



C/2024/4409

11.7.2024

PEŁNE SPRAWOZDANIE Z OBRAD 16 STYCZNIA 2020 R.

(C/2024/4409)

PARLAMENT EUROPEJSKI

SESJA 2019-2020

Posiedzenia od 13 do 16 stycznia 2020 r.

STRASBURG

Spis treści	Strona
1. Otwarcie posiedzenia	4
2. Wniosek o uchylenie immunitetu : patrz protokół	4
3. Instytucje i organy unii gospodarczej i walutowej: zapobieganie konfliktom interesów związanym z zatrudnieniem byłych urzędników instytucji publicznych (debata)	4
4. Debaty nad przypadkami łamania praw człowieka, zasad demokracji i praworządności (debata)	13
4.1. Burundi, w szczególności wolność słowa	13
4.2. Nigeria, w szczególności niedawne ataki terrorystyczne	21
5. Wznowienie posiedzenia	34
6. Głosowanie	35
6.1. Burundi, w szczególności wolność słowa (RC-B9-0054/2020, B9-0054/2020, B9-0055/2020, B9-0057/2020, B9-0058/2020, B9-0061/2020, B9-0066/2020) (głosowanie)	35
6.2. Nigeria, w szczególności niedawne ataki terrorystyczne (RC-B9-0056/2020, B9-0056/2020, B9-0059/2020, B9-0060/2020, B9-0062/2020, B9-0063/2020, B9-0064/2020, B9-0065/2020) (głosowanie)	35
6.3. Sytuacja w Wenezueli po nielegalnym wyborze nowych władz i prezydium Zgromadzenia Narodowego (przewrót w parlamencie) (B9-0051/2020, B9-0052/2020, B9-0053/2020, RC-B9-0048/2020, B9-0048/2020, B9-0049/2020, B9-0050/2020) (głosowanie)	35
6.4. Wysłuchania w toku prowadzone na mocy art. 7 ust. 1 TUE w sprawie Polski i Węgier (B9-0032/2020) (głosowanie)	36

Spis treści	Strona
6.5. Konferencja Stron Konwencji o różnorodności biologicznej (COP15) – Kunming (2020) (B9-0035/2020) (głosowanie)	36
6.6. Sprawozdanie roczne z działalności Europejskiego Rzecznika Praw Obywatelskich za rok 2018 (A9-0032/2019 - Peter Jahr) (głosowanie)	36
6.7. Instytucje i organy unii gospodarczej i walutowej: zapobieganie konfliktom interesów związanym z zatrudnianiem byłych urzędników instytucji publicznych (B9-0047/2020) (głosowanie)	36
7. Wyjaśnienia dotyczące sposobu głosowania	36
7.1. Sprawozdanie roczne z realizacji wspólnej polityki bezpieczeństwa i obrony (A9-0052/2019 - Arnaud Danjean)	36
7.2. Stanowisko Parlamentu Europejskiego dotyczące konferencji w sprawie przyszłości Europy (B9-0036/2020, B9-0037/2020, B9-0038/2020)	37
7.3. Sytuacja w Wenezueli po nielegalnym wyborze nowych władz i prezydium Zgromadzenia Narodowego (przewrót w parlamencie) (B9-0051/2020, B9-0052/2020, B9-0053/2020, RC-B9-0048/2020, B9-0048/2020, B9-0049/2020, B9-0050/2020)	39
7.4. Wysłuchania w toku prowadzone na mocy art. 7 ust. 1 TUE w sprawie Polski i Węgier (B9-0032/2020)	40
7.5. Konferencja Stron Konwencji o różnorodności biologicznej (COP15) – Kunming (2020) (B9-0035/2020)	41
7.6. Instytucje i organy unii gospodarczej i walutowej: zapobieganie konfliktom interesów związanym z zatrudnianiem byłych urzędników instytucji publicznych (B9-0047/2020)	41
8. Korekty do głosowania i zamiar głosowania: Patrz protokół	42
9. Wznowienie posiedzenia	42
10. Przyjęcie protokołu poprzedniego posiedzenia: Patrz protokół	42
11. Kalendarz sesji miesięcznych Parlamentu w 2021 i 2022 r.: Patrz protokół	42
12. Przedmioty nielegalnie wydrukowane w technice 3D (debata)	42
13. Składanie dokumentów: patrz protokół	46
14. Decyzje w sprawie sporządzenia sprawozdań z własnej inicjatywy: patrz protokół	46
15. Zmiany w przekazaniu spraw komisjom (art. 56 Regulaminu): patrz protokół	46
16. Zaangażowane komisje (art. 57 Regulaminu): patrz protokół	46
17. Petycje: patrz protokół	46
18. Zatwierdzenie protokołu bieżącego posiedzenia i przekazanie przyjętych tekstów: patrz protokół	46

Spis treści	Strona
19. Kalendarz następnych posiedzeń: patrz protokół	46
20. Zamknięcie posiedzenia	47
21. Przerwa w obradach	47

PEŁNE SPRAWOZDANIE Z OBRAD 16 STYCZNIA 2020 R.

PRZEWODNICTWO: EWA KOPACZ

Wiceprzewodnicząca

1. Otwarcie posiedzenia

(Posiedzenie zostało otwarte o godz. 9.00)

2. Wniosek o uchylenie immunitetu : patrz protokół

3. Instytucje i organy unii gospodarczej i walutowej: zapobieganie konfliktom interesów związanym z zatrudnianiem byłych urzędników instytucji publicznych (debata)

Przewodnicząca. – Kolejnym punktem porządku dziennego jest debata nad pytaniem wymagającym odpowiedzi ustnej skierowanym do Komisji przez Irene Tinagli w imieniu Komisji Gospodarczej i Monetarnej w sprawie Instytucji i organów unii gospodarczej i walutowej: zapobieganie konfliktom interesów związanym z zatrudnianiem byłych urzędników instytucji publicznych (O-000048/2019 - B9-0001/2020) (2019/2959(RSP)).

Irene Tinagli, author. – Madam President, on 17 September 2019, Mr Adam Farkas announced his resignation from his position as Executive Director of the European Banking Authority (EBA), which will be effective on 31 January 2020 to become, starting on 1 February 2020, the CEO of the Association for Financial Markets in Europe (AFME), a well-known lobbying company that, according to its website, is the voice of Europe's wholesale financial services.

Let me remind you what the EBA's responsibilities are: the EBA is responsible for supervising the EU's banking sector and for setting technical standards implementing key financial regulations. This makes the EBA a fundamental institution that regulates and supervises the financial sector. It also, of course, makes it a constant lobbying target for the industry. AFME, like other stakeholders, appears to have permanent interactions with the EBA.

In compliance with the staff regulations and ethical rules, the EBA's Board of Supervisors has taken a decision to impose fairly light restrictions on its Executive Director, both while in service at the EBA and after leaving the EBA. However, the restrictions on Mr Farkas's future employment do not seem either realistic or enforceable. Unless Mr Farkas simply becomes AFME's poster boy, I cannot really find a single topic that AFME covers that does not fall within the remit of the EBA and does not relate to the work of Mr Farkas.

Moreover, it is not clear to me who will monitor the effective application of these restrictions, in particular the one that provides that he cannot engage in lobbying or advocacy of the EBA or have professional contacts with EBA staff for 24 months after leaving the Authority. How are we going to enforce that or control that? Who's going to do that? So, for this reason, we call for a review of this decision by the EBA Board of Supervisors. Sadly, Mr Farkas' is not the first case, and will probably not be the last, of a post-public employment job in the private sector that poses evident problems of conflicts of interest, but we absolutely must act to ensure that this is the last. I really hope that this is the last.

Revolving doors, where one jumps from public institutions to top positions in the private sector, from regulators to regulated, or from supervisors to supervised, and vice versa unfortunately not only undermine the credibility of the individual engaging in such behaviour, but undermine the credibility of the whole institution and, more generally, the trust that citizens have in public bodies, and the trust that citizens have in public institutions is the backbone of democracies. So we shall not tolerate our European institutions and agencies' credibility crumbling just because of some individuals' interest, and we should always remain vigilant in making sure and guaranteeing that they are not influenced by private interest.

For this reason, we call on the Commission to assess the current practice on post-public employment at European and national level, to extend this review to pre-public employment conflicts of interest, and also to put in place a harmonised legal framework, which should include an extension of the possibility to block professional moves and the provision of a cooling-off period that is proportionate to the specific case and accompanied by an appropriate temporary allowance. Finally, we call on the Commission also to assess whether it is appropriate that the EU agencies concerned decide for themselves on the enforcement of the rules for the prevention of conflicts of interest and how a consistent application of the rules can be ensured.

I was glad to see that the resolution was supported unanimously by Members in the Committee on Economic and Monetary Affairs (ECON) with no votes against and no abstentions. I hope this is a clear signal and that the plenary widely supports the resolution as well.

Janez Lenarčič, *Member of the Commission*. – Madam President, from the outset, let me underline that I fully share with you the consideration of the importance of high ethical standards in the European civil service in general. These high ethical standards are vital – vital components that allow democracy to thrive. The effective operation of ethics in the civil service requires that public officials and agents be independent, impartial and responsible to the people. I understand that the move of Mr Farkas from the European Banking Authority (EBA) to the private sector generated some concerns and in this context, you addressed questions to the Commission with regards to its policy and its legal framework. You have also raised the point in relation to the horizontal harmonisation of the ethical legal framework across the EU institutions.

The Staff Regulations and the implementing rules adopted by the Commission apply to all EU agencies, unless agencies adopt their own implementing rules which are validated by the Commission. At the same time, each agency holds its independence, since they are separate legal entities. This means that agencies are independently responsible for the implementation of the rules, compliance and for adopting individual decisions concerning their staff and this also concerns Mr Farkas.

The decision concerning Mr Farkas was taken by the EBA Board of Supervisors, which is the decision-making body to decide on and enforce post-employment restrictions. The members of the board with voting rights are the heads of the national public authorities, competent for the supervision of credit institutions in each Member State. The Commission participates in the board meetings with only one representative, without voting rights. This mode of governance is the choice of the legislator.

As mentioned, the EBA, like all EU institutions, is bound by the Staff Regulations. These contain a comprehensive ethical framework. The latest Staff Regulations – reform of 2013 — reinforced this framework in the area of post-employment restrictions. More specifically, the Staff Regulations require that potential conflicts of interest are assessed upon recruitment or integration after a period of leave on personal grounds. These provisions explicitly address the issue of lobbying in a democracy during leave on personal grounds or after having left the institution. With particular regard to post-employment activities, the assessment is made on a case-by-case basis. Prohibitions or restrictions must be well reasoned and proportionate. For each case there must be appropriate balance between the need to ensure the integrity of the work of the institution, through temporary prohibitions and restrictions and, on the other hand, the need to respect the former staff members' right to engage in work and to pursue a freely chosen or accepted occupation, as enshrined in the Charter of Fundamental Rights of the European Union.

On these matters, the Commission has in place implementing rules which are regularly revised to reflect recommendations, in particular from the European Parliament, the European Ombudsman and the European Court of Auditors. This was the case when the new decision on outside activities and assignments and occupational activities after leaving the service was adopted in 2018.

I would also like to underline the importance of transparency. Since 2014, the Staff Regulations provide that each institution must publish annually information on the implementation of the prohibition for former senior managers for one year to engage in lobbying or advocacy vis-à-vis staff of the former institution on matters for which they were responsible during the last three years in service. The Commission has just published its fifth report. This is part of the Commission's overall efforts to achieve greater transparency, which also includes publication of Commissioners' and senior staff meetings and updates to the EU transparency register, to name just a few.

Over the recent years, the Commission has indeed closely cooperated with the European Ombudsman in the framework of her inquiries looking into the revolving doors phenomenon. When closing its second inquiry in February last year, the European Ombudsman confirmed that the Commission has high standards in the area of ethics and transparency and encouraged the Commission to continue to lead by example. In July last year, the European Court of Auditors issued a report on the ethical framework of the European Parliament, the Council and the Commission. The Court of Auditors' audit confirmed that, to a large extent, the audited institutions have established adequate ethical frameworks and that the Commission is well advanced in this matter. The new College marks a new momentum to address ethical challenges, together with new ideas and determination. In this respect, Vice-President Jourová has been entrusted by the President to work with the European Parliament and the Council on setting up an independent ethics body common to all EU institutions. Cooperation with the other institutions in this process, of course, is key to making this a success.

Markus Ferber, *im Namen der PPE-Fraktion*. – Frau Präsidentin, Herr Kommissar, liebe Kolleginnen, liebe Kollegen! Latente Interessenkonflikte, wie sie durch einen direkten Wechsel von Spitzenpersonal aus den Aufsichtsbehörden in die Privatwirtschaft entstehen können, erodieren das Vertrauen in die Europäische Union und in ihre Institutionen. Zur Wahrheit gehört aber auch – und das wurde ja schon angesprochen –, dass wir natürlich auch keine Berufsverbote verhängen können. Wenn wir also Spitzenbeamte zu einer *Cooling-off*-Periode verpflichten wollen, muss natürlich auch eine entsprechende Kompensation gewährt werden. Andernfalls begeben wir uns wirklich in rechtlich schwieriges Terrain. Insofern ist es notwendig, dass die Europäische Kommission nicht nur sagt: „Das ist eine Agentur, die hat eigene Regeln“, sondern dass wir gemeinsam über einen einheitlichen Rechtsrahmen nachdenken. Ich bedauere sehr, dass der Rat an dieser Debatte nicht teilnimmt, denn für den einheitlichen Rechtsrahmen ist auch die Unterstützung des Rates notwendig. Es wäre schön, wenn der Ratsvorsitz sich auch dieses Themas mit uns gemeinsam annehmen würde.

Es gehört damit auch dazu, dass den Aufsichtsbehörden selbst weniger Spielraum gegeben wird. Es kann ja nicht sein, dass sie selbst darüber entscheiden, was zulässig ist und was nicht zulässig ist, weil sie nach anderen Kriterien messen, als es eigentlich für europäische Spitzenbeamte der Fall sein sollte.

Aber, liebe Kolleginnen und Kollegen, wir müssen natürlich auch ein bisschen aufpassen. Ich sage immer: Wer ausreiten will, muss den eigenen Stall auch sauber halten. Und deswegen gehört auch mit dazu – und wir als EVP haben das in die Entschließung mit hineingebracht –, dass wir das nicht nur für Institutionen sehen, sondern auch für das Parlament: Wenn ein Mitarbeiter der Grünen, der in einem Monat noch an der Regulierung von Investmentfonds und Wertpapierfirmen mitgearbeitet hat, im nächsten Monat plötzlich zum Dachverband der britischen Asset-Management-Industrie wechselt, und zwar natürlich ohne *Cooling-off*-Periode, dann ist das auch ein fragwürdiger Vorgang. Deswegen sage ich in aller Deutlichkeit: Ich bin froh, dass wir uns in unserer Entschließung klar dafür ausgesprochen haben, dass die Bestimmungen im Beamtenstatut hinsichtlich Interessenkonflikten auch für Mitarbeiter gelten sollen.

Paul Tang, *on behalf of the S&D Group*. – Madam President, today it feels especially good to be a Member of this Parliament. While the Guardian of the Treaties has looked the other way thus far, Commissioner, this institution has taken up the challenge to defend the rules that we hold dear.

The EU has strong safeguards against revolving doors and the perverse incentives that come from that. These new rules enable us to prevent employees from taking up positions that harm our collective interest. However, without their application and enforcement, rules turn into paper tigers. It is vital that this Parliament reminds the Commission, reminds the European Banking Authority (EBA), reminds the public that we will not let vital rules descend into irrelevance. With this resolution, we send the reminder loud and clear: we demand that Mr Farkas' move be blocked. If this demand is not met, we will stand ready to ban him from this Parliament.

But it doesn't end here. We see a sort of intimate love story developing between the EBA on the one hand, and Association for Financial Markets in Europe (AFME) on the other hand now that Gerry Cross has also been appointed. We need to continue to address potential conflicts of interest in the EU, and this starts in two weeks' time if Mr Farkas indeed takes up his new job. I trust that the parliamentary leadership will implement our call not to grant Mr Farkas an access badge. Commissioner, we will be monitoring you and other agendas from your colleagues to verify whether you heed our advice not to meet Mr Farkas in the coming two years.

Well, I'm proud of the strong stance that we have taken together. We should highlight one thing: no one comes out of this story looking good. So, much better than standing up in defence of our common rules is not to let their strength be doubted at all.

Luis Garicano, *on behalf of the Renew Group*. – Madam President, during the financial crisis, we learned that the excessive closeness between the regulators and the regulated – the banks, the financial sector – can have a real cost to taxpayers. We're not talking about vague ethical standards without implications, we're talking about rules that actually matter to the taxpayers. Why? Because if those who are setting the rules are actually not setting the rules for the taxpayers, but they are setting the rules for the system, because they're hoping to go back to the financial system, etc., what we end up is with rules that are actually not working, with rules that lead to bailouts and with rules that lead to taxpayers footing the bill. The favourite bet of investors is one where heads they win, tails the taxpayers lose. That's why this case is so important, and that's why Parliament is sending a very loud and clear message.

I congratulate my colleagues from all the four main parties – Mr Tang, Ms Tingali, Chair of the Committee, Mr Ferber, Mr Giegold – on coming together and passing already a resolution on this case unanimously, the entire Parliament. We are continuing working on building and maintaining these boundaries between regulators and those who are regulated. This case goes beyond any conception of those boundaries. It basically makes a laughing stock of those Staff Regulations you mentioned, Mr Commissioner, and it basically means, well you know, if you want to ignore those rules and go around them, then you may. That's why Parliament has taken such a decisive action. We don't take this problem lightly. We will be policing and monitoring in the future that the Staff Regulations are maintained and enforced. That ethical body you proposed, Mr Commissioner, seems like a good idea. Anything that can make this work, this prohibition and these boundaries between the two sides of the wall work, and we think that that's to the benefit of our economies, our citizens our taxpayers.

Sven Giegold, *im Namen der Verts/ALE-Fraktion*. – Frau Präsidentin! Der Fall *Ádám Farkas* hat zu Recht großes Aufsehen erregt, denn hier geht es um einen wichtigen Interessenkonflikt. Wenn die Nummer zwei der Europäischen Bankenaufsichtsbehörde direkt aus dieser Position an die Spitze der Großbankenlobby wechselt, schwächt das das Vertrauen der Bürgerinnen und Bürger in die europäische Demokratie. Und je weiter europäische Institutionen von der lokalen Demokratie weg sind, umso höher müssen die ethischen Standards sein.

Deshalb ist es auch richtig, dass zum Beispiel in Bereichen wie Transparenz von Lobbyismus und von Dokumenten die EU immer höhere Standards hatte. Aber im Bereich der Drehtür zwischen Privatwirtschaft und mächtigen Lobbys und öffentlichen Positionen sind die Regeln leider nicht so stark. Deshalb brauchen wir hier strengere Regeln. Die bisherigen Regeln sind ein schlechter Witz. Das gilt auch für die Regeln, die jetzt Herrn Farkas auferlegt wurden.

Es ist wichtig, dass die EU-Kommission das Beamtenstatut streng anwendet, und wir wissen, dass ein Grund dafür, dass der Fall Farkas von der Kommission bisher nicht so gründlich geprüft und abschlägig beschieden wurde, auch darin lag, dass man bei den eigenen Mitarbeitern häufig auch nicht so streng hinguckt.

Ja, es ist richtig, dass auch im Europäischen Parlament diese Probleme bestehen. Das fängt an bei Parlamentarischen Assistenten, hört aber auch bei den Abgeordneten nicht auf, die ja nach Ende des Mandats weiter Gehaltsbezüge bekommen, ohne dass daran irgendwelche Auflagen, was Interessenkonflikte angeht, geknüpft sind. Und deshalb nehme ich die Initiative gerne auf. Lassen Sie uns hier im Haus uns selbst Regeln geben. Denn als wir unseren Bericht über die Integrität, Transparenz und Rechenschaftspflicht des Europäischen Parlaments gemacht haben, da war die Unterstützung für meine Vorschläge zur Begrenzung der *revolving door* sehr, sehr gering. Deshalb freue ich mich, wenn wir das jetzt hier anders regeln.

Aber insbesondere muss die Europäische Bankenaufsichtsbehörde unseren Aufruf ernst nehmen, diesen Beschluss neu zu überdenken. Wenn sie das nicht tut, dann muss das Konsequenzen haben. Und wir haben eine Gelegenheit, denn die neue Nummer zwei kommt ja auch von der Großbankenlobby, und da werden wir sehen, wie ernst wir diesen Beschluss hier eigentlich meinen. Das ist zentral, und auch der Fall Sabathil, der derzeit ja weit berichtet wird, gibt Anlass zur Sorge, was den Drehtür-Effekt angeht. Alle Institutionen müssen also hier aufräumen und die Konsequenzen dieser Entschließung zeigen.

Joachim Kuhs, *im Namen der ID-Fraktion*. – Frau Präsidentin, liebe Kolleginnen und Kollegen! Es ist schon viel gesagt worden, nur noch nicht von jedem, und ich möchte deshalb auch gar nicht erst so viel anmerken, denn die Fakten liegen auf dem Tisch. Die Analyse ist, denke ich, eindeutig, und es muss sich hier etwas ändern.

Aber es kann aus meiner Sicht nicht sein, dass die betroffene Behörde selbst die Regeln definiert, mit der dann solche Fälle gelöst werden sollen. Diese Regeln müssen die entsprechenden Organe hier, nämlich der Rat, das Parlament und die Kommission, treffen. Da müssen wir an einem Strang ziehen, damit diese Probleme nicht mehr auftauchen.

Letztendlich, seien wir doch ehrlich, ist es doch so: Selbst wenn wir uns hier ganz viele Regeln geben – das kostet auf der einen Seite viel Geld, wie Kollege Ferber ausgeführt hat, das kostet uns auch viel, viel Kraft und Zeit – ist das Problem doch, wenn bei den betroffenen Personen kein Gespür vorhanden ist, dass das ganze Ding ein „Geschmäckle“ hat, wie wir in Baden-Württemberg, wo ich herkomme, sagen. Dann werden wir hier keine Lösungen finden.

Solche Geschichten, solche Wechsel von Beamtschaft in die Privatwirtschaft, müssen von den Personen selbst gelöst werden. Wir können da nicht zuschauen, wenn solche Dinge sich hier breitmachen, egal wo Sie sind, im Parlament oder bei diesen Organen. Deshalb bitte ich um mehr Gespür, auch um mehr persönliche Betroffenheit, dass solche Dinge nicht mehr vorkommen.

José Gusmão, *em nome do Grupo GUE/NGL*. – Senhora Presidente, nós apoiamos a resolução que o Parlamento irá votar e que a comissão ECON trouxe a este debate. Infelizmente, parece que o que a Comissão Europeia nos trouxe foi uma desilusão. O que aliás é habitual, e tem sido habitual em sucessivas Comissões Europeias.

Na sequência da crise financeira de 2008 o então Presidente da Comissão Europeia disse que era preciso reequilibrar a influência da indústria financeira nas políticas europeias com a influência dos cidadãos. O Presidente da Comissão Europeia que fez esta bela declaração chamava-se Durão Barroso e, como todos sabemos, acabou na *Goldman Sachs*.

E este problema, que é um problema endémico em múltiplas instituições europeias, torna-se infinitamente mais grave cada vez que discutimos o sistema financeiro e os seus reguladores em comissões europeias, em diversos reguladores, no Parlamento Europeu.

As decisões que foram tomadas pela Autoridade Bancária Europeia no caso Farkas são, como já foi dito, uma piada de mau gosto. As restrições que são impostas de não contactar com pessoas que trabalhem na Autoridade, mesmo que esta restrição pudesse ser fiscalizada e não pode, obviamente não o impede de passar a sua lista telefónica aos seus novos colegas. Tal como é ridícula e seria risível, se este não fosse um assunto tão sério, a restrição de não utilizar a informação que acumulou em oito anos na Autoridade Bancária Europeia nas suas novas funções, que são funções de *lobby*, em que a Autoridade Bancária Europeia é um regulador central. O Sr. Farkas vai ser pago para utilizar essa informação. O salário que ele irá receber é o preço dessa informação.

E o que a Comissão Europeia aqui nos veio dizer é que o princípio da independência do regulador significa basicamente que as instituições democráticas que os cidadãos europeus elegeram não podem fazer nada, o que significa que reguladores importantes como a Autoridade Bancária Europeia podem ser totalmente capturados pelos setores económicos que visam regular.

Aliás, convém sublinhar que esta decisão que estamos a discutir é tomada por um Presidente da Autoridade Bancária Europeia que vem, ele próprio, de uma posição de *lobby* no *Santander*, e portanto esta história, esta novela na Autoridade Bancária Europeia, já tem muitos episódios.

E embora este assunto seja um assunto sério, não posso deixar de sorrir quando é invocado o direito ao trabalho. O que nós estamos a discutir é o direito de passar diretamente de um regulador para uma posição de *lobby*. O direito ao trabalho? Se os trabalhadores europeus fossem tão protegidos pelas instituições europeias como está a ser protegido este homem, que passou de regulador a lobista, a Europa estaria bastante melhor.

Jonás Fernández (S&D). – Señora presidenta, señor comisario, la pasada crisis financiera dejó entrever un claro espacio de grises, donde el sector financiero, las autoridades, los reguladores, los supervisores, compartían información, compartían espacios, compartían debates. Y los compartían de tal manera que, de alguna manera u otra, acababan influenciando las decisiones. Y esta percepción de la ciudadanía europea, esta percepción de que las autoridades públicas no son lo independientes que debieran ser de algún tipo de grupos de interés, es una percepción que mina la confianza en el sistema democrático, es una apreciación que mina la confianza en Europa, en el proyecto comunitario.

Yo creo que es muy importante que, en este caso que estamos discutiendo, la Comisión de Asuntos Económicos y Monetarios del Parlamento haya aprobado por unanimidad —unanimidad, no una mayoría amplia, unanimidad— una serie de requisitos, de recomendaciones para evitar este tipo de puertas giratorias. Porque creemos que no es razonable que los colegas de las instituciones supervisoras sean aquellos que deban evaluar si los empleados públicos de esas agencias pueden o no pueden ir a determinadas empresas.

Es necesaria una agencia independiente, con competencia para todas las instituciones europeas, la Comisión y las agencias supervisoras, que, de alguna manera, evalúe claramente los criterios, evalúe, en fin, las características de esos movimientos laborales, para permitir mejorar la confianza de los ciudadanos europeos en las instituciones, para mejorar la confianza en la democracia europea y abrir un espacio, como digo, de una mayor responsabilidad política en el conjunto de la Unión.

Damien Carême (Verts/ALE). – Madame la Présidente, tout le monde le dit, mais il faut le faire: il faut en finir avec l'influence opaque et disproportionnée des lobbies sur nos politiques publiques: le lobby de la finance, mais aussi celui du nucléaire ou des énergies fossiles, etc. Ils sont nombreux et organisés pour faire avancer dans l'ombre leurs intérêts privés, avec les conséquences que l'on connaît: dérèglements bancaires, subventions à des énergies du passé, et j'en passe.

Il faut plus de transparence pour lutter contre ces forces de l'ombre, car on est loin d'en avoir fini avec la corruption; même en France aujourd'hui, comme en témoigne, à titre d'exemple, le dernier rapport du Conseil de l'Europe du 9 janvier 2020, qui pointe la persistance de zones grises dans la lutte contre la corruption et qui appelle à une plus grande transparence dans les contacts entre l'exécutif et les groupes d'intérêt afin que leur influence sur les décisions soit plus claire.

Pour retrouver toute la confiance des citoyens, ce que tout le monde appelle de ses vœux ici, il est temps de mettre fin à la collusion entre intérêts publics et privés. À titre d'exemple, car c'est celui qui nous intéresse aujourd'hui, un haut fonctionnaire, M. Farkas, en charge de la supervision européenne des banques, ne devrait pas pouvoir devenir du jour au lendemain directeur du principal lobby de la finance. C'est pourtant ce qui se passe en ce moment et ce n'est pas acceptable.

Il faut des règles plus strictes pour préserver l'intégrité de nos institutions. On a besoin, par exemple, de fixer des périodes plus longues de transition entre deux activités aux conflits d'intérêts potentiels avec interdiction de badges d'accès au Parlement. Il faut surtout une supervision véritablement indépendante lorsque de telles situations se présentent, grâce à la création de cette autorité indépendante pour l'éthique que vous évoquiez dans votre propos.

Quand on dit vouloir défendre l'intérêt général, il faut agir en conséquence, en commençant par accepter la transparence et la clarté.

Angelo Ciocca (ID). – Signora Presidente, onorevoli colleghi, non si pensi di guadagnare stamattina la verginità del Parlamento europeo e delle istituzioni europee lanciando l'allarme, a distanza di decenni, che esistono dentro le istituzioni europee i conflitti di interesse, l'influenza delle lobby, le porte girevoli e l'assenza di etica.

Lo denunciavamo da anni e lo denunciano i cittadini: questi palazzi e queste istituzioni sono stati sordi per anni sul fatto che dentro a queste istituzioni, alle istituzioni europee, all'unione monetaria ci fosse forte influenza delle lobby.

Però è importante anche andare a vedere cosa è accaduto, dove l'unione monetaria ha creato danni: ci sono negozi che hanno chiuso, aziende che hanno chiuso, cittadini che hanno perso posti di lavoro per l'influenza di queste lobby. Quindi che non ci si limiti solo a regolamentare il futuro ma si ricerchino le responsabilità di quelle azioni e di quegli errori ma soprattutto delle premeditazioni criminali che in questi anni ci sono state.

Alfred Sant (S&D). – Madam President, in the eurozone regulation at European level is still developing, sometimes by trial and error. The role of the top managers is crucial in setting, interpreting and implementing regulatory texts. On that basis, new administrative structures and practice will eventually be developed, as the Banking Union and the Capital Markets Union beckon. Complex interests are at play – national and transnational, state and private. Subject to such complex pressures, those managing and arbitrating the euro's regulatory movement must be totally neutral. All States and corporate actors, the general European public, the regulators themselves, must have the assurance that this is the case. That assurance is not available as of now.

Post-employment calculations and expectations can colour the way in which the regulatory process is being developed. Also, post-employment the inside information and know-how obtained when working in regulatory mode can serve to give advantages to one's new employer, but the revolving door practice is still being tolerated. There is, too, a reverse revolving door issue. We need to understand how conflicts of interest could arise from positions held pre-public employment when nominating people to top regulatory or executive positions. That problem, too, cannot be ignored. We should not tolerate the contamination of the regulatory neutrality that the eurozone requires if it is to develop properly.

Mikuláš Peksa (Verts/ALE). – Madam President, I am standing here today to denounce the problem of revolving doors between EU institutions and private lobby groups. Too often, senior EU officials leave their high level positions in order to exploit inside information and contacts to the benefit of private sector lobbying.

Whilst senior EU officials already have the obligation to report on the new functions they intend to take, this is too often ignored. Post-public employment conflict of interest has really become a systemic problem that has the potential to endanger our integrity and reputation.

EU institutions should be an example of high ethical and transparency standards. This is why I call on the Commission to do more to prevent such conflicts of interests and on the European Court of Auditors to look into this systemic issue and identify best practices.

Last October, the Commission promised to review the post-employment ethical regulations. And in order not just to criticise, but also to provide some solutions, I would like to ask for four things: first, a harmonised legal framework, which would apply the same ethical standards at EU and national level; second, establishment of an independent ethical body to investigate all problematic cases; third, a mandatory 12-months' cooling-off period to forbid a former senior EU official to lobby his ex-colleagues. Finally, in order to ensure maximum transparency of our public institutions, declarations of interests and finding of conflicts of interests shall be published online to make it accessible to all citizens.

Maximilian Krah (ID). – Frau Präsidentin, verehrte Kolleginnen und Kollegen. Wir befinden uns hier in einer Zwickmühle. Auf der einen Seite sind alle Bedenken, die gegen den Wechsel aus den europäischen Institutionen in die Privatwirtschaft vorgetragen wurden, berechtigt, sie verärgern zu Recht die Öffentlichkeit. Zum anderen wollen wir aber nicht, dass es keinen Ausweg aus öffentlichen Ämtern gibt. Öffentliche Ämter werden auf Zeit verliehen. Wir sind darauf angewiesen, talentierte Köpfe aus der Privatwirtschaft in die Institutionen zu holen, und umgekehrt müssen diese Köpfe wissen, dass es für sie keine Falle ist, sondern dass auch die Möglichkeit besteht, nachdem sie ihren Dienst geleistet haben, in andere Aufgaben zurückzukehren.

Das heißt, Probleme sind vorprogrammiert, und der Umgang damit kann nicht darin liegen, eine derartige Überregulierung zu schaffen, dass diese Menschen nicht mehr kommen. Denn das schadet uns, weil wir die Kompetenz brauchen.

Insofern ist die Lösung das, was mein Kollege Kuhs bereits angesprochen hat, nämlich die persönliche Betroffenheit zu stärken, indem wir Fälle offensichtlichen Missbrauchs an die Öffentlichkeit geben. Das Korrektiv für politisches Fehlverhalten ist eine kritische Öffentlichkeit, aber nicht die hundertste oder tausendste Behörde mit Regularien.

Maria Grapini (S&D). – Doamnă președintă, domnule comisar, revenim cu această dezbateră, pentru că nu este prima dată când vorbim de conflictul de interese și, mai ales, de prevenirea conflictului de interese.

Vreau să mă refer la ultima dezbateră, din 24 octombrie anul trecut, când domnul comisar Mimica ne spunea aici că da, recunoaște că trebuie să facem o revizuire, o revizuire a cadrului juridic, să-l armonizăm, să verificăm acest conflict de interese, să fie uniform în toate agențiile. Este straniu, de asemenea, că de atunci, din 24 octombrie, Comisia nu a venit cu nici o măsură concretă (pentru că așa promitea domnul comisar, că va vorbi și cu noua Comisie și se va veni cu măsuri concrete).

Sigur că reglementarea piețelor financiare europene, modul de reglementare, modul de supraveghere influențează întreaga piață internă și nu înțeleg decizia Consiliului și a Comisiei de a avea aceasta indiferență în evaluarea conflictului de interese. De asemenea, nu înțeleg cum poate să spună un comisar că, după angajare, post angajare, verificăm dacă există conflict de interese. Vorbim de prevenție, putem verifica înainte, iar cazul concret adus în această întrebare cred că trebuie să fie rezolvat urgent și să nu poată să fie angajat acest domn dacă are conflicte de interese recunoscute, de fapt.

Marek Paweł Balt (S&D). – Szanowna Pani Przewodnicząca! W interesie instytucji europejskiej jest między innymi zapobieganie nadużyciom i łamaniu prawa przez instytucje podległe. Zastanawia transfer polegający na tym, że pan Adam Farkas, zajmujący ważne stanowisko kontrolne, nagle staje się dyrektorem stowarzyszenia, które może lobbować i wpływać na instytucje unijne. Rodzi to podejrzenie o możliwość wywierania wpływu z korzyścią dla wcześniej wspomnianego stowarzyszenia, jak i innych zainteresowanych instytucji.

W interesie Komisji Europejskiej oraz Parlamentu Europejskiego jest monitorowanie takich przypadków i zapobieganie im. Dlatego chciałbym zapytać, czy Komisja Europejska zamierza kontrolować pracę Europejskiego Urzędu Nadzoru Bankowego oraz Stowarzyszenia Rynków Finansowych w Europie i sprawdzić, czy aby nie wykorzystano wpływów pana Farkasa. Jeśli tak, czy możemy liczyć na sprawozdanie z takiej kontroli?

Zgłoszenia z sali

Traian Bănescu (PPE). – Doamnă președintă, legat de conflictul de interese, aș spune că este izvorul celor mai importante fraude care se petrec în sistemul economic al Uniunii Europene. Conflictul de interese este un subiect care rămâne continuu în actualitate. Din păcate, conflictul de interese este reglementat și interpretat diferit în statele membre ale Uniunii Europene.

Nerespectarea unor criterii severe în reglementarea conflictului de interese este cea care ne și diferențiază de la țară la țară. Sunt unele țări care dau o atenție deosebită conflictului de interese, altele au o legislație relaxată. Dar conflictul de interese afectează și activitatea administrației locale, a administrației centrale.

De aceea, propun Comisiei ca, într-un termen rezonabil, să vină cu o propunere de reglementare a conflictului de interese, universal valabilă în toate statele Uniunii Europene și în toate domeniile, pentru că aici este izvorul corupției la nivelul Uniunii Europene.

Bogdan Rzońca (ECR). – Pani Przewodnicząca! Na kanwie tej bardzo interesującej dyskusji chciałbym poruszyć temat, nie oczekując od razu na odpowiedź, o którym mówi cała Europa. Wszyscy wiedzą, że budujemy Nowy Zielony Ład, że będą na to przeznaczane ogromne środki finansowe. Widzę, bo uczestniczę w procesie legislacyjnym, duże zainteresowanie tym procesem różnych grup lobbujących i rynków finansowych. Chciałbym więc poprosić może o to, żebyśmy na tym etapie wyraźnie oddzielili osoby, które pracują przy tym procesie legislacyjnym od osób, które będą później (myślę tu o późniejszych doradcach różnych firm) korzystały albo doradzały w pobieraniu tych pieniędzy czy implementowaniu ogromnych środków finansowych, które będą dostępne. Boję się, że mogą powstać bańki finansowe i różnego rodzaju oszustwa, więc na tym etapie proszę zwrócić na to uwagę.

(Koniec zgłoszeń z sali)

Janez Lenarčič, Member of the Commission. – Madam President, I listened very carefully to the comments that you made on this important matter. First of all, I would like to assure you all that, first, the Commission is not indifferent to issues of potential conflicts of interest, and, second, we are certainly not taking lightly this, or any other, case involving a potential conflict of interests. It is not for the Commission to play the role of an advocate for a decision taken by an independent body, the Board of Supervisors of the EBA, but we do feel that we can shed some additional light. I'll try to do so in view of the comments just made.

First of all, the representative of the Commission on the Board of Supervisors, who, I repeat, does not have voting rights, tried to get restrictions which were as strict as possible because there was indeed the finding that this case involved a conflict of interest. The Board of Supervisors looked very carefully into this matter and was of the view that the conflict of interest could be managed by imposing additional restrictions, such that go beyond the minimum condition applied to senior officials. So the length of the period prohibiting the lobbying contracts vis-à-vis the former staff is twice the duration as compared to the minimum, and so on. I won't go into the details of the restrictions now, but the Board had to weigh and find the right balance between the interests of the public, on the one hand, and the rights of a person to pursue their work.

An important question was raised among others: who would monitor and ensure the implementation and enforcement of this decision? I would like to note that the decision by the EBA Board of Supervisors includes a provision on implementation. The restrictions that were imposed will be communicated to the EBA staff and they will be required to report to the Chairperson on any contacts with Mr Farkas after he has left the service of the EBA. Furthermore, the EBA is subject to an obligation to inform the public each year on the implementation of the prohibition on lobbying and advocacy, including a list of the cases assessed. Mr Farkas, as any other active or former staff member, is subject to the Staff Regulations and disciplinary proceedings could be opened against him in case of breach, including after his departure from the EBA. Were the EBA Board of Supervisors or the European Anti-Fraud Office (OLAF) to become aware of evidence of failure, following an administrative investigation and eventual disciplinary proceedings, Mr Farkas could be subject to disciplinary measures, as defined in the Staff Regulations. I think this explains that not everything is left to chance. There are provisions in place that should ensure that these restrictions are properly implemented.

To conclude, let me reiterate that the Commission ensures – or tries to ensure – that high ethical standards are in place across all the agencies by having in place a harmonised legal framework. However, it is the responsibility of, in this case, the EBA Board of Supervisors to implement this legal framework by taking decisions independently on post-employment restrictions, in accordance with its founding regulation and with the Staff Regulations. It is also the responsibility of the EBA Board of Supervisors to ensure that these decisions are properly monitored and their implementation enforced.

Finally, the Commission is always seeking to improve the existing framework. The existing ethical framework is the subject of constant review. We are looking for possible improvements, including, as I mentioned earlier, by setting up an independent ethical body and, I repeat, we are looking forward to close collaboration with the European Parliament, the European Ombudsman and other institutions in this process.

Przewodnicząca. – Otrzymałam jeden projekt rezolucji złożony zgodnie z art. 136 ust. 5 Regulaminu.

Zamykam debatę.

Głosowanie odbędzie się dzisiaj, w czwartek 16 stycznia 2020 r.

4. **Debaty nad przypadkami łamania praw człowieka, zasad demokracji i praworządności (debata)**

4.1. **Burundi, w szczególności wolność słowa**

Przewodnicząca. – Kolejnym punktem porządku dnia jest debata nad sześcioma projektami rezolucji w sprawie Burundi, w szczególności wolności słowa (2020/2502(RSP)).

Ellie Chowns, author. – Madam President, colleagues, Burundi is a beautiful country which has seen more than its fair share of tragedy. The report of the Truth and Reconciliation Commission released this week identified more than 4 000 mass graves, with over 142 000 victims.

In such a context, the role of human rights defenders, the role of freedom of expression in an unfettered press, are even more important. They are cornerstones of democracy and of sustainable peace building.

We've been prompted to debate this topic today by the most recent example of Burundian government repression of freedom of expression. Burundi's Public Prosecutor, on 30 December, asked for a 15-year jail term for four journalists and their driver, Christine Kamikazi, Agnès Ndirubusa, Térance Mpozenzi, Egide Harerimana, and Adolphe Masabarakiza, who was simply driving them.

They were arrested in October when they were covering clashes between rebel and government forces and they've been accused of complicity with undermining the State.

I understand the only evidence that's been presented in the trial is a single WhatsApp message. They are not the first.

In July 2016, another reporter, Jean Bigirimana disappeared and has not been heard from since. In 2015 journalist Christophe Nkezabahizi, his wife and two children were murdered in their home in Bujumbura and there has been no adequate follow up.

Human rights activist, Germain Rukuki, a member of Action by Christians for the Abolition of Torture (ACAT) was sentenced to 32 years in prison last year and Nestor Nibitanga, was also sentenced to five years.

We call on the government to, immediately and unconditionally, release these journalists and these human rights defenders. There are upcoming elections in 2020 — an important point for the country.

I welcome the fact that President Pierre Nkurunziza has said that he will not seek re-election, but in order for there to be credible elections, major changes – considerable improvements to the political and human rights situation – are needed.

I urge Burundi in the strongest possible terms to change course and create the conditions needed for an open and vibrant democracy and I salute the efforts of the journalists and human rights defenders who are working for that end.

Anna Fotyga, author. – Madam President, Burundi is one of the poorest countries of the world and our very detailed draft joint resolution portrays the situation there in the time preceding the presidential and general elections. The situation of both human rights defenders and media representatives is really dire and we cannot imagine free elections without them being available for the general public, to present information, genuine, reasonable and reliable information. I thank my colleagues for the very good text of the resolution.

Maria Arena, auteure. – Madame la Présidente, la crise politique au Burundi a un impact dévastateur sur les populations burundaises, qui voient leurs droits économiques mais aussi leurs droits fondamentaux bafoués.

Depuis 2015, ces droits fondamentaux, comme par exemple le droit de vote, sont mis en difficulté. Des personnes considérées comme opposants politiques au sens large ont été menacées, poussées à l'exil, emprisonnées et parfois même victimes d'exécutions sommaires.

Le droit à la liberté d'expression a également été mis à mal et l'espace pour la société civile et les médias est de plus en plus restreint dans ce pays. Le 22 octobre 2019, Christine Kamikazi, Agnès Ndirubusa, Térance Mpozenzi et Egide Harerimana, quatre journalistes du groupe Iwacu, ainsi que leur conducteur Adolphe Masabarakiza ont été arrêtés et accusés de complicité d'atteinte à la sécurité de l'État. En outre, Jean Bigirimana, journaliste du groupe Iwacu, est porté disparu depuis juillet 2016. Et par rapport à ces arrestations et à ces assassinats, il y a des manquements systématiques des autorités qui constituent une violation du droit en matière de protection des citoyens par l'État. Nous condamnons fermement l'intimidation et les arrestations arbitraires. Nous appelons à la libération immédiate des journalistes d'Iwacu et de toute personne emprisonnée pour avoir exercé son droit à la liberté d'expression.

Afin d'éviter que la situation ne s'intensifie dans la région, nous appelons aussi l'Union africaine à envoyer ses observateurs des droits humains au Burundi et nous appelons les Nations unies à lancer des enquêtes impartiales sur les personnes suspectées d'avoir commis des violations des droits de l'homme. Nous appelons enfin les États membres de l'Union à fournir une aide financière aux acteurs de la société civile du Burundi et appelons les diplomates de l'Union à veiller à ce que les lignes directrices de l'Union européenne en matière de droits humains soient respectées, en observant les procès des journalistes prisonniers politiques et des défenseurs des droits humains, ainsi qu'en leur rendant visite. Enfin, réaffirmons avec force qu'il doit y avoir des sanctions qui soient maintenues à l'égard du Burundi, des sanctions ciblées qui ont été décidées par le Conseil et qui ne doivent pas être levées aujourd'hui: ce serait un message politique désastreux par rapport à la situation au Burundi.

Idoia Villanueva Ruiz, Autora. – Señora presidenta, asistimos a un retroceso generalizado en todo el mundo de los derechos civiles y políticos, que se está manifestando de forma diferente.

En Europa, a través de leyes que criminalizan la protesta y del aumento generalizado del odio, manifestado en la extrema derecha.

En América Latina, con *lawfare*, con diferentes ataques directos a personas diferentes, defensoras del territorio y del medio ambiente.

En Oriente Medio, con la creación de un agujero negro de impunidad en el que los convenios internacionales de Derecho humanitario y de Derecho internacional están barridos.

África no es un continente que se escapa a esta peligrosa tendencia. Hoy hablamos de Burundi, donde la crisis política y económica desde hace cuatro años se agrava, donde las violaciones de los derechos humanos son esencialmente de carácter político, desde el Gobierno, y la supresión de libertades civiles está intensificándose en un período previo a las elecciones presidenciales y legislativas de 2020. Es necesaria la liberación inmediata e incondicional de todos los detenidos que expresan libremente sus opiniones. Deben cesar de inmediato la violencia, las violaciones de derechos humanos y la intimidación política contra la sociedad civil y la oposición. Hay que actuar de manera decidida en favor de la libertad de expresión al abolir las medidas adoptadas contra ONG y medios de comunicación; respetar los tratados internacionales sobre derechos humanos y contra la tortura. El cese de estas violaciones de derechos humanos es la condición previa para que el Gobierno de Burundi, con mediación de países vecinos, establezca un proceso de diálogo político pacífico.

Pero nada de esto puede ocurrir si en Europa no nos implicamos. Y también es necesario que Europa decida qué papel quiere tomar en el mundo actual. Por eso necesitamos acciones concretas. Europa debe demostrar su compromiso con la paz, concediendo el estatuto de refugiado también a los solicitantes de asilo de Burundi, como lo recomendaban las Naciones Unidas, y, también, trabajar en la ayuda oficial al desarrollo sobre el terreno, también para que los países vecinos sean capaces de acoger a refugiados, y asegurar que las empresas europeas que operan en Burundi respetan las normas internacionales.

La relación de la Unión Europea con África siempre ha sido complicada. No nos vincula una historia de la que nos podemos sentir orgullosos. Precisamente por esto, es la hora de que Europa empiece una relación con objetivos de política exterior alineados con los intereses de la población africana, centrada en los derechos humanos, el desarrollo sostenible y la democracia.

Arba Kokalari, *författare*. – Fru talman! Yttrandefrihet och oberoende medier är en förutsättning för demokrati och för ett fritt samhälle. Vi är många här som ser allvarligt på att det finns en nedåtgående trend i världen. Enligt World Press Freedom Index minskar antalet länder runtom i världen som har en fri press.

Jag är väldigt orolig över den här situationen, och just Burundi är ett av de länder där fri media och fri press samt det civila samhället utsätts för stort förtryck. Hot och våld mot människorättsaktivister och journalister blir allt vanligare. Media är i stort sett statligt kontrollerad. Senast i oktober greps fyra journalister och deras chaufför när de försökte göra sitt arbete.

Världen kan inte bara titta på när de här kränkningarna sker varje dag runt om i världen. Vi måste agera, vi måste öka det politiska trycket på Burundi. Burundi måste se till att fullfölja sina internationella åtaganden och släppa de här journalisterna omgående.

Vad kan EU göra? Jo, vi från EU:s sida måste stötta det civila samhället, och vi måste utvidga sanktionerna mot dem som begår människorättsbrott i Burundi. Det handlar om vår möjlighet och vårt ansvar att se till att vi har en värld där mänskliga fri- och rättigheter och demokrati fungerar och där ofrihet bekämpas.

Jan-Christoph Oetjen, *Verfasser*. – Frau Präsidentin! Im Mai dieses Jahres stehen Wahlen an, und wie so oft spitzt sich die Situation dann in diesen Ländern zu. In Burundi jedoch ist die Situation seit mehreren Jahren angespannt. Menschen- und Bürgerrechte werden in Burundi mit Füßen getreten, Oppositionelle, Journalisten, Menschenrechtsaktivisten werden verhaftet, vor Gericht gestellt, manchmal einfach ermordet. Wir dürfen an dieser Stelle nicht wegschauen, sondern wir müssen unsere Stimme erheben und diese Menschen verteidigen.

Die konkreten Fälle sind gerade schon von den Kolleginnen Chowns und Arena genannt worden. Ich will sie an dieser Stelle nicht wiederholen, aber ich möchte mich der Forderung anschließen, dass die Anschuldigungen gegen diese verhafteten Personen sofort fallen gelassen werden müssen. Sie müssen auf freien Fuß gesetzt werden, und das ohne irgendwelche Konditionen. Das ist die Forderung, die wir hier als Europäisches Parlament lautstark nach Burundi senden sollten. Denn eine andere Meinung zu haben, kritisch Bericht zu erstatten oder für Menschenrechte einzutreten, das ist kein Verbrechen, sondern das ist etwas, was wertvoll ist und was wir als Europäisches Parlament verteidigen sollten. Deswegen rufen wir nach Burundi: Lassen Sie diese Menschen frei, sie haben nichts Unrechtes getan.

Wir müssen den Druck auf die burundischen Behörden aufrechterhalten. Deswegen muss die internationale Gemeinschaft stark zusammenstehen und darf in diesem Druck nicht nachlassen. Und die burundischen Behörden müssen endlich dafür sorgen, dass Menschenrechte geachtet werden, dass Bürgerrechte geachtet werden, dass freie Meinungsäußerung möglich ist und dass im Mai dieses Jahres freie Wahlen in einer sicheren Demokratie stattfinden können.

Seán Kelly, *thar ceann an Ghrúpa PPE*. – A Uachtaráin, táimid ar ais arís sa Bhurúin agus ón am a phléamar an scéal seo ó chianaibh, níl aon scéal maith againn. Drochscéal i ndáiríre, easpa saoirse do lucht an phreasa, easpa cearta daonna do mhuintir na Burúine agus is fiú díospóireacht a bheith againn ar an ábhar seo ar maidin.

On 14 March 2016, the EU suspended all direct financial support to the Burundian administration. This arose out of the 2015 presidential elections, which were boycotted by the opposition and which the UN Observatory condemned.

The EU deplores the continued oppression of freedom of speech and freedom of expression in Burundi. In 2018 and 2019, media outlets faced increased harassment by the Burundian authorities when foreign-operating licenses such as that of the worldwide respected BBC were withdrawn. The Burundian authorities continue to subject independent journalists to arbitrary arrests. In the World Press Freedom Index, Burundi is ranked 159th out of 180 countries in 2019. That says it all where freedom of expression and freedom of speech are concerned.

With presidential, parliamentary and local elections taking place in 2020, this remains a huge issue. On 22 October 2019, the Burundian police arrested four journalists on the basis of complicity in threatening state security and a judgment is to be given on those in 30 days. For that reason, it is so important that the European Union and our High Representative take immediate steps and make representations there to ensure that the 15-year prison term suggested is not given to these journalists.

Finally, I would say also that we need to work closer with the East African Community and the African Union to protect the Burundian population. We can only improve on the terrible situation that is there at the moment.

Isabel Santos, em nome do Grupo S&D. – (início da intervenção com o microfone desligado) ... a liberdade de expressão no Burundi tem sido alvo de diversos ataques. O caso dos jornalistas e do seu motorista presos no final de 2019 é apenas mais um numa longa lista de casos de sérias violações de direitos humanos cometidos neste país.

As Nações Unidas, através do seu Secretário-Geral e do Conselho dos Direitos Humanos, trouxeram a público preocupações graves sobre a situação dos direitos humanos, em geral, e o respeito da liberdade de expressão, em particular: assassinatos, tortura, detenções arbitrarias e outras formas de tratamento desumano são mencionadas pelas Nações Unidas, tudo num clima de impunidade generalizada.

Os casos de violação da liberdade de expressão hoje em discussão são um reflexo dessa repressão generalizada e devem merecer a nossa veemente reprovação.

Apelamos, por isso, à libertação dos quatro jornalistas presos no final do ano – Christine Kamikazi, Agnès Ndirubusa, Térance Mpozenzi, Egide Harerimana e o seu motorista, Adolphe Masabarikiza – e que se criem condições para eleições livres e democráticas no próximo mês de maio.

Dita Charanzová, on behalf of the Renew Group. – Madam President, Burundi has been facing multiple crises over the last five years. People considered as opposition are disappearing, being tortured and killed. Journalists are harassed and arbitrarily arrested. There is total impunity for the perpetrators, and thousands of Burundian refugees are fleeing to escape the violence and humanitarian crisis.

In an already dire situation the presidential elections this year risk generating even more instability and potential violence, with people opting to join armed opposition groups. The government must take action now. It must protect its people and restore and uphold their rights to prevent the situation escalating further. It must release the jailed journalists and cease to censure society. The rule of law must be upheld and democracy fostered or the country risks disintegrating further.

Under these circumstances, the EU has had no choice but to suspend financial support to the government of Burundi. But we should not let down the Burundian people. We must strengthen our development cooperation to help relieve the humanitarian crisis, and we must stand ready to offer all we can to support a peaceful electoral process.

Alice Kuhnke, för Verts/ALE-gruppen. – Fru talman! Jag är tacksam över att vi folkvalda i EU uppmärksammar situationen i Burundi, att vi inte låter den pågå i tystnad. Situationen är under all kritik, och förföljelsen av journalister måste få ett slut. Burundis regering måste frige varenda journalist.

EU har en vital roll att spela. Vi kan använda våra mekanismer och verktyg för att få ett slut på den här situationen. Och vi gröna uppmanar alla EU:s medlemsländer att stötta civilsamhällets organisationer, journalistförbund och kvinnorrättsrörelsen i Burundi.

EU måste också jobba för implementeringen av Arusha-avtalet, så att det blir verklighet. Vi gröna uppmanar Josep Borrell att ge stöd till Östafrikanska gemenskapen i Burundi-dialogerna.

Ryszard Czarnecki, w imieniu grupy ECR. – Pani Przewodnicząca! Panie Komisarzu! Byłem w Burundi, a także w krajach, które sąsiadują z Burundi, czyli w Rwandzie od północy, w Tanzanii od południa i wschodu i również w Republice Kongo zwanej demokratyczną. Myślę więc, że wiem, jaka jest sytuacja w tym kraju, który – uwaga! – jest krajem o długiej tradycji historycznej. Królestwo w tym kraju, królestwo Tutsi, powstało, zanim powstało szereg państw europejskich, także państwo, które później skolonizowało Burundi, czyli Belgia.

To dobrze, że po pierwsze zabieramy głos w tej sprawie, że domagamy się wolności dla tamtejszych dziennikarzy i wolnych wyborów wiosną tego roku. Ale bardzo ważne jest też to, że potrafimy pokazać, jak działa mechanizm presji, czyli wstrzymania pomocy finansowej dla kraju, który nie przestrzega praw człowieka.

Carlos Zorrinho (S&D). – Senhora Presidente, a proximidade do processo eleitoral no Burundi agudizou as tensões sociais e políticas no país e evidenciou como o Estado funciona com uma mão policial forte para limitar os direitos fundamentais dos cidadãos como o direito da liberdade de expressão.

O Estado tem vindo a boicotar o trabalho da ONU, que trabalha na assistência básica às populações, e também os trabalhos de outras ONG que o fazem.

A liberdade de expressão está em perigo com as prisões e manifestações feitas a quem ousa desalinhar com o discurso oficial. Vários jornalistas estão desaparecidos ou foram impedidos de exercer livremente o seu trabalho.

É urgente assegurar as condições para que as eleições de maio deste ano decorram de forma livre e justa, apelando para isso a um acompanhamento empenhado do nosso Serviço de Ação Externa e dos diplomatas europeus no terreno.

A imposição de sanções direcionadas pela União Europeia e pela ONU deve ser avaliada quanto antes e posta em prática como forma de punir as permanentes violações dos direitos humanos no Burundi.

A reconciliação e a paz política e social no Burundi são essenciais para que o país se possa desenvolver e sair da espiral de pobreza endémica em que se encontra.

Phil Bennion (Renew). – Madam President, the people of Burundi continue to suffer from human rights abuses. The United Nations report from September last year showed that the police, the intelligence services and even the youth wing of the governing party have been responsible for the killings, the disappearances and the arbitrary arrests of actual or alleged opposition politicians and their families.

One of the first steps to holding human rights abusers to account is freedom of expression, but this too has come under attack in Burundi. The BBC had its licence revoked by the Burundian authorities, which also banned its citizens from providing information to the BBC. Even children are not safe from prosecution. Three schoolgirls were arrested last year for allegedly doodling on the President's image in their school books. While they were later released, the government warned that future cases would be punished.

More recently, the police arrested four journalists from a Burundian media organisation – and their driver. They are potentially facing 15-year prison terms for just pursuing their profession. We must press the Burundian Government to release these journalists, cease the persecution of independent media and opposition politicians and reverse their suppression of freedom of expression.

Burundi is a signatory to the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights, in which the protection of freedom of expression is enshrined. This is critical to ensure that the upcoming presidential elections are free and fair, which is the best route to a peaceful and genuinely democratic society.

Nathan Gill (NI). – Madam President, it seems a little rich to me that we are here, in the European Parliament in Strasbourg, debating freedom of expression in Burundi when actually, because of a rule made by this Parliament this week, I am not free to express myself by having my national flag here, on my desk. Are you really lecturing other nations about their freedom to express themselves, when you are repressing and denying our colleagues here the right to proudly display their national flags? What are you afraid of?

Yes, help others to improve their nations, but get your own house in order. We, the British, are leaving, we're taking our flags with us, but stop being hypocrites and allow other MEP colleagues here to express themselves and their electorates, and their identity by having their national flags on their desks.

Neena Gill (S&D). – Madam President, it pains me to follow that presentation, but I want to focus on Burundi and on Agnès Ndirubusa, Christine Kamikazi, Egide Harerimana and TERENCE MPOZENZI. They were journalists just doing their job, investigating and holding the government to account. Now they face up to 15 years in jail. They were arrested on charges of undermining state security, but really these attacks on media freedom are aimed at preventing the world from knowing about serious human rights abuses happening in Burundi.

So, my questions to the Commission. What will the European External Action Service (EEAS) do to pressure the government to release these four journalists? How will it use its leverage, such as the EUR 400 million allocated in the European Development Fund? And as elections approach in May, how will the Commission ensure that President Nkurunziza acts to protect what is left of freedom of expression in Burundi and that there are free and peaceful elections?

This is perhaps my last speech in this plenary and it has been an honour and a privilege to be able to speak up for those who are less able to do so; a platform that I've been able to use to speak against human rights abuses around the world.

Marek Paweł Balt (S&D). – Pani Przewodnicząca! Wolność słowa jest wartością niekwestionowaną. Wywodzić tę wolność można z argumentów opartych na idei demokracji, z potrzeby służenia prawdzie i związanej z tym wolnością głoszenia idei, wreszcie z autonomii jednostki i praw podstawowych człowieka. Niestety obecna władza w Burundi blokuje swobodny przepływ informacji, manipulując przy tym opinią publiczną. Osoby, które starają się przekazać informacje poza granice kraju, są surowo karane, często bite i gwałcone, a na koniec skazywane na dożywocie bądź mordowane. Rząd Burundi wciąż nie szanuje praw człowieka oraz nie skłania się ku demokracji, która jest krucha i wrażliwa na wszelkie niebezpieczeństwa. Komisja Europejska i Parlament Europejski powinny odgrywać wiodącą rolę w monitorowaniu sytuacji przedwyborczej w Burundi, tak aby uniknąć manipulacji wyborczej i wreszcie żeby w kraju mógł zapanować pokój, a wraz z nim wolność słowa.

Fabio Massimo Castaldo (NI). – Signora Presidente, onorevoli colleghi, il 2020 potrebbe rappresentare un anno di grandi cambiamenti per il Burundi: finalmente il 20 maggio si dovrebbero tenere le elezioni presidenziali e le elezioni politiche, dopo una stagione terribile, iniziata con le contestate elezioni dell'aprile 2015.

Nel frattempo, però, il Burundi resta teatro di gravissime violazioni dei diritti umani. Il presidente Nkurunziza ha commesso crimini efferati per mantenere il potere contro la volontà popolare, attuando una sanguinaria repressione delle manifestazioni, che ha visto massacri ed esecuzioni extragiudiziarie di oppositori e membri della società civile.

Dal 1° maggio 2019, in particolare, è iniziata una lunga stagione di omicidi politici e di minacce rivolte dal regime agli osservatori dei seggi indipendenti e agli oppositori politici. Lo spazio per la società civile e i media si è ristretto sempre di più e molti attivisti e giornalisti indipendenti affrontano intimidazioni, detenzioni arbitrarie e processi sommari.

Voglio esprimere la mia più profonda preoccupazione per queste evoluzioni, che fanno presagire la natura violenta e antidemocratica delle prossime elezioni. Come può essere infatti garantita un'equa e corretta competizione elettorale per i partiti di opposizione, alla luce di una rafforzata repressione dei media indipendenti?

Il Burundi necessita di una soluzione politica duratura ma il suo governo attuale rifiuta di rispettare i trattati internazionali, l'accordo di Arusha del 2000 e la stessa Costituzione burundese, minando qualsiasi iniziativa di riconciliazione, di pace e di giustizia.

Per questo abbiamo bisogno di far sentire la voce dell'Unione europea più che mai, pretendendo rispetto dei trattati internazionali e della clausola degli accordi di Cotonou sui diritti umani.

(L'oratore accetta di rispondere a una domanda «cartellino blu» (articolo 171, paragrafo 8, del regolamento))

Tomislav Sokol (PPE), *blue-card question*. – Colleague, you mentioned the problems in Burundi, but this is not the only country where such things take place, especially in Africa. We discuss these things a lot here in this Parliament. But what do you think, honestly, that the EU can do to really influence issues in these kinds of countries? We know that we have development aid, etc., but to what extent do you think that the European Union can find a really unified voice and influence issues at the global level?

Fabio Massimo Castaldo (NI), *blue-card answer*. – Thank you very much for this important question. First of all let me say that it is true: it is not the only country, but that's why it is even more important than ever that we will respect of the human rights clause in the Cotonou agreement. It has never been effectively applied, and above all we must look into not only suspending our cooperation funds, but also eventually implementing targeted sanctions against those responsible for these atrocities.

We are speaking in Burundi of a covert genocide because still there is a conflict between the Hutu and Tutsi in the country as happened in Rwanda. And of course let me say that we must try to use our leverage and to ensure a united position of the European countries. We cannot allow some of our Member States to negotiate behind our back, not respecting the official position of the High Representative and, of course, the official position of the EU.

Zgłoszenia z sali

Jiří Pospíšil (PPE). – Paní předsedající, já jsem velmi pozorně poslouchal celou debatu a se všemi kolegy souhlasím. Ta situace v Burundi je opravdu velmi kritická a děkuji předkladatelům tohoto tisku, že předložili takovou zprávu. A to zvláště v situaci, která zde byla zmiňována. Za půl roku čekají v Burundi dvoje volby – parlamentní a prezidentské. A my bychom měli, Evropská unie, a je to otázka na Komisi, na Vás, pane komisaři, udělat maximum pro to, abychom vhodnou diplomatickou cestou, ale i ekonomickými nástroji udělali maximum pro to, aby ty volby proběhly demokraticky. To by mělo být cílem dnešní debaty. My tu můžeme říkat, jak je to tragické, jak se zachází s novináři, s opozicí v Burundi, ale cílem tohoto setkání by mělo být, co uděláme pro to, aby v květnu proběhly alespoň trochu demokratické volby. A ta situace nebude jednoduchá, byť zde kolega řekl, že současný prezident nechce kandidovat, tak někteří analytici tvrdí, že naopak ještě bude kandidovat, což by bylo v rozporu s burundskou ústavou. Takže čeká nás náročná cesta, abychom Burundi pomohli a v květnu proběhly demokratické volby.

Eugen Tomac (PPE). – Domnule președintele de ședință, am dorit să intervin tocmai pentru că este foarte bine că dezbaterem în Parlamentul European situația drepturilor omului, libertatea de exprimare peste tot unde este îngrădită în lume.

Milioane de cetățeni se uită cu speranță spre Uniunea Europeană pentru că suntem casa care apără aceste valori. Pe aceste principii, părinții fondatori au așezat Uniunea Europeană și este vital pentru noi să fim alături de jurnaliștii care își fac onest datoria în aceste țări unde democrația este fragilă. Este esențial, pentru că avem cel mai mare corp diplomatic din întreaga lume.

Serviciul de Acțiune Externă trebuie să se implice mai energic pentru că avem cea mai mare rețea de diplomați la nivel global și, pentru că avem această autoritate, oamenii se uită cu speranță spre noi și trebuie să facem mai mult și pentru Burundi.

Juan Fernando López Aguilar (S&D). – Señora presidenta, el pasado mes de noviembre tuve el honor de participar en la Asamblea Parlamentaria Paritaria ACP-UE, que se celebró en Ruanda, para discutir el futuro de la relación de la Unión Europea con los países africanos, esencialmente después del Acuerdo de Cotonú.

Pues bien, esa misma Asamblea Parlamentaria Paritaria, la Comisión Europea y el conjunto del Parlamento Europeo determinaron que Burundi -país fronterizo con Ruanda, que padeció también el espantoso genocidio a mediados de los años noventa- viola flagrantemente el Acuerdo de Cotonú, su artículo 96, por la situación represiva, que continúa.

Burundi es uno de los países más pobres de la tierra. El 50 % de su presupuesto depende de la ayuda exterior y, aun en esas condiciones, la Unión Europea mantiene una ayuda financiera que se incrementa de 91 millones de euros a 120 millones de euros, esencialmente humanitaria.

Por tanto, tenemos la autoridad y el deber de exigir que las elecciones inminentes en Burundi -presidenciales, parlamentarias y locales- tengan lugar en una atmósfera donde no sean tolerables la represión sistemática a los periodistas y a los defensores de los derechos humanos, el encarcelamiento, las detenciones arbitrarias, las desapariciones forzadas y las torturas sistemáticas.

Tenemos toda la autoridad moral y apoyamos a la Comisión para que la ejerza.

(Koniec zgłoszeń z sali)

Janez Lenarčič, *Member of the Commission*. – Madam President, I share your concern about the situation in Burundi. I recall that, last December, the Council confirmed the need to maintain appropriate measures, according to Article 96 of the Cotonou Agreement, against Burundi.

The EU believes that the Burundi crisis should remain high on the international agenda and we will continue to work with our partners in the United Nations, the African Union and African regional organisations. There are signs that tensions could increase further in the run-up to elections that are now foreseen for 20 May. Violations and abuses of human rights and fundamental freedoms, in particular freedom of expression, freedom of assembly and freedom of association, persist across the country.

The case of four journalists from Iwacu who have been imprisoned was mentioned by many here and I would like to assure you that the EU is keeping this issue very high on its agenda with the Burundi authorities. We have been raising this and coordinating with our like-minded partners. We will not let this issue just go away.

The Commission of Inquiry on Burundi, in its latest report in September, denounced the persistence of a climate of fear and intimidation of all persons who do not support the ruling party. The Commission also raised red flags at the serious human rights violations that were committed, some of them constituting international crimes. I do not, however, believe that we should just accept as inevitable that things can only get worse from now on. That is not in anybody's interests and most certainly not in the interests of Burundi and its people.

I wish to assure you that the European Union has no intention of abandoning Burundi. Through its development cooperation, the European Union remains strongly engaged in the country, also working with civil society and human rights defenders and building up the resilience of the population. In the next four months, the time leading up to the elections, it will be crucial that Burundi strives to ensure a credible, transparent and inclusive electoral process, open up political and civic space and bring an end to human rights violations and impunity.

Respect for the spirit and the letter of the Arusha Agreement is key. I encourage Burundi to take this path, noting that there are elements to build on, such as a Code of Conduct broadly supported by political parties and the President's reconfirmed announcements not to run for a fourth mandate. If Burundi chooses this path, it can count on the readiness of the European Union to accompany it.

Przewodnicząca. – Zamykam debatę.

Głosowanie odbędzie się po debacie.

4.2. Nigeria, w szczególności niedawne ataki terrorystyczne

Przewodnicząca. – Kolejnym punktem porządku dnia jest debata nad siedmioma projektami rezolucji w sprawie Nigerii, w szczególności niedawnych ataków terrorystycznych (2020/2503(RSP)).

Assita Kanko, author. – Madam President, 'Bring back our girls'. Remember six years ago this hashtag brought the world together to call upon the Islamic terror group Boko Haram to release the hundreds of schoolgirls they abducted. It is heart breaking to think that more than 100 of them have still not returned to their homes today. It's a terrible fate for them and for their families. The pain is easy to imagine.

Nigeria has been subjected to sectarian and religious violence for far too long. It's yet another country in sub-Saharan Africa that sees its economic and political potential wasting away. Nigeria with its oil wealth would be a leading example in the region. Instead, almost every day Nigerians are dying at the hands of violence and terror. Millions run for their lives. Millions more live every day in fear. Europe must continue to support the people of Nigeria and promote the regional cooperation and encourage further reforms like for security and in the army.

Our determination and efforts to end religious and sectarian violence and to protect women in the region must never waiver so we can stop the poisonous and destructive spread of terror.

Erik Marquardt, Verfasser. – Frau Präsidentin! Vielen Dank auch an die Kolleginnen und Kollegen, dass wir uns in doch kurzer Zeit dann auf so eine breit geeinte EntschlieÙung einigen können. Ich glaube, es ist wichtig, dass wir hier im Parlament auf diese humanitäre Notlage aufmerksam machen.

Seit Beginn des Aufstands von Boko Haram sind 36 000 Menschen getötet worden, inzwischen steht das Land hinter Afghanistan und Irak auf Platz 3 des internationalen Terrorismusindex, und allein im Nordosten des Landes wurden 2 - Millionen Leute vertrieben. 7 Millionen Menschen in Nigeria sind auf humanitäre Hilfe angewiesen, und ich glaube, es ist wichtig, dass wir auch sagen: Ja, in Nigeria werden Christen aufgrund ihrer Religion verfolgt.

Ich glaube aber, dass wir gut daran tun, auch in unserer EntschlieÙung klarzumachen – und das tun wir –, dass es in Nigeria eben kein Krieg der Religionen ist. Es geht um Ressourcenverteilung, und wir machen auch deutlich, dass die Klimakrise schon heute und nicht irgendwann einmal Einfluss auf die Lebensbedingungen haben wird, dass die Klimakrise schon heute entscheidenden Einfluss auf die wirtschaftliche Stabilität und die Konflikte vor Ort hat. Terrororganisationen treffen eben dort auf fruchtbaren Boden, wo Menschen keine Perspektiven, wenig Orientierung haben.

Wir sollten uns auch klarmachen: Vielleicht können wir etwas besser dazu beitragen, vor Ort zu helfen. Ich habe das Gefühl, und ich glaube, man kann es an Zahlen deutlich machen, dass unsere Entwicklungspolitik vor Ort zu oft auch von unseren eigenen Interessen geprägt ist und nicht unbedingt nur von den Interessen der nigerianischen Bevölkerung. Deswegen ist es gut, dass wir in der EntschlieÙung auch noch mal sagen, dass die Entwicklungszusammenarbeit vor Ort eben den Armutsbekämpfungsziele dienen soll und nicht irgendwelchen anderen Zielen.

Es mag sein, dass wir wollen, das weniger Menschen aus Nigeria fliehen, aber ich halte es für verwerflich, wenn wir so tun, als könnten wir einfach die Grenzen in Nigeria abschotten, Druck auf das Land aufbauen. *The Correspondent*, eine niederländische Zeitung, hat das vor Kurzem noch mal sehr ausführlich dargestellt. Ich glaube, diese EntschlieÙung ist wichtig. Es ist auch wichtig, dass wir uns zunehmend darauf konzentrieren, wie wir denn den Menschen vor Ort helfen können, dass sie nicht mehr fliehen müssen, statt einfach nur zu verhindern, dass sie fliehen können.

ELNÖKÖL: DOBREV KLÁRA*alelnök*

Lars Patrick Berg, *Verfasser*. – Frau Präsidentin! Ich habe eine gesonderte EntschlieÙung eingebracht, weil die Angriffe auf Christen in Nigeria, insbesondere die Enthauptungen am 26. Dezember 2019, einen barbarischen und unaussprechlich böartigen Akt der Gewalt darstellen. Gerne erhebt dieses Haus bei Menschenrechtsverletzungen zu Recht das Wort, aber wenn es um die systematische Ermordung von Christen geht, scheint das Parlament immer wieder zu zögern, seine Stimme zu erheben. Ich appelliere deshalb an Sie, dass wir nun in der gemeinsamen EntschlieÙung diese Schreckenstaten anerkennen und verurteilen und alle die Dringlichkeit zum Handeln erkennen.

Wir sollten über die schrecklichen Taten der Weihnachtszeit sprechen: Angriffe auf Christen im Namen des Islam. Diese Morde dürfen nicht wieder unter Hinweis auf allerlei andere Themen verschleiert werden. Die Verurteilung islamistischer terroristischer Aktionen gegen christliche Gemeinschaften muss klar benannt werden.

Ich wiederhole: Diese Menschen wurden enthauptet, und zwar, weil sie Christen waren. Sie wurden von Mitgliedern einer Terrormiliz grausam und brutal hingerichtet. Ich begrüÙe eine Aussprache über die Sicherheitslage in Nigeria, aber das Augenmerk sollte sich auf die Notlage der bedrohten christlichen Gemeinschaften in Nigeria und Westafrika richten.

Carlos Zorrinho, *Autor*. – Senhora Presidente, o terrível dano causado à Nigéria por dez anos de conflito armado com o radicalismo islâmico e pela presença do *Boko Haram* no país é enorme: cerca de 36 mil mortos desde 2009, quase 2 milhões de deslocados, mais de 7 milhões de pessoas em emergência humanitária. A estes impactos, que podem ser medidos, juntam-se os casos de violência física e sexual contra mulheres e raparigas, a falta de acesso à educação e cuidados de saúde provocados pelo conflito e toda a espiral de pobreza e insegurança que dele resulta.

Os recentes ataques terroristas reforçam a urgência da implementação da estratégia de combate ao terrorismo pelo Estado, estabilizando o território, protegendo os seus nacionais, muçulmanos e cristãos, dos radicalismos islâmicos e impedindo que as autoridades policiais continuem a ser cúmplices e autoras dos crimes contra a Humanidade.

É urgente capacitar a sociedade civil e as ONG que trabalham no terreno para responder à malnutrição e assegurar cuidados de saúde básicos, sobretudo às mulheres grávidas e às crianças. As alterações climáticas agudizam a situação vivida pelas populações, sendo essencial trabalhar a médio prazo na criação de condições de acesso aos recursos naturais disponíveis do país, o que será parte essencial da construção da paz, bem como da estabilidade económica e social na região.

Os movimentos migratórios na Nigéria e nos países vizinhos criam problemas suplementares, pelo que é necessária uma ação direcionada e coordenada por parte da comunidade internacional, assim como uma cooperação reforçada em matéria de medidas de combate ao terrorismo.

O combate a todas as formas de radicalismo religioso e grupos terroristas a operarem na Nigéria deve ser uma prioridade nacional, mas também a nossa prioridade. A segurança interna na Nigéria é também a nossa segurança. Na aldeia global em que vivemos, o que se passa no continente africano tem influência direta em todo o mundo, e na União Europeia em particular. Temos, por isso, todos que unir esforços para combater este flagelo.

Miguel Urbán Crespo, *autor*. – Señora presidenta, Nigeria es el mayor productor de petróleo de África y es un ejemplo más de un país rico en recursos, pero en el que más de la mitad de su población vive en la pobreza. Además, la violencia en el país es extrema. Hay más de dos millones de desplazados forzosos. Las mujeres y niñas sufren violaciones y explotación sexual y miles de menores son reclutados por Boko Haram o encarcelados por el Estado. Un Estado que lleva meses criminalizando la ayuda humanitaria y la labor de las ONG, utilizando la coartada de la supuesta lucha antiterrorista. En ningún lugar las leyes antiterroristas pueden ser una excusa para anular derechos y libertades.

Es necesario recordar a este Parlamento el respeto del Derecho humanitario internacional y los principios de la neutralidad de la ayuda oficial al desarrollo procedente de fondos europeos. Tenemos que exigir responsabilidad a nuestras empresas por las violaciones de derechos humanos y la destrucción del medio ambiente. Ahora, que tanto hablamos en este Parlamento del Pacto Verde Europeo, no podemos esconder que el delta del Níger es una de las regiones más contaminadas del mundo gracias a las multinacionales, también europeas. La pobreza, la violencia, el expolio económico están empujando a la gente a huir de Nigeria. Miles de personas arriesgan sus vidas en las rutas migratorias y son víctimas de esclavitud y explotación sexual. Abordamos los fenómenos migratorios únicamente desde sus consecuencias y con un enfoque securitario, levantando muros. Haríamos bien en poner el foco sobre las causas, las responsabilidades y la necesaria coherencia del conjunto de las políticas europeas y de las acciones de las multinacionales europeas en Nigeria y en otros países del sur global para comprender, justamente, estos flujos migratorios. No basta con aprobar fondos fiduciarios para África. Lo importante y urgente es dar un giro de 180 grados a las políticas económicas y geoestratégicas europeas en el continente africano.

Señorías, ni limosnas ni palabras vacías. Seamos consecuentes con nuestras políticas y coherentes con nuestras acciones. Cambiemos de rumbo. Tengamos otra política para África.

Tomáš Zdechovský, *Autor*. – Paní předsedající, pane komisaři, zatímco jsme navrhovali na půdě Evropského parlamentu usnesení o situaci v Nigérii ohledně jedenácti popravených křesťanů, stal se v Nigérii další zvrůdný čin. Minulou středu v noci unesli nigerijští ozbrojenci čtyři misionáře přímo z jejich semináře. Přidáme-li tento únos k vraždám, masakrům, násilnostem, útlu, loupežím, nuceným vystěhováním a dalším zločinům proti lidskosti, dostaneme hrozivý obrázek o tom, jak a co vlastně dnes v Nigérii probíhá. Více jak 6 tisíc zavražděných křesťanů, muslimů a dalších obyvatel Nigérie za posledních pět let, 3 600 dívek a chlapců ve vojenských zajateckých táborech s otřesnými životními podmínkami, 2 miliony lidí na útěku. To jsou jen střípky z toho, co se dnes v Nigérii děje. Stát nemá kontrolu nad militantními, většinou radikálně islamistickými ozbrojenými skupinami. Boko Haram je jednou z nich, jednou z těch největších, které v Nigérii provádí takové hanebnosti, že se hovoří o cílené genocidě a můžeme tyto hanebnosti srovnat pouze s nacistickým nebo komunistickým režimem. Nigérie nyní zažívá přesně to, co probíhalo v Iráku nebo v - Afghánistánu. Je třeba nigerijskou vládu na tuto genocidu neustále upozorňovat a chtít po ní, aby zkusila hledat řešení této situace, protože nelze pouze přijímat, ale je potřeba už něco s touto situací začít dělat.

Phil Bennion, *author*. – Madam President, Nigeria has been very close to being a failed state now for decades, largely due to petty squabbles between the two main political parties. This has led to a complete failure to address the real problems the country faces. For instance, despite some advances by the military, Boko Haram remains a threat to security in the northeast region. We have abductions, suicide bombings, attacks on civilian targets by Boko Haram, people are still getting killed, and of course Boko Haram also target their attacks across the border in Chad and in the Cameroon.

Decades of old communal conflict between nomadic herdsmen and settled farmers in the middle belt have recently intensified and further exacerbated the security situation in the country. Women and children are the most vulnerable in this conflict. Children often are recruited by the terrorist groups and used as child soldiers or suicide bombers. Farmers are getting killed and others are getting displaced as a result of all this violence. Civil society is left to lead the campaigns against arbitrary arrests, detention and torture, but it should be the Nigerian authorities themselves which guarantee the respect for human rights in the country and lead this fight. President Buhari was re-elected in 2019 on the promise of defeating violent extremism undertaken by terror groups such as Boko Haram. It's high time to concentrate all of the government's efforts to keep that promise, developing and implementing a comprehensive strategy. A strategy has been developed, but it's not been implemented. The External Action Service of the EU and the Member States need to help through technical assistance. In this way we should strongly support Nigeria's efforts in their fight against terrorism.

Željana Zovko, *on behalf of the PPE Group*. – Madam President, Nigeria is home to West Africa's largest Christian community with over 80 million Christians. This is about half of the country's population. Historic rivalry between the Muslim north and Christian south of Nigeria intensified with the spread of radical Islam. For more than 10 years, violent extremist and jihadist groups, such as Boko Haram and Islamic State in West Africa province, terrorised the country. They attacked Nigerian police, military, schools, public institutions and religious buildings. According to a humanitarian organisation, more than 6 000 Christians have been murdered since 2015 by jihadist groups.

The latest reports date from last week, 8 January, when Fulani Muslim herdsmen attacked the predominantly Christian village of Kulben in central Nigeria and killed 13 civilians. Also at the end of December, we witnessed several attacks on Christian villages causing the death of over 30 people. Responsibility for these actions has been claimed by Islamic State in West Africa province as retaliation for the death of Islamic State leader Abu Bakir Al-Baghdadi in Syria. Although the Nigerian President, a Muslim, condemned the atrocities, the announced governmental measures to prevent further violence lack efficiency. Nigerian security forces often seem to neglect the persecution of Christians.

We discuss case after case of violent actions against religious minorities. It is time that the international community recognised the persecution of Christians around the world. Africa is a deeply religious continent and it happens too often that misconceptions about other religions are used to instigate hate and terror. The European Union should use its financial instruments to invest in development of the region, leading to the protection of religious minorities. The EU should also increase its focus on inter-religious dialogue in its diplomatic relations with third countries.

A month ago, Parliament awarded the Sakharov Prize to a Muslim martyr, and with a symbol like this we should encourage countries like Nigeria to recognise and recompense the damages done to a church in need that is left alone. We should not be ashamed to call the crime by its name.

Maria Arena, *au nom du groupe S&D*. – Madame la Présidente, le Nigeria est le pays le plus peuplé d'Afrique avec plus de 200 millions d'habitants, avec une prévision à 500 millions d'habitants d'ici 2050. C'est également la plus grande force économique d'Afrique, ce qui lui vaut le nom de géant d'Afrique.

Le Nigeria fait face à de nombreuses tensions: Boko Haram qui tente d'occuper le nord-est et qui est l'auteur d'attaques terroristes qui ont fait, depuis plus de dix ans, des milliers de morts, mais aussi des millions de déplacés; tensions entre les bergers et les agriculteurs, qui n'est ni un conflit ethnique, ni un conflit religieux, mais le résultat des changements climatiques, qui poussent les bergers à occuper les terres plus fertiles, occupées actuellement par les agriculteurs.

Ce conflit est également sanglant du fait de la circulation des armes en provenance de la Libye: le conflit libyen a donc des effets sur la région du Sahel et du Nigeria. La réponse doit donc être globale.

Premièrement, le soutien à la solution libyenne et le contrôle de l'embargo des armes à destination de cette région. Deuxièmement, une garantie que l'exploitation des ressources naturelles au Nigeria (le pétrole, le gaz, mais aussi les métaux) permettra aux populations de se développer. Je rappellerai ici le cas de Shell qui a été attaqué par les populations locales parce que Shell était auteur de pollution importante et de vols par rapport aux ressources pétrolières. Troisièmement, une aide humanitaire urgente aussi pour les dix millions de personnes victimes de cette instabilité. Quatrièmement, un contrôle de la criminalité mondiale liée aux trafics: drogue, armes, ou prostitution, facilités par des systèmes financiers globaux qui permettent l'évasion fiscale au niveau du Nigeria. Et enfin, l'Union européenne doit considérer le Nigeria comme un partenaire prioritaire dans le cadre de sa stratégie Union-Afrique, car la stabilité du Nigeria est primordiale pour la région: pour le Sahel, le Tchad, le Cameroun, le Niger, qui sont ses voisins (4 000 kilomètres de frontières), mais aussi pour le Golfe de Guinée, qui est aujourd'hui le lieu de tous les trafics, et aussi pour l'ensemble du continent africain. Par conséquent, le Nigeria doit rester un partenaire privilégié.

María Soraya Rodríguez Ramos, *en nombre del Grupo Renew*. – Señora presidenta, Nigeria es el tercer país del mundo más afectado por el terrorismo, solo detrás de Irak y Afganistán. Como ya se ha dicho, diez años de violencia de Boko Haram, agravada esta situación por el conflicto y la violencia étnica entre religiones -musulmanes, cristianos- y, últimamente, también por la lucha por recursos escasos entre agricultores y pastores nómadas.

En este contexto de emergencia de violencia en Nigeria, la situación se agrava para los más vulnerables, mujeres y niños. Las mujeres viven una situación de discriminación generalizada y de violencia, como la mutilación genital y los matrimonios infantiles.

Pero permítanme que cite especialmente la situación de los niños y niñas, que viven una situación dramática. Son reclutados por los terroristas para ser utilizados en atentados suicidas, pero también detenidos por los militares en Nigeria, acusados de colaboración con el terrorismo sin apenas ninguna prueba. Según organizaciones internacionales, tres mil seiscientos niños -la mitad, niñas- han sido detenidos y el ejército ha denegado constantemente el acceso a los centros de internamiento militar. Pedimos, en este sentido, que las autoridades nigerianas pongan a estos niños a disposición de autoridades civiles.

Recordamos que la respuesta en la lucha contra el terrorismo, así como su marco judicial y policial, debe proteger fundamentalmente los derechos humanos y a la población civil y, especialmente, a la más vulnerable. Y, en este sentido, animamos a la comunidad internacional, y especialmente a la Comisión y a los Estados miembros, a seguir apoyando técnicamente y con todos los esfuerzos la construcción de la paz en este país.

Susanna Ceccardi, *a nome del gruppo ID*. – Signora Presidente, onorevoli colleghi, nell'indifferenza generale in Nigeria migliaia di cristiani vengono massacrati senza pietà da orde di fondamentalisti islamici. Il terrorismo non è stato ancora debellato e quanto sta accadendo in Nigeria, inerte davanti ai guerriglieri jihadisti, ne è la prova.

Solo pochi giorni fa il gruppo jihadista Boko Haram ha diffuso un video dove vengono brutalmente uccisi 11 prigionieri cristiani: un brutale assassinio perpetrato il giorno di Natale, un vero e proprio gesto di sfida alla cristianità dell'Occidente.

Secondo le agenzie umanitarie sono infatti almeno 30 000 i civili rimasti uccisi e 30 milioni gli sfollati dall'inizio dell'offensiva jihadista nel 2009. Da parte delle istituzioni europee, che promuovono pace, tolleranza e rispetto reciproco, niente è stato fatto di concreto per fermare questa continua barbarie, che ogni giorno mette in pericolo la vita di milioni di innocenti, la cui unica colpa è quella di essere cristiani.

Il fanatismo islamista sta divorando il paese. Non solo il movimento Boko Haram, affiliato all'Isis, tiene in ostaggio la Nigeria settentrionale: negli ultimi anni guerriglieri mossi dal fanatismo religioso, come i pastori fulani, uccidono impunemente e fanno razzia di interi villaggi nel centro del paese, con l'obiettivo di islamizzare con l'uso della forza la Nigeria.

Questa lunga scia di sangue deve essere fermata al più presto. L'Europa non deve abbassare la guardia. Difendere i cristiani in Nigeria significa difendere l'Occidente dalla brutalità del fanatismo islamista.

Ryszard Czarnecki, *w imieniu grupy ECR*. – Pani Przewodnicząca! Panie Komisarzu! Nigeria to kraj o wielkiej historii. Przecież już ponad dwa tysiące lat temu wytapiano tam żelazo i tworzono wyrafinowane rzeźby z terakoty. Miasta na północy kraju, jak Kano czy Katsina, mają ponad tysiącletnią historię. I co z tym krajem robi Boko Haram, czyli oficjalna nazwa Jama'atu Ahlis Sunna Lidda'Awati Wal-Jihad? Jaki jest teraz wizerunek Nigerii na świecie przez prześladowanie, zabijanie, mordowanie setek chrześcijan? Myślę, że nasz głos dzisiaj powinien zabrzmieć szczególnie donośnie. Nie możemy beczynnie przyglądać się temu, co z chrześcijanami i nie tylko zresztą robią ci terroryści spod znaku półksiężyca. To nasz moralny obowiązek. Nie możemy w tej sprawie milczeć. Musimy głośno, ponad podziałami domagać się od władz Nigerii twardej walki z terrorystami islamskimi.

Peter van Dalen (PPE). – Voorzitter, de Europese Unie moet nu een streep trekken. De ellende die vooral christenen in Nigeria wordt toegebracht is onacceptabel. Dat is wat de hoge vertegenwoordiger voor het buitenlands beleid nú moet doen: duidelijk maken aan de regering in Abuja: dit kan niet langer zo. Geen woorden maar daden dus. Het is nu hoog tijd de handels- en andere betrekkingen met Nigeria in de ijskast te zetten wanneer de regering blijft nalaten christenen te beschermen en Boko Haram aan te pakken. Ook Europese bedrijven moet een spiegel worden voorgehouden. Het kan niet langer zo zijn geld te verdienen aan dit land waar corruptie en machtsmisbruik domineren. De tijd voor fraaie verklaringen en holle statements is voorbij.

Al jaren zijn christenen in Nigeria de pineut. We kennen allemaal de 270 christenmeisjes van Chibok die door Boko Haram in 2014 werden ontvoerd. 112 van hen zijn nog steeds niet terug en de meisjes die terugkwamen, waren vaak verkracht en zijn getraumatiseerd. De misdaden van Boko Haram gaan al jaren door. Ook christelijke voorgangers zijn regelmatig ontvoerd. De Nigeriaanse bisschop Matthew Hassan Kukah heeft afgelopen week het geweld tegen christenen in zijn land messcherp veroordeeld toen hij zei: "Het enige verschil tussen de regering en Boko Haram, is dat de laatste een bom heeft." Snoeihard commentaar van deze bisschop. Premier Buhari zei inderdaad in 2015 dat hij het terrorisme zou gaan aanpakken. Het waren holle woorden. Nu moet de Europese Unie opstaan tegen dit onrecht. Haal alles uit de kast om de regering in Nigeria te bewegen Boko Haram aan te pakken, en help hen daarbij.

(De spreker stemt ermee in te antwoorden op een "blauwe kaart"-vraag (artikel 171, lid 8, van het Reglement))

Tomislav Sokol (PPE), *blue-card question*. – Dear colleagues, Christians are in fact the most persecuted religious group in the world and that is a topic which has not really addressed in the western and especially in the European media. Why is that the case? Why are these persecutions against Christians usually not talked about? Why is the focus more on the persecutions of other religious groups and what can we as MEPs in your opinion, do to change this kind of public perception?

Peter van Dalen (PPE), *"blauwe kaart"-antwoord*. – Voorzitter, ik ben het helemaal met de collega eens. Stelselmatig wordt aan de onderdrukking van en moord op christenen in Nigeria te weinig aandacht gegeven in de media. Daarom zijn dit soort debatten van belang. En ik zou ook tegen de collega willen zeggen: de Intergroep voor vrijheid van godsdienst en geloof en religieuze tolerantie is nu weer opgericht. Wij gaan van start met die intergroep en ik heb nu al gehoord dat dit thema belangrijk zal zijn op de agenda van die intergroep: vervolging van christenen, onder andere in Nigeria. We moeten hier inderdaad niet verstopptje spelen: dit is een cruciaal onderwerp.

(De spreker stemt ermee in te antwoorden op een "blauwe kaart"-vraag (artikel 171, lid 8, van het Reglement))

Maria Arena (S&D), *question «carton bleu»*. – Je prends bonne note de votre volonté de demander aux entreprises d'avoir un comportement respectueux des populations. La seule chose, c'est que votre groupe, le groupe PPE, vote systématiquement contre des mesures de diligence raisonnée qui concernent les entreprises européennes actives dans les pays tels que le Nigeria ou les pays en conflit. Est-ce que cela veut dire que votre groupe votera dorénavant en faveur des propositions qui sont faites sur la diligence raisonnée des entreprises qui agissent aujourd'hui dans ces pays?

Peter van Dalen (PPE), *"blauwe kaart"-antwoord*. – De collega heeft het helemaal juist. Als wij praten over mensenrechten en godsdienstvrijheid, moeten we ook de landen die mensenrechten en godsdienstvrijheid schenden aanpakken. Dat geldt voor Nigeria, dat geldt voor Saudi-Arabië, dat geldt voor India, noem ze allemaal maar op. En de zendingarbeid die u en uw fractie op bepaalde terreinen nog moeten doen, zullen ook ik en mijn fractie doen, om ervoor te zorgen dat we uiteindelijk op het terrein van mensenrechten en godsdienstvrijheid de daad bij het woord voegen. Doet u hetzelfde alstublieft, dan werken we samen.

Jackie Jones (S&D). – Madam President, we wholeheartedly condemn any terrorist attack regardless of where it happens but especially this one in Nigeria as well. Human rights abuses against women and children are the most pervasive in the world. They're always the most vulnerable. They're always the ones targeted right at the forefront of it and we must do everything we can to protect them throughout the world and especially in Nigeria. We saw lots of girls being trafficked many years ago and some of them are still missing. The Multinational Joint Task Force has to go forward and has to do its work in conjunction, in my view, with the African Union and all the actors that are on the African continent.

I want to just say, for the last speech in the European Parliament in Strasbourg, that I want to thank every single person who represented Wales very positively, sat in this seat throughout the time that the European Parliament had direct elections. I want to thank all staff members, past and present for all the work they've done on behalf of the Welsh people and the UK people and I want to thank all of those pro-European groups in Wales and around the UK who have sprung up as a result of this terrible referendum result. Keep up the good work. We will be back one day I hope and to the European Parliament and parliamentarians in particular, they've been fantastic colleagues, thank you very much and 'courage'.

President. – And we would like to thank you.

Dita Charanzová (Renew). – Madam President, Boko Haram has been terrorising Nigeria for over a decade now. More than 36 000 people have been killed and the power of Boko Haram and other terrorist groups is only increasing. While the attacks by these groups are already a serious cause for concern, Nigeria further faces ethnic, religious and communal violence. To make matters worse, these crimes are being carried out with impunity. Fearing for their lives, thousands of Nigerians are fleeing their homes and need aid.

As the security risks involved have led to humanitarian organisations leaving, the Nigerian Government must step up to fulfil its duty towards its citizens to protect them, to guarantee their human rights and uphold the rule of law. In an already unstable situation, the government must also de-escalate religious and communal tensions immediately.

Terrorism, however, as we know, knows no borders. The EU and the international community must continue to do everything it can to support the fight against terrorism in Nigeria and the region as a whole.

Dominique Bilde (ID). – Madame la Présidente, l'infiltration islamiste en Afrique de l'Ouest semble avoir trouvé dans le Nigeria son apogée le plus terrifiant: attentats, enlèvements et exécutions sommaires, notamment le jour de Noël. Qui pourrait contester désormais que la religion chrétienne reste la plus persécutée en Afrique, comme ailleurs du reste? Comment pourrait-il en être autrement alors que la communauté internationale persiste à rester l'arme au pied? Dans le Sahel, la France, seule, porte à bout de bras la lutte antiterroriste sur une étendue de huit millions de kilomètres carrés comparable à l'Europe. Pire, l'Occident semble prendre un malin plaisir à mettre des bâtons dans les roues aux États africains aux prises avec l'hydre islamiste. Que dire, par exemple, des hauts cris poussés par tant de belles âmes contre les mesures prises par le Nigeria à l'encontre de certaines ONG, et ce alors que tant d'exemples avérés de collusion, d'attaques ou d'infiltration de ces organisations incitent à la prudence? À l'heure où l'islamisme viole et décapite, il est urgent de resserrer les rangs car à l'évidence, cette guerre ne se gagnera que par les nations souveraines.

Adam Bielan (ECR). – Pani Przewodnicząca! Nigeria, najludniejszy kraj Afryki, liczący już w tej chwili 200 milionów mieszkańców, jest krajem potencjalnie bardzo bogatym, ma bowiem olbrzymie zasoby bogactw naturalnych, przede wszystkim ropy naftowej. Niestety ze względu na toczący ten kraj od lat proces korupcji jest jednym z najbardziej ubogich krajów na świecie. 87 milionów ludzi żyje w skrajnej nędzy. Jest to największa grupa mieszkańców na świecie po Indiach. Niewątpliwie największym problemem toczącym Nigerię jest jednak terroryzm. Według światowego indeksu terrorystycznego Nigeria jest na trzecim miejscu, jeśli chodzi o ten problem, po Iraku i po Afganistanie. Ofiarą terrorystów islamskich padają przede wszystkim chrześcijanie. W ciągu dziesięciu lat w Nigerii zginęło blisko 20 tysięcy osób, zaś dwa miliony osób musiały opuścić ten kraj.

Wzywamy dzisiaj prezydenta Buharię, który rządzi Nigerią od 2015 roku, żeby w końcu zaczął skutecznie chronić swoich obywateli.

(Mówca zgodził się odpowiedzieć na pytanie zadane przez podniesienie niebieskiej kartki (art. 171 ust. 8 Regulaminu))

Bogdan Rzońca (ECR), pytanie zadane przez podniesienie niebieskiej kartki. – Z ogromną ciekawością przysłuchuję się tej bardzo potrzebnej i bardzo ważnej dyskusji. Unia Europejska musi zająć bardzo jednoznaczne stanowisko wobec tych dramatów, które rozgrywają się na kontynencie afrykańskim. Dziś mówimy o Nigerii. Wspominano tutaj o ogromnych prześladowaniach chrześcijan. Chciałbym Pana zapytać (wiem, że jest Pan znawcą tej problematyki) o to, czy nie widzi Pan możliwości wznowienia debaty tu w Parlamencie na temat dramatu chrześcijan na świecie?

Elnök asszony. – Köszönöm szépen! Felhívnam a figyelmüket, hogy a kék kártya tényleg kérdésre való. A véleményyt azt adott esetben a „catch the eye” időszakában tudják megfogalmazni.

Adam Bielan (ECR), *odpowiedź na pytanie zadane przez podniesienie niebieskiej kartki.* – Zgadzam się z tym, co powiedział pan poseł Rzońca. Chrześcijanie są dzisiaj najbardziej prześladowaną grupą religijną na świecie. Dzisiaj dyskutujemy o tym, co się dzieje w Nigerii, ale w październiku rozmawialiśmy o sytuacji w Egipcie. Tam również chrześcijanie są prześladowani. Tak, uważam, że w tej kadencji, wzorem poprzedniej kadencji, powinniśmy w Parlamencie Europejskim przeprowadzić debatę na temat sytuacji chrześcijan na świecie.

François-Xavier Bellamy (PPE). – Madame la Présidente, le 25 décembre, le jour de Noël, onze chrétiens ont été décapités. Le 8 janvier, toujours au Nigeria, quatre séminaristes ont été enlevés: ils avaient entre 18 et 23 ans. Le même jour, treize personnes sont mortes dans l'attaque d'un village chrétien. Tous ces noms viennent s'ajouter aux 35 000 personnes qui ont été victimes directement du djihadisme – et de Boko Haram en particulier – depuis dix ans au Nigeria.

À cela il y a trois raisons: la première, ce sont ces conflits qui prospèrent dans ce pays et au fait que rien n'est fait pour les endiguer, peut-être parce que personne ne voit où ne veut voir que, derrière des guerres ethniques, se joue en réalité l'un des nouveaux champs de bataille de l'islamisme qui, au niveau mondial, cherche à diviser, à fracturer et à tuer.

La deuxième raison, c'est la passivité du gouvernement nigérian et même parfois la complicité de certaines forces de sécurité, qui n'interviennent pas. Nous devons mettre ce gouvernement devant sa responsabilité, car il a les moyens de rétablir la paix civile et il doit garantir le droit des minorités.

Enfin, la troisième raison, c'est notre propre fragilité, chers collègues, car dans ce pays, comme ailleurs en Afrique, les États-Unis se retirent, l'Europe elle-même est effacée et, dans le vide que nous laissons, d'autres acteurs prennent la place: la Chine, évidemment, mais aussi la Turquie, le Qatar, tous ces pays qui ont un intérêt économique, bien sûr, mais aussi sans aucun doute idéologique à agir dans une telle région et à la fragiliser encore plus.

L'Europe doit être au rendez-vous pour garantir le respect des droits des minorités et notamment des minorités chrétiennes, qui ont besoin de notre protection. Et pour garantir l'équilibre de cette région, nous devons mettre le gouvernement nigérian devant sa responsabilité: il faut que l'Europe agisse aujourd'hui au Nigeria.

Tudor Ciuhodaru (S&D). – Doamnă președintă, suntem pe un teren minat. Această situație persistă de prea mult timp, sunt mii de vieți pierdute și, în acest moment, soluțiile chiar nu par ușor de găsit.

Eu sunt medic, medic de urgență, lucrez în Iași, România, la Spitalul Clinic de Urgență „Nicolae Oblu” și consider că fiecare viață pierdută înseamnă o tragedie. Iar din păcate, când mă uit la măsurile luate pentru Nigeria, văd că ele nu au avut eficiență pe care ne-am fi dorit-o.

Așa că eu cer astăzi public – și voi vota această rezoluție fără niciun fel de problemă, chiar cu două mâini, pentru că poate așa salvăm niște vieți – dar este nevoie de măsuri concrete, de noi politici geostrategice în regiune, de limitarea acelei ipocrizii care spune că îi protejăm pe cei din Nigeria, dar continuăm să vindem arme către această regiune.

Și dacă vorbim despre ajutor umanitar, să știți că, așa cum m-am oferit voluntar în campania împotriva Ebola, așa voi fi și voluntar în Nigeria. Puteți să vă bazați pe mine. Vă doresc succes în demersurile pe care le întreprindeți, dar, până una-alta, constat că mai sunt multe de făcut.

Silvia Sardone (ID). – Signora Presidente, onorevoli colleghi, ogni giorno nel mondo muoiono dodici cristiani: muoiono mentre sono in chiesa, mentre vanno a lavorare, in mezzo alla strada, a scuola, negli asili, mentre pregano, mentre vanno in pellegrinaggio. Se sono donne a volte sono rapite e stuprate, se sono bambini sono torturati.

In Nigeria c'è una mattanza quotidiana di cristiani. Negli ultimi anni ci sono stati 12 000 cristiani uccisi, 13 000 chiese abbandonate e distrutte, 1 300 000 sfollati. A fine anno c'è stata la drammatica esecuzione da parte di terroristi dell'Isis di 11 cristiani. In Nigeria i cristiani, soprattutto nel nord del paese, sono emarginati, perseguitati, aggrediti, privati di alcuni diritti a scuola e anche nella società quotidiana.

L'Europa di fronte a tutto ciò balbetta: nessun segnale, nessuna concreta promessa di protezione, nessun intervento serio. Come diceva Oriana Fallaci: «Sveglia, Occidente!». I cristiani perseguitati chiedono aiuto.

Carlo Fidanza (ECR). – Signora Presidente, onorevoli colleghi, 11 cristiani fucilati e poi decapitati nella giornata di Natale, molti altri uccisi: un vero Natale di sangue in Nigeria. Attentati rivendicati dalla fazione di Boko Haram che, con l'ISWAP, rappresenta il braccio armato dello Stato islamico. La violenza islamista si è accentuata ancor più sotto la nuova presidenza di Buhari, nonostante le promesse.

I cristiani in Nigeria sono discriminati ovunque, persino nelle scuole, subiscono soprusi di ogni genere. Nel 2018 si contano almeno 1 200 persone uccise e 200 000 sfollati a causa della violenza islamista.

Vengono colpiti i cristiani in ragione della loro fede, eppure nel dispositivo della risoluzione che voteremo oggi la parola «cristiani» praticamente scompare e ieri, nel voto sui diritti umani, gli emendamenti sui cristiani perseguitati sono stati bocciati da quest'Aula.

Se vogliamo essere seri e concreti dobbiamo innanzitutto riconoscere le vittime e i carnefici e, infine, dobbiamo condizionare la nostra politica di cooperazione in Nigeria a una lotta finalmente seria contro il terrorismo islamista.

Tomislav Sokol (PPE). – Poštovana potpredsjednice, kršćani su danas najprogonjenija religijska zajednica na svijetu. I to nažalost nije nekakav moj osobni dojam, nego se ta činjenica, ta tvrdnja isključivo bazira na činjenicama.

Samo nekoliko brojki. U 2018. godini ubijeno je više od četiri tisuće kršćana u svijetu. Ali ne samo to, više od 245 milijuna kršćana u svijetu bilo je žrtva ozbiljnih progona zbog toga što su kršćani. To je 1 od 9 kršćana u svijetu. Mislim da se svi doista trebamo zamisliti nad tom brojkom i nad tim što ona govori. Nažalost, percepcija na Zapadu, pogotovo u zapadnim medijima je posve suprotna. Nigerija je u 2019. godini nažalost upravo bila predvodnica progona kršćana. Tamo je u toj godini samo zbog vjere ubijeno 1350 kršćana, a od 2015. godine njih više od 6000. Ako gledamo razdoblje od zadnjih 10 godina, više od 12 000 kršćana ubijeno je u Nigeriji zbog toga što su kršćani. Dakle, mislim da trebamo nazvati problem pravim imenom. Ovdje se ne radi primarno o sukobu sjevera i juga, o sukobu između nomada i ratara, ovdje se radi o progonu kršćana koji već skoro pa graniči s genocidom. Dakle, ne radi se naravno samo o ubojstvima, radi se o oduzimanju imovine po načelu „tvoja zemlja ili tvoja krv”. Radi se o silovanjima, radi se o protjerivanjima, radi se o sustavnom progonu kršćana na svim razinama u Nigeriji, a to je zemlja u kojoj kršćani čine gotovo 50 % stanovništva. Dakle, oni nisu manjina. Njih je tamo više od 80 milijuna, a sad zamislimo samo kako je u mnogim zemljama gdje doista jesu manjina.

Drugim riječima, Europska unija treba biti jasna u svom stavu oko progona kršćana kako u Nigeriji, tako i u drugim zemljama. Trebalo bi svakako otvoriti rasprave u ovom parlamentu općenito o progonu kršćana u svijetu i trebalo bi zauzeti jasan i nedvosmislen stav bez „fige u džepu”, bez licemjerja jer je ovo veliki problem o kojem se Europska unija treba očitovati i protiv kojega se moramo boriti.

Isabella Tovaglieri (ID). – Signora Presidente, onorevoli colleghi, sulla comunità cristiana in Nigeria incombe il genocidio. Negli ultimi dodici mesi i fondamentalisti islamici hanno ucciso più di mille cristiani e questo anche grazie alla complicità dell'esercito, che conosce i colpevoli ma non li arresta. Nella ricorrenza del Natale è stato compiuto un agghiacciante massacro ai danni di 11 cristiani e il massacro è stato anche postato sul web, mentre pochi giorni fa quattro seminaristi sono stati rapiti in una zona dove vige ancora la legge della Shari'a.

La Nigeria rischia davvero di diventare il nuovo Ruanda o il nuovo Darfur: dall'inizio dell'offensiva jihadista si contano ormai 30 000 vittime fra i civili e più di 30 milioni di sfollati, molti dei quali tentano di fuggire venendo in Europa. Solo nel 2017 hanno lasciato la Nigeria un milione e trecentomila persone.

L'Europa, che pure ha rifiutato di inserire nella Costituzione le proprie radici giudaico-cristiane, non può commettere l'errore di non fare nulla. I fondamentalisti islamici, infatti, non rappresentano un pericolo solo per la Nigeria o per i cristiani nigeriani ma anche per i giovani europei e per il futuro dei nostri figli.

Bert-Jan Ruissen (ECR). – Voorzitter, duizenden doden, miljoenen ontheemden, ontvoeringen, verwoeste huizen en afgebrande kerken, dat is de trieste balans van een decennium vol geweld in Nigeria. De historische rivaliteit tussen het islamitische noorden en het christelijke zuiden is ernstig toegenomen, met name met de verspreiding van de radicale islam: Boko Haram en Islamitische Staat. Het langlopende conflict tussen de Fulani-herders en de christelijke boeren in de *Middle Belt* intensiveert, en de intensiteit en de aard van de aanvallen wijzen erop dat er wel degelijk sprake is van een hele duidelijke religieuze component in het conflict. Hoe dan ook, de realiteit is dat het conflict een toenemend aantal mensen van hun huizen, menselijke waardigheid en dagelijks leven berooft. Ondertussen is de aanpak door de Nigeriaanse regering uitermate gebrekkig. Zeer terecht vragen we daar vandaag in onze resolutie de aandacht voor. De vraag blijft echter wel welke concrete acties de EU nu daadwerkelijk gaat ondernemen in de strijd tegen het geweld in Nigeria.

Isabel Benjumea Benjumea (PPE). – Señora presidenta, señor comisario, este debate que estamos teniendo hoy aquí responde a unos dramáticos hechos acontecidos en Nigeria, el día de Navidad, en el que se asesinó a sangre fría a fieles cristianos por el mero hecho de querer profesar su fe. Estamos hablando hoy y estamos teniendo este debate hoy porque ha ocurrido este terrible ataque contra los cristianos en Nigeria. No es un ataque aislado, son ataques que se están dando a lo largo del tiempo, ante la pasividad de las autoridades en Nigeria. Solo por darles algunas cifras de lo ocurrido, desde 2015 han muerto más de 6 000 cristianos a manos de terroristas yihadistas en Nigeria.

Por supuesto que Nigeria tiene otros dramas y que Boko Haram, por supuesto, está asesinando a musulmanes y a judíos. Pero este caso —y esta Resolución— trata de un drama que está ocurriendo, que es la persecución a los cristianos en el mundo, y no debemos apartar el foco. Y lamento ver cómo, cuando se ha negociado esta Resolución, había más interés, más énfasis, en quitar la palabra cristiano de la Resolución que en hablar de lo que había ocurrido, que en poner el foco en los hechos tan tremendos que están ocurriendo. En el último Pleno hablamos de los ataques que ocurrieron en Burkina Faso, y hoy lamentamos lo ocurrido en Nigeria, y, por supuesto, quiero mandar mis condolencias a los familiares y amigos de las víctimas.

Pero quisiera aprovechar los últimos segundos que me quedan para recordarles simplemente unas cifras, para que entendamos que verdaderamente estamos viviendo una persecución de cristianos en el mundo, ante la cual la Unión Europea no puede permanecer impasible. Debe reaccionar, porque estamos hablando de los valores de Occidente, de los valores judeocristianos sobre los cuales se construyó el proyecto europeo. Simplemente para que lo tengan en cuenta, estamos hablando de 4 305 cristianos asesinados, según el informe de Open Doors publicado en 2020. No podemos permanecer impasibles. Debemos reaccionar y defender los valores de esta Unión, los valores judeocristianos, que son sobre los que se sustenta esta Unión.

(La oradora acepta responder a una pregunta formulada con arreglo al procedimiento de la «tarjeta azul» (artículo 171, apartado 8, del Reglamento interno))

Eugen Tomac (PPE), Întrebare adresată conform procedurii „cartonașului albastru”. – Doamnă președintă de ședință, colega noastră a prezentat niște cifre cutremurătoare și, într-adevăr, trebuie să discutăm această temă pentru că creștinii sunt persecutați și este cutremurător că se întâmplă acest lucru, inclusiv de Crăciun, și a cerut acțiuni ferme din partea Uniunii Europene. Aș vrea să o rog să explice exact ce înseamnă acțiuni ferme din partea Uniunii Europene pentru a proteja creștinii din întreaga lume care sunt persecutați.

Isabel Benjumea Benjumea (PPE), respuesta de «tarjeta azul». – Señora presidenta, verdaderamente, lo han dicho algunos colegas en este hemicycle. No podemos huir de la realidad del continente africano. Debemos exigir a las autoridades, en este caso de Nigeria, que defiendan, que protejan a los cristianos. Que tomen medidas. Que no se queden de brazos cruzados, como estamos viendo, lamentablemente. Como estamos viendo cómo el ejército, cómo las fuerzas de seguridad no están defendiendo. Debemos exigir esas medidas.

Nicola Procaccini (ECR). – Signora Presidente, onorevoli colleghi, voteremo a favore per condannare la persecuzione dei cristiani in Nigeria e perché almeno ne stiamo parlando, ma non posso ignorare come nell'articolato di questa risoluzione sia stata cancellata la parola «cristiani» nei confronti degli uomini e delle donne che ogni giorno vengono umiliati, torturati e uccisi in Nigeria, soprattutto durante il Natale o «Season's greetings», come ipocritamente viene chiamato qui dentro.

Proprio ieri l'ONG Open Doors ha reso noto che gli attacchi nei confronti dei cristiani sono stati 260 milioni e 2 983 gli omicidi. È il numero più alto di sempre, più dell'attacco alle Torri gemelle, in un solo anno, nel 2019, ma erano solo 50 le nazioni messe sotto osservazione e in questa orribile classifica la Nigeria non è neppure tra le prime dieci.

Krzysztof Hetman (PPE). – Pani Przewodnicząca! Sytuacja w Nigerii jest niezwykle trudna. Tylko od 2015 roku organizacje terrorystyczne, takie jak Boko Haram, pozbawiły tam życia ponad sześć tysięcy chrześcijan. W obliczu tego ogromnego zagrożenia niezwykle ważny jest fakt, że prezydent Muhammada Buhari potępia ataki i chce działać na rzecz zjednoczenia społeczeństwa.

Potrzeba zdecydowanych działań, aby zagwarantować wolność wyznania i bezpieczeństwo obywateli. Powinniśmy więc wzywać nigeryjskie władze do zwalczania terroryzmu i osądzenia sprawców. Musi się to jednak odbywać z poszanowaniem obowiązującego prawa i godności ludzkiej. Niedopuszczalne jest bezpodstawne pozbawianie wolności obywateli, w tym dzieci, i długotrwałe przetrzymywanie ich bez procesu w warunkach uchybiających prawom człowieka, jak wykazał raport Human Rights Watch. Postępowanie takie jest niezgodne nie tylko z Powszechną Deklaracją Praw Człowieka, ale także z samą nigeryjską konstytucją. Ponadto działania wojskowe nie wystarczą, aby zwalczać zagrożenie terroryzmem. Aktywność terrorystyczna to wynik wieloletniej radykalizacji. Aby naprawdę poradzić sobie z tym problemem, należy prowadzić dialog międzyreligijny, promować wolność wyznania i walczyć z nierównościami społecznymi.

Nigeria boryka się też z poważnym kryzysem humanitarnym. Blisko połowa populacji żyje w skrajnym ubóstwie. Unia Europejska nie może patrzeć na to obojętnie. Pomoc humanitarna musi być kontynuowana, jednakże w obliczu ataków na wolontariuszy i pracowników organizacji pomocowych musimy jednocześnie wzywać nigeryjskie władze do jej właściwego zabezpieczenia. Niepokojący jest również fakt nagłego wydalania organizacji humanitarnych przez władze Nigerii, co powoduje, że tysiące osób zostają pozbawione pomocy, której desperacko potrzebują.

„Catch the eye” eljárás

Robert Hajšel (S&D). – Vážená pani predsedajúca, Nigéria je naozaj obrovská krajina v Afrike s obrovským potenciálom ľudským, ale aj v oblasti nerastných surovín, a čoskoro by sa mohla stať veľmocou na území Afriky, s ktorou my, ako Európska únia, musíme mať veľmi dobré vzťahy. V skutočnosti však Nigéria ako taká je obeťou obrovských teroristických útokov, resp. jej obyvatelia. Hlavne, bohužiaľ, naozaj kresťania. Pretože 80 percent obetí tvoria kresťania. Ale obeťami teroristov nie sú len kresťania, ale samozrejme aj moslimovia a aj iné národnosti, a treba povedať, že ide o sociálno-ekonomický konflikt, napríklad konflikt medzi pastiermi a farmármi – medzi tými, ktorí chcú vyhnúť iných z územia, aby mohli pásť vlastný dobytok. My im musíme, ako Európska únia, pomôcť po všetkých stránkach. Aj v oblasti humanitárnej pomoci, samozrejme, musíme viesť dialóg s nigérijskou vládou a viac nútiť, aby v krajine urobila poriadok, pokiaľ ide o dodržiavanie ľudských práv a náboženskej slobody.

Clare Daly (GUE/NGL). – Madam President, sadly, violence is nothing new in many regions of Nigeria, and for those – and we have them in Ireland – who criticise Nigerian asylum seekers as economic migrants and not worthy of coming to Europe, they should really look at what is happening in that country.

The decade-long conflict with armed groups such as Boko Haram has obviously resulted in the deaths of tens of thousands of people, the displacement of two million, and tens of thousands missing, a majority of them children. And how can it be that 50% of the population live in extreme poverty in the country which is the twelfth largest producer of oil? We do have to look at the role of European corporations there, like Total from France, and Shell, a Dutch-British company. There are deals with the Nigerian National Petroleum Corporation, which doesn't pay its taxes and has acted in an environmentally poor way, which has resulted in the deaths of others trying to defend their communities such as the Ogoni people.

So we have to join the dots. Is it any wonder this country has descended into barbarism, and is it any wonder that the Iraqi people mourn the death of General Soleimani, who saved them from the type of regime that is prevailing in Nigeria?

Seán Kelly (PPE). – A Uachtaráin, is scéal uafásach é scéal na Nigéire, gan dabht ar bith agus is fiú é a phlé anseo ar maidin. Gan dabht freisin is é grúpa sceimhlitheoireachta Boko Haram an chúis is mó leis na fadhbanna atá sa Nigéir. Aontaím leis na Feisirí Kanko agus Charanzová a deir gur cheart dúinn gach iarracht a dhéanamh chun an céad cailín atá ina gcime ag Boko Haram a ligean saor. Agus freisin cabhrú leis na húdaráis atá ann chun Boko Haram a chosc agus a stopadh. Tá sé sin an-tábhachtach chun dul chun cinn a dhéanamh.

Tír le hacmhainní saibhre agus, ag an am céanna, ceann de na tíortha is boichte í an Nigéir. Is féidir linn a lán a dhéanamh chun cabhrú léi, go háirithe leis na teifigh mar a dúirt Clare Daly, agus leis an athrú aeráide agus, gan dabht ar bith, na Críostaithe; mar sin fadhb eile agus ba chóir dúinn é sin a phlé níos mó amach anseo.

Pierrette Herzberger-Fofana (Verts/ALE). – Madame la Présidente, la situation au Nigeria, le plus grand pays d'Afrique, nous préoccupe tous. Je pense notamment à la détérioration de la situation en matière de sécurité et à la violence généralisée, qui entraînent des déplacements massifs de la population et une aggravation des besoins humanitaires.

En 2014, Boko Haram a enlevé des jeunes filles et des jeunes femmes et leur a fait subir toutes sortes de violences sexuelles. Cette violence s'est accrue contre les femmes et vise également les femmes des régions frontalières comme le Cameroun. C'est ainsi que, récemment, des religieuses ont été enlevées et emprisonnées. Nous condamnons ces attaques religieuses et ethniques.

En outre, on estime qu'environ 1 500 000 personnes sont touchées par l'incapacité des organisations humanitaires d'accéder à de grandes parties de la région. En conséquence, dans les zones difficiles d'accès, 60 % des enfants souffrent de malnutrition.

L'Union européenne doit s'unir et trouver de nouvelles façons de travailler avec le gouvernement nigérian pour permettre l'acheminement d'une aide humanitaire, et il faut surtout mettre fin à cette violence contre les femmes et les communautés religieuses. Ce qui s'est passé à Noël ne doit plus jamais se renouveler. L'Union européenne doit s'engager avec le gouvernement du Nigeria à faire progresser le respect des principes humanitaires, à intensifier le dialogue avec les autorités afin de mettre fin à ces raids contre les populations civiles, et également à mettre fin à cette exploitation sexuelle qui sévit depuis 10 ans. Nous devons demander le respect des droits de l'homme et la liberté de religion.

Jiří Pospíšil (PPE). – Paní předsedající, my jsme se v té debatě jasně shodli na problémech, které trápí tuto nešťastnou zemi. Já jsem připraven podpořit usnesení, byť mě také mrzí, jako některé kolegy, že tam je málo zdůrazněno to, že se páchá obrovské násilí na křesťanech, a do budoucna bychom měli tento aspekt více akcentovat.

Ale to, co chci doplnit k té debatě, to zde příliš nezaznělo, že často nigerijská vláda je velmi laxní ke konkrétním útokům, násilí a že často se na tom násilí podílejí i vládní vojáci. A tady jaksi je role nás a zvláště naší Komise, našich zástupců, aby při jednáních s nigerijskou vládou mnohem více tlačila tuto vládu na to, aby boj, který vede proti islámskému terorismu, se neobracel proti obyčejným Nigerijcům. Myslím si, že tady naše role a role Komise může být výrazná a kež bychom alespoň tímto trošku pomohli tomu, že boj nigerijské vlády proti terorismu bude do budoucna více efektivní, vedle řekněme humanitární pomoci, kterou jsme povinni také poskytovat.

Mick Wallace (GUE/NGL). – Madam President, I condemn the persecution of Christians, of Muslims, of Kurds, wherever they are. The current situation in Nigeria should hold lessons for the imperialists in Europe. The strife is a direct consequence of British colonialism and meddling. The empire's parting gift to Nigerians was to rig their first elections in favour of the pliant Islamist sultanates in the north, making sure to keep the more independent minded blacks from Yoruba and Igbo regions out of power. The brightest future for Nigeria was crushed and the oil kept flowing. We visited the Christian village of Maaloula in Syria two years ago and where the Christians were directly targeted by the Jihadists, Jihadists that were armed by the West, that were brought into the country, facilitated across the Turkish border. The lack of inconsistency is terrible. The treatment of the Palestinians by the Israelis. The treatment of Muslims in India. The genocide in Yemen. Let's call a spade a spade.

(„Catch the eye” eljárás vége)

Janez Lenarčič, Member of the Commission. – Madam President, since last year, the human rights and humanitarian situation in Nigeria has significantly deteriorated. Over the past year, terrorist attacks and armed conflict have continued to claim thousands of lives. I want to express our condolences to the families of the victims and our solidarity with the people of Nigeria, and in particular with the communities that have been so deeply affected by the insurgency of non-state armed groups, especially in the north-east of the country. The Boko Haram insurgency has killed more than 36 000 people in Nigeria alone since 2009. An additional challenge is the growing humanitarian crisis. More than two million people are estimated to be internally displaced, more than seven million are in need of humanitarian assistance and more than one million are estimated to be out of humanitarian reach.

The EU is following the situation very closely. We have promoted an integrated, multi-sectoral human rights oriented approach that focuses on peace-building, conflict prevention, humanitarian assistance and social and economic development at community level. The EU continues to stand ready to assist Nigeria in responding to its security, humanitarian and development crisis, in particular around Lake Chad but also in the north west, Middle Belt, Niger Delta and elsewhere, and in all these cases a comprehensive approach that addresses the root causes is necessary, in our view.

The EU is one of the leading contributors of humanitarian aid in Nigeria. It provides immediate assistance to cover the basic needs of the most vulnerable internally displaced people and host communities. Since 2014, the EU has allocated almost EUR 245 million to help people in need in Nigeria, and in 2019 we provided more than EUR 28 million in humanitarian assistance. The EU also aims to build long-term resilience through its development assistance, which addresses the underlying causes of violent conflict, as well as support to basic services and rebuilding livelihoods. Total EU support to the country under the European Development Fund amounts to well over half a billion euros for the period from 2014 to 2019.

Alongside these efforts, we are strongly committed to the fight against radicalisation and violent extremism. We continue to work on strengthening the military's civilian protection policies and practices, demobilisation, disassociation, reintegration and reconciliation efforts and in delivering improvements to Nigeria's criminal justice system.

Next week I will travel to Nigeria, including to the northeast, in order to convey a clear signal of the EU's commitment at the highest political level. Indeed, we are deeply concerned with the issue of shrinking humanitarian access in the northeast and with the breaches of international humanitarian law. Continued dialogue with the authorities therefore constitutes a key priority for me. Furthermore, the next session of the EU-Nigeria human rights dialogue will be held on 18 February and this indicates again our strong commitment to defending human rights in Nigeria through ongoing dialogue and programme.

Elnök asszony. – A vitát lezárom.

A szavazásra hamarosan.

(Az ülést a szavazások órájáig 11.43-kor néhány pillanatra felfüggesztik)

VORSITZ: KATARINA BARLEY

Vizepräsidentin

5. Wznowienie posiedzenia*(The sitting resumed at 12.07)*

Marco Zanni (ID). – Signora Presidente, onorevoli colleghi, per quanto concerne l'articolo 196, lunedì scorso il Presidente ha ordinato ai commessi di rimuovere le piccole bandiere che i rappresentanti del mio gruppo avevano sul loro tavolo. Ritengo questa decisione contraria alle regole.

Sappiamo che il Presidente del Parlamento ha deciso di imporre un divieto sui *banner* per evitare le proteste con cartelli che venivano fatte in Aula e per mantenere l'ordine.

Ci risulta abbastanza ambiguo il fatto che si proibisca l'esposizione di piccoli simboli delle nostre bandiere nazionali, quindi vorrei capire secondo quale regola queste bandiere sono state rimosse e ribadire che il mio gruppo orgogliosamente continuerà a portare queste bandiere in Aula.

President. – It is referring to Article 10 [of the rules of procedure]. I will switch to German because I only have the German version.

„Die Mitglieder stören die Ordnung im Plenarsaal nicht und sehen von unangemessenem Verhalten ab. Sie stellen keine Transparente aus.“ Der Präsident hat die Fahnen als Transparente ausgelegt. Wir werden das sicherlich in der nächsten Sitzung besprechen. Aber für den Moment möchte ich Sie bitten, diese Anordnung des Präsidenten, solange sie wirksam ist, auch zu beachten.

Marco Zanni (ID). – Non sono striscioni e non sono simboli che disturbano l'ordine della plenaria, quindi quell'articolo del regolamento non può essere applicato a questi simboli.

Die Präsidentin. – Sehr geehrter Herr Abgeordneter Zanni! Es findet jetzt hier keine Diskussion über Anordnungen des Präsidenten statt. Wenn Sie sich gegen die Anordnung des Präsidenten wenden möchten, dann können Sie das tun, darüber wird dann auch entschieden. Aber so lange bitte ich Sie auch, sie zu beachten.

Brian Monteith (NI). – *(Off-mic)*

President. – Another point of order but I will only take it when everyone has followed the order of the President. As long as that is not the case, we will not continue the discussion.

(Generalised applause)

(Chant from certain quarters 'Let him speak')

Sorry, colleagues, but it is you who are not letting him speak because you are not following the order of the President. Just do so and we will let him speak. There is no problem.

There is another point of order from Ms Strugariu.

Ramona Strugariu (Renew). – Madam President, let me point out to my colleagues that, if they read properly the rules of this House they will see that we can't even have a glass of water on the table, but we can decently put it under the table so, colleagues, you can just take them and put them under the table and they are there with you to represent you.

(Loud applause)

(Interjection from the floor: 'My flag is not a glass of water.')

(Loud applause from certain quarters)

Richard Corbett (S&D). – Madam President, the Rules of Procedure contain the words that ‘Members shall not display banners’, so it all hinges on the definition of what is a banner. Is a flag a banner? I’ve just looked up the definition of a banner on Wikipedia, and it says: ‘A banner can be a flag or other piece of cloth bearing a symbol, logo, slogan or other message’. So the President would appear to be within his rights to ask for these flags to be removed. I am not saying it is a wise decision but it is a legal decision.

President. – I have time. I have a lot of time. Now, the point is not what is a banner and what is not a banner: the point is that if the President of this House comes to a decision, then this decision is to be obeyed as long as it is not taken back. It is as easy as that. Keep calm, keep calm, it is Thursday and everybody wants to go home, I understand that completely. I will now start with the vote.

6. Głosowanie

President. – The next item is the vote.

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

6.1. Burundi, w szczególności wolność słowa (RC-B9-0054/2020, B9-0054/2020, B9-0055/2020, B9-0057/2020, B9-0058/2020, B9-0061/2020, B9-0066/2020) (głosowanie)

6.2. Nigeria, w szczególności niedawne ataki terrorystyczne (RC-B9-0056/2020, B9-0056/2020, B9-0059/2020, B9-0060/2020, B9-0062/2020, B9-0063/2020, B9-0064/2020, B9-0065/2020) (głosowanie)

6.3. Sytuacja w Wenezueli po nielegalnym wyborze nowych władz i prezydium Zgromadzenia Narodowego (przewrót w parlamencie) (B9-0051/2020, B9-0052/2020, B9-0053/2020, RC-B9-0048/2020, B9-0048/2020, B9-0049/2020, B9-0050/2020) (głosowanie)

— *Before the vote:*

Leopoldo López Gil (PPE). – Señora presidenta, quisiera denunciar gravísimos hechos ocurridos hace menos de veinticuatro horas en Caracas, donde las organizaciones paramilitares del régimen atacaron con piedras, palos y disparos a los vehículos donde viajaba el presidente de la Asamblea Nacional.

(La presidenta interrumpe al orador).

President. – Sorry, dear colleague, but do you have a point of order or an oral amendment? We’re not reopening the debate.

Leopoldo López Gil (PPE). – Quiero solicitar específicamente que se solicite que se garantice, además en la Resolución, la vida de los diputados legítimamente electos en la Asamblea Nacional de Venezuela.

President. – At which point of the resolution do you want to add which words? I am sorry but it is not an oral amendment and we will move on.

- 6.4. Wysłuchania w toku prowadzone na mocy art. 7 ust. 1 TUE w sprawie Polski i Węgier (B9-0032/2020) (głosowanie)**
- 6.5. Konferencja Stron Konwencji o różnorodności biologicznej (COP15) – Kunming (2020) (B9-0035/2020) (głosowanie)**
- 6.6. Sprawozdanie roczne z działalności Europejskiego Rzecznika Praw Obywatelskich za rok 2018 (A9-0032/2019 - Peter Jahr) (głosowanie)**
- 6.7. Instytucje i organy unii gospodarczej i walutowej: zapobieganie konfliktom interesów związanym z zatrudnianiem byłych urzędników instytucji publicznych (B9-0047/2020) (głosowanie)**

President. – That concludes the vote.

7. Wyjaśnienia dotyczące sposobu głosowania

7.1. Sprawozdanie roczne z realizacji wspólnej polityki bezpieczeństwa i obrony (A9-0052/2019 - Arnaud Danjean)

A szavazáshoz fűzött szóbeli indokolások

Manuel Bompard (GUE/NGL). – Madame la Présidente, mes chers collègues, l'Union européenne était un idéal de paix afin que plus jamais la guerre ne ravage le sol de notre continent. C'était aussi un idéal de coopération entre tous les peuples européens. L'Europe a déjà connu 50 ans de division et le risque permanent d'un retour à la guerre.

C'est au nom de cet idéal, malheureusement bien loin aujourd'hui, que je conteste le projet de l'Europe de la défense. Défense contre qui? Contre la Russie? Un autre pays européen qui doit être notre partenaire et non notre adversaire? Défense avec qui? Avec l'OTAN, organisation obsolète et belliciste attachée au char de l'impérialisme américain, nous rendant solidaires des actions inconsidérées de Donald Trump? Ce n'est pas raisonnable.

L'Europe de la défense c'est l'Europe de la guerre. Reprenons au contraire le chemin du dialogue en organisant une grande conférence sur la paix et la coopération en Europe pour faire baisser les tensions. Relevons le défi climatique et environnemental, plutôt que d'ajouter les feux de la guerre au grand incendie planétaire.

Daniel Hannan (ECR). – Madam President, this is going to be the last speech I make in this Chamber. It's difficult to recall the world when I was first elected. There was No Wiki, No WiFi, you had to get your tickets through a travel agent, they would come in physical form and our post arrived in envelopes with stamps on. An awful lot of things have changed, but one thing that hasn't changed is the direction of this Chamber and the other institutions, despite referendums against closer integration in the Netherlands, in France, in Denmark, in Ireland, in Greece and of course in the United Kingdom, it's still full speed ahead to closer and closer integration and it was that ultimately that I think made inevitable that Britain would take a different trajectory. So as we leave let me wish the many friends I've made here, including the committed believers in a federal Europe, every possible success. You can always rely on our open markets, on our military alliance, on our diplomatic support, but we will now be living under our own laws and for the rest of you, good luck. *Bon courage.*

(Applause)

Jan Zahradil (ECR). – Paní předsedající, já mám pocit, že právě po brexitu, po odchodu Velké Británie, se obnovily u některých našich kolegů a u některých politických sil v tomto Evropském parlamentu ambice na vytvoření samostatné autonomní bezpečnostní politiky a obranné politiky. Ambice, které zcela ignorují nutnost transatlantické vazby, které ignorují ten jediný bezpečnostní deštník, který máme k dispozici, což je Severoatlantická aliance. Za sebe i za svoji zemi říkám, že my nejsme s tímto vývojem spokojeni, že vždycky budeme podporovat transatlantickou bezpečnostní a obrannou vazbu a že nepřipustíme vytváření žádných autonomních nebo paralelních struktur k NATO, které by tuto vazbu oslabily.

7.2. Stanowisko Parlamentu Europejskiego dotyczące konferencji w sprawie przyszłości Europy (B9-0036/2020, B9-0037/2020, B9-0038/2020)

A szavazáshoz fűzött szóbeli indokolások

Manuel Bompard (GUE/NGL). – Madame la Présidente, mes chers collègues, l'Union européenne est malade du libre-échange, de l'austérité et de la concurrence libre et non faussée. Elle a rompu avec la souveraineté populaire quand elle a ratifié le traité de Lisbonne, pourtant rejeté en 2005 par le peuple français. Elle est en voie de dislocation: le Brexit en est une illustration flagrante.

Dès lors, une conférence sur le futur de l'Europe ne peut avoir de sens que si elle cherche à retisser le lien entre les peuples et la construction européenne. Il s'agit d'abord de reconnaître la forfaiture du traité de Lisbonne, plutôt que de faire comme si ce triste épisode n'avait pas existé. Il faut ensuite en préciser l'objectif: réviser des traités européens illégitimes qui gravent dans le marbre des politiques économiques dont les conséquences sont aujourd'hui massivement rejetées. Il faut enfin s'engager à ce que le résultat de toute conférence sur l'avenir de l'Union européenne soit soumis à la ratification des peuples des États membres, partout où c'est possible, par référendum. C'est le sens des amendements que nous avons proposés. Malheureusement, ce Parlement a fait le choix de les rejeter, comme s'il voulait poursuivre dans sa bulle, malgré la défiance toujours plus grande des citoyens. Qu'il ne compte donc pas sur nous pour approuver son opération de communication qui sèmera encore beaucoup de désillusions.

Claire Fox (NI). – Madam President, I abstained on this motion because as the Director of the Academy of Ideas in the UK, I am a champion of public debate, increased civil society and engagement in politics, and citizens having more chances to discuss their views. This is a virtue in its own terms. However, in this motion for this conference that the EU is organising, citizen engagement seems more about window dressing to save the EU's reputation as a top-down bureaucracy with a major democratic deficit.

The motion made it clear that this is not about free debate or trusting citizens, it is stage-managed. In the motion it included the phrase that said 'we need to provide preparatory sessions for well-established civil society groups and other experts to prepare the citizens', i.e. they don't trust citizens. Worse, the motion rejected amendments saying that the conference should be an open process with no predetermined goals. That was rejected and voted against, and rejected the conference as a chance for a fundamental debate on the EU.

I'm sorry but this is a wasted opportunity and a PR exercise. I wish you well in this Parliament, but you've really got to let the citizens speak freely and trust them and not keep trying to take over.

Veronika Vrecionová (ECR). – Paní předsedající, debata o budoucnosti Evropské unie je nejenom v souvislosti s brexitem velice potřebná. Zadání, o kterém jsme hlasovali, je ale velice úzké a zavádějící. Debata o budoucnosti EU by přeci neměla vést pouze k dalšímu přenášení pravomocí z členských států na EU, ale měla by zejména směřovat k reflexi brexitu a skutečného fungování Unie. Stávající pravomoci Unie by měly být podrobeny auditu a ty, které pro ni nejsou nezbytné, by se měly vrátit zpět národním státům. Ale s touto reflexí návrhy nepočítají. Počítají pouze s další integrací a se znovu se opakující hrou na celoevropské volby, ačkoliv již dvakrát selhala. Obávám se, že výsledkem bude další odklon občanů od EU a další nárůst extrémních sil v Evropě, a proto jsem tento návrh nepodpořila.

Joachim Stanisław Brudziński (ECR). – Pani Przewodnicząca! Jeden z przywoływanych bardzo często w dniu wczorajszym ojców założycieli Wspólnoty Europejskiej Robert Schuman stwierdził: „Europa będzie albo chrześcijańska, albo nie będzie jej w ogóle”. A co usłyszeliśmy wczoraj podczas tej debaty? Ano usłyszeliśmy, że najważniejsza z punktu widzenia przyszłości Europy – chociaż myłono tutaj Europę z instytucjami Unii Europejskiej – jest debata na temat roli Spitzekandidat oraz, że przyszłość Europy zależy od tego, czy na czele tej konferencji stanie pan Verhofstadt.

Zmarły kilka dni temu Roger Scruton, wybitny angielski filozof, obrońca cywilizacji europejskiej opartej na tradycji, mówił: „Trzeba mieć wizję przyszłości i wizję celu, do którego się zmierza. Nie jest dobrze reagować tylko na zagrożenia płynące z dnia dzisiejszego, improwizując odpowiedzi. Musimy wiedzieć, jak chcemy, żeby wyglądało nasze społeczeństwo”.

Glosowałem przeciw tej rezolucji, dlatego że w postulatach, które tutaj padały, ani jednym zdaniem nie odniesiono się do przyszłości Europy jako wspólnoty wartości. Fundamentem Europy są wartości chrześcijańskie wywodzące się ze Starego i Nowego Testamentu, filozofia grecka oraz prawo rzymskie, a Wy mówicie o tym, kto będzie *Spitzekandidat*.

Marc Botenga (GUE/NGL). – Voorzitter, een conferentie over de toekomst van Europa, een zoveelste praatbarak geleid door duurbetaalde politici – establishmentpolitici – gaat de democratische crisis in Europa echt niet oplossen.

Si vous voulez vous rapprocher des citoyens et des travailleurs européens, peut-être pouvons-nous commencer par couper dans les salaires: Mme van der Leyen, présidente de la Commission européenne, gagne quelque 32 000 euros par mois; Charles Michel, en tant que président du Conseil, à peu près autant; un député au Parlement arrive facilement à 10 000 euros par mois. Comment voulez-vous comprendre, en gagnant de tels salaires, ce que vivent les travailleurs qui n'arrivent pas à boucler leur fin de mois? C'est impossible. Et tant que nous y sommes, empêchons à l'avenir à des personnes qui viennent directement de multinationales de devenir commissaires ou ministres européens: c'est tout aussi incompréhensible. À ce moment-là, peut-être y aura-t-il un début de crédibilité dans ces institutions.

ELNÖKÖL: DOBREV KLÁRA

alelnök

Alexandr Vondra (ECR). – Paní předsedající, my se budeme za dva týdny loučit s britskými přáteli, uvidíme se naposledy na plénu v Bruselu a jeden by doufal, že se z toho nějakým způsobem poučíme, že nebudeme tlačit na pilu, že vezmeme rozum do hrsti. Bohužel, ta debata, která se zde otvírá, je přesně pravým opakem. Jenom dál dupat na plyn ke stále užší Evropské unii je to, co bude dělit Evropu, národy mezi sebou navzájem i tu šlechtu tady v této budově od normálních lidí v terénu. A já jako člověk, který jásal, že jsme se zbavili komunismu a stali jsme se součástí západní Evropy, tak jenom zírám, že dnes má frakce konzervativců je z této debaty vylučována, protože se vám naše názory nehodí do krámu, zatímco komunisté zde v této budově, kteří se chtějí objímat s Putinem a kteří chtějí rozbít NATO, jsou v této debatě vítáni.

Ангел Джамбазки (ECR). – Г-жо Председател, колеги, убедено гласувах против резолюцията, посветена на позицията на Парламента за конференцията за бъдещето на Европа, защото тази резолюция не само че не дава отговор, не само че не е лекарство, тя е рецепта за едно политическо заболяване, наречено крайно ляв либерализъм.

Отговорите в тази резолюция не са това, което е разумното бъдеще на Европа. Защото бъдещето на Европа не е в налагания диктат тука на мнозинствата, не е в продължаващото налагане на мултикултурното общество, не е в продължаващото налагане на еднополови бракове, не е в продължаващото налагане на сгрешени семейни модели.

Бъдещето на Европа, така както си го представяме ние, хората, които се определяме като родолюбци и патриоти, е в силна Европа на силните отечества, в Европа, основана на християнските ценности, на християнските традиции, в Европа, която уважава националното самосъзнание и националното самоопределение.

Jan Zahradil (ECR). – Paní předsedající, já si vzpomínám, že před mnoha lety jsem byl členem tzv. Konventu o budoucnosti Evropy. Obávám se, že teď směřujeme k nějakému podobnému modelu uvedením této konference v život. A dobře si pamatuji, že ten konvent, který nakonec vyústil v evropskou ústavu, která byla pak přejmenovaná na Lisabonskou smlouvu, byl ze samého začátku ovládnut federalisty v Evropském parlamentu a na evropské politické scéně a měl jediný úkol – protlačit hlubší integraci, více moci přihrát evropským institucím, více pravomocí odebrat národním státům. Obávám se, že teď nás čeká podobný vývoj, je to vidět i z toho, že kritické hlasy, eurorealistické hlasy, hlasy, které nestojí o hlubší integraci, jsou z této debaty předem vyloučeny a to je něco, co je prostě neakceptovatelné.

7.3. Sytuacja w Wenezueli po nielegalnym wyborze nowych władz i prezydium Zgromadzenia Narodowego (przewrót w parlamencie) (B9-0051/2020, B9-0052/2020, B9-0053/2020, RC-B9-0048/2020, B9-0048/2020, B9-0049/2020, B9-0050/2020)

A szavazáshoz fűzött szöbeli indokolások

Thierry Mariani (ID). – Madame la Présidente, Juan Guaidó et Nicolás Maduro obsèdent décidément notre hémicycle.

L'un est paré de toutes les vertus. Il vient d'être élu au siège de son journal et notre Parlement trouve cela normal. Si demain nos collègues écologistes organisent un scrutin dans leur journal, ceux-ci pourront-ils se vanter d'être présidents de notre assemblée?

Bref, Nicolás Maduro concentre nos critiques et nous le comprenons. Coincé dans des excès idéologiques, il condamne une large partie de sa population à l'exil. En même temps, nous voyons bien que ce qui retient l'attention de la communauté internationale, ce sont les alliances de Maduro avec ses adversaires déclarés des États-Unis.

Mais les sanctions américaines aident-elles le peuple vénézuélien? Ne prouvent-t-elles pas, au contraire, que derrière des affichages humanitaires se cache une volonté politique d'exercer une hégémonie culturelle et économique sur cette partie du monde? Une urgence humanitaire ne se résout pas à coup de sanctions économiques. À quand une large réflexion sur cette question des sanctions, des embargos, de l'extension de ces sanctions aux familles, aux proches et demain pourquoi pas aux voisins? Ces pratiques dissimulent, sous la question humanitaire, l'exercice d'immenses pressions politiques.

Jiří Pospíšil (PPE). – Paní předsedající, já jsem podpořil toto usnesení, které kritizuje další nelegitimní a nezákonné kroky diktátora Madura. My jsme o něm zde hovořili mnohokrát na plénu, bohužel je tedy houževnatý a opět posílil svoji moc nelegální změnou předsedy parlamentu. Měli bychom zvažovat to, co bylo řečeno, tedy zpřísnění sankcí vůči představitelům Madurova režimu a zda nezvolit tvrdší postup, protože evidentně Maduro má sílu stále přežívat. Vedle toho je nutná naše humanitární pomoc, o které jsme mnohokrát hovořili. Ta situace v zemi je naprosto úžasná, je tam humanitární katastrofa a podporuji tedy, abychom se dále podíleli a naopak ještě posílili humanitární pomoc obyvatelům této země, kteří nemohou za to, že jim vládne takovýto levicový diktátor.

Guido Reil (ID). – Frau Präsidentin, liebe Kolleginnen und Kollegen! Ich habe für die Entschließung gestimmt. Seit 20 Jahren leidet Venezuela jetzt unter dieser sozialistischen Diktatur, und wie in jedem anderen Land auch hat Sozialismus für Armut und Not gesorgt und vor allen Dingen für Unfreiheit. Damit muss endlich Schluss sein!

Venezuela ist eigentlich ein reiches Land, Venezuela verfügt über die größten Erdölreserven der Welt, und trotzdem leiden dort 70 Prozent aller Kinder unter Unterernährung, 3 Millionen Venezolaner sind mittlerweile geflohen. Damit muss endlich Schluss sein! Dieses Land braucht endlich Freiheit und Demokratie.

Mick Wallace (GUE/NGL). – Madam President, the EU's continued recognition of Guaidó is even more farcical now, given that on 5 January, with 150 of the 165 Members present, the National Assembly elected Luis Parra as its new President. Parra is from the right-wing opposition party Primero Justicia and was elected with 81 votes. Nor was Guaidó refused access to the National Assembly, as claimed by Josep Borrell. He's on camera inside the gated area, calmly refusing to enter unless he was allowed to take with him 11 former members of the Assembly. The event with him climbing the railing was staged afterwards.

The Declaration by Josep Borrell, expressing full support to Guaidó as President of the National Assembly is so disappointing and for me it's a disgrace. The EU leadership is supporting anti-democratic regime change again. It's crazy. Why don't we leave the Venezuelan people to themselves? It's time to stop inflicting suffering on these people and force the Americans to lift the sanctions and let the Venezuelans decide their future.

Eugen Tomac (PPE). – Doamnă președintă de ședință, am votat și eu această rezoluție și sunt uimit că aud încă în plenul Parlamentului oameni care îl văd altfel pe Maduro decât drept un dictator. Este un dictator, și orice dictator pe care l-am cunoscut de-a lungul istoriei, am observat ferm că își disprețuiește propriul popor.

Deci trebuie să dăm un semnal de solidaritate cu milioane de cetățeni ai Venezuelei care sunt în suferință în această perioadă, trebuie să acționăm mult mai ferm prin diplomația noastră pentru a sancționa acest regim criminal care a dus și a pus în situații incredibile milioane de cetățeni. Deci sunt alături de Venezuela și trebuie să luptăm pentru libertatea acestui popor.

Jan Zahradil (ECR). – Paní předsedající, já jsem rád, že se zabýváme na plénu Evropského parlamentu zase jednou situací ve Venezuele. Skutečnost je totiž taková, že pokud jde o Latinskou Ameriku, tak levice Evropského parlamentu, která tady převládá, to si přiznejme, se velice ráda strefuje do režimů např. v Brazílii nebo v Kolumbii, prostě do těch, které považuje za pravicové, a naopak velice ráda mlčí o režimech, které bychom směle mohli označit za levicové diktatury, ať je to Kuba nebo Nikaragua nebo konec konců Venezuela. Takže je dobře, že jsme se tím zabývali, a je dobře, že se tím zabýváme, a je dobře, že se tím budeme zabývat, a myslím, že neústavní kroky, porušování lidských práv a vůbec tragická ekonomická situace, do které zavedl Venezuelu socialistický režim, je důležitá věc na naší zahraničně politické agendě.

7.4. Wysłuchania w toku prowadzone na mocy art. 7 ust. 1 TUE w sprawie Polski i Węgier (B9-0032/2020)

A szavazáshoz fűzött szövegi indoklások

Claire Fox (NI). – Madam President, I voted against this motion because Article 7 is being used as a bullying weapon in defiance of the Hungarian and Polish voters. It is they, the Hungarian and Polish voters, and only they who should decide if their governments need punishment.

There is a tension in this Parliament, this relentless push by the EU to a federalist system in which all national cultural and political differences need to be eradicated and squashed seems to be incredibly destructive. You say you embrace diversity, but you never embrace diversity of opinion. And you show contempt for national sovereignty, shown, by the way, by the arbitrary diktat that you ban national flags from groups in this place.

Let me remind you that you discipline Hungary and Poland because they are accused of betraying European values. But those values must include the European enlightenment values of self-determination, popular sovereignty, democracy and, what's more, tolerance of political views you disagree with. I disagree with the governments of Hungary and of Poland but they need to be free, democratically elected to express them.

Joachim Stanisław Brudziński (ECR). – Pani Przewodnicząca! Jest to kolejna odsłona spektaklu, no nie chcę powiedzieć farsy, która w tej sali ma miejsce pod adresem demokratycznego rządu polskiego, rządu wybranego większością głosów polskich obywateli i w tej Izbie pada bardzo wiele słów przy okazji różnych debat, jak ważne dla przedstawicieli, szczególnie lewicy, są głosy obywateli. Natomiast w momencie kiedy te głosy padają na przedstawicieli partii czy rządu, które stoją w kontrze do tego brukselskiego czy strasburskiego establishmentu, to wtedy rozpoczyna się właśnie taka tragifarsa. Głosowałem oczywiście przeciw tej rezolucji, bo poziom hipokryzji, zakłamania, a mówiąc wprost również działań wbrew obowiązującym traktatom europejskim jest porażający. Państwa członkowskie mają pełną autonomię i prawo do tego, aby poprzez parlamenty narodowe reformować swój własny wymiar sprawiedliwości. Polska jest dzisiaj krajem bezpiecznym, Polska jest krajem praworządnym. Odmawia się debaty na temat praworządności we Francji, gdzie policja w sposób niezwykle brutalny łamie swobody obywatelskie, gdzie siłowo wyprowadza sędziów czy adwokatów z sądu apelacyjnego. W Polsce policja chroniła marsz sędziów, którzy protestowali przeciwko tej reformie wymiaru sprawiedliwości. Wstydem jest dla mnie, że europosłowie Platformy Obywatelskiej...*(Przewodnicząca odebrała mowę głos).*

Ангел Джамбазки (ECR). – Г-жо Председател, колеги, убедено гласувах срещу тази резолюция, тези две резолюции за наказване на Полша и на Унгария, защото те са срамни, защото те са фарс, защото те са лов на вещици.

Нито Полша, нито Унгария нарушават по някакъв начин върховенството на закона и свободата на словото в своите държави. Истинският ви проблем, колеги, с Полша и Унгария е, че и Полша, и Унгария избраха своите суверенни правителства — правителства от полски или унгарски родолюбци и патриоти, които знаят как да управляват собствените си държави, които не допускат антихристиянска пропаганда в своите държави, които не допускат диктата на фалшивата мултикултурна идеология, която се налага от спонсорирани от г-н Сорос неправителствени организации.

И Полша, и Унгария са суверенни държави, суверенни правителства, и те трябва да бъдат уважавани. Не трябва да бъде уважавано това, което се опитват да ни налагат левите болшевици от лявата част на залата.

Gilles Lebreton (ID). – Madame la Présidente, j’ai voté contre la résolution relative à la Pologne et à la Hongrie pour deux raisons.

D’abord, je trouve inadmissible que le Parlement européen s’y félicite du déclenchement de l’article 7 du traité sur l’Union européenne contre ces deux pays. On leur reproche notamment d’avoir violé l’indépendance du pouvoir judiciaire et la liberté académique, mais moi j’estime que des États souverains ont le droit d’organiser leur justice comme ils le veulent. Et pour être tout à fait clair, j’approuve la Hongrie de se protéger contre les tentatives de déstabilisation de George Soros.

En second lieu, je trouve inadmissible que la résolution du Parlement européen propose de créer une procédure de surveillance, par des sages prétendument indépendants, du respect des valeurs de l’Union par ses États membres. Je ne veux de tutelle idéologique de l’Union, ni sur la Pologne, ni sur la Hongrie, ni sur la France, ni sur aucun autre État membre.

Bogdan Rzońca (ECR). – Pani Przewodnicząca! Zabieram głos, ponieważ podczas wczorajszej debaty padło wiele kłamstw. Między innymi lewicowy, prawdopodobnie komunistyczny poseł z Grecji mówił, że w Polsce nie ma praworządności. Gdzie był wtedy, gdy Grecja jako beneficjent środków unijnych malwersowała środki finansowe? Gdzie był wymiar sprawiedliwości w Grecji? Chcę więc powiedzieć, że nie potrzebujemy takich doradców z lewicy, ze środka tego Parlamentu, którzy nie mówią prawdy.

Polska pod rządami Prawa i Sprawiedliwości także jest beneficjentem środków unijnych. Świetnie te środki wykorzystujemy, Eurostat to potwierdza. W Polsce ludzie cieszą się swoim życiem coraz bardziej. Natomiast rzeczywistość jest tak, że sędziowie po prostu szukają politycznego odwetu za przegrane wybory przez opozycję i sędziowie stają się politykami. To bardzo niedobry zwyczaj, bardzo niedobra praktyka. Historia to bardzo dobrze osądzi. Dlatego głosowałem przeciwko tej rezolucji.

7.5. Konferencja Stron Konwencji o różnorodności biologicznej (COP15) – Kunming (2020) (B9-0035/2020)

A szavazáshoz fűzött szóbeli indokolások

Catherine Rowett (Verts/ALE). – Madam President, we’re on the verge of a catastrophic biodiversity loss, and it’s great news that this Parliament passed a resolution today for the COP15 Convention on Biological Diversity. This reflects a moment at which this Parliament has increased its green vote considerably and a shift in public opinion. But it’s disappointing to see swathes of voters on the other side of the Chamber standing against acceleration of this action, trying to put on the brakes. This is a betrayal of people and animals, it’s a betrayal of the collaborative project that is the EU. Why are they preventing us from reforming the agricultural policy? Why are they holding us back from what needs to be done when the planet is at risk?

7.6. Instytucje i organy unii gospodarczej i walutowej: zapobieganie konfliktom interesów związanym z zatrudnianiem byłych urzędników instytucji publicznych (B9-0047/2020)

A szavazáshoz fűzött szóbeli indokolások

John Howarth (S&D). – Madam President, I am happy to support this resolution as there is no doubt that the public wishes to see transparency in these senior roles, particularly in the world of finance.

Since European economic and monetary union became a reality, we've been told by the sceptics, populists and Brexiteers that it was a disaster and that the euro was certain to collapse. Well, they were wrong. Given the circumstances, the euro has done remarkably well and I suggest that it will still be around long after their baboonery has been forgotten.

Timing is everything. I appear to be the last UK MEP to address this Chamber. I may or may not speak again in the Brussels session but if you'll bear with me, there's some people who need to be thanked: yourself and the other Vice-Presidents, and my friends, colleagues and opponents but never enemies, in this Chamber.

Most of all, you are as good as your staff, so public thanks are in order to Kay Wilcox, Sarah McKinley and Kim Chapman in my UK office, Mat Hogarth, Sive Thompson and, lately, Jenny McConnel, in my Brussels team who have been challenging and fabulously loyal to the last and have shared many things, including, I'm afraid, this cold. So thank you and gan canny.

When I was re-elected in May, however, I did the usual thanking of the police and the electoral staff and I forgot to mention one person who I could not have done any of this without and that of course is the absolutely fabulous Jane Coney. So Jane, it doesn't get more public than this. The worst aspect of this job is having to be away from you. So thank you for everything. I love you. People keep asking me what I want next, and you know, I want you.

Elnök asszony. – Az ülést 15.00 óráig felfüggesztem.

8. Korekty do głosowania i zamiar głosowania: Patrz protokół

(Az ülést 13.12-kor rekesztik be.)

PŘEDSEDNICTVÍ: DITA CHARANZOVÁ

místopředsedkyně

9. Wznowienie posiedzenia

(The sitting resumed at 15.00)

10. Przyjęcie protokołu poprzedniego posiedzenia: Patrz protokół

11. Kalendarz sesji miesięcznych Parlamentu w 2021 i 2022 r.: Patrz protokół

12. Przedmioty nielegalnie wydrukowane w technice 3D (debata)

President. – The next item is the debate on the oral question to the Commission on 3D-printed illicit objects by Lucy Nethsingha on behalf of the Committee on Legal Affairs (O-000002/2020 (B9-0002/2020)).

Liesje Schreinemacher, *author*. – Madam President, 3D printing is a technology with significant economic potential for European businesses, notably for small, innovative enterprises, and many countries have started to adapt strategies to promote its development. The technology, however, also raises legal and ethical questions. Different studies by the Commission have shown the existence of loopholes in EU legislation regarding the use of 3D printing. Recent tragic events have raised concerns and confirmed the need for action at EU level.

On 9 October 2019, two people were killed and two people were injured in Halle, Germany, when an attacker tried to enter the local synagogue during Yom Kippur, the Jewish holiday. The attacker used a 3D-printed weapon, the blueprint of which he uploaded on Twitter.

Already in its 2018 report, the Committee on Legal Affairs (JURI) expressed concerns regarding the manufacturing of weapons, explosives, drugs and other hazardous products in the context of 3D printing, but also regarding the problems relating to civil liability and intellectual property rights.

In light of the urgency of this matter, the JURI Committee would like to ask the Commission the following: How do you intend to tackle this problem raised by the use of 3D-printed illicit objects? Do you foresee taking any legislative action based on ongoing and previous studies and evaluations? If so, which EU measures do you foresee to be impacted, and what is the timeline of the actions you plan to undertake? What will you do to ensure a timely response? Finally, what progress has been made regarding the actions the Commission has committed to undertake following the 2018 JURI Committee report?

Janez Lenarčič, *Member of the Commission*. – Madam President, I share this Parliament's view as it was expressed in its 2018 report that the distinguished author of the question mentioned, namely that 3D printing technology may also raise security, and especially cybersecurity, concerns, particularly with regard to the manufacturing of weapons, explosives and drugs, and any other hazardous objects, and that particular care should be taken with regard to production of that kind.

The main problem with three-dimensional printed firearms is not that they are defective and therefore subject to the Product Liability Directive. The actual problem is that these firearms were illegally manufactured and used. According to the Directive on the acquisition and possession of weapons, also known as the Firearms Directive, the manufacturing of weapons is already illicit unless it is authorised by a competent authority of the Member State where the manufacture or assembly takes place. And this applies also to manufacturing through 3D printing and using technical specifications available on the Internet.

Monitoring of the situation is currently taking place in the context of the EU policy cycle for organised and serious international crime. The Operational Action Plan 2020 includes an operational action aiming at raising awareness of the threat of the use of new technologies, such as 3D printers. Europol issued in October last year an intelligence notification for all law enforcement authorities on this subject.

The Commission is preparing a report on the application of the Directive, covering issues notably related to the impacts of new technologies such as three-dimensional printing. This report, which is due by September this year, will assess whether further action with respect to 3D printing is required.

Ibán García Del Blanco, *en nombre del Grupo S&D*. – Señora presidenta, yo creo que todos los que nos hemos aproximado y nos aproximamos a esta cuestión coincidiremos en que estamos ante una herramienta, un avance tecnológico y de carácter también democratizador que, de alguna forma, supone una grandísima oportunidad.

La impresión 3D desde luego que tiene muchas diferentes aproximaciones, pero es evidente que puede ayudarnos, incluso desde el punto de vista del ahorro de materiales, desde el punto de vista de una menor contaminación. Estamos hablando de que la producción, la posibilidad de producir cada vez con, además, herramientas y máquinas más grandes y con mayor capacidad en el lugar donde se quiera establecer la actividad evita transportes, por ejemplo, también. Una democratización, al final, como decía, del acceso a determinadas cosas.

Pero es verdad también, por otra parte, que plantea también un reto importante con respecto a un montón de cosas. La seguridad es una de ellas. Antes se ha hecho referencia a lo que tiene que ver con la posibilidad de, sin ir más lejos, construir armas. Y hemos tenido algún ejemplo durante estos últimos meses y estos últimos años de la dificultad que existe todavía de control de determinadas cosas, determinados planos, determinadas formas de construir que se pueden incluso descargar de la misma web, de lo que se llama el *deep internet*, de la web profunda.

Y también, desde luego, plantea otra serie de retos que, legalmente, todavía no están bien solucionados. Y a mí me gustaría aprovechar esta ocasión para pedirle a la Comisión que lo tenga en cuenta desde el punto de vista del propio respeto a la propiedad intelectual. Y existen también un montón de ejemplos de cómo, de alguna forma, existe poco control con respecto a la utilización de la producción intelectual de personas o de colectivos que, de alguna manera, han estado trabajando en producciones -como digo- de carácter intelectual. Y no existe una protección suficiente todavía en nuestra legislación. Es más, las excepciones que se están planteando son demasiado vagas y demasiado amplias.

A mí me gustaría que, como hemos hecho con tantas cosas y como hemos hecho con la propia web y con la utilización, con el uso digital del propio acceso a contenidos intelectuales y culturales, lo hagamos también en este terreno.

En fin, y termino con esto. Perdón por la extensión. Yo le animo a la Comisión, sobre todo, a ir rellenando algunas lagunas legales y también, de alguna manera, a coordinar y armonizar alguna legislación que ya existe.

Liesje Schreinemacher, *on behalf of the Renew Group*. – Madam President, thank you to the Commission for its answer. Well, allow me to continue in my mother tongue, Dutch.

Voorzitter, 3D-printen: het is een technologie die inmiddels een flinke vlucht heeft genomen en nog steeds veel potentie heeft voor Europese bedrijven, voor zowel grote bedrijven als het midden- en kleinbedrijf. De mogelijkheden zijn eindeloos en het heeft ons leven al stukken verbeterd. Denk bijvoorbeeld aan het printen van protheses in de medische wereld, of in de bouw, waar een klein huis inmiddels al in 48 uur kan worden opgetrokken.

Maar zoals bij vele innovaties kent ook deze innovatie een keerzijde wanneer ze in verkeerde handen valt, zoals we hebben kunnen zien bij die verschrikkelijke gebeurtenis in Halle, Duitsland, waar iemand de synagoge probeerde binnen te dringen en waarbij twee mensen gedood zijn en twee mensen gewond zijn geraakt. Hoewel 3D-printen ons dus veel goeds brengt, mogen we onze ogen niet sluiten voor andere mogelijkheden en gevaarlijke toepassingen, zoals het printen van wapens, explosieven of drugs. We moeten onszelf daarom de vraag stellen of we het nu wel goed genoeg geregeld hebben, en het antwoord is nee.

De Commissie gaf net al aan dat ze stappen heeft genomen, het *Operational Action Plan*. Ook de politie en vervolginginstanties zijn hierop gezet. Maar de vraag is of dit voldoende is, want als je erin duikt, blijkt er inderdaad een lappendeken te zijn over regels van intellectueel eigendom, maar ook civiele aansprakelijkheid en natuurlijk de vuurwapenrichtlijn. De Commissie zei zelf al dat de wapens illegaal geprint zijn. Ja goed, hoe gaan we dat voorkomen? Want toch kon dit gebeuren.

Mijn vraag is dus aan de Commissie: u heeft al gezegd welke acties u heeft ondernomen, maar moet er nog nieuwe wetgeving komen en komen er nieuwe standaarden? Want ik geloof dat u echt wel – en iedereen hier met mij – van mening is dat zo'n incident als in Duitsland nooit meer zou mogen voorkomen.

Ангел Джамбазки, *от илто на групата ECR*. – Г-жо Председател, г-н комисар, уважаеми един, двама, трима, четирима колеги в залата, преди да започна с темата по същество, повдигната от уважаемата колега, искам да се обърна към Вас, г-жо Председател, и да кажа нещо, което казах и на миналото заседание и на по-миналото и ще продължа да го казвам, докато не се вземат мерки. Присъствието на толкова хора, на толкова представители в залата в четвъртък, в работен ден, е обида за данъкоплатците и разочарование за тези хора там, които идват да гледат работата на Парламента. Тя трябва да се промени — или да няма заседание в четвъртък след обяда, или дневните да се изплащат след края на заседанието, или да се изплащат за половин ден. Такова присъствие и такъв дебат по важна тема, пак казвам, е обида за данъкоплатците и за хората, които ни гледат тук. Така че трябва да се вземат мерки. Моля, предайте това натам.

Сега по темата: безспорно навлизането на новите технологии във всички сфери на нашия живот поставя нови предизвикателства. Триизмерното принтиране е важна технология, която води до изключително ценни постижения в редица сфери като медицина, строителство и научни изследвания.

Точно, както никой не може да предвиди въздействието на парната машина през 1750 г. или пресата за печатане през 1450 г., така и днес не можем да предвидим какво ще бъде дългосрочното въздействие на триизмерното принтиране.

Ясно е, че освен безспорно полезните приложения на тази технология, то ще носи и рискове. Принтирането на оръжия е ниша, която не е регулирана и трябва да бъде внимателно изследвана. Безотговорно е хора без морални устои да имат достъп до триизмерно принтирани оръжия след няколко минути търсене в световната мрежа. Тези оръжия са непроследими, на практика неоткриваеми, и могат да бъдат достъпни за всеки престъпник, насилник или терорист.

Но искам да ви обърна внимание на нещо друго — самият факт, че има хора, които прибегват до триизмерно принтиране, за да се сдобият с лично оръжие, показва следното нещо: законите в редица държави-членки на Европейския съюз относно притежаването на лично оръжие са ненужно рестриктивни и пречат на съвестните граждани данъкоплатци, които искат да защитят себе си и семейството си.

В моята страна, в България, има огромен проблем с битовата престъпност, извършвана от страна на несоциализирани маргинални групи. За редица граждани в малките населени места, които нямат достъп до полицейска защита, притежаването на лично оръжие е единственият начин да защитят себе си и семейството си. Нека ви напомня, че единственият, който може да спре лош човек с оръжие, е добър човек с оръжие. Каквито и регламенти и регулации да бъдат приети относно триизмерно принтираното оръжие, те не трябва да засягат законно придобитото оръжие.

В тази зала се говореше много пъти за ограничаване на притежаването на ловно оръжие, на спортно оръжие, за ограничаване в сферата, примерно, на използването на стоманени сачми, замяната им с оловни, и други такива, меко казано, безумни рестрикции, които вместо да бъдат в полза на гражданите, ги натоварват и разрушават стари, традиционни спортове като лова и спортната стрелба.

Нека да направим сериозни стъпки за либерализиране на режима за придобиване не само на личното оръжие, но и на спортното и на колекционерското такова. Знаете, че единствено свободният човек е въоръженият човек.

(Ораторът приема да отговори на въпрос „синя карта“ (член 171, параграф 8 от Правилника за дейността))

Андрей Слабаков (ЕСР), въпрос, зададен чрез вдигане на синя карта. – Г-жо Председател, аз имам, освен някакъв вид изказване, и въпроси към г-н Джамбазки. Аз не мога да разбера как въобще може да се прави разлика между нормално и принтирано оръжие. В смисъл, разлика не може да има и това е моят въпрос към г-н Джамбазки: дали той смята, че има някаква разлика между двете.

Режимите са изключително странни, защото няма разлика между носене и притежание на оръжие. Според моите разбирания в моя дом, който би трябвало да бъде неприкосновен и никой да няма право да влиза в него, мога да държа, ако искам, и тежка картучница. Мисля, че това е нормално. Може би аз просто харесвам тежки картучници. И не разбирам тези странни рестриктивни закони, в които на хората се забранява да защитават собствения си живот.

Мога да ви дам пример с България, че в България, ако някой ме нападне с брадва, аз трябва да отговоря със същото оръжие, т.е. вероятно аз трябва да сложа един куфар оръжия до леглото си, ако влязат в къщи.

Ангел Джамбазки (ЕСР), отговор на въпрос, зададен чрез вдигане на синя карта. – Колега Слабаков, до голяма степен споделям Вашето мнение. Аз мисля, че за да не се принуждават хората да си правят 3D-принтирани оръжия, всеки един гражданин, който спазва законите, всеки един гражданин, който няма осъдителна присъда, всеки един гражданин, който е данъкоплатец, трябва да може да придобива възможности, за да се защитава сам себе си и семейството си, без да нарушава законите, разбира се.

President. – Now I would like to give the floor back to the Commission.

Commissioner Lenarčič, the floor is yours for the final remarks.

Janez Lenarčič, *Member of the Commission*. – Madam President, thank you for this short but very interesting debate. I will take this back and I can assure you that the Commission will look at this matter from all the angles that were mentioned today. But I can already give you some preliminary feedback on each of them.

I will start with intellectual property rights. The Commission recently commissioned a study on the intellectual property rights implications of the development of industrial three-dimensional printing. The purpose of this study is to analyse the intellectual property implications of the development of industrial 3D printing. The Commission will take account of the study's conclusions and recommendations and will decide on the next steps. Obviously, the fight against counterfeit products, be it through 3D printing or any other production method, is of paramount importance for the Commission.

On product liability, this is a matter that is covered by the Product Liability Directive. On this issue, I can tell you that the Commission published its fifth report on the Product Liability Directive and the evaluation of the Directive back in 2018. It also published a staff working document on liability for emerging digital technologies in the same year. In addition, the Commission is working on a guidance document for the implementation of the Directive and this guidance document should be available later this year. Furthermore, the Commission is examining whether it would be useful to amend the Product Liability Directive.

Finally, on the illicit arms production angle, the incident that you mentioned in Halle was of course looked at very closely by the German authorities. Among others, the German Bundestag found that no legislative changes are necessary because the current German law explicitly sanctions the unlicensed manufacture of guns and firearms regardless of the method of their production. Nevertheless, the Commission will submit to this Parliament and to the Council a report on the application of the Firearms Directive, including a fitness check of its provisions accompanied, if appropriate, by legislative proposals, notably concerning the impacts of new technologies such as 3D-printing, but also the use of QR code and the use of radio-frequency identification.

President. – The debate is closed.

13. Składanie dokumentów: patrz protokół

14. Decyzje w sprawie sporządzenia sprawozdań z własnej inicjatywy: patrz protokół

15. Zmiany w przekazaniu spraw komisjom (art. 56 Regulaminu): patrz protokół

16. Zaangażowane komisje (art. 57 Regulaminu): patrz protokół

17. Petycje: patrz protokół

18. Zatwierdzenie protokołu bieżącego posiedzenia i przekazanie przyjętych tekstów: patrz protokół

19. Kalendarz następnych posiedzeń: patrz protokół

20. Zamknięcie posiedzenia

(The sitting closed at 15.23)

21. 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