

**PEŁNE SPRAWOZDANIE Z OBRAD 10 PAŹDZIERNIKA 2019 R.**

(C/2024/3958)

PARLAMENT EUROPEJSKI

SESJA 2019-2020

Posiedzenia z 9 i 10 października 2019 r.

BRUKSELA

Spis treści	Strona
1. Otwarcie posiedzenia .....	3
2. Wieloletnie ramy finansowe na lata 2021-2027 i zasoby własne: czas, by spełnić oczekiwania obywateli (debata) .....	3
3. Polityka zatrudnienia i polityka społeczna w strefie euro (debata) .....	20
4. Składanie dokumentów: patrz protokół .....	31
5. Przesunięcia środków i decyzje budżetowe: patrz protokół .....	31
6. Wznowienie posiedzenia .....	32
7. Oświadczenia Przewodniczącego / Przewodniczącej .....	32
8. Głosowanie .....	32
8.1. Wniosek o zastosowanie trybu pilnego: Okresy stosowania rozporządzenia (UE) 2019/501 i rozporządzenia (UE) 2019/502 (Karima Delli) (głosowanie) .....	32
8.2. Porozumienie o współpracy między Eurojustem a Serbią (A9-0009/2019 - Juan Fernando López Aguilar) (głosowanie) .....	32
8.3. Projekt budżetu korygującego nr 4 na rok budżetowy 2019: Zmniejszenie środków na zobowiązania i środków na płatności zgodnie ze zaktualizowanymi potrzebami w zakresie wydatków i aktualizacją dochodów (zasoby własne) (A9-0012/2019 - John Howarth) (głosowanie) .....	33
8.4. Dostosowania kwot uruchamianych z instrumentu elastyczności na 2019 r. do wykorzystania w związku z migracją, napływem uchodźców i zagrożeniami bezpieczeństwa (A9-0013/2019 - John Howarth) (głosowanie) .....	33

Spis treści	Strona
8.5. Sprzeciw na podstawie art. 112 Regulaminu: Substancje czynne, w tym flumioksazyne (B9-0103/2019) (głosowanie) .....	33
8.6. Sprzeciw na podstawie art. 112 Regulaminu: Substancje czynne, w tym chlorotoluron (B9-0104/2019) (głosowanie) .....	33
8.7. Sprzeciw na podstawie art. 112 Regulaminu: Genetycznie zmodyfikowana kukurydza MZHGOJG (SYN-ØØØJG-2) (B9-0107/2019) (głosowanie) .....	33
8.8. Sprzeciw na podstawie art. 112 Regulaminu: Genetycznie zmodyfikowana soja A2704-12 (-ACS-GMØØ5-3) (B9-0105/2019) (głosowanie) .....	33
8.9. Sprzeciw na podstawie art. 112 Regulaminu: Zmodyfikowana genetycznie kukurydza MON 89034 × 1507 × MON 88017 × 59122 × DAS-40278-9 oraz zmodyfikowana genetycznie kukurydza łącząca dwie, trzy lub cztery modyfikacje MON 89034, 1507, MON 88017, 59122 i DAS-40278-9 (B9-0106/2019) (głosowanie) .....	33
8.10. Zewnętrzna ingerencja w wybory i dezinformacja w procesach demokratycznych państw członkowskich i Unii Europejskiej (B9-0108/2019, B9-0111/2019) (głosowanie) .....	33
8.11. Wieloletnie ramy finansowe na lata 2021-2027 i zasoby własne: czas, by spełnić oczekiwania obywateli (B9-0110/2019, B9-0112/2019, B9-0113/2019) (głosowanie) .....	34
8.12. Polityka zatrudnienia i polityka społeczna w strefie euro (A9-0016/2019 - Yana Toom) (głosowanie) .....	34
9. Wyjaśnienia dotyczące sposobu głosowania .....	34
9.1. Sprzeciw na podstawie art. 112 Regulaminu: Genetycznie zmodyfikowana kukurydza MZHGOJG (SYN-ØØØJG-2) (B9-0107/2019) .....	34
9.2. Sprzeciw na podstawie art. 112 Regulaminu: Genetycznie zmodyfikowana soja A2704-12 (-ACS-GMØØ5-3) (B9-0105/2019) .....	34
9.3. Zewnętrzna ingerencja w wybory i dezinformacja w procesach demokratycznych państw członkowskich i Unii Europejskiej (B9-0108/2019, B9-0111/2019) .....	35
9.4. Wieloletnie ramy finansowe na lata 2021-2027 i zasoby własne: czas, by spełnić oczekiwania obywateli (B9-0110/2019, B9-0112/2019, B9-0113/2019) .....	38
9.5. Polityka zatrudnienia i polityka społeczna w strefie euro (A9-0016/2019 - Yana Toom) .....	39
10. Korekty do głosowania i zamiar głosowania: patrz protokół .....	40
11. Zatwierdzenie protokołów posiedzeń bieżącej sesji i przekazanie przyjętych tekstów: patrz protokół .....	40
12. Kalendarz następnych posiedzeń: patrz protokół .....	41
13. Zamknięcie posiedzenia .....	41
14. Przerwa w obradach .....	41

## PEŁNE SPRAWOZDANIE Z OBRAD 10 PAŹDZIERNIKA 2019 R.

VORSITZ: RAINER WIELAND

Vizepräsident

### 1. Otwarcie posiedzenia

(Die Sitzung wird um 9.00 Uhr eröffnet.)

### 2. Wieloletnie ramy finansowe na lata 2021-2027 i zasoby własne: czas, by spełnić oczekiwania obywateli (debata)

**Der Präsident.** – Der erste Punkt der Tagesordnung ist die Aussprache über die Erklärungen des Rates und der Kommission betreffend den Mehrjährigen Finanzrahmen 2021-2027 und Eigenmittel: Die Erwartungen der Bürger sollten jetzt erfüllt werden (2019/2833(RSP)).

Bevor ich die Aussprache eröffne, möchte ich Sie davon in Kenntnis setzen, dass wir nach wie vor ein neues System erproben, mit dem Mitglieder spontane Wortmeldungen und blaue Karten elektronisch anmelden können.

Sie haben per E-Mail Informationen über die Nutzung dieses Systems erhalten, und die Anleitung befindet sich auf Ihrem Tisch. Zur Einreichung eines Antrags auf eine Wortmeldung können die Mitglieder die Funktionstasten auf ihren elektronischen Abstimmungsanlagen nutzen.

Bitte nehmen Sie zur Kenntnis, dass parallel zur Nutzung des elektronischen Systems auch eine „Standard-Anmeldung“ (durch Hochheben eines weißen Blatts Papier oder durch die persönliche Anmeldung zu Beginn der Aussprache bei den Kollegen vom Plenum für spontane Wortmeldungen und durch Hochheben einer blauen Karte für das Verfahren der blauen Karte) möglich ist.

Ich möchte Sie deshalb höflich daran erinnern, Ihre Abstimmungskarte mitzubringen, damit Sie dieses System nutzen können. Eine Anmeldung per E-Mail ist nicht möglich.

Wenn Sie eine spontane Wortmeldung anmelden möchten, können Sie das ab sofort tun. Sie brauchen nicht bis zum Ende der Aussprache zu warten.

**Tytti Tuppurainen, President-in-Office of the Council.** – Mr President, the next multiannual financial framework (MFF) will set the stakes for the financing of EU policies until 2027.

Our aim is a balanced financial framework that reflects both new priorities and traditional policies and contributes to the common European objectives. It is not too easy to achieve these substantial aims, but we are working hard. The timetable is also challenging us. Even though we are in the middle of the institutional change, the Presidency will do its best to finalise the Council negotiations by the end of the year. I am personally very committed to this target.

Today's plenary debate gives me a unique and concrete opportunity to cooperate with Parliament. I personally chair the General Affairs Council meetings, but I also represent the Council in every plenary session during our Presidency, which gives us an opportunity to have an up-to-date discussion regularly.

In the spirit of good interinstitutional cooperation and in line with the approach outlined by the Bulgarian Presidency, we are committed to continuing the established practice of holding an exchange of views before and after sessions of the General Affairs Council (GAC) when the MFF is on its agenda.

Now a few words on the EU's challenges and our common priorities. The next MFF is to respond to Europe's current and future challenges by increasing the share of expenditure in policy areas with the highest European added-value.

For decades, traditional policies have been supporting EU integration by fostering convergence and development as well as maintaining high standard agriculture in Europe. We can see the positive results of these investments across the Union and they will continue to foster convergence and support transition towards a sustainable agriculture. Rural development funding plays a crucial role here.

One of the key challenges of our time is climate change. We already see its impact on our environment and it is set only to worsen if we do not step up our efforts. Many voices – firstly, the one of our youth – call upon us to do more. The MFF will be essential to this purpose, as it will cover the period leading towards the 2030 climate targets deadline. On climate, Member States seem to support the 25% mainstreaming target, even if some see it as the maximum and others as the minimum.

Further to the EU's climate target on energy transition aiming for carbon neutrality, as a Presidency we see that there is the need for a fund to facilitate fair transition towards carbon neutrality. The MFF will also better support innovation and research, at a time when society is undergoing massive changes due to the digital transformation. Europe needs to stay at the forefront of research, development and innovations.

The future MFF needs to be aligned with new priorities. Managing migration requires a comprehensive approach. By providing funding and using different MFF headings, it will be possible to better respond both to international and external aspects of migration. At the same time, our expectations must be grounded in reality.

One of the biggest EU Member States is set to leave the Union. I have had consultations with the ministers of all Member States, and in this context, many have expressed the need for the EU budget to reflect this new reality. As the Presidency, this is an element that we have to take into account. As for own resources, they must provide a fair, transparent and equitable system for the financing of the next MFF and to limit the administrative burden for the Member States.

From the Presidency's point of view, on new own resources the non-recycled plastic packaging waste proposal seems to gain the strongest support, and a positive approach from the majority of Member States. As far as new own resources are concerned, we need to keep in mind that also here a consensus between all Member States is needed.

Now defending European values starts from respect for the rule of law within the Union, and above all, in its Member States. Rule of law is not a political declaration but a legal norm. From the Presidency's perspective, Article 2 of the Treaty concerning the rule of law will not stay in force by itself, and this should be reflected in our policy work. Rule of law is a crucial element in the next MFF as it includes the proposal on protecting the Union budget from rule-of-law deficiencies. That proposal applies equally to all Member States and all EU funds, just like the rule of law itself.

Rule of law and democracy form the foundation of European freedom, security and prosperity. Respect for the rule of law is self-evidently linked to the legitimacy and proper functioning of the EU. One of the priorities of the Finnish Presidency is to ensure protection of the rule of law and to reinforce its links to the budget. Following the leaders' guidance, we will continue our work on this important matter. I am convinced that there is a way to create a balanced and legally sound instrument based on the Commission's proposal.

I am aware of the concerns of Members of this Parliament on the timeline. So far, the Presidency's work within the Council has focused on listening to the Member States and their priorities. Now there will be an opportunity for the leaders to give the Presidency direct guidance.

To this end, the Presidency is preparing a paper that will facilitate the first substantial discussion of the leaders in October's European Council. Obviously, this will depend on the reactions of delegations and above all, on the way President Tusk will want to conduct the discussion. On the basis of the leaders' guidance, we will prepare a finalised draft negotiation box with numbers to facilitate an agreement by the end of the year, as concluded by the European Council in June this year.

I would like to underline once more that the Presidency is fully committed to meeting this timetable and we will do our utmost to facilitate the final stages of the MFF negotiations. It is also fundamental for us to cooperate with you in line with the previous Presidencies and to progress on sectoral MFF proposals with a view of reaching additional common understandings.

Thank you very much for your attention and I look forward to our discussion.

**Jérôme Rivière (ID).** – Monsieur le Président, effectivement, j'avais fait un rappel au règlement et il intervient au milieu de cette discussion.

Je suis inquiet d'un certain nombre d'événements qui se sont déroulés hier lors de l'élection du bureau de la délégation Cariforum. M<sup>me</sup> Maxette Pirbakas, qui est une élue de notre groupe Identité et Démocratie, a été nommée le 17 juillet dernier membre de cette délégation Cariforum. Alors qu'elle est membre titulaire de cette délégation depuis le mois de juillet, nous avons appris par l'administration de notre Parlement européen qu'elle ne pouvait pas se présenter à l'élection du bureau parce qu'elle ne serait plus, tout d'un coup, membre titulaire de la délégation Cariforum. Elle est candidate à la première vice-présidence selon cette règle d'Hondt, même si elle n'est pas respectée, et rien ne doit pouvoir l'empêcher de se présenter.

Après les propos parfois un peu inquiétants qui avaient été tenus concernant un cordon sanitaire devant nous empêcher d'accéder à des postes, ce retournement, qui ne respecte pas une décision prise en assemblée plénière, est-il une volonté d'écarter systématiquement les membres du groupe Identité et Démocratie, ou s'agit-il d'une erreur? Si c'est le cas, j'espère qu'elle sera bientôt réparée. Il est important que M<sup>me</sup> Pirbakas, qui est l'une des rares élues de l'outre-mer français et donc de l'outre-mer européen, puisse être candidate à cette élection.

**Der Präsident.** – Zum Herrn Kollegen Rivière will ich sagen: Er hat seinen Grund, dass die Ausschüsse wählen. Es gibt eine Vereinbarung zwischen den Fraktionen, die nicht in der Geschäftsordnung festgelegt ist und bei der die Fraktionen entscheiden. Dabei kommen natürlich auch politische Erwägungen mit ins Spiel. Was den ersten Punkt anbelangt, den Sie genannt haben: Es kann jeder kandidieren, der Vollmitglied ist, und wir werden diesem Teil Ihrer Wortmeldung nachgehen.

Ihr Anliegen war zweigeteilt. Dem ersten Anliegen werde ich nachgehen, weil es ein formaler Punkt ist, der in der Geschäftsordnung geregelt ist. Wenn die Kollegin Vollmitglied ist, dann muss sie kandidieren dürfen. Die Frage, ob sie gewählt wird, ist eine völlig andere Frage.

**Thierry Mariani (ID).** – Monsieur le Président, je voulais intervenir aussi sur le respect de la règle d'Hondt. Ce qui s'est passé la semaine dernière en commission des affaires étrangères est assez surprenant. La commission des affaires étrangères a attribué treize rapports permanents, c'est-à-dire pour les cinq ans de ce mandat. Ces treize rapports ne sont pas anodins, puisqu'ils concernent treize pays qui sont liés à l'Union européenne soit par des accords de voisinage, soit par un processus de préadhésion. Ces treize rapports ont été répartis entre trois groupes seulement, c'est-à-dire que les groupes ECR, GUE et ID ont totalement été exclus, et on nous explique que ces rapports ne rentrent pas dans le calcul de la règle d'Hondt. Il faudrait quand même savoir un jour quand cette règle s'applique et quand elle ne s'applique pas.

Une fois de plus, c'est quand même quelque chose de totalement discriminatoire car je pense que sur treize rapports, on aurait pu respecter un peu la proportionnelle.

**Der Präsident.** – Vielen Dank, Herr Kollege Mariani! Auch hier bezieht sich meine Antwort auf den zweiten Teil der Antwort für Herrn Rivière. Hier ist nur allgemein in der Geschäftsordnung geregelt, dass auf eine Ausgewogenheit zu achten ist. Letztlich findet die Entscheidung in den Ausschüssen statt. Ich sehe jedenfalls a prima vista keine Veranlassung, hier Ihrer Wortmeldung nachzugehen. Ihrer Fraktion steht es natürlich frei, sich an den Präsidenten zu wenden.

**Johannes Hahn**, *Member of the Commission*. – Mr President, I thank you for the opportunity to react to the European Parliament's political resolution on the next EU long-term budget. I salute your engagement on this file of strategic importance which will help shape the future of the European Union over the coming decade.

I also recognise the intense work carried out by this Parliament, in particular the co-rapporteurs and negotiating team appointed by the Chair of the Committee on Budgets (BUDG) Mr van Overtveldt – Ms Marques, Ms Hayer, Mr Olbrycht, Mr Fernandes and Mr Andresen – to bring forward this political resolution now. The European Council will hold an exchange of views on the next multiannual financial framework next week and I can only encourage the leaders and the Council Presidency to take into due consideration the European Parliament's positions.

The interim report that Parliament adopted in November last year was a substantial contribution to the negotiations on the next multiannual financial framework. One year later, and after the European elections of May, it was essential to leave absolutely no ambiguity about the continuity of Parliament's stance. I therefore welcome that this political resolution largely endorses the position already expressed in 2018. I also take note of the new elements that this political resolution brings forward. I will address them in a minute. But before doing so, I would like to recall the Commission's position on the overall level of expenditure. It is certainly one of the issues, if not the issue, that steers the ongoing negotiations the most.

Parliament would like to set the next EU long-term budget at the level of 1.3% of the EU27 GNI. At the other end of the spectrum, several Member States have been repeatedly calling for a budget limited to 1% of the EU27 GNI. I believe we all need to address those divergences. All institutions need to be active and constructive in seeking a compromise. At the end of the day, there will need to be an agreement on the next EU long-term budget, and the sooner the better. We urgently need to make progress in the negotiations and avoid entrenched positions. We must acknowledge that the Union is asked to do more and better on its political priorities. This requires a modern budget focused on EU added value, and more resources for programmes contributing, for example, to climate action, research and innovation, digital security, border management, etc.

On the other hand, we cannot escape reality. The Union will lose an important contributor to the EU budget so that moderate savings in the biggest spending areas – cohesion policy and the common agricultural policy – are inevitable. In the light of those two constraints, what the Commission has proposed for the next multiannual financial framework, with an overall level of 1.114% of EU27 GNI, is balanced and realistic. I remain convinced that it would be a fair outcome for all.

On top of endorsing most of Parliament's position expressed last year, this political resolution also adds a limited number of new elements.

First and foremost, let me address the point on the financing of the President-elect's political guidelines. You will understand that they cannot infringe upon the next College prerogative. However, the Commission's proposal of May last year and the ongoing negotiations already provide a solid framework for these priorities. The Budgetary Instrument for Convergence and Competitiveness for the euro area is one element. Another one, the rule of law, is an integral part of the next EU long-term budget: EUR 120 billion on external action investment, a closer partnership with Africa and a strengthening of the European Defence Fund with a 22-fold increase compared to the current pilot and preparatory actions, which means in absolute figures, from EUR 590 million to EUR 13 billion.

For other initiatives, I cannot anticipate on the detailed content of the new initiatives. It's essential to continue the MFF negotiations with speed and determination. They provide for an opportunity to translate the political guidelines of the President-elect into action and accommodate them within the framework of the MFF agreement. We must avoid damaging delays in the launch of the new programmes that are in the clear interest of our regions, our researchers, our small businesses, our farmers and our young people.

Let me now address the issue of climate change and Parliament's call for a more ambitious quantified target in relation to climate-related expenditure.

The Commission is committed to delivering on the Paris Agreement on climate change and to making the Union lead by example on the global stage. That's why we have proposed to set ourselves a high objective and to dedicate 25% of the overall next EU long-term budget, or approximately EUR 320 billion, to projects contributing to climate action. That is ambitious and credible too.

The target of 25% is based on our experience and on our bottom-up assessment of how much each and every spending programme can actually contribute to climate action. Some programmes and funds will contribute significantly to climate action. Some others among them – also those for which you propose further reinforcement like the single market, Erasmus, Creative Europe or the European Social Fund (ESF) will not.

Any target higher than 25% would require a difficult choice. For instance, the climate objective of those programmes that already contribute to climate action could be increased. In practice, this would require mostly much higher targets within the common agricultural policy, the European Regional Development Fund and the Cohesion Fund because of their critical mass in the budget or, in relative terms, the overall share of the budget allocated to programmes that don't contribute to climate action could be decreased. In practice, this would mostly affect the European Social Fund and other reinforced or new priorities, such as Erasmus, defence, security and border management. That is the harsh mathematical alternative that we are facing.

I acknowledge Parliament's intention to exercise its rights fully and I can say that I can relate to the feeling of impatience expressed by some Members that, one and a half years after the Commission proposal, the Council has not yet agreed on its position on the MFF. Please be assured that the Commission is fully committed to facilitating dialogue. We will continue to provide both Parliament and the Council with the technical information to support transparency, openness and constructive cooperation.

Finally, the resolution calls on the Commission to present a contingency plan for early 2020 to ensure continuity until the next EU long-term budget is agreed. It will be up to the incoming Commission to respond to your call but, as you rightly point out, the Treaty in its Article 312 and also the MFF Regulation itself, provide the relevant legal framework if an agreement cannot be reached. Now is not the time to consider any additional measures. For the moment, our priority and focus must remain to reach a timely agreement on the new multiannual financial framework and sectoral basis acts.

Finally, let me thank this House for your continuous firm support to reform of the own resources system, to maintaining the flexibility of the MFF and to introducing a mechanism aimed at protecting the EU budget in case of generalised deficiencies as regards the rule of law. I agree with Members of this Parliament that it's high time to decide and meet citizens' expectations. We all have a collective responsibility to agree on the next EU long-term budget on time so that the next generation of programmes is operational on 1 January 2021.

**Jan Olbrycht**, w imieniu grupy PPE. – Panie Przewodniczący! Pani minister! Panie komisarzy! Czas ucieka! Czas ucieka, a uczelnie, przedsiębiorstwa, samorządy lokalne, studenci, którzy będą chcieli korzystać z Erasmusa, czekają na informację, co będzie z budżetem po roku 2020. Czy będzie ten budżet, czy go nie będzie, i jakie będą decyzje? Kiedy zapadną decyzje?

Myślę, że warto przypomnieć, że Komisja Europejska rozpoczęła zarówno od swojego ogólnego sprawozdania dotyczącego scenariuszy, jak również przedłożyła swoją propozycję w maju roku 2018. Teraz mija półtora roku od tego momentu. Parlament bardzo szybko postarał się odpowiedzieć na tę propozycję, mimo tego że procedura przewidziana w traktacie nie daje Parlamentowi takich możliwości na tym etapie. Natomiast Parlament w poczuciu odpowiedzialności w listopadzie zaprezentował swoje stanowisko, i jest to stanowisko realistyczne. Wzięliśmy wszystkie informacje i dane z tego, co zaprezentowała Komisja Europejska. My niczego nie tworzyliśmy. Zgodziliśmy się na nowe priorytety, stwierdziliśmy, że w przyszłości trzeba wzmocnić „Horyzont 2020” taki, jaki jest dzisiaj, i trzeba wzmocnić np. Erasmusa. To stwierdziliśmy jako stanowisko polityczne, ale uważamy, że tzw. tradycyjne polityki nie mogą być dosyć mechanicznie zredukowane. My zdajemy sobie sprawę z tego, ile kosztuje odejście Wielkiej Brytanii, natomiast dzisiaj Parlament mówi: Czas ucieka, potrzebujemy decyzji, a nie tylko – skądinąd sympatycznych i miłych – spotkań dotyczących wymiany informacji. Jesteśmy gotowi do współpracy, ale oczekujemy współpracy po to, żeby na końcu rzeczywiście wyrazić zgodę.

**Margarida Marques**, *em nome do Grupo S&D*. – Senhor Presidente, Senhora Ministra Tytti Tuppurainen, Senhor Comissário Hahn, começo por destacar do título desta resolução: «é tempo de satisfazer as expectativas dos cidadãos». É para isso que estamos aqui. Temos a obrigação de prever os meios financeiros à altura dos compromissos políticos e das ambições da União.

Com esta resolução, o Parlamento confirma a sua posição do relatório intercalar de novembro de 2018, mas, agora, com legitimidade renovada.

Atualiza o mandato negocial, respeitando os resultados eleitorais de maio de 2019. Valoriza o clima, reitera que o próximo Quadro Financeiro Plurianual deve ser fixado em 1,3% do Rendimento Nacional Bruto da UE a 27. Só este valor permite continuar a apoiar, de forma robusta, as políticas de coesão e a política agrícola, mas também a inovação e o investimento, a política migratória, a política externa e de defesa ou a implementação de um forte pilar europeu dos direitos sociais.

Apoiamos o princípio da integração das questões climáticas em todas as políticas e de uma transição justa para uma economia neutra em carbono, com base nos mais elevados critérios de justiça social, sem deixar ninguém para trás.

Preconizamos a criação de um novo mecanismo para proteger o orçamento da União Europeia, sempre que o Estado de Direito não seja respeitado.

Acolhemos com agrado os compromissos políticos assumidos pela Sra. Van der Leyen em relação a iniciativas adicionais, mas reiteramos que para novas iniciativas dinheiro novo. Aguardamos uma proposta concreta sobre o pacto verde europeu. Congratulamo-nos com os compromissos assumidos pela Presidente eleita de relançar propostas legislativas de forma a construir um cabaz de novos recursos próprios. Será um bom momento para uma reforma do sistema de financiamento da União Europeia, alinhado com as principais prioridades políticas.

O Parlamento está pronto para iniciar as negociações sobre o orçamento 21-27 e recursos próprios. É tempo de o Conselho encetar negociações com o Parlamento sobre o orçamento e sobre os aspetos da legislação sectorial que cria os novos programas da União Europeia, bem como a proposta relativa ao Estado de Direito. Temos, sem demora, de alcançar um acordo sólido que evite um *gap* temporal entre o fim deste quadro financeiro e o início do próximo e que responda às expectativas dos cidadãos.

**Valerie Hayer**, *au nom du groupe Renew*. – Monsieur le Président, Madame la Ministre, Monsieur le Commissaire, chers collègues, soyez assurés que nous suivrons avec attention les discussions du prochain sommet européen. La raison est simple: le Parlement s'impatiente.

En mai 2018, c'est-à-dire il y a 17 mois, la Commission a présenté sa proposition pour le prochain cadre financier. Le Parlement s'est immédiatement mis au travail et a exprimé sa position et ses priorités. Depuis, nous attendons que le Conseil avance et tranche nombre de dossiers. Or, le temps presse et l'heure est venue de passer à la vitesse supérieure dans les négociations. L'heure est également venue d'y associer le Parlement. La ligne adoptée par le Parlement est claire et nous réaffirmons aujourd'hui ses priorités avec le maintien du budget de la politique agricole commune et de cohésion, le renforcement de programmes emblématiques comme Erasmus ou Horizon 2020, de nouveaux crédits pour les nouveaux défis ou encore la mise en place d'un mécanisme lié à l'état de droit.

Le prochain cadre devra aussi répondre au changement climatique et préserver la biodiversité. Sur cette question, l'engagement de la présidente élue Ursula von der Leyen, avec le lancement d'un *Green deal* et l'instauration d'une taxe carbone aux frontières, notamment, est encourageant.

Un point d'alerte cependant: ces initiatives, que nous saluons, doivent s'accompagner de moyens budgétaires supplémentaires. J'entends déjà ça et là, les attaques en irresponsabilité du Parlement qui voudrait toujours dépenser plus, mais soyons concrets: à enveloppe constante, plus d'initiatives, cela signifie des coupes dans d'autres programmes, parfois du saupoudrage et donc des politiques publiques moins efficaces. Ne donnons pas du grain à moudre aux eurosceptiques.



Je conclurai avec les ressources propres. Le système de recettes, tel qu'il a été conçu dans les années 1970, a été dévoyé au fil du temps. Aujourd'hui, la prédominance des contributions nationales alimente la logique du juste retour. Dit autrement, nous entretenons un système dans lequel les approches nationales sont reines, alors même que nous devrions privilégier la valeur ajoutée européenne. Il est urgent d'avancer sur ce dossier qui, je le rappelle, est essentiel pour le Parlement. Nous ne donnerons pas notre accord sur le cadre de dépenses sans nouvelles ressources propres pour l'Union.

Madame la Ministre, vous le savez, la balle est dans votre camp. Vous connaissez nos positions, nous attendons les vôtres, afin d'entamer enfin les discussions au service des Européens.

**Rasmus Andresen**, *im Namen der Verts/ALE-Fraktion*. – Herr Präsident! Die Klimakrise, soziale Spaltung oder auch die Digitalisierung: Alle großen Zukunftsthemen können wir nicht mehr national lösen. Wir brauchen dafür eine starke Europäische Union und wir Grüne wollen eine starke Europäische Union. Wir wollen eine EU, die bereit ist, allen Menschen eine Zukunft zu geben und in 20 Jahren klimaneutral ist. Dazu müssen wir die EU verändern, und wir müssen massiv investieren. Der Finanzrahmen bietet uns dafür genau jetzt die richtige Chance, und deshalb lassen Sie es mich am Anfang gleich ganz deutlich sagen: Die Position der deutschen Bundesregierung und von vielen anderen Mitgliedstaaten schadet Europa. Es ist populistisch, einfach nur für ein Budget von 1 % einzustehen und für einen kleinen Haushalt zu kämpfen.

Die deutsche Bundesregierung und andere handeln antieuropäisch. Gerade von Bundeskanzlerin Angela Merkel und Bundesfinanzminister Olaf Scholz erwarten wir mehr! Wir erwarten, dass sie mutig für ein starkes Europa eintreten und nicht einfach alles ausbremsen. Wir haben kein Verständnis für diese Stammtischposition. Denn wer beim EU-Budget kürzt, zerstört unser Klima. Wer beim EU-Budget kürzt, nimmt hin, dass sich die soziale Spaltung auf unserem Kontinent verschärft, und wer beim EU-Budget kürzt, wird weniger in Forschung, in schnelles Internet und in die Erasmus-Programme investieren können.

Noch immer wird der größte Teil vom EU-Budget für klimaschädliche Agrarsubventionen ausgegeben – das müssen wir ändern! Statt Massentierhaltung, Massenproduktion wollen wir Umweltschutz und eine artgerechte Tierhaltung fördern. Wir wollen in erneuerbare Energien, in den ÖPNV und in bessere europäische Bahnverbindungen investieren. Soziale und ökologische Investitionen gehören für uns zusammen, und für uns Grüne ist es einer der größten Skandale in der Europäischen Union, dass über 120 Millionen Menschen auf unserem Kontinent in Armut leben müssen. Wir können das nicht hinnehmen und wir müssen auch als Europäische Union mehr tun, um Armut zu bekämpfen.

Deshalb freut es uns ganz besonders, dass es uns gelungen ist, im Verhandlungsteam des Parlaments für den Finanzrahmen große Einigkeit über wichtige Positionen herzustellen, dass wir hier im Parlament bei den großen Fragen gemeinsam stehen, dass wir bereit sind, zu handeln und dass wir gemeinsam in harte Verhandlungen mit dem Rat einsteigen werden, denn wir müssen hart verhandeln. Es geht um unsere Zukunft, es geht um die Zukunft aller Menschen in der Europäischen Union.

**Marco Zanni**, *a nome del gruppo ID*. – Signor Presidente, onorevoli colleghi, sono ormai parecchi mesi che in quest'Aula e in sede di commissione per i bilanci discutiamo del prossimo Quadro finanziario pluriennale, ma i progressi, a mio avviso, sembrano abbastanza insufficienti. Ad oggi, nonostante il *commitment* della Presidenza finlandese di voler chiudere un accordo entro la fine dell'anno, non si vede all'orizzonte lo spazio di un accordo. Questo, a mio avviso, soprattutto perché non si guarda al prossimo quadro finanziario con pragmatismo e perché la maggioranza in questo Parlamento ha un approccio totalmente utopico a quello che deve essere il prossimo Quadro finanziario pluriennale. Si chiedono molte risorse in più, 200 miliardi di euro in più, per finanziare alcuni programmi e alcune nuove priorità.

Io credo che per trovare un accordo sia necessario tornare al pragmatismo e porci una domanda: se ogni volta che dobbiamo negoziare il bilancio, il Quadro finanziario pluriennale, chiediamo più risorse e gli Stati membri non le vogliono mettere, evidentemente un motivo c'è. Se un investimento è buono, io credo che i finanziatori siano contenti di mettere delle risorse in più. Se non le vogliono mettere, è abbastanza evidente il motivo, e cioè che non considerano i programmi e le linee di spesa efficienti nel portare avanti quegli obiettivi.

Soprattutto a me preoccupa una deriva, è cioè il fatto che la prossima proposta di Quadro finanziario pluriennale è permeata di condizionalità, condizionalità che renderanno questo strumento uno strumento antidemocratico e metteranno le decisioni di spesa e di allocazione dei fondi alla mercé di qualche burocrate di Bruxelles.

Ultima chiosa sulle risorse proprie. Iniziamo a chiamarle con il proprio nome: le risorse proprie sono nuove tasse illegittime che Bruxelles vorrebbe mettere sui cittadini europei. Questo non è l'approccio corretto e su questa strada non troveremo mai un accordo per rendere questo strumento uno strumento al servizio dei cittadini e non uno strumento di ricatto politico.

**Roberts Zīle**, *ECR grupas vārdā*. – Priekšsēdētāja kungs, cienījamā prezidentūra! Godātais komisāra kungs! Rezolūcijas nosaukums ir lielisks. Laiks piepildīt gaidas — pilsoņu gaidas no daudzgadu budžeta. Taču skaidrs, ka šīs gaidas ir pretrunīgas. Dažās valstīs vairums pilsoņu uzskata, ka budžetam jābūt lielākam. Citās valstīs uzskata, ka iemaksām, protams, jābūt mazākām un cik vien iespējams maz. Un arī ir skaidrs, ka pēc Eiropas Komisijas priekšlikuma parādīšanās vairākās dalībvalstīs, kohēzijas valstīs, faktiski bija sarūgtinājums no tās situācijas, ka jau tad breksita kopējais samazinājums ir daudz mazāks izdevumos nekā tas, ko mēs iegūstam mūsu piedāvājumā kohēzijas aploksnē. Respektīvi, breksits bieži vien tiek vainots kā iemesls, kaut gan tas nav īstais iemesls.

Vai arī lauksaimniecībā pilsoņi gaida, ka kompensācijas maksājumi tiešmaksājumu formā faktiski izlīdzinās, jo minerālmēsli vai degviela visās Eiropas Savienības valstīs maksā vienādi. Un arī runā tas, ko *von der Leyen* kundze minēja par Eiropas Komisijas jaunajām iniciatīvām, — ir jāsaprot, vai ir sagaidāmi papildu resursi no jaunās Eiropas Komisijas priekšlikuma vai ir kādas citas reakcijas, vai tas saspiež vēl vairāk esošo projektu izdevumus.

Un visbeidzot, pat tā pozīcija, kas pieauga attīstībai un pētniecībai, — skaidrs, ka velns ir detaļās. Jautājums, kā šī nauda sadalīsies, kur viņa nogulsnēsies, kur būs attīstība un kur būs tieši otrādi — pagrimums dalībvalstīs.

**Δημήτριος Παπαδημούλης**, *εξ ονόματος της ομάδας GUE/NGL*. – Κύριε Πρόεδρε, η πολιτική μου ομάδα θεωρεί ανεπαρκείς τις προτάσεις της Επιτροπής για το νέο πολυετές δημοσιονομικό πλαίσιο και απαράδεκτες τις περικοπές που προτείνει — ακόμη και στην ισχυρή πρόταση της Επιτροπής — το Συμβούλιο. Όπως θεωρούμε και επικίνδυνη την καθυστέρηση και τη δυστοκία στο Συμβούλιο, που επί ενάμιση χρόνο έχει έναν φάκελο και δεν τον προχωρά, ενώ το Κοινοβούλιο έχει επιτελέσει στο ακέραιο το καθήκον του.

Θεωρούμε ανεπαρκή την πρόταση της Επιτροπής και απαράδεκτη τη στάση του Συμβουλίου, όχι μόνο σε ό,τι αφορά το ύψος του προϋπολογισμού, όπου το Κοινοβούλιο ζητεί έναν πιο φιλόδοξο προϋπολογισμό για να αντιμετωπίσουμε την κλιματική κρίση, να ενισχύσουμε την κοινωνική ατζέντα, την απασχόληση και τη στροφή από τη λιτότητα σε μια βιώσιμη ανάπτυξη, αλλά και σε ό,τι αφορά την εσωτερική κατανομή αυτών των κονδυλίων. Γιατί είναι προκλητικό, άδικο και παράλογο να πολλαπλασιάσουμε —όπως ομολόγησε ο κύριος Hahn— 22 φορές τις δαπάνες για την άμυνα και να περικόπτουμε τις δαπάνες για την Κοινή Αγροτική Πολιτική και τη συνοχή και να μην δίνουμε τα χρήματα που απαιτούνται για να υλοποιηθούν οι φιλόδοξοι στόχοι που θέτουμε για την αντιμετώπιση της κλιματικής κρίσης.

**Richard Tice (NI)**. – Mr President, the Treaty on the European Union prevents the allocation of EU budget for defence spending. Yet in this financial framework, some EUR 27 billion have been allocated to defence, including a 22-fold increase for the European Defence Fund. Outside this budget, using other budgets, Member States contribute to the EU Peace Facility and PESCO, as well as the EU Defence Agency. It is quite clear, despite assurances to the contrary, that the EU is looking to create and build an EU army. The United Kingdom wants nothing to do with an EU army, and that is one of the many benefits of leaving the European Union.

Although Member States seem to find this money for these defence contributions, only six Member States meet their NATO obligations to pay 2% of GDP. If wealthy countries like Germany and Italy cannot meet their obligations for NATO, why should they expect NATO to come to their assistance in their hour of need if they won't pay.

(Applause)

**José Manuel Fernandes (PPE).** – Senhor Presidente, o Parlamento está unido, o Parlamento está à espera do Conselho mais uma vez, um Conselho que avança a passinho de caracol. A Senhora Presidente do Conselho não está atenta às posições sequer do Parlamento, mostra mais uma vez o desrespeito que tem para com os cidadãos da União Europeia.

Nós queremos manter a política de coesão, a política agrícola comum, as pescas, as políticas tradicionais e, em simultâneo, aumentar, reforçar a investigação, a inovação, o apoio ao clima, o apoio aos jovens, o Erasmus+, prioridades que o Conselho também diz serem dele.

Fazendo a adição das políticas, temos 1,3% do Rendimento Nacional Bruto. Não é nada de extraordinário. Para além disso, é claro que só daremos o nosso consentimento ao Quadro Financeiro Plurianual se tivermos um acordo amplo sobre os novos recursos próprios, que devem trazer transparência, que devem trazer também simplificação, que devem ajudar a mitigar as transferências nacionais. Novos recursos próprios que também não podem sobrecarregar os cidadãos e, aí, a harmonização fiscal é essencial. São contas da Comissão: um bilião de euros perdidos em fraude e evasão e elisão fiscais.

Podemos ter um orçamento que não direi ambicioso, mas ao nível das expectativas dos cidadãos.

Os cidadãos pedem, o Conselho rejeita quase sempre, a Comissão e este Comissário ajudam, o Parlamento vai forçar.

**Eider Gardiazabal Rubial (S&D).** – Señor presidente, señor comisario, señora ministra. Hoy debatimos esta Resolución sobre el marco financiero, que tiene más importancia si cabe que nunca, a juzgar por los ecos que nos están llegando desde el Consejo.

Este Parlamento ya adoptó hace un año una posición clarísima sobre cómo tenía que ser el próximo marco financiero. Una posición razonada que partía de las necesidades, de las prioridades y de los compromisos políticos y que cuantificaba a cuánto debía ascender el presupuesto europeo —de ahí sale ese 1,3 %—. Adoptamos también una posición muy clara, diciendo que el presupuesto europeo no puede depender casi en exclusiva de las aportaciones de los Estados miembros y que, por lo tanto, hay que establecer un nuevo sistema de financiación basado en el mercado interior, en la fiscalidad justa y en la lucha contra el cambio climático.

Y en esta nueva Resolución queremos poner cuatro temas encima de la mesa. El primero, que este Parlamento confirma lo que ya aprobó en 2018 el Parlamento anterior. El segundo, que la lucha contra la emergencia climática necesita un compromiso mayor que el que tuvimos el año pasado. El tercero, que la presidenta electa Von der Layen y muchos de los comisarios que han estado en las audiencias se han comprometido ante esta Cámara a poner en marcha una serie de iniciativas que todavía no están contempladas en la propuesta de la Comisión y que, por eso, hemos pedido que se revise. Y, por último —y lo hemos dicho todos—, que llevamos un año esperando al Consejo; que no vamos a aceptar cualquier Acuerdo solo por el hecho de que nos estamos quedando sin tiempo. Y sí, por eso hemos pedido medidas transitorias. Ya sabemos que el Tratado las contempla, pero luego en la práctica es mucho más complicado, así que vayamos trabajando.

**Moritz Körner (Renew).** – Herr Präsident, sehr geehrte Damen und Herren! Ich freue mich, meine erste Rede hier im Europäischen Parlament als Berichterstatter der Renew-Fraktion für den mehrjährigen Finanzrahmen halten zu dürfen. Denn mit diesem EU- Finanzrahmen legen wir die Schwerpunkte der Politik der nächsten Jahre fest. Ich finde, dieses EU-Budget muss in die Zukunft und vor allem für die Zukunft ausgerichtet sein und einen echten europäischen Mehrwert bringen. Das schaffen wir vor allem, indem die EU für große Fragen ein großes Budget und für kleine Fragen eben ein kleines Budget zur Verfügung stellt und Prioritäten setzt. Zu den großen europäischen Fragen zählen für mich vor allem die Förderung und der Umgang mit der Digitalisierung, die Unterstützung von Forschung, mehr Erasmus, der Kampf gegen den Klimawandel und vor allem der Kampf gegen den Terrorismus und der Schutz unserer Außengrenzen.

Aber bei den Verhandlungen über den Finanzrahmen wird meine Fraktion vor allem auf eines achten: Es kann nicht sein, dass europäische Gelder gerne genommen, aber europäische Grundwerte und Regeln anschließend mit Füßen getreten werden. Die EU ist eine Wertegemeinschaft und wer die Grundwerte in der EU nicht unterstützt, der sollte in Zukunft eben auch keine geldwerte Unterstützung der EU mehr erhalten. Mit uns, Renew Europe, wird es keinen Rabatt auf Rechtsstaatlichkeit und auf Grundwerte in der EU geben, und dafür werden wir uns bei diesen Haushaltsverhandlungen einsetzen. Wir wollen einen Finanzrahmen, der das tatsächlich mitberücksichtigt.

**David Cormand (Verts/ALE).** – Monsieur le Président, nos choix, dans la décennie qui s'ouvre, seront déterminants pour le climat. L'Europe a une responsabilité historique et doit avoir un budget à la hauteur des enjeux.

Le texte présenté ce matin comporte des avancées. Je salue en particulier la mention explicite du respect des objectifs de Paris pour le budget 2021-2027. Mais il faut aller plus loin. Comment assurer leur traduction concrète si aucun objectif chiffré n'est inscrit dans le prochain CFP? Voici la bataille que nous entendons mener.

C'est une bonne nouvelle que le Parlement n'approuve le CFP que si la partie ressources propres est revue et renforcée. Cette question est cruciale si nous voulons sauver le climat. Dans cet esprit, nous défendrons la création de taxes sur les transactions financières, sur le kérosène et sur le carbone, car le statu quo n'est plus possible. Il faut un nouveau deal avec les États membres. Pour deux euros collectés par ces taxes que les États ne savent pas collecter, un euro ira dans les caisses de l'État et l'euro restant sera versé au budget européen, pour soutenir les investissements verts dont nous avons besoin.

Le budget doit redevenir un outil au service d'une politique qui garantisse les droits humains et le respect de la planète.

**Hélène Laporte (ID).** – Monsieur le Président, mes chers collègues, en lisant la proposition de résolution commune, j'ai rapidement compris que tout était prétexte à augmenter le budget de l'Union européenne.

En France, les partis «En marche» et les Républicains, toujours si prompts à défendre la rationalisation des dépenses et les baisses des impôts sur la scène nationale, soutiennent ici, au Parlement européen, une hausse sans précédent du budget qui entraînera une explosion de la contribution française. 1 324 milliards d'euros, c'est le budget que vous réclamez pour le prochain cadre financier pluriannuel 2021-2027, soit une hausse de 40 % par rapport au précédent CFP. En économie, cela s'appelle l'effet cliquet, c'est-à-dire l'incapacité totale d'une institution bureaucratique comme l'Union européenne, à réduire son budget lorsqu'il atteint un certain seuil, c'est-à-dire ne pas accepter de vouloir revenir en arrière.

La question que l'on peut légitimement se poser est la suivante: qui va bénéficier de cette nouvelle manne financière: nos agriculteurs, nos entrepreneurs, les PME qui, eux, subissent les conséquences de la concurrence déloyale exacerbée par la multiplication des traités de libre-échange? À cette question, nous répondons, certainement pas.

Je cite votre texte: ces moyens supplémentaires sont nécessaires pour faire face aux nouvelles responsabilités, par exemple, dans les domaines de la migration, de l'action extérieure et de la défense. Sur ce texte, bien évidemment, nous n'apporterons aucun commentaire.

En revanche, lorsqu'il s'agit de créer de nouvelles sources de recettes, là vous débordez d'imagination avec, par exemple, la suppression des frais de perception retenus par les États membres sur les droits de douane ou bien l'introduction dans le budget des recettes générées par les amendes et les pénalités ou encore la contribution liée au plastique.

La résolution du groupe Identité et Démocratie, dont je suis membre, se veut au contraire pragmatique avec deux propositions à retenir. La première: limiter le prochain CFP à 1 % du RNB de l'Union européenne 27.... *(le Président retire la parole à l'oratrice)*

**Bogdan Rzońca (ECR).** – Panie Przewodniczący! Przyjęcie wieloletnich ram finansowych to nasze wielkie zadanie. Parlament Europejski ma mandat negocjacyjny zarówno w odniesieniu do wydatków, jak i dochodów w następnych wieloletnich ramach finansowych. Domagamy się więc negocjacji uwzględniających rzeczywiste problemy i potrzeby w celu terminowego osiągnięcia solidnego porozumienia. Naszym zdaniem Komisja powinna przygotować plan awaryjny na wypadek opóźnień w przyjęciu nowych ram finansowych. Plan awaryjny, polegający na wydłużeniu obecnych ram finansowych, pomoże chronić beneficjentów z Unii Europejskiej. Rezolucja ta powinna zostać poparta jak najszybciej, aby przejść do negocjacji. Nawiązując do mającego prawdopodobnie powstać przyszłego koszyka nowych zasobów, chcielibyśmy przypomnieć, że każda nowa inicjatywa musi być zgodna z zasadami określonymi w protokole nr 28 do Traktatu o funkcjonowaniu Unii Europejskiej, taka aby nie miała charakteru regresywnego w stosunku do partnerów i beneficjentów.

**Younous Omarjee (GUE/NGL).** – Monsieur le Président, hier, devant le comité des régions, je disais qu'un petit budget pour l'Europe serait un manque cruel d'ambition politique. Sacrifier la politique agricole commune, sacrifier la politique de cohésion serait un renoncement terrible et ce serait donner une victoire, en définitive, aux europhobes. Est-ce cela que les chefs d'État veulent? Est-ce la leçon qu'ils ont tirée des élections européennes? C'est la question que je leur pose.

Et je dis au Conseil que le Parlement européen n'acceptera pas des coupes dans le budget de la cohésion parce que, plus que jamais, nous avons besoin de plus de cohésion et les coupes dans le budget de la cohésion, ce sera moins de formation pour les jeunes, ce sera moins d'innovation, ce sera moins d'investissements dans les régions, ce sera moins d'emplois, ce sera moins d'aide alimentaire pour les plus démunis et ce sera plus de fracture territoriale.

Alors, au moment où une crise mondiale – semble-t-il – se prépare, le meilleur moyen de protéger les citoyens européens, c'est de doter l'Union européenne d'un vrai budget, d'un budget politique offensif, qui soit en capacité de répondre également au niveau des défis qui se posent à nous, notamment concernant le changement climatique.

**Mislav Kolakušić (NI).** – Poštovana predsjedavajuća, poštovani povjereniče, Višegodišnji finansijski okvir i proračun Europske unije mora biti razvojan i osigurati jednaki prosperitet svim državama članicama. Gospodarski razvijene države ostvaruju veću gospodarsku aktivnost zbog proširenja tržišta, dok su određene manje razvijene države poput Hrvatske na šteti od članstva u Europskoj uniji. Samo u pogledu poljoprivredne gospodarske proizvodnje Republika Hrvatska je u pet godina, od 2013. do 2018., izgubila tri i pol milijarde eura, dok je u tom istom razdoblju, primjerice Rumunjska, ostvarila plus od šesnaest milijardi eura.

Republika Hrvatska je, dakle, od članstva u Europskoj uniji uprihodovala, što se tiče povlačenja sredstava, 1,8 milijardi, a samo je u poljoprivrednom gospodarstvu izgubila 3,5 milijarde. Prema tome, logično je zahtijevati od gospodarski razvijenih država da više doprinose u europski proračun.

**Siegfried Murešan (PPE).** – Mr President, I would like to welcome the Minister and the Commissioner to Parliament. We are debating today the next Multiannual Financial Framework at a very important moment in time, and we are reconfirming the position of Parliament in light of the results of the European elections. We have seen people come out and vote in large numbers, expecting Europe to do more – students, researchers, farmers, people in the cities and in the villages, people who expect more security, and people who expect us to innovate, to research more and better deliver on digital, and to tackle climate change – and it is our duty to listen to them and to deliver it to them. People expect more, and we should do more.

My first message to you, Minister, is that we cannot do more with much less. In the previous MFF, the philosophy was that if we need to do something new, if we need to allocate money for something, we take it away from something else. EFSI was created, but the Connecting Europe Facility and Horizon 2020 suffered, and examples can continue. This philosophy has to end. New priorities have to be financed with new resources. Otherwise, we need to tell students that there are fewer Erasmus scholarships, and farmers that the subsidies are smaller. We should not do that.

Secondly, Minister, my question to you is this: when and what are you ready to negotiate with Parliament? What we have seen so far from the Finnish Presidency is too little, and it is too weak. We need political commitment at the highest level now. Parliament will, with a large majority, adopt its position now. We need to sit down, and it's your responsibility to come and talk to Parliament. Otherwise – and I have to say it very clearly – the Council will be blamed by the beneficiaries of Europe for us not being able to finance them on 1 January 2021.

**Elisabetta Gualmini (S&D).** – Signor Presidente, onorevoli colleghi, una premessa generale e due punti molto veloci. La premessa è che la risoluzione è molto buona. È condivisibile l'idea di riaffermare con forza la posizione del Parlamento e l'ambizione di avere un bilancio coraggioso per il prossimo settennato. Molto bene il paragrafo 5, che introduce la revisione delle risorse proprie come un obiettivo strategico.

I due punti. È importantissimo collegare in qualsiasi bilancio, e lei Commissario Hahn lo ha detto positivamente nell'audizione, il versante delle entrate con il versante delle uscite. La politica di bilancio non è un mero esercizio burocratico, non è una prova di matematica, è il modo in cui noi allochiamo le risorse per rispondere ai problemi dei cittadini, è il cuore di funzionamento delle nostre democrazie, senza le quali le democrazie non stanno in piedi. Ecco perché, se gli obiettivi sono ambiziosi – transizione ecologica, occupazione giovanile, ricerca, fondi strutturali –, dobbiamo collegare delle entrate che siano genuinamente europee. Questo è il primo punto.

Secondo punto: serve un cambiamento culturale, un salto in avanti. Trasformare le entrate europee non vuol dire chiedere più tasse ai cittadini, ma anzi ridurre i contributi netti delle popolazioni e creare una europeizzazione delle imposte, una visione integrata delle entrate e finalmente non sovranista.

**Nils Torvalds (Renew).** – Herr talman! Kommissionsledamot! Bästa minister Tuppurainen! På en minut är det inte många goda råd man kan ge det finska ordförandeskapet, men det finns kanske fyra.

För det första måste vi klara av det hål Storbritannien lämnar efter sig. Det kommer att kräva lite solidaritet och lite mer pengar av medlemsstaterna.

För det andra behöver vi förutsättningar för innovationer och teknik. Det betyder att vi måste hålla fast vid alla de löften som vi hittills har gett om pengar för forskning.

Den tredje frågan handlar om någonting som andra också har talat om här, det vill säga att det är nödvändigt med investeringar. Det hål som Europa har när det gäller investeringar är oroväckande stort, och om vi inte klarar av dessa investeringar, så klarar vi inte av resten heller av det som vi har föresatt oss.

Den fjärde saken handlar om rättvisa lösningar. Vi har stora skillnader mellan medlemsländerna när det gäller ekonomiska och vetenskapliga tekniska resurser. Om vi inte klarar av att överbrygga dem, klarar vi inte heller våra utmaningar.

**Joachim Kuhs (ID).** – Herr Präsident! Ich möchte dem Herrn Kollegen Andresen danken. Ich habe etwas dazugelernt. Ich habe gelernt, dass der Rat – wenn er keine Erhöhungen möchte – populistisch ist. Ich bin gerne ein Populist, wenn das die Definition von Populismus ist, denn wir wollen auch nicht mehr Geld ausgeben. Aber was ist Populismus?

In diesem Fall wurden hier immer wieder Zahlen genannt. Es wird immer davon erzählt: Die Kommission möchte 1,14 % des Nationaleinkommens, das Parlament möchte 1,3 % des Nationaleinkommens haben. Das hört sich doch sehr harmlos an, das sind kleine Zahlen. Aber wenn wir das mal umrechnen, dann sind das eben 11 % und das sind 30 %, und das sollten Sie den Bürgern sagen, den Bürgern, deren Erwartungen Sie erfüllen wollen. Es geht hier um die Bürger, und wenn wir ständig von Erhöhungen reden und der Bürger möchte das hundertprozentig nicht, dann glaube ich, dass wir denen einfach Sand in die Augen streuen, und das wollen wir nicht.

**Henrik Overgaard Nielsen (NI).** – *(inaudible)* acknowledges that the UK is leaving the EU, and that the UK's net contribution of EUR 75 to 100 billion is not included for the next seven years. Due to the repatriation of democracy to the UK, we will not be party to the scrapping of all the rebates, including the UK one, the increase in tax-raising powers of the EU, and the increased spending on a European army. This Parliament wants to increase the proposed budget by almost 20%, while the take-home pay for workers has hardly gone up in the last 10 years.

*(Applause in some quarters)*

That is a disgrace and entirely ignores, with breathtaking arrogance, the realities of your constituents' lives and struggles. May I suggest that this Parliament starts repaying the trust put in it by European taxpayers and takes a leading role in saving the EU taxpayer some money? Let's start with getting rid of the 130 chauffeur-driven limos and having allowances paid on production of receipts, reflecting the normal practice expected in any company across Europe.

*(Applause)*

**Monika Hohlmeier (PPE).** – Herr Präsident, liebe Ratspräsidentschaft, lieber Herr Kommissar, liebe Kolleginnen und Kollegen! In Bezug auf den mehrjährigen Finanzrahmen: Wenn ich hier so die verschiedenen Erwartungen höre, dann glaube ich, dass die Position des Parlaments eine ziemlich vernünftige ist. Vernünftig deshalb, weil neue Aufgaben auf uns zukommen werden, der Bereich der Verteidigung auf uns zukommen wird. Wenn man den Herrn eben gehört hat, dann merkt man, dass sie Streit zwischen europäischen Staaten wünschen und nicht Freundschaft und Frieden. Wir wollen Freundschaft und Frieden. Deshalb gehört die Verteidigungspolitik auch gemeinschaftlich gestaltet, deshalb muss uns aber auch ein Anliegen sein: Forschung, Wissenschaft, Innovation, Klimawandel, Digitalisierung.

Auch wenn ich sehr stolz bin auf Bayern – der Himmel reicht halt nun einmal über Bayern hinaus, und das bedeutet in dieser Erkenntnis, dass dieser Himmel nicht an Bayern haltmacht, dass wir einen europaweiten Himmel haben, der sogar darüber hinausgeht. Das heißt, wir müssen europäisch forschen. Das Forschungsprogramm *Horizon Europe* ist eines der besten. Der Rat hat sich inhaltlich in dieser Frage schon verständigen können. Wir haben auch schon bessere Fortschritte in inhaltlichen Verständigungen innerhalb des Rates als vor dem letzten MFR.

Beim Geld allerdings hapert es. Ich bin keine derjenigen, die dauernd sagt, es muss mehr sein. Aber wenn es neue Aufgaben und mehr Aufgaben gibt, dann wird nichts anderes übrig bleiben, als das ein Stück weit auch mit finanzieller Ausstattung zu versehen. Ich glaube, insofern ist die Position des Parlaments sehr konsequent.

### VORSITZ: NICOLA BEER

*Vizepräsidentin*

**Pierre Larroutou (S&D).** – Chers amis, pour gagner la bataille du climat, la Commission européenne nous dit qu'il manque, chaque année, entre 175 et 290 milliards d'euros – ce sont les chiffres de la Commission. Comment gagner la bataille du climat si le budget européen n'augmente pas? Et comment mettre en place un bouclier «emploi» qui va protéger les salariés des plus petites entreprises de la prochaine crise financière, comment le faire si nous n'avons pas plus de moyens? Il faut absolument augmenter les ressources propres de l'Europe.

Quand il est arrivé au pouvoir, en 1933, Roosevelt a eu le courage de tripler le budget fédéral américain. En quatre ans seulement, Roosevelt triple le budget en mettant en place une fiscalité efficace. Pourquoi ne pas faire pareil en Europe?

Depuis 30 ans, le taux moyen de l'impôt sur les bénéficiaires a été divisé par deux: il était à 45 %, il est tombé aujourd'hui à 20 % alors que les dividendes explosent. Pourquoi ne pas reprendre l'idée de Jacques Delors, l'idée de Mario Monti, d'un vrai budget européen financé par des ressources propres, en particulier un impôt fédéral sur les bénéficiaires?

Si nous voulons gagner la bataille du climat et de l'emploi, il faut effectivement que le Parlement adopte cette résolution et se donne les moyens d'avoir un budget beaucoup plus ambitieux.

**Martin Hojsík (Renew).** – Vážená pani predsedajúca, vážený pán komisár, vážená pani ministerka, milé kolegynie a kolegovia. Tento rozpočet Európy bude dôležitý tak, ako hádam žiaden pred ním. Výzvy, ktorým Európa, ale aj celá planéta čelí, sú existenčné. Klimatická kríza, ničenie biodiverzity od Amazonu po slovenské lesy, tsunami plastového odpadu, ale aj koktail toxických látok všade okolo nás. Toto ohrozenie je však aj obrovskou príležitosťou. A tento rozpočet tomu musí zodpovedať. Nie je to len o tom, aké percento prostriedkov vynaložíme na ochranu klímy alebo biodiverzity. To musí byť základ a musí to byť dostatočne ambiciózne. Rovnako dôležitá je koherencia politik, aby ľavá ruka vedela, čo robí pravá. Nemôžeme tvrdiť, že chránime klímu a prírodu, keď súčasne dotujeme jej ničenie. A to sa ešte stále deje. Európa potrebuje obnoviteľnú energiu, priemysel, ktorý nezamoruje prostredie, potrebuje poľnohospodárstvo chrániace farmárov, chrániace prírodu aj zvieratá. Tento rozpočet nie je o nás. Tento rozpočet je o tom, či naše deti budú mať budúcnosť. A nesmieme ich sklamať.

**Herbert Dorfmann (PPE).** – Frau Präsidentin, liebe Kolleginnen und Kollegen! Mir ist klar, dass ein Haushalt nach vorne schauen muss und dass ein Haushalt auch neue Prioritäten vorsehen muss. Dabei sollten wir aber die sogenannten „alten“ Politiken der Union nicht ganz vergessen. Sie haben sich nämlich bewährt, und es wäre ein Fehler, gerade diese totzusparen, und dazu gehört vor allem auch die Landwirtschaftspolitik.

Wir haben heute einen Vorschlag auf dem Tisch. Dieser Vorschlag sieht deutliche Einsparungen im Bereich Landwirtschaft vor und selbst diesen Vorschlag sind manche Mitgliedstaaten eben nicht bereit zu akzeptieren. Was meiner Meinung nach noch gravierender ist: dass der Vorschlag massive Kürzungen vor allem in der ländlichen Entwicklung vorsieht. Der ländliche Entwicklungsplan ist heute für viele Regionen das wichtigste Instrument zur Entwicklung des ländlichen Raums. Wenn man diesen Fonds nun um mehr als ein Viertel kürzt, dann werden die reicheren Staaten – übrigens jene, die das nicht bezahlen wollen, was die Kommission bisher vorgeschlagen hat – das Loch auffüllen durch eigene Mittel, und die anderen, die ärmeren, werden auf der Strecke bleiben, und die Union wird noch weiter auseinanderdriften. Das kann eben nicht Sinn einer vernünftigen Politik sein.

**Olivier Chastel (Renew).** – Madame la Présidente, chers collègues, en votant aujourd'hui en faveur de cette résolution, nous voulons lancer un signal politique fort aux citoyens européens exprimant que leurs préoccupations ont été entendues. C'est aussi un avertissement à l'intention du Conseil traduisant notre volonté d'être partie prenante à part entière dans ce débat sur les futures négociations du cadre financier pluriannuel.

Chers collègues, financer nos priorités à la veille d'un Brexit qui s'annonce difficile requiert non seulement de moderniser, de simplifier les ressources propres, mais aussi d'en créer de nouvelles. Ce n'est qu'avec un budget ambitieux que nous pourrions faire face aux nouvelles priorités en matière de climat, d'emploi des jeunes, de formation, de recherche, mais aussi de renforcement de la zone euro. Nous avons, par ailleurs, besoin d'une politique agricole commune ambitieuse pour protéger nos agriculteurs et leurs revenus afin qu'ils soient à même de produire une alimentation saine, durable, abordable et de qualité, respectueuse de l'environnement.

**Othmar Karas (PPE).** – Frau Präsidentin, Herr Kommissar, meine Damen und Herren! Zu der heutigen Debatte passt ein Zitat von Oscar Wilde, der einmal gesagt hat: „Ein Zyniker ist jemand, der von allem den Preis und von nichts den Wert kennt.“ Die populistischen feigen Zyniker sind für mich jene, die verzögern, Investitionen als Verschwendung denunzieren, blockieren und den Wert von Forschung und Bildung, Klimazielen und Investitionen, flächendeckender Landwirtschaft und sozialem Zusammenhalt, Außengrenzschutz und Sicherheit, Verteidigungs-, Außenpolitik, Energiepolitik nicht erkennen wollen.

Die heutige Abstimmung und die Debatte der nächsten Wochen ist eine zwischen Nationalismus, Populismus, Feigheit und Ignoranz und auf der anderen Seite Verantwortung, Zukunft, Vernunft und Aufrichtigkeit. Jeder von uns weiß, dass die 1 %-Grenze unsere gemeinsame Zukunft, für die jeder von uns Verantwortung trägt, verraten wird und dass unseren Bürgerinnen und Bürgern damit der Mehrwert europäischer Entscheidungen und Investitionen verschwiegen wird. Herr Kommissar, das Parlament steht hoffentlich heute auf Ihrer Seite und stärkt Ihnen für die Verhandlungen den Rücken. Wir müssen uns die Zukunft zum Freund machen.

#### *Spontane Wortmeldungen*

**Cláudia Monteiro de Aguiar (PPE).** – Senhora Presidente, todos sabemos que o turismo é uma competência partilhada desde a entrada em vigor do Tratado de Lisboa.

Em novembro de 2018, este plenário, na resolução sobre a posição do Parlamento com vista ou ao próximo quadro financeiro, foi clara e aprovou a criação de uma linha de financiamento para o turismo sustentável e, para isso, pediu à Comissão que avançasse de imediato com uma proposta legislativa, uma proposta concreta, como prova de respeito e reconhecimento deste sector.

Lamento que até hoje não tenhamos nada por parte nem da Comissão, nem dos Estados-Membros.

Relembro que só em 2018 as chegadas de turistas internacionais cresceram 6% em todo o mundo. O turismo é, sem dúvida, uma indústria muito importante não só para o meu país, Portugal, mas para toda a Europa. Esta indústria permitiu, contribuiu para que vários países saíssem mais rapidamente da crise económica e financeira.

Por isso, um apelo final à Comissão e aos Estados-Membros: é tempo de satisfazer as expectativas dos cidadãos. Façamos do turismo sustentável uma prioridade.

**Tudor Ciuhodaru (S&D).** – Doamna președintă, Tudor Ciuhodaru mă numesc, sunt din Iași, România. Eu cred că sunt două (*cuvinte care nu se aud*) puse în discuție, mai ales dacă vrem să răspundem cu adevărat așteptărilor cetățenilor. În primul rând este partea cantitativă a acestui buget și da, într-adevăr, trebuie făcut în așa fel încât să acopere cât mai multe lucruri necesare pentru toți cetățenii europeni, a nu-i mai pune pe cei care sunt mai slabi în acest moment să plătească pentru ceilalți.

Dar în al doilea rând este problema și cum distribuim acest buget. Pe mine m-au trimis românii în Parlamentul European pentru că își doresc spitale regionale, autostrăzi și sănătate, sau subvenții egale la agricultură. Pentru că puteți vorbi despre foarte foarte multe lucruri, despre dezvoltare, despre o agricultură ecologică, despre ceea ce înseamnă investiții în cercetare, dar dacă nu răspundem nevoilor fundamentale ale fiecărui cetățean, lucrurile acestea nu pot să se realizeze. Îmi doresc să intrați în negocieri cu Parlamentul European, pentru că nu uitați, noi suntem cei pe care i-au trimis cetățenii Europei în Parlament, și sincer, voi vota un buget care să răspundă și celor de acasă și ceea ce își doresc toți cetățenii europeni. Vă mulțumesc.



**Valter Flego (Renew).** – Poštovana predsjedavajuća, poštovani povjereniče, reći ću da je još veći izazov od Brexita naći novi uspješan, moderan ekonomski model koji će Europa i sve zemlje članice koristiti u sljedećim godinama. Naime, europski proračun nikako ne smije biti strogi, bankarski, već razvojni, vizionarski proračun s ciljem da Europa ima najveći rast BDP-a na svijetu, a građani najveći rast standarda. Da bismo to učinili trebamo jasno definirati naše strateške prioritete poput obrazovanja, digitalizacije, zelenih politika ili sigurnosti. I u svemu tome nikako nemojte podcijeniti kohezijsku politiku i njen značaj.

I nikako ne mogu prihvatiti ideju o rastu udjela s 15 na 30 posto zemalja članica po odobrenom projektu. Zato očekujem zaustavljanje jedne takve ideje i zato vjerujem u Europu, vjerujem u kohezijsku politiku, solidarnost država članica.

**Ruža Tomašić (ECR).** – Poštovana predsjedavajuća, prijedlog Komisije o Višegodišnjem financijskom okviru u manjim i slabije razvijenim članicama izazvao je, s pravom, veliko nezadovoljstvo. Novi prioriteti šalju lošu poruku – da se odustaje od smanjenja razlika u razvijenosti među članicama, a zajednička sredstva preusmjerava u ciljeve važne velikim i utjecajnim članicama.

Kako drukčije protumačiti smanjenje potrošnje u području kohezije s istovremenim jačanjem uloge kohezijske politike u dugoročnoj integraciji migranata?

Dolazim iz Hrvatske, države koja prvenstveno ima problema s iseljavanjem mladog i radno sposobnog stanovništva. Nama su potrebna veća kohezijska sredstva za dostizanje europskog standarda. Važno nam je i sačuvati život u ruralnom prostoru i podići konkurentnost poljoprivrede, što uz manja izdvajanja za zajedničku poljoprivrednu politiku nećemo moći.

Ovaj prijedlog cementira postojeće stanje i dijeli Uniju na prvorazredne i drugorazredne članice. Ta je podjela meni apsolutno neprihvatljiva, a trebala bi biti i svima nama u ovome domu.

**João Ferreira (GUE/NGL).** – Esta é uma integração assimétrica na distribuição dos benefícios e dos prejuízos do mercado único, das políticas comuns, da moeda única. Uns e outros caem sempre para os mesmos lados.

O orçamento da União Europeia deveria ter por função combater a divergência, contrariar os efeitos assimétricos da integração, promover a convergência real. Digo deveria, mas não o faz e não o faz porque a coesão nunca teve os meios necessários para tal.

Apesar disso, em vez de reforçarem a coesão, querem agora desferir-lhe um forte golpe, o mesmo é dizer desferir um forte golpe nos países como Portugal, para os quais a coesão tem um maior significado. Tudo isto para beneficiarem ainda mais os beneficiários líquidos da integração: as grandes potências europeias que se lançam agora numa perigosa deriva securitária e militarista que querem financiar com o orçamento da União Europeia à custa da coesão.

Ora este é um caminho que deve ser rejeitado. A resolução que estamos a discutir, infelizmente, não o faz com a firmeza que era necessária; pelo contrário, legitima-o.

**Jörgen Warborn (PPE).** – Fru talman! Jag har alltid förespråkat en stram budgetpolitik. För mig har detta gällt som kommunalråd, det har gällt som riksdagsledamot och det gäller nu också som Europaparlamentariker.

För mitt parti var det ett tydligt löfte till väljarna att inte låta EU-budgeten svälla mer än nödvändigt, vilket skulle innebära en kraftig höjning av den svenska EU-avgiften. Det förslag som nu ligger på bordet riskerar att innebära en 40-procentig ökning av den svenska avgiften och går betydligt längre än vad jag kan acceptera.

Europa har stora utmaningar framför sig, inte minst när det gäller konkurrenskraften. Då vore det fel att tynga våra medborgare och våra företagare med ännu högre skatter för att finansiera ökade EU-avgifter. Jag tycker i stället att budgeten måste moderniseras och effektiviseras. Vi borde satsa mer på forskning, infrastruktur och effektiviseringar som bygger tillväxt. Då kan EU verkligen göra skillnader i människors liv.

**Pedro Marques (S&D).** – Madam President, Commissioner Hahn, Madam Minister, these are troubling times. Europe is about to go through one of its most challenging moments due to an irresponsible government in the UK that is willing to risk everything just for electoral reasons. This has been the case with the Conservative Party in the UK for a number of years now.

The European Council therefore has to decide how we face this situation. The economic risks for the EU are significant ones. The downturn is coming, and we need to provide a strong budget now so that we can provide confidence to investors and promote growth in cohesion and the EU. Instead, we face several members of the Council that want to cut the proposed budget even further. As the President of the Commission has said, it is simply not enough. We have finally just now had a Member of this Parliament – coming from the EPP – defending the same position as these Members of the European Council. It is clear now from where these kind of positions come. These are not acceptable. We need more Europe. We need to face this situation with more Europe, not with less budget as proposed by several members of the Council.

*(Ende der spontanen Wortmeldungen)*

**Johannes Hahn, Member of the Commission.** – Madam President, Minister, dear Members, I have listened with great attention to your interventions today. They all demonstrate that the huge majority of the European Parliament is fully committed to making the next EU long-term budget modern, ambitious and future-proof. You rightly underline in your resolution that now is the time to decide. We cannot afford to lose time and risk any damaging delay in the start of the next generation of programmes. We owe it to our citizens to provide predictability on the way the Union will respond to modern challenges, in particular in areas such as digital, climate action, border management and defence.

I would like to thank the Finnish Presidency for its paper for Coreper yesterday that is meant to prepare the debate of the October European Council on the next Multiannual Financial Framework. While we welcome the fact that the paper has been produced, we are – to be very clear from the start – very disappointed about the main elements of the content.

There is an important gap to bridge at this point of the discussions between the institutions. We have to acknowledge this. But we call on the Council Presidency and the leaders to take full account of the positions expressed by the European Parliament. The Commission is fully committed to work closely with all institutions and to facilitate dialogue.

I look forward to working with the European Parliament and its negotiating team and to bringing the MFF negotiations to a timely and successful conclusion.

**Tytti Tuppurainen, President-in-Office of the Council.** – Madam President, honourable Members, dear Commissioner, thank you for your valuable views, your pertinent questions and your clear observations.

Many of our common key challenges have been mentioned here today in this debate. I'd like just to list innovations, climate change, investment, sustainable agriculture, cohesion and last, but not least, the rule of law and respect for our common values. It is self-evident that these are our common interests – common interests of our institutions, common interests of our European citizens. They are our common challenges, and they need to be reflected in our common budget. The next MFF needs to respond to these common challenges.

The MFF is not just an accounting exercise. It is an implementation tool and an enabler for our political decisions. But at the same time, we need to be aware of the contributions which need to be made by the Member States. These contributions need to be fair, feasible and acceptable for all of the Member States.

Let me reiterate our Finnish Presidency's firm commitment to regularly meeting the European Parliament's negotiation team ahead of General Affairs Council meetings. In addition, the trilogues have already resumed on several sectoral files, and we are very much interested in hearing the Parliament's position on these.

I would like to point out that, here today in this very plenary hall, we are debating the MFF together; we are exchanging views on the next financial framework. So we will not adopt the new MFF without our common efforts to ensure that our budget is fit for the new period. Thank you very much for this debate, and our work continues.

**Die Präsidentin.** – Gemäß Artikel 132 Absatz 2 der Geschäftsordnung wurden drei Entschließungsanträge eingereicht.

Die Aussprache ist geschlossen.

Die Abstimmung findet heute statt.

Ganz herzlichen Dank, Frau Ministerin, und ein gutes Händchen jetzt grade auch bei den Beratungen im nächsten Rat!

*Schriftliche Erklärungen (Artikel 171)*

**Carmen Avram (S&D), in writing.** – The new Multiannual Financial Framework 2021-2027 should give an answer to the big challenges ahead of us in Europe. It puts facts and numbers on the vision and priorities the EU wants to deliver and achieve. When people see the numbers, they realise what is deliverable and achievable, and what's not. I welcome the fact that the Commission is proposing significant increases in funding for research, development and innovation. These are indeed positive investments for the future. But I deeply regret the drastic cuts to the common agriculture policy (-15%) and cohesion policy (-10%). For the most recent members of the EU that haven't yet reached the pace of the others, funding to the agriculture sector is and will be an essential element in my final assessment of the MFF. If we want to have an ambitious, green, sustainable PAC and if we want our farmers to survive further competition coming with the Mercosur deal, for example, we need to support this core backbone of our societies. If we fail to do so, we might face the big risk of Euroscepticism arising in rural areas of Europe, which might feel abandoned by the institutions they look up to today.

**Gunnar Beck (ID), schriftlich.** – Wenn Großbritannien die EU verlässt, werden die anderen Bäume umso zahlreicher Früchte tragen, denn der EU-Haushalt soll steigen, obwohl künftig gut 10 Mrd. EUR fehlen. Ein Großteil der Mehrkosten entfällt auf Deutschland, das bereits jetzt über 25 Mrd. Euro und damit über ein Fünftel zum EU-Haushalt beiträgt. Wenn Großbritannien ausscheidet, wird sich der deutsche Beitrag noch einmal um mindestens ein Viertel erhöhen. Für Deutschland sind die Budgetbeiträge nur Peanuts, nicht, weil Deutschland so reich, sondern weil die Gesamtkosten der EU viel höher sind. Seit 2010 zahlen deutsche Steuerzahler und Sparer nämlich nicht nur 25 Mrd. Euro, sondern jährlich zwischen 135 und 174 Mrd. Euro für die Eurorettung. Der Löwenanteil dieser Kosten entfällt dabei auf ca. 36 Mrd. Euro an verlorenen Zinseinnahmen für die Sparer, ca. 90 Mrd. Euro an Targetkrediten und bis zu 400 Mrd. Euro Ausfallrisiko für die seit 2015 von der EZB angehäuften Anleihen von über 2 Billionen Euro. Insgesamt subventioniert Deutschland damit EU und Euro mit 160 bis 200 Mrd. Euro pro Jahr. Die Kosten des Euro und des EU-Haushalts für die anderen EU-Mitgliedstaaten sind mindestens noch einmal genauso hoch. Insgesamt kosten EU und Euro die EU-Bürger also mindestens rund 400 Mrd. Euro pro Jahr.

**Tamás Deutsch (PPE), írásban.** – A 2021-2027 közötti pénzügyi keret (MFF) javaslata jelenlegi formájában elfogadhatatlan. Az Európai Bizottság tervezete kettős mércét alkalmaz, ráadásul a regionális fejlesztési és agrárforrásokat is jelentősen csökkentené. Magyarország számára elfogadhatatlan, hogy régióink 24%-os forrásvesztést szenvedjenek el. A Közös Agrárpolitikában a Magyarország esetében javasolt 16,4%-os vágás a közvetlen kifizetések terén és a 26,6%-os forrásvesztés a vidékfejlesztési támogatásoknál teljesen elfogadhatatlan számunkra. Az EU költségvetéséhez kapcsolódó kondicionalitások tekintetében nem fogadjuk el semmilyen új elem bevezetését; sem a jogállamisággal, sem a migrációval, sem a szociális pillérrel kapcsolatban. A Bizottság által bevezetni kívánt új jogállamisági mechanizmus megkerüli a Szerződéses rendelkezéseket és duplikációt hoz létre a már meglévő eszközökkel.

Elutasítjuk a közösségi források szubjektív, politikai büntetésként alkalmazható ún. jogállamisági feltételekhez kötését, a gazdaságilag, munkahelyteremtés szempontjából jól teljesítő régiók politikai vádak alapján történő büntetését. Az uniós fejlesztési pénzek nem könyöradományok. A magyar régiók objektív feltételek alapján jogosultak ezekre a forrásokra. Egy uniós intézmény számára sem megengedhető, hogy a politikai nyomásgyakorlás eszközeként tekintsen a fejlesztési forrásokra. Sajnos az EU finn soros elnökségének előterjesztése sem tartalmaz elfogadható javulást ezeken a területeken Magyarország számára, sőt a költségvetés főösszegét tekintve még kevésbé ambiciózus, mint az Európai Bizottság. Az pedig kifejezetten felháborító, hogy a jelentősen visszavágott regionális és agrárforrásokot még tovább csökkentené.

**Marian-Jean Marinescu (PPE)**, *în scris*. – Susțin Rezoluția privind cadrul financiar multianual 2021-2027, prin care Parlamentul European solicită încă o dată Consiliului să deblocheze negocierile pe acest dosar. PE și-a stabilit deja poziția de mai bine de un an de zile și așteaptă intrarea în dialog cu Consiliul. Pentru prima dată, la propunerea mea, Parlamentul European a introdus cifre cu alocările bugetare pentru fiecare domeniu și politică europeană. Prioritățile PE pentru următorii 7 ani sunt bine stabilite și unele dintre ele vin în ajutorul României. De exemplu, PE respinge propunerea Comisiei de reducere a fondurilor alocate politicii de coeziune și politicii agricole comune și va intra în dialogul cu Consiliul cu mandat de a menține actuala finanțare a acestor domenii. În plus, solicită Comisiei să se asigure că noul buget multianual corespunde noilor obiective de protecție a mediului, prin alocări financiare care să asigure o tranziție justă spre o economie cu zero emisii de carbon, astfel încât să nu existe zone sau regiuni defavorizate.

Alegerile din mai 2019 au demonstrat atașamentul cetățenilor față de valorile și instituțiile europene. PE este dator să semnaleze Consiliului că blocarea negocierilor pe CFM 2021-2027 implică riscul ca bugetul să nu fie votat la timp și ca beneficiarii programelor UE – adică cetățenii europeni – să nu își poată continua proiectele.

**Iuliu Winkler (PPE)**, *în scris*. – 200 de milioane de cetățeni europeni au votat în alegerile pentru PE din 2019, formulându-și clar așteptările pe care le au de la UE în dezbaterile publice din campania electorală. Este datoria tuturor instituțiilor europene, dar în primul rând este responsabilitatea noastră, a PE, să răspundem acestor așteptări legate de mai multă siguranță, eficiență, sustenabilitate, locuri de muncă și un viitor prosper pentru Europa. Această responsabilitate presupune și mesajul clar pe care azi îl dăm Consiliului European: CFM post-2021 trebuie dimensionat în așa fel încât să asigure derularea tuturor proiectelor și politicilor europene, vechi sau noi. PE nu își va da acordul pentru proiectul CFM post-2021 decât dacă acesta va asigura finanțarea corespunzătoare a politicilor de coeziune și dezvoltare regională, și a politicii agricole comune, inclusiv pilonul 2, dezvoltarea rurală. Pentru toate acestea, avem nevoie de noi resurse bugetare. Solicităm Comisiei propuneri legislative urgente bazate pe documentele adoptate în PE. De asemenea, constatăm cu îngrijorare întârzierea în care se află elaborarea CFM. Solicităm așadar alcătuirea urgentă a prevederilor tranzitorii pentru anul 2021 în așa fel încât niciun fermier, nicio companie europeană și niciun beneficiar de fonduri europene să nu întâmpine dificultăți în tranziția către noul CFM post-2021.

### 3. Polityka zatrudnienia i polityka społeczna w strefie euro (debată)

**Die Präsidentin**. – Als nächster Punkt der Tagesordnung folgt die Aussprache über den Bericht von Yana Toom im Namen des Ausschusses für Beschäftigung und soziale Angelegenheiten über die Beschäftigungs- und Sozialpolitik des Euro-Währungsgebiets (2019/2111(INI)) (A9-0016/2019).

Bevor ich die Aussprache eröffne, möchte ich Sie davon in Kenntnis setzen, dass wir nach wie vor ein neues System erproben, mit dem Mitglieder spontane Wortmeldungen und blaue Karten elektronisch anmelden können.

Sie haben per E-Mail Informationen über die Nutzung dieses Systems erhalten, und die Anleitung befindet sich auf Ihrem Tisch. Zur Einreichung eines Antrags auf eine Wortmeldung können die Mitglieder die Funktionstasten auf ihren elektronischen Abstimmungsanlagen nutzen.

Bitte nehmen Sie zur Kenntnis, dass parallel zur Nutzung des elektronischen Systems auch eine „Standard-Anmeldung“ (durch Hochheben eines weißen Blatts Papier oder durch die persönliche Anmeldung zu Beginn der Aussprache bei den Kollegen vom Plenum für spontane Wortmeldungen und durch Hochheben einer blauen Karte für das Verfahren der blauen Karte) möglich ist.

Ich möchte Sie deshalb höflich daran erinnern, Ihre Abstimmungskarte mitzubringen, damit Sie dieses System nutzen können.

Wenn Sie eine spontane Wortmeldung anmelden möchten, können Sie das ab sofort tun. Sie brauchen nicht bis zum Ende der Aussprache zu warten.

**Yana Toom**, *Rapporteur*. – Madam President, Commissioner, I'm happy to introduce the report on employment and social policies in the euro area, which was widely supported in the Committee on Employment and Social Affairs.

Coming from Estonia, I can be proud that, during our Presidency of the Council of the European Union, our Prime Minister, Jüri Ratas, had the privilege of co-signing, with Jean-Claude Juncker, the European Pillar of Social Rights. That was on 17 November 2017. This ambitious document, supported by the European Parliament, sets out important principles that we will have to implement now in the Member States.

I have to thank Commissioner Thyssen for her hard work on improving social policies across the Union. We all know that this is not easy: every time, when it comes to social standards across the Union, somebody says 'No, no no', and refers to the principle of subsidiarity.

At the same time, we all know that the situation is far from ideal. Since 2012, in the context of the European semester, the Commission has been issuing country-specific recommendations, not only on economics but also with regard to social policies in the euro area. This is an extremely important process but unfortunately – and this is reflected in the report – the rate of implementation of these recommendations is unacceptably low. Whereas at least some progress, or what was termed progress, was reported concerning 72% of country-specific recommendations in 2012, the figure decreased to 39%, the lowest rate ever, in 2018.

So we are asking the Commission to take measures and find a way to convince Member States that the social health of the European Union is not less important than defence, the single market, or whatever other common policy of the Union. We are also asking them to consider extending these recommendations to non-euro states.

I was happy to hear the new head of the Commission, Ursula von der Leyen, during her speech here before she was approved by Parliament, promising that, during the first 100 days of her term of office, she will come up with new legislative mechanisms to ensure for Europeans a fair minimum wage. For those who are sceptical, I have to underline that this proposal will take into account national traditions and legislation, which means that nobody is going to violate the principle of subsidiarity.

The thing is that we have to fight so-called 'working poverty', and help people who live at the risk of poverty and social exclusion, otherwise we will end up in Europe with brain drain and depopulated areas, on the one hand, and more protests and Polish plumbers, on the other.

During their hearings, several Commissioners-designate referred to a bill of social rights as a universal tool to solve the problems of depopulated regions and rural areas, but we also have people with disabilities, we have a gender pay gap, we have minorities facing discrimination and people at risk of poverty, and we have to help them. This is exactly what Europeans want, not only from national governments but also from us, the elected representatives in the European Union.

In the report there is also a call for the Commission to create a new unemployment insurance scheme, which was warmly welcomed by trade unions. A funny thing that happened yesterday evening was that I received a letter from the European Confederation of Trade Unions in which they asked me to support my own report. When I answered them that this was kind of funny, they told me 'No, no, you have to support this and that amendments.'

I really believe we're standing for the right thing here, and, colleagues, I rely on your support.

**Marianne Thyssen**, *Member of the Commission*. – Madam President, Europe's economy is in its seventh year of uninterrupted growth and today more people than ever have a job. Poverty is declining at a steady pace on the back of good labour market outcomes.

Europe is also stronger when it comes to our economic governance setting, and in particular the European Semester. We have managed to put social and economic policies on an equal footing, most recently by embedding the European Pillar of Social Rights. We are sharing good practices and have developed solid analysis and common understanding in close dialogue with the Member States and the involvement of social partners.

However, divergences persist across and within countries. While labour shortages increase in some countries, in others unemployment remains high. In-work poverty is still a major challenge, with almost one out of ten workers at risk of poverty. Atypical and new forms of work may have an impact on the segmentation of the labour market. In this perspective, a key priority must be to make labour markets more inclusive and to ensure all jobs created are of good quality. Furthermore, women remain at a disadvantage on the labour market, despite achieving better educational outcomes than men. Closing this gap would liberate a huge untapped potential with a positive impact for the economy and society. Ensuring effective work-life balance policies and access to childcare is crucial in this sense.

In addition, technological change and digitisation are deeply changing European societies and economies. It is crystal clear that we need to step up investment in education, training and skills in order to properly accompany our people through these changing times, in order to harness productivity-enhancing technologies and also in order to ensure a just transition to a climate-neutral economy.

Indeed, bringing people to the centre of our policy-making is now more important than ever, because while poverty is finally declining across the board, at the same time we witness an increasing number of Europeans expressing a sense of vulnerability. This is triggered by income inequality, labour market precariousness, but also the uneven impact of globalisation and technological change among countries, regions, sectors and people. While investing in skills remains crucial to foster the inclusion of all people in tomorrow's societies, social protection systems should be adapted to properly empower and protect our people. In this context, I want to thank the rapporteur and the Committee on Employment and Social Affairs for this very balanced report. It presents well both the positive trends and the challenges ahead, and I broadly share its goals and conclusions.

Tackling these challenges, ensuring that we have a social market economy that works well for businesses and citizens, also in changing times, and fostering convergence is indeed the motivation behind the European Pillar of Social Rights. Less than two years since its proclamation, the implementation of the Pillar has already started. Its principles have been embedded in all the stages of the last two semester exercises, and almost half of the country-specific recommendations – 44% of which today address Pillar priorities.

Important legislative measures have been proposed and approved, implementing several principles of the Pillar, and EU funding has been re-gearred to support implementation of the Pillar through an enhanced link between the semester and the programming of the European funds, notably the European Social Fund. Even more importantly, the Pillar has contributed to anchor job quality, investment in skills, social fairness and just transitions at the centre of the European agenda.

Our Pillar of Social Rights is one of the main legacies of the outgoing Commission, but the work is far from finished, as we all know. Supported by the commitment of the European Parliament, the Commission, Member States and social partners, the Pillar is here to stay to act as a compass of our future action in the employment and social fields. Moreover, starting from the new cycle, the semester will be refocussed to integrate the United Nations' sustainable development goals in line with the semester's legal basis.

Madam President, ladies and gentlemen, further efforts are needed to make our societies more inclusive and to prepare them for future changes. Stronger and more inclusive economies and societies would also strengthen the resilience of the euro area and pave the way for the deepening of the economic and monetary union.

As you all very well know, implementing the Pillar principles on the ground, as well as pursuing the sustainable development goals, is a joint endeavour which will be pursued both at the national and European level. I am sure that the Commission will remain at the forefront to promote upward convergence of social and living conditions throughout Europe and support people, businesses and regions in these changing times.

**Maria Walsh**, *on behalf of the PPE Group*. – Madam President, I would like to begin by thanking rapporteur Yana Toom, of Renew, and my other colleagues for their hard work and cooperation on this report, especially my colleagues in the PPE Group. It is vitally important that we all have well-performing social and economic policies, that these policies are not contradictory and that we move in the same direction.

This report has continued to draw attention to the need for action on some persistent problems that we face in the EU. We need to take stronger action to reduce youth unemployment; tackle poverty, especially child poverty; increase labour market participation; achieve equality for each and every one of our people in society; boost competitiveness; and also think about the future and how we are going to adapt our skill sets and social systems to the future of our work, especially in rural and urban areas. I believe these are the issues and themes on which we need to take action over the coming years.

Today, 10 October, is World Mental Health Day, and something I'm happy to see in this report is a call for us to take concrete measures to address mental health. It is regrettable that the EU focus on mental health has, in fact, lessened in recent years, despite its significant individual and economic cost. I think this should be a priority in employment, health and social policy. We are not looking after our citizens' health if we are not looking after our mental health.

Parliament, the Commission and the Member States all have the capacity to take action to improve mental health policy in the EU, and this report calls for specific measures including mental health promotion and prevention measures. During the recent hearings of our Commissioners-designate for both health and jobs, they too pledged to work hard, and I look forward to working with them, as does this Parliament, in the coming years.

Finally, I'd like to thank again our rapporteur, Yana Toom, for her hard work.

**Agnes Jongerius**, *namens de S&D-Fractie*. – Voorzitter, Europa moet meer zijn dan een markt met een munt. Europa moet er zijn voor mensen die aan hun toekomst willen werken. We weten dat ons werk, niet alleen door nieuwe technologieën en economische ontwikkelingen, maar ook door de transitie die nodig is vanwege de klimaatverandering, in een razend tempo zal veranderen. Of je nu uit Spalbeek, Split of Stockholm komt: alle Europeanen krijgen hiermee te maken. We moeten ons dus goed voorbereiden, zodat iedereen in de maatschappij mee kan doen en bij kan dragen. Het gebalanceerde verslag van collega Toom waar we vandaag over stemmen draagt bij aan dit proces.

We roepen de lidstaten en de Europese Commissie daarom op om platformwerkers betere sociale bescherming te geven, om snel een einde te maken aan het grote onrecht van de loonkloof tussen mannen en vrouwen die hetzelfde werk doen, om ouderen een beter uitzicht te bieden op nieuw werk, om jongeren perspectief te bieden op betaalbare huizen en om gehandicapten te faciliteren en ervoor te zorgen dat zij kunnen floreren op de arbeidsmarkt. We willen investeren in nieuwe banen en opleidingen, zodat mensen hun toekomst met vertrouwen tegemoet kunnen zien.

De nieuwe Commissievoorzitter heeft ons idee dat we mensen moeten bijstaan wanneer het economisch flink tegenzit, gelukkig al omarmd. De lidstaten moeten we daarin echter nog meekrijgen. Als we samenwerken kunnen we langdurige werkloosheid tegengaan en kwetsbare regio's steunen. Dan kunnen mensen er zeker van zijn dat Europa ook voor hen werkt.

**Sylvie Brunet**, *au nom du groupe Renew*. – Madame la Présidente, Madame la Commissaire, chers collègues, je tiens tout d'abord à remercier M<sup>me</sup> Tom pour cet excellent rapport.

Je me réjouis que le Parlement européen s'exprime majoritairement en faveur de ce rapport sur l'emploi et les politiques sociales de la zone euro, rapport qui fait suite aux recommandations spécifiques par pays publiées par la Commission européenne, en juin dernier, dans le cadre du Semestre européen. Les orientations générales de ce rapport reflètent l'intérêt marqué de la nouvelle assemblée pour avancer vers davantage d'Europe sociale en mettant l'accent sur les investissements. Je tiens à souligner deux points.

Tout d'abord, la demande formulée par la Commission européenne de présenter un instrument juridique afin que chaque travailleur au sein de l'Union européenne puisse bénéficier d'un salaire minimum équitable, en respectant les traditions nationales, est un point majeur pour moi. Il a été inscrit dans les orientations politiques d'Ursula von der Leyen comme une priorité pour la législature à venir en termes de convergence sociale. C'est aussi une des réponses, me semble-t-il, aux problématiques de pénurie de main-d'œuvre que rencontrent la plupart des États membres.

Mon second point concerne les travailleurs des plateformes et leurs conditions de travail. Nous savons que le travail réalisé dans l'Union européenne par l'intermédiaire de plateformes en ligne – et c'est une bonne chose – a augmenté de plus de 25 % ces deux dernières années et concerne maintenant près de 5 millions d'Européens. Alors que plusieurs États membres mettent en place individuellement des mesures nationales en la matière, il est temps que l'Union européenne donne le cap. Nous devons développer une action coordonnée en vue de veiller à la protection sociale de ces travailleurs et de garantir l'ensemble de leurs droits sociaux et du travail.

**Kira Marie Peter-Hansen**, *on behalf of the Verts/ALE Group*. – Madam President, first of all, I would like to thank the rapporteur for her great work and cooperation on this file. We, as Greens, are happy with the report as it stands, especially because it covers several social issues which we believe should be addressed in the coming mandate at a European level. We are very pleased to see that the report supports giving the Union's social goals a much higher priority, both when it comes to the coming legislative framework from the Commission and also when it comes to financial resources within the next budget.

Another important aspect to address from a Green's perspective is the importance of combating gender inequalities in the labour market. We are therefore pleased that we, with this report, make it clear to the Commission that we want a proposal for a directive on pay transparency in order to once and for all close down the unacceptable gender employment and pay gap that we see across the Union. The same goes for the pension gap.

Finally, we are very pleased that the report pushes for a solution to tackle long-term unemployment, brings focus to the inclusion of people with disabilities in the labour market, and – last but not least – calls for initiatives at European level to ensure platform workers' rights and social protections, regardless of their employment status. These are all areas where we'll keep a close eye on the Commission's legislative actions in the months and years to come.

**France Jamet**, *au nom du groupe ID*. – Mes chers collègues, Madame la Rapporteuse, non, l'Union européenne ne va pas mieux et comparaison, Madame la Rapporteuse, n'est pas raison. L'Union européenne est composée d'économies parfaitement disparates, avec des situations sociales, économiques et réglementaires n'ayant rien à voir entre elles.

Ce rapport, par ailleurs, est tout empreint d'idéologie et de partialité qui transparaissent à travers l'inclusion de la Turquie dans vos données et ce souci constant de l'intégration d'émigrants sur le marché du travail, au détriment de nos compatriotes les plus modestes.

Nous voterons donc, évidemment, contre ce rapport et nous soutiendrons la résolution alternative de notre collègue Guido Reil parce qu'il est bien plus nécessaire de redonner leur souveraineté aux États en matière de politique économique et sociale, et parce qu'il l'est tout autant de leur permettre d'instituer une priorité aux ressortissants de l'Union européenne en matière d'emploi.

**Anna Zalewska**, *w imieniu grupy ECR*. – Pani Przewodnicząca! Na początku oczywiście dziękuję za twórczą, intensywną pracę wszystkim, którzy tworzyli ten dokument. Przypomnę, że dotyczy przede wszystkim strefy euro, jest właściwą, ale powtarzaną systematycznie diagnozą rynku i polityki społecznej. Mowa jest o ubóstwie, o bezrobociu, o trudnej sytuacji młodzieży, o edukacji niedostosowanej do rynku pracy, o starzejącym się społeczeństwie i o tym, że społeczeństwa nie nadążają za rewolucją 4.0. Nie ma pomysłów i rozwiązań. Mam nadzieję, że razem z Komisją będziemy na ten temat dyskutować.

Chcę zwrócić uwagę, że bardzo wiele zapisów tego sprawozdania wychodzi poza zakres strefy euro, jest dużą ingerencją w prawodawstwo państw członkowskich. Mam nadzieję, że kiedy Komisja będzie opracowywać kolejne dokumenty, będziemy mogli na poważnie rozmawiać nie tylko o diagnozie, ale o tym, jak problemy rozwiązywać.

**Sandra Pereira**, *em nome do Grupo GUE/NGL*. – Senhora Presidente, as políticas sociais e de emprego que têm sido implementadas nos países da área do euro têm sido subjugadas a um tratado que foi concebido para criminalizar qualquer política de esquerda ou progressista. As políticas sociais e de emprego no meu país, desde a nossa adesão ao euro, têm significado regressão social, destruição dos rendimentos, redução de direitos da classe trabalhadora, emigração massiva, caridade e assistencialismo. Por isso, não compactuamos com visões socializantes do Semestre Europeu e da governação económica. As recomendações específicas por país também acentuam esse caminho.

Como se diz no meu país, não se pode ter sol na eira e chuva no nabal, isto é, não podemos querer acabar com a pobreza e a exclusão social, promover o aumento geral dos salários, garantir uma rede pública de creches de acesso universal e gratuito, acabar com o flagelo do emprego juvenil e de longa duração ou garantir uma vida digna aos nossos idosos e, ao mesmo tempo, defender as regras draconianas do euro.

Para nós, não restam dúvidas. A contínua e sustentada elevação dos direitos laborais e sociais, do nível de vida de quem menos tem e menos pode, só será conseguida quando se romper com os constrangimentos do euro com o Tratado Orçamental e com o Pacto de Estabilidade e Crescimento.

*(A oradora recusa uma pergunta «cartão azul» de Tomáš Zdechovský)*

**Chiara Gemma (NI)**. – Signora Presidente, onorevoli colleghi, l'adozione di politiche di sostegno al reddito da parte di molti paesi, come l'Italia, sta già incidendo con concretezza a favore delle fasce più deboli della popolazione, ma i livelli di povertà e l'acuirsi della disuguaglianza economica permangono inaccettabili.



Le politiche di *austerità* hanno colpito soprattutto chi è già in difficoltà e tra questi mi piace rivolgere un'attenzione particolare alle persone con disabilità. Il Comitato delle Nazioni Unite per i diritti delle persone con disabilità ha preso atto con profonda preoccupazione della ricaduta negativa che i vincoli di austerità hanno sugli standard di vita dignitosi, sottolineando l'urgenza di interrompere tali misure restrittive per garantire loro una maggiore qualità di vita. Il mio impegno sarà costante e andrà nella direzione di un piano di protezione sociale, che garantisca pienamente un livello di vita decorosa e soprattutto rispetti il loro diritto alla differenza e non all'uguaglianza.

**Dennis Radtke (PPE).** – Frau Präsidentin, liebe Kolleginnen und Kollegen! Zunächst ganz herzlichen Dank an die Berichterstatter für die hier vorgelegte Arbeit, die direkt zu Beginn der Legislaturperiode deutlich macht, dass wir auch in den nächsten fünf Jahren auf dem Weg mutig weitergehen wollen, den Jean-Claude Juncker vor fünf Jahren angefangen hat zu ebnet. Ich will an dieser Stelle keinen Hehl daraus machen, dass zum Instrument einer Arbeitslosenrückversicherung in meiner Fraktion eine differenzierte Position vorliegt und dass in meiner eigenen – der deutschen – Delegation eine kritische Haltung dazu vorliegt. Ich will auch keinen Hehl daraus machen, dass wir in meiner Fraktion weitergehenden, darüber noch hinausgehenden Instrumenten sehr kritisch gegenüberstehen. Gleichwohl werden wir diesem Bericht heute unsere Zustimmung erteilen, weil der Kampf gegen die Jugendarbeitslosigkeit, um faire Arbeitsbedingungen, gegen die Armut in der Europäischen Union etwas ist, was natürlich zutiefst in der DNA der EVP verwurzelt ist.

Wir werden uns in den nächsten fünf Jahren hier über Details streiten – müssen wir auch –, aber über eines werden wir uns nicht streiten: über die Richtung. Die ist für unsere Fraktion klar, und die ist auch für mich klar.

**Elisabetta Gualmini (S&D).** – Signora Presidente, onorevoli colleghi, la relazione è assolutamente positiva, buona e efficace. Mette in luce le caratteristiche ancora preoccupanti del mercato del lavoro europeo, ma nello stesso tempo conferma con forza l'obiettivo del 75 % come tasso di occupazione in media.

Non si capisce come mai si mettano in discussione misure innovative fondamentali, come lo schema integrativo di battaglia alla disoccupazione per molti cittadini europei, che tra l'altro Ursula von der Leyen ha già inserito nei suoi primi cento giorni. Addirittura sento mettere in discussione la richiesta di uno strumento finanziario per gli shock esterni e per le crisi aziendali.

Invece abbiamo bisogno di più Europa, di un'Europa del lavoro, di un'Europa sociale. Abbiamo bisogno che si torni a quella strategia di Amsterdam, la strategia europea per l'occupazione del 1997, perché l'Europa non può essere solo economica, ma deve essere un'Europa del lavoro e sociale.

**Katrin Langensiepen (Verts/ALE).** – Frau Präsidentin, sehr geehrte Kolleginnen und Kollegen! Es gibt Berichte, die kommen zur richtigen Zeit, identifizieren die richtigen Probleme und fordern zum engagierten Handeln auf. Der Bericht der Berichterstatterin Toom ist so einer. *Hartstikke bedankt daarvoor, mevrouw Toom.* Ich möchte hier den Aspekt der Benachteiligung von Menschen mit Behinderungen hervorheben, nicht alleine aus persönlicher Betroffenheit, sondern vielmehr, weil es sich hier um einen strukturellen Missstand im Bereich von Beschäftigung handelt.

Der Bericht konstatiert und bedauert ausdrücklich die Benachteiligung von Menschen mit Behinderungen. Überdurchschnittliche Arbeitslosigkeit und hohe Langzeitarbeitslosigkeit sprechen da eine deutliche Sprache. Zugang, Inklusion und Beteiligung sind Menschenrechte. Die Europäische Union hat die entsprechende UN-Konvention 2010 ratifiziert. Gleichstellung und Nichtdiskriminierung müssen daher Priorität haben. Der Bericht hebt dies hervor. Wirtschaftspolitik und Sozialpolitik in der EU müssen Hand in Hand gehen, das Budget für Soziales muss daher hierfür ausreichend sein.

**Guido Reil (ID).** – Frau Präsidentin, liebe Kolleginnen und Kollegen! Europa ist bunt und vielfältig und Europa ist national und regional sehr unterschiedlich, und das muss so bleiben, das ist unsere Stärke. Zentralismus und Planwirtschaft à la Sowjetunion haben noch nie zu Wohlstand und Freiheit geführt, und deswegen lehnen wir die europäische Arbeitslosenversicherung ab. Die Arbeitsmärkte sind in Europa regional völlig unterschiedlich und wir brauchen regionale Lösungen. Wir lehnen auch den europäischen Mindestlohn ab. Wir stehen zum deutschen Mindestlohn, aber ein europäischer Mindestlohn würde zu massiven Wettbewerbsverzerrungen führen. Wir lehnen auch die europäische Garantie zur Kinderarmut ab. Selbstverständlich müssen wir die Kinderarmut bekämpfen, das ist ja klar. Aber es gibt bereits drei Fonds und die sind verpufft, die haben nichts gebracht. Ich selbst war als Kind von Armut betroffen – in meiner Geburtsstadt Gelsenkirchen leben heute die meisten armen Kinder in Deutschland, und da muss was getan werden.

Aber wir können nicht immer versuchen, diese Probleme mit Geld zu lösen, wir schaffen hier völlig falsche Anreize. Die Armen kriegen Kinder, das ist das Problem. Wir müssen diese Menschen in Arbeit kriegen. So bekämpft man Armut. Sozial ist nicht der, der das Geld anderer Menschen verteilt. Sozial ist der, der viel arbeitet.

**Elżbieta Rafalska (ECR).** – Pani Przewodnicząca! Pani komisarz! Polityczne strategie społeczne wymagają podjęcia wielu terminowych wyzwań; musimy stawić czoła problemom starzenia się społeczeństwa, cyfryzacji i zmian, jakie wywołują one na rynku pracy. Europa starzeje się od dekad, udział osób w wieku 65+ rośnie we wszystkich państwach członkowskich. Jest to oczywiście efekt dłuższego trwania życia, i dobrze, ale też niższej dzietności, i to jest źle. Europę czeka starość demograficzna z takimi problemami jak feminizacja starzenia, singularyzacja starzenia – w związku z tym musimy opracować strategię na rzecz jakości i dostępności systemów opieki długoterminowej. Palącą potrzebą jest podejmowanie większych inwestycji, ale to jest też rynek pracownika, dlatego musimy przyglądać się, jaki jest standard pracy.

Na koniec, Pani komisarz, bardzo serdecznie dziękuję za dotychczasową współpracę.

**Daniela Rondinelli (NI).** – Signora Presidente, onorevoli colleghi, ritengo che non si possa sostenere questa relazione che dice tutto e il contrario di tutto. Alla giusta richiesta di investimenti per la politica sociale, per l'occupazione e per la formazione si contrappone – leggo il paragrafo 2 – «che la Commissione faccia la necessaria pressione sugli Stati membri per implementare le raccomandazioni paese», che altro non sono che quelle politiche di austerità che portano tagli allo stato sociale, ai servizi essenziali, all'inclusione degli ultimi e degli svantaggiati. Questa è una grande contraddizione politica che non è più accettabile nell'ambito delle politiche europee. Non basta parlare di salario minimo e di disoccupazione giovanile, se poi non si consentono investimenti per la crescita, il benessere e la qualità di vita delle persone.

Abbiamo presentato in commissione emendamenti, molti dei quali accolti, ma purtroppo non sono stati sufficienti a modificare quell'impronta liberista e rigorista che i cittadini europei, con il loro voto, ci hanno chiesto di cancellare a favore dello sviluppo, della solidarietà e delle opportunità per tutti. Pertanto, il Movimento 5 Stelle dichiara il suo voto di astensione a questa relazione che continua ad ignorare i bisogni e le aspettative dei cittadini europei.

**Sara Skyttedal (PPE).** – Fru talman! När den sociala pelaren antogs var vi många som kände en viss oro för vilka lagförslag som skulle följa. I Sverige var våra socialdemokrater glasklara med att det aldrig skulle leda till att våra skattebetalare skulle betala för bidrag till andra länder. De menade att vår oro var helt obefogad.

Socialdemokraterna har dock i den här valrörelsen, med Timmermans i spetsen, gjort det glasklart att EU ska styra över socialförsäkringarna och att vi bör inrätta ett europeiskt system för arbetslöshetsförsäkring. PPE och kristdemokraterna har hela tiden motsatt sig ett sådant förslag.

Nu sitter vi här och kan läsa förslaget, svart på vitt. Tack och lov är det ännu ingen lagstiftning på plats, men ambitionen från socialdemokratiska gruppen är tydlig: Våra skattebetalare ska kunna tvingas betala för bristande bidragssystem i andra EU-länder.

Man kan ställa sig frågan om det kommer att finnas kvar några incitament för länderna att fullt ut finansiera sina egna socialförsäkringssystem och genomföra nödvändiga reformer, nu när EU erbjuder sig att stå för notan.

**Alex Agius Saliba (S&D).** –Sinjura President, dan ir-rapport jitkellem dwar kundizzjoni ekonomika aktar favorevoli fl-Unjoni Ewropea fejn ir-rata tal-impjeggi komplet tizdied. Pero', l-inugwaljanzi fil-gid u d-differenza fid-dhul xorta wahda baqghu jzidu d-distakk bejn dawk illi huma sinjuri u dawk illi huma fqar.

L-in work poverty, standard of living diċenti, impjeggi u pagi ta' kwalità huma l-akbar sfidi li għandna quddiemna llum il-gurnata. Illum mhuwiex biżżejjed illi wiehed ikollu xogħol. Irridu naraw illi permezz tal-impjeggi li noffru liċ-ċittadini tagħna – huma u l-familji tagħhom ikunu jistgħu jgħixu hajja diċenti.

Ghandna bżonn politika tas-suq tax-xoghol illi tkun immirata sabiex ittejjeb il-kundizzjonijiet tax-xoghol u toffri impjegji ġusti u ta' kwalità liċ-ċittadini Ewropej. Għall-ewwel darba, permezz ta' dan ir-rapport u emenda li mexxejt 'il quddiem, il-Parlament Ewropew ser ikun qed jaddotta l-prinċipju tar-Right to Digitally Disconnect. Dan huwa l-ewwel pass, iżda pass importanti hafna sabiex noffru bilanċ aħjar bejn il-hajja privata u x-xoghol lill-haddiema tagħna.

Fil-bidu, meta kont bdejt nitkellem dwar dan ir-right to disconnect, dan kien kważi suġġett tabù, iżda wara l-vot tal-lum, dan il-prinċipju ser isir rakkomandazzjoni uffiċjali tal-Parlament Ewropew.

Qabel nagħlaq, nixtieq nitlob is-support ta' kull wiehed u waħda minnkom ukoll fuq il-European Unemployment Benefit Insurance Scheme u fuq l-istrument il-gdid illi mistenni jindirizza l-problema tal-qgħad fit-tul fl-Unjoni Ewropea.

**Lucia Āuriš Nicholsonová (ECR).** – Madam President, we should stop talking about the employment rates that have been achieved and we should look at the alarming studies telling us that we are not ready for the challenges of an ageing population and the climate and digital transformations.

The cost of these transformations will come and we cannot deal with it only by increasing funds. According to the OECD, around 17% of jobs in the EU are at risk of being automated. The jobs threat from automation ranges from less than 10% in Finland to a shocking 33% in Slovakia, my country. One-third of the EU labour force has almost no digital skills. Transitions will affect the most vulnerable people in our societies.

What needs to be done?

Innovation, productivity growth and social rights are closely connected. Social Europe will flourish only if our economic policies create a perfect environment for it. We have the same goal, so I think we should stop basing our decisions on ideologies or political slogans, and we should start with data-based policymaking.

**Tomáš Zdechovský (PPE).** – Paní předsedající, nejdříve mi dovoluťe poděkovat Yaně Toomové za tuto zprávu. Já si myslím, že celkově, když se na ni podíváme, tak je, řekl bych, z mého pohledu velmi dobrá.

Nicméně mi dovoluťe jednu věc, na kterou bych tady navázal, a je to bod číslo 1. Je to bod, kde vlastně Yana Toom tvrdí, že chce, aby byl představen nový finanční nástroj pro řešení dlouhodobé nezaměstnanosti. Ale my tu přeci máme revidovaný ESF, který dobře funguje. My tu máme Evropský globalizační fond. Já se ptám: Kde vezmeme peníze na tento nový nástroj, který chceme tady založit? Tyto dva nástroje, které dobře fungují a osvědčily se, tedy oslabíme a strčíme peníze do nástroje třetího? Místo toho, abychom Evropu zjednodušovali, se snažíme vytvořit Evropu složitější a vytvořit něco, co si bude vzájemně mezi sebou konkurovat. Doufám, že tato debata odpověděla na tuto otázku, a to je i důvod, proč tento bod já osobně nemůžu podpořit, i když podpořím celou zprávu.

#### *Spontane Wortmeldungen*

**Радан Кънев (PPE).** – Г-жо Председател, искам да кажа пред колегите, че аз подкрепям този доклад въпреки безспорното наличие на спорни и противоречиви моменти в него. Аз смятам, че подобни противоречиви предложения ще бъдат първа обект на сериозна работа в тази камара и съответно на политически сблъсък между различните визии, различните групи, често и различните държави с техните национални интереси.

Подкрепям доклада преди всичко, защото той слага основния акцент там, където трябва – върху държавите, върху регионите, върху обществените групи, но и върху индивидите, които са най-уязвими в днешната ситуация на пазара на труда. Слага акцента, без да скрива рисковете, пред които европейската икономика и европейският трудов пазар са изправени.

Като представител на България – страната, за съжаление, с най-ниски доходи в Европейския съюз и с някои от най-уязвимите обществени групи в Европейския съюз – приветствам този доклад и се надявам неговите препоръки да влязат в сила.

**Mick Wallace (GUE/NGL).** – Madam President, the Commission says that social policies are on an equal footing with other priorities in the EU. I find this hard to believe. In the budget, Commissioner, defence spend is being increased from EUR 590 million to EUR 13 billion. That's 22 times more. Why isn't this money going towards fighting poverty and inequality across Europe? It's a subsidy to the arms industry.

People say that the Europeans need more security. You know what? They do. They need the security of a home. They need the security of a liveable wage. They need the security of affordable, good healthcare. That's the security they need.

And, if you are worried about the security threat from terrorism, well maybe you might put some control on arms exports from Europe. Maybe you'd get the European countries to stop bombing other countries and creating problems and destabilising other regions. That's the way forward with peace, not filling the pockets of the arms industry.

**Julie Ward (S&D).** – Madam President, over the next five years the European project must be built upon a progressive platform that unites both economic and social issues. Without such a platform, there will continue to be discrimination and disparity in the workforce and in pay. We must lower income inequalities, ensure wage growth for the bottom and middle percentiles, design training and education fit-for-purpose for the fourth industrial revolution, as well as tackling the gender pay and pension gaps.

The European Pillar of Social Rights is our project here in the Socialists and Democrats group, and this legislature has a historic opportunity to set the first-ever EU minimum wage. It is a basic human right to be paid enough in order to live. For sustainable economic growth, we must invest in people. The two are intertwined, and failure to acknowledge that will prevent us from tackling the great injustices that we currently face.

**Ruža Tomašić (ECR).** – Poštovana predsjedavajuća, hrvatska vlada i guverner imaju vrlo ambiciozne planove za priključenje naše države europodručju. Ja ne dijelim njihov entuzijizam i smatram da nije ni izbliza došlo vrijeme za prihvaćanje zajedničke valute.

Hrvatska je daleko od europskog standarda, a pred nama je, sasvim izvjesno, nova recesija čije razmjere ne možemo predvidjeti. Pojedine europske regije još uvijek se suočavaju s dugotrajnom nezaposlenošću, ali i depopulacijom, koja primjerice muči i Hrvatsku.

Slažem se s preporukom o preusmjeravanju oporezivanja s rada na druge čimbenike koji manje štete održivom rastu. Revitalizacija pasivnih krajeva ne može biti bez ulaganja u infrastrukturu i stimulativne porezne politike te, stoga, trošenje novca poreznih obveznika na snažnije socijalne mjere neće dati puno rezultata. Velika većina ljudi želi dostojanstveno živjeti od svoga rada, a ne životariti na socijalu.

**Clare Daly (GUE/NGL).** – Madam President, we are talking about the employment and social policies in the euro area, and I'd like to deal with the latest European Semester report from the Commission in relation to Ireland, where, although it's possible to present employment in Ireland in an optimistic light, the reality is, as the report reveals, massive amounts of transient work, zero hour contracts, casual work, bogus self-employment, a rise in precarious employment – no coverage for these people in terms of social security, which has an enormous impact on the quality of life in citizens. So the report, while recognising serious social ills, I have to say is undermined by the fact of the lack of political imagination in how to address it, because the world has changed; the types of industry and work have changed, and there's a total disconnect between this and the EU structures and institutions in terms of how to deal with it. And even when a Member State tries to deal with it, they are gagged and bound by the fiscal restraints that are built in to our Treaties. So these problems aren't going to be solved by technical fixes or incremental adjusters, but by a radical transformation and a break with the god of neoliberalism.

**Λευτέρης Νικολάου-Αλαβάνος (NI).** – Κυρία Πρόεδρε, η πανάκεια που προτείνεται σήμερα είναι η αυστηρότερη εφαρμογή των συστάσεων της Επιτροπής κατά χώρα. Όμως, βάσει οδηγιών της Ευρωπαϊκής Ένωσης, τα όρια συνταξιοδότησης αυξάνονται περαιτέρω, η κοινωνική ασφάλιση ιδιωτικοποιείται —ως αποτέλεσμα του ΠΕΠ, μειώνονται οι συντάξεις, οι συλλογικές διαπραγματεύσεις διαλύονται, μπαίνουν σοβαρά εμπόδια στη δράση των συνδικάτων, περιορίζεται το δικαίωμα στην απεργία και απελευθερώνονται οι απολύσεις. Ο ευρωπαϊκός πυλώνας δικαιωμάτων και η λογική του ελάχιστου εγγυημένου εισοδήματος έχουν ως αποτέλεσμα τη συμπίεση του συνόλου των δικαιωμάτων προς τα κάτω, ιδιαίτερα για νέους και για γυναίκες. Ο μέσος μισθός υποχωρεί· αυτό δείχνουν τα στοιχεία. Στην Ευρωπαϊκή Ένωση ζουν περισσότεροι από 100 εκατομμύρια φτωχοί, 20 εκατομμύρια άνεργοι και 5 εκατομμύρια άστεγοι, ενώ ταυτόχρονα το 1/3 των θέσεων εργασίας που δημιουργούνται είναι ελαστικής απασχόλησης και δεν καλύπτουν τις βασικές ανάγκες. Αυτά είναι τα αποτελέσματα των αντεργατικών κατευθύνσεων της Ευρω-

παίκης Ένωσης, εξειδικευμένα από τις κυβερνήσεις σε κάθε χώρα, με στόχο να στηριχθεί η κερδοφορία των ομίλων καθώς στο βάθος διακρίνεται νέα καπιταλιστική κρίση. Οι εργαζόμενοι στην Ευρωπαϊκή Ένωση πρέπει συλλογικά και οργανωμένα να απαντήσουν μέσα από τα ταξικά τους συνδικάτα, βάζοντας στην ημερήσια διάταξη την πάλη για τα σύγχρονα δικαιώματά τους για μόνιμη σταθερή δουλειά, συλλογικές συμβάσεις που εξασφαλίζουν αξιοπρεπείς μισθούς και όρια και όρους εργασίας, καθώς και δωρεάν περίθαλψη και ασφάλιση με ευθύνη του κράτους.

*(Ende der spontanen Wortmeldungen.)*

**Marianne Thyssen**, *Member of the Commission*. – Madam President, dear rapporteur, dear shadow rapporteurs, Members of Parliament, colleagues, and if I may say, dear friends, I would like to thank you for this constructive and rich debate. I've taken good note of your positions, your concerns, your comments, and I will make sure to pass them on also to my successors. This debate reaffirmed our shared commitment to social Europe and to what is the guiding principle of the social market economy: that economic growth and social progress are two sides of the same coin and that they are reinforcing each other. This principle must steer all our work going forward.

Dear Members of Parliament, this debate is special for me for one more reason: as you know, it is also my last debate here as a Commissioner. This gives me the opportunity to thank you: to thank you for the good cooperation. Of course I expected nothing less, having myself served as a Member of the European Parliament for more than 20 years.

Over the past five years we worked together constructively in a friendly way, putting all this – the interests of Europe's people – first. Over the last weeks and months, I have been receiving many compliments that the EU has become more social- and people-oriented. I always reply that these compliments should be extended beyond me, and I share these compliments with you, because good results are the fruit of honest and good interinstitutional dialogue and shared commitments.

Results are ultimately why we got involved in public life: to deliver what counts for people and to do our part for a dynamic, inclusive and fair society and economy. And following almost 30 years in public life, I can say that I am proud of what we have achieved and very hopeful of what comes next.

But don't get me wrong. Important challenges lie ahead; we were just discussing them. And just transitions don't happen automatically. But the guidelines of the new President-elect of the new European Commission, Ms von der Leyen, show that our successors will build further on what has been achieved on the basis of our shared values.

So I wish you very constructive years, and be sure that you can always count on me as a close ally on your work for a social Europe.

*(Applause)*

**Yana Toom**, *Rapporteur*. – Madam President, I think that we are on the same item. I would like to thank everybody for this very fruitful debate. It was a very warm feeling to hear shadow rapporteurs thanking me for an excellent job. I have to do the same and thank shadow rapporteurs for their excellent cooperation. I agree with Ms Thyssen that it is a remarkable social shift, even in this House, and it's really good to know.

I also want to say to those who are not going to support the report, claiming that it is too ambitious or not ambitious enough: just keep in mind – and maybe reconsider your decision – that, whatever we do in this House, it is always a compromise and there is no possibility to have a compromise which makes all of us one hundred percent happy.

When I was working on the report, like, I believe, every Member of Parliament we have kind of key words. My key words were: labour market, unemployment, women in the labour market, children, fight ageism in the labour market, ethnic groups, disabilities, digitalisation and automation, online platform, workers' rights, climate change and transition to the green economy, reduction of poverty, health care system, mental health. Yesterday somebody told me that my report is like a Christmas tree. For everything good against everything bad, this is not serious and this is not doable. I have to agree that this is a Christmas tree, but this is a Christmas tree of problems we are facing. So please make an effort and solve them.

**Die Präsidentin**. – Die Aussprache ist geschlossen.

Die Abstimmung findet heute statt.

*Schriftliche Erklärungen (Artikel 171)*

**Milan Brglez (S&D)**, *pisno*. – Poročilo o zaposlovanju in socialni politiki v euroobmočju, ki je dobilo široko politično podporo na Odboru za zaposlovanje in socialne zadeve, je priložnost, da se EU odmakne od osredotočanja na stabilnost in (predvsem) rast, na kateri je utemeljeno euroobmočje (npr. skozi Pakt o stabilnosti in rasti).

Če mislimo resno z gospodarstvom za ljudi, potem socialne politike ne morejo biti zgolj privesek ali prva pomoč za stransko škodo, ki jo povzroča sodelovanje v globalni konkurenčni tekmi za nenehno (gospodarsko) rast.

Žal tudi nastop kandidata za podpredsednika komisije in komisarja, pristojnega za področje gospodarstva za ljudi, kaže, da je bodoča Evropska komisija na deklaratorni ravni prepoznala nujno prilagajanja gospodarstva na klimatske spremembe, noče ali ne zna pa prepoznati temeljne nezdružljivosti koncepta stalne rasti s trajnostnim razvojem in socialno unijo, ki naj bi skupaj z ekonomsko unijo enakopravno tvorila evropsko gospodarstvo za ljudi.

Evropsko gospodarstvo za ljudi mora izhajati iz ljudi in ne iz ohranjanja obstoječega modela tržnega gospodarstva. Gospodarstvo za ljudi je gospodarstvo kakovostnih delovnih mest, v katerega se ljudje vključujejo glede na svoje zmožnosti in ki omogoča dostojno življenje za vse. Hkrati pa poskrbi za tiste, ki so začasno ali spričo osebnih okoliščin brezposelni ali niso polno zaposleni.

**João Ferreira (GUE/NGL)**, *por escrito*. – As políticas sociais e de emprego que têm sido implementadas nos países da zona euro são determinadas, em grande medida, pela armadura neoliberal da moeda única, ou seja, são, na verdade, políticas antissociais e promotoras do desemprego, do subemprego e do trabalho precário.

Estas realidades cresceram significativamente com a integração monetária no euro. Estas duas décadas caracterizam-se por um acentuado retrocesso no plano social, pela degradação dos rendimentos do trabalho (e concomitante crescimento dos lucros do capital), pelo ataque aos direitos da classe trabalhadora, pela emigração massiva, pela caridade e pelo assistencialismo.

O edifício da moeda única foi crescendo – Tratado Orçamental, Governação Económica, Semestre Europeu – e, hoje, constringe profundamente a prossecução de políticas de esquerda, ou até mesmo de políticas democráticas, de cariz progressista. Quaisquer visões socializantes do Semestre Europeu ou da Governação Económica, da muralha antissocial do euro, como as que se têm esforçado por difundir a social-democracia, são nada menos do que um embuste. Não se pode servir a dois amos. Não podemos querer acabar com a pobreza e a exclusão social, promover o aumento geral dos salários, acabar com o flagelo do desemprego juvenil e de longa duração, garantir uma vida digna aos reformados e pensionistas e, ao mesmo tempo, defender as regras draconianas do euro.

**Ádám Kósa (PPE)**, *írásban*. – Magyarországon mélyebb volt a 2008-as pénzügyi válság, mint az európai országok többségében, és ezt nagy részben az akkori baloldali kormányzás felelőtlen ígéretéseinek alapuló költségei okozták. Ma, egy évtizeddel később, hála a Fidesz kormányzat kitartó munkájának, a magyar gazdaság sokkal ütésállóbb, kevésbé sérülékeny, mint a korábbi világgazdasági lassulások, válságok előtt volt.

Most, hogy az ország növekedési pályán van, nagyon kell vigyáznunk elért eredményeinkre. Meg kell akadályoznunk, hogy baloldal újra felelőtlen és fedezet nélküli ígérekkel tévessze meg a választópolgárokat. A baloldal olyan fantazmagóriákkal áll elő, mint az európai minimálbér vagy az európai munkanélküli viszontbiztosítás. Teszi mindezt egy olyan időszakban, amikor a Brexit miatt az Európai Unió költségvetésnek a csökkenésétől kell tartani. Felelős politikusként nem támogathatok olyan ötleteket, amelyek új pénzügyi eszközt (vagyis új kiadást) kívánnak bevezetni, ráadásul korlátozza a tagállamok gyors reagálási képességeit a szociálpolitikai kihívásokra. Örülök, hogy az egyébként szocialista Nicolas Schmit luxemburgi biztosjelölt is egyértelműen ezt az álláspontot osztja. Kevesebb pénzből nem lehet többet költeni, ezt minden háziasszony nagyon jól tudja.

**Lukas Mandl (PPE)**, *schriftlich*. – Eine Arbeitslosenrückversicherung als neues Finanzierungsinstrument wäre eine weitere Finanzausgleichsmaßnahme gleichsam durch die Hintertür. Für die Zukunft Europas und die Wohlstandschancen aller Bürgerinnen und Bürger ist die Solidarität zwischen wirtschaftlich stärkeren und wirtschaftlich noch weniger starken Mitgliedstaaten von entscheidender Bedeutung. Im Sinne der Transparenz zu den Finanzströmen sollten Maßnahmen des Finanzausgleichs beim Namen genannt und in ihrer Gesamtheit gesehen werden. Um dies zu unterstreichen, habe ich gegen Ziffer 1 Teil 2 und 3 gestimmt.

Dessen ungeachtet beinhaltet der Gesamtbericht viele sinnvolle Ideen, wie etwa Maßnahmen zur Bekämpfung von Jugend Arbeitslosigkeit und Altersdiskriminierung am Arbeitsmarkt. Darüber hinaus setze ich mich ausdrücklich für eine Verringerung der Einkommensunterschiede zwischen Männern und Frauen ein und will Menschen dabei helfen, die Chancen der Digitalisierung in vollem Umfang zu nutzen. Umfangreiche Aus- und Fortbildungsmaßnahmen sind daher unerlässlich. Daher habe ich mich entschlossen, dem Gesamtbericht zuzustimmen.

**Sándor Rónai (S&D)**, *írásban*. – Az Európai Parlament már többször foglalkozott a következő 7 éves időszak költségvetésével. Fontos, hogy a finn elnökség a kérdést napirendre tűzte. És ugyanilyen fontos, hogy a vita ennek az évnek a végéig, vagy a jövő év elején lezáruljon. Az Európai Bizottság a korábbiaknál kisebb költségvetést javasol. A csökkentést kiemelten érintené a kohéziós politikát, ami Magyarország szempontjából például 20-25%-os csökkenést eredményezne. Ez így nem fogadható el. Teljes mértékben támogatom azt a parlamenti álláspontot, hogy az Unió költségvetése érje el a közös GDP 1,3%-át, és hogy a kohéziós- és agrárpolitikai források reál értékben megegyezzenek az eddigiekkel.

Hasonlóképpen, messzemenően egyetértek azzal, hogy a jogállami követelmények betartása az EU-támogatások folyósításának előfeltétele legyen. Az olyan kormányokat, amelyek lebontják a demokráciát, az igazságszolgáltatás függetlenségét, megtagadják a korrupció elleni harcot – sőt, szervezik a korrupciót – ne nyúljanak hozzá az európai adófizetők pénzéhez. Az ilyen kormányokat a támogatások elosztásából ki kell zárni, helyettük az önkormányzatokat, civil szervezeteket, vállalkozásokat közvetlenül kell támogatni. Az ehhez szükséges eljárások az EU költségvetési szabályaiban most is megtalálhatóak. Az Uniónak kötelessége megtenni mindent azért, hogy megvédje polgárait az illiberális rezsimek garázdálkodásától. Az adófizetők pénzét meg kell védeni a korrupciós politikusoktól. Ez azonban nem kell azt jelentse, hogy egész országokat zárjunk ki a támogatásokból.

**Valdemar Tomaševski (ECR)**, *raštu*. – šis EP narės Y. Toom pranešimas yra svarbus ES darbo rinkai. Socialinės užimtumo strategijos reikalauja nuolatinio keitimo ir pritaikymo prie kintančių ekonominių sąlygų. Ataskaitoje pabrėžiamos svarbiausios problemos, dėl kurių Europos institucijoms reikia imtis veiksmų. Vis dar nerimą kelia tai, kad valstybės narėse, regionuose ir socialinėse grupėse labai skiriasi užimtumo lygis. Tokiems ilgalaikiams iššūkiams kaip visuomenės senėjimas, skaitmeninimas ir jo poveikis darbui vis dar reikia skubių sprendimų. Todėl reikalinga veiksminga politika, apimanti įvairias užimtumo formas ir tinkamai apsauganti darbuotojus nuo piktnaudžiavimo, diskriminacijos ir besitęsiančio skurdo. Turėkime omenyje, kad ilgalaikis nedarbas ypač veikia jaunos žmonės, vienišus tėvus, ilgą laiką sergančius asmenis, neįgaliuosius ar sveikatos problemų turinčius asmenis, kurie, norėdami gauti darbą, vis dar patiria specifinių kliūčių ir diskriminaciją visais įdarbinimo etapais. Be to, padidėjęs laikinų ar nestabilių įdarbinimo formų skaičius gali turėti pavojingų padarinių pensijos išmokų pakankamumui, ypač jaunesnėms kartoms, kurių karjeroje dažnai yra spragų, dėl kurių gali būti nutraukiamos įmokos, taip pat atsižvelgiant į socialinės apsaugos sistemų stabilumą. Tam reikia greitų įstatymų pakeitimų. Mūsų prioritetu turi būti tinkamų darbo vietų užtikrinimas, galimybė gauti tinkamą socialinę apsaugą, neatsižvelgiant į darbo santykius ar sutarties tipą, darbo užmokesčio didinimas ir aukštos kokybės viešosios paslaugos.

(Die Sitzung wird um 11.19 Uhr unterbrochen.)

#### 4. Składanie dokumentów: patrz protokół

#### 5. Przesunięcia środków i decyzje budżetowe: patrz protokół

**PRESIDENZA DELL'ON. DAVID MARIA SASSOLI***Presidente***6. Wznowienie posiedzenia***(La seduta è ripresa alle 11.34)***7. Oświadczenia Przewodniczącego / Przewodniczącej**

**Presidente.** – Colleghe e colleghi, vi invito a prendere posto. Buongiorno a tutti. Vorrei ricordare che oggi si celebra la Giornata europea e mondiale contro la pena di morte. In un mondo in cui i valori e i diritti umani tendono a diventare relativi, la pena di morte è un affronto alla dignità umana che non può essere tollerato in nessun caso.

Quest'anno rendiamo un omaggio particolare ai bambini i cui genitori sono stati condannati a morte. Resto convinto che la morte inflitta dallo Stato non può mai costituire una vera giustizia. È altrettanto importante considerare i traumi che subiscono questi bambini. Ecco perché, più che mai, il nostro Parlamento è determinato e impegnato a difendere la dignità umana, come sancito nei nostri trattati.

Faremo tutto il possibile per avvicinarci al giorno in cui tutti i paesi aboliranno la pena di morte. Lo dobbiamo alle future generazioni, lo dobbiamo a noi stessi. Sono sicuro che questo sia il sentimento di tutto il Parlamento. Grazie.

**IN THE CHAIR: KATARINA BARLEY***Vice-President***8. Głosowanie**

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

*(For the results and other details of the vote: see Minutes)***8.1. Wniosek o zastosowanie trybu pilnego: Okresy stosowania rozporządzenia (UE) 2019/501 i rozporządzenia (UE) 2019/502 (Karima Delli) (głosowanie)****8.2. Porozumienie o współpracy między Eurojustem a Serbią (A9-0009/2019 - Juan Fernando López Aguilar) (głosowanie)**



**8.3. Projekt budżetu korygującego nr 4 na rok budżetowy 2019: Zmniejszenie środków na zobowiązania i środków na płatności zgodnie ze zaktualizowanymi potrzebami w zakresie wydatków i aktualizacją dochodów (zasoby własne) (A9-0012/2019 - John Howarth) (głosowanie)**

— *After the vote:*

**Tytti Tuppurainen**, *President-in-Office of the Council*. – Madam President, honourable Members, ladies and gentlemen, the European Parliament has just adopted amendments to the Council's position on Draft amending budget No 4 to the general budget for 2019.

I take note of the differences in the positions of our two institutions concerning this Draft amending budget No 4 of 2019 presented by the Commission.

Consequently, in my capacity as President of the Council, I agree that the President of the European Parliament convenes the conciliation committee, as required in point C of Article 314, paragraph 4, of the Treaty on the Functioning of the European Union.

**President**. – Thank you Minister. The Parliament will now convene the Conciliation Committee, and we move on to the vote on the second report by Mr Howarth, by roll call. The vote is open.

**8.4. Dostosowania kwot uruchamianych z instrumentu elastyczności na 2019 r. do wykorzystania w związku z migracją, napływem uchodźców i zagrożeniami bezpieczeństwa (A9-0013/2019 - John Howarth) (głosowanie)**

**8.5. Sprzeciw na podstawie art. 112 Regulaminu: Substancje czynne, w tym flumioksyna (B9-0103/2019) (głosowanie)**

**8.6. Sprzeciw na podstawie art. 112 Regulaminu: Substancje czynne, w tym chlorotoluron (B9-0104/2019) (głosowanie)**

**8.7. Sprzeciw na podstawie art. 112 Regulaminu: Genetycznie zmodyfikowana kukurydza MZHG0JG (SYN-ØØØJG-2) (B9-0107/2019) (głosowanie)**

**8.8. Sprzeciw na podstawie art. 112 Regulaminu: Genetycznie zmodyfikowana soja A2704-12 (ACS-GMØØ5-3) (B9-0105/2019) (głosowanie)**

**8.9. Sprzeciw na podstawie art. 112 Regulaminu: Zmodyfikowana genetycznie kukurydza MON 89034 × 1507 × MON 88017 × 59122 × DAS-40278-9 oraz zmodyfikowana genetycznie kukurydza łącząca dwie, trzy lub cztery modyfikacje MON 89034, 1507, MON 88017, 59122 i DAS-40278-9 (B9-0106/2019) (głosowanie)**

**8.10. Zewnętrzna ingerencja w wybory i dezinformacja w procesach demokratycznych państw członkowskich i Unii Europejskiej (B9-0108/2019, B9-0111/2019) (głosowanie)**

**8.11. Wieloletnie ramy finansowe na lata 2021-2027 i zasoby własne: czas, by spełnić oczekiwania obywateli (B9-0110/2019, B9-0112/2019, B9-0113/2019) (głosowanie)**

**8.12. Polityka zatrudnienia i polityka społeczna w strefie euro (A9-0016/2019 - Yana Toom) (głosowanie)**

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

## **9. Wyjaśnienia dotyczące sposobu głosowania**

**9.1. Sprzeciw na podstawie art. 112 Regulaminu: Genetycznie zmodyfikowana kukurydza MZHG0JG (SYN-ØØØJG-2) (B9-0107/2019)**

### **Oral explanations of vote**

**Stanislav Polčák (PPE).** – Paní předsedající, já jsem u této námitky trochu váhal. Chtěl bych vysvětlit své hlasování. Hlasoval jsem nakonec proti této námitce.

Já osobně nejsem proti používání geneticky modifikovaných potravin, samozřejmě počítaje v to i kukuřici, pokud jsou splněna přísná kritéria. V EU máme poměrně přísné limity na bezpečnost samozřejmě potravin, na zdraví a tyto limity musí bezpodmínečně všichni dodržovat.

Samozřejmě když je umožněn kukuřici a jejím výrobcům z jiných, třetích států přístup na trh, tak musí být i tyto potraviny bezpečné. Z tohoto důvodu mám za to, že naše evropská pravidla platí a že tato dosavadní politika je správná.

To, co ovšem nepovažuji za zcela správné, je, že se dovází tato kukuřice právě např. ze zalesněných a odlesněných oblastí v Jižní Americe a působí velmi výrazné problémy v tamějším zemědělství, já se k tomu dostanu i v otázce sóji.

**9.2. Sprzeciw na podstawie art. 112 Regulaminu: Genetycznie zmodyfikowana soja A2704-12 (ACS-GMØØ5-3) (B9-0105/2019)**

### **Oral explanations of vote**

**Mazaly Aguilar (ECR).** – Señora presidenta. Yo voto en contra de las tres objeciones de hoy relativas a la autorización de organismos genéticamente modificados por varios motivos.

Las sistemáticas objeciones presentadas hasta la fecha no se basan en temas técnicos sino en prejuicios o aspectos emocionales, que omiten los requisitos establecidos en las reglas de procedimiento para su presentación. La evaluación del riesgo de la EFSA ha concluido en el análisis de esos productos que son tan seguros como los productos convencionales.

Existe un consenso científico a ese respecto.

La Comisión tiene la obligación de implementar la legislación existente, y este Parlamento no puede apoyar objeciones sin base científica.

**Stanislav Polčák (PPE).** – Paní předsedající, já jsem v té předchozí odpovědi poskytl své stanovisko právě ke geneticky modifikovaným organismům, potravinám.

Podle mého názoru pravidla, která máme v evropském prostoru, fungují, jsou přísná, jsou vědecky podložena. I z tohoto důvodu jsem hlasoval proti této námitce ve věci sóji. To, co ovšem myslím, že stojí za úvahu, je otázka související právě s tím, jak jsou pěstovány tyto produkty v některých třetích státech, např. mým konkrétně Brazílii, kde právě spotřeba a hlad po těchto potravinách v evropském prostoru nutí do jisté míry tamější zemědělce vypalovat les a my to potom samozřejmě v evropském prostoru kritizujeme.

Já osobně bych chtěl podporovat takovou politiku, která udrží jak otázku geneticky modifikovaných potravin v rozumných mezích, tak samozřejmě i udržitelnost lesnictví a zemědělství celosvětově. Proto bychom měli v této věci postupovat velmi obezřetně.

### 9.3. Zewnętrzna ingerencja w wybory i dezinformacja w procesach demokratycznych państw członkowskich i Unii Europejskiej (B9-0108/2019, B9-0111/2019)

#### Oral explanations of vote

**Ramona Strugariu (Renew).** – Doamna Președintă, numărul cazurilor de dezinformare atribuite hackerilor ruși și identificate de East StratCom s-a dublat practic anul acesta față de 2018, ajungând la 1 000. Fabrica de dezinformare a Kremlinului lovește țintit. Luna aceasta, de pildă, jurnaliștii din România au descoperit că un post național de știri avea nu mai puțin de cinci pagini clonate pe Facebook, cu foarte multe like-uri rusești. Comisarul King la rândul lui avertiza luna trecută că numărul de conturi false de pe Facebook se ridică la 20 de milioane. Moscova pune la bătaie aproximativ un miliard de euro pe an pentru acțiuni de dezinformare și propagandă. Noi trebuie să facem mult mai mult. Cer viitorului Înalț Reprezentant să-și asume acum, ca prioritate, transformarea East StratCom într-o structură permanentă și finanțată corespunzător, iar viitoarea Comisie trebuie să aibă o agendă foarte clară pentru combaterea dezinformării, dar și pentru educarea publicului european.

**Dace Melbārde (ECR).** – Priekšsēdētāj! Kā Latvijas pārstāvis es nešaubīgi balsoju par Dezinformācijas apkarošanas rezolūciju, jo visai Eiropai un īpaši valstīm, kas veido Eiropas ārējo robežu, ir pastāvīgi un koordinēti jācīnās pret dezinformāciju un trešo valstu iejaukšanos demokrātijas procesos.

Krievija savās politikās atklāti norāda uz plānu izveidot vienotu kultūras un informācijas telpu savās blakusvalstīs, īpaši Baltijas valstīs, tāpēc Latvija jau kopš 2016. gada īsteno kompleksu dezinformācijas apkarošanas plānu. Un es arī no savas pieredzes gribu ļoti uzsvērt nepieciešamību strādāt kompleksi. Ir būtiski gan apkarot dezinformāciju, bet vēl jo vairāk ir būtiski strādāt preventīvi, stiprinot demokrātijai nozīmīgās jomas un pie tam ne tikai vēlēšanu gados.

Kompleksās pieejas būtiskais aspekts ir spēcīgi un uzticami nacionālie mediji, īpaši redakcionāli neatkarīgi un labi apmaksāti sabiedriskie mediji. Bet ir īpaši svarīgi atbalstīt arī komerciālos medijus un īpaši lokālos un reģionālos medijus. Tāpat ir ļoti svarīgi domāt par citiem uzticamiem ziņu avotiem.

Šodien burtiski paralēli mūsu sesijai Norvēģijas namā notiek konference, kur kopā sanākušas enciklopēdijas no vairākām valstīm, un šo konferenci caurstrāvo doma par to, ka mums ir nepieciešams pārskatīt enciklopēdijas lomu Eiropas demokrātijas uzturēšanā un nodrošināt ekspertīzē [...] (*sēdes vadītāja liedz runātājai turpināt runu*).

**Mick Wallace (GUE/NGL).** – Madam President, I voted against the motion, which I found to be a farce. The subtext is that Russia, China, Iran, North Korea and Venezuela are spreading disinformation that's helping to fuel gains made by anti-EU extremist and populist candidates across Europe.

Yet there is zero concrete evidence to support these claims, which the Commission report from June on the subject explicitly admits. This motion is itself part of a disinformation campaign against other states, part of a long-running record of NATO electoral interference. Take the record of our great NATO ally, the US, as a case in point. Since the end of the Second World War, they have endeavoured to overthrow more than 50 foreign governments, most of whom were democratically elected, openly interfered in democratic elections in over 30 countries, attempted to assassinate more than 50 foreign leaders, and dropped bombs – often with our assistance – on the people of around 30 countries.

What of the ongoing EU and US imposed sanctions against Crimea, Iran, Syria, Venezuela and North Korea – a form of economic terrorism. This weapon is used to hurt the ordinary people of these countries and very often they change their political position because of the pressure from the sanctions. That's the worst of interference.

**Thierry Mariani (ID).** – Madame la Présidente, j'ai aussi voté contre ce texte parce qu'en réalité, comme cela a été dit par le précédent orateur, il n'y a aucune preuve; il y a des insinuations, on alimente ce climat de guerre froide. En fin de compte, tous ceux qui sont contre l'opinion dominante, contre, dirais-je, les louanges permanentes de ce que fait l'Union européenne, se retrouvent condamnés.

J'ai voté aussi contre parce qu'en réalité, on voit très clairement que tout cela est dirigé contre deux ou trois pays. Je me permets de rappeler qu'en France, certes, *Russia Today* émet et que, jusqu'à présent, il n'y a jamais eu de constat de fausses informations.

Pour finir, la seule fausse information que nous avons eue massivement en France, ces dernières années, je m'en souviens, c'était sur la Syrie. C'était une fausse information véhiculée par l'État, par les médias d'État: on nous a baladé partout un faux maire d'Alep pour nous expliquer qu'Alep était dans telle ou telle situation, pour se rendre compte, quelques mois plus tard, que tout cela avait été totalement inventé.

En matière de *fake news*, je pense que nous n'avons pas beaucoup de leçons à donner.

**Antony Hook (Renew).** – Madam President, the integrity of our elections is critical for the success in survival of democracy. A UK Government report concluded that we cannot say there was no foreign interference in the 2016 referendum. Anti-EU articles by Russian-backed media containing false information received widespread circulation, and in the UK our party-funding laws suffer terrible loopholes. Money can be donated by individuals and also by companies, not only companies in the UK, but those active overseas, and there is no practical way to be sure that money is not originated from another country or even a foreign government. Our newspapers are mostly owned by a tiny handful of people, many of whom do not even live in the UK. The need for reform is great. This is an issue on which Europe must work together.

**Catherine Rowett (Verts/ALE).** – Madam President, some terrible events this week, both in Europe and beyond our borders, remind us that seismic shifts are afoot with respect to what kinds of opinions are normalised. The unspeakable is becoming speakable, the unthinkable is being thought. Of the money funding hatred and disruption, some clearly comes from within the EU from our own oligarchical elites, but evidence is growing that some is from foreign sources.

We need powerful internal regulations about electoral funding, but we must also address the root causes – the rising inequality, the unseemly wealth of the few in our increasingly cruel and intolerant society – and we need powerful international tools to combat interference by enemies overseas.

I've signed this resolution and voted in favour because our EU was founded on a politics of friendship. We need to restore the hearts and minds of the European people to allow the voice of peace, of friendship, of unity and diversity, to be heard. That voice needs to come through in every conversation between sister and brother across our continent, but for it to be heard we must adjust the volume on the voices of aggression and fear.

**Claude Moraes (S&D).** – Madam President, I want to make the specific point that we mustn't be complacent about the question of foreign interference and the integrity of our elections. We specifically asked for a special committee of inquiry and this was narrowly defeated today. I very much regret this because colleagues have talked about hard evidence on this issue and that is exactly what we were attempting to do, to ensure that what we do is based on facts and that we protect our elections and the democratic will of our people, both in our Member States and indeed in cross-border elections.

So this is an extremely important issue, given the increasing influence of disinformation, electoral fraud and reports of foreign interference in many of our Member States. Despite the fact that we don't have the special committee, let us ensure that this House, the Committee on Civil Liberties, Justice and Home Affairs (LIBE) and our Commissioner –our Security Commissioner who has begun work on this issue – continue to do so and that we do not fall into complacency on protecting our elections.

**Christian Allard (Verts/ALE).** – Madam President, I voted for this amended resolution, but there is one point I would like to make to my colleagues. When we use the word foreign, I think we have to be a bit careful that we are not targeting individuals, as opposed to targeting those whom we should target, which are states and non-state actors from third countries. Why do I say that? Because we have a climate just now of intolerance across the world and in the EU.

I'm a foreigner in my own country, the country I represent in this Parliament. We are all foreigners to one another, but we have to try to avoid using this sometimes pejorative term of 'foreigner'. Let me give you one example. We are, in the Scottish Parliament, putting forward a bill just now to extend the franchise to everybody who lives in Scotland to vote. Let's share our democratic values that make sure people can vote whether they are foreigners or not if they live in our states.

**Michaela Šojdrová (PPE).** – Paní předsedající, já považuji tuto diskuzi a toto usnesení o vnějším ovlivňování voleb a dezinformacích ve vnitrostátních a evropských demokratických procesech za velmi důležité, a proto jsem ho podpořila.

Považuji také za důležitou i tu část, která vyzývá Evropskou komisi k větší podpoře jak finanční, tak personální skupiny *East StratCom*, která se zabývá právě šířením dezinformací, bojem proti dezinformacím v této části Evropy. Jsem ráda, že EP velkou většinou toto usnesení přijal.

**Claire Fox (NI).** – Madam President, I voted against this motion because what does it say to and about voters? It says you were all duped; you had no agency to decide; you did not know what you were voting for.

Honest misinformation and fake news, we have heard far too much of it in this Parliament, including slanderous accusations in UK terms. Let me tell you now, Brexit voters did not vote because of Russian bots, or Facebook, but because we believe in sovereignty. I want a warning to my European colleagues about interference in European elections, which is a problem. The EU, sadly, interferes in nation-states' elections. It interferes when they have referenda. Ireland, France, Denmark, UK; they say you got it wrong, vote again, vote again, vote again – until we vote your way! And what's worse is this motion amounts to giving the EU the power to censor what we see and what we read. I vote against this motion because it gives more power to you and it attacks voters.

**Tatjana Ždanoka (Verts/ALE).** – Madam President, I voted against this resolution. We just need to strengthen the democratic processes, but not by the means proposed. For example, to upgrade the EU East StratCom Task Force to a permanent structure entails significantly higher financing. In the very same resolution we find the justification – the doubled number of disinformation cases in 2019 when compared with the previous year. But the reason for that phenomenon is the doubling of the StratComm budget for this year, not vice versa. Demand creates supply.

As a subscriber of StratComm mailing, I see hundreds of fake disclosures. For example, the story on Russian TV telling us that it is immoral to dissect an animal in front of children was mentioned as a case of disinformation. But it was a real case in a Danish zoo. In such a way, any criticism can be qualified as disinformation. Is this what we will spend millions of euros on?

**Ангел Джамбазки (ECR).** – Уважаема г-жо Председател, уважаеми колеги, подкрепих предложената резолюция относно външната намеса в изборите и дезинформацията в националните и европейските демократични процеси. Последните години безспорно ставаме свидетели на множество такива случаи на намеса както в Европейския съюз, така и в Щатите.

Няма как обаче да не спомена, че има и случаи, в които намесата не е външна за Съюза. Говоря за тези кръгове от неправителствени организации, финансирани неясно откъде, които се опитват да променят волята на нациите, на държавите, които сами искат да решават своите вътрешнополитически процеси. Свидетели сме на такива процеси в Унгария, в Полша, в България дори.

Свидетели сме как групи от неправителствени организации се намесват в изборите в България и в момента. Леви, зелени се обединяват в защита на организации като Хелзинкския комитет, които защитават откровено престъпници и доказани осъдени убийци. И това се случва в момента и тези организации недопустимо се намесват в изборния процес и се опитват да влияят на волята и на българските граждани, което аз не допускам и възразявам.

**Stanislav Polčák (PPE).** – Paní předsedající, já jsem tento návrh usnesení jednoznačně podpořil, byť některé prostředky, s nimiž právě toto usnesení počítá, jsou skutečně sporné. Podle mého názoru to, co není sporné, je fakt, že jsou zde snahy třetích států, třetích mocností, ovlivňovat volby na národní nebo nadnárodní, evropské úrovni. Myslím si, že toto je fakt. Já bych chtěl ocenit třeba práci finské novinářky Jessikky Aro, která zdokumentovala existenci trollů farmy v Petrohradě. Takže pokud o tom někdo pochybuje, jak zde zaznělo, myslím, že ty důkazy jsou naprosto jasné a jsou to fakta.

Podívejte se, jakým způsobem, velmi razantně vyšetřují tyto útoky na své svobodné volby Spojené státy. Je to různé vyšetřování, myslím si, že by si takovou ráznou akci zasloužil i evropský prostor. Já to maximálně podporuji, měli bychom samozřejmě dát podporu i médiím jak veřejným, tak i komerčním, sdílet informace a samozřejmě rozkrývat tyto sítě. To je velmi důležité.

**Petras Auštrevičius (Renew).** – Madam President, I was stunned – as I'm sure many of you here were – to learn about the existence of the fake website of the European Parliament vulgarly named 'EP Today'. According to the EU's East StratCom Task Force which exposed the website, the majority of its content is republished from the Kremlin-based propaganda channel Russia Today, and this is clear evidence and a fact for those who still do not see and miss the propaganda all around.

We need to increase our citizens' resilience and their capacity to distinguish fact from fake. In order to achieve this, we must boost our support to such actors as the team of the EU's East StratCom Task Force, which tirelessly work to expose foreign interference and disinformation. Moreover, we must improve civic education and media literacy programmes and enable civil society organisations.

With these resolutions we rightly call for greater national and European attention, accompanied by the increased financial support for the activities I just mentioned. We also task the next High Representative of the Union to make the fight against disinformation a central foreign policy objective.

#### **9.4. Wieloletnie ramy finansowe na lata 2021-2027 i zasoby własne: czas, by spełnić oczekiwania obywateli (B9-0110/2019, B9-0112/2019, B9-0113/2019)**

##### **Oral explanations of vote**

**Ramona Strugariu (Renew).** – *(start of speech off mic)* ... this resolution because we need to send this strong signal to the Council ahead of next week's discussion, and yet I was extremely surprised to see that, although it was supported by the four main political groups of this House, there is not a single word in the resolution about the new financial instrument for supporting civil society, the rights and values instrument, and there's not a single word in it about civil society.

Traditionally speaking, this House – Parliament – has always been a supporter of civil society. They need a proper instrument, finally, to be able to follow their agenda. It is not acceptable for us not to mention and not to ask for more action in this area as a push ahead of next week's discussion when the space for civil society is shrinking in countries like Hungary, Poland or Bulgaria, and even in my country, Romania.

**Jeroen Lenaers (PPE).** – Voorzitter, wij werden deze week verrast door het bericht van de Europese Rekenkamer dat er zo'n 300 miljard euro van de Europese meerjarenbegroting op de plank blijft liggen. Dat is meer dan twee keer de volledige Europese jaarbegroting. Ik vind het daarom net zo verrassend dat bepaalde collega's in dit huis de volgende meerjarenbegroting nog verder willen ophogen.

Natuurlijk heeft de brexit consequenties voor de begroting, maar wat het CDA betreft, kijken we ook eerst kritisch naar de uitgaven. Waar en waarom blijft er geld op de plank liggen en waar kan wellicht ook iets vanaf? Nieuwe prioriteiten hoeven niet per se meer geld te betekenen. De Europese begroting is geen kerstboom waar ieder zijn eigen projectje in kan hangen. Er moet een balans zijn.

We kunnen iedere euro maar één keer uitgeven, dus laten we er zorgvuldig mee omgaan. Geen politieke cadeautjes die vervolgens door de burger betaald moeten worden, maar verstandig en doelmatig besteden zoals het hoort. Dat is in dit geval niet gebeurd en daarom heeft het CDA tegen deze resolutie gestemd.

**Leszek Miller (S&D).** – Pani Przewodnicząca! Ja poparłem stanowisko w sprawie wieloletniego budżetu, ale chciałem zgłosić dwie kwestie.

Po pierwsze, w kontekście nadal niejasnego brexitu uważam, że Komisja Europejska powinna opracować plan awaryjny, na wypadek gdyby Wielka Brytania wyszła bez porozumienia i w efekcie już od przyszłego roku przestała odprowadzać do wspólnego budżetu jakiejkolwiek składki. Uważam, że należy tu znaleźć rozwiązanie, które zapewni bezpieczeństwo wypłat beneficjentom programów finansowanych przez Unię we wszystkich państwach członkowskich, w tym także mieszkańcom województwa wielkopolskiego w Polsce, którzy powierzyli mi mandat do Parlamentu Europejskiego.

Druga kwestia to reforma systemu zasobów własnych Unii. Jestem przekonany, że wśród nowych źródeł finansowania – poza likwidacją rabatów i korekt – powinny znaleźć się nowe rozwiązania fiskalne, w tym podatek cyfrowy. Powinien on objąć wszystkie przedsiębiorstwa internetowe, które generują w Unii kolosalne zyski, ale w przeciwieństwie do innych uczestników rynku wewnętrznego nie odprowadzają z tego tytułu należnych podatków, jedynie dlatego że ich siedziby mieszczą się poza granicami Unii.

**Michaela Šojdřová (PPE).** – Paní předsedající, já jsem nakonec toto usnesení k víceletému finančnímu rámci podpořila, a to přesto, že jsem váhala úplně ze stejných důvodů, jako tady zmínil předcházející řečník kolega Lenaers. Podpořila jsem to proto, protože si myslím, že tady ten faktor času je důležitý. My jsme chtěli vyzvat a vyzýváme tedy Evropskou radu, aby se co nejdříve domluvila s Evropským parlamentem a aby byl přijat stabilní rozpočet, protože všichni chceme financovat důležité programy, jako je Erasmus, Horizon. Chceme financovat kohezní politiku, společnou zemědělskou politiku a tady hrozí určité provizorium. Samozřejmě také rozhodnutí o vlastních příjmech, to je podmínkou toho, aby ten rozpočet byl reálný. Mně se nelíbilo to výrazné navýšení oproti návrhu Komise, která navrhla 1,11 %, my navrhuje 1,3 %, já myslím, že tady musí dojít k rozumnému kompromisu.

**Veronika Vrecionová (ECR).** – Madam President, I voted against the resolution on the multiannual financial framework. The resolution is full of words about stability, the fight against climate change, and so on, but behind it lies a classic social plan. Besides other things, the draft resolution calls for the introduction of, for example, corporate taxes, digital services taxes, financial transaction taxes, VAT adjustment, etc. I understand this attention and these efforts among our Socialist colleagues. However, I am surprised by the attitude of many Members who consider themselves as centre-right politicians. It's basically a call for a tax increase.

**Ангел Джамбазки (ECR).** – Уважаема г-жо Председател, подкрепих предложената резолюция, която е част от стратегията на нашата институция – Европейския парламент, да повлияе върху преговорите за следващата многогодишна финансова рамка. В текста се съдържат редица важни елементи, които подкрепят вече изразената от Парламента позиция относно обема на следващата многогодишна финансова рамка.

Безспорно важен елемент в настоящия документ е призивът за създаване на план за действие в извънредните ситуации. Този план би функционирал като предпазна мрежа за защита на бенефициентите и ползвателите по програмите за финансиране от Европейския съюз и би позволил удължаване на настоящата финансова рамка, в случай че сделката не бъде договорена навреме.

## 9.5. Polityka zatrudnienia i polityka społeczna w strefie euro (A9-0016/2019 - Yana Toom)

### Oral explanations of vote

**Rory Palmer (S&D).** – Madam President, let me quote: ‘Employees are leaving left, right and centre, being suspended and sacked at every opportunity, it’s an awful environment to work in. The ballot results are in, and we’re going to strike.’ That’s a worker at Wilko in my constituency who will take industrial action tomorrow with their trade union, the GMB. Wilko’s used to be a good family firm with strong values and a commitment to the local community. Sadly, it has moved away from that and I want to give my full support to the workforce at Wilko’s taking action tomorrow against new working practices, against new working arrangements, which will force workers to spend less time with their families, more weekend work. This has been imposed on those workers in an atrocious, unfair way, and those workers, their trade union the GMB, taking that action tomorrow, have my full support.

**Michaela Šojdrová (PPE).** – Paní předsedající, také zde, v tomto případě bych chtěla vysvětlit, proč jsem nakonec hlasovala pro tuto zprávu. Obsahuje totiž návrhy, které si myslím, že je důležité, aby Evropská unie ze své úrovně podporovala a vytvářela určitý tlak na všechny státy, aby zde nebyly země s různými rychlostmi. Zejména přístup k zaměstnávání mladých lidí: zde již máme určité evropské nástroje, kterými členské státy by měly a mají možnost daleko více podpořit mladé lidi, jako jsou Erasmus, Evropský sociální fond, Evropský sbor solidarity. Takže jde jen o to, aby evropské státy byly aktivní. Stejně tak je důležitá otázka vzdělávání, kvality, dostupnosti, vzájemné uznávání kvalifikací. Nesouhlasím s unifikací evropského systému zajištění pro případ nezaměstnanosti, ale souhlasím s tím, aby zde byla určitá úroveň koordinace a nastavení společných minimálních standardů. Je to důležité.

**Claire Fox (NI).** – Madam President, I abstained on this motion because despite the great sentiments on tackling unemployment and workers’ rights and benefits, there’s a big ‘but’. The EU likes to tell us that trade union rights and workers’ rights are guaranteed by the EU but that’s fake news. They’ve been historically fought for by millions of ordinary people taking on their bosses and governments, and yet you reduce these struggles to paternalistically handing out rights like crumbs with more bureaucracy added on. And also, isn’t it virtue signalling? How will all this rhetoric about rights go down in Greece and Italy and so many eurozone countries which have been punished by the EU, which imposed austerity, the misery of poverty and unemployment, and humiliated nation states by telling them they couldn’t decide on their own economic policies?

So I abstain because I agree with supporting workers’ rights and unemployment, but I don’t trust you lot to do it, I’m afraid, and I appeal to my fellow Europeans who support workers’ rights to not rely on the bureaucrats here in Brussels.

**Ангел Джамбазки (ECR).** – Уважаема г-жо Председател, уважаеми колеги, докладът е доста балансиран. Основният му фокус е да стимулира държавите членки да постигат по-голям баланс между икономическите и социалните измерения. Част от приоритетите в текста, които мога да подкрепя, са насърчаване на цифровите умения и предприемачеството, особено в малките и средните предприятия.

Същият документ обаче съдържа отново призови за по-голям натиск върху държавите членки и политики относно мигрантите. Отново както и преди два доклада, които обсъдих, в смислени текстове се вкарват политики, свързани с нелегалната имиграция, насърчаването ѝ и изобщо тези дейности на неправителствените организации, които не подкрепям и отхвърлям. Такива текстове категорично не мога да подкрепя.

Смятам, че документът не отчита достатъчно и принципа на субсидиарност, т.е. правата на държавите членки да решават своите вътрешни въпроси с вътрешно законодателство. Затова, отчитайки положителните страни на доклада, гласувах с „въздържал се“.

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

## 11. Zatwierdzenie protokołów posiedzeń bieżącej sesji i przekazanie przyjętych tekstów: patrz protokół



**12. Kalendarz następnych posiedzeń: patrz protokół**

**13. Zamknięcie posiedzenia**

*(The sitting closed at 12.33)*

**14. Przerwa w obradach**

**President.** – I declare adjourned the session of the European Parliament.

---

*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