



PEŁNE SPRAWOZDANIE Z OBRAD 21 LISTOPADA 2016 R.

(C/2024/2112)

PARLAMENT EUROPEJSKI

SESJA 2016-2017

Posiedzenia od 21 do 24 listopada 2016 r.

STRASBURG

Spis treści	Strona
1. Wznowienie sesji	3
2. Przyjęcie protokołu poprzedniego posiedzenia	3
3. Skład Parlamentu: patrz protokół	3
4. Skład grup politycznych: patrz protokół	3
5. Skład komisji i delegacji: patrz protokół	3
6. Kalendarz sesji miesięcznych Parlamentu w roku 2018: Patrz protokół	4
7. Podpisanie aktów prawnych przyjętych zgodnie ze zwykłą procedurą ustawodawczą (art. 78 Regulaminu): Patrz protokół	4
8. Składanie dokumentów: patrz protokół	4
9. Pytania wymagające odpowiedzi ustnej (składanie dokumentów): patrz protokół	4
10. Działania podjęte w związku z rezolucjami Parlamentu: Patrz protokół: Patrz protokół	4
11. Porządek obrad	4
12. Sprawozdanie roczne Europejskiego Banku Centralnego za rok 2015 (debata)	6

Spis treści	Strona
13. Zielona księga w sprawie detalicznych usług finansowych (debata)	26
14. Finalizacja pakietu Bazylea III (debata)	35
15. Europejska Unia Obrony (krótka prezentacja)	46
16. Uwolnienie potencjału pasażerskiego transportu wodnego (krótka prezentacja)	53
17. Zwiększanie skuteczności współpracy na rzecz rozwoju (krótka prezentacja)	57
18. Jednominutowe wypowiedzi w znaczących kwestiach politycznych	61
19. Porządek obrad następnego posiedzenia: Patrz protokół	68
20. Zamknięcie posiedzenia	68

PEŁNE SPRAWOZDANIE Z OBRAD 21 LISTOPADA 2016 R.

VORSITZ: MARTIN SCHULZ

Präsident

(Die Sitzung wird um 17.00 Uhr eröffnet.)

1. Wznowienie sesji

Der Präsident. – Ich erkläre die am Donnerstag, dem 27. Oktober 2016, unterbrochene Sitzungsperiode für wieder aufgenommen.

2. Przyjęcie protokołu poprzedniego posiedzenia

Der Präsident. – Das Protokoll und die angenommenen Texte der Sitzung vom 27. Oktober 2016 sind verfügbar.

Gibt es dagegen Einwände?

Das ist nicht der Fall.

Herr Szanyi, Sie haben einen Antrag zur Tagesordnung.

Tibor Szanyi (S&D). – Mr President, human rights abuses must never go unnoticed by the EU, no matter if they occur within or outside of its borders. Therefore we cannot let certain worrying political developments in Malaysia pass without comment. Howard Lee, a Malaysian Assembly Member and president of the International Union of Socialist Youth, and other activists were taken into custody by the Malaysian police for participating in a rally. They were arrested because they called for clean elections, clean government, the strengthening of parliamentary democracy and the right of dissent. Although they have been released – just today – I would ask you, on behalf of the European Parliament, to address this issue in the relevant fora so that it never happens again.

3. Skład Parlamentu: patrz protokół

4. Skład grup politycznych: patrz protokół

5. Skład komisji i delegacji: patrz protokół

6. **Kalendarz sesji miesięcznych Parlamentu w roku 2018: Patrz protokół**
7. **Podpisanie aktów prawnych przyjętych zgodnie ze zwykłą procedurą ustawodawczą (art. 78 Regulaminu): Patrz protokół**
8. **Składanie dokumentów: patrz protokół**
9. **Pytania wymagające odpowiedzi ustnej (składanie dokumentów): patrz protokół**
10. **Działania podjęte w związku z rezolucjami Parlamentu: Patrz protokół: Patrz protokół**

11. Porządek obrad

Der Präsident. – Der endgültige Entwurf der Tagesordnung dieser Tagung, wie er in der Konferenz der Präsidenten in ihrer Sitzung vom Donnerstag, dem 17. November 2016, gemäß Artikel 149 der Geschäftsordnung festgelegt wurde, ist verteilt worden.

Montag: Keine Änderungen

Dienstag:

Die ECR-Fraktion beantragt, den Titel der Erklärungen der Vizepräsidentin der Kommission/Hohen Vertreterin für Außen- und Sicherheitspolitik über die Lage im Westjordanland und in den Siedlungen zu ändern.

Der Titel soll lauten: „Herausforderungen des Friedensprozesses im Nahen Osten“.

Zdzisław Krasnodębski, w imieniu grupy ECR. – Panie Przewodniczący! Proponujemy więc, aby rzeczywiście zmienić tytuł tej debaty z „Sytuacja na Zachodnim Brzegu, w tym w osiedlach żydowskich”, na tytuł ogólniejszy: *Challenges in the Middle East Peace Proces*, ponieważ uważamy i wiemy wszyscy tutaj jak siedzimy na tej sali, że przyczyny konfliktu na Bliskim Wschodzie w tym regionie są o wiele bardziej złożone niż tylko kwestia związana z osiedlami żydowskimi. Jeżeli chcemy jako Parlament przyczynić się do procesu pokojowego w tym regionie i rzeczywiście rozważyć wszystkie przyczyny i aspekty, aby ten proces pokojowy postąpił naprzód, powinniśmy prowadzić dyskusję ogólniejszą, a nie tylko koncentrować się na jednym zagadnieniu. Zresztą wszystkie doniesienia, również to, co pisze Kwartet w swoim sprawozdaniu, wskazują na to, że nie można problemu, o którym mówimy, redukować tylko do tego jednego zagadnienia. Dlatego prosimy bardzo o zmianę tytułu i o debatę szerszą, tak żebyśmy się mogli wszyscy wypowiedzieć na temat różnych aspektów tego tragicznego procesu, tego tragicznego konfliktu i zaproponować nasz wkład w rozwiązanie tego problemu.

Marita Ulvskog (S&D). – Herr talman! Jag tycker inte att vi ska använda rubriker på våra debatter och på våra ärenden som förvanskar verkligheten. Senast vi hade en omröstning här i Europaparlamentet om situationen på Västbanken, Palestina, var röstsiffrorna på ett ungefär 500 röster för och 150 emot. Jag tycker att det är fullständigt solklart att vi ska ha kvar den rubrik vi har, och jag vill därför motsätta mig Zdzisław Krasnodębskis förslag.

Der Präsident. – Ich lasse über den Antrag abstimmen.

(Das Parlament lehnt den Antrag ab.)

Ebenfalls für Dienstag haben die Fraktion der Grünen/Freie Europäische Allianz und der Vereinigten Linken/Nordische Grüne Linke beantragt, eine Erklärung des Rates sowie der Kommission zu einem Gutachten des Gerichtshofs über die Vereinbarkeit des vorgeschlagenen CETA-Übereinkommens zwischen Kanada und der Europäischen Union mit den Verträgen als sechsten Punkt am Nachmittag auf die Tagesordnung zu setzen, und zwar nach dem Bericht von Frau Fotyga.

Heidi Hautala, *on behalf of the Verts/ALE Group*. – Mr President, 89 Members from five Groups have proposed a resolution calling for the opinion of the Court of Justice on the compatibility with the Treaties of the proposed agreement between the European Union and Canada (CETA). The resolution is currently scheduled for Wednesday, but is only to be put to the vote. I request that this resolution be debated on Tuesday and demand a roll-call vote on my request. There is no reason to avoid debate: many statements are coming from stakeholders, the expert Community law professors, and even the Advocate General of the EU Court of Justice.

Furthermore, after the objection by the Walloon Parliament, the Council has supplemented CETA with a joint interpretative instrument. The legal validity of that instrument is unclear, and this further adds to the complexity of the agreement. So it is necessary to ensure that the suggested investment court system is compatible with EU law, and all these considerations and this House's interests require that the Members have the possibility to express their views before this important vote.

(Applause)

Anne-Marie Mineur (GUE/NGL). – De GUE/NGL-Fractie steunt de aanvraag van de groenen met volle overtuiging. Het CETA-verdrag is een groot en ingrijpend verdrag met zeer verstrekkende gevolgen voor onze regelgeving, onze besluitvorming, ons rechtssysteem, het voorzorgsbeginsel en onze economie. Met name het stelsel van investeringsgerechten (ICS) is een zeer omstreden onderdeel van het verdrag. Tijdens een openbare raadpleging in 2005 kwamen er op zijn voorganger, het systeem voor beslechting van geschillen tussen investeerders en staten (ISDS), 150 000 reacties, waarvan 97 procent uitgesproken kritisch.

Een aantal van die fouten is verbeterd in het stelsel van investeringsgerechten, maar in essentie is ICS hetzelfde systeem als ISDS. Dat is betoogd door een aantal vooraanstaande wetenschappers, waaronder de Canadese hoogleraar Gus Van Harten, en is ook aangetoond in een studie getiteld "Investment Court System put to the test" van een aantal vooraanstaande ngo's. Zij hebben aangetoond dat de meest omstreden ISDS-zaken onder ICS nog steeds kunnen worden gevoerd met hetzelfde of een nog slechter resultaat. Het klopt dat de Juridische Dienst van het Europees Parlement heeft gezegd dat het geen problemen verwacht met ICS, maar daar staat tegenover dat er brieven zijn van de European Association of Judges en de Deutsche Richterbund die dat bestrijden. We moeten kunnen praten over dit onderwerp.

Daniel Caspary (PPE). – Herr Präsident, geschätzte Kolleginnen und Kollegen! Die Menschen haben Sorge: Was kommt da auf uns zu? Was passiert da in der Globalisierung? Wie werden unsere Unternehmen und Arbeitsplätze den Wettbewerb mit Ländern wie China, Indien und Brasilien bestehen? Mit unseren Handelsabkommen wie dem mit Kanada geben wir auf diese Sorgen eine Antwort, ohne unsere demokratischen Entscheidungsräume zu beschneiden. Wir geben der Globalisierung Regeln, ohne kommunale Daseinsvorsorge, Kunst und Kultur zu gefährden. Und wir sichern unsere Umwelt-, Sozial- und Verbraucherschutzstandards ab und sichern auch unserer Landwirtschaft eine gute Zukunft. Das ist die Überzeugung der großen Mehrheit hier im Haus.

Meine Damen und Herren, von den 89 Kollegen, die den Antrag eingereicht haben, haben 82 hier im Parlament gegen die letzten Handelsabkommen gestimmt. Der Kollege Jadot schreibt in einer Pressemeldung: Die Grünen werden alles tun, um das CETA zu zerstören. Unser Kollege bringt es auf den Punkt: Es geht nicht darum, Antworten zu geben, sondern zu zerstören – Zerstören des Vertrauens in unsere europäischen Institutionen, Zerstören des Vertrauens in unseren Juristischen Dienst und auch Zerstören des Vertrauens in uns Abgeordnete. Meine Damen und Herren, da machen wir nicht mit!

Das Gutachten des Juristischen Dienstes unseres Parlaments sagt eindeutig: Auswirkungen auf die EU-Rechtsordnung: keine, Auswirkungen auf die Kompetenzverteilung in der EU: keine, Auswirkungen auf konstitutionelle und fundamentale Rechte: keine. Aber nochmal: Es geht hier nicht um Prüfung, sondern um Zerstörung. Und wenn man sieht, wer gerade eben bei dem Antrag geklatscht hat: die Grünen und die Populisten – Sie suchen den Applaus von den Falschen wie schon so oft in den letzten zwei Jahren. Hören Sie mit dem Populismus auf und kommen Sie zurück in die Reihen der Demokraten!

Wir lehnen Ihren Antrag ab. Wir werben für das CETA. Wir wollen Globalisierung gestalten und den Menschen gute Antworten geben.

(Beifall)

Der Präsident. – Ich lasse über den Antrag namentlich abstimmen.

(Das Parlament lehnt den Antrag ab.)

Mittwoch und Donnerstag: Keine Änderungen.

(Der Arbeitsplan ist somit angenommen.)

Andrejs Mamikins (S&D). – Priekšsēdētāj! Dārgie kolēģi! Es gribu jūs lūgt aizkavēties, jo šodien pirms 40 minūtēm manā valstī, Latvijā, apritēja precīzi trīs gadi kopš brīža, kad, sabrūkot supermārketa, Latvijā gāja bojā 54 personas. 16 bērni palika daļēji bez vecākiem – bez viena no vecākiem – un trīs vispār bez vecākiem.

Šeit zālē atrodas komisārs Dombrovskis, kurš tolaik bija premjerministrs un atceras šo traģisko brīdi... (runa uz brīdi tiek pārtraukta). Tā bija vislielākā traģēdija Latvijas pastāvēšanas vēsturē kopš neatkarības atgūšanas un vislielākā traģēdija pēdējo 30 gadu laikā Austrumeiropā.

Godātais priekšsēdētāj, ja jūs neesat pret, es lūgtu šos deputātus, kuri palikuši zālē, ar klusuma brīdi pieminēt upurus šajā traģēdijā, kas notika Rīgā, Latvijā, pirms trīs gadiem.

Der Präsident. – Herr Mamikins, wir werden sicher darauf zurückkommen. Sie können mir den Hintergrund noch einmal nennen, und wir schauen, wie wir das mit Würde hier im Hause organisiert bekommen.

12. Sprawozdanie roczne Europejskiego Banku Centralnego za rok 2015 (debata)

Der Präsident. – Als erster Punkt der Tagesordnung folgt die Aussprache über den Bericht von Ramon Tremosa i Balcells über den Jahresbericht der Europäischen Zentralbank für 2015 (2016/2063(INI)) (A8-0302/2016).

Herr Präsident Draghi ist durch einen verspäteten Flug noch auf dem Weg hierher, sodass wir mit der Aussprache zunächst beginnen, indem ich dem Berichterstatter, Herrn Tremosa i Balcells, das Wort gebe.

Ramon Tremosa i Balcells, rapporteur. – Mr President, we live in times of uncertainty where future stability in our economies cannot be taken for granted any more. In this context, the biggest reassurance we can have for the future is the ECB's safe pair of hands. ECB policies have been correct in general terms, and tomorrow I hope this Chamber will clearly endorse them, as we did in the Committee on Economic and Monetary Affairs (ECON) some weeks ago.

ECB policies are subject to improvement and critique, of course. In this report you will find several ideas that may be of interest to you. We believe, for instance, that the asset purchase programmes (APP) should be redirected away from buying public debt into investment assets related to the EIB. The ECB should try harder to buy assets, such as a new wave of project bonds related to EU projects with clear EU added value, for example assets related to the building of the trans-European network of energy and transport, which is fundamental for the economy of the eurozone but lacking in proper investment in some Member States.

These European projects related to the Energy Union and the Transport Union were voted through by a large majority in this Parliament during the last legislature. We need investment, but smart investment: no more airports without planes; no more high speed trains without passengers; no more roads without trucks or cars. I believe that the current APP is being used by some Member States to avoid necessary reforms in the fields of late payments, energy reform and public deficits.

We also ask the ECB to study how it would impact the European monetary policy if Member States issued debt directly related to public investment so that the ECB could buy it. This may give incentives to Member States to increase their level of investment in research and education. We are also worried about the effects of negative interest rates in our banks and in our economy if they are maintained in the medium term. We know that the ECB is aware of these downside risks. I hope that negative interest rates will be the first measure to be unwound.

We express also our concerns in the report on the creation of housing bubbles in many big cities in Europe, such as Barcelona, where I come from. The cities are more and more expensive due to international capital inflows. Ultra-low interest rates are partly responsible for it together with, of course, local mistakes. Income inequalities are also worryingly on the rise.

Finally, we call on the ECB to study in depth how small saving banks and big banks react differently during the crisis on the concession of new credit. So we ask: are healthy and well-managed, small saving banks a key part of the rapid recoveries in some countries of the eurozone? I also ask myself in this Chamber, do we need to balance concentration at the big bank level, which is happening in some Member States, with a new wave of small banks linked directly to their local territories? Dear Commissioner, dear colleagues, I really look forward to your views on all these issues.

Președintă: ADINA-IOANA VĂLEAN

Vicepreședintă

Valdis Dombrovskis, *Vice-President of the Commission*. – Madam President, first of all I would like to thank the rapporteur, Mr Ramon Tremosa i Balcells, and all the members of the Committee on Economic and Monetary Affairs for their work on this report.

Ex-post assessment of the ECB's activities by the European Parliament is an important part of the democratic accountability of the ECB and a necessary complement to its independence. The ECB's independence in the conduct of its monetary policy, as enshrined in the Treaties, is crucial to the objective of safeguarding price stability. The Commission shares the view that the ECB's unconventional monetary policy actions have had a positive impact on overall financing conditions in the euro area. The implementation of the measures previously announced by the ECB is expected to lead to further gradual improvements in financial conditions and help bring inflation closer to the ECB's objective of keeping inflation rates below, but close to, 2% in the medium term.

However, we also share this Parliament's view that a prolonged period of low, or even negative, interest rates represents a challenge for the European financial system. While low interest rates are necessary to support the recovery and have had some positive impact in the short term on financing costs and capital gains for banks, a protracted environment of very low or negative interest rates would be a symptom of persistently weak aggregate demand and overall macroeconomic conditions.

As emphasised by Mario Draghi a number of times, we cannot ensure a sustainable recovery with monetary tools only. EU Member States must make wise use of the time provided by an accommodating monetary policy and advance necessary structural reforms, while continuing with responsible fiscal policy. Moreover, within the European Systemic Risk Board we have worked hard to assess the financial stability risks that may arise from a prolonged period of low interest rates. We are aware of the risk that this poses both to banks' business models through depressed net interest income and for insurers and pension funds with fixed liabilities. We have policy measures in place to address the most severe risks and are continuing to monitor developments in this issue. I look forward to a fruitful debate.

Thomas Mann, *im Namen der PPE-Fraktion*. – Frau Präsidentin, Herr Kommissar Dombrovskis, liebe Kolleginnen und Kollegen! Die ökonomischen und finanziellen Probleme in der EU lassen sich durch die geldpolitischen Maßnahmen der EZB allein nicht lösen. Deren Bestrebung ist es, die Gesamtnachfrage zu stimulieren. Mario Draghi hat recht: Notwendig sind ausgewogene Strukturreformen und eine solide Haushaltsführung in allen Mitgliedstaaten der Eurozone. Gute Beispiele dafür liefern Zypern, Irland und Slowenien. Sie konnten ihre Defizite unter den Referenzwert von 3 % des BIP senken. Genau so entsteht eine positive, nachhaltige Wirtschafts- und Finanzentwicklung.

Die EZB hat im Jahre 2015 ihr Programm zum Aufkauf von Vermögenswerten ausgeweitet. Bis zum März 2017 sind dafür 1,7 Billionen Euro vorgesehen. Dazu gehören jetzt auch Anleihen von Nicht-Finanzunternehmen, ebenso von lokalen und regionalen Gebietskörperschaften.

Eine allzu expansive Geldpolitik aber birgt Gefahren. Ich halte all die Bedenken für gerechtfertigt, dass es zu Wettbewerbsverzerrungen kommen kann, wenn Käufe von Anleihen der Großunternehmen am Kapitalmarkt stattfinden und die KMU daran nicht ausreichend partizipieren. Außerdem belastet die immer noch andauernde Niedrigzinspolitik die Zukunft der Altersvorsorgesysteme. Problematisch ist ebenso, dass die längerfristigen Sparzinsen in einigen Mitgliedstaaten unter der jeweiligen Inflationsrate liegen.

Dagegen sind die außerordentlichen Aktionen der EZB mit dem Ziel, die Teuerungsrate auf 2 % anzuheben, zu begrüßen. Sie sind rechtmäßig, sie stehen im Einklang mit ihrem Mandat. Ja, die Kreditvergabe an Haushalte und an Unternehmen im Euro-Währungsgebiet ist zweifellos verbessert worden. Allerdings sind die Investitionen, die dadurch erzielt werden sollten, noch nicht ausreichend und liegen sage und schreibe zehn Punkte unter dem Vorkrisenniveau.

Diese kritischen Bemerkungen und auch manche Sorgen, die der Berichterstatter geäußert hat, erfahren breite Unterstützung im Bericht von Tremosa i Balcells. Ich danke Ramon im Namen der EVP-Fraktion für seine Arbeit und für seine Bereitschaft zum Kompromiss, außerdem für die stete Kooperation mit uns Schattenberichterstattern. Ich hoffe, dass wir morgen gemeinsam – bei aller Unterschiedlichkeit – eine deutliche Mehrheit finden können.

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

Paul Rübzig (PPE), *Frage nach dem Verfahren der „blauen Karte“*. – Ich möchte mich beim Abgeordneten Mann bedanken, weil er erwähnt hat, wie wichtig eigentlich die kleinen und mittleren Betriebe sind und auch die Förderung der Selbständigkeit. Wir haben letzte Woche 500 Mio. EUR im europäischen Haushalt für 2017 für Jugendbeschäftigung vorgesehen. Ich glaube, gerade die kleinen und mittleren Betriebe könnten hier eine deutlich bessere Rolle spielen.

Herr Kollege Mann, sehen Sie Möglichkeiten, dass die EZB sich auch einmal eine Strategie überlegt, wie man Beschäftigung bei Jugendlichen und die Selbständigkeit fördern kann und mehr für KMU tut, um hier die Finanzierungsmöglichkeiten zu fokussieren und zu sehen, dass KMU in der Lage sind, gemeinsam mit kleinen und mittleren Banken auch Risikokapital zu bilden?

Thomas Mann (PPE), *Antwort auf eine Frage nach dem Verfahren der „blauen Karte“*. Ich kann Herrn Rübzig nur zustimmen. Das Europäische Parlament hat viele Sonderfazilitäten gegeben zur Stützung der KMU. Genau das brauchen wir. Was ist denn das Herzstück der europäischen Wirtschaft? Kleine und mittelständische Unternehmen! Die meisten Ausbildungsplätze und die meisten Arbeitsplätze – genau dafür brauchen wir das.

Und das muss auch mal den Sinn schärfen bei der Europäischen Zentralbank, dafür zu sorgen, dass wir nicht sagen können: Wir arbeiten nur mit den Großen, mit den Großunternehmen, mit den Großbanken. Kollege Ramon hat schon darauf hingewiesen, wie wichtig es ist, dafür zu sorgen, dass auch die anderen Unterstützungsmöglichkeiten erhalten. Daran müssen wir wirklich mit Hochdruck arbeiten. Hier müssen Ergebnisse ankommen und nicht nur große Absichtserklärungen. Ich stimme Paul Rübzig absolut zu.

Jonás Fernández, *en nombre del Grupo S&D*. – Señora Presidenta, en primer lugar me gustaría agradecer el trabajo del ponente, de nuestro colega Tremosa, en estos meses y el del conjunto de ponentes alternativos que hemos redactado y trabajado en este informe, que yo creo que es un documento equilibrado, que ayuda a entender la labor de la política monetaria del BCE, pero que también pone las luces largas indicando hacia dónde debería conducirse esa política monetaria.

Probablemente este informe, como decía, respalda claramente las principales medidas que ha venido tomando el BCE dirigidas a conseguir que se cumpla el objetivo de inflación, que es el principal propósito del Banco Central Europeo. Porque realmente seguimos estando lejos del objetivo, aun con todas las medidas expansivas que hemos tomado, y, por lo tanto, animamos y, de alguna manera, aludramos algunas vías para mejorar el acceso al crédito de las pymes, como decía alguno de nuestros colegas que hablaban previamente: cómo las pequeñas y medianas empresas podían tener también cabida dentro de los programas de expansión monetaria del BCE.

Pero el informe también dice claramente que la política monetaria sola no sirve, que es verdad que necesitamos hacer reformas estructurales en algunos sectores, y principalmente en la banca, porque la banca europea, y en algunos países poniendo mayores dificultades, sigue restringiendo la capacidad de que el crédito llegue a todas las empresas y a todos los consumidores.

Pero, aparte de esa reforma, necesitamos una política fiscal seria. En los próximos días veremos el informe anual de crecimiento que elabora la Comisión, y aquí está el Vicepresidente de la Comisión Dombrovskis, que debe alumbrar cuál debe ser la política fiscal. Esa política fiscal tiene que acompañar claramente a la política monetaria, porque cuando los tipos están tan bajos, cuando los inversores privados no tienen certidumbre sobre su rentabilidad porque las previsiones de crecimiento son muy bajas, porque realmente el entorno en el que se está moviendo Europa es un entorno muy incierto, necesitamos que el sector público haga su trabajo. Y, por lo tanto, necesitamos que el sector público, que al final es quien asume los riesgos en una sociedad, sea capaz de impulsar la demanda para facilitar también el cumplimiento del objetivo de inflación por parte del Banco Central Europeo.

Y, por lo tanto, en los próximos meses, en el marco del Semestre Europeo también, deberemos definir cuál debe ser esa política, que no tiene que ser solo una aproximación país por país, sino que tiene que haber una aproximación holística de la política macro, de la política fiscal, que acompaña a la política monetaria que ejecuta el Banco Central Europeo, con un resultado razonable en un entorno, como decía antes, muy complejo.

En cualquier caso, estos últimos segundos me gustaría dedicarlos a seguir insistiendo en la necesidad de que los beneficios del Banco Central Europeo, de que los beneficios de la única institución federal, de la institución de la moneda de la Unión, que es el euro, retornen al presupuesto del conjunto de la Unión. Y este debate se puede sacar adelante, se puede realizar sin necesidad de una reforma agravada de los Tratados, y deberíamos en algún momento discutirlo en los próximos meses.

Mario Draghi, *President of the European Central Bank*. – Madam President, first and foremost let me apologise for this delay, which was due to transport problems.

I am happy to be back at the European Parliament to discuss with you the European Central Bank Annual Report for 2015. This debate is an important pillar of our accountability. We take your comments and suggestions very seriously.

At your request, last year, we began publishing the ECB's feedback on your resolution on the ECB Annual Report. On 4 October 2016, the Governing Council also approved principles increasing transparency in developing ECB regulations on European statistics. These principles take into account the transparency practices of the European Parliament, the Council of the European Union and the Commission.

In my remarks today, I will retrace the economic developments since our last plenary exchange in February. In particular, I will discuss the role of the ECB's monetary policy in supporting the ongoing recovery. I will also review the policy agenda aimed at addressing current vulnerabilities in the euro area.

Let me say a few words now about economic developments and the role of the ECB's monetary policy in supporting the recovery. The euro area recovery continues to proceed at a moderate but steady pace. It has shown remarkable resilience to adverse developments and uncertainties emanating from the global environment. In fact, euro area unemployment has been steadily declining. More than four million jobs have been created since 2013, when the situation was at its worst. Domestic demand has also strengthened and positive figures for real GDP growth have been recorded for 14 consecutive quarters. Since the beginning of the year, headline inflation has gradually picked up, moving from the negative rate of -0.2% in February to +0.5% in October.

Our monetary policy measures since June 2014 have been a key factor behind these positive developments. Asset purchases, targeted longer-term refinancing operations (TLTROs, as they are called) and low policy rates have strongly supported the recovery. Let me explain more in detail.

First, the pass-through of our monetary stimulus to bank lending conditions has been remarkable. Interest rates have fallen markedly across a broad spectrum of asset classes and credit markets since June 2014. As a result, euro area firms and households have experienced more favourable borrowing conditions. For example, bank lending rates for companies declined by more than 100 basis points between June 2014 and September 2016. Bank lending conditions for small and medium-sized enterprises (SMEs) – the backbone of our economy – have improved even more. Since May 2014, bank lending rates on very small loans to corporations have declined by around 170 basis points. They are now converging towards those on loans to large-scale borrowers.

Evidence from our bank-lending survey supports this picture. Banks report that our measures are contributing to more favourable terms and conditions on loans and are supporting credit creation. Moreover, we see that banks are passing on the very attractive funding conditions of the TLTROs to their customers.

Lower borrowing costs for firms and households have stimulated both consumption and investment. For example, household income is benefiting from lower interest-rate expenses. Likewise, investment spending benefits from lower financing costs, which are making more investment projects profitable.

Supported by our monetary policy, the recovery is sustaining its momentum. We also expect headline inflation to continue rising over the coming months. At the same time, we are not seeing a consistent strengthening of underlying price dynamics. Much of the expected increase will be driven by statistical factors related to the stabilisation of oil prices.

Moreover, the return of inflation towards our objective still relies on the continuation of the current, unprecedented level of monetary support, in spite of the gradual closing of the output gap. It is for this reason that we remain committed to preserving the very substantial degree of monetary accommodation necessary to secure a sustained convergence of inflation towards levels below, but close to, 2% over the medium term.

However, as your draft resolution on our Annual Report argues, our monetary policy support has to be accompanied by decisive action from other policy areas. In fact, we continue to face a number of structural challenges that are holding back a more dynamic expansion of the euro area economy. So the right policies need to be designed to address existing vulnerabilities and challenges and, ultimately, to secure higher sustainable growth for the euro area.

As I argued before, the euro area economy has proved resilient despite the uncertainty caused, among other things, by the crisis in emerging market economies, the collapse in oil and commodity prices, and the consequences of the UK referendum.

Beyond the relevance of the ECB's monetary policy, an important contributing factor has been the more robust financial sector which has emerged from the financial crisis. The decision to address the mistakes of the pre-crisis era through ambitious regulatory reforms is thus paying off. It has resulted in a European financial sector that is now stronger in terms of capital, leverage, funding and risk-taking.

For example, Common Equity Tier 1 ratios in the euro area have improved substantially, rising from less than 7% for significant banking groups in 2008 to more than 14% today. The welcome improvements in bank solvency – and the related improvement in asset quality – are a tangible result of our common work to create the Banking Union.

The comprehensive assessment we conducted in 2014 — together with a deep asset quality review – encouraged banks to strengthen their balance sheets without delay. As a result, while the level of non-performing loans (NPLs) remains high in some countries, today this problem is not primarily related to the robustness of balance sheets. Coverage ratios are close to 50% and much of the remainder is collateralised.

A more resilient euro area banking system has been able to respond to the impetus originated by our monetary policy and facilitate the recovery in credit we have witnessed so far. However, a number of structural factors are still weighing on the ability of the financial sector to fully support the euro area recovery. Notably, the profitability of euro area banks remains a challenge to be addressed. While bank profitability and the level of bank equity prices is not, per se, a matter for policymakers, insofar as it raises financing costs for banks, it could ultimately curtail lending to the real economy and hold back the recovery. We should therefore consider what factors are behind this and what we can do to address them.

One factor is certainly the low-growth and low-inflation environment, which translates into low interest rates. By supporting the recovery, our monetary policy measures are supporting a return towards higher rates of return. In other words, low interest rates today are necessary for a return to higher interest rates in the future.

But legacy and structural challenges are also important factors behind banks' low profitability. Where profitability is being affected by structural issues, such as overcapacity and inefficient cost structures, rationalisation and consolidation must form part of the answer.

Where the non-performing loans (NPLs) are at a high level, creating the conditions for a faster resolution of bad loans is an essential part of the solution. ECB Banking Supervision has presented its draft guidance on NPLs for public consultation. We have also conducted a stocktake of national supervisory practices and legal frameworks related to NPLs. With a view to creating liquid markets of distressed debt, efforts will be required to foster the development of an NPL servicing industry, to improve data quality and access, and to remove tax and legal impediments to debt restructuring.

The European Parliament also has an important role to play in a number of key legislative dossiers. Some relate to the Banking Union, with the proposed European Deposit Insurance Scheme and the introduction of 'risk-reduction' measures in the context of the upcoming revision of the legislative pillars of the Single Rulebook for banks – namely the Bank Recovery and Resolution Directive (BRRD), the Capital Requirements Regulation (CRR) and the Capital Requirements Directive (CRD). Others relate to the Capital Markets Union (CMU). In particular, the negotiations concerning the Securitisation Regulation need to be finalised soon. Securitisation can play a very important role in increasing bank funding to the economy but regulatory uncertainty is detrimental to European securitisation markets. We consider that the Commission has put forward a strong package that balances a revival of the European securitisation markets with the preservation of a prudent regulatory framework.

Progress needs to be made in other areas too, in particular insolvency law and taxation, as announced in the Commission's communication. It will also be necessary to address the financial stability aspects of CMU as part of the macroprudential review.

A stable, profitable and competitive financial sector is essential for sustainable economic growth; but the reverse is also true. This is why we need more decisive action to raise the potential growth rate of the economy.

First, let me echo your draft resolution. The implementation of structural reforms needs to be substantially stepped up. This concerns, in particular, policy actions to raise productivity and improve the business environment. We will soon discuss the Annual Growth Survey 2017, which touches upon these exact issues. We should make the best use of the annual cycle of economic governance by ensuring that recommendations – including euro area recommendations – are really taken into account and effectively implemented.

Second, fiscal policies should also support the economic recovery, while remaining in compliance with the fiscal rules of the European Union. For instance, a more growth-friendly composition of fiscal policies could boost growth. This leads me to my concluding point.

During our last plenary exchange in February, I said that the cohesion of Europe was being tested. Since then, the challenges have increased. It is now, more than ever, important and necessary that Europe responds cohesively and decisively to the challenges it is facing.

I believe we should remember the words of a great European, Carlo Azeglio Ciampi, spoken in this room more than ten years ago: 'If we act alone we will be at the mercy of events bigger than us, events that threaten peace and European security.'

I am confident that the foundations on which the EU project is built are strong enough to achieve the objectives that have been entrusted to us by the people of Europe.

I am now looking forward to the debate.

Bernd Lucke, *im Namen der ECR-Fraktion*. – Frau Präsidentin, meine Damen und Herren! Ich möchte zunächst dem Berichterstatter sehr danken für seinen Bericht. Und ich möchte Herrn Draghi dafür danken, dass er mir die Ehre erwiesen hat, gerade rechtzeitig zu meiner Rede im Europäischen Parlament zu erscheinen. Ich freue mich auch, Herr Draghi, dass Sie gesagt haben, dass Sie das sehr ernst nehmen wollen, was ich in meiner Rede ausführe.

Denn der Euro, Herr Draghi, ist nach wie vor in einer schweren Krise. Und wenn man wissen möchte, wie schwer diese Krise ist, muss man nur diesen Bericht lesen, den Herr Tremosa i Balcells geschrieben hat. Er weist genau auf die Schwierigkeiten hin, die in der Eurozone existieren. Es ist jetzt auch in dieser Debatte bereits mehrfach ausgeführt worden, dass wirtschaftlich und fiskalisch eben ganz viel in der Eurozone nicht in Ordnung ist. Trotz all der Maßnahmen, die die Europäische Zentralbank ergriffen hat, haben wir nichts als Verzerrungen auf den Märkten. Aber wir haben keine Fortschritte im Bereich der Produktivität und der Wettbewerbsfähigkeit.

Wir haben jetzt negative Zinssätze. Und, Herr Draghi, Sie loben das damit, dass Sie sagen: Jetzt haben die Haushalte ja mehr Geld, das sie ausgeben können, weil sie nicht mehr so viele Zinsen zahlen müssen. Aber die Wahrheit ist, dass Sie eine Kultur des Sparens zerstören und dass Sie mit den negativen Zinssätzen eine Kultur der Verschuldung befördern. Und das ist das Gegenteil dessen, was wir brauchen.

Sie zerstören – wie ausgeführt worden ist – die private Altersvorsorge. Herr Draghi, ich habe in den 90er-Jahren für mich selbst eine Rentenversicherung abgeschlossen, für die mir die Versicherung 4 % Garantiezins zugesagt hat. Wie soll denn diese arme Versicherung 4 % Garantiezins erwirtschaften, wenn Sie die Zinssätze in den Nullbereich oder sogar in den Negativbereich hineindrängen? Und gleichzeitig haben wir diese Verzerrungen, und gleichzeitig sehen wir die Hypothekenblasen, die Immobilienblasen, die Herr Tremosa i Balcells ausgeführt hat. Wir sehen die steigenden Mieten in den Großstädten, wir sehen die Zunahme der Ungleichheit zwischen denjenigen, die Vermögen besitzen, deren Vermögenswerte stark ansteigen, und denen, die es nicht tun. Ich gehöre wirklich nicht zu den Linken in diesem Hause, aber, Herr Draghi, das sind Verteilungseffekte, die wir eigentlich nicht wollten als Resultat einer Zentralbankpolitik.

Ein letztes Wort zu der Debatte, die innerhalb der EVP geführt worden ist: Die Europäische Zentralbank ist kein Wirtschaftsministerium, und sie ist nicht zuständig für den Abbau von Jugendarbeitslosigkeit. Ich widerspreche dem ganz entschieden. Die Europäische Zentralbank hat ein Mandat, und dieses Mandat ist Geldpolitik. Und mehr als Geldpolitik darf sie nicht tun. Aber leider hat sie dieses Mandat weit überschritten.

Fabio De Masi, *im Namen der GUE/NGL-Fraktion*. – Frau Präsidentin, Herr Präsident Draghi, lieber Ramon! Nichts ist gut in der Eurozone, insbesondere nicht für die von Herrn Lucke angesprochenen arbeitslosen Jugendlichen in Portugal, Griechenland oder Spanien.

Die USA haben nach der Krise eine expansive Fiskalpolitik gemacht und Banken unter staatlicher Regie rekapitalisiert. In Europa hat man Banken zum Nulltarif gerettet und öffentliche Investitionen, Löhne und Renten gekürzt. Seit Jahren verfehlt die EZB daher ihr Inflationsziel. Das billige Geld landet auf den Finanzmärkten, nicht in der realen Wirtschaft, weil Banken wegen fauler Papiere sowie der unzureichenden Investitionen kaum Kredite vergeben. Die erneute Verpackung von Schrottkrediten über die Kapitalmarktunion ist aber absurd, denn es geht dabei nicht um den Mittelstand, es geht darum, die faulen Papiere aus den Bilanzen zu kehren und wie heiße Kartoffeln weiterzureichen.

Finanzstabilität und Wachstum sind aber kein Widerspruch. Es war doch die Finanzkrise, die uns ein verlorenes Jahrzehnt beschert hat. Die Deutsche Bank ist weiterhin die gefährlichste Bank der Welt, die italienischen Banken haben erhebliche Probleme, und auch die Versicherer sind ein Systemrisiko. Deswegen brauchen wir öffentliche Investitionen, um die Zinspolitik zu normalisieren. Es war eben ein Fehler, so viele Menschen in die private Altersvorsorge zu drängen. Wir brauchen daher harte Strukturreformen für Banken statt für Rentner oder Beschäftigte. Die deutsche Megabank muss aufgespalten werden. Die EZB muss öffentliche Investitionen unterstützen, denn die deutsche Regierung verstößt mit ihren Leistungsbilanzüberschüssen von 8 % des BIP weiterhin gegen die Spielregeln.

Die Erpressung, das Abdrehen des Euros, wenn Regierungen – wie in Griechenland – die Löhne und Renten nicht kürzen wollen, ist mit dem Mandat der EZB unvereinbar und muss sofort beendet werden.

Ernest Urtasun, *en nombre del Grupo Verts/ALE*. – Señora Presidenta, señor Draghi, bienvenido al Parlamento. En primer lugar, permítame que agradezca al ponente del informe el trabajo realizado.

Es verdad que usted, señor Draghi, ha tenido que enfrentarse a una situación de una parálisis absoluta por parte de los Estados miembros, de una política de austeridad absolutamente suicida, y ha sido usted el que se ha visto obligado a mantener una línea de salvación, una línea de vida para las economías europeas a través del desarrollo de las políticas no convencionales.

Evidentemente, eso no ha sido suficiente para que ustedes llegaran al objetivo de inflación que se marca el propio Banco Central Europeo que, yo creo, —eso lo hemos dicho muchas veces en esta Cámara— que con el tiempo que llevamos sin llegar a ese nivel de inflación marcado (el 2 %), tal vez el Consejo debería empezar a revisarlo, puesto que tiene potestad para hacerlo.

Pero es verdad que usted se ha visto enfrentado a la inacción fiscal. Y vemos con preocupación —y mi Grupo ve con preocupación también— que, después de la propuesta de la Comisión Europea de tener una política fiscal un poco expansiva el año que viene —un poco más que la posición fiscal de este año—, la reacción de algunos Estados miembros haya sido decir «no» de entrada; no solo la del Gobierno federal alemán sino, sorprendentemente, también del ministro de Economía español —sorprendentemente, digo, porque sería uno de los países a los que más le interesaría—.

Y esa es la situación a la cual usted se ha tenido que enfrentar y, desde este punto de vista, creo que los Estados miembros tienen mucha responsabilidad de la situación en la que estamos.

Me ha parecido entenderle que, a medio plazo, usted considera que no deben retirarse los estímulos. Algún miembro del Consejo de Gobierno lo ha dicho también esta semana. Mi Grupo comparte eso —nos parece que es prematuro—. Pero también tengo que decirle que los estímulos monetarios han generado determinadas situaciones de riesgo muy preocupantes y que ustedes no pueden retrasarse en afrontarlas.

Es evidente que tenemos —hay muchos estudios que lo señalan— problemas con el impacto que las medidas no convencionales pueden tener en la desigualdad porque, evidentemente, los tenedores de activos financieros salen beneficiados, con los subsidios implícitos que supone su política en relación con la banca, los subsidios implícitos a grandes corporaciones. Eso tuvimos la ocasión de discutirlo en la última comparecencia en la Comisión de Economía: ustedes están comprando bonos de grandes corporaciones que no necesitan ayuda. Sería mucho más interesante que junto con, por ejemplo, el Banco Europeo de Inversiones se crearan canales para que la expansión cuantitativa pudiera financiar directamente determinados proyectos sociales y medioambientales, algo que está instalado en el debate público y que es extremadamente positivo.

Se han mencionado también las burbujas inmobiliarias, creo que también es un riesgo evidente.

Y, después, hay otra cosa de la cual quiero hablarle y que nos preocupa especialmente, que tiene que ver también con el control democrático del Banco: nos parece que en algunos de sus instrumentos, ustedes, como Consejo de Gobierno, tienen tal discrecionalidad en aplicar las normas que se ha vuelto un auténtico problema democrático.

Y ya que estamos —porque este informe es del año 2015—, tengo que hablar de la línea de liquidez de emergencia, en la cual ustedes, ante situaciones parejas, han aplicado una política y decisiones totalmente distintas. En el caso de Chipre, siendo la banca insolvente, diciendo el regulador que la banca era insolvente, ustedes decidieron mantener la línea de liquidez de emergencia, y en el caso de Grecia, en cambio, sin haber dicho el supervisor que la banca era insolvente, ustedes decidieron cortarla. ¿Por qué? A día de hoy, aún nadie lo sabe.

Y ahora tengo que decirle que este tipo de cosas dañan la credibilidad del Banco Central Europeo. Deben aclarar las normas de la línea de liquidez de emergencia. Me parece una cuestión central porque, si no, la credibilidad democrática del banco está en juego. Lo digo también porque en el caso de Grecia —y ya que estamos en 2015, también hay que decirlo— las decisiones que ustedes tomaron muchas veces fueron demasiado en paralelo a las decisiones que adoptaba el Eurogrupo. Y eso también, de alguna manera, puso en riesgo la reputación del Banco como entidad independiente.

Creo que esas cosas son lecciones de las cuales tenemos que aprender y espero, en cualquier caso, que muchas de las preocupaciones que hoy generan las medidas de política monetaria no convencional las afronten y las solucionen.

Marco Valli, *a nome del gruppo EFDD*. – Signora Presidente, onorevoli colleghi, io sono un po' deluso, come ogni anno, dalla relazione della Banca centrale europea perché si perde una grande occasione per evidenziare, con un po' di onestà intellettuale, quella che è la situazione economica e monetaria. Si assiste a un fallimento per i cittadini europei, che è evidente, perché in termini occupazionali e in termini di sviluppo economico siamo fermi da diversi anni, a fronte di grandi affari per chi in questo momento si sta comprando gli Stati membri a prezzo di sconto. Questo perché, ovviamente, grazie alle politiche applicate tramite l'euro e tramite l'austerità intrinseca che c'è in questo progetto, ci sono tagli agli investimenti pubblici, svalutazioni salariali per compensare l'incapacità del sistema di poter bilanciare in altro egli squilibri esistenti, perché abbiamo bloccato i cambi e quindi si svalutano i salari e le politiche del *jobs act* implicano semplicemente rendere più povere le persone per rendere competitiva l'Eurozona.

Ecco, questo è un progetto che obiettivamente non può funzionare in questi termini e ne approfitta ovviamente chi vuole speculare e privatizzare tutto quello che è bene di Stato. E per questo è un progetto insostenibile e anche irriforabile. La zona euro non sarà mai uno spazio valutario ottimale, proprio perché non ci sono i presupposti: se andiamo a leggere i libri di tutti i più grandi economisti del mondo, tra cui anche Stiglitz, ci rendiamo conto di come questo sia improponibile come progetto.

Quindi non può esserci un'unica politica monetaria per 19 paesi e neanche per 27 o per 28, nel momento in cui non ci sono le condizioni per farlo. E perché? Perché vi sono bisogni diversi in termini di tassi d'interesse e tassi d'inflazione. Questo è un problema che l'euro e la BCE non potranno mai riuscire a risolvere e noi, non inserendolo in questa relazione, perdiamo una grande occasione perché la dissoluzione dell'area valutaria oramai è alle porte.

Noi non ne parliamo ma questo evento si verificherà e molto probabilmente succederà in modo non controllato e sarà colpa proprio della politica, che non ha voluto affrontare questo tema nel momento in cui poteva affrontarlo.

Bernard Monot, *au nom du groupe ENF*. – Madame la Présidente, Monsieur le Président, les critiques face à la politique de la BCE sont toujours plus nombreuses au sein de ce Parlement. Il faut maintenant sauter le pas et dénoncer désormais la légitimité même de votre institution monétaire.

Encore une fois, il est annoncé que votre plan de création monétaire (assouplissement quantitatif) de 1 500 milliards serait prolongé maintenant jusqu'en septembre 2017. Votre credo est d'acheter toujours plus de titres et de dettes pour sauver des marchés financiers et les banques privées européennes en difficulté, mais rien n'est fait pour relancer l'économie productive dans la zone euro.

Le carcan de votre «euro monnaie unique» oblige les économies à subir une politique monétaire aberrante qui est tout sauf optimale, puisque tous les taux sont divergents dans la zone euro. C'est une hérésie économique et certains économistes avisés vous qualifient même d'incendiaire.

Il faut redonner aux pays européens le contrôle de leur outil monétaire afin qu'ils adaptent la parité de leur devise aux caractéristiques et aux besoins de leur économie nationale. Le Royaume-Uni le fait, ainsi que la Suisse. Il faut aussi redonner aux pays européens la supervision de leur système bancaire national.

Bref, il faut revenir à une gouvernance économique nationale «quoi qu'il en coûte», pour reprendre votre expression. Pour avoir une reprise de l'activité économique, il faut convaincre l'Allemagne de faire jouer ses marges budgétaires pour relancer le moteur de la demande.

En définitive, n'oubliez pas, Monsieur Draghi, que, si vous ne voulez pas que les peuples renversent l'Europe, il faut annoncer très rapidement que vous transformez l'euro monnaie unique en monnaie commune, c'est-à-dire l'écu.

Κωνσταντίνος Παπαδάκης (NI). – Κυρία Πρόεδρε, η ποσοτική χαλάρωση της Ευρωπαϊκής Κεντρικής Τράπεζας είναι η άλλη όψη της αντιλαϊκής πολιτικής της Ευρωπαϊκής Ένωσης. Χρηματοδοτεί με άφθονο χρήμα τους τραπεζικούς και άλλους μονοπωλιακούς ομίλους για να σπρώξει την καπιταλιστική ανάπτυξη. Η όποια μείωση της ανεργίας, την οποία επικαλείστε, κύριε Draghi, σημαίνει γενίκευση της ελαστικής εργασίας. Οι δε ανταγωνισμοί στο εσωτερικό της Ευρωπαϊκής Ένωσης για το μείγμα διαχείρισης και τη νομισματική πολιτική της Ευρωπαϊκής Κεντρικής Τράπεζας δεν αφορούν τα λαϊκά συμφέροντα, αλλά τους επιχειρηματικούς ομίλους, που προσπαθούν να ισχυροποιήσουν τη θέση τους σε βάρος των ανταγωνιστών τους, στο έδαφος της αναμικτής ανάπτυξης σε ευρωζώνη και Ευρωπαϊκή Ένωση.

Η προεούρα της ελληνικής κυβέρνησης να κλείσει τη δεύτερη αξιολόγηση, να αποσπάσει μια μορφή επιμήκυνσης του χρέους και να ενταχθεί στα μέτρα της Ευρωπαϊκής Κεντρικής Τράπεζας προϋποθέτει νέα βάρβαρα αντιλαϊκά μέτρα, πιθανά, και τέταρτο μνημόνιο στην Ελλάδα. Το χρέος όμως είναι των καπιταλιστών και όχι του λαού. Με την πάλη του ο λαός, σε σύγκρουση με τα μονοπώλια, την εξουσία και τις ιμπεριαλιστικές ενώσεις τους, μπορεί να γίνει ιδιοκτήτης του πλούτου που παράγει.

Danuta Maria Hübner (PPE). – Madam President, President Draghi, Commissioner, dear colleagues, I think that this report is very rich in content, contrary to what some colleagues underlined. I also think that its main message, at least from my point of view, is that we probably are at a turning point. Timid recovery fails to gather momentum. It is true that the political events of the past months have not helped to foster confidence and stability. It is true that monetary policy has done a lot to preserve and enhance this fragile growth, but it seems that unconventional monetary policy is reaching its limits, and the ECB has in fact been in charge of coping with most parts of the post-crisis adjustment. As President Draghi stressed earlier this year, half of the growth we have witnessed is due to the exceptional monetary policy that has been put in place. But this alone cannot solve the problem of imbalances; it cannot solve the problem of huge debt overhang. The quantitative easing seems to blur the line between monetary and fiscal policy. It might not be stimulating other adjustments – fiscal and structural – needed to resolve impediments to put the economy on a more robust growth path.

We also know that even though this policy's benefits have so far outweighed the costs, there are negative side effects to it which are well outlined in the report. Whatever it takes in terms of ECB action, I hope that it does not make the leaders continue to think 'why should we bother?' We must continue to emphasise that the last bell is indeed ringing for fiscal policy, for public investment and for private investment to take it over. I also believe that the proposals in the context of the Capital Markets Union look very promising as tools stimulating growth policy.

The results of some studies also suggest that monetary policy might no longer be able to be the same in the future, with real interest rates lower than in the decades preceding the crisis. Whatever it will be, monetary policy will remain fundamentally important for the eurozone in the future, and the ECB will continue to be on the front line. There are still many black swans out there ready to test our cohesion and resilience. Therefore, let me finish by saying very strongly that we must avoid anything that could cause a loss of confidence in the monetary policy of the European Central Bank.

Pervenche Berès (S&D). – Madame la Présidente, Monsieur le Président, Monsieur le Vice-président, merci d'être ici. Au fond, l'examen du rapport annuel de la Banque centrale est aussi le moment de faire le point sur l'équilibre du *policy mix* européen et c'est bien le sens du débat qui vient de s'engager.

Monsieur le Président, vous avez dit combien cette politique non conventionnelle de la Banque centrale avait permis de soutenir l'activité de l'Union et, vous le savez, ce Parlement, avec le rapport de M. Tremosa i Balcells, soutient le maintien de cette activité non conventionnelle de votre banque afin de soutenir à la fois la demande et le retour de l'inflation en Europe. Mais, pour autant, y compris sur le volet monétaire, on voit bien qu'un certain nombre de choses doivent encore être examinées et améliorées.

D'abord, la question des prêts non productifs. À un moment, je pense qu'il faudra se poser la question de savoir si, au-delà du travail fait par les superviseurs, nous avons besoin ou non d'un cadre de réflexion ou d'action européen.

S'agissant de ma deuxième interrogation, vous avez à nouveau évoqué les surcapacités, les besoins de rationalité ou les insuffisances en termes de rentabilité dans le secteur bancaire. C'est une piste sur laquelle vous insistez maintenant régulièrement et sur laquelle il faudra que l'on revienne.

Enfin, vous avez mentionné la question de l'union bancaire. Nous voudrions vous demander de ne pas perdre confiance et de continuer à plaider à nos côtés en faveur de cet EDIS (système européen de garantie des dépôts), mais aussi en faveur du *final backstop* du deuxième pilier car, sinon, nous savons bien que les pas considérables qui ont été faits seront fragilisés.

Il y a un élément dans le contexte international que vous n'avez pas évoqué – donc je le fais volontiers –, qui est la question de l'élection de Donald Trump aux États-Unis et de l'impact que cela aura en termes d'évolution des taux d'intérêt. Je suis sûre que votre institution s'y prépare, mais il faut aussi que, du côté européen, nous ayons une visibilité sur la façon dont cela impactera ou non l'économie européenne.

À côté de vous – vous le dites toujours – vous avez besoin que les gouvernements fassent le travail. C'est en ce sens que nous soutenons une des propositions que vous faisiez aussi dans le rapport des cinq présidents en faveur d'un budget de la zone euro. Là aussi, nous avons besoin que vous gardiez votre force de conviction pour aller de l'avant.

Sander Loones (ECR). – Ik heb een groot vertrouwen in de rapporteur, onze Catalaanse collega Ramon Tremosa. Met dit verslag komt het goed, we gaan de goede richting uit. Ik heb veel minder vertrouwen in het promotiepraatje dat we hier gekregen hebben aan het begin van de toespraak van meneer Draghi. Ik denk oprecht dat mensen geen behoefte hebben aan zo'n Europees promotiepraatje.

Waar ze wel behoefte aan hebben en waar ze recht op hebben, is uitleg. Ze hebben recht op uitleg over wat de Europese instellingen doen. Ze hebben recht op uitleg in klare taal, in een taal die ze begrijpen, want ik stel vast dat vandaag niet iedereen begrijpt wat de gevolgen zijn van uw beleid, meneer Draghi. Niet iedereen ziet wat de gevolgen zijn van uw beslissing om massaal geld bij te drukken, van uw uiterst lage rentes. Ja, de mensen zien dat hun spaargeld niets meer opbrengt, maar weten zij ook dat door uw beleid hun pensioenen in gevaar komen? Weten zij ook dat door uw beleid de ongelijkheid toeneemt in plaats van afneemt? Weten zij ook dat door uw beleid onze productiviteit wordt aangetast en dat dus ook de koopkracht van de mensen wordt aangetast? Daar moeten we iets aan doen. We moeten mensen opnieuw leren wat er met hun geld gebeurt, want vandaag moeten zij vooral leergeld betalen door uw beleid en uw monetaire spelletjes.

Δημήτριος Παπαδημούλης (GUE/NGL). – Κυρία Πρόεδρε, κύριε Draghi, κύριε Dombrovskis, το δόγμα «λιτότητα, λιτότητα, λιτότητα» έχει αποτύχει. Η ευρωζώνη χρειάζεται στροφή προς μια βιώσιμη και ισχυρή ανάπτυξη, και την χρειάζεται τώρα. Αυτό σημαίνει, πρώτον, περισσότερες επενδύσεις και τόνωση της ζήτησης ιδιαίτερα σε χώρες με υψηλά πρωτογενή πλεονάσματα, όπως η Γερμανία, που έχουν δημοσιονομικό χώρο και με πλεονάσματα της τάξης του 8% παραβιάζουν τις ευρωπαϊκές συνθήκες.

Δεύτερον, ολοκλήρωση της τραπεζικής ενοποίησης, επιτέλους, και με τη δημιουργία του Ευρωπαϊκού Συστήματος Εγγύησης Καταθέσεων και, τρίτον, επέκταση του προγράμματος ποσοτικής χαλάρωσης και μετά τον Μάρτιο του 2017 με τη συμμετοχή, επιτέλους, και της χώρας μου της Ελλάδας σε αυτό.

Κύριε Dombrovskis και κύριε Draghi, οι Έλληνες και οι Ελληνίδες τηρούν τις δεσμεύσεις τους. Κάνουν μεγάλες αλλαγές με τεράστιες θυσίες. Αλλά νιώθουμε ότι ζούμε επί χρόνια τον μύθο του Σισύφου. Είναι η ώρα και εσείς, η Επιτροπή, η Ευρωπαϊκή Κεντρική Τράπεζα, μαζί με το Eurogroup, να τηρήσετε τις δεσμεύσεις σας στις 5 Δεκεμβρίου και για την ελάφρυνση χρέους και για την ποσοτική χαλάρωση.

David Coburn (EFDD). – Madam President, each time Mario Draghi visits this Parliament I eagerly look forward to it. He tells us how well the eurozone is functioning and how strongly the economic recovery on the European continent is going along. Nothing could be further from the truth. The macroeconomic forecasts about growth, productivity and employment rates are painfully low. In 2015 the youth unemployment rate in Greece, Spain and Italy was reaching levels of 40% to 50%. The gap between the countries in the North and the South of the eurozone is becoming even bigger. Only naive euro-federalists believe that the euro is good for the citizens and that the euro project is creating wealth and economic growth.

Mario Draghi and his European Central Bank are ruining this continent. Mr Draghi, you still believe, with your unconventional monetary policy, that you are stabilising the economy. But, in reality, you are creating massive financial bubbles that will burst sooner or later and will trigger a new financial crisis. As a consequence, the political groups in this House that are still supporting the crazy monetary policy of the ECB are taking a monstrous responsibility. It was the libertarian philosopher Ayn Rand who wrote, 'You can avoid reality, but you cannot ignore the consequences of avoiding reality'. Even the former EU Commissioner Frits Bolkestein, who created the internal market, said last weekend in the Dutch and Flemish press that the euro will die in the next few years, and he is right.

We in Great Britain do not want your fairy-tale politics any longer. That is the reason why, as Great Britain never wanted to join the euro project, we are now leaving. Great Britain has had enough of the single market and that is the reason why we will leave the European Union – the sooner the better. Scotland will go with us too, despite the fantasies of our First Minister.

Gerolf Annemans (ENF). – De ECB is wellicht de enige centrale bank in de wereld, en wellicht zelfs in de geschiedenis, die in zo'n grote mate een politiek orgaan geworden is. Ze is wellicht de enige centrale bank die haar mandaat heeft uitgerekt tot ze de facto een politiek orgaan geworden is, evenwel zonder enige democratische controle, hetgeen wellicht de bedoeling is van dit alles.

Logisch is die evolutie wel. Waar een normale centrale bank een instrument is van een politieke regering, opereert de centrale bank in de eurozone, een zone die eigenlijk geen politiek gezag heeft. Ze opereert in een zone waar het politiek gezag op de een of andere manier gereconstrueerd wordt of de schijn daarvan wordt gewekt door een stabiliteitspact, door een Europees Semester, door een bankenunie, door een depositoverzekeringstelsel en dergelijke meer. Zo probeert men te compenseren dat er in die eurozone, in de Europese Unie, geen politiek gezag is waarmee men een eenheid van een munt zou kunnen verantwoorden.

Het op het spoor houden van dat vehikel, samen met al het geld dat u daar inpompt, samen met de fondsen die daarvoor moeten dienen, een vehikel dat vanaf de aanvang gedoemd is om neer te storten, dat op het spoor houden is de fase waarin wij ons nu bevinden, met een ECB die altijd maar meer onderdeel geworden is van het politiek mandaat dat ze heeft gegeven, dat ze zichzelf eigenlijk heeft gegeven. De belofte om "al het nodige te doen", de kwantitatieve versoepeling, het opkopen van waardepapieren of van waardeloze papieren, de volmachten, de bijzondere bevoegdheden waar die ECB zich van bedient zonder nog veel controle te moeten vrezen: dit is een situatie die de burgers vrees aanjaagt. De inflatie zou men stimuleren, maar dit heeft tot deflatie geleid. De groei zou men stimuleren, maar er is nagenoeg een groeistop die alle risico's inhoudt dat de schuldbubbel die u zelf hebt gecreëerd, zou ontploffen. Dat de mensen geen vertrouwen hebben, is iets dat wij volkomen kunnen begrijpen.

Ελευθέριος Συναδινός (NI). – Κυρία Πρόεδρε, το 2015 ο ελληνικός λαός απώλεσε την εμπιστοσύνη του στην Ευρωπαϊκή Ένωση και αντελήφθη την υποκρισία της Αριστεράς. Με το «όχι» στο δημοψήφισμα του Ιουλίου του 2015 ξεκαθάρισε ότι διαφωνεί ριζικά με τις οικονομικές πολιτικές της Ένωσης. Η εξασφάλιση της βιωσιμότητας του ευρώ τον οδήγησαν στην ανεργία, τον αφανισμό των επιχειρήσεων, τη φτώχεια και την ανέχεια. Η εντολή του δημοψηφίσματος, όμως, δεν υλοποιήθηκε από την αριστερή κυβέρνηση Τσίπρα. Έτσι η χρηματοδοτική πίεση της Ευρωπαϊκής Κεντρικής Τράπεζας και η απάνθρωπη στάση της Επιτροπής ποδοπάτησαν την αξιοπρέπεια ενός υπερήφανου λαού.

Η παρούσα έκθεση επιβεβαιώνει την κρίση των Ελλήνων. Χρειάζονται άμεσα υιοθέτηση νέας οικονομικής πολιτικής και νέου μοντέλου ανάπτυξης, γενναίο κούρεμα του χρέους μέσω σημαντικής μείωσης της ονομαστικής του αξίας, άμεση παύση των μέτρων λιτότητας και καταπολέμηση της κερδοσκοπίας των τραπεζών και της διαφθοράς των πολιτικών και οικονομικών παραγόντων. Με απλά λόγια, χρειάζονται εθνικιστικές κυβερνήσεις και χαιρόμαι ιδιαίτερα που οι λαοί έδειξαν τις προθέσεις τους με το Brexit και την εκλογή Trump στις ΗΠΑ. Θα ακολουθήσουν, βέβαια, η Αυστρία και η Γαλλία.

Romana Tomc (PPE). – Najprej seveda bi se rada zahvalila vsem kolegom, ki so omogočili, da je pred nami danes tukaj poročilo, ki se resnično osredotoča na delovanje same centralne banke, in ne na finančno politiko Unije, kot smo že v preteklosti bili priča.

Glavna tematika evroobmočja v letu 2015 je bilo okrevanje gospodarstva, čeprav to še vedno ni na našo žalost enako prisotno v vseh državah. Nekateri so uspeli bolj, drugi malo manj.

Poleg tega pa nas pesti, kot je bilo že večkrat poudarjeno, nizka inflacija in zelo nizke obrestne mere. To seveda je zelo velik razlog za skrb. Vsi to poudarjamo. Ta politika je dajala rezultate, vendar ni nujno, da jih bo dajala tudi naprej. Če ti ukrepi ne bodo kombinirani z nekaterimi drugimi ukrepi, potem se ne moremo nadejati uspeha.

Veseli me, da se s tem poročilom ukvarjamo relativno hitro, že v letošnjem koledarskem letu. In kaj moramo pri tem poudariti in vsi poudarjamo: da poleg teh monetarnih ukrepov potrebujemo tudi strukturne ukrepe.

Gospodarska rast, h kateri so pripomogli tudi ukrepi centralne banke, nas je morda malce preveč uspavala in nekatere države sedaj ne vlagajo dovolj napora, da bi ob tej še tako majhni gospodarski rasti naredile prepotrebne strukturne reforme, posebej na pokojninskem področju. Demografske razmere ne bodo jutri boljše, ampak bodo slabše. Naši pokojninski skladi so ravno zaradi takšne politike, ki jo vodi Evropska centralna banka, tudi v nevarnosti.

Želim pa ob tem opozoriti še na nekaj: Evropska centralna banka lahko s svojimi ukrepi, v okviru svojih pristojnosti seveda vpliva tudi na kredibilnost vseh mikrosistemov, ki jih imamo v Evropi.

Nismo še povsod naredili domače naloge in v mnogih državah, med drugim tudi v moji državi Sloveniji, se še vedno ukvarjamo s posledicami reševanja bančnega sistema, ki so jih povzročila ali načrtno goljufiva dejanja ali pa ne nepodjetniška... nepodjetniško delovanje. Zato me veseli, da je gospod Draghi govoril tudi o osnutku smernic za slaba posojila. Upam, da bomo prišli s tem kakšen korak naprej.

In pa seveda, moji kolegi v Sloveniji se zelo trudijo, da bi našli odgovorne za povzročitelje bančnih lukenj, in upam, da bodo pri tem imeli večjo ali pa vsaj dobro podporo Evropske centralne banke.

Roberto Gualtieri (S&D). – Signora Presidente, signor presidente Draghi, signor vicepresidente Dombrovskis, onorevoli colleghi, con questa relazione il Parlamento europeo esprime il suo sostegno all'azione di politica monetaria della BCE, riconoscendo che le misure attuate sono coerenti con il suo mandato, con l'obiettivo della stabilità dei prezzi e, per questa via, con quello di concorrere alla più generale politica economica dell'Unione. È difficilmente contestabile che, di fronte allo scenario senza precedenti di bassa crescita, bassa inflazione, basso livello del tasso di interesse naturale, le misure straordinarie di politica monetaria realizzate dalla BCE sono state decisive per preservare l'area euro dalla deflazione e per contribuire alla ripresa economica in atto.

A chi si interroga sui loro rischi e sulle loro implicazioni negative, è bene ricordare che la politica monetaria della BCE non è la causa dei bassi tassi di interesse ma ne è il sintomo e la necessaria – anche se non unica – terapia. Di fronte al ritmo moderato della ripresa e alla sua esposizione ai rischi al ribasso che derivano dall'attuale fase di incertezza politica ed economica, appare evidente che una prosecuzione dell'attuale carattere espansivo della politica monetaria sarà necessaria ad assicurare un ritorno del tasso di inflazione sotto, ma vicino, al 2%.

Al tempo stesso, è altrettanto evidente che tale azione, pur necessaria, non è sufficiente. Dobbiamo quindi fare un uso migliore e più forte degli strumenti di politica economica di cui disponiamo. Siamo di fronte al rischio di un circolo vizioso tra aspettative di bassa crescita e bassi investimenti, che può avere un impatto negativo anche sulla crescita potenziale, rendendo strutturale, e non solo ciclico, l'effetto della crisi. Questo scenario è aggravato dalle incertezze del quadro politico e dal possibile perseguimento di una linea di unilateralismo economico da parte della nuova amministrazione americana.

Per questo occorre rendere il nostro *policy mix* di riforme strutturali e politiche fiscali più orientato alla crescita, in particolare sostenendo gli investimenti pubblici e privati e rafforzando la coesione sociale e territoriale. In questo senso, la raccomandazione della Commissione di una *fiscal stance* moderatamente espansiva costituisce un passo avanti importante che ora va tradotto in azioni e strumenti concreti. Il Parlamento europeo non farà mancare la sua voce in questo dibattito.

Stanisław Ożóg (ECR). – Pani Przewodnicząca! Cieszyć może, że sprawozdanie prezentuje umiarkowanie krytyczne podejście Parlamentu Europejskiego w kwestii reakcji na sprawozdanie EBC, szczególnie jeśli chodzi o utrzymanie ujemnych stóp procentowych. Moim zdaniem to jednak za mało. Nie mogę głosować za sprawozdaniem, które akceptuje i z zadowoleniem przyjmuje stosowanie przez EBC polityki obrony euro za wszelką cenę, korzystając przy tym z tak niekonwencjonalnych środków jak między innymi program zakupu aktywów. Nazwałbym to po prostu wręcz dodrukowywaniem pieniędzy. Moje obawy budzi również apel o ukończeniu tworzenia unii bankowej i umów rynków kapitałowych, które, mówiąc skrótowo, są przecież poważnym zagrożeniem nie tylko dla krajów znajdujących się w strefie euro. Dziwi mnie, że o tym się milczy.

Beatrix von Storch (EFDD). – Frau Präsidentin, Herr Draghi! Wir reden über den Jahresbericht der EZB, und es dreht sich wieder alles um Ihren Ausspruch von August 2012: „*What ever it takes.*“

Es gibt keinen Ausdruck, der so sehr auf den Punkt bringt, dass Ihnen Recht und Gesetz vollkommen gleichgültig sind, dass Sie bereit sind, alles zu brechen. Unser ehemaliger Verfassungsrichter Kirchhof brachte es auf den Punkt und sagte: „Eine Instabilität des Rechts wiegt schwerer als eine Instabilität der Finanzen.“

Herr Draghi, Sie haben das Mandat der EZB illegal und rechtswidrig ausgeweitet. Sie machen Politik. Sie wollen Arbeitsmarktpolitik machen, und Sie wollen Italien oder Griechenland am Austritt aus dem Euro hindern. Sie machen Politik. Aber Sie haben dazu kein Mandat. Sie haben dazu kein Recht, es ist nicht Ihre Aufgabe, Politik zu machen. Und noch dazu: Nichts im Leben ist kostenlos. Irgendjemand wird für Ihre Politik bezahlen: Es werden die Sparer sein, die keine Zinsen mehr kriegen. Es werden die Krankenversicherten sein, deren Leistungen reduziert werden, und es werden die Menschen mit Lebensversicherungen sein, die Zinsen brauchen, um im Alter etwas zu haben.

Nichts ist im Leben umsonst. Sie werden den Preis nicht zahlen. Aber es sind die Kleinen, die den Preis zahlen werden. Es sind die Kleinen. Deswegen ist Ihre Politik nicht nur falsch und illegal, Sie ist vor allen Dingen asozial. Hören Sie damit auf.

Marcus Pretzell (ENF). – Frau Präsidentin, Herr Draghi! Es gibt einen Satz, den ich von der gesamten EU-Kamarilla zwar immer wieder höre, aber inzwischen nicht mehr hören kann: „Die Kommission hat ein sehr gutes Papier vorgelegt.“ Sie hat ein Papier vorgelegt, das die makroökonomische Schiefelage aufzeigt, das den Verschuldungsanstieg der Eurostaaten anzeigt, den Investitionsrückgang, die Vermögenswertebulge mit ihren sozialen Folgen – und das trotz aller von Ihnen ergriffenen Maßnahmen. Oder, Herr Draghi, vielleicht gerade aufgrund der von Ihnen ergriffenen Maßnahmen? Staatsfinanzierung: illegal, Konzernfinanzierung: illegal, inzwischen auch die Finanzierung von KMU – ja, auch das: illegal. Herr Draghi, Sie werden irgendwann vielleicht auch noch Privatpersonen finanzieren, auch das wäre illegal. Und Sie betreiben im Übrigen inzwischen Politik auf allen wirtschafts- und sozialpolitischen Feldern – auch das illegal, außerhalb Ihres Mandats, Herr Draghi.

Sie sprachen davon, dass wir möglicherweise Spielball werden von Ereignissen, die größer sind als wir. Herr Draghi, die Mathematik ist größer als wir, und Schulden, die Sie aufbauen wollen, sind systemimmanent. Es ist ein Pyramidenspiel. Sie haben nur noch die Wahl zwischen deflationärer Spirale oder Hyperinflation. Sie werden sich entscheiden müssen, Herr Draghi. Das ist Betrug am Bürger, Betrug am Sparer, Betrug am zukünftigen Rentner und dem arbeitenden Mittelstand, Herr Draghi. Je länger Sie Ihr zerstörerisches Werk fortsetzen, desto dramatischer werden die Folgen für die Bürger des Euro-Gefängnisses sein. Hören Sie auf damit! Hören Sie auf, diese sozialen Verwerfungen zu erzeugen!

Pedro Silva Pereira (S&D). – Senhora Presidente, Senhor Comissário Dombrovskis, Senhor Presidente Mário Draghi, a primeira coisa que devemos reconhecer neste debate é que a política monetária do Banco Central Europeu tem dado um contributo não apenas importante, mas decisivo para defender o euro, estabilizar os mercados de dívida soberana, dar uma oportunidade à economia europeia e contrariar as pressões deflacionistas. Devemos valorizar isso de forma clara.

Todos sabemos que podem existir danos colaterais de uma política demasiadamente prolongada de juros negativos. Mas são perigosamente imprudentes as vozes que pedem um recuo precipitado da política monetária neste tempo, que é ainda um tempo de incertezas e de turbulência, e que se pode tornar, depois do *Brexit* e da nova administração Trump, um tempo de especulação financeira descontrolada nos mercados de dívida soberana.

Aquilo que esperamos do Banco Central Europeu é uma mensagem de estabilização dos mercados, uma mensagem de intervenção decidida para garantir a integridade da zona euro.

Pergunto ao Senhor Presidente Mário Draghi se continua a ser essa a missão fundamental do BCE neste momento histórico da economia europeia, em que o euro está ainda sob ameaça. Isso é muito importante para toda a zona euro, mas também para os países mais ameaçados pela especulação, como Portugal.

Gostava ainda de lhe perguntar se, depois dos resultados alcançados na frente económica e na frente orçamental, com a avaliação dos ratings, Portugal continua a ser elegível para o programa de compra de ativos do Banco Central Europeu.

Νότης Μαρίας (ECR). – Κυρία Πρόεδρε, ξανά στο ίδιο έργο θεατές, μια και ο κύριος Draghi επιμένει στη βίαιη δημοσιονομική προσαρμογή, στις αντικοινωνικές δήθεν μεταρρυθμίσεις και στη μερκελική λιτότητα που γέμισαν την Ευρώπη με στρατιές ανέργων. Και παρότι, κύριε Draghi, δαπανήσατε πάνω από 1,3 τρισεκατομμύρια ευρώ στην ποσοτική χαλάρωση, η ανεργία συνεχίζει να βρίσκεται στα ύψη. Το μόνο που καταφέρατε είναι να δημιουργήσετε με τα χρήματα των Ευρωπαίων φορολογουμένων μια τεράστια φούσκα χρέους, αγοράζοντας κυρίως γερμανικά ομόλογα 250 δισεκατομμυρίων ευρώ. Μάλιστα όχι μόνο δεν δίνετε ούτε σεντς στην Ελλάδα μέσω της ποσοτικής χαλάρωσης, αλλά αναγκάσατε την Τράπεζα της Ελλάδος να συμμετάσχει το 2015 στην ποσοτική χαλάρωση με 17 δισεκατομμύρια ευρώ, δηλαδή, αντί να γίνει διαγραφή του ελληνικού επενδιστού χρέους, αναγκάσατε την Ελλάδα να δανείσει τους δανειστές της.

Ταυτόχρονα δίνετε τα κόκκινα δάνεια στα κοράκια και συνεχίζετε, κύριε Draghi, να βρίσκεστε παράνομα στην τρόικα, παρότι υπάρχει απόφαση εξώσεως από το Δικαστήριο της Ευρωπαϊκής Ένωσης. Πότε θα φύγετε λοιπόν από την τρόικα, κύριε Draghi; Πότε θα σταματήσετε τη σύγκρουση συμφερόντων στους κόλπους της ΕΚΤ, αφού δεν μπορεί η ΕΚΤ να είναι ταυτόχρονα και μέλος της τρόικας και δανειστής και επόπτης και δήθεν ανεξάρτητη νομισματική αρχή; Δεν μπορείτε, κύριε Draghi, να φοράτε τέσσερα καπέλα ταυτόχρονα. Καταλάβετε το: ανεξάρτητη ΕΚΤ δεν σημαίνει ανεξέλεγκτη ΕΚΤ.

PRESIDENZA DELL'ON. DAVID-MARIA SASSOLI

Vicepresidente

Luke Ming Flanagan (GUE/NGL). – Mario Draghi, you said you were going to listen, you spoke about credibility, you spoke about legacy issues. Your credibility and the credibility of the ECB are intrinsically interlinked. In 2007, Jonathan Sugarman was risk manager at the UniCredit Bank in Ireland. That summer, Jonathan officially reported to the regulator in the Irish Central Bank a multi-billion-euro liquidity breach amounting to 20 times the permissible deviations. There was no sanction by the Central Bank and the breaches continued, forcing Sugarman to resign. In February 2010, Irish Finance Minister Brian Lenihan stated that the financial regulator maintains close communications with the regulator of other Member States. In 2007 you were the Governor of Banca d'Italia, with UniCredit the biggest bank on your watch. You spoke about transparency. Answer this: can you please confirm whether you were informed by the Central Bank of Ireland of these multi-billion-euro breaches at UniCredit Dublin? If so, can you explain why that bank has never been sanctioned, and now that you know this what are you going to do about it? You spoke about the cohesion of Europe being tested. You are testing it. Answer this question, otherwise you test it further.

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

David Coburn (EFDD), blue-card question. – A very, very, good speech, Mr Flanagan, as always. I just wanted to know. You and I were concerned before about whether Mr Draghi had appeared before the Irish Parliament and the committees of the Irish Parliament. Did that ever happen? Could you enlighten us all?

Luke Ming Flanagan (GUE/NGL), blue-card answer. – We were told that Mr Draghi was answerable to the European Parliament. Unfortunately, whenever I make any attempt to ask him this question at the Committee on Economic and Monetary Affairs, I am refused because apparently I am not a member. I am a Member of this Parliament, and I am asking him now. People are waiting with baited breath: what did you know about this? We need an answer. People are watching, and we want one.

Csaba Molnár (S&D). – Elnök Úr, Matolcsy Györgyöt Európa bármely országában a nemzeti bankok közelébe sem engednék, egyedül Orbán Viktor Magyarországon lehet belőle a Magyar Nemzeti Bank elnöke. Bűnlajstroma nagyon hosszú, csak néhányat hadd idézzek ebből. Adófizetők pénzének milliárdjaiból indított unortodox gazdasági képzést. A mi pénzünkéből vett milliárdos műemlékeket, kastélyokat és túlárzott irodaházakat. Az unokatestvérének folyamatosan gyanús módon jutnak a pénzek a magyar adófizetők zsebéből. Az alapítványokba próbálja kiszervezni Matolcsy úr a Magyar Nemzeti Bank pénzét, mondván, így az elveszíti közpénz jellegét. Legutoljára pedig azt tudtuk meg, hogy saját barátjának alkalmazza milliós fizetésért, és ezzel párhuzamosan az egyik kereskedelmi bank vezetőjének a luxuslakásában él Budapesten.

Matolcsy György körül minden búzlik. Szabályokat szegnek, össze-vissza szórják a pénzt, direkt gyengén tartják a forintot, és késleltetik az euró bevezetését. Matolcsy György nem a magyar emberek pénzének védelméért dolgozik. Ezért mondom Önnek, tisztelt Draghi Elnök Úr, nem jelentéseket kell írogatni ebben az ügyben, hanem az európai szabályok nyílt megszegése miatt, és a magyar emberek pénzének védelme érdekében azonnal ki kell tenni Matolcsy György szűrét.

Joachim Starbatty (ECR). – Herr Präsident, Herr Draghi! Sie sagen, Sie kennen die Risiken Ihrer Politik.

Das ist ja hier im Hause schon beschrieben worden – aber es gäbe nichts Besseres. Ich mache Sie auf zwei Sätze ökonomischer Logik aufmerksam. Sie fordern, dass die strukturellen Reformen in den Haushalten der Nationalstaaten aufgestockt werden. Aber wenn Sie eine Nullzinspolitik betreiben, besteht ja gar kein Anreiz mehr, strukturelle Reformen durchzuführen. Ja, Sie verhindern geradezu strukturelle Reformen mit Ihrer Politik.

Der zweite Satz ist, Herr Valli hat es gesagt: Wir haben innerhalb der Währungsunion einen falschen relativen Preis: die Unterbewertung des Euro für Deutschland und die Überbewertung des Euro für den Süden der Eurozone. Mit Ihrer Politik kriegen Sie diesen falschen relativen Preis nicht weg, auch wenn Sie noch einmal ein Billionenprogramm auflegen. Deswegen lassen Sie doch mal Ihren Stab berechnen, warum die Arbeitslosigkeit in Portugal, in Griechenland, hoch ist und warum sie in Deutschland auf Rekordniveau heruntergegangen ist!

Nehmen Sie das doch einmal zur Kenntnis. Andernfalls, sage ich Ihnen, ist die EZB sozusagen der Henker des Euro und der Eurozone.

Merja Kyllönen (GUE/NGL). – Arvoisa puhemies, tämän vuoden huhtikuussa Euroopan keskuspankin pääjohtaja Mario Draghi onnitteli vuoden 2015 raportin esipuheessa pankkiaa siitä, että se oli onnistunut hyvin tehtävässään lisätessään sekä yritysten, kansalaisten että pankkien tulevaisuudenuskoa tilanteessa, jossa talous huojuu sekä unionin alueella että globaalisti, tuli brexit ja äärintationalismi nousee halki Euroopan.

Minusta tuntuu, pääjohtaja Draghi, että me elämme eri todellisuuksissa, sillä näen jatkuvan eurooppalaisen eriarvoistumisen kasvun ja sellaisen tulevaisuudenuskon, joka sekään ei kuulu kaikille, köyhien jatkuvan köyhtymisen ja jopa kansantalouksille äärimmäisen tärkeän keskiluokan kurjistumisen, ja luotettavina pidetyt pankit jäävät kerta toisensa jälkeen kiinni järkyttävän mittakaavan ahneudesta.

Puhutte siitä, kuinka Euroopan keskuspankki toimii tulevaisuuden uskon ankkurina. Onko tämä ankkuri kiinni missään?

Daniele Viotti (S&D). – Signor Presidente, onorevoli colleghi, io penso che dobbiamo dire un grazie alla Banca centrale europea e al lavoro del Presidente Draghi, perché in questi periodi, in questi anni, hanno dato stabilità finanziaria al nostro continente e all'eurozona e perché hanno tenuto quest'ultima al riparo dalle gravi tempeste finanziarie che ci sono state. Però io – non me ne voglia il Presidente Draghi – vorrei fare in questa occasione un richiamo soprattutto alla politica, soprattutto a voi Commissione e a noi Parlamento.

Vorrei fare un richiamo a due responsabilità che abbiamo noi come politici. La prima è che noi dobbiamo rinnovare le nostre istituzioni per dare un controllo democratico alla nostra eurozona, un controllo democratico ai nostri bilanci e alla nostra economia. Il secondo richiamo è che noi dobbiamo trasformare il lavoro che è stato fatto dalla Banca centrale europea in politiche: politiche del lavoro, della crescita, di sviluppo, politiche d'investimento per le nostre giovani imprese e per l'ambiente. Dobbiamo farlo! In una frase: noi non possiamo continuare a scaricare sulla Banca centrale europea le nostre responsabilità. Alla Banca centrale europea dovremmo lasciare la responsabilità della politica monetaria ma noi dobbiamo avere il coraggio di riappropriarci delle politiche economiche, delle politiche fiscali e delle politiche sociali.

(L'oratore accetta di rispondere a una domanda «cartellino blu» (articolo 162, paragrafo 8, del regolamento))

Marco Valli (EFDD), Domanda «cartellino blu». – Ho ascoltato con interesse l'intervento e siccome ha detto che vuole che la Banca centrale europea si occupi di politiche monetarie, voglio capire come è possibile che un'unica politica monetaria vada bene per 19 paesi che proprio in questo momento dimostrano necessità diverse in termini di tassi d'interesse e d'inflazione? Come è possibile che questo avvenga dal punto di vista sia politico che, soprattutto, tecnico? Perché tecnicamente ad oggi è impossibile.

Daniele Viotti (S&D), *Risposta a una domanda «cartellino blu»*. – Confesso che, dal punto di vista tecnico, lascio ai tecnici la risposta. Dal punto di vista politico, che è ciò che interessa di più a questo Parlamento, credo che, come dicevo nel mio intervento, o noi siamo in grado di rinnovare le nostre istituzioni e quindi rendere democratica anche l'eurozona, oppure, naturalmente, non saremo in grado di rispondere all'esigenza che richiama lei che, peraltro, condivido.

Ruža Tomašić (ECR). – Gospodine predsjedniče, euro je prvenstveno politički projekt koji je unesrećio milijune ljudi i opako poljuljao ugled Unije u očima građana. No, preko socijalnog se nezadovoljstva olako prelazi zbog jasnih političkih ciljeva. Monetarna unija teško da može funkcionirati bez fiskalne unije. Ona je sljedeća na redu i onda ćemo imati Europsku federaciju. To je plan.

Ne čudi stoga što euro ima toliku podršku među europskim elitama i što ovo izvješće pozdravlja obećanje Europske središnje banke da će učiniti što god je potrebno da bi obranila euro. Ja to obećanje ne mogu pohvaliti. Euro vezuje previše različite ekonomije koje će se na kraju svakog poslovnog ciklusa, kad nastupa recesija, naći u istim problemima kao krajem prošlog desetljeća.

Južnim je državama euro omča oko vrata, a one sjeverne ih na kraju novcem svojih poreznih obveznika izvlače iz blata u koje su i jedne i druge natjerane nerealnim ambicijama europske političke klase. Vrijeme je da se dozovemo pameti.

Peter van Dalen (ECR). – De euro is een reus op lemen voeten. Van bovenaf ziet dat beeld met roestvast staal uit Luxemburg, Duitsland en Nederland er nog wel aardig uit, maar hoe meer je afdaalt, hoe meer leem je tegenkomt. Er zijn wel pogingen gedaan, Voorzitter, om dat beeld te versterken, maar gek genoeg is dat gedaan door nog meer leem toe te voegen. Zo is de handhaving van het afbrokkelende bouwwerk totaal verwaarloosd.

Afgelopen week kregen landen met grote schulden nog meer uitstel om hervormingsmaatregelen te nemen. Een desastreus besluit, alleen van leem. Ook bleef de inflatie onverantwoord laag met tal van negatieve effecten, bijvoorbeeld voor de pensioenfondsen. President elect Trump heeft afgelopen maand op de inflatie al een gunstiger effect gehad dan het opkoopprogramma QE van de Europese Centrale Bank in de afgelopen twintig maanden. De huidige aanpak van de problemen in de eurozone vergroot het risico dat het beeld van de euro op een dag met een daverende klap ineenstort.

Procedura catch-the-eye

Jean-Luc Schaffhauser (ENF). – Monsieur le Président, je n'aimerais pas être à votre place. Je vous crois lucide et obligé de tenir un discours auquel vous ne croyez plus. La zone euro ne fonctionne plus, il n'y a pas d'avantages comparatifs, les excédents du Nord ne vont plus vers le Sud, elle n'a plus de sens. Comment s'en sortir puisque, de toute façon, vous êtes déjà dans l'illégalité?

La seule chose qu'il eût fallu faire – et vous pouvez encore la faire, mais la ferez-vous? –, c'eût été de procéder à un assouplissement quantitatif orienté uniquement vers les pays du Sud, de créer de la monnaie non pas pour sauver un système financier, mais pour bénéficier à l'économie réelle, à des projets véritablement rentables. Vous ne créeriez ainsi pas de la fausse monnaie, comme vous le faites actuellement.

Cette chance, vous l'avez, mais si vous ne la saisissez pas, vous aurez historiquement la responsabilité de la crise que vous aurez suscitée.

Γεώργιος Επιτήδειος (NI). – Κύριε Πρόεδρε, η νομισματική πολιτική που εφήρμοσε μέχρι τώρα η Ευρωπαϊκή Κεντρική Τράπεζα είχε ως αντικειμενικό σκοπό να διασώσει τις τράπεζες και το ευρώ. Σε γενικές γραμμές αυτόν τον στόχο τον επέτυχε. Η παρενέργεια όμως αυτής της επιτυχίας ήταν η καταστροφή των οικονομιών των χωρών και η δυστυχία των λαών, κυρίως, των κρατών του Νότου και ακόμη περισσότερο της Ελλάδος.

Οι μισθοί και οι συντάξεις των Ελλήνων έχουν εξατμιστεί, τα περιουσιακά τους στοιχεία κατάσχονται με ένα απαράδεκτα ταχύ ρυθμό και όσοι λίγοι, ελάχιστοι έχουν τη δυνατότητα να εξασφαλίσουν κάποιες αποταμιεύσεις ζουν με τον εφιάλτη ότι και αυτά τα χρήματα θα τους τα κλέψει η τράπεζα στο πλαίσιο και στο όνομα μιας πολιτικής διασώσεως των τραπεζών.

Εφόσον η Ευρωπαϊκή Κεντρική Τράπεζα δεν είναι ανεξάρτητη για να εφαρμόσει νομισματική πολιτική, αλλά είναι θεραπευίδα και δούλη της γενικότερης πολιτικής εξαθλιώσεως των λαών της Ευρώπης, τόσο η ίδια η Ευρωπαϊκή Κεντρική Τράπεζα θα αποτύχει, θα γελοιοποιηθεί και θα εξευτελιστεί όσο και ο ίδιος ο κύριος Draghi.

Miguel Viegas (GUE/NGL). – Senhor Presidente, hoje é claro que a união bancária, criada para dar solidez ao sistema financeiro e tratar dos bancos sistémicos, apelidados de «demasiadamente grandes para falir», não passou de uma manobra destinada a retirar da esfera nacional pública qualquer possibilidade de intervenção e a impor um conjunto de operações de fusões entre instituições financeiras, agravando, portanto, o problema que supostamente deveria resolver.

No caso português, a situação é gritante. Com a centralização de todas as funções de supervisão e resolução no BCE, os maiores bancos portugueses acabaram por ser vendidos a grupos estrangeiros a preço de saldo, ficando o prejuízo por conta dos contribuintes, uma vez que o fundo de resolução apenas tem sido financiado pelo Estado português.

Como é evidente, esta união bancária não ajuda a resolver nenhum dos problemas das economias, com ou sem sistema de garantia depósitos, porque esta união bancária é a expressão do domínio do sistema financeiro sobre o poder político da União Europeia, que há muito se demitiu de defender os interesses do cidadão para se dedicar a servir os interesses daqueles que mandam efetivamente na Europa.

Franc Bogovič (PPE). – Hvala poročevalcu za poročilo in tudi kolegom, ki so v svojih nagovorih, pri svojem delu priznali centralni banki, da je opravila zahtevno delo v zadnjem obdobju, da se je na marsikaterem področju, pri reševanju evra, gospodarske situacije v državah stvar do neke mere stabilizirala in so neki znaki tudi okrevanja znotraj Evrope.

Zagotovo pa nas čaka vse skupaj zelo veliko izzivov, da poiščemo odgovore na problem nizkih obrestnih mer, kajti delim mnenje tistih, da so tako nizke obrestne mere, kot so danes, zelo nevarne za varčevalno miselnost, predvsem pa tudi nevarne za pokojninske sisteme, kajti lahko jih zelo ogrozimo.

Naslednji izziv bo zagotovo najti razliko rešitve med razvitejšim evropskim Severom in Jugom, pri čemer je del odgovornosti zagotovo na evropskih institucijah. Prepričan pa sem, da je to, kar opozarja Evropska komisija, pa tudi Evropska centralna banka, se pravi reformne spremembe, spremembe šolstva, spremembe različnih drugih podsistemov, ključ do te poti. Na tej poti vam želim srečno roko in pa veliko uspeha.

Nicola Caputo (S&D). – Signor Presidente, onorevoli colleghi, il presidente Draghi, da ultimo, nel preparare l'estensione del *quantitative easing* oltre marzo, ha dichiarato che non possiamo abbassare la guardia, in quanto l'economia è in costante e moderata ripresa ma i fondamentali sono ancora fragili e la politica monetaria resta un ingrediente chiave per la ripresa del PIL. Restano urgenti le riforme strutturali e una migliore regolazione del settore bancario. Vi sono da considerare gli effetti distorsivi di una *hard Brexit* e lo scenario USA dall'elezione di Trump, fattori di incertezza e di volatilità dei mercati e delle economie europee. In quest'ottica il ruolo della BCE è fondamentale, considerando l'acquisto di milioni di euro di ABS dall'inizio del programma, la riduzione dei tassi a livelli senza precedenti, la creazione del meccanismo di vigilanza unico e la metodologia di valutazione comune SREP. Valuto dunque positivamente la relazione e l'impegno assunto dalla BCE di fare tutto il necessario per difendere l'euro, cosa che, a mio avviso, sta effettivamente facendo.

(Fine della procedura catch-the-eye)

Valdis Dombrovskis, Vice-President of the Commission. – Mr President, let me thank you all, but first and foremost the rapporteur, Ramon Tremosa i Balcells, for this debate.

The ECB's independence is a precondition for its effectiveness in safeguarding price stability. But so too is accountability, especially in difficult economic times, with monetary policy playing an important role in improving the financing to the real economy. To understand and debate monetary policy it is therefore essential for us to shoulder our part of the responsibility, first and foremost, as President Draghi has outlined, regarding the implementation of structural reforms. This debate thus perfectly sets the tone for the discussions which will be held tomorrow on the European Semester. It has demonstrated that there is much common ground between the Commission's and the European Parliament's views, so we count on your continued support in building the foundations for sustainable growth and job creation in Europe.

Mario Draghi, *President of the European Central Bank*. – Mr President, let me thank Mr Tremosa i Balcells and his colleagues for the report. I would also like to thank Vice-President Dombrovskis, and let me thank all of you for the very relevant and useful debate, and also for the deep concerns that you have expressed on various issues and on the present situation.

Let me just present to you a few scattered observations. First of all, this is the first year when the GDP of the euro area has returned to the level of before the crisis. It has taken us seven and a half years. So if we look back, things are better today than they were before. That is the first statement of fact that we should collectively keep in mind. And all this in spite of the serious geopolitical risks that are maturing and have matured especially this year. Any available evidence suggests that the transmission of our accommodative monetary policy is effective. It has contributed, as I was saying before, to a significant easing in the borrowing conditions for firms and households – not for the large capitalists as such, but for everybody – and our policy has stimulated credit creation, and it is basically supporting the euro area recovery.

There are two surveys. One is the bank lending survey where we asked banks what they are doing with their credit conditions, and they all say they have expanded credit, they have expanded the standards and their costs have been going down considerably for a long time. Then we also asked the Commission for a survey for SMEs, and similar questions were asked revolving around how they felt today with respect to credit conditions. The answers are unambiguously positive. The annual rate of growth of loans to firms has increased from -3% to +2% since May 2014.

Some of your points, and also those in the draft resolution, raised the issue of heterogeneity within the euro area, along with some other points raised before. That also has improved as well. Development in lending rates to non-financial corporations point to a drastic reduction in the fragmentation of bank lending across the euro area, and I can give you all kinds of numbers about that.

We have next to the Asset Purchase Programme for the public sector a programme – and it was referred to in some of the interventions – where we buy corporate sector bonds. One lingering worry is that this programme actually benefits large corporates and does not benefit SMEs. Nothing could be further from the truth. SMEs have actually improved their lending conditions a lot. There is one good reason for this, which is that if the large corporates borrow more on the capital markets they will free space in the banks' balance sheets for SMEs. And, by the way, the corporate bond market has also experienced a significant increase in issuance. So funding costs and better access to finance have improved for both small and large companies, and this has and will have a positive effect on investment.

Having said that, I understand – from your words, of course, but also we are aware – that there are concerns as regards the risks associated with low interest rates and our unconventional measures. Our measures still entail some medium-term risks and have side effects. However, do we see a bubble today? If we look at asset valuations we do not see that their valuations are somewhat high or stretched. Also, any analysis would show that it is not a rise in asset prices per se that can create long-term damage to financial and macroeconomic stability, but it is an asset price boom which is fuelled by excess borrowing and leveraging, and this we do not have.

In summary, financial stability risks related to our monetary policy measures are for the time being contained, but we will certainly watch them closely, and we are certainly aware that they have to be observed and monitored very, very closely. But we should also be aware that the right macroeconomic policy is the best safeguard of financial stability. On the low interest rates let's be clear: low interest rates are a consequence of low growth and low inflation all over the world. They are not the creation of the ECB. In this situation, as I was saying I think in my introductory remarks, the policy rates by the ECB have to be low in order to stimulate growth and when you have higher growth and higher inflation, the policy rates of the ECB will also increase. By and large so far, the negative rate situation, when we weigh up benefits and costs, we see that the benefits are bigger than the costs. Of course, there are many different considerations here, and you have all kinds of actors, but the impact of recent monetary policy measures on bank profitability so

far has been contained. We are aware that this is not going to be forever. In the medium term, negative interest rates will certainly create a negative effect on banks' profitability.

On the economic outlook, as I have communicated before, at our next monetary policy meeting in early December we will assess the inflation outlook and our monetary policy stance. Our assessment in December will benefit from the new staff projections extending up to 2019, and we will also take stock of the work of the eurosystem committees on the options that ensure a smooth implementation of our purchase programme until March 2017 or beyond, if necessary. We are committed to preserving an accommodative monetary policy stance that is necessary to bring inflation towards levels below, but close to, 2% over the medium term. And we are also committed to act if warranted by using all the instruments available within our mandate to achieve our objective. Of course, other policies should also play a role, and I have commented on these several times in the past.

Let me now address some of the points – unfortunately in quite a scattered way – but, first of all, our monetary policy is by and large similar to the monetary policy that has been pursued in the United States, in the United Kingdom and in Japan. The policies of the large central banks do not differ very much today. Second, the Troika. There isn't any sentence by any court that forbids the ECB to be in the Troika. It is true that, over the years, in the last two or three years, the ECB has carved itself, in a sense, a much narrower role in the Troika, closer to our own specificity – namely the financial sector and the banking sector. It does not have as much of a voice as it used to in the past on the macroeconomic programmes, where it is the Commission which is the predominant voice. I have already addressed the point that the large corporates benefit from our programmes while the SMEs do not.

On our mandate, some of the statements were saying either explicitly or implicitly that we are overstepping our mandate. Well, we went to court and that is not the view of the European Court of Justice. Our policies generate inequality? That is not what the data shows. The creation of four million jobs has done more for reducing inequality than anything else. It is true that when the central banks' buy assets, asset prices go up and the owners of the assets are usually wealthy, and you may have a worsening of distribution in the short term, but then the effect upon employment and upon economic activity reduces the major sources of inequality, which is unemployment, and that is what has happened in the euro area, where we have basically created four million jobs.

A point was raised on ELA which, by the way, is the prerogative of the national competent authorities – in this case, the national central banks of Cyprus and Greece – and this emergency liquidity assistance has to comply with the monetary financing prohibition laid down in Article 123 of the Treaty. So the ELA decisions have not violated any of these principles. They did not violate the Treaty and they were taken in a fair and uniform way across countries and across time.

On Ireland, we had a dedicated hearing on Ireland in the Committee on Economic and Monetary Policy and any MEP can ask us any question in writing and we always answer. So if there are questions about Ireland, on UniCredit and so on, please send us the question and we will answer it.

I think I have answered most of the questions. Some of you raised the point of what the consequence of the US elections will be on our outlook. It is really very difficult to assess what the impact of this change will be on our economic policy and on the economic outlook of the euro area, but in general – and we have seen this with the outcome of the UK referendum – we had a reaction in the markets in both cases which at the beginning was pretty significant, but then it became muted and markets have shown their resilience thanks also, especially in the first case, to the preparation of the Bank of England on the one side, and the European Central Bank on the other. But I do not think we should stop at that. Clearly these changes have a long-term impact which is very difficult to assess, and in the case of the UK it will depend on the shape of the final negotiation and the length of time it will take to find an agreement.

Ramon Tremosa i Balcells, *relatore*. – Signor Presidente, onorevoli colleghi, caro presidente Draghi, benvenuto ancora una volta al Parlamento europeo.

Just one minute to say that I hope that tomorrow Parliament will support the ECB policies, as the Committee on Economic and Monetary Affairs did some weeks ago. We had a very clear majority of 36 votes in favour and only seven against. I have to say that it has not been easy because, on the one side, there are MEPs asking for helicopter money and, on the other side, there are MEPs regretting that there are increasing worries about negative interest rates, bubbles and rising inequalities. I think that tomorrow we can give clear support to the policies instead of all the concerns that we have heard and to which you replied very well, Mr Draghi, in your second answer.

I wanted to make a final call especially to the Green Group – though I do not see any MEPs from the Green Group in this House now – which has always been pro-European. In recent years they were all on board, with a big majority of this House, in supporting ECB policies. Populism is currently on the rise everywhere, including in various countries in the eurozone. The Green Group has always been pro-European and many of the points and amendments by the Green Group have been included in the final compromises. I want to say to Green MEPs that the narrower the vote tomorrow, the weaker we will leave the ECB in the face of rising populism.

Presidente. – La discussione è chiusa.

La votazione si svolgerà domani.

Dichiarazioni scritte (articolo 162)

Barbara Kappel (ENF), schriftlich. – Der vorgeschlagene Bericht unterstützt die unkonventionellen Instrumente der Geldpolitik, welche angesichts der andauernden Finanzkrise, die ihren Ursprung in der US-Immobilienkrise hatte, ergriffen wurden. Das weitreichende und bekannteste unkonventionelle Instrument ist die Quantitative Lockerung (QE), welche bereits 2011 begann. Im Jahr 2015 erweiterte die EZB ihr Programm zu QE und begann mit dem massiven Zukauf von Staatsanleihen und Anleihen von privaten Schuldnern. Hier bediente sich die EZB eines Schlupflochs in ihrem Statut, um massiv Staatsanleihen am Sekundärmarkt aufzukaufen. Ungeachtet der teilweisen wirtschaftlichen Erfolge von QE in Japan und den Vereinigten Staaten zeigt sich jedoch, dass Geldpolitik auch Grenzen hat. Denn Geldpolitik allein kann nicht über tieferliegende strukturelle, wirtschaftliche Probleme und Ungleichheiten hinweghelfen. Das Problem mit QE bleibt, dass Staaten keinen Druck mehr verspüren, notwendige Strukturreformen umzusetzen, und damit die Signale von Europäischer Kommission, der Troika/Quadrige und dem geldpolitischen Umfeld in einem Widerspruch zueinander stehen. Eine enge Verknüpfung von Fiskal- und Geldpolitik ist für eine erfolgreiche Krisenbewältigung jedoch essentiell. Dies stellt den Euroraum vor große Herausforderungen, auf Ratsebene sind Beschlüsse zwar durchaus möglich, doch sollten diese Zielsetzungen von der EZB durch ihre Geldpolitik unterstützt und nicht, wie es jetzt der Fall ist, indirekt unterminiert werden.

Liadh Ní Riada (GUE/NGL), i scríbhinn. – Mar thoradh ar an bhfiosrúchán ar bhaincéireacht na hÉireann, tá a fhios againn go raibh an Banc Ceannais Eorpach chun tacaíocht a ghearradh do bhainc na hÉireann dá mbeadh aon bhagairt ann do na sealbhóirí bannaí.

Anois, tá géarchéim tithíochta againn sa bhaile agus tá na bainc ag súil le brabús tapaidh a dhéanamh as. Is iad seo na bainc chéanna a tharrtháil muintir na hÉireann agus atá fós á dtarrtháil acu. D'oibrigh na príomhbhainc le chéile chun rátaí úis morgáiste chomh hard leis an spéir a chur i bhfeidhm, beag nach a dhá oiread níos airde ná an meán don limistéar Euro. Tá os cionn 100 000 teach tar éis titim isteach i riaráistí.

Cé gur dhein an freasúra moladh chun caidhp a chur ar rátaí, thacaigh an rialtas leis na bainc seachas tacú leis na daoine. Ní haon ionadh an moladh a d'fhoilsigh BCE ar an Aoine ag tabhairt foláirimh a bheith cúramach maidir le caidhp a chur ar na rátaí. Sin masla don phobal atá faoi bhrú maidir lena dtithe cónaithe a choimeád. Ba chóir go mbeadh dualgas ar BCE aitheantas agus freagracht a ghlacadh as tionchar a gcuid polasaithe ar an bpobal agus seasamh leo.

13. Zielona księga w sprawie detalicznych usług finansowych (debata)

Presidente. – L'ordine del giorno reca la relazione di Olle Ludvigsson, a nome della commissione per i problemi economici e monetari, sul Libro verde sui servizi finanziari al dettaglio (2016/2056(INI)) (A8-0294/2016)

Olle Ludvigsson, föredragande. – Herr talman! Jag vill börja med att rikta ett stort tack till partigrupperna, som har varit mycket samarbetsvilliga och möjliggjort för oss att uppnå en bred enighet inom ett område som kommer att bli viktigare med tiden, nämligen hur vi kan skapa förutsättningar för en inre marknad för finansiella tjänster för privatpersoner och mindre företag. Jag vill understryka att jag välkomnar kommissionens grönbok. Den har kommit helt i rätt tid.

På grund av betydande gränshinder är den gränsöverskridande handeln med finansiella tjänster fortfarande outvecklad. Det är dåligt för konsumenterna, hämmande för innovativa företag och stör den europeiska ekonomins funktionssätt. Därför behöver vi jobba för att frigöra den marknadens fulla potential och stödja innovativa lösningar som kan komma konsumenterna till del.

En stor del av de finansiella tjänsterna är idag knutna till 28 olika marknader som kännetecknas av låg konkurrens och brist på global konkurrenskraft. Om digitaliseringens kraft utnyttjas rätt kan ett europeiskt regelsystem stärka den enskilda konsumenten och bidra till en bättre finansiell produkt till lägre priser. Det är ett gyllene tillfälle som vi inte får missa.

En större del av betalningarna görs numera digitalt. Här behöver vi ett konkurrensneutralt regelverk som säkerställer att nya innovativa aktörer kan fortsätta bidra med tillväxt för fler jobb i Europa. Lagstiftningen behöver säkerställa att ökad konkurrens bidrar till ett rejält mervärde för konsumenterna. De mest grundläggande rättigheterna för medborgarna, till exempel rätten att öppna ett bankkonto, behöver stärkas. De finansiella tillsynsmyndigheterna behöver bättre följa upp hur banker och andra finansinstitut lever upp till antagna, implementerade rättsakter som PSD II, Mifid och direktivet mot penningtvätt.

Jag är övertygad om att EU i tider som dessa måste koncentrera sig på ett av sina kärnuppdrag. Vi måste riva fler barriärer så att den fria marknadens rörlighet kan främjas. Så snart det är möjligt behöver därför kommissionen presentera en rad lagstiftningsförslag som beaktar parlamentets synpunkter. En bred uppsättning av regelverk för finansiella tjänster inom unionen är sannolikt en viktig pusselbit för att uppnå bättre rörlighet bland EU:s medborgare.

Finansiella aktörer villkorar idag alltför ofta privatpersoners konsumtion av finansiella tjänster med kravet på permanent bosättning. Ett tydligt exempel är att kreditkort slutar fungera för vissa européer när de väljer att flytta till en annan medlemsstat. Kommissionen bör därför presentera förslag för att komma åt problemet med geoblockering som är specifikt kopplat till handel för finansiella tjänster.

En annan utmaning är att få identifieringen att fungera i praktiken. Idag finns det stora problem som kan kopplas till identifiering och digitala finansiella tjänster. Därför behöver teknologin för identifiering standardiseras. Tolkningen av penningtvättsdirektivet måste också finjusteras för att säkerställa effektiva identifieringsmöjligheter.

En övergripande utmaning är frågan om finansiell inkludering. Om du som medborgare inte får tillgång till de mest grundläggande finansiella tjänsterna blir livet väldigt svårt. Oavsett vilka åtgärder vi vidtar, måste frågan om finansiell inkludering alltid stå i centrum.

Det nya betalningsdirektivet kommer att ge varje medborgare rätt till ett grundläggande bankkonto. Även om steget är i rätt riktning så får vi inte nöja oss. Att bygga en välfungerade inre marknad för finansiella tjänster är ett omfattande projekt. Samtidigt är det mödan värt om det skapar ett verkligt mervärde för Europas medborgare.

Valdis Dombrovskis, *Vice-President of the Commission*. – Mr President, first of all I would like to thank Mr Olle Ludvigsson for his excellent report on retail financial services.

Last year the Commission published its Green Paper on that subject. Its title was 'Better products, more choice, and greater opportunities for consumers and businesses'. Those remain our objectives. We launched a consultation to ask consumers and businesses for their thoughts on how to achieve them. The responses are shaping our approach to deepening the single market for these services so as to enable consumers to make informed purchases that meet their needs wherever they might be in Europe and to allow financial firms to make the most of economies of scale, lower costs and improve service. We received more than 400 responses to our consultation. This underscores the need to tackle some of the barriers to cross-border retail financial services at European level. I am pleased to see that the conclusions of your report go in the same direction.

Consumers cannot understand why, in our single market, it is still so difficult to purchase financial products from another Member State, particularly as other services are more easily available. Financial firms can have their ambitions to sell into bigger markets frustrated by additional requirements in different European countries.

The Green Paper consultation has now closed. The Commission issued a feedback statement in July and we will follow up with an action plan on retail financial services next year. It will cover a number of areas touched upon in Mr Ludvigsson's report. The action plan will tackle barriers that consumers face when they want to access financial products at a distance. We want to make it easier for consumers to be identified remotely without weakening important anti-money laundering requirements. We will look into reducing obstacles which financial firms can face when they want to expand into another European country without establishing a physical presence. And we want to give consumers the confidence that they need to purchase products across borders by giving them better access to reliable information and by making sure that they have a right to redress if things go wrong.

The work that we are taking forward with a Consumer Financial Services Green Paper is part of our broader push to build a single market for capital in Europe, a capital markets union. Working together we have a real opportunity to strengthen the single market around the principles of transparency, competition and choice, and we can make the daily lives of European consumers easier. This is an opportunity and, by working together, I hope we can take it.

Sergio Gutiérrez Prieto, *ponente de opinión de la Comisión de Mercado Interior y Protección del Consumidor*. – Señor Presidente, señor Comisario, cuando analizamos el mercado de los servicios financieros al por menor, es decir, los productos donde los ciudadanos guardan sus ahorros, los seguros médicos, los planes de pensiones, los seguros de automóvil, incluso los mecanismos de financiación para empresas y familias, nos encontramos con mercados, en primer lugar fragmentados, que promueven también el aumento de costes porque evitan la competencia entre distintos operadores; encontramos mercados rígidos, que imposibilitan la portabilidad de unos productos de un Estado miembro a otro; y también nos encontramos con mercados opacos, que hacen que sea imposible comparar los mismos productos, productos semejantes, como digo, entre distintos operadores de distintos Estados miembros.

Y, por lo tanto, el Libro Verde que ustedes han presentado es una oportunidad para hacer tres cosas a la vez: una, para regular y acabar con la fragmentación que hoy domina en los mercados a escala europea; dos, para empoderar y proteger también a los consumidores; y tres, para aprovechar, en favor del crecimiento, las oportunidades de la digitalización.

Acabar con la fragmentación: pero ahí, señor Comisario, nosotros no creemos ni en las buenas prácticas ni en las buenas intenciones. Necesitamos regulación, que se cumpla la existente y que se cubran los huecos que ella misma ha dejado. No creemos, como digo, que no es necesario pasar del Libro Verde a acciones legislativas concretas que garanticen la igualdad de oportunidades y eviten también la fragmentación entre Estados miembros.

Empoderar a los consumidores, a través del aumento de la transparencia, aumentando la confianza de los mismos, la comparabilidad de productos, y, para eso, proponemos una herramienta que permita la comparabilidad entre los mismos productos de distintos Estados miembros, y, fundamental, mecanismos ágiles, rápidos, seguros para la resolución de conflictos entre distintos Estados miembros.

Y, tercero, todo ello se puede hacer impulsando, aprovechando, las oportunidades de la digitalización. Pero permítanme que me centre únicamente en una cuestión: las *fintechs*. Es también una nueva oportunidad para mejorar la financiación a escala europea, mucho más allá de la dependencia bancaria abusiva que tenemos en la zona comunitaria. Pero para ello también es necesario regular mejor cómo operan estas en los préstamos monetarios.

Tenemos que establecer las mismas reglas, las mismas protecciones y exigencias que tiene el sistema bancario tradicional para aquellos operadores nuevos que se aprovechan de las nuevas tecnologías de la digitalización para abrir nuevos campos de negocio. Nuevas reglas y redes, las mismas oportunidades, también con las mismas salvaguardas que las que ya conocemos en el mercado tradicional.

Gunnar Hökmark, *on behalf of the PPE Group*. – Mr President, first of all I would like to thank Mr Ludvigsson for this report. It is a very important discussion and very important substance. I think we have every opportunity now to do what we can in order to achieve an efficient and liquid European financial market.

Digitalisation means that we will have all these opportunities. It will open things up for the fintech industry and a lot of new services, but it will also create better competition, better credit situations, and better credit opportunities. The challenge for us is to set all these things in the perspective of digitalisation, because while it makes most things possible, we can still see that legislation and regulations are hindrances. I think it is important to see what we can do in order to do what we must do.

First of all, we can create better credit situations all over Europe: liquid markets. Second, we can secure for consumers their being able to use a new range of services in other countries, but also being able to use services from other countries in their own country. You can move from country to country, having your pension with you, but also having the opportunity to pay your invoices which is, by the way, quite important. And you will be able to participate in all the new services, in parallel with banks, competing with banks, but also in innovating financial markets. It will create new jobs, but it will also give a more efficient European economy.

I think, in order to achieve this, that we need to secure an open mind for all the new competition that will arise. That has to do with how we deal with the Payment Service Directive. I think banks will still be as important as they are, but if we can open up new arenas and new opportunities for credit and for financing and new services, we must do that in order to help consumers. I think we need to implement a number of items of legislation that so far are not as implemented as they should be – the Mortgage Credit Directive, taking one example – but also set all the other legislation we have in place.

Digitalisation is not new. It has dominated the financial sector for quite a long time. But the thing that we need to do is to ensure that we facilitate all the opportunities that digitalisation can provide for European financial markets. That is why this discussion is very important. Once again, my congratulations to the rapporteur.

Pervenche Berès, *au nom du groupe S&D*. – Monsieur le Président, Monsieur le Vice-président, merci de votre initiative avec ce Livre vert sur les services financiers. Je crois que le rapport de mon collègue Ludvigsson donne une bonne analyse de vos propositions. Au fond, la question centrale, maintenant, c'est de savoir comment mobiliser l'épargne des particuliers et la mettre au service d'une stratégie européenne qui est nécessairement une stratégie d'investissement de long terme. Pour cela, je crois que la proposition que nous faisons d'un produit d'épargne européen doit être examinée sérieusement par votre Commission. Je sais bien que les taux bas ne créent pas un environnement favorable à une telle proposition, mais vous répondriez ainsi, selon moi, à une aspiration de nos concitoyens et offririez un moyen de trouver des financements pour un investissement en faveur de la transition écologique.

De telles avancées doivent aussi passer par la question de la protection des consommateurs, qui ne peut jamais être laissée de côté. De ce point de vue, j'espère que nous arriverons à déboucher rapidement sur cette fameuse législation PRIIPs sur laquelle nous essayons de déboucher. Cependant, on le voit bien, et c'est très significatif, les opérateurs de secteurs différents veulent pouvoir se faire concurrence pour collecter l'épargne, mais ils ne veulent pas ensuite qu'on puisse comparer leurs produits de manière ouverte et transparente. Il faut que le législateur et la Commission soient très fermes dans ce domaine.

Mon collègue a beaucoup évoqué les FinTech. Je suis aussi favorable aux FinTech mais je pense que, dans ce domaine, il faut que les superviseurs et la Commission européenne soient très vigilants, car j'observe ici ou là le développement de plateformes de négociation qui sont parfois de pures escroqueries contre lesquelles l'Europe doit agir en mobilisant plus fortement l'ESMA et les autorités nationales compétentes.

Enfin, nous attendons de votre part, lorsque vous examinerez les prochaines propositions en matière d'union des marchés des capitaux, que vous n'oubliez pas les engagements auxquels vous nous invitez à travers ce Livre vert. À ce moment-là, nous serons à vos côtés pour progresser.

Stanisław Ożóg, *w imieniu grupy ECR*. – Panie Przewodniczący! Detaliczne usługi finansowe są ważnym elementem codziennego życia obywateli. Dyskutujemy tutaj nad dobrym sprawozdaniem, które szeroko prezentuje rozwiązania związane z usługami finansowymi, wskazując jednocześnie możliwość rozwoju tego sektora i kładąc nacisk na stworzenie bardziej otwartego, niedyskryminującego i konkurencyjnego rynku. Z tego typu usprawnień niewątpliwie skorzystają konsumenci oraz małe i średnie przedsiębiorstwa.

Osobiście nie zgadzam się tylko z ustępem 29, nawiązującym do przyjęcia wspólnej waluty przez wszystkie bez wyjątku państwa członkowskie. Szanowni Państwo! Doskonale wiemy, że żadne regulacje nie są obojętne dla wszystkich stron, których one dotyczą. Apeluję więc do Komisji Europejskiej, aby zanim zaproponuje kolejne regulacje w tym obszarze oraz innych, przeprowadziła odpowiednią ocenę skutków na środowisko biznesu, tak aby nie były one obciążeniem dla podmiotów świadczących usługi finansowe, jak i podmiotów z nich korzystających.

Sophia in 't Veld, *on behalf of the ALDE Group*. – Mr President, first of all I would like to thank and congratulate the rapporteur for doing a very good job and ensuring a compromise that will indeed be supported by my Group. As the previous speaker said, this is a very important topic for citizens. This is about everyday products that they use. Everybody has insurances, loans, mortgages, pension savings, investment accounts, etc., but we see that only three percent of the market – three percent of the potential – is being used and that is worrying. But I have to say that what worries me even more is the lack of ambition and the lack of urgency – just look around the room – because, even if the report is very good, we shy away from the taboos.

I also note that the Commission had initially planned to come forward with an action plan in September and now the talk is about next year. I understand that some people are afraid of rapid developments – fintech was mentioned – but this is reality. This is what is happening and, as long as we sit on our hands, we will be overtaken by other parts of the world. If I look at the level of investment by the United States and China, this overtakes the European Union by far. The European Union is fragmented into 28 national markets. We are weak and not attractive for investors.

I get very worried when I read in the newspaper that a major European bank is actually investing EUR 20 million euros in fintech in China. It should be the other way around. We should be attractive enough for Chinese investors to come here and develop our own services. Europe has the potential to become the hub for retail financial services but, if we do not act more speedily, with more urgency and with more ambition, then we are going to lose the race because, colleagues – or those of you who are still around – this is not necessary for multinationals; they will find their way anyway. This is, however, urgently needed for consumers and SMEs, because they do need the European Union in order to eliminate the barriers. ALDE and the Green Group have tabled amendments and I very much hope for the support of the EPP Group and the S&D Group, because we do not think it is enough to make noble statements here about the objective of eliminating barriers, maybe sometime next century. We need concrete deadlines and we need concrete objectives. That is why we hope that these amendments mentioning the deadlines will be adopted.

Finally, it is a pity that, as usual, the Council is absent – the Council representing the Member States – because we all know that the biggest obstacle of all is national governments protecting their national champions. So where are they? Even the biggest Eurosceptics are always saying how important the internal market is. The government leaders are always saying how important the internal market is but, when it really comes down to it, they are actually blocking the opening-up of the internal market, doing a big disservice to their own citizens. So I hope that the Commission will come up with a really ambitious action plan as soon as possible.

Paloma López Bermejo, *en nombre del Grupo GUE/NGL*. – Señor Presidente, creo que la Comisión se equivocaría si no refuerza enormemente la protección financiera. Servicios fundamentales, como tener una cuenta bancaria o acceder a efectivo, no pueden estar sometidos a enormes comisiones. Productos tan sencillos como los depósitos o las hipotecas no deben estar abiertos a prácticas fraudulentas tan graves como las de las preferentes o la del índice de referencia de préstamos hipotecarios.

Hay que simplificar la oferta de productos financieros existentes y ofrecer como derecho los servicios bancarios fundamentales —por ejemplo, a través de una banca pública—.

Y, en este sentido, ligar la reforma de los servicios financieros a la unión bancaria y de capitales, es decir, a la liberalización, privatización y concentración del sector financiero, es un grave error.

No debemos olvidar tampoco a los trabajadores del sector: desarrollos como la digitalización, además de abrir una brecha con muchos consumidores, son hasta el momento sinónimo de precarización laboral, lo que exige también nueva regulación a nivel europeo.

Patrick O'Flynn, *on behalf of the EFDD Group*. – Mr President, enhanced international competition in consumer markets certainly has the potential to give customers a better deal for insurance, banking, savings, investments and much else besides. In some product markets, benefits from competition are fairly straightforward to attain, but in retail financial services there are clearly complexities to be overcome in order to boost international competition.

Many products rely on putative income streams or pay-outs far into the future, while charging regimes can be opaque, and let us not forget we are dealing with high value items designed to make a big difference to a person's standard of life. This is not a pair of socks or a new pencil sharpener. The potential complexity of pursuing cross-border redress is one factor that has led thus far to pragmatic consumers tending to stick with suppliers from their own country of origin or residence. But, given the potentially large gains to consumers of being able to access the best advice and widest choice of products from across the world, Europe's countries would do well to keep working at bringing down barriers in this field.

As a world leader in retail financial services, the United Kingdom has much to offer the savers, investors and future pensioners of Europe. Any bid by the EU to use Brexit as a pretext for closing down consumer choice would leave Europe's citizens facing a less prosperous and less secure future. Governments would be failing in their duty were they to allow this to happen.

Róza Gräfin von Thun und Hohenstein (PPE). – Mr President, firstly congratulations to Mr Ludvigsson and all the shadows for the work on this own-initiative report. I agree fully with those of you who spoke about the 28 different legal regimes on our single market that fragment this market and do not allow it to use the whole potential that lies there. My committee, the Committee on the Internal Market and Consumer Protection (IMCO), also contributed to this work; we provided an opinion. We all see that the retail financial market is, despite the number of legislative measures at the EU level, still not used. We will continue our work on it.

Also in the report on the regulation on geoblocking, which you mentioned already, consumers encounter numerous barriers. Having a bank account or a credit card is a prerequisite to almost every economic activity. But if consumers have problems with those services, they cannot as a result access any other services or goods normally accessible on this market, not to mention consumers' problems and consequent frustration with other services such as loans, mortgages, investment products, insurance, etc. According to the most recent Consumer Markets Scoreboard, those markets are quite poorly rated by consumers domestically, and the cross-border perspective is even worse by a long way.

The single market and the digital single market cannot work effectively without cross-border retail financial services. This is one of the most important issues. Therefore, I would like to repeat the conclusions from our committee and ask the Commission to undertake a detailed examination analysis of both national and cross-border obstacles, remaining barriers to cross-border operations and to the completion of the single market financial sector. The European Commission needs to identify the reasons behind the existing market segmentation and price discrimination and the European Commission should recommend measures to encourage financial institutions to compete beyond national borders.

Anneliese Dodds (S&D). – Mr President, the ability for everyone to access high-quality, safe and affordable financial services has become increasingly important. Olle Ludvigsson's report offers many suggestions on how we can encourage new growth areas, including cross-border services. But, of course, we also need to consider how we can better protect consumers.

People can be financially excluded in many different ways; they may lack safe ways to borrow, encouraging them to turn to payday lenders or loan sharks, or they may be unable to access funds and services across countries – with one of my constituents finding it next to impossible to access funds stolen from her family by the National Socialists mainly because of administrative impediments.

So I am really pleased the rapporteur has taken on board many of my concerns, from calling for a simple, safe and portable financial products framework to acknowledging issues arising from the digital divide, to making sure incentive structures for staff in financial services do not promote mis-selling or inappropriate cross-selling, to advocating rigorous and consistent enforcement of consumer protection across states.

British consumers have been subject to many of the same sharp practices and scandals as other Europeans. So I hope the UK Government will follow and emulate developments at EU level to improve retail financial services, rather than trail behind them.

Cora van Nieuwenhuizen (ALDE). – We leven niet meer in een tijdperk van verandering, we leven in een verandering van tijdperk. Dat geldt in het bijzonder als je kijkt naar de financiële sector, want alle nieuwe technologieën, van de analyse van big data tot *robo advice*, tot *blockchain*, noem maar op: alles wat er tegenwoordig aan nieuwe dingen tegelijk samenkomt, verandert het landschap ontzettend. Daardoor wordt het mogelijk dat heel veel producten goedkoper worden, beter worden, sneller worden en, zeg ik tegen collega Anneliese, ook meer toegankelijk voor heel veel mensen. Er liggen dus ontzettend veel kansen, want het belangrijkste doel dat we hier immers met z'n allen hebben gesteld, is het creëren van banen en economische groei. Om dat te kunnen bewerkstelligen, moeten we internationaal de concurrentie aankunnen. Daar hebben we in ieder geval ook een geavanceerde financiële infrastructuur voor nodig.

Daartoe kan dit verslag, en daar feliciteer ik de heer Ludvigsson ook mee, een belangrijke aanzet geven om ervoor te zorgen dat we innovatievriendelijk zijn en tegelijkertijd zorgen voor consumentenbescherming en natuurlijk ook oog hebben voor de systeemrisico's die er in ons hele financiële systeem zitten. Die balans moeten we met elkaar zien te vinden, want zoals mijn collega in 't Veld net al zei, wordt hierin ontzettend veel geïnvesteerd in de hele wereld. Als wij niet uitkijken, dan lopen we achter op dit gebied. Daar benadelen wij onze economie maar vooral ook onze burgers mee, want die willen heel graag op wereldniveau kunnen meedraaien. Daar heb je die vernieuwingen gewoon keihard voor nodig.

João Pimenta Lopes (GUE/NGL). – Senhor Presidente, estamos perante mais um aprofundamento do mercado único, estendendo-o aos serviços financeiros de retalho. Tal como outras iniciativas, apresenta-se sustentado em conceitos que, estando aparentemente direcionados à melhoria das condições dos utilizadores, representam, na prática, mais um elemento de harmonização, de aprofundamento federalista, que servirá aos grandes interesses financeiros, facilitando a concentração da riqueza e a centralização do poder económico.

Alguns dos aspetos mais perversos desta iniciativa: liquidação de empresas de menor dimensão e promoção de oligopólio bancário pan-europeu; aumento dos lucros dos grandes bancos, nomeadamente pela redução de custos operacionais, onde se incluem o despedimento de trabalhadores, processos facilitados pela vertente digital e a redução da implantação física das empresas; degradação das condições de atendimento direto ao público e precarização laboral; desregulamentação da economia e intensificação da livre circulação de capitais; ainda maior supressão da autonomia e soberania dos Estados-Membros; e facilitação da fuga de capitais, dificultando o combate ao branqueamento de capitais.

São objetivos e consequências que merecem o nosso total repúdio e condenação.

Sergio Gaetano Cofferati (S&D). – Signor Presidente, signor Commissario, onorevoli colleghi, come ha notato, l'ottima relazione del collega Ludvigsson chiede sostanzialmente due cose alla Commissione. La prima è di dare attuazione alla legislazione già adottata, perché nell'applicare i patti sottoscritti c'è un senso di credibilità delle istituzioni che a noi pare importante. E poi chiede alla Commissione ulteriori iniziative, compresa quella della proposta di conto di risparmio nell'Unione europea e di incoraggiamento agli investimenti sostenibili e, in particolare, a quelli verdi. Perché queste due richieste vanno in parallelo? Perché c'è bisogno di creare consapevolezza e forza nel mercato interno presso gli utenti, i consumatori, che sono il soggetto principale al quale destinare le azioni che vi chiediamo.

Vorrei tornare rapidamente su due degli aspetti relativi ai consumatori che Lei stesso ha citato. Il primo riguarda l'informazione: una corretta informazione dà consapevolezza a chi deve utilizzare un servizio. Può scegliere così che cosa fare e con chi fare le azioni che gli servono per l'investimento e per la valorizzazione dei suoi risparmi. Il secondo tema è quello dei ricorsi: la possibilità di fare ricorso dà sicurezza a chi investe. Noi oggi purtroppo soffriamo di mancanza di consapevolezza e anche di uno stato elevatissimo di insicurezza.

Se voi farete queste scelte aiuterete il rafforzamento del mercato interno e, soprattutto, dei soggetti che dentro vi operano, che sono i consumatori.

Nils Torvalds (ALDE). – Herr talman! Jag vill naturligtvis inleda med att tacka Olle Ludvigsson för hans arbete. Det utgör en ganska god bas för fortsatta studier på området.

De flesta av oss är säkert överens om att bankerna utför ett viktigt och mångsidigt arbete som betjänar oss alla som privatpersoner, som småföretagare, eventuellt också dem som är storföretagare.

Det väcker dock några tankar när man tittar på de uppgifter vi ser om bankernas avkastningskrav. En bank som har ett avkastningskrav på sitt kapital på 15 procent överträder eventuellt de regler som vi i vår stora klokskap håller på att skriva här. Det ställer oss en allvarlig fråga om på vilket sätt vi kan slå vakt om att reglerna faktiskt skapar en spelplan som är någorlunda jämn och som gör det möjligt för små banker i mindre länder att överleva i en hård konkurrens.

Vi behöver alltså ett rättvist system. Vi behöver en jämn spelplan. Jag hoppas att kommissionen i sitt framtida arbete klarar av att beakta detta och se till att också de perifera bankerna och det perifera banksystemet klarar sig i ett spel som ibland är hårt och som inte alltid är särskilt rent.

Ashley Fox (ECR). – Mr President, my Group supports Parliament's response to the Commission Green Paper on retail financial services. The report rightly points out that a single approach to retail services across the EU would be counter-productive at the moment, given the diversity of actors and the different products on the market, which are often tailored to local markets.

However, there are definitely improvements that can be made to the status quo, which the report highlights. For example, I am pleased that our amendments calling for the sector to work better for consumers, start-ups, investors and SMEs through delivering a healthy and competitive environment were adopted. I also support the emphasis placed on the simplification of legislation, the opportunities for digitalisation and fintech, the benefits of switching, and the financial education of consumers.

We do, though, have concerns. For example, the creation of a common tax identification number is not something I support, as it goes beyond the competences of the EU. For this reason my Group will vote against this provision. I am also baffled as to why there are calls in this report for more Member States to adopt the euro. That has nothing to do with this report. I will also not be supporting amendments from colleagues calling on the European supervisory authorities to increase their activities on consumers' and retail investors' issues. We need to be careful about duplication of existing structures in Member States and ensure that taxpayers' money is well spent.

The call to intensify work against geoblocking in the financial sector should not be legislative at this stage. My Group agrees with the Commission approach of a financial services carve-out, due to its complexity. On the whole, this is a good report with some positive recommendations for the retail financial services sector and we thank Mr Ludvigsson for his good work.

Procedura catch-the-eye

Νότης Μαριάς (ECR). – Κύριε Πρόεδρε, σύμφωνα με την Πράσινη Βίβλο της Επιτροπής για τις λιανικές χρηματοπιστωτικές υπηρεσίες, όλοι οι καταναλωτές θα πρέπει να έχουν πρόσβαση σε διαφανή και έντιμα προϊόντα, ενώ παράλληλα κύριος στόχος θα πρέπει να είναι και η πάταξη της φοροδιαφυγής. Με την Πράσινη Βίβλο προωθείται η μείωση του κατακερματισμού της αγοράς, η ψηφιοποίηση και η ενίσχυση της θέσης των καταναλωτών, προκειμένου να βελτιωθεί η λειτουργία της ενιαίας αγοράς.

Βέβαια η εμπιστοσύνη των καταναλωτών στις χρηματοπιστωτικές υπηρεσίες είναι αρκετά χαμηλή, κυρίως, λόγω της έλλειψης χρηματοοικονομικών γνώσεων εκ μέρους των ίδιων των καταναλωτών. Επίσης πολλές φορές η άνοδος του αριθμού των διασυνοριακών συναλλαγών δημιουργεί προβλήματα, καθώς προϋποθέτει πληροφορίες σχετικά με τα προσωπικά δεδομένα. Για τον λόγο αυτό, είναι αναγκαίο να υπάρχει άντληση προσωπικών δεδομένων και αυτή να γίνεται πάντα με βάση τους κανόνες της προστασίας των δεδομένων, ενώ οι καταναλωτές θα πρέπει να έχουν την κατάλληλη ενημέρωση σχετικά με τις χρηματοοικονομικές υπηρεσίες .

Nicola Caputo (S&D). – Signor Presidente, onorevoli colleghi, anche in precedenti interventi ho ribadito la necessità di implementare nei mercati finanziari la trasparenza delle operazioni, nell’ottica di instaurare maggiore fiducia nei consumatori. Se i servizi finanziari al dettaglio sono solo embrionali, dipende dalla mancanza di trasparenza, coerenza e tutela del risparmio a livello macroeconomico e, innanzitutto, dallo scarso rispetto dei principi di cooperazione e scambio di informazioni.

Un *driver* fondamentale è il coordinamento con il mercato unico digitale ma grande è la responsabilità sotto il profilo della privacy, se solo si considera il fenomeno che muove velocemente i primi passi della «*robo-advisory*», che rappresenta l’avamposto più moderno della *fintech*. Ma mi chiedo: come possiamo permettere ad un operatore elettronico e non più umano di consigliarci l’acquisto di prodotti finanziari se non abbiamo ancora risolto le sfide cruciali di sicurezza, protezione dei dati, tutela dei consumatori, concorrenza leale e stabilità finanziaria a livello di Stati membri e di banche centrali?

Stanislav Polčák (PPE). – Já chci rovněž souhlasit se svými předřečníky, že právě rozříštenost právního rámce 28 členských států opravdu odrazuje lidi od využívání těchto služeb. Vzhledem k jejich obecné složitosti lidé potřebují skutečně více informací k tomu, aby měli důvěru ve využívání maloobchodních finančních služeb. Na úrovni evropských institucí by měla být posílena právě ta informační složka sledování světového vývoje a řešení některých palčivých otázek, které spočívají např. v určení příslušnosti soudu, který má rozhodovat případné spory vyplývající z těchto právních vztahů.

Je zde řada otevřených momentů. Já chci podpořit Komisi v tom přístupu, který předložila. Připadá mi rozumný. Měli bychom nyní sledovat světový vývoj a navrhnout tomu odpovídající právní rámec pro využívání těchto služeb.

Ruža Tomašić (ECR). – Gospodine predsjedavajući, izvjestitelj je postavio točnu dijagnozu koja se može primijeniti i na ostala područja, ne samo na maloprodajne financijske usluge. Neophodno je iskoristiti puni potencijal dostupnih informacijskih tehnologija, ali moramo biti svjesni toga da one same mogu ukloniti tek administrativne barijere. Ostale barijere, poput onih pravne i porezne prirode, može smanjiti samo snažna politička volja, koje prečesto manjka.

Iako su propisi u ovom području mnogobrojni, od Direktive o uslugama platnog prometa do one o sprječavanju pranja novca, put do istinski jedinstvenog tržišta neće biti ni brz ni lagan. Izvjestitelj dobro prepoznaje da je ključno podići razinu povjerenja i zadovoljstva potrošača. Oni su još uvijek suočeni s relativno visokim naknadama u prekograničnim tokovima novca koje ne odgovaraju realnim troškovima pružatelja usluga i to je nepravda koju moramo ispraviti.

(Fine della procedura catch-the-eye)

Valdis Dombrovskis, Vice-President of the Commission. – Mr President, I would like to thank the European Parliament for this engaging and interesting debate on the report.

The Commission will take account of the issues which were raised today, and those outlined in the report, when preparing the retail financial services action plan. I believe our positions are similar in many ways. The Commission is focused on practical solutions. To keep the momentum, we will commit to actions which can be implemented quickly and which will bring tangible benefits to the everyday lives of consumers. So I agree that we need to be ambitious in this area.

In preparing our action plan, we will, of course, remain open to ideas and cooperation with stakeholders across the board, very much including the European Parliament. So I am looking forward to working closely and constructively with all of you to push this agenda forward.

Olle Ludvigsson, föredragande. – Herr talman! Jag får tacka så mycket för de olika åsikterna och de synpunkter som har kommit på detta med "retail financial services", vilket jag är väldigt tacksam för. Jag har själv försökt att som föredragande skapa en så stor enighet som möjligt i parlamentet, eftersom jag tror att det är viktigt.

Den fråga som vi har framför oss om finansiella tjänster är självklart viktig. Den måste koncentreras på konsumenterna, medborgarna, så att de ska kunna ha säkra och trygga system att fungera i. Jag tror också att vi självklart ska försöka gå fram så fort det överhuvudtaget är möjligt. Vi kan konstatera att det rör sig om en komplicerad del som kommer att ta en viss tid, men vi måste starta på ett vettigt och rimligt sätt.

Det vi gjorde i vårt betänkande var att dela upp det på kort och på lång sikt, vilket jag tror är väldigt, väldigt viktigt att göra. Vi måste lyfta blicken också och titta på den yngre generationen. Det är de i den yngre generationen som ska leva med detta. Vi måste skapa förutsättningar så att dessa produkter blir billigare, bättre, effektivare och säkrare. Det är det absolut viktigaste. Dessutom måste vi självklart försöka snabba på om det är möjligt.

Ett stort tack ännu en gång till alla skuggföredragandena, ett stort tack till alla parlamentariker som nu har deltagit i diskussionen. Jag känner väl ändå att det finns en ganska stor samstämmighet i vart vi vill gå hän och vad vi vill göra, och jag hoppas på ett fortsatt bra samarbete i denna fråga. Jag tackar även kommissionen för det förslag som man har lagt fram.

Presidente. – La discussione è chiusa.

La votazione si svolgerà domani.

14. Finalizacja pakietu Bazylea III (debata)

Presidente. – L'ordine del giorno reca la discussione sull'interrogazione con richiesta di risposta orale alla Commissione sul completamento di Basilea III, di Roberto Gualtieri, a nome della commissione per i problemi economici e monetari (O-000136/2016 - B8-1810/2016) (2016/2959(RSP))

Roberto Gualtieri, autor. – Mr President, this debate takes place one week before the next meeting of the Basel Committee in Chile, which will be an important step in the process towards the finalisation of the so-called Basel III agreements with a fundamental review of the banking book. As we know, this review is focused on three groups of measures: the review of the standardised approach for credit and operational risk, in order to enhance the risk sensitivity and robustness; the introduction of constraints to the use of internal models; the potential introduction of capital output floor based on the standardised approaches that defines the minimum amount of capital requirement for internally model exposures. The Parliament will be called, as co-legislator, to introduce the outcomes of this review into EU law.

Taking into account the relevance and potential impact of the measures under discussion, we consider it necessary to intervene in the debate. We had an exchange of views with the Single Supervisory Mechanism (SSM), the Commission, the European Banking Authority (EBA) and the Secretary-General of the Basel Committee, and we drafted this oral question and the resolution, which has been approved by the Committee on Economic and Monetary Affairs (ECON) with a very broad majority and will now be put to the vote before the plenary.

As the resolution clearly states, we believe in the importance of sound global standards, and we reaffirm that banks need to be well capitalised in order to support the real economy and reduce risk. We also consider it important to increase simplicity, comparability and convergence of the risk-weighted capital framework in order to address excessive variability in risk-weighted assets and to apply the same rules to the same risks. However, we think that the current revision, in order to be effective and not to have unintended and counterproductive consequences, needs to fully respect two principles. Firstly, it should not significantly increase overall capital requirements for European banks as the Basel Oversight Board has clearly stated. Secondly, the revision should not have a negative impact on the level playing field at global level. It should not exacerbate – rather it should mitigate – the differences between types of banks and between geographical areas, and it should not unduly penalise the EU banking model.

As we know, although the draft standard has been built up by specific proposal subject to public consultations and specific quantitative impact studies, during the summary many concerns have been expressed and it clearly emerged that the various drafts did not respect the two above-mentioned principles. For this reason, we are calling on the Basel Committee to revise its proposals. We also call on the ECB, the SSM and the Commission to ensure the respect of the two principles in the finalisation and monitoring of the new standard. As the resolution clearly states, we consider that this would be instrumental for ensuring a consistent incorporation of the new measures into EU legislation. We understand that some steps in the right direction have been taken, and we encourage all the remaining critical elements to be addressed.

As regards the use of internal models, they need to address the variability of risk-weighted assets should not be a reason to drop the sensitiveness of prudential requirement. It should be rather an incentive to deal with lack of organisation in modelling approaches, as the EBA and the SSM have already been doing since 2014, in order to ensure that risk-weighted assets are always consistent with the actual risk behaviour of banking assets.

Last, but not least, the resolution expresses concerns about the potential effect on the real economy of the possible introduction of output floors. The output floor is closely linked to the leverage ratio, and the new standard should ensure that the level of calibration of these two measures does not lead to an unintended duplication that could not only end up with an undoubtedly punitive outcome for the euro in terms of capital requirements, but also undermine the effectiveness of the overall reform package.

In conclusion, with this resolution the Parliament reaffirms its commitment to work on agreed international standards, but at the same time it warns that those standards should fully take into account the specificity of the EU banking model and strike the right balance between stability and growth. We hope that the adoption of this resolution with a broad majority will contribute to this balanced outcome.

Valdis Dombrovskis, *Vice-President of the Commission*. – Mr President, as you know, the Basel Committee is currently reviewing the rules on capital requirements for banks. The declared aim is to find a better balance between risk sensitivity, simplicity and comparability of the outcomes of those rules. A key focus of the Basel Committee is the use of internal models. Specifically, the Basel Committee considers that, under the current rules, capital requirements calculated using source models can vary in a way that does not always reflect the differences in banks' risk profiles, and feels that such unjustified variations should be tackled.

The Commission supports the Basel Committee's broad objectives, but we are also clear that we need an intelligent solution which maintains a risk-sensitive approach to setting capital requirements and which does not significantly increase capital requirements. We believe that the work undertaken by the Basel Committee would lead to less variability in risk-weighted assets, but not all variability is bad. In fact most of the variability is perfectly justified as it reflects actual differences in risk. It is important to ensure that the capital framework continues to reflect these differences. It is perfectly normal for a bank focused on lending in a sector and region with low risks to have lower average risk rates than a bank operating elsewhere.

A problem we see with the proposals made by the Basel Committee is that they could potentially come at the expense of reducing some of the justified variability, which would result in less risk-sensitive rules. The revisions contemplated by the Basel Committee should recognise that in a number of areas banks and borrowers in Europe have their particularities.

As William Coen told the Committee on Economic and Monetary Affairs (ECON) recently, the Basel Committee has already made important changes to the revisions of the rules proposed initially and on some, but not all, EU specificities had to be taken into account through those changes. For example, the capital requirements for mortgages have been adjusted to take into account the very stable mortgage markets we have in the EU.

However, the Commission considers that, at this stage, the changes do not fully ensure a level playing field between the different regions in the world. In terms of the impact of capital requirements and on financial stability, the Basel Committee's proposals could address some weaknesses in the current rules and could therefore increase the soundness of the banking sector and, consequently, financial stability. At the same time, taken together, the proposals could lead to a potentially significant increase in the capital requirements of EU banks, which would have an adverse effect or impact on lending to the economy, at least in the short term.

So we need to find a solution which would not unduly weigh on the financing of the broader economy in Europe. At a time when we are focused on supporting investment, we want worldwide changes which would lead to a significant increase in overall capital requirements shouldered by Europe's banking sector.

This is not just the Commission's position. All Member States backed it in July and I understand that the resolution to be voted on in plenary on Wednesday goes very much in the same direction. Indeed this approach has been agreed by the Basel Committee itself so that the completion of Basel III should not lead to overall significant increases in capital requirements.

The Commission remains committed to the work done in the Basel Committee and we believe that it is in everyone's interests to find a balanced solution. The Commission will keep on working intensively to ensure a solution that works for Europe and that does not put our banks at a disadvantage compared to our global competitors.

Markus Ferber, *im Namen der PPE-Fraktion*. – Herr Präsident, Herr Vizepräsident der Europäischen Kommission, liebe Kolleginnen, liebe Kollegen! Schon im Juli dieses Jahres ist ja auf meine Initiative hin hier im Europäischen Parlament im Plenum eine Anfrage zur mündlichen Beantwortung an die Kommission gerichtet worden. Damals war der Kollege Katainen hier und hat uns ja schon damals eine klare Bestätigung gegeben, dass die besonderen Bedürfnisse der europäischen Banken auch im Baseler Ausschuss berücksichtigt werden sollen. Deswegen haben wir als EVP-Fraktion von Anfang an die Initiative unterstützt, auch eine Meinungsbildung in Form einer EntschlieÙung im Plenum vorzunehmen. Ich darf mich ausdrücklich bei unserem Ausschussvorsitzenden, der diese Aufgabe übernommen hat, die EntschlieÙung vorzubereiten, bedanken, auch für die konstruktive Art und Weise, wie wir das im Ausschuss beraten haben.

Wir müssen uns über eines im Klaren sein: Natürlich müssen Banken ihre Risiken selber tragen können. Dafür haben wir viel getan. Wir werden diese Woche ja auch Vorschläge zur Überarbeitung der Eigenkapitalvorschriften von der Kommission bekommen, und wir werden diesen Weg weitergehen. Aber wir müssen auch aufpassen, dass wir das Ganze mit Augenmaß betreiben.

Proportionalität ist ein Thema, das wir in all unsere Gesetzgebung mit eingefügt haben. Wir haben alle Banken in der Europäischen Union bei der Umsetzung von Basel II gezwungen, einen Risikostandardeinsatz wenn sie keine internen Ratingmodelle haben – zur Anwendung zu bringen. Ich habe kein Verständnis dafür, dass dieses Modell jetzt in Basel plötzlich wieder zur Disposition gestellt werden soll und gerade kleine, mittlere Banken besondere Eigenkapitalanforderungen erfüllen müssen, die weder dem Proportionalitätsgrundsatz entsprechen noch der Risikogewichtung.

Deswegen begrüÙe ich es auch sehr, Herr Vizepräsident, dass die Kommission von Anfang an klar gesagt hat, dass der KMU-Korrekturfaktor oder KMU-Unterstützungsfaktor aufrechterhalten bleiben soll, auch wenn das in Basel kritisiert wurde.

Auch das war uns als EVP ein großes Anliegen: Wir müssen schon mal darauf achten, wie wir Basel umsetzen. Basel gilt ja nicht für die Europäische Union, sondern ist eine globale Verabredung. Wenn ich mir andere Wirtschaftsräume anschau - Roberto Gualtieri hat in seiner Rede darauf hingewiesen: Nicht alle Wirtschaftsregionen dieser Erde setzen Basel so um, wie wir das bisher getan haben. Wir sollten uns hier auch überlegen, ob eine Eins-zu-eins-Umsetzung für alle Banken oder vielleicht nur eine partielle Umsetzung richtig wäre.

Eine letzte Bemerkung, die ich machen möchte: Wir Europäer sollten auch in Basel lernen, zusammenzuarbeiten. Wir haben eine Reihe von Notenbanken, eine Reihe von Aufsichtsbehörden im Baseler Ausschuss sitzen. Wenn hier Europa im Interesse unseres Bankensektors besser zusammenarbeiten würde, könnten wir die Meinungsführerschaft im Baseler Ausschuss übernehmen und nicht die Amerikaner, und ich glaube, wir Europäer hätten das Zeug dazu.

Pervenche Berès, *au nom du groupe S&D*. – Monsieur le Président, Monsieur le Vice-président, nous discutons ici de ce que le comité de Bâle va adopter d'ici à la fin du mois et je crois que c'est très important que, en tant que vice-président, vous assistiez à cette discussion et que vous puissiez être l'avocat de ce Parlement, puisqu'au fond, nous savons très bien que nous sommes les principaux utilisateurs – les principaux bénéficiaires, si j'ose dire – des travaux du comité de Bâle. Nous sommes ceux qui appliquent avec le plus de sérieux et de consistance ces standards élaborés à Bâle.

Il faut que la voix des Européens soit entendue et il faut que ce que nous représentons comme modèle bancaire soit représenté. De ce point de vue-là, la remise en cause du modèle interne interroge, car nous savons très bien que beaucoup de banques en Europe utilisent ce modèle avec efficacité et qu'il permet d'affiner les conditions de financement de l'économie.

Du point de vue du financement de l'économie réelle – un thème qui doit quand même nous préoccuper en priorité lorsque nous nous intéressons à la santé du secteur bancaire –, l'audition de M. William Coen en commission des affaires économiques et monétaires ne nous a pas totalement rassurés.

Je ne voudrais pas que nous nous engagions dans une révision des fonds propres des banques qui ne tienne pas complètement compte des besoins d'investissement de nos économies, que ce soit dans le secteur du logement, et donc sur la question des crédits immobiliers – qui est un thème sur lequel le comité de Bâle se penche avec des effets peut-être très perturbateurs pour ce marché fragile, au cœur de la reprise de l'activité économique dans beaucoup de nos pays –, ou sur la question du financement des infrastructures, au cœur de la stratégie du plan Juncker que nous soutenons, par ailleurs.

Enfin, je note que, dans la résolution que nous allons voter à une grande majorité – je l'espère –, nous soulevons à nouveau la question de la distribution de dividendes par des banques qui, par ailleurs, apparaissent comme sous-capitalisées, question qui doit être préoccupante, Monsieur le Vice-président, lorsque l'on cherche des pistes pour retrouver la confiance des citoyens dans leur secteur bancaire.

Sylvie Goulard, *au nom du groupe ALDE*. – Monsieur le Président, Monsieur le Vice-président, je suis ravie de votre présence ce soir, parce que je crois que, même si les foules ne sont pas présentes autour de vous, il est quand même très important que vous preniez le temps, comme cela a été dit précédemment, de venir discuter avec les représentants des Européens.

Au printemps, nous avons adopté à une large majorité un rapport d'initiative qui insistait sur le besoin à la fois de transparence et de responsabilité des organes comme le Comité de Bâle. Par conséquent, nous apprécions beaucoup que vous soyez présent. J'apprécie aussi beaucoup, personnellement et au nom du groupe, que vous ayez pris des positions très claires et très fermes sur un sujet sur lequel on n'a pas toujours eu des messages aussi clairs de la Commission.

Une première étape a été la venue de M. Coen en commission des affaires économiques et monétaires. Je crois qu'on peut aussi se féliciter qu'il soit venu même si, évidemment, un seul débat ne peut pas suffire à établir des relations de confiance. Il faudra que cela soit suivi dans la durée par un dialogue.

Aujourd'hui, je voudrais transmettre deux messages. Le premier est assez évident, mais je pense qu'il faut le répéter encore et encore: nous sommes favorables à une coopération internationale. Il est évident que l'Europe veut être ouverte et travailler avec les autres, mais il n'est pas question que cela se traduise in fine par un plus grand impact en Europe que dans d'autres zones du monde sur le financement de l'économie.

Mario Draghi nous a dit tout à l'heure, en votre présence, que l'on commençait à peine à retrouver les niveaux de croissance d'avant la crise après huit années. Il n'est donc vraiment pas nécessaire de porter atteinte, en quoi que ce soit, à la croissance, et il faudra y veiller. Sur ce point, effectivement, nous comptons beaucoup sur la Commission pour travailler à rapprocher les positions des États. J'espère qu'il pourra y avoir un suivi du rapport d'initiative dont j'ai parlé, de manière à ce que à la fois au Conseil et à la Commission, entre la BCE et l'Autorité bancaire européenne, on arrive à mieux défendre en commun les intérêts européens, sans forcément créer des procédures très lourdes, en veillant toujours à ne pas mettre en péril le financement de l'économie.

Une dernière remarque à propos des élections américaines. Je me rappelle que, pour ce rapport, j'étais allée au Congrès l'année dernière. J'avais été très frappée par l'opposition entre les démocrates, d'un côté, et les républicains, de l'autre, autour de la loi Dodd-Frank et de la règle Volcker. Il est un peu tôt pour le savoir, mais peut-être que l'élection de Donald Trump aura un impact sur la manière dont les Américains voient la régulation.

Je souhaiterais, Monsieur le Vice-président, que l'on essaie autant que possible de ne pas se retrouver en Europe à progresser au Comité de Bâle avec des Américains de l'administration précédente pour ensuite être confrontés, le jour où il faudra mettre en œuvre, à des partenaires, y compris d'autres régions du monde, qui ne seraient plus d'accord pour avancer.

Par conséquent, je vous demande d'être vigilant, comme vous avez su l'être jusqu'à présent.

Miguel Viegas, em nome do Grupo GUE/NGL. – Senhor Presidente, após a onda neoconservadora dos anos 80 e a fúria neoliberal que desregulamentou o setor financeiro, cedo se percebeu que a banca privada necessitava de algumas regras sob pena de pôr em causa todo o sistema. As regras criadas desde Basel 1 até 3 pretendem impor níveis mínimos de capitais próprios. Contudo, as regras para a sua contabilização foram-se tornando cada vez mais complexas e opacas como convém, sempre, aos grupos de interesses que lucram sempre com a falta de transparência.

Hoje, o cidadão aprende que os modelos de avaliação de risco dos ativos são da responsabilidade dos bancos ditos sistémicos, ao contrário dos outros que estão sujeitos a um modelo normalizado, ou seja, temos, como foi comprovado por um estudo da Standard & Poor's, ativos com ponderações diferentes de banco para banco, ou seja, temos um sistema em que os rácios de solvabilidade e os testes de stress são completamente manipulados pelos grandes bancos, retirando assim qualquer credibilidade ao sistema de supervisão.

Pela nossa parte, a solução é muito simples. O crédito é demasiado importante para ser deixado à livre iniciativa do setor privado. O controlo público sobre a banca e sobre o sistema financeiro é hoje mais do que uma evidência, é uma necessidade.

Marco Zanni, a nome del gruppo EFDD. – Signor Presidente, onorevoli colleghi, il pacchetto di completamento di Basilea III è lontano dalla perfezione, ma rigettarlo in toto, a mio avviso, è un approccio completamente sbagliato e pericoloso, perché favorisce chi vorrebbe in Europa un ritorno della *deregulation* finanziaria.

Io credo che sia necessario capire che la crisi di oggi è, invece, proprio figlia di una deregolamentazione dei mercati finanziari che è iniziata negli anni Ottanta. L'UE guarda la pagliuzza, in questo caso, e non guarda la trave. Il problema delle nostre banche non è «Basilea sì o Basilea no», bensì una crisi del sistema che è stata «euro-indotta» e l'introduzione di nuove regole che sono state asimmetriche e distorsive e hanno danneggiato il nostro sistema bancario.

Credo che bastino tre piccoli passi per risanare il nostro sistema. Il primo passo deve consistere nello staccare la spina alla moneta unica, che sta causando una crisi senza fine all'interno del sistema dell'eurozona e quindi delle banche. Due: liberarsi della *banking union*. E tre: adottare una stringente regolamentazione che parta dalla separazione tra banche d'affari e banche commerciali.

Barbara Kappel, *im Namen der ENF-Fraktion*. – Herr Präsident, Herr Kommissar Dombrovskis! Wir diskutieren hier die Reform von Basel III eine Woche vor der entscheidenden Sitzung des Baseler Bankenausschusses in Chile. Zur selben Zeit will die neue US-Administration den *Dodd-Frank Act* abschaffen. Schon im Wahlkampf erklärte der designierte Präsident Trump, dass höhere Eigenkapitalvorschriften und verstärkte Aufsicht die Kreditvergabe der Banken einschränken. Und nach seinem Wahlsieg kündigte er nun an, „den *Dodd-Frank Act* auseinanderzunehmen und durch neue Vorschriften zu ersetzen, die Wirtschaftswachstum und die Schaffung von Arbeitsplätzen fördern“. Wirtschaftswachstum, die Schaffung von Arbeitsplätzen und Investitionen – das ist jetzt auch, was wir in Europa brauchen. Und dazu brauchen wir europäische Banken, die Unternehmen, Privatpersonen und die öffentliche Hand mit ausreichend Liquidität versorgen, das heißt, die entsprechenden Finanzierungen zur Verfügung stellen.

Mit dem nun im Baseler Bankenausschuss vorliegenden Entwurf der Eigenkapital- und Liquiditätsstandards werden wir genau das Gegenteil erreichen: Europäische Banken verlieren durch die neuen Basel-III-Regeln an Wettbewerbsfähigkeit und Ertragskraft, indem sie durch eine Standardisierung der internen Risikobewertung um 25 bis 30 % – was die Kleineren betrifft – und manche sogar um 50 % mehr Eigenkapital zur Kreditunterlegung brauchen. Diese vor allem von US-Seite angestrebte massive Erhöhung der Kapitalunterlegung von Banken könnte zu Kreditengpässen führen. Insbesondere Klein- und Mittelbetriebe sind davon betroffen, die wenig andere Finanzierungsformen haben. Aus diesem Grund ist es besonders wichtig, dass die Anwendung von internen Modellen zur Risikobewertung, mit denen Banken selbst ihre Risiken und damit ihren Kapitalbedarf berechnen dürfen, erhalten bleibt, auch wenn die US-Verhandler noch so sehr darauf drängen, einen *output floor* einzuführen.

Bendt Bendtsen (PPE). – Hr. formand! Først tak til kommissær Dombrovskis for at varetage europæiske interesser i forhold til Baselkomitéen. Baselkomitéen er ikke en demokratisk institution, og mange EU-lande er ikke repræsenteret. Baselkomitéen er fortid, slet ikke nutid og total udemokratisk! Vi bliver nødt til at rejse denne debat også. Jeg synes, det er bekymrende, og det betyder, at komitéens resultater ikke altid rammer plet over en bred kam og kan risikere at ramme nogle lande meget hårdere end andre helt uberettiget. Det er selvfølgelig vigtigt, at vi har ensartede vilkår globalt, og at vi sikrer, at bankerne er behørigt forberedt på kommende kriser, men vi skal altså være påpasselige i Europa med, at vi ikke bare danser efter den amerikanske pibe, når Baselkomitéens arbejde skal implementeres i EU. Vi er nødt til at tage højde for de forskellige europæiske bankmarkeder, og vi kan ikke arbejde med en model baseret på »one size fits all«. Hvis vi helt ukritisk skal acceptere en anden risikovurderingsmetode end den, vi har i dag, så gør vi os selv en bjørnetjeneste! Vi risikerer i sidste ende, at der skelnes meget mindre mellem sikre og mindre sikre lån. Det vil gøre det dyrere at låne, uanset om lånet er til et sikkert eller mindre sikkert formål. Vi skal huske på, at vi i Europa er særligt baserede på, at vore smv'er finansieres gennem bankerne, og vi skal ikke gøre det så dyrt at låne penge, at vi bremser væksten i Europa. Vi står altså i øjeblikket med Juncker-plan, hvor vi går ud og finansierer en masse små og mellemstore virksomheder, og så sidder der folk i Baselkomitéen, der vil gøre det modsatte, nemlig trække væksten ud af vore smv'er, mindske mulighederne for at smv'er i fremtiden kan låne penge, fordi de finansielle institutioner skal til at polstre sig selv. Det hænger simpelthen ikke sammen, og jeg har stor forhåbning til, at kommissær Dombrovskis kan varetage vore interesser i denne sag.

Cora van Nieuwenhuizen (ALDE). – In de tijd van de financiële crisis hebben we wereldwijd heel veel banken in de problemen zien komen en hebben we banken met belastinggeld moeten redden. Ook in mijn land hebben we dat moeten doen. Die situatie willen we natuurlijk nooit meer terug. Daarom is het ook heel goed dat de kapitaalvereisten voor die banken zijn verhoogd, want banken moeten gewoon zelf hun eigen broek kunnen ophouden.

Wat we nu echter zien bij het Bazels Comité is dat er standaarden worden neergelegd op internationaal niveau, waarbij iedereen op dezelfde manier behandeld wordt terwijl de situatie niet gelijk is. Want, dit is ook al door andere sprekers gezegd, ons bankwezen zit echt anders in elkaar dan bijvoorbeeld het Amerikaanse. Als je kijkt naar de situatie rondom de hypotheek bijvoorbeeld, dan is er bij ons in Nederland eigenlijk zelfs op het diepste van de crisis op de woningmarkt amper verlies geleden op de hypotheek. Het is dus ook niet logisch dat je die op eenzelfde manier behandelt als de hypotheek in Amerika, die daar voor veel problemen hebben gezorgd.

Ik ben er dus heel erg blij mee dat we als Parlement gezamenlijk een stevig signaal kunnen geven dat wij het niet willen zoals het Bazels Comité nu voorstelt, want onze ondernemers hebben het in de afgelopen jaren ontzettend moeilijk gehad om aan krediet te komen. Als we deze vereisten weer zouden gaan toepassen, dan komen ze van de regen in de drup. Wat ons betreft kan vicecommissaris Dombrovskis dus, om in voetbaltermen te spreken, met gestrekt been erin, in het Bazels Comité, om onze belangen te vertegenwoordigen en goed te behartigen.

Pervenche Berès (S&D). – Monsieur le Président, j'aimerais simplement rappeler l'ordre des interventions, parce que j'ai un collègue qui a été appelé et qui n'aurait pas dû l'être. Je ne voudrais donc pas perdre la minute de temps de parole dont je vais avoir besoin pour mon groupe.

Gunnar Hökmark (PPE). – Mr President, I would like to underline one thing that is important for the whole of this discussion: if you want to have a stable financial sector then you need to have a stable economy with growth and investments. You cannot look upon the financial sector as isolated from the economy as such. What we can see today is that an important part of the financial instability in the European Union is the lack of loans and investments, because that creates a vicious circle – decreasing investment, decreasing innovations, decreasing and undermined competitiveness, lower profits and increasingly non-performing loans and instability. Those things are linked together, and that is why we need to look upon the requirements for stability from the whole economy as such, and not only from one part of the economy. The financial economy is not decoupled from the rest of the economy, and in Europe banks are dominating regarding financing of SMEs but also financing on households and housing. They do a lot of different business, and that is why it is wrong to have the same sort of leverage rate for all sorts of banks. In the US, you have the banks that are one part of the financial sector, one part of the capital markets and may be focusing more on high-level business risks, while in Europe you have the whole perspective. That is why it is important to go further on regarding stability – to have the risk based approach but also to ensure that banks can lend money in order to secure that we can have growth in the economy. That is why, when we discuss Total Loss-absorbing Capacity (TLAC) we need to include it in the banking recovery resolution directive and the discussion about the MREL, and not to invent higher capital requirements but to secure that we have more stable banks and more stable growth in the economy.

Jonás Fernández (S&D). – Señor Presidente, en primer lugar, me gustaría agradecer el trabajo del ponente, de Roberto Gualtieri, en este informe para delimitar cómo aplicar Basilea, en unos días, en unas semanas previas a una reunión muy importante.

La verdad es que muchas veces discutimos sobre las reformas estructurales que tenemos pendientes en la economía europea y muy pocas veces hablamos de la necesidad de que esa reforma estructural afecte a la banca. Porque la banca sigue siendo un grave problema para la recuperación económica de la zona euro, del conjunto de Europa; sigue siendo un problema para que la política monetaria funcione; sigue siendo un problema para que los créditos baratos lleguen a los ciudadanos y a las pequeñas empresas, y es importante que en ese marco discutamos cómo aplicar las nuevas medidas de Basilea y cómo tomarlas en consideración y aplicarlas, como decía, a la regulación europea.

Porque es verdad que en los años previos a la crisis, el mundo entero y Europa avanzaron en un sistema de liberalización financiera que lo único que hizo fue abundar en el crecimiento de la deuda y conducirnos a la crisis de 2007-2010 de los últimos años. Por lo tanto, ahora tenemos que ser prudentes en la aplicación de esas medidas porque tenemos en juego la recuperación económica, la sanidad y la seguridad de los bancos y el futuro del empleo en Europa.

Nils Torvalds (ALDE). – Herr talman! En diskussion om Baselreglerna skulle egentligen förutsätta ett lite större deltagande också här i parlamentet och en större entusiasm inför uppgiften. Om vi ser på Baseltalens historia kan vi säga att de har återspeglat de illusioner politiker i olika skeden har haft kring bankverksamheten. Under krisen 2007-2008 fick vi göra en bitter erfarenhet, dvs. en stor del av den krisen uppstod egentligen på basis av de felaktiga regler Baselkommittén hade skrivit.

Av den orsaken är det av största vikt att vi lyckas skriva om dessa regler och faktiskt införa dem på ett sätt som gör att de fungerar. I fråga om detta är vi lite oroade över den situation som nu råder i Baselkommittén, dvs. att de europeiska bankerna inte förmår försvara sina intressen utan snarare flyger omkring som en flock sparvar. Det är ett oroväckande tecken, och vi hoppas därför att man inom kommissionen tar detta på allvar och ser till att vi får en enig bankfront som klarar av att slå vakt om de europeiska bankernas intressen.

Danuta Maria Hübner (PPE). – Mr President, I would like to refer to three issues which I consider crucial when it comes to Basel III. The first one is the comparability of internal models, and this is a precondition for proper supervision. Models must be comparable across the institutions supervised. So we must keep up the good work which is already done in this area – and it is not only about the work of the European Banking Authority (EBA) but also about the functioning of the Single Supervisory Mechanism (SSM), which takes us towards a common understanding of the assessment and the approval of models.

I believe that the use of internal models, in which there has been huge investment in recent years, enables information to be processed better and with a higher level of granularity than a standardised approach would permit. Given that these have been introduced only relatively recently, it is no surprise that we still need to figure out how to fine tune some concepts and rules. And, in this context, transparency on the process of granting authorisation to use internal models seems a key point.

The second issue is that of proportionality. I would be in favour of a wide definition of the term as a fair balance between the costs and benefits of a measure for each group of stakeholders, so that the new rules do not result in a disproportionate burden on some types of banks or some regions of the world.

The last issue is that of global standards. My belief is that, if we want to avoid global fragmentation, we should adhere to these closely, in particular when we regulate an activity such as finance, which is transnational and cross-border in nature. I can understand that some would want to depart from the global standards on certain points, when they are not suited to specific situations. But the best way is to act before tensions arise, and to try to influence the standard-making process at global level, and we are well represented in Basel, so we are equipped to do that if we speak with one voice.

Pedro Silva Pereira (S&D). – Senhor Presidente, Senhor Vice-Presidente Dombrovskis, as novas regras de supervisão bancária em desenvolvimento de Basileia 3, em especial sobre a metodologia de avaliação do risco de crédito, suscitam duas questões especialmente importantes.

A primeira é saber se estas novas exigências regulatórias correm ou não o risco de limitar ainda mais o fluxo de crédito disponível para as famílias e para as empresas e que salvaguardas vai a Comissão adotar para proteger uma economia que precisa de crédito para crescer.

A segunda questão é a da proporcionalidade, portanto saber como é que estas regras se vão adequar à diferente dimensão, nível de risco e modelo de negócio das várias instituições financeiras.

Que garantias pode a Comissão dar-nos de que o que é igual vai ser tratado como igual e o que é diferente vai ser tratado como proporcionalmente diferente.

Annie Schreijer-Pierik (PPE). – De agrarische sector en het midden- en kleinbedrijf hebben grote zorgen over de toekomstige kredietverlening van de Bazel IV-normen. Natuurlijk, financiële stabiliteit en een robuuste bankensector met voldoende eigen vermogen staan voorop, maar de vrees bestaat dat de voorgestelde regels ernstige gevolgen hebben voor deze reële economie.

Op dit moment verkeert de agrarische sector in Europa en in Nederland in een moeilijke periode, onder andere door de lage melkprijzen en de Russische boycot. De agrarische sector, vooral jonge boeren met veel eigen vermogen in de vorm van grond, moet vaak een nieuwe hypotheek afsluiten, onder andere om te kunnen voldoen aan dierenwelzijn, de nitraatrichtlijn en het klimaatakkoord. Daarom hebben zij een voortzetting van hun hypotheek nodig. De toekomst van veel boeren hangt af van de verlening van overgangskredieten. Datzelfde geldt ook voor onze bouwsector, die uit een diep dal komt. Burgers moeten een hypotheek kunnen blijven krijgen om een huis te kopen. Daarom mag ook de Europese Commissie niet aan de kant blijven staan. Er is een mogelijkheid om sleutelinstrumenten in te zetten, zoals het Junckerplan, en dit voorstel wordt ook gedaan in het verslag van Cees Veerman van de taskforce over de toekomst van de agrarische sector.

Voorzitter, tot slot: wat u van mijn betoog moet onthouden is dat we een kredietschaarste moeten voorkomen. De economische groei, de stimulering van de banenmarkt en het voortbestaan van een krachtige agrarische sector in Europa vragen hierom. Europa staat voor vrede, maar ook voor voldoende voedsel, voldoende krediet om voedsel te blijven produceren, onder meer door familie- en gezinsbedrijven. Wat is een leefbaar platteland zonder een gezonde boerenstand, met daarnaast natuurlijk een gezonde bank.

PRÉSIDENCE DE MME SYLVIE GUILLAUME

Vice-présidente

Neena Gill (S&D). – Madam President, the big challenge is how to kick-start economic growth and create new jobs. Banks are key players in achieving this goal by bolstering the EU economy. However, we have to ensure that banks are stable and well capitalised because they are fundamental to sustainable economic growth.

As co-legislator, Parliament needs to assess carefully the qualitative and the quantitative impact of these new reforms on the European economy, in particular the financing of infrastructure and real assets. Therefore we need to be mindful that we are not disadvantaging the European competitive position. But to do this we need to recognise that we must speak with one voice. Global developments in recent weeks mean there is a potential impact due to the result of the American elections. It is now unclear whether the US will stick to its commitments, and it may well be that Basel III/IV gets kicked into the long grass.

Vice-President Dombrovskis, in the committee a fortnight ago, you were clear in saying that anything that leads to significant increases in overall capital requirements on Europe's banking sector would be unacceptable to the Commission. Are you concerned about recent developments across the Atlantic, and about the potential implications for the finalisation of Basel III?

Paul Tang (S&D). – Wie het Global Financial Stability Report van het IMF leest, slaat de schrik toch wel om het hart. Europa heeft te veel banken, te veel zwakke banken en dan ook nog een paar te grote banken. Verder zijn er ook nog banken die worstelen met oninbare leningen. Er is geen reden voor Europese arrogantie of zelfgenoegzaamheid, integendeel haast. De weerstand vanuit de financiële sector is weinig verrassend en ook weinig overtuigend. In hun verhaal staan regels altijd groei in de weg. In hun verhaal is het aantrekken van extra kapitaal altijd een sta-in-de-weg. Maar laten wij wel wezen, een goed gereguleerde en goed gekapitaliseerde financiële sector is een voorwaarde voor economische groei.

Het is dan ook goed dat deze resolutie, met dank aan de rapporteur, een evenwichtig signaal uitzendt dat nadruk legt op de specifieke moeilijkheden die kunnen opduiken op de Europese markt, maar dat ook laat zien dat er robuuste interne modellen moeten zijn en dat banken ook voldoende gekapitaliseerd moeten zijn. Het is nog te vaak gebeurd dat banken wel dividenden hebben uitgekeerd maar niet hun kapitaal op orde hadden, met Deutsche Bank als duidelijk voorbeeld. Zij hebben nog zo'n 5 miljard aan dividenden uitgekeerd sinds 2008. Ik ben dus blij met deze discussie, blij dat in deze zaal het belangrijke werk van Bazel openlijk wordt besproken, maar laten we niet arrogant of zelfgenoegzaam zijn.

Jeppe Kofod (S&D). – Madam President, Commissioner, the financial crisis has shown us that there is an acute need to make our banks and finance institutions more robust to serve the real economy, investment and jobs – and not only in Europe but also globally. However, it is also very important that we have a risk-based approach to regulation, with the same rules being applied to the same risk, and the way we look at the Basel Committee and its recommendations is also very important in Europe.

As you know, Commissioner, many countries are not members of the Basel Committee, and there are also ways of financing our economy that have proved to be very strong, even during the financial crisis. I would point to covered bonds – I come from Denmark and I see that some of the proposals put forward would hurt ordinary families with a mortgage loan which proved to be very robust during the financial crisis, or small and medium-sized enterprises that finance their businesses by mortgage loans, by covered bonds – and also to systems where we see consumer rights at the core.

Such approaches give consumers transparency, supervision and affordability. It is essential that we keep that in Europe, so we need to regulate to make loans from risky banks more robust, but we also need to ensure that the system works well for the people, and that our economy is being protected so we can protect our competitiveness. I hope the Commission is well aware of that.

Sergio Gaetano Cofferati (S&D). – Signora Presidente, signor Commissario, onorevoli colleghi, io credo che il comitato di Basilea debba agire prioritariamente per affrontare e risolvere quelle che a me sembrano le difficoltà maggiori che oggi condizionano il settore delle banche.

Come lei sa, le banche sono e resteranno il soggetto principale per gli investimenti anche nel tempo a venire, sia quelli che riguardano le imprese, sia quelli che riguardano le famiglie. Lo stato di sottocapitalizzazione di alcune di esse e i rischi che ne sono conseguiti, ma anche i comportamenti sleali nei confronti degli investitori, hanno creato un clima negativo che porta moltissime persone ad essere seriamente preoccupate e dunque ad avere un rapporto non lineare e non trasparente con le banche.

Credo che sia molto importante affrontare questa priorità e nel contempo dare regole altrettanto nette al sistema bancario ombra: qualsiasi forma di alterazione nella competizione è un danno oggettivo, da un lato per l'economia e dall'altra parte per gli investitori.

Bernd Lucke (ECR). – Frau Präsidentin! Was das Europäische Parlament hier im Begriff ist zu tun, ist ausgesprochen gefährlich. Es ist ein hohes Risiko, das wir eingehen, wenn wir hier eingreifen in den Basel-Prozess auf der Seite derer, die der Auffassung sind, wir müssen die Kapitalanforderungen an die Banken nicht weiter erhöhen. Es ist ausgesprochen gefährlich, wenn wir den Banken nach wie vor den Freiraum einräumen, mit ihren internen Modellen die Risikoabschätzung vorzunehmen und damit ihre Kapitalerfordernisse kleinzurechnen.

Wir haben eine schwere Finanzkrise hinter uns, und diese Finanzkrise kam dadurch zustande, dass die Kapitalausstattungen der Banken zu gering und die Risikoeinschätzungen falsch gewesen sind. Und ich wundere mich, wenn ich jetzt hier diese Debatte höre, wo ein Redner nach dem anderen praktisch immer wieder dasselbe sagt, nämlich, wir würden unsere Wirtschaft abwürgen und ich weiß nicht was alles. Wir würgen unsere Wirtschaft dann ab, wenn wir eine neue Finanzkrise produzieren, wenn wir eine neue Finanzkrise riskieren dadurch, dass wir jetzt schon wieder in der notwendigen Regulierung des Finanzsystems nachlassen.

Nein, meine Damen und Herren, wir brauchen erheblich höhere Kapitalerfordernisse bei den Banken, erheblich höhere Kapitalquoten. Wir müssen wegkommen von diesen internen Modellen. Wir müssen auf Standardmodelle übergehen, damit die Risikoabschätzung richtig ist. Das ist die Aufgabe der Zeit!

Bernard Monot (ENF). – Madame la Présidente, Monsieur le commissaire, les règles prudentielles que l'Union européenne a imposées à la suite des recommandations du Comité de Bâle ont contribué à responsabiliser les banques. C'est très bien. Mais rajouter sans cesse des contraintes supplémentaires obligerait les banques européennes à prêter moins ou plus cher.

Face aux banques américaines moins encadrées par la régulation financière, la concurrence deviendra inégale. Elle le sera d'autant plus que Donald Trump a clairement annoncé vouloir alléger la réglementation prudentielle sur les banques américaines.

Que doit être le but d'une réglementation? Il doit à la fois protéger les épargnants et assurer la stabilité du système. Mais les banques continuent de spéculer. Le système bancaire parallèle s'envole, les effets de levier et la volatilité sont à nouveau préoccupants. Pour atteindre ces objectifs de protection et de stabilité financière, il faut supprimer le *bail-in* de l'union bancaire et assurer une véritable séparation bancaire en coupant en deux les activités de marché à risque, les activités de dépôt et de crédit. C'est tout le contraire de ce que fait l'Union européenne.

C'est pourquoi les peuples ont besoin et veulent une reprise en main du financement de leur économie par des politiques de patriotisme économique.

Interventions à la demande

Othmar Karas (PPE). – Frau Präsidentin, Herr Kommissar! Ich verstehe die Aufregung nicht ganz.

Auf der einen Seite erwarten wir einen Vorschlag der Kommission zur Vertiefung von Basel III. Hier muss als Schwerpunkt die Frage der Proportionalität gesehen werden, sowohl die Definition als auch die Auswirkungen der Definition auf die Realwirtschaft und auf der anderen Seite die Verlängerung des KMU-Faktors, sowohl was den Zeitrahmen als was auch die Höhe der Summe betrifft.

Auf der anderen Seite haben wir Basel, wo wir auf Basel IV warten und es noch keine Einigung gibt, weil es zu Recht Meinungsverschiedenheiten vor allem zwischen der Europäischen Union und den Amerikanern gibt. Hier ist es goldrichtig, dass das Europäische Parlament die Stimme erhebt, weil Basel kein Gesetzgeber ist. Die Ausgangslage ist unterschiedlich. In Amerika betrifft die Regelung 15 Banken, die international tätig sind, und bei uns im Regelfall mehr als 8 000 Banken.

Daher haben wir dafür Sorge zu tragen, dass diese Unterschiede berücksichtigt werden, dass die unterschiedlichen Geschäftsmodelle berücksichtigt werden und dass es eine Auswirkungsstudie gibt, bevor wir etwas beschließen.

Nicola Caputo (S&D). – Signora Presidente, onorevoli colleghi, l'attuale congiuntura economica impone di ristabilire adeguate disponibilità di credito nel sistema impresa e un maggior presidio sulla qualità del credito da parte delle banche. Basilea III deve innanzitutto avviare un ripensamento del rapporto banca-impresa: l'industria finanziaria deve infatti supportare maggiormente il sistema produttivo nell'accesso al mercato dei capitali e nell'assistenza all'individuazione di nuove forme di capitalizzazione, garantendo nel contempo stabilità finanziaria.

In questo contesto il ruolo della Commissione può e deve essere da traino nel garantire condizioni concorrenziali di parità, nel calibrare le norme finali e nel gestire l'eventuale aumento dei requisiti patrimoniali bancari. Il recepimento delle nuove normative, infatti, se non effettuato in modo strutturato e coordinato, potrebbe tradursi in un innalzamento medio del costo dei finanziamenti alle imprese, reinnescando la spirale negativa degli ultimi anni.

Νότις Μαρίας (ECR). – Κυρία Πρόεδρε, η διασφάλιση της σταθερότητας και της αποτελεσματικότητας του χρηματοπιστωτικού συστήματος είναι πρώτιστης σημασίας για την οικονομική και κοινωνική ευημερία. Η αναθεώρηση των τυποποιημένων προσεγγίσεων για τον πιστωτικό κίνδυνο μπορεί να οδηγήσει σε αύξηση των κεφαλαιακών απαιτήσεων, με αποτέλεσμα να καταστήσει δυσκολότερη τη δυνατότητα των τραπεζών να χορηγούν δάνεια σε επιχειρήσεις και νοικοκυριά.

Υπολογίζεται ότι η πλήρης εφαρμογή του πλαισίου της Βασιλείας III το 2019 αναμένεται να επιφέρει στις ευρωπαϊκές τράπεζες αυξημένες κεφαλαιακές απαιτήσεις πέραν των 550 δισεκατομμυρίων ευρώ. Δεδομένης της ήδη υπάρχουσας χρηματοπιστωτικής αστάθειας, η Επιτροπή θα πρέπει να διασφαλίσει ότι οποιαδήποτε ενδεχόμενη αύξηση κεφαλαιακών απαιτήσεων δεν θα έχει αρνητική επίδραση στη δανειοδοτική ικανότητα των τραπεζών. Τα χρηματοπιστωτικά ιδρύματα πρέπει να έχουν τη δυνατότητα να χορηγούν ρευστότητα για ανάπτυξη και δημιουργία θέσεων εργασίας, ιδίως στις μικρομεσαίες επιχειρήσεις που αποτελούν τη ραχοκοκαλιά της ευρωπαϊκής οικονομίας.

(Fin des interventions à la demande)

Valdis Dombrovskis, Vice-President of the Commission. – Madam President, I would like to thank the Parliament for the useful elements and suggestions which have been provided during the debate. Banks' capital requirements need to balance prudential aims with our jobs and growth agenda. Today's debate has clearly shown the extent to which this matters to the EU institutions, and I am pleased to see that there is agreement on many key issues. We are committed to implementing these Basel standards in a way that makes sense for the EU. The Commission will continue to work on the issue with a view to growing solid and evidence-based policy recommendations and will carefully consider all the ideas which emerge from the discussions in our future work.

La Présidente. – J'ai reçu, conformément à l'article 128, paragraphe 5, du règlement une proposition de résolution¹.

Le débat est clos.

Le vote aura lieu mercredi, le 23 novembre 2016.

(La séance est suspendue pour quelques instants)

¹ Voir procès-verbal

15. Europejska Unia Obrony (krótka prezentacja)

La Présidente. – L'ordre du jour appelle le rapport de Urmas Paet sur l'Union européenne de la défense (2016/2052(INI)) (A8-0316/2016).

Urmas Paet, rapporteur. – Madam President, the state of European security has grown increasingly fragile. The surge of instability and unpredictability around the Union borders is a reality and a cause of concern to all European citizens. In order to defend itself and increase its security, the European Union must do more and must be consistent. Our Union is not equipped to face overwhelming defence challenges. For almost 30 years, the majority of the Member States applied cuts in their defence budgets, leading to smaller armed forces. Cooperation among Member States is occasional, and Europe continues to rely heavily on NATO capabilities and on US solidarity.

Many Member States have called, over the past year, for effective and increased cooperation on defence. Let us be clear: the momentum to move towards a working European defence policy is here. Tomorrow, Parliament is voting on the European Defence Union report. As rapporteur, my main recommendations included the goal for EU countries to spend 2% of their GDP on defence, helping to finance infrastructure in Member States at the Union's eastern border, and establishing a military Schengen area.

The role of NATO has been, is and will continue to be paramount. There is also no reason to say that EU defence cooperation is weakening NATO. This is simply not true. On the contrary, for years NATO has wished to see the EU as a partner complementing it.

There are several issues on which the EU could improve its security cooperation internally as well as with NATO. At the moment, movement of the allies' defence forces personnel is troublesome, bureaucratic and time consuming. The EU must create a system to change this reality: in other words, the so-called military Schengen should be established. We can talk endlessly about increasing the efficiency of defence costs – and that is necessary – but in order to reach a certain level of quality we need also quantity. The EU Member States must set themselves the goal of spending 2% of their GDP on defence, as the NATO countries have done. This would give a clear signal of the joint positions of the EU and NATO. In order to carry out the EU defence policy we must contribute additionally from our common EU budget. The right way to do this will be through the EU's Multiannual Financial Framework.

The EU can financially support, for example, the placement of international NATO battalions in the EU Member States by backing the building of necessary infrastructure such as roads, barracks and other facilities. At the moment, most of this burden falls on a few specific Member States who, due to their geopolitical location, need an increased NATO presence. At the same time, the increased presence serves as a protection for all the EU and NATO countries.

The EU must also gear up the defence research programme and start developing a common European policy on capabilities and armament. We need to strengthen the industrial and technological base of our defence sector in order to decrease dependency on third parties. The practical steps also require a political framework in order to ensure sufficient political attention. Therefore, it would be reasonable to create the position of European Commissioner for Defence and to set up regular meetings of the EU defence ministers. Furthermore, it is necessary to establish the headquarters for the EU military operations.

The Member States that are ready to undertake more binding commitments could set up permanent structured cooperation arrangements so that it would be possible to establish multinational forces. An option would be to further develop the EU battle group system. And, lastly, Europe can and must enable a real defence dimension without further delay. The Union must become proactive, especially in the security field.

Interventions à la demande

Michael Gahler (PPE). – Frau Präsidentin! Vielen Dank insbesondere an unseren Berichterstatter Urmars Paet für seinen Bericht. Wir brauchten in der Tat nicht erst den Weckruf der amerikanischen Präsidentenwahl, um uns mit den Herausforderungen im Bereich Sicherheits- und Verteidigungspolitik zu beschäftigen. Letztlich ist seit Inkrafttreten des Lissabon-Vertrags eine neue Möglichkeit geschaffen, die Zusammenarbeit deutlich zu verstärken. Die ständige strukturierte Zusammenarbeit muss jetzt von den Mitgliedstaaten angegangen werden, und wir als Parlament haben das seit Langem unterstützt. Ich unterstütze insbesondere auch die Überlegungen, die der Berichterstatter angestellt hat, zum Beispiel zum Thema *battle groups*, oder auch – was ich für wichtig halte – zur künftigen Finanzierung unserer Aktivitäten. Da brauchen wir eine grundlegende Reform des Athener Mechanismus. Wir können nicht wie bisher weitermachen, dass weiter das Konzept *costs lie where they fall* gilt. Das müssen wir auch gemeinschaftlich angehen.

Tonino Picula (S&D). – Gospođo predsjednice, ovaj izvještaj doprinosi traženju djelotvornijih odgovora Europske unije u području obrane. Naš svijet postaje sve nestabilniji, nesigurniji i nepredvidljiviji. Moramo na rastuće izazove odgovoriti jer su ugroženi ne samo naš integritet nego i naše vrijednosti. Da bi to postigli, zemlje članice moraju bliže surađivati.

Sigurnost i obrana ne smiju ostati najslabije karike europskih integracija. Trebamo slušati građane. Njih dvije trećine želi veću suradnju. Neuspjeh da građanima omogućimo sigurnost dovest će do daljnjeg udaljavanja od europskog projekta i okretanja nacionalnim sigurnosnim rješenjima.

Europska obrambena unija nije paralelna struktura NATO-u. Ona će se razvijati u potpunoj koordinaciji s NATO-om kao našim primarnim partnerom i stupom europske obrane. Izvješće to naglašava. Pozivam vas da ga podržimo jer Europski parlament mora biti uključen u proces koji je odmakao u ostalim institucijama. Izvješćem bi poslali snažnu poruku o temi koja je postala prvorazredno političko pitanje i kriterij kojim građani ocjenjuju vjerodostojnost europskog projekta.

Ruža Tomašić (ECR). – Gospođo predsjednice, Europa teško odgovara na sigurnosne izazove koje pred nas stavljaju ova turbulentna vremena u kojima živimo. Činjenica je da većina država članica premalo izdvaja za obranu i da su vremena kada je Europa bila sigurna, bez prevelikog izdvajanja za vojsku, daleko iza nas. No povratak rješenjima starima više od šezdeset godina neće nam donijeti sigurnost. Ono što se pedesetih godina prošlog stoljeća zvalo Europska obrambena zajednica sad se naziva Europskom obrambenom unijom. Nije zaživjelo ni onda, a neće ni sada. A nema ni potrebe da zaživi.

Temelj obrane Europe i naše civilizacije općenito je NATO. I njemu se moramo više posvetiti. Nakon predsjedničkih izbora u SAD-u postalo je jasno da će doći do redefinicije odnosa unutar NATO-a i Europa tu mora pokazati spremnost za dijalog s Amerikom i ostalim ključnim partnerima te odlučnost da predvodi obranu zapadne civilizacije i njezinih vrijednosti.

Jasenko Selimovic (ALDE). – Madam President, in recent years the security situation in and around Europe has significantly worsened and has created challenges that no single country or organisation is able to face alone. These challenges therefore require the EU to act together with our allies.

However, our current efforts to build the European Defence Union must also take into account the impact and constraints of the EU relationship with NATO. Twenty-two European Member States belong to both the EU and NATO and we do have common values, historically shared by both institutions. I firmly believe that an increase in European military capability, which I support, must be conducted in cooperation with NATO: not as a supplement to NATO but as a complement to it. Europe must focus energy and resources on fixing those tasks that NATO cannot do and is not equipped to do. That way, we will create both the security needed and the ability to deal with new tasks.

Javier Couso Permuy (GUE/NGL). – Señora Presidenta, este informe ahonda en dos errores: se centra en la dimensión securitaria y en la perspectiva militarista, es decir, busca soluciones a la seguridad obviando un enfoque holístico que combata las asimetrías económicas, culturales y sociales. Así, no hay más seguridad.

Además, propone el despliegue militar en el exterior, algo peligroso viendo la actitud agresiva que la Unión Europea y algunos Estados mantienen con nuestra vecindad oriental y mediterránea. Además, pide un aumento del gasto armamentístico, algo obsceno cuando esta Unión Europea de la desigualdad impone recortes draconianos en salud, educación y servicios.

Y, como colofón, amparándose en una supuesta Unión Europea de la defensa propone reforzar la labor de la OTAN: es una contradicción evidente. Nosotros queremos una defensa que busque la paz y no a mayor gloria de los designios agresivos o las cuentas de resultados de las empresas de armamento.

Reinhard Bütikofer (Verts/ALE). – Frau Präsidentin! Dass die EU mehr für ihre eigene Sicherheit tun muss, steht außer Zweifel. Aber zu dem Bericht und der Strategie, die da vorgeschlagen wird, habe ich Fragen:

Wie viel mehr Effizienz schafft es, wenn wir die Rüstungsausgaben auf zwei Prozent anheben? Derzeit gibt die EU dreimal so viel für Rüstung aus wie Russland, aber wir haben deutlich weniger Fähigkeiten. Geht es um mehr Geld oder geht es um mehr Effizienz?

Zweitens: Wieso trägt es zur Sicherheit bei, wenn wir mit einem Verteidigungs-Schengen Zonen unterschiedlicher Sicherheit in der EU schaffen?

Drittens: Wieso soll die EU durch Präsenz – militärische Präsenz – im Osten bestimmte Begrenzungen, die die NATO für sich aus guten Gründen vorgenommen hat, über den Haufen werfen?

Und viertens: Wieso wollen wir mehr Geld für den Haushalt, ohne klarzustellen, dass der Rüstungshaushalt nicht in die Forschungsinvestitionen der EU hineinfressen darf?

Jean-Luc Schaffhauser (ENF). – Madame la Présidente, la défense européenne n'a aucun sens si elle ne s'appuie pas sur l'indépendance de l'Europe et sa politique propre extérieure.

Indépendance veut dire autonomie et souveraineté. Pour le moment, il n'y avait qu'un seul pays qui se situait dans cette politique en Europe, c'était la France, et la Russie.

Vouloir aligner la politique européenne sur celle de l'OTAN signifie vouloir partager une politique agressive et insensée qui nous a conduits là où nous sommes. D'ailleurs, cette politique a changé. Il faudrait donc que, nous aussi, nous changions. Il n'est pas sérieux de ne pas vouloir une Europe indépendante et souveraine et dans ce cas-là, il n'y a qu'un seul pays qui continue à vouloir cette indépendance et cette souveraineté, c'est mon pays.

Je tiens à dire que jamais, dans la construction européenne, nous ne sommes arrivés à partager un tel objectif. C'est l'échec de la défense européenne pour raison d'alignement sur la politique otanienne.

Γεώργιος Επιτήδειος (NI). – Κυρία Πρόεδρε, η άμυνα και η ασφάλεια είναι δύο σημαντικοί παράγοντες για την επιβίωση και την ευημερία μιας χώρας. Υπό την έννοια αυτή είναι εύλογη η συζήτηση που κάνουμε για τη δημιουργία μιας Ευρωπαϊκής Αμυντικής Ενώσεως. Όμως, η έκθεση κινείται προς εντελώς εσφαλμένη κατεύθυνση.

Την ανάγκη για συλλογική άμυνα της Ευρωπαϊκής Ενώσεως την καλύπτει το NATO. Τα περισσότερα κράτη της Ενώσεως είναι και μέλη του NATO και διαθέτουν δυνάμεις σε αυτό. Η Ευρωπαϊκή Ένωση δεν αντιμετωπίζει κίνδυνο επιθέσεως από κάποια μεγάλη και ισχυρή στρατιωτική δύναμη, ούτως ώστε να αυξήσει υπέρμετρα τις αμυντικές της δυνατότητες.

Από την άλλη πλευρά, δεν νοείται να γίνει η Ευρωπαϊκή Ένωση χωροφύλακας της περιοχής και να εισβάλει, όπως αναφέρεται στην έκθεση, με δυνάμεις στα γειτονικά κράτη. Την ασφάλεια κάθε χώρας την αναλαμβάνουν οι εθνικοί στρατοί της χώρας, οι οποίοι εξοπλίζονται και οργανώνονται, ενώ οι χώρες διαθέτουν αμυντικές δαπάνες ανάλογα με τις υποχρεώσεις και τις ανάγκες που έχουν. Η πατρίδα μου, η Ελλάδα, δέχεται απειλές από την Τουρκία και σας πληροφορώ ότι διαθέτει περισσότερο από το 2% του ΑΕΠ για τις αμυντικές δαπάνες.

Stanislav Polčák (PPE). – Já jsem opačného názoru než můj předřečník i než někteří moji kolegové. Jsem přesvědčený, že EU musí zaručit svým občanům pocit bezpečí, že nemůžeme resignovat na tuto základní hodnotu. Souhlasím s panem zpravodajem i z mé politické frakce, že zabezpečení právě obranné politiky je jedna z těch základních úloh EU, která třeba není úplně jasně popsána v primárním právu, ale měli bychom se o to snažit.

Já vnímám tyto síly a složky jako komplementární k tomu, co vykonává NATO, a je naší zodpovědností nejen zapojit EP, jak se o tom zde hovořilo, do tvorby této politiky, ale především volat k odpovědnosti i členské státy EU, protože ony by měly zabezpečit minimálně alespoň ten finanční rámec, který dlouhodobě mnohé státy nesplňují. Dvě procenta do obrany nevěnuje ani má země a já to vnímám jako náš dluh vůči společné obraně. EU na ni nesmí resignovat.

Maria Grapini (S&D). – Doamnă președintă, în calitate de raportor alternativ din partea Grupului S&D la Comisia pentru piața internă, am sugerat comisiei de fond câteva lucruri din perspectiva Comisiei pentru piața internă și protecția consumatorilor. Am luat în calcul situația fragmentării pieței din industria apărării și, evident, ne-am gând și la problemele pe care le întâmpină IMM-urile în accesarea unor contracte în această industrie care asigură, de fapt, o mai bună apărare. Am solicitat comisiei să evalueze dacă obiectivele Directivei 2009/81 privind atribuirea unor contracte în domeniul securității și apărării au fost atinse și să ia măsurile necesare în scopul unei posibile adaptării a acesteia la nevoile reale ale pieței din domeniul apărării.

De asemenea, am sugerat și am încurajat comisia pentru consolidarea cercetării prin finanțarea în sectorul apărării. Este necesar pentru că suntem îngrijorați de scăderea bugetului pentru cercetare și inovare în acest domeniu. Și, sigur, ne gândim la decalajul de competențe care poate apărea datorită forței de muncă îmbătrânite și încurajăm tinerii să meargă în acest domeniu pentru a asigura o mai bună apărare a Uniunii Europene.

Νότης Μαριάς (ECR). – Κυρία Πρόεδρε, η προσπάθεια φυγής προς τα εμπρός που επιχειρούν οι κυρίαρχοι κύκλοι της Ευρωπαϊκής Ένωσης συνεχίζεται παρά το Brexit. Είναι εμφανής πλέον η καταστρατήγηση των διατάξεων των Συνθηκών με στόχο να δρομολογηθεί ένας ευρωστρατός.

Τα αποτελέσματα των εκλογών στις ΗΠΑ, που καθιστούν αβέβαιο το μέλλον του ίδιου του NATO, και οι ανησυχίες κάποιων κρατών μελών σχετικά με τη συνέχιση των επεμβατικών τους σχεδίων στη Μέση Ανατολή και στην Αφρική οδηγούν σε αποφάσεις οι οποίες δεν έχουν καμιά δημοκρατική δικαιοδοσία.

Ο υπό ίδρυση ευρωστρατός δεν πρόκειται να προστατεύσει τα ελληνικά σύνορα από τις επιθετικές ενέργειες της Τουρκίας και θα ακολουθήσει την πεπατημένη του NATO που παριστάνει τον Πόντιο Πιλάτο στις τουρκικές απειλές έναντι της Ελλάδος. Ο τομέας της άμυνας είναι τομέας αρμοδιότητας των εθνικών αρχών. Ο ελληνικός λαός δεν θα αποδεχθεί τα τελεσίγραφα και τις πολιτικές κανονιοφόρων που επιχειρούν να επιβάλουν οι Βρυξέλλες και το Βερολίνο.

João Pimenta Lopes (GUE/NGL). – Senhora Presidente, este relatório não nos traz novidades, apenas confirma o cariz militarista e bélico da União Europeia. As justificações são as de sempre: a insegurança em solo europeu ou a pretensa luta contra o terrorismo, sem qualquer referência ao absoluto falhanço das políticas de integração ou ao que foram e são as responsabilidades da União Europeia nas agressões a países do norte da África e Médio Oriente, bem como na promoção, financiamento, treino e armamento de grupos extremistas.

Tão-pouco faltam as supostas ameaças de leste para justificar o cerco à Federação Russa. A subserviência à NATO e aos seus objetivos, como o aumento para 2 % do PIB dos orçamentos militares dos Estados-Membros e o reforço do financiamento para investigação militar e para a indústria militar em solo europeu, não esconde as pretensões de ter na UE um grande bloco militar, com capacidades operacionais próprias, nomeadamente por via de um exército europeu.

Quem faz a guerra e alimenta a sua indústria não quer nem defende a paz.

Κωνσταντίνος Παπαδάκης (NI). – Κυρία Πρόεδρε, η δημιουργία Ευρωπαϊκής Αμυντικής Ένωσης με ευρωστρατηγείο, ευρωστρατό, πολυεθνικά τμήματα του NATO, αποστολές στρατευμάτων, στη βάση της παγκόσμιας στρατηγικής της Ευρωπαϊκής Ένωσης, συνιστούν πολύ επικίνδυνη εξέλιξη για τους λαούς.

Το στρατιωτικό Σένγκεν, όπως το αποκαλείτε, συνιστά μια επικίνδυνη εξέλιξη, γιατί αποτελεί πολεμική προετοιμασία της Ευρωπαϊκής Ένωσης με ταυτόχρονη ενίσχυση της συμπληρωματικότητας με το NATO. Εκφράζεται έτσι η επιθετικότητα και οι ανταγωνισμοί των μονοπωλίων.

Στα κριτήρια του σχεδιαζόμενου Ευρωπαϊκού Εξαμήνου Άμυνας και της Λευκής Βίβλου για την άμυνα η ελληνική κυβέρνηση έχει σπεύσει ήδη να ανταποκριθεί και με το παραπάνω. Χωμένη μέχρι τα μπούνια στα ιμπεριαλιστικά σχέδια λαμβάνει ήδη επαίνους από τις Ηνωμένες Πολιτείες, το NATO και την Ευρωπαϊκή Ένωση για τους εξοπλισμούς της, που ξεπερνούν το 2% του ΑΕΠ, και διαθέτει τη βάση της Σούδας ως αναβαθμισμένο ορμητήριο των νέων ιμπεριαλιστικών πολέμων.

Οι λαοί δεν πρέπει να χύσουν το αίμα τους για τα συμφέροντα των ιμπεριαλιστών. Πρέπει να δυναμώσουν την πάλη τους ενάντια στους ιμπεριαλιστικούς πολέμους και στις επεμβάσεις της Ευρωπαϊκής Ένωσης και του NATO, ενάντια στα βρώμικα σχέδιά τους.

Marek Jurek (ECR). – Europa potrzebuje dzisiaj elementarnej solidarności, a nie armii europejskiej, no bo w końcu o to chodzi. Przewodniczący Juncker powiedział parę dni temu, że chodzi po prostu utworzenie armii europejskiej. Przecież po to, żeby każdy z naszych krajów wydawał po dwa procent dochodu narodowego na swoją obronę, my nie musimy tworzyć wspólnej armii. Przecież po to, żeby w ramach polityki sankcji, traktując sankcje serio, zatrzymać budowę Nord Stream 2, my nie potrzebujemy żadnej wspólnej armii. Nawet po to, żeby na forum Przymierza Atlantyckiego udzielić większej obrony państwom bałtyckim, my nie potrzebujemy do tego stworzyć wspólnego wojska.

Tak naprawdę można tworzyć nowe instytucje wtedy, kiedy rośnie nasza solidarność. Dzisiaj nie ma na to dowodów, co więcej mamy do czynienia w Unii Europejskiej z nieodpowiedzialną władzą, która wywołała kryzys migracyjny. Nie daje się nowych instrumentów tym, którzy nie wiedzą, co zrobić z tą władzą, którą dzisiaj dysponują.

Maria Lidia Senra Rodríguez (GUE/NGL). – Senhora Presidente, Senhor Vice-Presidente, não é pela via da militarização nem das medidas repressivas que haverá mais segurança na Europa. Com um aumento da despesa militar pretendem reforçar uma aparato repressivo e militar para defender os interesses das corporações transnacionais, das empresas de segurança e de armamento e também para continuar a impor as políticas neoliberais que concentram ainda mais riqueza nos já mais ricos e continuam a despojar as classes populares dos seus direitos e do direito a uma vida digna e também os pobres dos seus recursos naturais, dos bens comuns e do direito ao desenvolvimento.

Contra o aumento da despesa militar e as políticas repressivas, contra a União Europeia da defesa, queremos mais educação pública e mais saúde pública para todas e para todos em todo o mundo. Queremos que devolvam aos povos o direito de decidir, de trabalhar e de se desenvolver com base nos seus recursos, em harmonia com a conservação do meio ambiente.

(Fin des interventions à la demande)

Valdis Dombrovskis, Vice-President of the Commission. – Madam President, as you know on 14 November the High Representative, Vice-President Mogherini, presented to foreign and defence ministers the implementation plan on security and defence. This is part of the wider package, together with the Commission's European Defence Action Plan and concrete proposals for the implementation of a joint declaration on EU/NATO cooperation, signed in Warsaw.

The adoption of the related Council conclusions last Monday is a major step forward for the EU, as it opens a new chapter for all the security and defence efforts in the union. A stronger Europe is what we need now more than ever, in view of the unprecedented security challenges we are facing. This is what our citizens and our partners expect from us.

I would like to welcome Mr Urmas Paet's report on the European Defence Union. Our views coincide in most of the areas, and the report addresses many critical issues that we have been working on in the security and defence implementation plan for the EU global strategy. The objective is to define our security and defence strategic priorities and to see how common security and defence policy, being part of wider EU efforts, can contribute to tackling today's and tomorrow's multifaceted security challenges, as European citizens demand.

From this point of view, I am also grateful to Mr Paet for drawing political attention to priority policy areas and issues that need the Member States' and the European Parliament's support. I would like to mention in particular capacity building on security and development, permanent structured cooperation, deployability of the battle groups and the strengthening of the defence industry. Mr Paet's report is a useful asset to our future work and to thinking ahead on how and in what direction should we move in policy issues and also in terms of structures if and when Member States decide that the time has come for a European Defence Union.

The three strategic priorities drawn from global strategy are clear: responding to crisis, building capacities of partners, and protecting the Union and its citizens. It is around these three strategic priorities that the Council has defined a new, comprehensive level of ambition for the EU and identified a number of actions to be undertaken in order to implement this level of a mission.

Let me mention some of them: setting military and civilian capacity deployment development priorities; deepening defence cooperation, including setting up a coordinated annual review on defence; exploring the possibility of permanent structured cooperation; adjusting European External Action Service structures to improve our planning and conduct capability for Common Security Defence Policy missions and operations; strengthening the EU rapid response toolbox; looking into financing in the area of security and defence, including revision of internal mechanism.

I would like to underline a few key principles on which there was broader agreement. First, the Common Security and Defence Policy (CSDP) remains an important instrument for external action. Second, cooperation with our partners is essential, but the EU needs to be able to act autonomously when necessary. And third, collective defence is NATO's task so ensure full complementarity here. Particularly appreciated is the report's reference to improving our structures for planning, conduct and situational awareness. In the short-term we will address the gaps we have in the operational planning and conduct for non-executive military options. We will present a proposal as soon as possible on this. It is important to know that we are not creating big new structures, but addressing shortcomings or streamlining the present components.

We welcome the report's strong statements about the need for a fair functioning and transparent internal market and for the Commission's involvement in supporting defence research. We share the report's statement that the current fragmentation of the market represents a weakness for the competitiveness of the European defence industry. So the European Defence Action Plan will set out proposals to strengthen the internal market, support the competitiveness of Europe's industry and foster cooperation.

The Council last week encouraged the Commission to support the Member States in implementing the identified capacity priorities, notably through the Action Plan. In particular, the Action Plan will propose ways to ensure an effective implementation of the two defence directives: procurement and transfers. We also welcome the strong support the Parliament has given to launching and providing a significant budget for preparatory action for defence research to be launched next year with a view to a substantial future defence research program under the next multiannual financial framework.

We think the main message is that today's complex security challenges can only be tackled together. Therefore, we need a shared vision, a strategic framework and common actions. Cooperation in the field of security and defence is a must.

La Présidente. – Le point est clos.

Le vote aura lieu le mercredi 23 novembre 2016.

Declarations écrites (article 162)

Ivo Belet (PPE), schriftelijk. – Het is met de komst van Trump almaar duidelijker dat we voor onze veiligheid niet meer automatisch zullen kunnen rekenen op de steun van de V.S. We staan stilaan voor het moment waarop we werk moeten maken van een opgedreven inzet en coördinatie van onze politie- en militaire diensten om de terreurdreiging doeltreffend te bekampen en onze buitengrenzen efficiënt te bewaken. Bilaterale samenwerkingsprojecten moeten de opstap worden naar programma's waarbij we de defensie-inspanningen Europees nog veel meer coördineren. De Belgisch-Nederlandse vernieuwing van de defensievloot geeft al het goede voorbeeld.

De EU-28 geven elk jaar 195 miljard euro uit aan defensie. Als we die uitgaven beter op elkaar afstemmen, kunnen we tot 26 miljard euro besparen en dus verstandiger inzetten. De *battle groups* moeten evolueren naar permanente multinationale korpsen onder één Europees commando. Die moeten niet alleen voor operaties met betrekking tot vredeshandhaving worden ingezet, maar binnen de NAVO één blok vormen dat kan optreden als de NAVO dat niet wil of kan. Europa is nog steeds een vredesproject en lost conflicten in de eerste plaats op aan de onderhandelingstafel. In grimmige tijden moeten we echter een duidelijk signaal geven dat we klaarstaan om als één blok op te treden. *Don't mess with Europe.*

Marian-Jean Marinescu (PPE), *în scris*. – UE trebuie să acționeze urgent pentru a-și consolida atât securitatea internă, cât și apărarea externă în contextul problemelor legate de imigrație, terorism și noua administrație a SUA. Cetățenii europeni au nevoie de o concretizare a acțiunilor europene printr-o revizuire substanțială a Politicii de Securitate și Apărare Comune pentru a permite UE să acționeze acolo unde NATO nu o face.

Consider că, în cadrul următorului summit UE din decembrie, care va aborda consolidarea cooperării UE în materie de securitate externă și de apărare, trebuie să se țină cont de viitoarea strategie europeană spațială.

UE trebuie să devină o putere spațială reală, iar tehnologia joacă un rol-cheie deoarece condiționează accesul la spațiu și la competitivitate. Suntem încă foarte dependenți de surse de bază non-europene atunci când este vorba de tehnologiile spațiale primordiale. Pentru moment, nu putem spune că Europa este o „putere spațială”. Pentru moment, accesul european la tehnologiile spațiale primordiale este asigurat dacă există acordul autorităților americane.

De aceea, viitoarea Politică de Securitate și Apărare Comună trebuie să fie mai eficace și mai vizibilă, cu atât mai mult cu cât capacitățile spațiale au devenit o parte esențială a politicilor de securitate și apărare ale statelor membre și, prin urmare, a suveranității lor.

Csaba Molnár (S&D), *írásban*. – Nincs az rendben, hogy az európai állampolgár nem érzi magát biztonságban az EU-n belül. Az orosz agresszió, a terrorfenyegettség, a közös uniós határőrizet és az európai hadsereg hiánya erősítik ezt az érzést. Nem ördögtől való ötlet ezért az, hogy ha az EU-nak van központi költségvetése, közös külpolitikája – és a sor még hosszan folytatható –, akkor uniós katonák védjék külső határainkat, feleljenek az európai állampolgárok biztonságáért. A sokkoló Brexit-szavazás, illetve az Észak-Atlanti Katonai Szövetség súlyának csökkentése csak felerősíti ezt az európai védelmi közösség igényét. Ideje, hogy Európa felelősséget vállaljon saját biztonságáért.

Közös uniós hadsereggel, európai katonai főhadiszállással, gyorsreagálású nemzetközi hadtestekkel, védelmi miniszterekből álló védelmi tanács megalakításával Európa sokkal magabiztosabb nagyhatalom lehet. A közös hadsereggel meg tudjuk mutatni az agresszív szomszédos hatalmaknak, mint amilyen Putyin Oroszországa is az elmúlt években, hogy komolyan gondoljuk az uniós értékek és határok védelmét. Ha van uniós hadsereg, két dolgot kőbe vésünk: az EU hangja sokkal erősebb lesz a nemzetközi szinten, illetve soha nem törhet ki háború európai nemzetek között.

Tibor Szanyi (S&D), *írásban*. – Az Európai Védelmi Unió létrehozásának politikai és katonai szükségszerűségét az új típusú biztonsági kihívások mellett az EU évek óta romló biztonsági környezete, a déli és keleti szomszédságunkban jelentkező fenyegetés teremtette meg. Támogatom a gyors uniós döntéshozatalt ennek érdekében, hiszen az európai védelmi autonómia kialakításának fő értelme az EU-tagállamok biztonságáért való felelősségvállalás, főleg a putyini Oroszország gátlástalan és – az ukrajnai agresszió példáján okulva – nem alaptalan fenyegetései tükrében.

A szükséges politikai akarat kialakításában fontos az EP szerepe, mert az uniós szolidaritás érvényesülésében a védelem terén sem lehet kizárólag a tagállami kormányokra számítani. A szolidaritás egyirányú, önző felfogása, a saját védelmi képességek elhanyagolása ugyanis eddig sem akadályozta meg egyes országok vezetőit abban, hogy szövetségeseik védelmi garanciáit adottnak tekintsék.

Van olyan tagállam is – például az Orbán-rezsim által uralt Magyarország –, ahol a meglévő honvédelmi kapacitásokat az EU értékeivel ellentétes, antidemokratikus belpolitikai célok érdekében (tömegkontrollra, rendészeti feladatokra, határzár építésére) vetik be. Holott az Európai Védelmi Uniótól közös európai értékeink védelmét, valamint az Unió, mint a demokrácia és az emberi jogok nemzetközi zászlóvivője tekintélyének megőrzését is várjuk. Ezért szorgalmazom, hogy már a Védelmi Unió előkészítési szakaszában megfelelő politikai és jogi garanciákat építsünk be a rendszerbe az ilyen „potyautas” tagállami magatartás megelőzése érdekében.

Jarosław Wałęsa (PPE), in writing. – Madam President, the EU security environment is deteriorating considerably, which coincides paradoxically with flagging defence investments in the Union. That is why I welcome Mr Urmas Paet's report on the European Defence Union (EDU), whose establishment is indeed a matter of urgency. I strongly agree with the report that the Lisbon Treaty provides already a solid basis for the EDU. One of the remarkable examples of that is Article 42(6) on permanent structured cooperation which has never been used. Therefore, I am very glad that the report calls finally for the creation of a permanent council of defence ministers. In addition, it is important that the report brings to life Article 41(3) on creating the military start-up fund. It does so through establishing a preparatory action for a future EU defence research programme. This can become a first crucial step in overcoming the obstacles among Member States regarding the collective procurement of defence resources which should be at level of 35%, according to the European Defence Agency benchmark. Consequently, I hope that this time Member States will take their obligations seriously and a fully-fledged EDU will become a reality sooner rather than later.

16. Uwolnienie potencjału pasażerskiego transportu wodnego (krótka prezentacja)

La Présidente. – L'ordre du jour appelle le rapport de Keith Taylor, au nom de la commission des transports et du tourisme, sur l'exploitation du potentiel du transport de voyageurs par voie d'eau (2015/2350(INI)) (A8-0306/2016).

Michael Cramer, stellvertretender Berichterstatter. – Frau Präsidentin, meine sehr geehrten Damen und Herren! Keith Taylor ist in dieser Woche leider nicht hier, weil er im Krankenhaus ist, und er bat mich, den Bericht an seiner Stelle hier vorzustellen.

Es geht eben um den Personentransport auf Binnenwasserstraßen und auch im Seeverkehr. Dieser Bericht umfasst sowohl die Fährdienste als auch Kreuzfahrten, sowohl im Seeverkehr wie auch in der Binnenschifffahrt. Es ist uns gelungen, dass diese Themen höher auf die Agenda der EU-Verkehrspolitik gesetzt worden sind, und dafür möchte sich Herr Keith Taylor bei allen Schattenberichterstattern recht herzlich für die gute Unterstützung bedanken.

Natürlich spielt die Nachhaltigkeit auch hier eine große Rolle. Es gibt natürlich nichtfossile erneuerbare Energiequellen. Es gibt zum Beispiel eine Fähre, eine *Zero-Emission-Fähre* auf der Ostsee und viele andere Sachen. Nach Paris und Marrakesch müssen wir eben die Schiffe auch in diese Zielsetzung einbeziehen. Das betrifft insbesondere den Schwefelausstoß, und wir sind froh, dass die IMO jetzt entschieden hat, dass der Schwefel weltweit auf 0,5 % gesenkt werden soll. In der EU sind wir in den nördlichen Gebieten bei 0,1 %, und das geht alles in die richtige Richtung.

Der Verkehrstransport auf dem Wasser soll natürlich auch die externen Kosten minimieren und die externen Kosten internalisieren, aber das gilt ja nicht nur für die Wasserwege, sondern für alle Transportarten, denn wir haben zwischen den unterschiedlichen Arten des Transports einen unfairen Wettbewerb: einmal zulasten der umweltfreundlichen Transportarten, und das sind die Wasserwege und die Eisenbahn, und zugunsten der klimaschädlichen Transportarten, das ist die Straße und der Flugverkehr.

In dem Bericht wird auch viel auf die Sicherheit geachtet: durch bessere Qualifikation und Ausbildung und durch das Training des Personals. All das soll gestärkt werden und die Kriterien der IMO, das sind Minimal Kriterien, die sollte die EU zumindest beachten, sie können aber auch verstärkt werden.

Die Qualität und die Zugänglichkeit bei Fähr- und Kreuzfahrtdiensten muss optimiert werden, insbesondere müssen alle Menschen mit Behinderungen die Möglichkeit haben, diese Schiffe auch zu betreten. Dort darf es keine Diskriminierung der Behinderten geben.

Das ist alles ganz wichtig. Abschließend möchte sich Herr Taylor noch einmal bei den Schattenberichterstatterinnen und Schattenberichterstattern recht herzlich für die gute Unterstützung und die gute Zusammenarbeit bedanken.

IN THE CHAIR: ANNELI JÄÄTTEENMÄKI

Vice-President

Catch-the-eye procedure

Stanislav Polčák (PPE). – Já chci podpořit důležitost vodní dopravy i z ohledu na specifické téma, kterým je propojení dopravy Dunaj-Odra-Labe.

Je to jeden ze segmentů, který zůstává zatím ladem. Je to bohatství jak ČR, tak Polska a zemí, které navazují na tuto vodní dopravní stezku. Myslím si, že bychom měli tyto projekty posoudit i z evropského hlediska a motivovat tyto země, aby k tomuto dopravnímu propojení došlo.

Tím jsem se vyjádřil pouze k jedné části té vodní dopravy a její důležitosti z hlediska ekonomiky, ale ona není důležitá pouze z hlediska ekonomických výsledků. Ona je důležitá i z hlediska naší bezpečnosti, protože umožňuje větší modalitu dopravních propojení a za druhé, umožňuje např. přivést vodu i do těch částí, kde dnes již pociťují nedostatek těchto vodních zdrojů.

Je to velmi široký problém a já děkuji za předložení této zprávy panu zpravodaji a jeho zástupci.

Juan Fernando López Aguilar (S&D). – Señora Presidenta, participé hace escasas semanas en la Conferencia de Regiones Periféricas Marítimas, que tuvo lugar en las islas Azores, y ahí tuve la oportunidad de exponer la importancia que tienen para las regiones ultraperiféricas la conectividad y la accesibilidad, que son cruciales para la competitividad, los tres grandes ejes de expresión y realización de la política europea para con las regiones ultraperiféricas. Pero también para poner de manifiesto que la consignación presupuestaria del Mecanismo «Conectar Europa» destinado a las regiones ultraperiféricas se ha agotado ya en su 86 % y, por tanto, que es imprescindible incrementar esa partida presupuestaria, precisamente para mejorar la inserción de las regiones ultraperiféricas en el mercado interior europeo y para así compensar ese déficit de competitividad que afecta a regiones alejadas, a regiones fragmentadas, a regiones insulares, en relación con la conectividad. Y por el transporte marítimo de las regiones ultraperiféricas, que, además del aéreo, es absolutamente crucial para sostener su modelo de vida, basculante sobre el comercio, sobre los servicios y, sobre todo, sobre el turismo.

Νότης Μαρίας (ECR). – Κυρία Πρόεδρε, το 75% των εμπορικών συναλλαγών της Ευρώπης με τρίτες χώρες καθώς και το 40% των εμπορευματικών συναλλαγών εντός της Ευρώπης πραγματοποιούνται δια θαλάσσης, ενώ παράλληλα κάθε χρόνο περίπου 400 εκατομμύρια άτομα στην Ευρώπη χρησιμοποιούν πλωτά μεταφορικά μέσα.

Υπάρχουν πολλά μέρη στην Ευρώπη όπου η μετακίνηση με πορθμεία θα ήταν βιωσιμότερη, ευκολότερη και ταχύτερη αυξάνοντας την κοινωνική και οικονομική ζωή στην εκάστοτε περιοχή. Επιπλέον, η αύξηση των θαλάσσιων μεταφορών θα μπορούσε να παράσχει ζωτικής σημασίας υπηρεσίες στις απομακρυσμένες κοινότητες και περιοχές, συμβάλλοντας έτσι στην αναζωογόνηση του τουριστικού δυναμικού.

Η Ευρωπαϊκή Ένωση, λοιπόν, πρέπει να ενισχύσει τις θαλάσσιες μεταφορές, προκειμένου οι κάτοικοι των νησιωτικών περιοχών και ιδίως των νησιών του Αιγαίου, τα οποία πλήττονται συνεχώς από τις προσφυγικές ροές, να έχουν συνεχή πρόσβαση στην ενδοχώρα. Πρέπει, λοιπόν, να λάβουμε σημαντικά μέτρα.

João Ferreira (GUE/NGL). – Senhora Presidente, o desenvolvimento do transporte através de vias navegáveis marítimas e fluviais comporta benefícios potenciais, económicos e ambientais, em termos de mobilidade de passageiros e mercadorias. O desenvolvimento deste meio de transporte pode constituir um fator indutor da coesão territorial, social e económica, além de contribuir para reduzir as emissões de gases de efeito de estufa.

Nos últimos anos, o desinvestimento nos equipamentos e infraestruturas e a precarização laboral neste setor colocou em causa muitos serviços. Ora, a operacionalidade deste modo de transporte requer a adequação das condições naturais e das infraestruturas, o que exige investimento. Desde logo, investimento público, a estimular, orientar e enquadrar o investimento privado.

Do nosso ponto de vista, a solução não passa por privatizações, por desregulamentação, ou mais parcerias público-privado, mas sim por uma forte intervenção e protagonismo públicos, como condição imprescindível para a materialização dos benefícios potenciais deste meio de transporte e para a resolução dos problemas e dificuldades existentes.

Tomáš Zdechovský (PPE). – Já jsem se osobní vodní dopravě věnoval minulý rok ve zprávě výboru CONT. Zde bylo konstatováno Evropským účetním dvorem, že nedochází dlouhodobě k velmi pozitivnímu nárůstu jak nákladní, tak osobní vodní dopravy z důvodu toho, že řada států investuje peníze pouze na dílčích oprav některých přístavů, ale nesnaží se rozšířit splavnění řek a toků.

Zde musíme upozornit, že na vnitrostátní lodní dopravě je obrovským problémem také sucho. Řada řek se potýká s tím, že není dostatečně splavná po celý rok, a to může vést k obrovským ekonomickým problémům právě rejdařů a různých skupin, které podnikají v tomto odvětví. Proto bych chtěl vyzvat Komisi, aby se tímto problémem dlouhodoběji zabývala ve své strategii.

Ruža Tomašić (ECR). – Gospođo predsjednice, hrvatski dio Jadrana broji oko sedamsto otoka te petstotinjak otočica i grebena. Pedesetak je hrvatskih otoka naseljeno. I sama živim na otoku Korčuli, drugom po broju stanovnika u hrvatskom priobalju, i mogu potvrditi kako je loša prometna povezanost s kopnom jedan od glavnih razloga ekonomskog i demografskog odumiranja otoka.

Stoga posebno podupirem izvjestitelja u isticanju važnosti trajektnih i ostalih brodskih linija za otoke i njihove stanovnike. Slažem se s njim kako je povezanost otoka s područjima u kojima se ostvaruje gospodarski i industrijski rast ključna za teritorijalnu, socijalnu i gospodarsku koheziju. Bolja prometna povezanost otoka s kopnom smanjila bi ovisnost otočke ekonomije o turizmu i ribarstvu te osigurala stalniji izvor prihoda građanima, ali i jedinicama lokalne samouprave koje bi potom mogle dodatno uložiti u infrastrukturu.

(End of catch-the-eye procedure)

Valdis Dombrovskis, Vice-President of the Commission. – Madam President, on behalf of the Commission and, in particular, my colleague Commissioner Bulc, I would like to welcome this initiative.

This report is indeed timely. We are convinced it will give further momentum to our maritime year 2017. The issues the report raises are very much the ones we want to work on. We want to ensure safe, secure and sustainable maritime transport that serves the internal market, connects Europe globally and keeps the EU maritime cluster competitive. Waterborne passenger transport is part of this story with the role it plays in people's daily lives, for their leisure and for the employment it provides to many Europeans. So we welcome the fact that the report looks into passenger transport and leisure activities.

However, in some cases there are differences that should be recognised, for example, when it comes to financial assistance to transport operators linked to public service obligations, which is not generally available to cruise services. Regarding environmental aspects, limits on the sulphur content of shipping emissions were included in EU legislation in 2012 with effect from 1 January 2015. The International Maritime Organisation recently confirmed the global sulphur cap, as of 2020, in line with EU legislation.

In 2013 the Commission set up the European Sustainable Shipping Forum, bringing together stakeholders to facilitate the implementation of environmental legislation in the maritime sector. In this framework a Green Shipping Guarantee Programme was developed and launched by the Commission in cooperation with the European Investment Bank this year. This programme is aimed at providing guarantees to accelerate investments in clean maritime technologies and to help the industry to go beyond the current EU environmental legislation. A first framework agreement with national financial institutions was recently signed, to be followed by others later this year. The total financial envelope of EUR 750 million approved for the Green Shipping Guarantee Programme is provided by the Connecting Europe Facility and the European Fund for Strategic Investment.

Clean and sustainable shipping will be further promoted with the effective implementation of the directive on the development of alternative fuels infrastructure, ensuring the necessary standardisation and setting up of the basic fuel supply infrastructure between 2025 with EU financial support. The European Maritime Safety Agency will assist with the drafting of technical guidance to port authorities and administrations for liquefied natural gas bunkering. The TEN-T guidelines and their main financing instrument, the Connecting Europe Facility, supports the promotion of green shipping. In this context, over EUR 185 million were allocated in 2014 and 2015 for studies, pilot actions and infrastructure projects to support new technologies and innovation in processes. With regard to transport provided by ferries, integration with other means of transport, including integrated ticketing, is indeed important and, through the ITS Directive, technical and functional specifications are being developed. This will include timetables, as well as information, for passengers with reduced mobility.

The Commission notes Parliament's interest in extending passenger rights to multimodal journeys, in line with the principles enshrined in the current passenger rights regulations, among others the Waterborne Passengers' Rights Regulation. The Commission is currently looking into possible initiatives in this field. In May 2016 the Commission submitted its report on the operation of the Waterborne Passengers' Rights Regulation. Stakeholders and national authorities expressed their satisfaction with the regulation, but also agreed that further coordinated action, such as information campaigns to inform citizens about their rights, and cooperation between authorities to ensure the uniform application of the regulation, is needed to improve the regulation's effectiveness.

The Commission welcomes the interest of Parliament in the question of the international governance of inland waterway transport. This issue is relevant both for passenger and freight transport and, in the context of the Commission's NAIADES II programme, important steps of streamlining and regulatory convergence have already been taken through the creation, in the framework of the CCNR, of the European Committee for drawing up standards in the field of inland navigation. The Commission would also support the call to have more statistical data on passenger numbers, but it must be underlined that Eurostat can only collect data on the basis of legislation. Harmonised rules for accident statistics exist and a detailed report is published every year. Unfortunately this is not the case for inland waterways.

Finally, the Commission fully agrees that ports play an important role in the performance of waterborne passenger transport and has already, since 2013, proposed a comprehensive ports policy. This includes measures to improve the efficiency of ports. We therefore count on your vote in favour of the Ports Regulation, which the Council and Commission expect to go to the plenary without much delay. We also count on your support in promoting good use of the EU's instruments for finance and investments, notably the Connecting Europe Facility and EFSI.

The Commission believes that ports cannot develop in isolation from their neighbourhoods and thus encourages initiatives that improve the relationship between ports and port cities. Let me also use this opportunity to thank Parliament for its support in relation to issues on securing our external sea borders and the decisions on European coastguard cooperation.

President. – The debate is closed.

The vote will take place on Tuesday, 22 November 2016.

Written statements (Rule 162)

Isabella Adinolfi (EFDD), per iscritto. – Sappiamo bene che il sistema di trasporto marittimo italiano ha bisogno di essere migliorato in alcuni aspetti e nella relazione che andremo a votare viene proposto di incentivare la competitività e di migliorare le infrastrutture. Inoltre, si pone una speciale attenzione alla sostenibilità ambientale, promuovendo il rispetto degli obiettivi della COP 21 e incentivando la decarbonizzazione dei trasporti. Ritengo che l'aspetto ambientale rappresenti un tema molto importante e delicato a cui è necessario porre molta attenzione.

Andor Deli (PPE), írásban. – A vízi közlekedés alapvető szerepet játszik az Európai Unió különböző régióinak összekapcsolásában, egy környezetbarát és energiatékonyabb módon történő közlekedésben, melyben az új, innovatív technológiák, mint a nap- és szélenergia alkalmazása is teret kaphat. Kiemelném, hogy a vízi személyszállítás terén rendelkezésre álló kapacitások jobb kihasználása nemcsak hogy segítheti a közúti forgalmi torlódások és a CO₂-kibocsátás csökkentését, de javítja a levegő minőségét, és összességében jobb közlekedési szolgáltatásokat biztosít. Egy olyan közlekedési forma fejlődhet ki, amely a turizmus fellendülését a vízi útvonal mentén. Ezáltal egy kevésbé ismert régió gazdaságának fellendüléséhez, új munkahelyek kialakulásához, kisvállalatok megalakításához is hozzájárulhat. Számomra igen fontos, hogy a belföldi hajójáratokon szállított utasok többsége olyan

hajókon utazzon, amelyek megfelelnek a közös uniós biztonsági normáknak. Ehhez szükséges a személyzet számára a megfelelő, Európa-szerte elfogadott képzés. Pozitívként tekintek a jelentés fontosságára, és szavazatommal támogatni fogom.

Patricija Šulin (PPE), pisno. – Tako za nas, ki ladijske storitve uporabljamo predvsem za počitniške namene, še bolj pa za tiste, ki so dnevno odvisni od njih, je pomembna razpoložljivost in dobra povezanost ladijskih storitev z drugimi transportnimi povezami.

Pomembna je ustrezna vključenost ladijskega potniškega prometa v projektih, ki spodbujajo prometno multimodalnost, kot je integrirani evropski sistem izdaje vozovnic oz. vseevropska prometna omrežja in instrument za povezovanje Evrope. Pozdravljam poročilo, ki opozarja na vrsto potrebnih sprememb v ladijskem potniškem prometu, s katerimi bi povečali njegovo uporabo s številnimi pozitivnimi posledicami kot je manjša gneča na cestah.

Claudia Țapardel (S&D), în scris. – Succesul politicilor europene de transport va depinde în mare măsură de felul în care Uniunea Europeană va reuși să redirecționeze fluxurile de transport pe toate modulele existente, precum și de calitatea serviciilor oferite. Pe fondul unei cereri aflate în creștere, dar și în contextul unei preocupări din ce în ce mai mari pentru reducerea emisiilor, transportul pe apă poate fi soluția unui transport sustenabil și sigur, care să dea un nou impetus dezvoltării economice în zonele riverane și de coastă.

Pe aceste considerente, statele membre și Comisia ar trebui să acorde o mai mare atenție transportului de pasageri pe apă, începând cu reabilitarea infrastructurii necesare și terminând cu o pregătire riguroasă a personalului din acest sector. O mai bună utilizare a acestui mod ar avea efecte semnificative asupra conectivității, mai ales în zonele izolate, și ar contribui, totodată, la dezvoltarea industriei turismului, oferind un acces îmbunătățit la destinațiile turistice europene.

Se impune, astfel, ca executivul european să intensifice colaborarea cu statele membre în vederea atragerii de fonduri europene, cu precădere a celor destinate IMM-urilor și politicilor de coeziune, pentru a elabora o strategie de transport corespunzătoare nevoilor fiecărei regiuni, dar și în raport cu prioritățile rețelei TEN-T.

17. Zwiększanie skuteczności współpracy na rzecz rozwoju (krótka prezentacja)

President. – The next item is the report by Cristian Dan Preda, on behalf of the Committee on Development, on increasing the effectiveness of development cooperation (2016/2139(INI)) (A8-0322/2016).

Cristian Dan Preda, rapporteur. – Madame la Présidente, je suis très content que notre Parlement vote demain le texte que j'ai initié et rédigé au sein de la commission du développement. Nous aurons ainsi la possibilité de présenter notre position avant la réunion de haut niveau du partenariat mondial pour une coopération au développement efficace, qui se tiendra la semaine prochaine à Nairobi. Cette réunion revêt une importance cruciale pour la thématique de l'efficacité du développement puisqu'il s'agit de la première réunion de ce type après l'adoption de l'Agenda 2030.

Pour nous, il est capital que l'Union européenne adopte une position forte à Nairobi en insistant avec détermination sur la nécessité de bâtir sur l'acquis en matière d'efficacité du développement et de renforcer les cas de coopération existants.

Les quatre principes de l'efficacité du développement, à savoir l'appropriation des stratégies de développement, l'orientation vers les résultats, le partenariat inclusif, la transparence et la redevabilité réciproque sont, en effet, comme le reconnaît le projet de document final de Nairobi, les forces motrices pour la réalisation des objectifs de développement durable (ODD).

C'est maintenant qu'il faut agir pour rendre notre coopération au développement aussi efficace que possible pour atteindre ces objectifs ambitieux et utiliser au mieux les ressources publiques et privées pour le développement.

Même si elle est particulièrement adaptée à certains contextes, l'aide officielle au développement ne peut pas tout faire, surtout dans le contexte économique actuel. Elle doit compléter les efforts des pays visant à mobiliser les ressources nationales et aider à catalyser des investissements privés et des ressources publiques supplémentaires. Néanmoins, nous devons tout de même insister sur le respect de l'engagement d'allouer 0,7 % du PIB au développement – et nous en sommes encore loin – ainsi que sur des efforts supplémentaires s'agissant de la qualité de l'aide fournie. Sur des questions comme le déliement de l'aide ou l'alignement avec les priorités des pays, on doit accélérer le progrès.

Puisque nous parlons de la mobilisation des ressources pour le développement, je dois en particulier souligner le rôle du secteur privé. Je crois que celui-ci est un important partenaire pour atteindre les ODD et, comme les autres acteurs du développement d'ailleurs, il doit s'engager à s'aligner sur le principe de l'efficacité du développement.

Au-delà du secteur privé, la réunion de Nairobi doit aussi être une occasion de réaffirmer l'importance de l'inclusivité et des partenariats avec tous les acteurs pour atteindre les ODD. Nous avons besoin de synergies entre les divers acteurs du développement pour y arriver et réaliser tout le potentiel de ces partenariats. Le partenariat global pour une coopération au développement efficace a un rôle important à jouer à cet égard. Il est essentiel de le renforcer, y compris en termes de suivi, pour qu'il soit bien positionné dans l'architecture globale en vue de la mise en œuvre de l'Agenda 2030.

L'Union européenne, qui a été un des pionniers de l'efficacité de l'aide au développement, doit continuer à jouer un rôle de leader sur ces questions ainsi que sur la participation de la société civile, des parlements nationaux et des autres parties prenantes, la coopération Sud-Sud, l'égalité des genres et la responsabilisation des femmes.

La responsabilité pour des résultats en matière de développement est certes partagée et, avec l'Agenda 2030, nous avons une exigence supplémentaire qui résulte de la philosophie d'ensemble de ne laisser personne en retrait.

Enfin, il y a toute une réflexion, que nous avons développée dans ce rapport, qui me semble absente du projet de document final de Nairobi. Je pense qu'il faut insister sur ce point. L'efficacité du développement ne peut pas être garantie sans la paix, le respect des droits de l'homme et de l'état de droit. Nous plaidons donc pour un soutien accru à l'amélioration de la transparence, de la bonne gouvernance et de l'état de droit dans les pays en développement. Ils sont aussi essentiels pour atteindre les ODD que les autres prescriptions plus techniques de l'agenda global pour l'efficacité du développement.

Catch-the-eye procedure

Bogdan Brunon Wenta (PPE). – Pani Przewodnicząca! Na wstępie chciałbym pogratulować koledze Predzie świetnego sprawozdania, w którym temat podniesienia skuteczności współpracy na rzecz rozwoju został potraktowany z uwzględnieniem jego kompleksowości i wielowymiarowości. Dyskutujemy o tym sprawozdaniu – o czym zresztą sprawozdawca wspominał – dokładnie na tydzień przed spotkaniem globalnego partnerstwa na rzecz skutecznej współpracy rozwojowej, którego celem jest podsumowanie i ewaluacja realizacji zasad uzgodnionych w Busanie. Istotne jest doprecyzowanie programu działań pod kątem wdrażania celów zrównoważonego rozwoju, które powinny być w centrum ram współpracy, a także postanowień z Addis Abeby dotyczących jej finansowania.

Należy podkreślić potrzebę konkretnych i wymiernych skutków polityki rozwojowej, ponieważ ważna jest nie tylko ilość wsparcia, ale również sposób, w jaki go udzielamy, i na co tę pomoc przeznaczamy. W związku z tym zaangażowanie i wola polityczna władz krajów beneficjentów, a także włączenie w ten proces podmiotów lokalnych i społeczeństwa obywatelskiego ma szczególne znaczenie.

Victor Negrescu (S&D). – Doamnă președintă, Uniunea Europeană este principalul donator mondial, cu aproape 55 % din fondurile alocate la nivel mondial. Cu toate acestea, întâmpinăm o serie de dificultăți: fie că vorbim de problema impactului pe termen mediu și lung a fondurilor de asistență pentru dezvoltare, fie că vorbim de insuficiența proiectelor comune între statele membre, fie că vorbim de finanțarea, uneori, a aceluși proiecte de către mai multe state membre sau din mai multe linii bugetare.

Toate aceste probleme, însă, pot fi rezolvate cu o serie de soluții concrete. Pentru creșterea eficienței fondurilor de asistență pentru dezvoltare trebuie să reglementăm alocarea asistenței la nivel european. Trebuie să dezvoltăm programe complete de monitorizare și sprijinire a beneficiarilor atât pe parcursul proiectelor, cât și după terminarea acestora. Trebuie să creștem transparența în alocarea și cheltuirea fondurilor, dar trebuie, în același timp, să realizăm un sistem public de raportare a finanțărilor și a proiectelor europene. Pentru că, în definitiv, ceea ce trebuie făcut este să găsim maniera prin care putem coordona toate proiectele dezvoltate de Uniunea Europeană și de statele membre.

Problema eficienței poate fi rezolvată dacă ne dorim acest lucru și luptăm în acest sens.

Νότης Μαρτιάς (ECR). – Κυρία Πρόεδρε, το θεματολόγιο του ΟΗΕ για το 2030 αποτελεί μια φιλόδοξη δέσμη δεκαεπτά στόχων για τη βιώσιμη ανάπτυξη και την εξάλειψη της φτώχειας. Η αποτελεσματικότερη παροχή βοήθειας και η αναπτυξιακή συνεργασία παραμένουν παράγοντες κείρας σημασίας για την καταπολέμηση της ανεργίας και την ενδυνάμωση των τοπικών κοινοτήτων.

Η πολιτική που εφαρμόζει η Ευρωπαϊκή Ένωση τα τελευταία χρόνια κάθε άλλο παρά βοηθά τα κράτη μέλη της στην επίτευξη αυτών των σκοπών. Η μερκελική λιτότητα και η επιβολή μνημονίων στην Ελλάδα έχουν αυξήσει την ανεργία, έχουν δημιουργήσει στρατιές ανέργων, έχουν αυξήσει τα ποσοστά της φτώχειας και του κοινωνικού αποκλεισμού. Στα χρόνια της μνημονιακής κρίσης το ποσοστό των νοικοκυριών που ζει στην Ελλάδα σε συνθήκες απόλυτης φτώχειας διπλασιάστηκε το 2015 και έφτασε πάνω από το 22%.

Εάν η Ευρωπαϊκή Ένωση επιθυμεί όντως να επιτύχει τους στόχους του θεματολογίου του 2030 θα πρέπει να εγκαταλείψει την πολιτική της λιτότητας, την πολιτική που πλήττει την ανάπτυξη, και να συμβάλει ουσιαστικά στη διαγραφή του δημοσίου χρέους τόσο στις χώρες της ευρωπαϊκής περιφέρειας όσο και στις υπό ανάπτυξη χώρες.

Csaba Sógor (PPE). – Elnök Asszony, jelenleg a világ fejlesztési segélyeinek több mint a felét az EU és tagállamai biztosítják. A fejlesztési politikák sikeressége azonban a nemzetközi fejlesztési együttműködés, valamint a fenntartható fejlődéssel kapcsolatos együttműködés hatékonyságától függ. Látnunk kell, hogy a nemzetközi mechanizmusok, bár komoly elkötelezettséget jelentenek, s nagyon sok esetben az egyetlen segítséget jelentik egy adott helyzetben, csak nagyon korlátozott eredményeket tudnak felmutatni. A globális egyenlőtlenségek lassú csökkenése nem tudja ellensúlyozni a környezeti változásokat, a vízhiány problémáját, s a részben ezekből fakadó migrációt, a robbanásszerű népességnövekedés egyes következményeit. A fejlett világ csak a jelenleginél határozottabb és ambiciózusabb fejlesztési politikával, továbbá a nemzetközi kereskedelmi mechanizmusok korrekciójával tudja alátámasztani, hogy elkötelezett a célok elérése mellett.

Anna Záborská (PPE) – Prílev migrantov z Afriky do Talianska, ktorý neslabne ani v zlom počasí, je asi najkritickejší svedectvom o nás ako poskytovateľoch rozvojovej pomoci, ale aj o vládach rozvojových štátov, ktoré sú jej oficiálnymi prijímateľmi. Preto som veľmi rada, že sa v tomto Parlamente pravidelne snažíme priebežne kontrolovať a vyhodnocovať účinnosť vynaložených prostriedkov, upozorňujeme na nedostatky pri aplikácii dohodnutých pravidiel a navrhujeme zlepšenia. Zároveň ma však mrzí, že ani Slovensko, ktorého občanov tu zastupujem, ani ďalších 22 členských štátov EÚ nedokázalo prispieť na rozvojovú pomoc toľko, koľko sa zaviazali. Akoby sme nechápali, že každé krátenie týchto prostriedkov sa nám vráti v podobe rastúcich výdavkov na ochranu hraníc a záchranu ľudských životov.

João Ferreira (GUE/NGL). – Senhora Presidente, a discussão sobre a eficácia da ajuda ao desenvolvimento é recorrente neste Parlamento, uma discussão que não está isenta de alguma hipocrisia. É que, ao mesmo tempo que alguns aqui desfiam um rol de extensas preocupações, fazem por esquecer que são as políticas que aqui são decididas o que, em larga medida, entrava as possibilidades de desenvolvimento dos países menos desenvolvidos, da desregulação e liberalização do comércio internacional à libertina circulação de capitais, de que os paraísos fiscais são um instrumento privilegiado, passando pelas políticas agrícolas, de pescas, entre outros exemplos.

A coberto destas preocupações, o que alguns querem é, na verdade, impor aos países em desenvolvimento modelos de organização política, económica e social, a sacrossanta economia de mercado, erígida em panaceia para todos os males a humanidade, o papel do setor privado, a abertura dos mercados à concorrência mundial, esquecendo que, como lembrava Lacordaire, entre o fraco e o forte, entre o rico e o pobre, é a liberdade que oprime e é a lei que liberta.

A solução passa pela mudança de políticas, não passa pela insistência nos mesmos caminhos que nos trouxeram até aqui.

Krzysztof Hetman (PPE). – Pani Przewodnicząca! Od ponad 10 lat dyskutujemy na temat konieczności zwiększenia skuteczności pomocy rozwojowej i pomimo iż należy docenić postęp, który dokonał się od tego czasu, w dalszym ciągu pozostaje jeszcze wiele aspektów, nad którymi musimy pracować. Z mojego punktu widzenia szczególnie istotne są dwa z nich: po pierwsze, jestem przekonany, iż bardzo ważne jest zwiększenie współpracy pomiędzy donatorami oraz zmniejszenie fragmentacji pomocy. Zgodnie z badaniem Komisji Europejskiej wyeliminowanie fragmentacji pomocy spowodowałoby oszczędności w wysokości aż dwóch do trzech mld euro rocznie, które mogłyby być z powodzeniem wykorzystane na działania związane z likwidacją ubóstwa. Drugą ważną kwestią są intensywne działania na rzecz zwiększenia stabilności, pokoju i rządów prawa w krajach partnerskich. Jak dowodzi wiele badań skuteczność pomocy rozwojowej jest znacznie wyższa w krajach o wyższym indeksie demokracji, dlatego też również z tego względu działania takie są niezwykle potrzebne.

(Pyynnöstä myönnettävät puheenvuorot päättyvät)

Valdis Dombrovskis, *Vice-President of the Commission*. – Madam President, honourable Members, I welcome the report on increasing the effectiveness of development cooperation. It provides an important input to the second High-Level Meeting of the Global Partnership for Effective Development Cooperation (GPEDC). The development effectiveness agenda and GPEDC marked a shift from aid to development effectiveness, moving the focus from official development assistance flows to broader development partnerships and actors.

Five years after the forum held in Busan, Korea, it is a good moment to assess the implementation of commitments taken and to discuss how effective development cooperation can best contribute to implementing the 2030 Agenda on sustainable development and the Addis Ababa Action Plan on financing for development.

The EU should continue to lead and move these agendas forward. The new European consensus for development, which will guide the EU and Member States' development policy in the years ahead will help develop effectiveness at its heart. We need to consider not just what we do, but how we do it.

Important steps have been taken to advance a more strategic and coordinated EU approach, for example by advancing a joint programming of EU and Member States development assistance; maximising our collective impact and minimising overlaps; increasing transparency of aid and mutual accountability; measuring results on the basis of our new results framework; promoting ownership of the development priorities by partner countries, and addressing conflict and fragility.

Nevertheless, in order to implement the 2030 Agenda successfully, more needs to be done at both EU and global level. The Commission believes that the Global Partnership should strengthen the political momentum behind effective development cooperation and support implementation of these principles and commitments at country level.

It should promote multi-stakeholder platforms at country level and the use of available data to enhance dialogue. If strategically developed and used, the Global Partnership can indeed provide added value to other international fora in the implementation, thus contributing to the follow-up process of the 2030 Agenda.

The report rightly recognises that the specific value added of the Global Partnership is in its inclusive and multi-stakeholder character, and stresses the need for all actors to be involved in moving the effectiveness agenda forward. In order to become a true partnership of all relevant actors, the involvement of parliaments, civil society organisations, local authorities and private sector is essential. Averting situations of fragility also entails closer cooperation, notably with humanitarian actors, to build the resilience of vulnerable populations.

The private sector and providers of south-south cooperation can make a huge contribution to achieving the sustainable development goals. We need to improve our ways of working in partnership, such as through the recently proposed External Investment Plan and dialogues with southern providers. We also need to see action and commitments from these actors. We would like the outcome document of the Nairobi High-Level Meeting to include their ideas on how they will implement the principles in practice.

The Global Partnership brings a special perspective by focusing on relations between development actors, but also through monitoring the progress of the implementation of principles and commitments. The recently published 2016 progress report entitled 'Making Development Cooperation More Effective' is a valuable source of evidence-based information to stimulate policy dialogue at country, regional and international level.

To conclude, I would like to stress the Commission's commitment to development policy principles – results, transparency, country ownership and inclusive partnerships. We call on all development partners to ensure that the Nairobi High Level Meeting further enhances the contribution of the Global Partnership to the 2030 Agenda. The Commission is committed to keeping the European Parliament and its relevant committees informed on the advancement of Global Partnership.

President. – The debate is closed.

The vote will take place on Tuesday, 22 November 2016.

18. Jednominutowe wypowiedzi w znaczących kwestiach politycznych

President. – The next item is the one-minute speeches on matters of political importance (Rule 163).

Tomáš Zdechovský (PPE). – Celá Evropa se potýká s podvody spojenými se stáčením tachometrů. Je možné s tím něco dělat? Já si myslím, že rozhodně ano.

Belgie a Nizozemí už zavedly systém *car pass*, který umožňuje podvody účinně potírat. Obě zmíněné země tak mohou dát inspiraci dalším státům. Ani opatření na národní úrovni bohužel nemohou zabránit přetáčení tachometrů u aut dovezených z jiného státu.

Už třetí rok proto bojuji za jednotlivé systémy *car pass* pro celou EU. Negativní důsledky podvodů na tachometrech bývají dalekosáhlé a největšími oběťmi jsou právě chudí spotřebitelé. Kupují auto za cenu neodpovídající jeho skutečné hodnotě. Ptám se proto, pane komisaři, jak dlouho budeme těmto praktikám nečinně přihlížet?

José Blanco López (S&D). – Señora Presidenta, la pobreza energética no puede esperar. Por eso, he decidido intervenir en este debate a estas horas de la noche para reclamar medidas, medidas para esos millones de personas en Europa que no pueden pagar el recibo de la luz o que tienen que optar entre comida o luz.

Recientemente, en España, hemos vivido una situación dramática que sensibilizó a muchos ciudadanos; pero no es necesario que tengan que ocurrir estas cosas para que todos nos sensibilicemos, para que la Comisión Europea adopte medidas, para que esas medidas sean urgentes.

Hay que actuar. No podemos mirar para otro lado. Solo la dejación de la responsabilidad, solo no tener sensibilidad, solo situaciones que están siendo y exigiendo una respuesta tienen que ser abordadas con inmediatez. Si no lo hacemos, estaremos contribuyendo a que este tipo de situaciones permanezcan y a que cada vez las situaciones sean más terribles y nos conmuevan más.

Ruža Tomašić (ECR). – Gospođo predsjednice, krajem listopada u Orašju u Bosni i Hercegovini uhićeno je 10 pripadnika Hrvatskog vijeća obrane, vojne formacije koja je prva stala u obranu Bosne i Hercegovine od srpske agresije.

Među uhićenima su i umirovljeni časnici Oružanih snaga Republike Hrvatske, države članice NATO-a. Svi ti ljudi od završetka rata žive u Bosni i Hercegovini i dostupni su pravosudnim organima. Zanimljivo, svih ovih godina nisu gonjeni zbog ratnog zločina.

Još zanimljivije, kad god se potegne pitanje unutarnjeg preustroja Bosne i Hercegovine, revizije Dayton a i ravnopravnosti Hrvata, kreće politički progón hrvatskih branitelja, bilo po nalogu Sarajeva ili Banja Luke.

Ako Bruxelles doista vidi europsku perspektivu Bosne i Hercegovine, mislim da je konačno došlo vrijeme da se Sarajevu pošalje jasna poruka kako se pravosuđe ne smije koristiti u političke svrhe i kako daljnje maltretiranje državljana Republike Hrvatske, članice Europske unije, neće biti tolerirano.

Marian Harkin (ALDE). – Madam President, on Wednesday this Parliament will vote on a resolution that I co-authored with other MEPs. This resolution asks Parliament to refer the Canadian trade deal, CETA, to the European Court of Justice to decide if the proposed investor protection courts are compatible with the EU Treaties.

These investor protection courts appoint their own judges and they are not answerable to national or European courts. President Juncker, in one of his first speeches to this House, said: 'My Commission will not accept that the jurisdiction of courts in EU Member States be limited by special regimes for investor-to-state disputes'. Yet that is exactly what is happening.

I am horrified that Ireland has provisionally signed this deal without rigorous debate and vote in our Dáil. We are the only country in the EU not to have these special investor courts in our legislation and yet we will leave ourselves open to multi-million-euro claims in these courts if we agree the deal. Our Seanad voted to reject the deal and the very least our Dáil can do is to debate and vote on CETA. In this context I hope this Parliament will vote on Wednesday to support the resolution if for nothing else but to have legal certainty.

Κώστας Χρυσόγονος (GUE/NGL). – Κυρία Πρόεδρε, την περασμένη εβδομάδα, σε συνέδριο στη Φρανκφούρτη, ο υπουργός Οικονομικών της Γερμανίας εξαπέλυσε συκοφαντική επίθεση κατά της Ελλάδας. Ισχυρίστηκε ψευδώς ότι οι Έλληνες ζουν πάνω από τις δυνατότητές τους, ενώ το ελληνικό ισοζύγιο τρεχουσών συναλλαγών ήταν ήδη ισοσκελισμένο σχεδόν από το 2015 και έχει καταστεί πλεονασματικό κατά περισσότερο από ένα δισεκατομμύριο ευρώ για το 2016. Το πλεόνασμα αυτό έχει επιτευχθεί με τεράστιες θυσίες του ελληνικού λαού στα τελευταία επτά χρόνια, τις οποίες δεν δικαιούται να αγνοεί ο κύριος Schäuble.

Εξίσου ψευδής είναι ο ισχυρισμός του ότι οι συντάξεις στην Ελλάδα εξακολουθούν να είναι υψηλές, όταν η μέση νέα σύνταξη βρίσκεται πια στα επίπεδα των 660 περίπου ευρώ, δηλαδή οριακά μόνο πάνω από το ελάχιστο όριο αξιοπρεπούς διαβίωσης με βάση τα σημερινά επίπεδα τιμών. Με όλα αυτά ο κύριος Schäuble δημαγωγεί και υπονομεύει την ευρωπαϊκή ιδέα.

Tatjana Ždanoka (Verts/ALE). – Madam President, this week we will vote on the Fotyga report which accuses Russia of engaging in propaganda against the West. But where is the condemnation of anti-Russian propaganda?

One recent example: on 11 November 2016 my country, Latvia, celebrated Bear Slayer's Day, which commemorates the victory of Latvian independence fighters in 1919 over the troops of German-backed warlord Pavel Bermont-Avalov. On 14 November the *Financial Times Europe* published an article saying that Bear Slayer's Day honoured Latvian freedom fighters who secured independence against Russian forces. This year, US troops were in Riga for the commemoration — part of NATO's attempt to reassure the Baltic states in the face of a 'renewed threat from the big bear to the east' (end of quote). But Bermont-Avalov did not represent any Russian Government, neither that of Imperial Russia nor that of Soviet Russia. His idea was to create a pro-German Baltic duchy.

The blatant Russophobic propaganda based on false historical facts must be punished, a serious manifestation of racism and xenophobia. We must not allow historic misrepresentation to stand in the way of reconciliation.

Beatrix von Storch (EFDD). – Frau Präsidentin! Der designierte Präsident der Vereinigten Staaten wird die TTIP nicht unterschreiben, und ich denke, das ist ein Glücksfall. Die TTIP steht nicht für Freihandel schlechthin. Die meisten TTIP-Befürworter sind für Handelssanktionen, zum Beispiel gegen Russland. Das sind keine Freihändler. Im Programm unserer Partei, der AfD, steht wörtlich: „Internationaler Handel ist die Grundlage unseres Wohlstands und des friedlichen Miteinanders. Wirtschaftliche Sanktionen halten wir grundsätzlich für falsch.“

Handelsschranken wollen wir in Europa und weltweit abbauen. Das ist eine klar freihändlerische Position. Und das ist gut so. Denn da, wo Waren die Grenzen nicht überschreiten, werden es Armeen tun. Wer Russlandsanktionen fordert, leistet dem Frieden keinen Vorschub. Daher freue ich mich, dass sich der Ostausschuss der deutschen Wirtschaft dafür ausgesprochen hat, die Strafmaßnahmen der EU gegen Russland wieder einzustellen. Danke dafür. Das ist ein dringender Schritt zur Normalisierung unserer Beziehungen mit Russland.

Σωτήριος Ζαριανόπουλος (NI). – Κυρία Πρόεδρε, παρά την αποθέωσή του από την κυβέρνηση ΣΥΡΙΖΑ-ΑΝΕΛ, ο Αμερικανός πρόεδρος Obama δεν επισκέφθηκε την Ελλάδα ούτε από θαυμασμό για την ιστορία της ούτε από συμπάθεια προς τον λαό της. Η παρέμβασή του για το ελληνικό χρέος απαιτεί σκληρότερα αντιλαϊκά μέτρα. Στόχος ήταν τα γεωπολιτικά συμφέροντα επέμβασης των Ηνωμένων Πολιτειών και του NATO, μαζί με Ευρωπαϊκή Ένωση, στη Μέση Ανατολή, τη Μεσόγειο, το Αιγαίο για τον έλεγχο της ρωσικής παρούσιας.

Αυτοί, μαζί με τις κυβερνήσεις της Ελλάδας, της Τουρκίας και της Κύπρου, προωθούν τη διχοτόμηση της Κύπρου ως σταθερή βάση επενδύτων ενέργειας στην περιοχή. Κουβέντα δεν ειπώθηκε για την αμφισβήτηση των συνόρων από την τουρκική κυβέρνηση. Συμφώνησε με την ελληνική κυβέρνηση την περαιτέρω εμπλοκή της και νέες στρατιωτικές διευκολύνσεις βάζοντας σε άμεσο κίνδυνο τον ελληνικό λαό και τους γειτονικούς λαούς.

Trump, Obama και Clinton: δεν τους χωρίζει χάος· έχουν την ίδια αποκρουστική ιμπεριαλιστική στρατηγική. Οι λαοί πρέπει να ανησυχούν και να μην διαλέξουν ανάμεσα στη Σκύλλα και τη Χάρυβδη. Πρέπει να χαράξουν τον δικό τους αυτοτελή δρόμο ανατροπής του καπιταλισμού, ο οποίος επιφυλάσσει μόνο φτώχεια, ανεργία, πολέμους και προσφυγιά για τους λαούς

Andrea Bocskor (PPE). – Elnök Asszony, üdvözlölni szeretném az Ukrajna vízummentességéről szóló elvi megállapodást, amelyet remélem, hamarosan a folyamat pozitív befejezése követ. Ukrajna két éve az európai integráció útját választotta, emiatt aggodalomra ad okot az a napirenden lévő oktatási reform, mely szerint a nemzeti kisebbségek rovására módosítják az oktatási törvény oktatás nyelvére vonatkozó cikkelyét. A törvénytervezet szerint nemzetiségi tanulóknak csupán az ukrán nyelv mellett lenne joguk az anyanyelvű oktatáshoz, csak alap- és középfokon, és csak azokon a helyeken, ahol az adott nemzeti kisebbség egy tömbben él. Az emberi jogok és alapvető szabadságjogok, illetve nemzeti kisebbségek jogai fontos elemek képezik az EU–Ukrajna közötti társulási egyezménynek. Így a törvénytervezet ellentmond a nemzetközi kötelezettségeknek, de megsérti az ukrainai nemzeti kisebbségek alkotmányos jogait is. Remélem, ez a nem európai szellemiségű folyamat, mely nagy visszalépést jelent a kisebbségi joggyakorlat terén, még megállítható, és Ukrajna törekedni fog arra, hogy a kisebbségeit tiszteletben tartó jogállammá váljon.

Maria Grapini (S&D). – Doamnă președintă, respectarea drepturilor omului este reglementată atât la nivel european, cât și la nivelul fiecărui stat membru. Cu toate acestea, sunt încălcări grave ale drepturilor cetățenilor în multe state membre. Și, din păcate, acest lucru afectează grav și, câteodată, iremediabil viața și demnitatea oamenilor.

Cazul cetățeanului Mariana Rarinca din țara mea este bine-cunoscut și, de aceea, consider că acest exemplu este elocvent pentru afirmația mea. Doamna Rarinca, din reclamantă în raport cu președinta CSM-ului din România, a ajuns acuzată. A fost arestată 191 de zile înainte de a fi judecată. Calvarul acestei doamne a durat ani de zile și, în final, după ce a fost achitată, a fost din nou condamnată.

Cazul Rarinca este un caz tipic în care simplul cetățean se luptă cu instituțiile pentru dreptate și nu reușește să câștige. Este grav, în acest caz, că atât instituția CSM, cât și instituția prezidențială nu au respectat prevederea legală privind timpul de cincisprezece zile acordat unui cetățean pentru a depune o contestație.

Cred că trebuie, de aici, de la nivel european, să supraveghem instituțiile unui stat de drept astfel încât acestea să acționeze separat, nediscriminatoriu, cu respectarea dreptului omului. Și mai cred că lipsa, în legislația unor state, a răspunderii magistraților duce la abuzuri și suferințe, dar și la cheltuirea unor sume imense din buget pentru despăgubirile cetățenilor care, în final, își găsesc dreptatea la instituții europene.

Marek Jurek (ECR). – Obecne władze Unii Europejskiej ponoszą odpowiedzialność za eskalację kryzysu migracyjnego i towarzyszących mu tragedii. Gdyby w Unii obowiązywały zasady odpowiedzialności politycznej, dobra wspólnego, czy wreszcie demokracji, to ta Komisja Europejska byłaby już dawno odwołana przez ten właśnie Parlament. Artykuł 79 Traktatu o funkcjonowaniu Unii Europejskiej uznaje wyraźnie, że zwalczanie nielegalnej migracji jest zadaniem Unii, obowiązkiem wobec naszych państw. Tymczasem Komisja nie tylko kontynuuje swoją destrukcyjną politykę, ale co więcej wywołuje nowe konflikty, dopuszczając się presji wobec naszych państw na uruchomienie mechanizmu przymusowego rozsyłania imigrantów po Europie. Tymczasem państwa Europy Środkowej, w tym Polska – mój kraj – nie kierują się w tej sprawie żadnym egoizmem, tylko odpowiedzialnością wobec przyszłych pokoleń. Kto tego nie rozumie, godzi nie tylko w naszą wolność, ale godzi również w przyszłość Europy.

Jasenko Selimovic (ALDE). – Madam President, the enlargement process in the Balkans is complex and challenging. If we do not handle it right it might be an extremely long process. Meanwhile, Russian influence in the region is increasing; pro-Russian candidates are winning in Bulgaria and Moldova. Part of Bosnia – Republika Srpska – is helping to spread Russian influence through energy and several other countries are exposed to organised information campaigns from the Kremlin.

If we do not find a way to stop this, Russia will be a hurdle to the enlargement process and eventually will stop it. We cannot afford this. The EU is having an existential crisis and we need the Balkan countries to show that the EU is still worth joining and that there is a reason for its existence. We need to see the flame of the will of these countries to join the EU. We need these countries as much as they need us. The integration of the Balkans into the EU must be a strategic and urgent asset for us. We cannot allow those who want to destroy the EU to succeed. The enlargement process has to be faster and the Commission must take it steadily forward.

Miguel Viegas (GUE/NGL). – Senhora Presidente, presenciámos hoje mais uma página negra da história deste Parlamento. Perante o coro de protestos sobre o CETA, as reservas levantadas por partidos, associações de todo o tipo, este Parlamento inviabilizou a realização de um debate que teria tido o mérito de clarificar os seus reais objetivos e confrontar cada deputado com um debate livre e democrático. Desta forma, iremos ter uma votação sobre um projeto de resolução sem direito a debate, o que diz muito sobre a qualidade da democracia que se respira neste hemiciclo.

O CETA foi discutido de forma secreta ao longo de sete anos, tendo sido apresentado sob a forma de um documento de 1 600 páginas, sem qualquer possibilidade de alteração. O CETA representa um instrumento destinado a abrir os mercados públicos às multinacionais e a nivelar por baixo todas as normas sociais e ambientais. É isto que o Parlamento recusa discutir. Perde a democracia, perdemos os povos da Europa.

Josep-Maria Terricabras (Verts/ALE). – Señora Presidenta, hace muy pocas horas hemos sabido que el Tribunal Supremo de España ha confirmado la sentencia que condenaba al juez Santiago Vidal por haber redactado un esbozo de posible Constitución para Cataluña. Lo hizo en su tiempo libre, sin encargo de nadie y sin menoscabo de su ejemplar dedicación a la judicatura. Se había condenado al juez a tres años de suspensión de empleo y sueldo. La confirmación de la condena es tan absolutamente increíble y ridícula, tan negadora de la libertad democrática de expresión, que provoca el más enérgico rechazo. Desde luego, el mío, que ya no me sorprende de ninguna decisión de las más altas magistraturas españolas, porque los antecedentes de resoluciones del Tribunal Supremo y del Tribunal Constitucional van a aparecer algún día en los manuales europeos como jurisprudencia ideológica carente de sentido de la realidad.

No me sorprende, pero me duele, y quiero que quede constancia en el Parlamento Europeo de este nuevo abuso del Tribunal Supremo español, por ahora, el último.

Gerard Batten (EFDD). – Madam President, the recent decision of the High Court demonstrates the British establishment's desire to delay, impede and eventually prevent our exit from the EU. If the Supreme Court upholds the High Court decision it will precipitate a constitutional crisis. This has been possible because our political establishment persists in saying that we can only leave the EU by means of Article 50. We are being led up the garden path so that we can all bark up the wrong tree. We can restore the supremacy of our own law by repealing the European Communities Act 1972. We will then have left the EU. Parliament will have to vote on that anyway, either at the beginning or at the end of the process of disentangling Britain from the European Union. Parliament should accept the vote of the referendum and repeal the act as a first step, not as a last step. Brexit means exit.

Anna Záborská (PPE) – Tento týždeň v piatok si pripomenieme Svetový deň boja proti násiliu na ženách. Je to príležitosť odsúdiť všetky formy násilia a zároveň upriamiť pozornosť na ženy, ktoré sú až príliš často jeho obeťami. Chcem žiť vo svete, v ktorom sa každá žena môže cítiť bezpečne, v ľudskom spoločenstve, ktoré urobí maximum pre prevenciu násilia a pomoc jeho obetiam, vo svete, kde je každý svojvoľný násilný skutok namierený voči žene prísne potrestaný bez ohľadu na motívy páchatela. Násilie voči žene je vždy odsúdeniahodné a nemá zmysel skúmať, či je namierené voči žene ako žene, žene ako manželke alebo partnerke, žene ako kolegyni alebo žene ako náhodnej okoloidúcej na ulici. V tomto duchu vítam aj plánovanú rozpravu o návrhu uznesenia o predchádzaní násilia na ženách a veľmi rada sa do nej zapojím.

Javi López (S&D). – Señora Presidenta, mi intención hoy es denunciar aquí un caso que recientemente hemos padecido en España —en Cataluña, en Reus— especialmente derivado de la pobreza energética, un problema que hemos tratado en algunas ocasiones aquí.

Rosa, una mujer de ochenta y un años —así se llamaba: Rosa—, murió fruto de un incendio en su casa porque Gas Natural, una gran compañía eléctrica española, le cortó la luz tras dos meses de impagos. Una vela con la que alumbraba su casa acabó finalmente provocando un incendio y su muerte.

Eso hoy está pasando en casas europeas: tenemos cinco millones de personas que padecen pobreza energética en España y cincuenta en Europa. Y ya es hora de que la Comisión Europea tome cartas en el asunto, afronte medidas claras para poder asegurar que las compañías no cortan el suministro ni hacen escoger a los ciudadanos entre comer o pagar la luz, haga un control claro sobre las tarifas e imponga a las compañías reglas claras para poder enviar el mensaje de que la Unión Europea está para proteger a los ciudadanos.

Νότης Μαριάς (ECR). – Κυρία Πρόεδρε, πριν λίγες ώρες ακούσαμε τον απολογητικό λόγο του κυρίου Draghi. Απέφυγε να απαντήσει στα καίρια ερωτήματα που του θέσαμε. Απέφυγε να απαντήσει στο γιατί έχει αποκλείσει την Ελλάδα από την ποσοτική χαλάρωση. Δεν είπε ούτε μια συγγνώμη στον ελληνικό λαό, τον οποίο ως μέλος της τρόικας πτώχευσε και τον έστειλε στην ανεργία.

Μάλιστα ο κύριος Draghi, ως νέος Πόντιος Πιλάτος, έριξε τις ευθύνες στην Επιτροπή. Επίσης είπε ότι δήθεν δεν υπάρχει απόφαση του Δικαστηρίου της Ευρωπαϊκής Ένωσης για έξωση της Ευρωπαϊκής Κεντρικής Τράπεζας από την τρόικα. Να διαβάσει ξανά την απόφαση C 62/2014 του Δικαστηρίου. Να διαβάσει την παράγραφο 30 της περσινής έκθεσης του Ευρωπαϊκού Κοινοβουλίου, που ενέκρινε την πρότασή μου.

Δεν είπε κουβέντα ο κύριος Draghi για το γεγονός ότι, με εντολή της Ευρωπαϊκής Κεντρικής Τράπεζας, οι ελληνικές τράπεζες πωλούν τα δάνεια των Ελλήνων στα κοράκια που τους αρπάζουν τα σπίτια. Ο κύριος Draghi πέταξε την μπάλα στην εξέδρα και για το ζήτημα του ελληνικού χρέους, ένα χρέος το οποίο είναι επονειδιστο (odious debt) και για το οποίο ο ελληνικός λαός πρέπει πλέον να προχωρήσει στη διαγραφή του. Να γνωρίζει, λοιπόν, ο κύριος Draghi ότι σύντομα ο ελληνικός λαός θα πετάξει την τρόικα έξω από την πατρίδα μας.

Paloma López Bermejo (GUE/NGL). – Señora Presidenta, 2016 va camino de ser otro año negro para la siniestralidad laboral en España: los accidentes con baja aumentan un 7,6 % y la siniestralidad mortal eleva en un 1,5 % los fallecimientos: 461 víctimas mortales de la explotación y de la avaricia, de la precarización de la clase trabajadora. Datos que además se quedan cortos, pues el miedo de muchos a perder el trabajo y la manipulación de las mutuas esconden muchas de las enfermedades y accidentes de los que son víctimas los trabajadores y las trabajadoras.

La Unión Europea es responsable junto con el Gobierno de España del ataque a la negociación colectiva y de las políticas de recortes que han disparado el desempleo, la temporalidad y el deterioro de las condiciones laborales, así como el recorte de los recursos de salud y seguridad laboral.

Exigimos que se refuerce el papel de las inspecciones y el reconocimiento de las enfermedades profesionales, con la participación de los sindicatos y organizaciones europeas como la OSHA o la plataforma contra el trabajo no declarado, y que en el futuro pilar de derechos sociales europeos el trabajo digno, seguro, decente, esté en el centro de la norma europea.

Ignazio Corrao (EFDD). – Signora Presidente, onorevoli colleghi, Nino Di Matteo in Italia è il pubblico ministero che indaga sulle stragi di mafia degli anni Novanta e sulle relazioni tra la stessa mafia e la politica italiana. Il suo costante impegno contro «Cosa nostra» ha prodotto un invito, da parte dello Stato italiano, a lasciare Palermo e la Sicilia.

Chi, come me, è cresciuto in Sicilia negli anni delle stragi di mafia, non può non ricollegare i comportamenti istituzionali di quei terribili anni con alcuni eventi che riguardano oggi Nino Di Matteo. Lo Stato italiano sta, per l'ennesima volta, dimostrando di non avere paura più grande che processare se stesso, mentre il silenzio dei media amplifica l'ancora attuale commistione tra mafia e politica.

Per questo, a nome degli italiani, inviterò tutti i deputati di questo Parlamento a vedere il documentario prodotto da Al Jazeera sul magistrato più in pericolo d'Europa. Nino Di Matteo ci prova da vent'anni a dire che il problema non è la mafia in se stessa, ma che la stessa si nutre di collusione e copertura politica. Forse sarebbe ora che a livello europeo qualcuno si interessasse di più del fenomeno mafioso.

Stanislav Polčák (PPE). – Já bych chtěl opětovně hovořit o problému právě propojení vodní dopravy v rámci evropského regionu střední Evropy, a to je propojení kanálu Dunaj-Odra-Labe.

O tom se mimo jiné zmiňuje i jedna ze zpráv, o které budeme zítra hlasovat, a já tuto vodní cestu nejen že podporuji dlouhodobě, ale zároveň bych chtěl volat i orgány EU k tomu, aby tento projekt našel jejich dostatečnou podporu, protože není v zájmu pouze ČR, Polska, případně Německa, pokud by šlo to propojení i na Labe, ale zároveň i Slovenska a nepochybně Rakouska i Maďarska.

Podle mého názoru je to rovněž velmi strategická investice i do naší bezpečnosti. Přivede alpskou vodu, propojí regiony z hlediska vodní dopravy. Má své nepochybné náklady, a to si musíme přiznat, i v oblasti životního prostředí. Přesto bych chtěl podpořit tento projekt, protože ho vnímám jako strategickou investici do naší společné budoucnosti.

Virginie Rozière (S&D). – Madame la Présidente, depuis 2011, la Commission européenne et le Parlement ont uni leurs efforts pour renforcer la transparence au moyen d'un registre qui recense les représentants d'intérêts qui peuvent accéder aux institutions – louable effort qui devrait se voir renforcé par la révision du 28 septembre dernier.

Malheureusement, une catégorie entière de groupes d'influence échappe à ces obligations. En effet, les églises et les communautés religieuses sont purement et simplement exemptées d'enregistrement. Ces organisations ont déjà, du fait de l'article 17 du traité, un accès privilégié aux institutions européennes. Le minimum serait qu'elles se voient appliquer les mêmes obligations de transparence.

En tant que coprésidente de la plateforme du Parlement européen pour la laïcité, j'ai pu constater, lors de nos réunions, la présence de certains groupes extrémistes, comme Civitas, ou sectaires, comme l'Église de scientologie, et les failles instaurées par cette révision ne peuvent que renforcer leur capacité à influencer nos décisions. Nous connaissons leur force de frappe en la matière, et nul n'est besoin de leur faciliter la tâche.

Alors, à défaut de pouvoir, pour l'instant, prémunir nos institutions de l'influence de groupes religieux, exposons au grand jour leurs pratiques. Trop de droits, trop de libertés sont en jeu pour maintenir l'obscurité. Il nous appartient de faire la lumière et de faire en sorte que la transparence soit la règle.

Lynn Boylan (GUE/NGL). – Madam President, recently two EU-funded independent reports into media ownership in Ireland documented the chilling effect Denis O'Brien, one of the largest shareholders of Ireland's print and broadcast media, is having on media freedom and plurality in Ireland. Now, in spite of his domination of the media industry and his history as a serial litigator of journalists, it is revealed that his sphere of influence stretches to the broadcast media watchdog, the Broadcasting Authority of Ireland (BAI).

In February 2015 a Mr Nigel Heneghan was appointed to the BAI watchdog without public consultation or competition despite his PR company being a client of the same Denis O'Brien by representing his print media company and the business interests of Siteserve. Concerns of conflicts of interest were brushed aside and to this day Mr Heneghan sees no problem with adjudicating on complaints to the watchdog about his client Mr O'Brien's broadcast companies.

Media freedom in Ireland is under serious threat and the next European Centre for Press and Media Freedom report will likely show no change. It seems that our politicians are too scared to act when it comes to dealing with the media.

Csaba Sógor (PPE). – Elnök Asszony, nagyon sok olyan hanggal lehet találkozni az európai közvéleményben, amely szerint a romániai korrupcióellenes harc példát mutat sok más államnak is. Magam is úgy gondolom, hogy nagy változás ment végbe Romániában és a közélet megtisztulása óriási pozitívuma lehet ennek a folyamatnak. Am nem tehetünk úgy, mintha nem látnánk a rendszer túlkapasait is. Jelenleg épp egy, a romániai restitúciós törvények értelmében a katolikus egyháznak visszaszolgáltatót épületben működő katolikus magyar iskola kapcsán vizsgálódik a korrupciós ügyesség, mert a gyanú szerint az engedélyezési eljárás kapcsán szabálytalanságok történhettek. Ha történt ilyen, akkor azt ki kell javítani, ám elfogadhatatlan, hogy korrupcióval vádolnak olyan tisztviselőket, akik csak a törvényeket ültették gyakorlatba és megkérdőjelezzik az iskola igazgatójának jóhiszeműségét, továbbá bizonytalanságot keltenek szülőknél és gyermekekben. A visszakapott egyházi ingatlanokban működő iskolák törvényességének megkérdőjelezése egyre gyakoribb Romániában, féltő, hogy a teljes restitúciós folyamat visszafordításának szándéka vezérli az illetékeseket.

Csaba Molnár (S&D). – Elnök Asszony, néhány hete kiderült, hogy Orbán Viktor magyar miniszterelnök családja egy nemzetközileg körözött bűnözővel, szaúdi milliárdossal, Ghaith Pharaonnal üzletel. Pharaont többek között terrorizmus támogatása és illegális fegyverkereskedelem miatt már hosszú évek óta körözi az FBI és az Interpol, Magyarországon viszont nem fenyegeti őt a letartóztatás veszélye. Annál inkább nem, hiszen épp a közelmúltban vásárolt egy nagy értékű ingatlant a magyar miniszterelnök közvetlen szomszédságában. Annál inkább nem fenyegeti a letartóztatás, mert a magyar hatóságok annak ellenére adtak neki európai vízumot és letelepedési, tartózkodási engedélyt, hogy nemzetközi körözés alatt áll, és mindezt úgy tették, hogy még ujjlenyomatot sem vettek tőle – ami egyébként a törvények szerint kötelező lenne –, nehogy kiderüljön később, hogy kiket engedtek be az országba, és az európai vízum miatt az egész Európai Unióba.

Ez egy európai botrány, hiszen Pharaon, ez a körözött nemzetközi bűnöző nem csak Magyarországon, hanem a vízuma miatt az egész Európai Unióban szabadon mozoghat. Mivel a magyar hatóságok nem tartóztatták le ezt a bűnözőt, ezért az európai hatóságoknak, az Európának lesz a dolga a körözött bűnöző kézre kerítése.

László Tótkés (PPE). – Elnök Asszony, az 1989-es temesvári népfelkelés decemberi évfordulója közeledtével az egykori és az új román titkosszolgálat volt magas rangú vezetői a televízió széles nyilvánossága előtt próbálják hiteltelenné tenni az antikommunista és Szekuritate-ellenes román forradalmat, egy Erdély elszakítására irányuló, szovjet és magyar háttérű szubverzióknak és államcsínynek állítva be azt. Ezúton hívom fel az Unió és a Parlament figyelmét arra, hogy Románia demokratikus átalakulására nézve a legnagyobb veszélyt mind a mai napig a hatalmát és befolyását átmentett volt Szekuritate, a régi-új titkosszolgálat jelenti, mely Ceausescu nacionálkommunista politikájának folytatójaként a sovinszta magyarellenesség eszközének bevetésével fejt ki ellenforradalmi tevékenységét. Védjük meg a román–magyar történelmi szolidaritást!

Victor Negrescu (S&D). – Doamnă președintă, Uniunea Europeană are printre obiective stimularea cercetării la nivel european. Dar, din păcate, prin modul în care implementează programele sale, generează noi discriminări de salarizare între cercetătorii din estul și cei din vestul Europei. În ciuda faptului că fondurile sunt câștigate prin competiții la nivel european, în cadrul principalului program de cercetare și inovare Orizont 2020 există diferențe uriașe între grilele de salarizare aplicate.

Întreb, astfel, Comisia Europeană: cum este posibil ca un expert de tip A în cadrul unui proiect european să poată câștiga aproximativ 70 de euro (300 de lei), în timp ce venitul cercetătorului român în cadrul aceleiași proiect să fie de zece ori mai mic, fiind redus la doar aproximativ șapte euro?

Mă solidarizez, astfel, cu inițiativa Universității Babeș Bolyai din Cluj-Napoca și a Universității Politehnica din București și solicit cu toată fermitatea Comisiei Europene să restabilească o salarizare unitară pentru toți cercetătorii europeni. La muncă egală, plată egală. În calitate de membru în Parlamentul European și de cadru universitar român, nu pot accepta o astfel de discriminare și voi lupta pentru a restabili dreptatea.

Deirdre Clune (PPE). – Madam President, last month a former Taoiseach (Prime Minister) of Ireland and former EU Ambassador to Washington, John Bruton, appeared before a committee in the British House of Lords to discuss the impact of Brexit, or Britain leaving the EU, on its closest neighbour, Ireland. He said that Brexit might deal Ireland's economy an even heavier blow than Britain's, even though we had no say in the referendum.

Already we have seen the impact of the changes on sterling. This has had an immediate effect on small businesses, particularly those that export. Their exports are less competitive, they are more expensive on the shelves and when dealing with UK relationships. Imports from Britain are cheaper, thus putting further pressure on small businesses in Ireland. Britain takes two-fifths, or 40%, of exports from Ireland. Beef and dairy are already feeling a strong impact, as is the mushroom sector, which exports 80% of its production to Britain. Undoubtedly, the impact of Brexit on Ireland – as has been said by others and not just in our country – is going to be severe, and it needs to be ensured that this is reflected in the negotiations as we move forward.

Puhemies. – Kohdan käsittely on päättynyt.

19. Porządek obrad następnego posiedzenia: Patrz protokół

20. Zamknięcie posiedzenia

(Istunto päätyi klo 22.40.)

—

Skróty i symbole

*	Procedura konsultacji
***	Procedura zgody
***I	Zwykła procedura ustawodawcza, pierwsze czytanie
***II	Zwykła procedura ustawodawcza, drugie czytanie
***III	Zwykła procedura ustawodawcza, trzecie czytanie

(Typ procedury zależy od podstawy prawnej zaproponowanej w danym projekcie aktu.)

Rozwinięcia skrótów nazw komisji parlamentarnych

AFET	Komisja Spraw Zagranicznych
DEVE	Komisja Rozwoju
INTA	Komisja Handlu Międzynarodowego
BUDG	Komisja Budżetowa
CONT	Komisja Kontroli Budżetowej
ECON	Komisja Gospodarcza i Monetarna
EMPL	Komisja Zatrudnienia i Spraw Socjalnych
ENVI	Komisja Środowiska Naturalnego, Zdrowia Publicznego i Bezpieczeństwa Żywności
ITRE	Komisja Przemysłu, Badań Naukowych i Energii
IMCO	Komisja Rynku Wewnętrznego i Ochrony Konsumentów
TRAN	Komisja Transportu i Turystyki
REGI	Komisja Rozwoju Regionalnego
AGRI	Komisja Rolnictwa i Obszarów Wiejskich
PECH	Komisja Rybołówstwa
CULT	Komisja Kultury i Edukacji
JURI	Komisja Prawna
LIBE	Komisja Wolności Obywatelskich, Sprawiedliwości i Spraw Wewnętrznych
AFCO	Komisja Spraw Konstytucyjnych
FEMM	Komisja Praw Kobiet i Równych Szans
PETI	Komisja Petycji
DROI	Podkomisja Praw Człowieka
SEDE	Podkomisja Bezpieczeństwa i Obrony

Rozwinięcia skrótów nazw grup politycznych

PPE	Grupa Europejskiej Partii Ludowej (Chrześcijańscy Demokraci)
S&D	Grupa Postępowego Sojuszu Socjalistów i Demokratów w Parlamencie Europejskim
ECR	Grupa Europejskich Konserwatystów i Reformatorów
ALDE	Grupa Porozumienia Liberalistów i Demokratów na rzecz Europy
GUE/NGL	Konfederacyjna Grupa Zjednoczonej Lewicy Europejskiej/Nordycka Zielona Lewica
Verts/ALE	Grupa Zielonych/Wolne Przymierze Europejskie
EFDD	Europa Wolności i Demokracji Bezpośredniej
ENF	Grupa Europa Narodów i Wolności
NI	Niezrzeszeni