esprits.

Je me rappelle le sentiment d'injustice ressenti face au caractère arbitraire de cette ligne de partage, issue de la Deuxième Guerre mondiale, et la chance que j'avais d'être du côté de la liberté. On m'a décrit la Seconde Guerre mondiale et ses atrocités. Je me rappelle l'horreur ressentie par l'adolescente que j'étais quand j'ai découvert, lors d'une visite d'un camp de concentration, les atrocités commises durant cette guerre.

Or, aujourd'hui, il semblerait que, les années passant, la réalité des exterminations, l'inhumaine utilisation d'êtres humains, comme s'ils étaient un quelconque matériau, se trouve recouverte d'une sorte de voile atténuant, allant même jusqu'à permettre la négation de l'existence de ces réalités. Ceci est inacceptable! La mémoire de notre histoire n'est pas seulement un devoir de respect envers ceux qui ont péri et souffert, mais également une façon de lutter contre les extrémismes de tous bords qui, aujourd'hui, prennent une ampleur inquiétante.

Notre histoire nous impose à nous, Européens, un devoir de mémoire. Nous devons instruire nos jeunes sur ce qui s'est passé, et nous devons rester vigilants si nous voulons nous protéger d'un avenir qui pourrait répéter les crimes du passé.

Puhetta johti HEIDI HAUTALA

varapuhemies

Andrzej Halicki (PPE). – Pani Przewodnicząca! Rezolucja, którą, mam nadzieję, jutro przyjmimy, a której jestem współautorem, oczywiście tkwi korzeniami w historii, ale musimy wyciągnąć wnioski na przyszłość z tych dramatycznych w skutkach wydarzeń kosztujących życie milionów ofiar. Pakt Ribbentrop-Mołotow, który jest symbolem sojuszu dwóch totalitaryzmów, nie może być zapomniany i musi stanowić naukę na przyszłość, bowiem wszyscy, którzy ignorują radykalizmy, nacjonalizmy rzeczywiście pozwalają na to, żeby to co wydarzyło się w Europie dwudziestego wieku, te dramaty mogły powtórzyć się w przyszłości. Nie wolno na to pozwolić, nie ma na to zgody.

Dlatego apeluję do wszystkich, by reagować na rodzące się w niektórych społeczeństwach (widzimy to także w Polsce, która wczoraj obchodziła 80. rocznicę napaści rosyjskiego komunizmu, który próbował pozbawić Polaków wolności i tożsamości) skrajne ruchy, które używając symboliki totalitarnych systemów, fałszując historię, używając propagandy, czasem także czynią to populistyczni politycy, no po prostu, krótko mówiąc, burzą ten historyczny obowiązek Europejczyków budowania Europy bezpiecznej, wolnej od totalitaryzmów, wolnej od tych zagrożeń, które stanowić może nowy pakt egoizmu i nacjonalizmu. Tej wolności w Europie musimy bronić, ostro reagując na radykalizm.

Puhemies. – Sitten siirrymme puheenvuorolistan ulkopuolisiin pyyntöihin ja niitä on nyt niin paljon, että voin myöntää niistä ehkä alle puolet, viisi kappaletta. Itse asiassa niitä on 15 ja istunto on jäljessä.

Pyynnöstä myönnettävät puheenvuorot

Isabel Benjumea Benjumea (PPE). – Señora presidenta, señor comisario, claro que es importante que la sociedad europea no olvide su pasado. Es necesario recordar, conocer y aprender de nuestra historia, con sus luces y sus sombras. Recordar y honrar a las víctimas. Y la importancia de recordar aquello por lo que se luchó, que es por la libertad de la que todos disfrutamos.

Pero, señorías, quisiera alertarles de algo que observo con mucha preocupación. Y es alertarles de que no nos corresponde a nosotros la tarea de escribir la historia. Los políticos no debemos imponer un único relato de la historia. No se puede utilizar la historia como arma política.

Sé bien de lo que les hablo, porque esto es lo que está tratando de hacer la izquierda española desde hace unos cuantos años, con la Ley de Memoria Histórica, en España. No se puede imponer por una ley un único relato de la historia. La misión de escribir la historia es labor de los historiadores, señorías, de los historiadores.

Nuestra labor, la suya y la mía, es garantizar que los historiadores puedan trabajar en un marco de libertad. Y, por otro lado, la educación. La educación en humanidades de las nuevas generaciones. Son las humanidades las que forman el juicio y la capacidad crítica que dotan a las personas de las herramientas para razonar y buscar la verdad.

Jackie Jones (S&D). – Madam President, the Commissioner asked the question: how do you remember and honour the past, a past filled with war and conflict and borders? Well, in my opinion as a human-rights lawyer for over 25 years, I would suggest that we respect human rights and human dignity.

How do we do that? We respect the rule of law, we respect human life, we respect freedom of association and speech, and we respect living a life in dignity, for older people, for children, for individuals in all their diversity, not excluding anyone. It means enabling human dignity through economic prosperity and a freedom to live the way we wish to.

How do we do this? It is enshrined in our human rights instruments that came on line after the Second World War: the European Convention on Human Rights, the UN Charter, all of the international conventions that we have at the moment, and our European Charter of Human Rights. And, of course, finally, for Britain to stay in the EU.

Joachim Stanisław Brudziński (ECR). – Pani Przewodnicząca! Panie Komisarzu! Wczoraj w Polsce obchodziliśmy 80. rocznicę sowieckiej agresji, a dziesięć lat temu, w 70. rocznicę na Westerplatte, w 70. rocznicę wybuchu II wojny światowej, premier Federacji Rosyjskiej relatywizował powody wybuchu II wojny światowej, odwołując się do niesprawiedliwości traktatu wersalskiego.

Minister spraw zagranicznych Mołotow po agresji sowieckiej Rosji na Polskę użył takiego określenia pod adresem Polski po rosyjsku *ypodлyboe demyue*, co w tłumaczeniu znaczy pokraczny bękart.

Wczoraj, przedwczoraj mogliśmy usłyszeć z ust rosyjskich polityków kolejną próbę relatywizowania historii. Mówimy o przeszłości Europy w kontekście jej przyszłości, ale ta przyszłość musi być oparta na prawdzie, a prawda wygląda następująco: nie byłoby współczesnej Europy, gdyby nie filozofia grecka, prawo rzymskie i wartości wywiedzione ze Starego i Nowego Testamentu, czyli chrześcijaństwo. Jan Paweł II zostawił nam patronkę Europy, zakonnicę pochodzenia żydowskiego zamordowaną w Auschwitz-Birkenau. Wtedy świat nie brał pod uwagę głosu rotmistrza Pileckiego, nie brał pod uwagę głosu Jana Karskiego, Jana Nowaka-Jeziorańskiego.

Nie pozwólmy, abyśmy w ramach kolejnego totalitaryzmu, już tym razem nie sowieckiego, nie nazistowskiego, dopuścili do totalitaryzmu politycznej poprawności opartej...

(Przewodnicząca odebrała mówcy głos.)

Sandra Pereira (GUE/NGL). – A deplorável tentativa de equiparar fascismo e comunismo absolve e silencia os crimes do nazi-fascismo e as coniventes responsabilidades das grandes potências capitalistas que, com o Tratado de Munique, entre outros, abriram caminho ao início da Segunda Guerra Mundial e à invasão da União Soviética.

Uma cumplicidade que hoje persiste. Pretendem apagar o contributo decisivo dos comunistas para a derrota do nazi-fascismo. O seu contributo para a libertação dos povos, como no meu país, Portugal, com a Revolução dos Cravos que pôs fim ao regime fascista.

Pretendem apagar o seu papel no avanço das condições de vida dos trabalhadores, mas pretendem mais, pretendem abrir caminho para legitimar e generalizar a perseguição e proibição de partidos comunistas, como ocorre já em vários Estados-Membros ou na Ucrânia, com a cumplicidade da União Europeia.

Ao mesmo tempo toleram a reabilitação e o elogio histórico do fascismo.

Esta revisão histórica visa, obviamente, desviar atenções de permanente confronto da União Europeia com as aspirações dos povos e o desenvolvimento de tendências e práticas repressivas de limitação a direitos e liberdades.

Κωνσταντίνος Παπαδάκης (NI). – Κυρία Πρόεδρε, με πρωτόγονο αντικομμουνισμό και ανιστόρητο βιασμό της αλήθειας η Ευρωπαϊκή Ένωση και το Ευρωκοινοβούλιο επιχειρούν να αθώωσουν τον φασισμό. Συμπλέετε με όσους στις χώρες του Βίτγκεραντ και της Βαλτικής αποδίδουν τιμές στους συνεργάτες των ναζί και έχουν το θράσος να αποκαλούν «εγκληματίες» και «συνεργάτες του Χίτλερ» τους κομμουνιστές, τη Σοβιετική Ένωση, που πρωτοστάτησαν στην πάλη των λαών για να ξεριζώσουν το τέρας του φασισμού στην Ευρώπη.

Η Ιστορία έγραψε ότι συνεργάτες των ναζί ήταν τα μονοπώλια που η Ευρωπαϊκή Ένωση στηρίζει και άνοιξαν τον δρόμο στον Χίτλερ. Ήταν αστικές κυβερνήσεις όπως του Vichy στη Γαλλία, των «Κουίσλινγκς» στην Ελλάδα. Η προκλητική εξίσωση του κομμουνισμού με το έκτρωμα-γέννημα του καπιταλισμού, τον φασισμό, δεν θα περάσει! Ματαιοπονείτε αν νομίζετε ότι με ιστορικές αθλιότητες και παχυλά κονδύλια θα νομιμοποιήσετε απαγορεύσεις, διώξεις σε βάρος των κομμουνιστών και θα αποτρέψετε ότι ο σοσιαλισμός είναι το μέλλον του κόσμου. Αποσύρετέ το τώρα! Κάθε ευρωβουλευτής οφείλει να καταψηφίσει αυτή την προσβολή στην Ιστορία χαραγμένη με το αίμα των λαών.

(Pyynnöstä myönnettävät puheenvuorot päättyvät)

Dimitris Avramopoulos, Member of the Commission. – Madam President, dear colleagues, let me start by expressing my thanks for this lively and very interesting debate, which proved to be very timely. As you know, every year the Commission marks 23 August as the day when we honour the memory of the millions of victims of all totalitarian regimes. Totalitarianism is not about ideology or colour – it is about authoritarian mentality, practice and methodology. Totalitarianism is an enemy of democracy, freedom and human dignity.

Our duty is to keep those memories alive to inspire and guide new generations in defending fundamental rights, the rule of law and democracy. We firmly stand together against whatever threatens the values of our European democracy. I see here in this House a collective and democratic commitment to defend, uphold and safeguard the European project.

This European project was started in the aftermath of the Second World War, when wise and determined leaders – although it was very fresh in their memories what they had experienced just some years ago – took the historical decision to lay the foundations and to create a wider space of liberty, peace, democracy and stability. It is exactly what we Europeans are enjoying today.

However, we should never take this for granted. It is our duty to take this project forward. Today we know that certain challenges are putting the European Union into question. Now is the moment to show leadership towards our citizens. We must never forget both the privilege and the responsibility that we have inherited from our founding fathers and the previous generations. This is why it is paramount not only to remember, but also to ensure that history is not repeated.

If we ignore, or fail to understand or read history, we cannot draw lessons from the past. This is the biggest threat to our future that we are facing. This was the consequence in the past, when history was indeed ignored.

Today's debate gives me hope, because I know how committed this institution is, together with the European Commission. Together we must uphold our duties towards our citizens. While some may try to make us believe that our citizens are losing faith or the connection with the European Union, we know that the opposite is true. In fact, we have data telling us that, on average, more than 70% of the citizens of Europe feel that they are EU citizens, while at the same time being attached to their homelands, to their nations. This figure has been steadily increasing, even since 2012, when it was at the level of 61%. We need to continue working together towards making all citizens of this Union feel like European citizens. By working together, I mean involving the whole society from all corners and strata.

Cooperation is in our European spirit, and synthesis is at the core of our democracy, because being European is not just a nice pleasant motto, it is the essence of tolerance, pluralism and solidarity. It is the recognition of our common values and humanity, as well as our common will and determination to live in a fair, free and peaceful world.

It is the embracement of diversity, multilingualism and respect for different cultures, identities and traditions. It is to care for each other, to love our own nation, to respect our neighbours, to share the feelings of belonging in our European family.

I hope that these efforts will be sustained with your support for a Union that remembers its past, draws lessons from it and does not revert to it – a Union that shatters silence, empowers unity and shines as a global beacon and as a unique paradigm of solidarity among citizens, communities and nations.

Tytti Tuppurainen, *President-in-Office of the Council*. – Madam President, honourable Members, ladies and gentlemen, we need to learn a lot from our history in these times where our common values are fragile and need to be upheld.

Together, we must now tackle the rise of extreme ideas and, for instance, the rise of anti-Semitism across Europe. This is a common challenge to all of us. Raising awareness and ensuring appropriate information are key elements for fighting against extremism and disinformation. Education can be a powerful tool in this respect, and we need to continuously make efforts to safeguard our free societies. Our youth, the generations to come, need to remember and learn from the mistakes made in our common history.

The future of Europe should be based on common values, mutual understanding of our diverse traditions, and shared awareness of the history of Europe, including totalitarianism.

Let's keep our garden of rule of law maintained. Thank you very much, once again, for your engagement in this highly important topic. Thank you, ladies and gentlemen.

Puhemies. – Olen vastaanottanut neljä työjärjestyksen 132 artiklan 2 kohdan mukaisesti käsiteltäväksi jätettyä päätöslauselmaesitystä.

Keskustelu on päättynyt.

Äänestys toimitetaan torstaina 19. syyskuuta 2019.

Kirjalliset lausumat (171 artikla)

Andrea Bocskor (PPE), *írásban*. – A XX. század legsúlyosabb emberiség elleni bűntetteit a náci és a kommunista totalitárius rendszerek követték el. Többmillió ember vesztette életét, vagy szenvedett a deportálások, bebörtönzések során. A múlt ezen bűneiről igenis beszélni kell, tanítani történelemórán és emlékeztetni, hogy soha többé ne fordulhasson ismét elő. A náci bűnök többsége napvilágra került, megtörtént a felelősségre vonás, az áldozatokat kárpótolták, a kommunizmus áldozatairól viszont kevés szó esik. Ilyen például a kárpátaljai magyar közösség is, melynek 18-50 év közötti férfitársait 1944-ben a megszálló szovjet hatalom, a kollektív bűnösség elvére hivatkozva úgynevezett „málenkij robotra”, kényszermunka-táborokba deportálta, ahonnan csak nagyon kevesen tértek vissza élve. A Szovjetunió idejében ez tabu téma volt! Pedig jelen tudásunk szerint 27-30 ezer ember esett áldozatul, akiket azóta se rehabilitáltak, nem kárpótoltak és még bocsánatot sem kértek tőlük. Ezért üdvözlöm a határozat szövegét és remélem, az európai integráció és megbékélés része lesz ezen áldozatok rehabilitációja is!

18. Skład komisji i delegacji: Patrz protokół

19. Stan wdrażania przepisów dotyczących przeciwdziałania praniu pieniędzy (debata)

Puhemies. – Esityslistalla on seuraavana neuvoston ja komission julkilausuma rahanpesun vastaisen lainsäädännön täytäntönnäpön tilanteesta (2019/2820(RSP)).

Nyt pyydän, että kuuntelette tarkkaan. Ennen keskustelun avaamista nimittäin voin ilmoittaa, että tällä istuntojaksolla testataan uutta järjestelmää, jonka avulla jäsenet voivat rekisteröidä sähköisesti pyynnöstä myönnettäviä puheenvuoroja ja sinisen kortin kysymyksiä koskevat pyynnöt.

Teille on toimitettu sähköpostilla tietoa siitä, miten tämä järjestelmä toimii ja teille on jaettu pöydillenne käyttöohjeet. Jäsenet voivat siten esittää puheenvuoropyynnön käyttämällä äänestyskoneensa painikkeita annetun ohjeen mukaisesti.

Äänestyskoneella esitettävien pyyntöjen lisäksi puheenvuoroa voi pyytää myös perinteisellä tavalla. Pyyntöstä myönnettävää puheenvuoroa voi pyytää nostamalla valkoisen paperin tai ilmoittautumalla henkilökohtaisesti keskustelun alussa täysistuntoyksikön kollegoille täällä ja sinisen kortin kysymystä voi pyytää edelleen nostamalla sinisen kortin.

Tätä sähköistä järjestelmää testataan useiden keskustelujen ajan ja haluankin muistuttaa teille, että pitääkää äänestyskorttinne mukana, koska se on edellytys sille, että voimme testata tätä järjestelmää. Toivon, että myös käytätte sitä.

Tytti Tuppurainen, *President-in-Office of the Council*. – Madam President, dear Commissioner, honourable Members, thank you for inviting the Presidency to contribute to this debate. The fight against money laundering and terrorist financing is a key topic during the Finnish Presidency and is an area to which the Council is strongly committed.

Over the last years, we have – the Parliament, the Council and the Commission – worked closely with the aim of establishing an effective regime to counter money laundering and the financing of terrorism. We particularly strengthened the EU rules in 2019 with the adoption of the latest amendments to the Anti-Money Laundering Directive. The Member States are due to transpose it into national law by January 2020. Once in effect, the fifth Anti-Money Laundering Directive will improve the powers of financial intelligence units, increase the transparency around beneficial ownership information, and regulate virtual currencies and prepaid cards to better prevent terrorism financing.

As you know, on the previous fourth Anti-Money Laundering Directive, the Member States transposition is facing some delays. On this, the Commission will be better placed to update you, but I understand that some of the infringement procedures have already been closed. Through the review of the European System of Financial Supervision, on which we agreed just before the parliamentary recess, we progressed further and reinforced the role of the European Banking Authority as regards risks posed to the financial sector by money laundering. Lawyer linguists are now finalising the legal texts in order for it to enter into force in January. They have also included strengthened rules on anti-money laundering in the banking package, namely with the revision of the Capital Requirements Directive.

With the fifth Anti-Money Laundering Directive, we streamlined the cooperation between prudential supervisors and anti-money laundering authorities. The prudential supervisors should now have better abilities to intervene in cases where activities endanger financial stability. These rules already entered into force, and Member States are currently transposing them into national law. This is due to be completed by December 2020.

On anti-money laundering, we also have the EU list of high-risk third countries, with strategic deficiencies. As you know, in March the Council objected to the Commission's related delegated act. This decision does not mean that the listing is not an important element of the ongoing work – on the contrary – but in order to achieve the full impact of this instrument and to ensure its quality, we need to introduce the list in an orderly process. We believe that in order to establish a strong and effective instrument, the Commission proposal needs to be established in a transparent manner and needs to incentivise affected countries to take action. I know the Commission has been working intensively on the new methodology, which it will present to ministers in October.

The criminal law framework in the area of money laundering has also recently been strengthened through the adoption of a directive on combating money laundering by criminal law. This directive is currently being implemented in Member States, and the transposition deadline is December 2020.

Honourable Members, the Council is advancing on other fronts as well. It agreed, in December 2018, on a dedicated anti-money laundering action plan to further improve the current system, and the Council is regularly monitoring the delivery of the various actions. We have also asked the Commission to deliver a post-mortem review of recent alleged money laundering cases involving EU banks, with a view to better informing possible additional actions in the medium to long term. The Commission published its report in July and will present it to the Council in October.

On the basis of this important input and other recent reports we are inviting the Economic and Financial Affairs Council (ECOFIN) to adopt the Council conclusions by December on an anti-money laundering strategic agenda that will guide the Commission going forward.

Ladies and gentlemen, much is being done to tackle this important problem and, overall, our joint work in the area of anti-money laundering stands as a very good example of good cooperation. It is our priority as the Presidency to fight tax fraud, tax avoidance and aggressive tax planning. I look forward to hearing your views on the matter. Thank you very much for your attention.

Věra Jourová, *Member of the Commission*. – Madam President, money laundering hit the headlines in recent years and is at the centre of several key challenges Europe is facing today.

The Commission is fully committed to safeguarding the EU financial system and its citizens from the harmful effects of the laundering of proceeds from criminal activities. Protecting citizens from terrorism also requires a robust system to counter the financing of terrorism. It is vital that our anti-money laundering policy retains the trust of citizens and also the trust of our international partners.

In the past five years, together with the European Parliament, we worked hard to strengthen EU rules in this area. The revision of the anti-money laundering rules, the directive on criminal sanctions for money laundering, the directive on cooperation between financial intelligence units and law-enforcement authorities, as well as the strengthening of the role of the European Banking Authority, are all very important steps.

But what matters now is the effective implementation of these rules, and Parliament is right to highlight this subject at the beginning of this term. I would insist on the importance of Member States' implementing both the Fourth and Fifth Anti-Money Laundering Directives. The latter will become applicable as of January 2020. And the Commission has watched Member States closely on effective implementation of the rules. Infringement proceedings have been opened against Member States for incomplete transposition of the Fourth Directive and some of them are still ongoing.

We are closely checking both the conformity of the legislation and the way these rules are implemented in practice. While many shortcomings could be remedied through the implementation of the Anti-Money Laundering Directive, it seems that some structural issues will remain. We addressed some of them in the report that the Commission adopted on 24 July on the state of implementation of the EU's anti-money laundering framework.

I believe these reports are a good basis for assessing what needs to be done in the future. The way in which anti-money laundering rules are applied in practice by all economic operators is of critical importance to the good functioning of the whole system. For instance, national banking supervisors must act decisively. Weak supervision was an issue in some of the large-scale money-laundering scandals we saw. Here a harmonised, directly applicable Union regulatory anti-money laundering framework could help. In addition, we could consider conferring specific anti-money laundering supervisory tasks on a Union body.

We also found cases where supervisors were critically understaffed, failing to carry out on-site inspections as frequently as they should have done, or not taking appropriate measures when they found violations. Group supervision was also largely deficient. Prudential supervisors did not sufficiently take into account money-laundering concerns in their supervision of banks or in their suitability assessment of managers.

We are aware that such programme problems are not limited to the banking sector only. They exist also in other parts of the financial sector, as well as the non-financial sector. This is another area that should not be overlooked.

With regard to the report on financial intelligence units, the assessment confirmed that cooperation between financial intelligence units needs to be improved further, including through a stronger mechanism at EU level, to coordinate and support national financial intelligence units.

It will be for the next Commission to decide on the next steps, but the policy guidelines of the President-designate are clear on this matter. We have to strengthen supervision and close loopholes.

Finally, allow me to update you on the list of high-risk third countries.

The Commission remains committed to delivering an updated list, in line with the requirement of the directive. Following the rejection of the delegated regulation by the Council, and the Parliament resolution in March, we have made strong efforts to take into account the views expressed by both Parliament and the Council. Our aim is to ensure consensus between all institutions on the process in order to avoid either Parliament or the Council rejecting the list.

I would like to reiterate that the Commission will continue to carry out an autonomous assessment. We will, in principle, list countries which are listed by the Financial Action Task Force (FATF). At the same time, the listing criteria of the directive also go beyond the FATF criteria, in particular on transparency of beneficial ownership. This means that we will also list third countries with strategic deficiencies, even if they are not on the FATF list.

Within this framework, we are working to refine the methodology of June 2018. Firstly, we aim at clarifying the interaction between the EU list and the one at international level by the FATF. Secondly, we proposed to detail further the engagement with third countries prior to a listing. Here we proposed to engage with third countries on the basis of our preliminary assessments and to seek commitments from third countries to implement mitigating measures within one year. This will help ensure that deficiencies are effectively addressed. We will also consider listing immediately those countries which present an overriding level of risks.

We hope that this new approach will allow both co-legislators to reach a common understanding with a view to adopting the EU list on high-risk third countries.

The Commission will maintain a regular political dialogue with Parliament and the Council in implementing the methodology. I intend to address the matter with finance ministers at the October ECOFIN Council. I would like to assure you that we will continue sharing the same goal of protecting the EU financial system from risks of money laundering posed by third countries.

I also want to thank the European Parliament for its continued support for this challenging but necessary process in the interest of our citizens.

Markus Ferber, *im Namen der PPE-Fraktion*. – Frau Präsidentin, Frau Ratspräsidentin, Frau Kommissarin, liebe Kolleginnen, liebe Kollegen! Wenn man Ihnen so zuhört, dann hat man wirklich den Eindruck, es ist alles wunderbar. Alles im Griff; der Rat verpflichtet sich und kämpft Tag für Tag, Stunde um Stunde gegen Geldwäsche, die Kommission prüft alle Länder – alles wunderbar.

Die Wahrheit ist: Nichts ist wunderbar. Wenn wir uns den Prüfbericht der Kommission genau anschauen, dann sind zwei Dinge offensichtlich geworden. Erstens: In 28 Mitgliedstaaten wird die Geldwäscherichtlinie 28 mal unterschiedlich umgesetzt. Wir haben keine einheitliche Umsetzung in Europa. Und zweitens: Schon bei den nationalen Behörden klappt die Zusammenarbeit zwischen den Justizbehörden und der Finanzaufsicht nicht, bei grenzüberschreitenden Fällen funktioniert überhaupt nichts mehr.

Wenn ich mir diese zwei Probleme anschau, dann gibt es eigentlich auch zwei Lösungen. Die Lösung Nummer eins heißt, keine Richtlinie mehr, sondern eine Verordnung. Wenn wir einheitliches Recht in Europa wollen, dann müssen wir den Weg der Verordnung gehen. Und zweitens: Wenn die Zusammenarbeit nicht funktioniert und – seien Sie mir nicht böse – auch wenn wir jetzt gerade erst verhandelt haben, dass die Europäische Bankenaufsicht als Aufsicht der Aufsicht zu prüfen hat, ob alles richtig gemacht wird: Damit bekämpfen Sie nicht Geldwäsche, sondern damit schaffen Sie nur Formulare zwischen Aufsichtsbehörden.

Wir brauchen eine Struktur, die durchgreifen kann. Wir haben OLAF bei der Kommission, wir haben den Europäischen Staatsanwalt bei Fällen gegen die finanziellen Interessen der Europäischen Union, und wir sollten uns wirklich Gedanken machen, Frau Justizkommissarin, ob man nicht einen Vorschlag macht, dass wir auch den Europäischen Staatsanwalt oder eine ähnliche Struktur mit Durchgriffsrechten ausstatten, damit hier auch strafrechtlich schnell reagiert werden kann und es nicht in den Händen der Mitgliedstaaten bleibt.

Wir müssen hier dringend handeln – die Zahlen sind genannt worden. Wir dürfen uns nicht selber die Welt schönreden, sondern wir müssen Lösungen erarbeiten. Dieses Parlament ist bereit dazu, deswegen diese klare Botschaft heute in der Debatte, morgen in der Abstimmung – bitte liefern Sie entsprechend.

Evelyn Regner, *im Namen der S&D-Fraktion*. – Frau Präsidentin! Ich knüpfe gleich bei meinem Vorredner an. Wir haben in der Europäischen Union strenge Bestimmungen gegen Geldwäsche. Doch was bringen die schärfsten Gesetze, wenn diese nicht umgesetzt werden, wenn sie nicht ordentlich umgesetzt werden, wenn sie nicht einer strengen Aufsicht unterliegen? Die Aufsicht der Geldwäscherichtlinie ist stark national ausgerichtet. Damit muss Schluss sein! Da sind wir uns einig. Wir müssen auch einsehen, dass das Problem langfristig gesehen mit einer europäischen Antigeldwäsche-Behörde gelöst werden kann. Bis dahin muss eine europäische Anti-Geldwäscheinheit diese Aufgabe übernehmen. Jeder neue Geldwäscheskandal ist größer als der vorherige. Wir dürfen nicht warten, bis der nächste Skandal platzt.

Und der zweite Punkt, das ist das Problem der *golden visa* – eine lukrative Einnahmequelle für manche Staaten. Reiche können sich wie eine Luxusware, wie einen Wagen, wie eine Villa, wie eine Yacht, wie eine teure Handtasche die Staatsbürgerschaft oder eine Aufenthaltsgenehmigung kaufen, ohne dass die Herkunft der Gelder hinterfragt wird. Das ist skandalös! Denn wir wissen, Geldwäsche geht Hand in Hand mit Korruption, mit Steuerhinterziehung, mit kriminellen Aktivitäten. Das Problem muss ganzheitlich angepackt werden. Und als solches muss die Kommission auch bei den *golden visa* ansetzen und praktikable Vorschläge machen, wie wir das Problem in Zukunft lösen.

Luis Garicano, *on behalf of the Renew Group*. – Madam President, I want to say to the Commissioner and the Council representative: let's be honest, the reason we are here is because the anti-money laundering system is not fit for purpose. It just doesn't work.

We hear about a lack of resources. We had a hearing with the Commission and with the European Banking Authority and we hear about a lack of resources, legislation that cannot be implemented, legislation that is different in every country, lack of personnel, three to eight people. It is really, really not fit for purpose and we all agree, and citizens have to agree. They are worried because combating money laundering is basic to fighting against every possible crime, from drug trafficking to people trafficking. Fighting against money laundering is fighting those terrible crimes.

Why does the system not work? The system doesn't work because states don't have the incentive to have a system that works: states have an incentive to get capital when they need capital. So, at the end of the day, if the capital includes proceeds from places which are not very clear, we turn a blind eye. And the problem is that the system is as strong as the weakest link. If only one state has a bad system, we're going to have a problem in all the other states.

We heard about the Danske Bank scandal – EUR 200 billion of money laundering! What is really scandalous about this problem is not just that no action was taken, and not just that the Estonian and Danish regulators let it happen, because for each it was the problem of the other: it is that, when it came to the EBA, the states said that, because there was No European legislation involved, there was nothing to be done.

We believe that this Parliament is united. I'm proud to have worked with my colleagues to have a resolution together. Parliament believes that the Commission needs to do its work, the Council needs to do its work and Parliament needs to do its work so that these agencies are well resourced, so that we have the resources to fight against money laundering, so that we have legislation that can be applicable everywhere in the European Union, and so that we have a system that is European and that works for all.

Sven Giegold, *im Namen der Verts/ALE-Fraktion*. – Frau Präsidentin, liebe Kolleginnen und Kollegen! Es gibt in Europa ein Sicherheitsrisiko, das von den Regierungen notorisch vernachlässigt wird, und das ist das Thema Geldwäsche. Wir haben milliardenschwere Geldwäsche jedes Jahr. Kriminelle verdienen mit den übelsten Formen der Wirtschaftlichkeit sozusagen Milliarden und Abermilliarden. Dieses Geld wird gewaschen und dann wieder in kriminelle Ökonomie investiert – in Terrorismus, aber zunehmend werden damit auch Häuser gekauft, und in den Immobilienzentren werden die Preise entsprechend hochgetrieben.

Und während wir darüber reden, sehen wir, dass wir eigentlich die rechtlichen Möglichkeiten haben. Europa bietet die rechtlichen Möglichkeiten für die Mitgliedstaaten, dagegen vorzugehen. Wir haben aber trotzdem ein weitverbreitetes Versagen der Mitgliedstaaten bei der Verfolgung der Geldwäsche. Die zehn größten Geldwäscheskandale, die die Europäische Kommission aufgearbeitet hat, zeigen dieses Versagen in aller Klarheit. Dabei muss man nicht in einige notorische Steueroasen wie Zypern, Malta und so weiter gehen, sondern fangen wir mal in Deutschland an, beim größten Mitgliedstaat.

Zirka 100 Milliarden Euro werden pro Jahr an Geldwäsche in Deutschland gemacht. Dabei liegen bei der *Financial Intelligence Unit* 20 000 Geldwäscheverdachtsanzeigen weitgehend unbearbeitet. Die Behörde funktioniert nicht, obwohl es schon seit der dritten Geldwäscherichtlinie, die schon seit über zehn Jahren umsetzungspflichtig ist, eine europäische Vorgabe ist, sie richtig auszustatten.

Seit Monaten streite ich mit den Dienststellen der Europäischen Kommission, ob hier jetzt endlich ein Vertragsverletzungsverfahren eingeleitet wird. Und genau solche Vertragsverletzungsverfahren wären nicht nur angemessen für Deutschland, sondern für eine ganze Reihe von Mitgliedstaaten, die einfach nicht nur den Gesetzentwurf entsprechend umsetzen müssen, sondern diesen Gesetzentwurf auch endlich in der Realität umsetzen müssen.

Deshalb fordere ich Sie in der Europäischen Kommission auf: Schlagen Sie hier ein neues Kapitel auf! Gucken Sie nicht vor allem, ob die Buchstaben des Gesetzes übereinstimmen, sondern ob das europäische Geldwäscherecht tatsächlich vollzogen wird! Und bei allen, die das nicht machen, leiten Sie endlich Vertragsverletzungsverfahren ein, die sich wirklich auf die Implementierung beziehen! Lösen müssen wir das letztlich durch europäische gemeinsame Institutionen – das haben hier mehrere Redner gesagt –, die tatsächlich entsprechend europaweit handeln und durchgreifen können. Und Sie im Rat können vieles dafür tun, damit die Umsetzung endlich funktioniert, und uns unterstützen, solche europäischen Institutionen zu schaffen.

Gunnar Beck, im Namen der ID-Fraktion. – Frau Präsidentin! Mit der fünften Geldwäscherichtlinie verpflichtet die EU die Mitgliedstaaten, in vielen Bereichen persönliche Daten an die Europäische Bankenaufsicht weiterzuleiten – Entscheidungen, gegen die die Anleger und Sparer kaum rechtliche Handhabe haben. Der Bürger wird gläsern. Die Rolle von NGOs hingegen hat die EU bislang vom Kampf gegen die Geldwäscher ausgenommen.

Im letzten Jahr warnte der maltesische NGO-Kommissar Professor Kenneth Wain vor einer Anfälligkeit der NGOs für Geldwäschedelikte und die Finanzierung von terroristischen Vereinigungen. Professor Wain forderte deshalb die Ausweitung der EU-Geldwäschegesetzgebung auf NGOs. Aufgrund massiven politischen Drucks musste er zurücktreten.

MONEYVAL, die Anti-Geldwäsche-Behörde des Europarats, teilt die Besorgnis von Professor Wain, da eindeutige Beweise vorlägen, dass NGOs als Geldwäschevehikel genutzt werden.

Im Ausschuss stellte ich deswegen die Frage, wieso die Kommission NGOs außer Acht lasse. Die lapidare Antwort war: Weil die Kommission nicht wünsche, dass NGOs als kriminell betrachtet würden. Wir verlangen, NGOs nicht länger vom Gesetz auszunehmen.

Emmanuel Maurel, au nom du groupe GUE/NGL. – Madame la Présidente, il est vrai que c'est un sujet d'apparence complexe, technique, mais je crois qu'il est très important pour la crédibilité de l'Union européenne.

Lors du précédent mandat, nous avons beaucoup discuté déjà de ces textes sur le blanchiment. Je rappelle quand même que notre émotion était due à un certain nombre de scandales, notamment celui des Panama Papers. Et nous parlons tout de même d'activités de blanchiment liées à la corruption, au trafic d'armes, à la traite des êtres humains, au trafic de drogue et à la fraude fiscale. Cela concerne des centaines de milliards d'euros, c'est donc vraiment un sujet très important.

Que nous montrent le texte dont nous discutons aujourd'hui et les évaluations de la Commission? C'est qu'aujourd'hui, il y a des insuffisances, des manquements insupportables. D'abord, la transposition des directives n'a pas été réellement suivie d'effets, et c'est le cas au sein de la majorité des États membres. Donc, à un moment, il va quand même falloir constater les infractions. D'autre part, nous n'en avons pas parlé depuis le début, mais la capacité d'impulsion et de décision de l'Autorité bancaire européenne semble avoir atteint certaines limites – limites d'ailleurs énoncées par le président lui-même.

Enfin nous gardons en mémoire, nous parlementaires, le refus du Conseil d'approuver la liste des 23 pays dont l'action est notoirement défaillante en matière de lutte contre le blanchiment et le financement du terrorisme. Vous vous souvenez du débat et de la décision funeste d'absoudre les complices avérés du terrorisme, comme l'Arabie saoudite, ou des paradis fiscaux, comme les Îles Vierges ou le Panama.

Donc là, il est vraiment temps d'agir. Et, en effet, le problème qui se pose aujourd'hui à nous, la question qui se pose, c'est est-ce qu'il n'est pas temps de passer au règlement? Parce qu'on a vraiment une impuissance qui est très préoccupante, pour nous, parlementaires, mais surtout pour les citoyens européens.

Laura Ferrara (NI). – Signora Presidente, onorevoli colleghi, l'immissione di proventi di attività illecite nell'economia legale è un crimine dall'alta pericolosità sociale, assume caratteri transfrontalieri, crea effetti distortivi nell'ambito del mercato interno e della concorrenza, finendo con il danneggiare le imprese rispettose delle regole. Inoltre consente ad individui e organizzazioni criminali, anche di tipo terroristico, di procurarsi fonti di finanziamento per alimentare ulteriormente le proprie attività.

Come delegazione del Movimento 5 Stelle abbiamo considerato il contrasto a questo fenomeno una priorità nel nostro programma nazionale ed europeo. Abbiamo dato un importante contributo in questa direzione con la direttiva sulla lotta al riciclaggio mediante il diritto penale, prevedendo ad esempio per i condannati di tale crimine il divieto di concludere contratti con la pubblica amministrazione, accedere a finanziamenti pubblici o candidarsi a cariche elettive.

Inoltre, nella relazione di iniziativa legislativa sulla lotta alla corruzione e alla criminalità organizzata, di cui sono stata relatrice, è stato compiuto un altro passo verso l'estensione a livello europeo di una efficace legislazione antimafia attraverso norme minime comuni, una più forte cooperazione giudiziaria e di polizia e un migliore scambio di informazioni.

I soggetti coinvolti nel riciclaggio di denaro sfruttano tutte le lacune legislative per garantirsi l'impunità ed è quindi indispensabile avere un quadro normativo europeo di contrasto che richiede non solo aggiornamenti continui, per tenere il passo dei nuovi sviluppi del fenomeno, ma anche il recepimento e un'attuazione rapida, coordinata ed uniforme tra gli Stati membri, tuttora carente.

David Casa (PPE). – Sinjura President, il-hasil ta' flus, kif nafu, huwa konsegwenza ta' atti kriminali – ghandna diversi eżempji ta' politici, negozjanti, frodisti, li kollha jaraw kif jagħmlu biex jahbu dawn il-flejjes illi jkunu ġabu b'mod illegali. Il-verità hi li mhux faċli tinduna b'dan kollu – strutturi kumplessi f'diversi ġurisdizzjonijiet u hafna drabi jkun hemm ukoll l-involvement ta' numru kbir ta' entitajiet finanzjarji.

Hafna mill-istituzzjonijiet jagħmlu l-investigazzjonijiet tagħhom imma hafna jfallu wkoll, u meta dawn ifallu u ma jinvestigawx, jew ma jipprocedux, fuq każijiet ta' hasil ta' flus, ikollhom ikunu l-whistleblowers u l-ġurnalisti investigattivi li jirriskjaw hajjithom biex jikxfu dan kollu. Kollha nafu x'gara mill-ġurnalisti bhal Daphne Caruana Galizia u bhal Jan Kuciak! Ix-xahar li ġej, irrid infakkar hawn, illi huwa t-tieni anniversarju mill-qtil brutali ta' Daphne Caruana Galizia. Illi jiena nemmen, illi kieku l-istituzzjonijiet kienu aktar effettivi fil-ġlieda kontra l-hasil ta' flus, kieku forsi Daphne Caruana Galizia, illum, għadha magħna.

U allura naqbel illi l-affarijiet hemm b'żonn li jinbidlu. Ma jistax ikun illi negozjanti tajbin u onesti li huma fil-maġġoranza jimxu skont ir-regoli waqt li daww li huma fil-poter u korrotti jibqgħu jagħmlu li jridu b'detriment għaċ-ċittadini Ewropej.

Caterina Chinnici (S&D). – Signora Presidente, onorevoli colleghi, la lotta al riciclaggio costituisce una priorità per contrastare le più gravi forme di criminalità transnazionale e per proteggere l'economia europea da pericolose distorsioni, che possono minare la fiducia dei cittadini nei confronti delle istituzioni bancarie e finanziarie.

I più recenti scandali di riciclaggio nel sistema bancario tuttora evidenziano la necessità di un sistema di supervisione ed *enforcement* effettivo per prevenire, identificare e sanzionare le violazioni da parte degli operatori economici. Un sistema che richiede uno scambio informativo, una stretta cooperazione interdisciplinare tra le autorità di regolamentazione del sistema bancario e le autorità di polizia e giudiziarie e, ancora, il coordinamento transnazionale fra tutti gli attori di contrasto.

L'Unione europea ha di recente adottato importanti strumenti legislativi: la quinta direttiva antiriciclaggio; la direttiva sullo scambio di informazioni tra le FIU e le autorità di *law enforcement* per la prevenzione di gravi reati; la direttiva, particolarmente significativa, che armonizza la definizione penale di riciclaggio; nonché il regolamento che rafforza la competenza dell'Autorità bancaria europea nella supervisione antiriciclaggio.

Occorre però vigilare sulla corretta e tempestiva attuazione di tali strumenti e occorre continuare a lavorare per promuovere una più stretta cooperazione tra le autorità di regolamentazione del settore bancario, a livello europeo e nazionale, e le autorità giudiziarie degli Stati membri.

Ramona Strugariu (Renew). – Doamna președintă, aproximativ 188 de miliarde de euro, însemnând 1 % din produsul intern brut al Uniunii Europene sunt bani implicați în activități financiare suspecte în fiecare an. Directiva a patra privind combaterea spălării banilor trebuia implementată până în iunie 2017. Creativitatea unor state membre în transpunerea acestei directive a depășit orice așteptări: de la măsuri excesive impuse organizațiilor nonguvernamentale și până la tabele de transpunere celebre precum al fostului ministru Toader, care aveau pe o coloană paragrafe întregi din directivă și pe cealaltă coloană sintagma „Nu se aplică”. Realitatea este că niciunul dintre cele 28 de state membre nu a transpus complet și corect directiva a patra.

Directiva a cincea trebuie transpusă până în ianuarie 2020. Doar opt state membre au transpus până în acest moment această directivă. Cred că răspunsul este simplu. Avem nevoie de regulamente. Dacă nu funcționează transpunerea directivelor, avem nevoie de regulamente și nu mai avem niciun moment de pierdut. Avem nevoie atât de regulamente în acest domeniu, care este esențial pentru funcționarea Uniunii și pentru combaterea mării criminalități, cât și de sancțiuni ferme pentru acele state membre care nu respectă și nu implementează regulamentele.

Ernest Urtasun (Verts/ALE). – Señora presidenta, señora comisaria, señores del Consejo, tenemos un problema gravísimo sin resolver, de miles y miles de millones de euros que circulan por el sistema financiero europeo, blanqueados, provenientes de actividades criminales, y los escándalos en los últimos años creo que son palpables. Desde el banco letón ABLV, el Danske Bank, el Deutsche Bank, el Pilatus Bank, podríamos hacer una lista muy muy larga de los escándalos que ustedes bien conocen.

Y, en las evaluaciones que ustedes mismos han hecho, encontramos fallos de todo tipo: desde la falta, por ejemplo, de las obligaciones de lucha contra el blanqueo dentro de los bancos, la falta de personal en los organismos de supervisión, la falta de inspecciones, una nula cooperación entre países. Esto es un problema muy muy serio y, por lo tanto, debemos tener más acción, ser mucho más valientes en la aplicación —de entrada— de la legislación europea. No puede ser que vayamos con tanto retraso en la aplicación de la cuarta Directiva. Tenemos que ser muy diligentes con la aplicación de la quinta.

Como le hemos pedido a este Parlamento y le vamos a pedir en esta Resolución, con el monitoreo de los terceros países que son un auténtico problema, con esa lista gris que hace tiempo que proponemos que ustedes establezcan, así como también, cuando estas Directivas no se aplican correctamente, que sean mucho más diligentes con la apertura de procedimientos de infracción. Tenemos auténticos Estados que no cumplen de ninguna de las maneras la legislación que nosotros hemos adoptado en esta casa. Y, por lo tanto, ustedes deben ser mucho más diligentes.

Y, finalmente, como también les hemos pedido durante repetidas ocasiones, debemos avanzar progresivamente hacia la creación de una auténtica autoridad europea, para poder atajar este fenómeno. Así que esa debe ser una prioridad absoluta de este mandato.

Herve Juvin (ID). – Madame la Présidente, à des entreprises confrontées quasi quotidiennement au côté pointilliste formaliste et quelquefois excessif de la lutte contre le blanchiment, il est difficile de refuser un sentiment d'hypocrisie.

Pour nous, la véritable cause de cette lèpre qu'est le blanchiment de capitaux vient tout simplement du principe de la libre circulation des capitaux dans le monde. Il est difficile de concevoir des opérations de blanchiment à grande échelle sans des réseaux bancaires complices, sans des plateformes électroniques de financement complices, sans la facilité que les trusts et la fiducie, qui dissimulent l'identité des bénéficiaires finaux des opérations financières, assurent à des opérations de blanchiment.

Il est également difficile de nier le rôle que des ONG, des fondations qui cachent quelquefois des opérations d'optimisation fiscale et d'évasion fiscale, financent des opérations de corruption et se livrent à grande échelle à des opérations de blanchiment jouent dans ce paysage dramatique.

À cet égard, nous ne pouvons qu'inciter la Commission à évaluer son action, le formalisme par rapport aux résultats réels de la lutte contre le blanchiment de capitaux et à mettre fin à une hypocrisie qui veut qu'un certain nombre de paradis fiscaux, domiciliation d'entreprise sans activité réelle, se situent au coeur même de l'Union.

Mislav Kolakušić (NI). – Poštovana predsjedavajuća, korupcija i pranje novca su dva izuzetno povezana pojma.

U današnje doba, najveća korupcija i najveći nestanak novca kojeg je poslije potrebno oprati nije od trgovine i šverca cigareta, nije od ucjena, nego on dolazi iz postupaka javnih nabava i stečajnih postupaka. I ono što je još gore, što se dogodilo u Republici Hrvatskoj, moguće je tu korupciju legalizirati novodonešenim zakonima. U Hrvatskoj je donesen Zakon o predstečajnim nagodbama i o izvanrednoj upravi koji su bili teški 10 milijardi eura. A sudovi, koji su trebali nadzirati zakonitost tih postupaka i spriječiti korupciju i pranje novca bili su pretvoreni u najobičnije notare.

Ogroman novac je nestao na na taj način. Mnogi su postali vlasnici velikih trgovačkih društava u Republici Hrvatskoj, a da mi ne znamo tko su oni. Sve se to odvija preko fondova koji imaju sjedište u trećim zemljama.

Othmar Karas (PPE). – Frau Präsidentin, Frau Kommissarin, meine sehr geehrten Damen und Herren! Die Debatte und vor allem die Wortmeldungen zeigen parteiübergreifend eines: Wie wichtig und richtig es ist, dass wir als europäische Bürgerkammer erneut unsere Stimme im Kampf gegen Geldwäsche und Terrorismusbekämpfung erheben.

Warum? Noch immer werden pro Jahr in der EU 110 Milliarden EUR Schwarzgeld gewaschen; noch immer sind zehn große europäische Banken weitreichend von Geldwäscheskandalen betroffen; noch immer gibt es einen klaren Widerspruch zwischen den Verpflichtungen, die wir vereinbart haben, und der Umsetzung; noch immer gibt es einen Mangel an Kontrolle, einen Mangel an Sanktionen, einen Mangel an Personal für die Aufsicht, einen Mangel an Geld für die Europäische Bankenaufsicht bei der Umsetzung der Geldwäscherichtlinie.

Noch immer ist die vierte Geldwäscherichtlinie nicht umgesetzt, obwohl die fünfte bereits bis Jänner 2020 umzusetzen wäre, und noch immer haben wir die Situation, dass es durch diesen Mangel zu einem Fleckerlteppich der Umsetzung und damit zu neuen Schlupflöchern kommt, die den Binnenmarkt schwächen, die Bankenunion und unsere gemeinsame Regulierung und Aufsicht behindern.

Daher ist das Gebot der Stunde, dass wir alles zu tun haben, dass wir von der Richtlinie zur verpflichtenden Verordnung kommen; dass wir Europa stärken; dass kontrolliert und sanktioniert wird; dass wir die gemeinsamen Verpflichtungen in die Tat umsetzen, und dass wir kooperieren, statt uns voneinander abzuschotten. Nur dann sind wir glaubwürdig. Wir werden den Finger nicht von dieser Wunde wegnehmen, bis alles das getan wurde, wozu wir uns gemeinsam verpflichtet haben.

Neena Gill (S&D). – Madam President, the scandals that have been exposed in recent years – and we've heard about them, we've seen millions and in some cases billions of euros being laundered – have left the people we represent fed up. They are fed up with always being the ones to bear the burden of the consequences when there are economic downturns, and fed up that the richest in our society and criminals are able to find ways to stash their cash away from regulatory oversight and tax collection.

Just one example: as we heard earlier, Danske Bank facilitated EUR 200 billion of suspicious transactions over eight years in Estonia. Despite executives facing criminal prosecution in several countries, the European Banking Authority this year rejected proposals that there had been breaches of Union law. Are they serious?

The Commission is still prevaricating. A few weeks ago it said it was still examining the matter. There are many, many more examples. We cannot simply wait for another big scandal. There are too many loopholes in our legislation that give opportunities to criminals and those who want to bend the rules.

If we don't fight this kind of cross-border criminality here, where will it be done? How is the Commission going to ensure we get tougher on this issue? We have to go further with the tools available to us, and the legislation has to be implemented with vigour in all 28 Member States.

Just one quick question to the Commission: what are we doing to investigate the thousands of shell companies registered in offshore tax havens, who else is linked to them and what are their purposes?

Antony Hook (Renew). – Madam President, it was my honour to come to this Parliament after 16 years as an advocate in criminal law, including some time as a Crown prosecutor in the UK. And what I saw in my work was that money laundering is to crime what the circulation of blood is to our bodies. Money can be obtained in a fraud, then reinvested, say, in a drugs factory, reinvested in human trafficking, and then maybe reinvested in weapons – and someone loses their life. Each time, it can move between different countries. Or it can be used to buy luxury cars, luxury houses, private education, anything of high value – lifestyles which motivate more crime.

In my country, the police estimate money laundering at GBP 100 billion every year and we have 25 different organisations meant to have some responsibility in addressing it. It is too divided.

It's outrageous and unacceptable that some Member States have not implemented this legislation, though we also need partnership that goes beyond the European Union. Money laundering can go into Africa, into America, into Asia, and we need a framework for partnerships that trace money and trace the criminals. We need to change a culture where some law-enforcement officers, be they police or prosecutors or something else, think that money laundering is second-division crime and not important.

Brexit, of course, puts my country at much greater risk.

I hope very much the new Commission will attack this issue with vigour.

Mikuláš Peksa (Verts/ALE). – Paní předsedající, zabránit praní špinavých peněz je klíčová otázka boje s organizovaným zločinem. Je to ale také otázka udržení důvěry občanů a prosazování principu transparentnosti. Já oceňuji posun, který přináší čtvrtá i pátá směrnice proti praní špinavých peněz. Problém ale je, že řada zemí nedokázala ani čtvrtou směrnicí dostatečně implementovat.

Takže jak bude vypadat další postup? Občané věří Evropské komisi a spoléhají, že dokáže vymáhat právo. Není možné jejich důvěru zahodit, paní komisařko Jourová. Veřejné rejstříky konečných vlastníků firem jsou zásadním posunem. Pokud ale chceme efektivní veřejnou kontrolu, je nutné, aby s těmito daty šlo efektivně pracovat, musí být strojově čitelná. Jak jsme se sami přesvědčili v České republice, transparentci je nutné zavést i do svěřenských fondů. Registr skutečných majitelů svěřenských fondů je zatím dobrý krok vpřed. Už teď ale musí Komise zajistit, že členské státy nebudou omezovat přístup do těchto rejstříků např. novinářům nebo neziskovým organizacím. Neměli bychom opakovat chyby, které se staly v minulosti.

Емил Радев (PPE). – Г-жо Председател, уважаеми колеги, с тази резолюция ние призоваваме държавите членки да прилагат ефективно европейското законодателство, прието в областта на борбата с прането на пари в Европейския съюз, а именно Четвъртата и Петата директива за борба с прането на пари.

Критиките ни са основателни, имайки предвид, че голяма част от държавите членки все още не са транспонирали правилно правилата на Четвъртата директива, а до няколко месеца трябва да въведат разпоредбите и на Петата директива. Това е изключително важно, имайки предвид, че прекъсването на финансовите източници на тероризма цели да предотврати атаки на територията на Европейския съюз.

Факт е, че настоящата рамка на Европейския съюз в областта на борбата с прането на пари страда от недостатъци и прилагането. Ето защо е важно да се изгради един всеобхватен европейски подход, който максимално ефикасно да противодейства на прането на пари и финансирането на тероризма. Европейският съюз трябва да е способен да се справя с изпирането на пари и да се бори с финансирането на тероризма по начин, който е ефективен и автономен, особено що се отнася до включването на трети страни в черния списък на ЕС.

Niels Fuglsang (S&D). – Madam President, in the years 2007 to 2015 the Danish bank, Danske Bank, had a department in Estonia that worked as a money-laundering central with suspicious transactions for up to EUR 200 billion. The Estonian authorities warned the Danish authorities several times but the Danish authorities did nothing. As was mentioned in April, however, the European Banking Authority came with a report saying that there was no breach in Union law and that the Danish authorities had done nothing wrong.

For me, this shows that there's something wrong, completely wrong, with the system and that we need to change. The main problem seems to be that the national authorities, which the European Banking Authority scrutinises, sit on the very board that can accept or reject the report that is critical of the Member States. It is an obvious conflict of interest. I think something should be done, and I hope the Commissioner agrees and I would like to know what the Commission proposes and how to reform the governance of the European Banking Authority.

Ondřej Kovařík (Renew). – Madam President, it is clear that tackling money laundering is a major policy issue and cross-border challenge. Fragmentation in national implementation and supervisory practices in relation to anti-money laundering and countering the financing of terrorism is aggravating the problems we face. We must find a way for better enforcement of EU rules.

In the framework of the Fifth Anti-Money Laundering (AML) Directive, a number of corrective measures have been taken to address the existing shortcomings. It is important that, in transposing the directive into national legislation, Member States work together on critical points which have been identified, including poor information sharing at both supervisory level and the level of financial institutions themselves. Information sharing is key and we should make better use of new technologies in this regard, with the aim of improving the interconnectivity of relevant databases so as to increase access to data and facilitate cross-border cooperation.

Also, as new challenges arise, such as broader use of crypto-assets, we need to adapt our approach to make sure these are covered by our AML framework. Time is of the essence, so we all need to take responsibility and act together swiftly to stem the flow of illegal money in Europe.

Romana Tomc (PPE). – Spoštovana predsednica, hvala lepa za besedo. Dobro je, da imamo čim boljše zakonodajo, ampak nič ne pomaga, če imamo ljudi, ki imajo namen to zakonodajo zlorabiti. Taki imajo denar in imajo odvetnike, ki jim svetujejo, kako se izogniti pravilom. Po svoje si pišejo zakone in celo vplivajo na postopke pred sodišči. Celo tu, v tem Parlamentu, smo pred preiskovalnim odborom PANA obravnavali pranje iranskega denarja v slovenski Novi Ljubljanski banki. 30 000 transakcij, milijarda eurov opranega denarja, ki je bil zelo verjetno porabljen tudi v teroristične namene. In kaj se je zgodilo? Nič.

Ravnokar v Sloveniji odmeva tudi primer, ko je bilo podjetjem, ki so v tesni povezavi z županom Ljubljane, glavnim mestom Slovenije, odpisano 29 milijonov eurov na škodo upnikov. Kot poročajo mediji, so dolžniki pred tem premoženje varno skrili na Malto, poslovanje pa poteka prek nabiralnikov in skladov neznanega porekla. Kaj nam koristi zakonodaja v preprečevanju denarja in pravila o dejanskih lastnikih. Pravne podlage imamo, kar rabimo, je pošten sistem in poštene ljudje, ki bodo sposobni preiskati in obsoditi take zlorabe.

Spoštovana komisarka, kaj lahko storite vi oziroma institucije Evropske unije, ko gre za takšne anomalije? Imeti bi morali moč, da ukrepajo v primerih, ko nacionalni organi odpovedo.

Pyynnöstä myönnettävät puheenvuorot

Juan Fernando López Aguilar (S&D). – Señora presidenta, comisaria Jourová, señora representante de la Presidencia finlandesa, la lucha contra la corrupción y la criminalidad organizada importa muchísimo a la Unión Europea, y no solo en lo económico, porque es un atentado a sus valores.

Por eso, ha hecho falta el instrumento del Derecho penal contra el blanqueo de dinero y la financiación del terrorismo. Por eso, la Comisión de Libertades Civiles, Justicia y Asuntos de Interior se empleó a fondo y algunos de sus miembros, yo particularmente, participamos en los trabajos de la comisión de investigación sobre los papeles de Panamá. Y las lecciones fueron claras.

Ahí está la quinta Directiva para mejorar la transparencia, el intercambio de información, las unidades de inteligencia financiera, la prevención del nivel de implicación de determinados terceros países y la prevención del uso de instrumentos de prepago al servicio de la corrupción, el blanqueo de dinero y la financiación del terrorismo. Pero tan importante como este compromiso legislativo es velar por su correcta aplicación e implementación en los Estados miembros.

Por eso, urgimos a la Comisión, y este es el sentido de este debate, a que se emplee también a fondo en incoar la correcta implementación, la aseguración del cumplimiento del objetivo en los tiempos señalados por la Comisión y, en su caso, expedientes de infracción contra los países incumplidores.

Marek Belka (S&D). – Madam President, various money laundering scandals in the banking sector, be it Danske Bank, Deutsche Bank, ING, Pilatus or ABLV, have shocked Europeans and provided proof of many weaknesses in EU cooperation. Let me remind you – let me remind ourselves – that we even needed the US authorities to shore up our own weaknesses.

I see the following main problems: national Financial Intelligence Units do not exchange the information needed, Member States do not fully implement the necessary legislation and undermine the cooperation required, while many banks do not equally apply EU rules. The problem is real. As was already mentioned, according to Europol about one percent of the EU's GDP is detected as being involved in suspect financial activities. The lack of coordinated actions on anti-money laundering (AML) legislation deepens the already fragmented capital markets, which we want to integrate. Let me add one more thing: the ball is on the Council's side. Any new legislative proposals are meaningless without the will for greater cooperation by the countries.

(Pyynnöstä myönnettävät puheenvuorot päättyvät)

Věra Jourová, Member of the Commission. – Madam President, the debate clearly shows that this will remain the priority for this term of office, and I heard the contribution by those of you who went through the saga of all the action against money laundering in the term that is now finishing.

We did a lot of useful things both in legislation and in supervision and we pushed on implementation, but I would never say that the situation is ideal, or that there is nothing to improve. It will be a priority in this term of office for this Commission and this Parliament to take further action, and I agree that it should be, or could be, the regulation so that Member States will not be able to deviate from the purpose of why we are doing all this legislation against money laundering.

We are not talking here about money, we are talking about serious organised crime. We are talking about the money which enables the serious organised crime, and we are also talking about people's trust – trust that we will do something together which will change the situation and which will finally be efficient.

We want to have a healthy financial system in Europe, which is the important element of European prosperity, so we have to filter out the risks and address them through properly functioning rules to be implemented by all. And to those of you who said that our system is only as strong as the weakest element of the system – exactly! This system must be taken seriously by all the Member States.

I heard here that the Member States should be motivated. Well, the motivation should be the same everywhere – that the laws must be implemented – and that is the crucial task of the Member States. But we have negative motivation, we have infringements.

I can give you a picture of what we are doing to enforce the Anti-Money Laundering (AML) Directive. The process of supervision led to the opening of infringement proceedings against all – all – Member States, and at this moment the proceedings have been closed for five Member States only. For all the other Member States, the Commission has issued letters of formal notice and reasoned opinions and the procedure is ongoing.

On the Fifth AML Directive, to be transposed in January next year, up to now we have received the following notifications: three Member States notified complete transposition, and another five notified transposition measures. For the rest, we are monitoring the situation, and we will act very soon after the implementation date.

I shared with you my view that the regulation will be needed: it will be the right step forward. Of course, I am leaving this sector, so it is just my personal view after working on this topic.

As to why we adopted the Fourth and Fifth AML Directives: well, the Fifth Directive, which was adopted in my term of office, was a clear and very quick reaction to the Panama Papers scandal and to terrorist attacks, which it was not easy to predict or uncover early enough because there were anonymous payments involved. We had to react to that.

We also had to react to a very clear request for full transparency of beneficial ownership, and here I want to respond to Mr Kolakušić, or Mr Peksa. It was my personal very strong desire to make the beneficial ownership register fully open, fully transparent for the public, without differentiation between who has a legally proven interest and who does not, including journalists. And that will be the case. We will have fully public registers. For trust funds, the situation was more difficult, because some trust funds have a purely private foundation. So we are addressing, especially, commercial trusts, but for other trusts too there will be the possibility of getting information about the owners.

Other steps forward could include full implementation of the regulation on financial intelligence units' cooperation. Mr Radev has left, and I had wanted to thank him for his efforts because he was the rapporteur on this piece of legislation. He could give me his confirmation that it was a very tough exercise to convince the Member States to take the necessary measures so that financial intelligence units cooperate and share information with the law-enforcement authorities within their country, and even more difficult to convince them that there should be an exchange of information cross-border.

So, to those who mentioned cross-border cooperation: it's very weak, you are right, and we tried to improve it through this new piece of legislation, but it was not tough enough and we had to make compromises. Here too I expect some progress in this parliamentary term.

On the question of having one Union body for better supervision, while we have taken the first step, the European Banking Authority should have strengthened competences, and it is in the legislation that there should be better data collection and the possibility to act when a Member State seems to be failing to act – which was, by the way, the case of the Danske Estonian bank. I still cannot imagine how it is possible, over five or seven years, for the laundering of up to EUR 200 billion to go unnoticed. Who failed?

The investigations are still ongoing and we will know for sure who is failing, or who was the failure in the system. Denmark, in the meantime, has changed its legislation. So there are reactions, but I certainly agree that there should be one strong Union body which should supervise this.

There was also a question from Ms Tomc: who will act at European level when the Member States fail in the field of criminal law? Well, the European Public Prosecutor's Office (EPPO) will start functioning from November next year, and this will be the body having specialised prosecutors on financial crime. It would be worth considering whether the EPPO could not be the body which takes cases over if Member States fail.

I know I am speaking for too long, but there were many questions. Just to conclude, Mr Casa mentioned the Whistle-blowers Directive, and this might also bring some benefits.

Thank you very much for your patience. I felt the need and obligation to react to your comments and questions because this is a priority topic, which needs to be well mastered on a political level, at European Union level, in the next term of office.

President. – Thank you, Commissioner. It is very good to see that you always respond and answer the questions from MEPs. Not every Commissioner does the same, so thank you very much for your engagement and involvement in this very important topic.

Tytti Tuppurainen, President-in-Office of the Council. – Madam President, thank you very much for this debate. I have followed your valuable contributions with great interest. I've also heard the input from the Commission, which I highly value. I hope also that the Commission-to-come is aiming high here.

I was asked in particular asked about the actions taken by the Council with regard to money laundering and the recent scandals in our banks, and I agree that this is a problem. We need to get to the bottom of the issue and address it further if we conclude that the measures taken recently are not enough. We are starting to analyse the Commission's post-mortem review of the recent alleged money laundering cases involving EU banks, and the Council will discuss this in October, that is, next month. We plan to arrive at conclusions by December this year, so actions will follow.

I also take this opportunity to reaffirm the importance which the Presidency attaches to the fight against money laundering and terrorist financing and I look forward to working together on these matters. The message from this discussion has been very clear: there needs to be more done for anti-money laundering and the subject was widely supported by all the different political groups. I personally can promise you that I will convey your message to my colleague, the Minister of Finance, as your contribution on this very important issue. The Presidency will remain available for exchanges on the subject as needed, so I would like to thank you all very much again for your commitment to this issue.

President. – I have received two motions for resolutions tabled in accordance with Rule 132(2).

The debate is closed.

The vote will take place on Thursday, 19 September 2019.

Written statements (Rule 171)

Pedro Marques (S&D), por escrito. – Dados da Europol: cerca de um por cento do PIB anual da Europa está envolvido em lavagem de dinheiro. Para a Europol, corrupção, tráfico de armas e de seres humanos, crimes fiscais e terrorismo têm acesso a este dinheiro. Práticas cada vez mais elaboradas, sofisticadas. E transfronteiriças.

A UE, o Conselho, a Comissão e o PE têm, em conjunto, uma força que separados não teriam. É justo reconhecer as tentativas da Comissão para implementar as regras que existem. O S&D, com propostas concretas, tem-se batido por uma supervisão mais forte, por sanções mais duras a bancos e empresas suspeitos, em Estados-Membros que não aplicam, ou aplicam mal, as regras da UE.

É fundamental legislação que dê instrumentos de intercâmbio, de troca de informações e de inteligência financeira que nos coloquem no mesmo patamar de sofisticação dos criminosos, indo além dos padrões mínimos atuais. Apoiamos a criação de um mecanismo de apoio e de coordenação e uma análise contínua do fluxo de informações entre as unidades de inteligência financeira, adotando padrões legais comuns, sem descuidar a proteção e a segurança dos dados pessoais. Combater a lavagem de dinheiro e o branqueamento de capitais é combater o terrorismo, é defender os cidadãos. É uma batalha para travarmos. Em conjunto.

20. Porządek obrad następnego posiedzenia: Patrz protokół

21. Zamknięcie posiedzenia

(Istunto päätyi klo 21.03.)

—

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
Renew	Grupa Renew Europe
Verts/ALE	Grupa Zielonych/Wolne Przymierze Europejskie
ID	Grupa Tożsamość i Demokracja
ECR	Grupa Europejscy Konserwatyści i Reformatorzy
GUE/NGL	Grupa Zjednoczonej Lewicy Europejskiej/Nordycka Zielona Lewica
NI	Niezrzeszeni