



PEŁNE SPRAWOZDANIE Z OBRAD 10 WRZEŚNIA 2018 R.

(C/2024/3403)

PARLAMENT EUROPEJSKI

SESJA 2018-2019

Posiedzenia od 10 do 13 września 2018 r.

STRASBURG

Spis treści	Strona
1. Wznowienie sesji	3
2. Otwarcie posiedzenia	3
3. Oświadczenia Przewodniczącego / Przewodniczącej	3
4. Przyjęcie protokołu poprzedniego posiedzenia	4
5. Skład Parlamentu: patrz protokół	5
6. Weryfikacja mandatów: patrz protokół	5
7. Skład komisji i delegacji: patrz protokół	5
8. Negocjacje przed pierwszym czytaniem w Parlamencie (art. 69c Regulaminu): patrz protokół	5
9. Wniosek o zasięgnięcie opinii Europejskiego Komitetu Ekonomiczno-Społecznego (art. 137 ust. 2 Regulaminu): patrz protokół	5
10. Sprostowanie (art. 231 Regulaminu): patrz protokół	5
11. Podpisanie aktów prawnych przyjętych zgodnie ze zwykłą procedurą ustawodawczą (art. 78 Regulaminu): patrz protokół	5
12. Pytania wymagające odpowiedzi ustnej (składanie dokumentów): patrz protokół	6

Spis treści	Strona
13. Interpelacje dotyczące kwestii pierwszorzędnych (art. 130b Regulaminu) (składanie dokumentów): patrz protokół	6
14. Akty delegowane (art. 105 ust. 6 Regulaminu): patrz protokół	6
15. Środki wykonawcze (art. 106 Regulaminu): patrz protokół	6
16. Działania podjęte w związku ze stanowiskami i rezolucjami Parlamentu: patrz protokół	6
17. Składanie dokumentów: patrz protokół	6
18. Porządek obrad	6
19. Europejski Korpus Solidarności (debata)	10
20. Program wspierania reform strukturalnych: pula środków finansowych i cel ogólny (debata)	19
21. Wpływ polityki spójności UE w Irlandii Północnej (debata)	25
22. Szczególne środki dla Grecji (debata)	32
23. Pożary w Mati, region Attyka w Grecji, w lipcu 2018 r.: reakcja UE (debata)	38
24. Metody reintegracji pracowników na stanowiska pracy wysokiej jakości w następstwie urazów lub chorób (krótka prezentacja)	43
25. Środki na rzecz zapobiegania mobbingowi i molestowaniu seksualnemu w pracy, przestrzeni publicznej i życiu politycznym w UE, a także zwalczania tych zjawisk (krótka prezentacja)	46
26. Stosunki między UE i państwami trzecimi w zakresie uregulowania sektora finansowego i nadzoru nad nim (krótka prezentacja)	50
27. Równość językowa w erze cyfrowej (krótka prezentacja)	52
28. Przejrzyste i odpowiedzialne zarządzanie zasobami naturalnymi w krajach rozwijających się: kwestia lasów (krótka prezentacja)	55
29. Zwiększanie wzrostu gospodarczego i spójności w regionach przygranicznych UE (krótka prezentacja)	59
30. Jednominutowe wystąpienia w znaczących kwestiach politycznych	62
31. Porządek obrad następnego posiedzenia: patrz protokół	68
32. Zamknięcie posiedzenia	68

PEŁNE SPRAWOZDANIE Z OBRAD 10 WRZEŚNIA 2018 R.

PRESIDENZA DELL'ON. ANTONIO TAJANI

Presidente

1. Wznowienie sesji

Presidente. – Dichiaro ripresa la sessione del Parlamento europeo interrotta giovedì 5 luglio 2018.

2. Otwarcie posiedzenia

(La seduta è aperta alle 17.09)

3. Oświadczenia Przewodniczącego / Przewodniczącej

Presidente. – Signori parlamentari, come prima cosa voglio rivolgere un pensiero alle vittime delle catastrofi che hanno colpito i paesi europei nel corso degli ultimi due mesi.

Voglio citare innanzitutto i violenti incendi che hanno colpito la Grecia a luglio, causando più di novanta vittime e oltre duecento feriti. Il fuoco ha inoltre distrutto oltre mille abitazioni e causato danni ambientali ed economici enormi.

Anche la Svezia, nello stesso periodo, è stata vittima di un numero senza precedenti di incendi devastanti, dovuti tra l'altro alle alte temperature registrate. Un'ennesima prova della portata del cambiamento climatico e dei danni provocati dal riscaldamento del pianeta.

Voglio sottolineare però che, grazie al meccanismo di protezione civile europea, è stato possibile sostenere gli sforzi delle autorità nazionali con vigili del fuoco, aerei ed elicotteri messi a disposizione da numerosi paesi dell'Unione. È un esempio di solidarietà concreta che illustra bene il valore aggiunto dell'Unione europea.

Anche l'Italia, il mio paese, ha conosciuto un mese di agosto drammatico, con il crollo del ponte Morandi a Genova, il 14 agosto, crollo che ha provocato 43 morti e privato centinaia di famiglie delle loro abitazioni.

Mi auguro che, da una parte, vengano accettate le responsabilità amministrative e politiche di questo grave disastro e, dall'altra, si possa procedere rapidamente alla ricostruzione di questa struttura, che è un punto di passaggio fondamentale per la città di Genova, il suo porto, l'Italia e l'Europa intera. Genova è infatti uno snodo delle reti europee TEN-T. Per questo l'Unione europea mette a disposizione risorse destinate alle infrastrutture di importanza europea che, unite ai fondi regionali dell'Unione e al Fondo europeo per gli investimenti, potranno essere utilizzate per migliorare le infrastrutture della città.

Purtroppo, pochi giorni dopo la tragedia di Genova, sempre in Italia, una piena del torrente Raganello ha travolto e ucciso dieci persone nella provincia calabrese di Cosenza. Questa piena improvvisa ha fatto anche numerosi feriti. Mi auguro che le risorse che l'Unione europea mette a disposizione delle regioni possano essere utilizzate per la messa in sicurezza di siti turistici esposti a rischi naturali.

Voglio esprimere le condoglianze del Parlamento europeo e la nostra vicinanza alle famiglie di tutte le vittime degli eventi che si sono succeduti in Europa in questi mesi. Vi chiedo pertanto di osservare un minuto di silenzio e di raccoglimento per ricordare le vittime innocenti.

(Il Parlamento, in piedi, osserva un minuto di silenzio)

4. Przyjęcie protokołu poprzedniego posiedzenia

Presidente. – Il processo verbale della seduta del 5 luglio 2018 è stato distribuito.

Vi sono osservazioni?

Dichiaro approvato il processo verbale della seduta del 5 luglio 2018.

* * *

Younous Omarjee (GUE/NGL). – Monsieur le Président, je souhaite faire un rappel au règlement sur la base de l'article 2 visant l'indépendance de notre mandat et porter à la connaissance de mes collègues que ce jeudi 30 août, une fonctionnaire du Parlement, qui revendique agir avec un mandat du Bureau du Parlement européen pour chasser les fausses informations, m'a demandé de modifier un tweet ou de le supprimer. Un tweet dans lequel j'exprimais ma position sur la signature par le président Juncker du JEFTA (accord de partenariat économique UE-Japon) sans que le Parlement européen n'ait été au préalable consulté. Cette fonctionnaire s'est crue autorisée à me menacer si je n'obtempérais pas.

Qu'est-ce que tout cela veut dire? Qu'il existe au Parlement européen une police de la pensée, mandatée pour nous dicter – à nous, députés – ce que nous sommes en droit de dire et corriger ce que nous disons? Que toute critique de l'Union européenne constitue désormais une fausse information? Je vous le dis, mes chers collègues, cette affaire, elle nous concerne tous, car la liberté d'expression des parlementaires est sacrée.

Vous savez, Monsieur le Président, j'aime la confrontation politique, à l'intérieur et en dehors du Parlement européen, mais je n'accepterai jamais qu'une fonctionnaire me dise ce que je dois dire et s'immisce à ce point dans mon mandat.

Vous êtes, Monsieur le Président, le garant de nos droits et j'attends de vous une réponse, car cette affaire est une affaire extrêmement grave, car elle porte atteinte à des principes essentiels sur la liberté d'expression des parlementaires.

Le Président. – Merci Monsieur le Député, on va discuter de ce sujet lors de la réunion du Bureau ce soir.

Philippe Lamberts (Verts/ALE). – Monsieur le Président, c'est ce que j'attendais de votre part. Comme je vous l'avais dit en conférence des présidents, si les faits sont avérés, en effet, ils sont graves. Nous avons tous la liberté d'expression et nous avons le loisir de défendre des positions très différentes, qui sont – je l'espère – toujours fondées dans les faits, mais en tout cas, il n'appartient pas à des membres de la fonction publique européenne de corriger des élus.

Le Président. – Je ne peux que répéter. Toujours sur le même sujet, M^{me} Zimmer.

Gabriele Zimmer (GUE/NGL). – Herr Präsident, Sie verwiesen eben darauf, dass Sie diese Frage in das Präsidium bringen möchten. Ich habe Sie am vergangenen Donnerstag gebeten, auch in der Sitzung der Fraktionsvorsitzenden eine Klarstellung zu geben, eine Prüfung vorzunehmen, inwieweit irgendeine Direktion, die Generaldirektion Kommunikation, berechtigt ist, Mandate zu vergeben, Tweets und Facebook-Einträge von Abgeordneten zu kontrollieren und uns Aufklärung zu geben. Also bitte schön nicht nur im Präsidium, auch in der in der Konferenz der Präsidenten!

Андрей Ковачев (PPE). – Г-н Председател, исках само да допълня към паметта на всички загинали и да информирам колегите, че за съжаление на 25 август в България в една ужасна катастрофа загинаха 17 души и десетки бяха ранени. Просто да допълня към това, което почетохме, към паметта на всички други загинали.

Presidente. – Senz'altro tutte le vittime degli incidenti stradali vanno ricordate e va ricordato anche l'impegno. Essendomi battuto, come Commissario europeo ai trasporti, per la sicurezza stradale, non posso che essere solidale con le sue parole.

Dobromir Sośnierz (NI). – Panie Przewodniczący! Państwo apelujecie tutaj do Przewodniczącego o obronę wolności słowa, ale przypominam Państwu, że na czele naszego Parlamentu stoi osoba, która została skazana za to, że złamała wolność słowa. Złamała prawo do wolności wypowiedzi polskiego posła, w dodatku powiedziała, że ten wyrok jej nie interesuje, tutaj na tej sali kilka miesięcy temu – o Panu mówię Panie Przewodniczący Tajani. Pan powiedział, że Pana nie interesuje wyrok Trybunału w Strasburgu i Pan nie będzie się zgadzał na wypowiedzi, które się Panu nie podobają. Za treść wypowiedzi polski poseł miał nakładane w tej sali kary i nie może być tak, że na czele naszej instytucji stoi osoba skazana, o której wiemy, że złamała prawo, zwłaszcza że ten Parlament chce pouczać cały świat, jak powinna wyglądać praworządność i demokracja. Domagam się, aby Pan Tajani podał się do dymisji – Pan Tajani i Pani García Pérez powinna złożyć mandat, bo ona pierwsza wzywała tutaj, żeby tę karę nakładać. Złamaliście Kartę Praw Podstawowych, nie może być tak, że nikt za to nie odpowiada.

Presidente. – Gentile onorevole, non posso che ripetere quello che penso. Rifarei la stessa cosa perché io considero tutti gli esseri umani uguali uno all'altro. Le donne non sono inferiori agli uomini. Può venire qualsiasi tribunale, può venire chiunque a dirmi questo, ma io mio rifiuto di accettare che si consideri in questa Aula una donna inferiore ad un uomo. Lei può dire quello che vuole, può chiedere le mie dimissioni, ma mi posso dimettere per tutto tranne che per questo.

5. **Skład Parlamentu: patrz protokół**
6. **Weryfikacja mandatów: patrz protokół**
7. **Skład komisji i delegacji: patrz protokół**
8. **Negocjacje przed pierwszym czytaniem w Parlamencie (art. 69c Regulaminu): patrz protokół**
9. **Wniosek o zasięgnięcie opinii Europejskiego Komitetu Ekonomiczno-Społecznego (art. 137 ust. 2 Regulaminu): patrz protokół**
10. **Sprostowanie (art. 231 Regulaminu): patrz protokół**
11. **Podpisanie aktów prawnych przyjętych zgodnie ze zwykłą procedurą ustawodawczą (art. 78 Regulaminu): patrz protokół**

12. Pytania wymagające odpowiedzi ustnej (składanie dokumentów): patrz protokół

13. Interpelacje dotyczące kwestii pierwszorzędnych (art. 130b Regulaminu) (składanie dokumentów): patrz protokół

14. Akty delegowane (art. 105 ust. 6 Regulaminu): patrz protokół

15. Środki wykonawcze (art. 106 Regulaminu): patrz protokół

16. Działania podjęte w związku ze stanowiskami i rezolucjami Parlamentu: patrz protokół

17. Składanie dokumentów: patrz protokół

18. Porządek obrad

Presidente. – Il progetto definitivo di ordine del giorno, fissato dalla Conferenza dei presidenti, ai sensi dell'articolo 149 del regolamento, nella riunione di giovedì 6 settembre 2018, è stato distribuito. Sono state presentate le seguenti proposte di modifica:

Lunedì

Ho ricevuto due richieste relative agli incendi in Grecia. La prima è stata presentata dal gruppo ECR, la seconda dal gruppo GUE/NGL. Il gruppo ECR ha chiesto di aggiungere la dichiarazione della Commissione sugli «Incendi scoppiati nel luglio 2018 a Mati, nella regione dell'Attica, in Grecia, e la risposta dell'UE», come quinto punto all'ordine del giorno dopo la discussione della relazione dell'onorevole Arimont sulle «Misure specifiche per la Grecia».

Do ora la parola all'onorevole Marias per formulare la richiesta del gruppo ECR.

Νότης Μαρίας, *εξ ονόματος της ομάδας ECR.* – Κύριε Πρόεδρε, πριν λίγο, όλο το Σώμα εξέφρασε τα συλλυπητήριά του και τήρησε ενός λεπτού σιγή για τα θύματα των φυσικών καταστροφών και, φυσικά, για τους 98 νεκρούς που είχαμε στις πυρκαγιές στο Μάτι της Αττικής. Την προηγούμενη εβδομάδα, στη συνάντηση των Γενικών Γραμματέων των πολιτικών Ομάδων την Τετάρτη, αλλά και την Πέμπτη στη συνάντηση των Προέδρων, η Ομάδα ECR έθεσε ως αίτημα, την Δευτέρα, δηλαδή σήμερα, να προστεθεί ως πέμπτο θέμα «Δήλωση της Επιτροπής για τις πυρκαγιές στο Μάτι της Αττικής». Δυστυχώς, αυτό δεν έγινε δεκτό από το Προεδρείο και για αυτό εμείς επαναφέρουμε αυτό το ζήτημα. Επισημαίνω ότι στις 25 Οκτωβρίου 2017 είχαμε συζητήσει εξειδικευμένα για τις φονικές πυρκαγιές στην Πορτογαλία και στην Ισπανία. Επομένως λοιπόν, εμείς υποβάλλουμε αυτό το αίτημα, θέλουμε να γίνει ειδική συζήτηση για τις πυρκαγιές στο Μάτι της Αττικής και λέμε στους συναδέλφους ή στις πολιτικές ομάδες που εμφάνισαν ως αιτιολογικό, για να απορρίψουν το αίτημά μας, ότι δήθεν επιθυμούν γενική συζήτηση τον Οκτώβριο, ότι θα πρέπει να λάβουν σοβαρά υπόψη την επιθυμία μας για εξειδικευμένη συζήτηση για τις πυρκαγιές στο Μάτι της Αττικής. Θέλουμε να γίνει σήμερα η συζήτηση ως πέμπτο θέμα διότι είναι εξαιρετικά επίκαιρη και, επιπλέον, διότι αύριο θα είναι εδώ και ο Πρωθυπουργός της Ελλάδος, ο κ. Τσίπρας, για να συμμετάσχει σε άλλη συζήτηση και διότι θα είναι πολύ σημαντικό να παρακολουθήσει και να λάβει υπόψη τα συμπεράσματα της συζήτησής μας.

Presidente. – Prima di chiedere chi vuole parlare contro, volevo sapere se il gruppo GUE/NGL e il gruppo ECR sono favorevoli ad accorpare le richieste, anche se il gruppo GUE/NGL chiede una risoluzione dopo la discussione, sempre sullo stesso argomento, sempre dopo la relazione dell'on. Arimont.

Vi chiedo se siete d'accordo ad accorpare le richieste – poi farò parlare anche il gruppo GUE/NGL – per avere una sola votazione e poi decidere se fare la risoluzione o no. Invece di fare quattro votazioni, sarebbe meglio votare insieme se inserire, dopo la relazione dell'on. Arimont, una discussione su questo argomento, e poi vedere se farlo con una risoluzione o meno.

L'on. Marias è favorevole. Volevo sapere se il gruppo GUE/NGL e l'on. Sakorafa sono d'accordo, dopo il suo intervento, ad accorpare poi la votazione. (L'on. Sakorafa fa un segno d'assenso) È favorevole ad accorpare la votazione, bene.

Allora do la parola all'on. Sakorafa perché illustri la sua posizione e poi daremo la parola all'on. Keller.

Σοφία Σακοράφα, εξ ονόματος της ομάδας GUE/NGL. – Κύριε Πρόεδρε και κύριοι συνάδελφοι, η τραγωδία που βίωσε η Ελλάδα στις 23 Ιουλίου είναι η μεγαλύτερη στην ιστορία της σε εθνικό αλλά και σε ευρωπαϊκό επίπεδο. Σε μια ευρωπαϊκή πρωτεύουσα, στο φως της ημέρας, σχεδόν εκατό άνθρωποι έχασαν τη ζωή τους με τον πιο φρικιαστικό τρόπο: απανθρακώθηκαν. Είναι βέβαιο ότι όλοι μας έχουμε δει αυτές τις εικόνες και περιγραφές και, λόγω σεβασμού στη μνήμη των θυμάτων, δεν θα τα επαναλάβω. Οι συνθήκες όμως και οι αιτίες αυτής της τραγωδίας, εκτός από πολλά ερωτηματικά, δημιουργούν και αισθήματα αγανάκτησης αλλά και απόγνωσης. Για τους λόγους αυτούς και σαν ελάχιστο δείγμα υγιών αντανακλαστικών αλληλεγγύης και έκφρασης συμπάραστασης, εκ μέρους του Ευρωπαϊκού Κοινοβουλίου, σε όλους όσους βιώνουν το δράμα των χαμένων ανθρώπων τους αλλά και των κατεστραμμένων περιουσιών τους, ζήτησα την επομένη των πυρκαγιών να συμπεριληφθούν στην ημερήσια διάταξη της Ολομέλειας συζήτηση και ψήφισμα. Δεδομένου ότι προηγήθηκε ο συνάδελφος κύριος Μαριάς, ως εκπρόσωπος μεγαλύτερης Ομάδας, υποστηρίζω την πρότασή του και καλώ τους συναδέλφους να υπερψηφίσουν το αίτημα. Κύριοι συνάδελφοι, η θετική σας ανταπόκριση θα είναι το καλύτερο μνημόσυνο στη μνήμη των θυμάτων.

Ska Keller, on behalf of the Verts/ALE Group. – Mr President, what several colleagues have said is very true: we had a terrible fire in Greece which cost the lives of so many people. We also had other big forest fires in Europe, and I think it is important that we look at them with a more holistic view. So I would propose we enlarge the title and talk about 'forest fires in Europe and consequences of climate change'. That would be my suggestion for a title so that the Greek situation can be put into that discussion, but also the Portuguese, the Swedish, etc. On a more technical note I would just like to ask what happens then to the debate already agreed in October I which was supposed to happen on exactly that issue?

Presidente. – Decide la Plenaria. Vediamo che cosa succede, se la Plenaria vota per avere una discussione ora. (In reazione ad un intervento senza microfono di un deputato) La Plenaria è sovrana. Se ci sono le richieste di due gruppi politici di tenere una discussione, io posso chiedere se, nel momento di votare la discussione proposta dal gruppo ECR e dal gruppo GUE/NGL sugli incendi in Grecia – poi vedremo se con risoluzione o meno – i due gruppi politici che propongono il dibattito sono d'accordo ad aggiungere nel titolo gli incendi della Grecia e gli incendi nelle altre parti d'Europa provocati anche dal cambiamento climatico. Siete favorevoli ad aggiungere?

Σοφία Σακοράφα, εξ ονόματος της ομάδας GUE/NGL. – Κύριε Πρόεδρε, προσωπικά δεν θα είχα αντίρρηση, αρκεί να μην μειώσει τη σοβαρότητα της κατάστασης στην Ελλάδα. Μιλάμε για εκατό απανθρακωμένους ανθρώπους και θα ήθελα, προσωπικά, να περιστραφεί η συζήτηση γύρω από αυτό το θέμα και πώς μπορούμε να βοηθήσουμε τους ανθρώπους αυτούς που έχασαν τους οικείους τους, που καταστράφηκε η περιουσία τους και που έχουν αβέβαιο μέλλον. Θα πρέπει να δούμε πώς μπορεί η Ευρωπαϊκή Ένωση μέσα από τα προγράμματά της – τα προγράμματα διάσωσης – να βοηθήσει την όλη κατάσταση. Δεν θα είχα καμία αντίρρηση, ούτε εγώ προσωπικά, ούτε η Ομάδα μου.

Νότης Μαρίας, *εξ ονόματος της ομάδας ECR*. – Κύριε Πρόεδρε, εμείς υποβάλαμε ένα συγκεκριμένο αίτημα, να γίνει συζήτηση για τις πυρκαγιές στο Μάτι της Αττικής. Η διαφορά με τις πυρκαγιές σε άλλες χώρες στις οποίες αναφέρεται η συνάδελφος των Πρασίνων είναι ότι εκεί δεν είχαμε νεκρούς. Επομένως, ας μην μπερδεύουμε τα πράγματα. Θέλω να υπενθυμίσω στην κυρία Keller ότι στις 25 Οκτωβρίου του 2017 συμμετείχαμε, εκείνη και εγώ, σε εξειδικευμένη συζήτηση για τις πυρκαγιές στην Πορτογαλία και στην Ισπανία και τότε δεν τέθηκε θέμα συζήτησης για άλλα γεγονότα. Εγώ λοιπόν καλώ όλους τους συναδέλφους και τις πολιτικές ομάδες, με ευθύ και κατηγορηματικό τρόπο, να τοποθετηθούν επί του αιτήματος που υποβάλλουμε, από κοινού με την ομάδα GUE, για θέμα με τίτλο «Δήλωση της Επιτροπής και συζήτηση για τις πυρκαγιές στο Μάτι της Αττικής». Εάν αυτό γίνει δεκτό, ας πάμε παραπέρα σε ψηφοφορία για το ψήφισμα. Εάν δεν γίνει δεκτό, ας αναλάβουν τις ευθύνες τους οι ομάδες που δεν θέλουν, για κάποιο λόγο, συζήτηση σήμερα, και θέλουν να γίνει δήθεν αυτή η συζήτηση μετά από λίγες μέρες.

Presidente. – Mi pare che i due gruppi tendano, con toni diversi però, a chiedere una discussione sulla tragedia che ha colpito la Grecia. Quindi, io metterei in votazione la proposta originaria, poi vediamo quale sarà il risultato e vedremo se sarà il caso poi di fare una risoluzione.

Quindi metto in votazione per appello nominale la richiesta di aggiungere, dopo la relazione dell'on. Arimont, una discussione sugli incendi boschivi che hanno colpito l'Attica orientale.

(Il Parlamento approva la proposta del gruppo ECR)

Adesso dobbiamo vedere se fare la risoluzione o meno. Soltanto il gruppo GUE/NGL ha proposto di aggiungere una risoluzione alla discussione. Quindi votiamo sempre per appello nominale la richiesta di avere una risoluzione sugli incendi in Grecia a conclusione della discussione.

(Il Parlamento approva la proposta del gruppo GUE/NGL)

Passiamo ora alle proposte di modifica per la giornata di martedì.

Martedì

Il gruppo S&D ha presentato la richiesta di aggiungere come sesto punto all'ordine del giorno del pomeriggio di martedì una dichiarazione del Vicepresidente della Commissione/Alto rappresentante dell'Unione per gli affari esteri e la politica di sicurezza sulla «Minaccia della demolizione di Khan al-Ahmar e di altri villaggi beduini».

Soraya Post, *on behalf of the S&D Group*. – Mr President, yes, it is a request from the S&D Group to have a statement from Ms Mogherini with a resolution. The reason for it is because last Wednesday the Israeli High Court gave its green light to the demolition of the Bedouin village of Khan al-Ahmar in the West Bank and the forcible displacement of its population, which can take place any time after 12 September.

The case of Khan al-Ahmar is a key precedent in the policy by the Israeli Government against Bedouin communities living in the Negev and in the occupied Palestinian territory. The European Parliament has to raise its voice against this policy, and we have to do this now as it is still possible to avoid the worst.

(Applause)

(Il Parlamento approva la proposta)

Philippe Lamberts (Verts/ALE). – Monsieur le Président, c'est aussi mardi que nous aurons le débat sur la situation en Hongrie.

Nous avons appris que la présidence en exercice de l'Union européenne, détenue par l'Autriche, a décidé de ne pas être présente à ce débat. Je trouve ce fait choquant. Il s'agit ici du respect des valeurs fondamentales de l'Union et je ne comprendrais pas que la présidence en exercice du Conseil ne soit pas présente pour assister à un débat dont on sait que l'objectif est précisément d'engager une procédure où le Conseil a une responsabilité lourde. Je ne comprends donc pas que vous acceptiez que le Conseil ne soit pas présent. Je vous enjoins donc de faire comprendre à la présidence autrichienne que sa place sera ici en plénière.

Presidente. – Vedremo. Il Consiglio è il destinatario e quindi vedremo che cosa succede. Non so se il Consiglio vuole aggiungere qualcosa. È libera scelta del Consiglio. Comunque sarà presente il Primo ministro ungherese, il signor Orbán.

Philippe Lamberts (Verts/ALE). – Monsieur le Président, si je peux me permettre, M. Viktor Orbán est le premier ministre de la Hongrie, pays qui n'occupe pas à l'heure actuelle – je pense, à moins que je n'aie mal compté – la présidence du Conseil, donc ce n'est pas de lui qu'il s'agit. S'il est présent, c'est parce que c'est de son pays qu'il s'agit. Or, ce que j'attends, c'est que la présidence du Conseil en exercice, à savoir la présidence autrichienne, assume ses responsabilités.

(Applaudissements à gauche)

Le Président. – Je connais assez bien l'organisation des institutions européennes et je sais bien que M. Orbán ne sera pas présent en tant que président du Conseil, mais en tant que premier ministre de son pays. J'ai informé l'assemblée à ce sujet. J'ai demandé à la présidence autrichienne si elle avait quelque chose à dire. Elle n'a rien à dire donc je ne peux pas l'obliger à parler.

Marek Jurek (ECR). – Panie Przewodniczący! W Radzie Europejskiej w wypadku postępowania w sprawie artykułu siódmego każde państwo może wypowiedzieć się zgodnie z przekonaniem swoich obywateli, zgodnie ze stanowiskiem swojego rządu. Uważam, że w żadnym wypadku nie powinniśmy wywierać presji na Austrii, która w sposób bezstronny powinna sprawować prezydencję, żeby w jakikolwiek sposób antycypowała głosowanie w Radzie Europejskiej, w ogóle mam nadzieję, że do niego nie dojdzie, albo zachęcała Parlament do zajęcia jakiegokolwiek stanowiska przeciwko jednemu z państw Unii Europejskiej. Naprawdę dość dzielenia nas na tej sali.

Presidente. – Il Consiglio sarà il destinatario dell'atto che verrà, qualora la proposta di risoluzione venisse approvata. Quindi io non so quali sono le motivazioni per le quali non sarà presente, onestamente non va valutato a priori. Può essere anche che sia da interpretare come volontà di non interferire in un atto che poi deve essere destinato al Consiglio. Questo non lo so, però devo anche fornire questa versione.

Maria João Rodrigues (S&D). – Mr President, this is indeed a very serious matter because we need proper representation from the Council as an institution, as is foreseen for all the other topics of this session. So we need to have a clear reply from the Austrian Presidency on whether the Presidency will be physically present, that is the first question. Secondly, if the President is supposed to take the floor, as it is you, on behalf of the Council, stating the principles of the European Union which should apply in this case. We need an absolutely clear answer from the President.

Presidente. – La Presidenza è presente.

(Un rappresentante del segretariato del Consiglio conferma la presenza della Presidenza austriaca alla discussione in questione)

La notizia è positiva: la Presidenza austriaca sarà presente alla discussione.

Mercoledì e giovedì

Non sono proposte modifiche.

(L'ordine dei lavori è così fissato).

IN THE CHAIR: IOAN MIRCEA PAȘCU

*Vice-President***19. Europejski Korpus Solidarności (debata)**

President. – The next item is the report by Helga Trüpel, on behalf of the Committee on Culture and Education, on the proposal for a regulation of the European Parliament and of the Council laying down the legal framework of the European Solidarity Corps and amending Regulations (EU) No 1288/2013, (EU) No 1293/2013, (EU) No 1303/2013, (EU) No 1305/2013, (EU) No 1306/2013 and Decision No 1313/2013/EU (COM(2017)0262 – C8-0162/2017 – 2017/0102(COD) (A8-0060/2018).

Helga Trüpel, Berichtstersterin. – Herr Präsident, Herr Kommissar! Wir sprechen jetzt über das Europäische Solidaritätskorps. Es war ein ausgesprochen guter Vorschlag der Kommission, jungen Menschen in der Europäischen Union und darüber hinaus mehr Möglichkeiten zu geben, sich freiwillig zu engagieren, Solidarität zu leisten und insgesamt die Solidarität in der Europäischen Union zu erhöhen. Ich habe mich sehr gefreut, dass ich Berichtstersterin war, weil das wirklich ein neues Flaggschiff-Programm ist, und das ist ein sehr positiver Ansatz. Nicht alle Programme der Europäischen Union werden so angesehen.

Wir im Parlament – und das ist mir besonders wichtig, es ist ja auch Teil unserer Kooperation – haben diesen Vorschlag verbessert. Wir haben nämlich ganz klar geregelt, was Freiwilligenarbeit, Freiwilligendienste, Freiwilligentätigkeiten wirklich bedeuten sollen. Es gibt sie im Sozialbereich, bei Arbeit mit Flüchtlingen, bei Kulturarbeit, wenn man Alte unterstützt oder auch wenn man sich gegen die Klimakrise engagiert und noch viele mehr. Es ist also eine große Chance für junge Menschen zwischen 18 und 30 Jahren, etwas für sich selber zu tun, indem sie in anderen Ländern sind, Sprachen lernen, die Verhältnisse vor Ort kennenlernen, dort in den Communities vor Ort sind – also sich selber weiterentwickeln können, also im wahrsten Sinne ein humanistischer Bildungsansatz –, und gleichzeitig tun sie etwas für die Gemeinschaft und für die Verbände, für die Institutionen, in denen sie sind, indem sie anderen Menschen helfen, weil sie davon überzeugt sind, dass Solidaritätstätigkeiten wirklich gut sind.

Und dann haben wir einen zweiten Punkt wirklich klargemacht: Wir wollen nicht, dass nachher andere Unternehmen ihre Jobs killen, um dieses Instrument zu nutzen. Also es soll keinen Missbrauch geben. Auch da hat es eine ganz deutliche Klarstellung gegeben. Aber es soll einen kleinen Anteil aus dem neuen Haushalt geben, auch für Jobmöglichkeiten, aber auf keinen Fall Missbrauch. Es soll kein junger Mensch darunter leiden, dass es hier staatliche Gelder oder europäische Gelder gibt und Unternehmen davon profitieren.

Dann haben wir einen klaren Fokus gesetzt auf benachteiligte Jugendliche und vor allem auf den ländlichen Raum. Wir wissen auch hier, bei unseren Praktikanten: Die jungen Leute, die hier ankommen, das sind in der Regel diejenigen, die eh schon einen großen Horizont haben, die mehrere Sprachen können, die eine tolle Bildung haben, die international unterwegs sind. Aber es geht ja nicht allen jungen Leuten in der Europäischen Union so. Und deswegen müssen wir gerade den jungen Leuten auf dem Land oder in ländlichen Gebieten, in kleineren Städten die Möglichkeit geben, von diesen tollen europäischen Angeboten zu profitieren.

Dann haben wir in harter Auseinandersetzung mit dem Rat erreicht, dass es sogenanntes frisches Geld gibt. Das ist Geld, das sonst die Mitgliedstaaten aus dem europäischen Budget zurückbekommen hätten, und das haben sie jetzt in einer Größenordnung von 75 Millionen Euro freigegeben, dass es zusätzliches Geld gibt. Das sind natürlich keine Riesensummen, aber es ist ein Einstieg in ein neues Programm, das junge Leute begeistern wird. Auch jetzt haben ja schon ganz viele Interesse gezeigt. Es gibt neue digitale Bewerbungsmöglichkeiten. Aber mir ist auch wichtig: Gerade benachteiligte junge Menschen brauchen persönliche Kontakte. Es geht nicht nur alles digital. Man braucht Beziehungen zu Menschen, die sich um diese jungen Menschen kümmern. Und deswegen haben wir das auch in unserem Parlamentsvorschlag für dieses Europäische Solidaritätskorps festgeschrieben.

Interessant finde ich jetzt politisch, dass von ganz links und von ganz rechts Kritik geäußert wird. Den einen ist es zu europäisch, den anderen ist es irgendwie nicht sozial genug. Aber die proeuropäischen Kräfte hier im Hause waren sehr geschlossen für dieses neue Programm. Dafür bedanke ich mich auch bei allen, die mit mir – es waren vor allem Kolleginnen – an diesem Programm gearbeitet haben. Es war eine tolle Kooperation. Vielen Dank! Ich hoffe, dass es wirklich ein tolles Programm für junge Menschen wird. Die haben es verdient, und die Europäische Union auch.

Brando Benifei, *relatore per parere della commissione per l'occupazione e gli affari sociali*. – Signor Presidente, onorevoli colleghi, è stato un onore contribuire in prima persona alla creazione del corpo europeo di solidarietà, insieme alla collega Trüpel e a tutti i colleghi. Certamente sono stati mesi di intensi negoziati con il Consiglio e con i colleghi di tutti i gruppi politici. Sono però fiero del risultato ottenuto, perché è la dimostrazione della capacità dell'Europa di proporre soluzioni concrete e innovative alle sfide del presente.

Il corpo europeo di solidarietà permetterà a migliaia di ragazze e ragazzi di mettersi al servizio delle persone che più hanno bisogno e per il bene comune. Una piattaforma, quindi, per azioni di volontariato, tirocini, posti di lavoro. Sono certo che sarà un successo, perché è con l'energia e l'entusiasmo dei giovani che possiamo riuscire a costruire un'Europa migliore, più giusta, più solidale.

Non ci faremo avvelenare dall'odio e dall'intolleranza che impregnano le parole e le azioni delle forze xenofobe e nazionaliste. Non cadremo nella trappola di chi vuole smantellare più di mezzo secolo di scambi fra i nostri paesi, scambi prima di tutto culturali, umani, di valori – il contrario di un programma – e di idee fondate sull'odio fra le persone e sul contrasto a un'idea di Europa solidale, l'idea di esponenti politici che purtroppo conosciamo anche nel mio paese, come il ministro Salvini. È proprio su valori umani e culturali opposti che si poggia invece il corpo europeo di solidarietà, che adesso richiede il coinvolgimento di tutti gli attori europei, nazionali, sociali e istituzionali per massimizzare il suo impatto.

Fin dalle fasi iniziali della discussione mi sono battuto affinché il programma rimanesse il più inclusivo possibile, permettendo a tutti i giovani europei di potervi prendere parte, indipendentemente dal loro paese di origine, dalle loro esigenze personali, dalla condizione economica familiare, con un'attenzione particolare ai giovani con disabilità. Era fondamentale garantire principi di pari opportunità, il rispetto di criteri sulla qualità delle offerte date, la possibilità di affiancare a un percorso di volontariato – centrale nel programma – anche una serie di misure per il lavoro, con un'adeguata remunerazione e condizioni contrattuali garantite.

Questo cosiddetto *strand* occupazionale del programma permetterà di creare delle partnership con diversi attori socio-economici, come le piccole e medie imprese, le camere di commercio, le imprese sociali e le cooperative, ampliando allo stesso tempo lo spettro delle azioni possibili al suo interno. Era necessario separare meglio le azioni di volontariato dal lavoro rispetto alla proposta iniziale della Commissione e ritengo che debba essere sempre considerato il lavoro come tale, quindi retribuito come tale.

Il testo che approveremo domani fornisce garanzie importanti su questo fronte. Sono lieto di vedere le mie proposte diventate parte del nuovo programma. Vorrei che il corpo europeo di solidarietà si dimostrasse capace, quindi, di diventare un potente mezzo di coesione sociale, anche intergenerazionale, uno strumento che, insieme a Erasmus e al Fondo sociale, sia in grado di aiutare le tante organizzazioni che si battono per fare del bene dove c'è più bisogno, soprattutto tante organizzazioni giovanili. Uno strumento, ad esempio, che in situazioni drammatiche, come nel caso del crollo del ponte Morandi a Genova, che abbiamo ricordato proprio oggi, permetta di attivare le ragazze e i ragazzi di tutta Europa che vogliono rimboccarsi le maniche per dare una mano, come già è stato fatto nella fase sperimentale anche a Norcia. Insomma, un esempio tangibile di un'Europa solidale. L'Europa solidale è l'Europa del futuro.

Eleonora Forenza, *relatrice per parere della commissione per l'ambiente, la sanità pubblica e la sicurezza alimentare*. – Signor Presidente, onorevoli colleghi, avendo seguito il lavoro relativo allo *European Solidarity Corps* per conto della commissione ENVI, e avendo lavorato al parere della commissione ENVI come relatrice, devo dire che ho guardato con grande interesse a un progetto che potesse rimettere al centro il tema della solidarietà, l'idea di solidarietà, nel mettere insieme un corpo di giovani europei che si occupasse di solidarietà.

Purtroppo, questa spinta iniziale non è stata mantenuta, e lo dico soprattutto alla luce di quello che è l'esito del trilatero. Trilatero che ha dirottato di nuovo fondi alle organizzazioni «profit», trilatero dopo il quale si continua in una pericolosissima sovrapposizione fra volontariato e lavoro mal retribuito, lavoro precario.

Voglio segnalare un'altra cosa e poi chiudo davvero, signor Presidente. Io credo che escludere da un programma di questo tipo migranti, richiedenti asilo e rifugiati ambientali sia il venir meno a quello spirito di integrazione e cooperazione che avrebbe invece dovuto rappresentare il cuore di questo programma.

Tibor Navracsics, *Member of the Commission*. – Mr President, honourable Members, I am glad to join you on the eve of your final vote on the regulation providing the European Solidarity Corps with a dedicated legal base. I want to express my thanks for the great dedication with which Parliament has handled this file. My particular thanks go to the rapporteur, Ms Trüpel, and her shadow rapporteurs.

For the Commission, the proposal to create a European Solidarity Corps is a major component of our commitment to invest in young people. Together with Erasmus+ the Solidarity Corps will be instrumental in creating new opportunities for young people – opportunities to learn, to engage for causes important to them, to support others and to help us build a resilient cohesive Europe for the future.

Most importantly, the European Solidarity Corps can offer young people the chance to experience what it feels like to be European. At a time of rising discord and widening cultural gaps between countries and even within communities, this is more important than ever.

The Solidarity Corps also shows how Europe can act and take responsibility. Together with Parliament and Council we have moved swiftly to make it a reality. Now we have the duty not to disappoint the many young people who have come forward to join the Corps. More than 75 000 young people have already registered in the European Solidarity Corps portal and over 8 000 have started their activities on the ground, and the numbers keep rising.

With the new regulation, and the budget which goes with it, we will be able to offer solidarity opportunities to 100 000 young people by 2020. But the new regulation you will be voting on tomorrow only covers the years up to 2020. Sending a strong signal to Europe's young people, the Commission has proposed to strengthen and further expand the European Solidarity Corps in the next long-term EU budget from 2021 to 2027.

We want to consolidate and build on what we already have during this period, with one important novelty: we propose to also support volunteering for humanitarian aid operations. This can be the start of creating a truly global volunteering community.

The European Solidarity Corps is a flagship project for Europe's youth. It therefore needs ambitious funding. That is why we have proposed to raise the budget to EUR 1.26 billion over the seven years. This will enable us to offer 350 000 solidarity opportunities by 2027.

I count on the support of this House, and especially of the rapporteur, Ms Šojdrtová. Let us work together to make sure we find a swift agreement on how to develop the Corps for the future.

Young people have a crucial role in building the future. With next year's European Parliament elections coming closer, further strengthening the European Solidarity Corps will send an important signal that we are putting that future in their hands. Thank you again for your support.

Tiemo Wölken, *Verfasser der Stellungnahme des mitberatenden Haushaltsausschusses*. – Herr Präsident! Seit der Gründung des Europäischen Freiwilligendienstes vor 22 Jahren haben einhunderttausend Europäerinnen und Europäer an diesem Programm teilgenommen. Der Europäische Freiwilligendienst soll jetzt noch attraktiver werden, und wir haben das ambitionierte Ziel, dass noch einmal einhunderttausend Teilnehmerinnen dazukommen, und ich finde, das ist ein guter Anspruch, den wir haben.

Für uns als S&D-Fraktion war es wichtig, dass wir das Non-Profit-Prinzip dieses Programms verteidigen, um den gemeinnützigen Charakter der Aktivitäten zu gewährleisten. Wichtig war es auch, dass klar unterschieden wird zwischen freiwilligem Engagement und beruflicher Arbeit, um zu verhindern, dass der Freiwilligendienst missbraucht wird, um Arbeitsplätze zu verdrängen. Als S&D-Fraktion war es uns besonders wichtig, dass das Geld für dieses Programm tatsächlich frisches Geld ist, und es ist gut, dass wir es hinbekommen haben, dass zumindest zwanzig Prozent frisches Geld sind, dass es Transparenz bei der Umschichtung der Gelder gibt und dass es keine negativen Auswirkungen auf andere Programme und Fonds wie zum Beispiel das Erasmus+-Programm gibt.

Mit Blick auf die Finanzierung und als Mitglied im Haushaltsausschuss muss ich aber an dieser Stelle auch ganz deutlich sagen, dass leider zutage getreten ist, dass die Mitgliedstaaten nicht bereit sind, für neue Projekte auch tatsächlich frisches, neues Geld zur Verfügung zu stellen. Aus meiner Sicht haben Rat und Kommission bei diesem für junge Europäerinnen und Europäer so wichtigen Projekt ein Stück weit auch unverantwortlich gehandelt. Es kann schlicht nicht sein, dass der Rat presseöffentlich ankündigt, dass es ein neues Programm gibt, und dann das Geld dafür nicht bereitstellt! Auch die Kommission hat sich nicht vollständig mit Ruhm bekleckert. Sie hat das neue Programm zwar entwickelt, aber nicht dafür gesorgt, dass die Finanzierung dieses Programms andere existierende Programme nicht gefährdet. Und die Finanzierung dieses sinnvollen Programms hat am Ende nochmal klargemacht, dass die Europäische Union den Mitgliedstaaten ein bisschen mehr wert sein muss als jetzt.

Krzysztof Hetman, autor projektu opinii Komisji Rozwoju Regionalnego. – Panie Przewodniczący! Cieszę się, że w toku negocjacji międzyinstytucjonalnych udało się uzyskać porozumienie w odniesieniu do tego ważnego projektu. Myślę, że wszyscy zgadzamy się, jak ogromne znaczenie dla dobrego funkcjonowania społeczeństwa ma pobudzanie postaw prospołecznych, empatii i poczucia solidarności. Jestem przekonany, że Europejski Korpus Solidarności może stać się wkrótce jednym z ważniejszych unijnych narzędzi służących promocji tych właśnie wartości wśród młodzieży. Europejski Korpus Solidarności to jednak nie tylko wolontariat, ale też staże oraz zatrudnienie w obszarach związanych z ideą solidarności. Jako opiniodawca do tego projektu w Komisji Zatrudnienia od początku popierałem tę propozycję i cieszę się, że udało się zachować także ten filar w ostatecznym porozumieniu. Wiele krajów Unii Europejskiej boryka się wciąż z wysokim bezrobociem wśród młodzieży i dlatego też jestem zdania, że każda nowa możliwość rozwoju zawodowego i każdego dodatkowego miejsca pracy jest na wagę złota.

Czesław Adam Siekierski, autor projektu opinii Komisji Rolnictwa i Rozwoju Wsi. – Panie Przewodniczący! Jako sprawozdawca opinii Komisji Rolnictwa chciałbym przedstawić najważniejsze elementy naszego stanowiska. Zwróciliśmy uwagę między innymi na potrzebę większego nakierowania projektu na młodzież z obszarów wiejskich, która zazwyczaj ma utrudniony dostęp do tego typu inicjatyw. Mówiła o tym pani poseł sprawozdawca. Podkreśliśmy znaczenie szkoleń, które w naszej opinii powinny być integralną częścią projektu oraz szansą na wymianę najlepszych praktyk w obszarze rolnictwa i rozwoju obszarów wiejskich. Zaproponowaliśmy również zwiększenie komponentu finansowego przeznaczonego na staże i zatrudnienie z 20 do 25 % oraz wyraziliśmy opinię, że wolontariat nie powinien być zamiennikiem dla pracy za wynagrodzeniem. Wreszcie wskazaliśmy, że jeśli na potrzeby korpusu będą wykorzystywane środki z innych polityk unijnych, to powinny one odzwierciedlać cele pierwotnej linii budżetowej. Europejski Korpus Solidarności daje szansę wzmocnienia przywiązania młodych ludzi do projektu europejskiego oraz nabycia przez nich cennych umiejętności i doświadczeń użytecznych na rynku pracy.

Michaela Šojdrová, on behalf of the PPE Group. – Mr President, we are going to approve a new European programme for young people, with a significant budget and impact as has been mentioned: EUR 375 600 000 over three years, targeting 100 000 young people. It is a huge programme and I am glad to confirm that the EPP Group will support the trilogue agreement to be voted on tomorrow.

More opportunities for youth volunteer activities will be available in Europe, as well as new internships and jobs in the solidarity sector. The key principles in this context are the European added value of the activities; no overlapping with national schemes; and the principle of non-profitability. We managed to strike a good deal with the Council in the middle of the financial framework. This was difficult as we had to find the necessary resources without harming existing programmes, in particular Erasmus +.

We have achieved this outcome only because, as representatives of the political groups, we stood united with our rapporteur, Helga Trüpel. There was a consensus among us on other issues, such as the emphasis on continuity with the European Voluntary Service and the perception of volunteering as a key part of the programme. That is why I would like to thank the rapporteur and the shadow rapporteur for their excellent cooperation.

I look forward to cooperating with our colleagues and with the Commissioner on the next programme.

Julie Ward, *on behalf of the S&D Group*. – Mr President, I believe the European Solidarity Corps is an interesting and timely initiative which gives young people the chance to take part in projects that will benefit communities across Europe. It is, in part, a response to the outpouring of compassion shown by many young people in response to numerous natural disasters, such as devastating floods in my region, and to the refugee crisis. The initiative is a unique chance to strengthen the European dimension of volunteering, hopefully enabling exchange of best practices among Member States and encouraging wider promotion of active participation and volunteering at national level.

However, I must take this opportunity to reaffirm the key role of citizenship, education and active participation of young – and less young – people more generally, and the importance of properly supporting all relevant initiatives in this field through the next EU budget. Citizenship, education and active participation facilitate intercultural dialogue, and promote personal and collective development and wellbeing and empowerment of individuals and communities. We must prepare a generation of young people with the motivation, commitments and skills, including critical and creative thinking, so that they can be audacious problem solvers and responsible citizens in a more fair and inclusive world.

Following the Charlie Hebdo and Danish attacks in 2015, the 28 EU Education Ministers signed the Paris Declaration calling for the use of education and active participation to promote fundamental values. I was proud to be given the responsibility of writing a report for Parliament's Committee on Culture and Education on this topic, making many concrete recommendations. We now have a historic opportunity to implement these recommendations and provide citizenship initiatives with proper funding.

But promoting our fundamental values through dialogue, diversity and education is a shared responsibility of societies, and all stakeholders must be included in that strategy. The next EU budget must, therefore, also properly recognise the key role of civil society and organisations working at grass roots level and provide them with appropriate support and resources.

Ruža Tomašić, *u ime Kluba zastupnika ECR-a*. – Poštovani predsjedavajući, ja se ispričavam, ali ja se nisam javila.

María Teresa Giménez Barbat, *en nombre del Grupo ALDE*. – Señor presidente, el Cuerpo Europeo de Solidaridad refuerza anteriores programas de voluntariado, adaptándolos a las circunstancias actuales. Hoy en día existen corrientes euroescépticas que pretenden socavar el edificio de solidaridad que estamos creando. Pero los jóvenes, que son los grandes europeístas, no van a permitirlo.

A través de este programa podrán prestar ayuda altruista o trabajar donde más se les necesita; obtendrán una valiosa experiencia que podrá servirles en su carrera profesional. Muy importante: jóvenes que conocerán a otros jóvenes e irán creando una trama de afectos que les hará más europeos y reforzará nuestra Unión.

Estos programas no son secundarios o accesorios entre los programas europeos. La economía, el transporte, las finanzas... todo esto es muy importante; pero la solidaridad y la amistad son el tejido vital que va a sostener Europa.

Νικόλαος Χουντής, *εξ ονόματος της ομάδας GUE/NGL*. – Κύριε Πρόεδρε, το πολυδιαφημιζόμενο από τον κύριο Juncker και την Επιτροπή Ευρωπαϊκό Σώμα Αλληλεγγύης αποτελεί, κατά την άποψή μου, τη συνέχεια της πολύπλευρης επίθεσης της νεοφιλελεύθερης Ευρωπαϊκής Ένωσης σε όλους τους κοινωνικούς τομείς και της ψεύτικης κάλυψης των πραγματικών αναγκών. Οι έννοιες της αλληλεγγύης και του εθελοντισμού χρησιμοποιούνται μόνο κατ' ευφημισμό και έχουμε δει τι σημαίνει αυτό στο πλαίσιο της Ευρωπαϊκής Ένωσης: σημαίνει απαλλαγή του κράτους από την υποχρέωση παροχής κοινωνικών υπηρεσιών, μείωση των αμειβομένων θέσεων εργασίας και αντικατάστασή τους από εθελοντική εργασία σε συνθήκες Μεσαίωνα. Το Ευρωπαϊκό Σώμα Αλληλεγγύης αποτελεί, επί της ουσίας, άλλον έναν ιδεολογικό και πολιτικό μηχανισμό υπό τον έλεγχο της Επιτροπής, είναι ένα περιορισμένο εγχείρημα που δεν μπορεί ούτε να αντιμετωπίσει αποτελεσματικά τις καταστροφικές συνέπειες των νεοφιλελεύθερων πολιτικών, ούτε να απαντήσει στα τεράστια κοινωνικά και οικονομικά προβλήματα και τις κοινωνικές ανάγκες. Η οικονομική κρίση, η ανεργία, η επισφαλής εργασία και η μετανάστευση των νέων δεν αντιμετωπίζονται με την ατομική δράση και την ιδιωτική πρωτοβουλία. Οι νέοι της Ευρώπης δεν έχουν ανάγκη από την ενίσχυση υποτιθέμενων δράσεων εθελοντισμού και αλληλεγγύης αλλά από την ενίσχυση των πραγματικών δαπανών για τη δημόσια εκπαίδευση και για τη δημιουργία ποιοτικών θέσεων εργασίας, με πλήρη εργασιακά δικαιώματα, ώστε να μπορέσουν να ξεκινήσουν με αξιοπρέπεια τη ζωή τους και να χτίσουν ένα πραγματικό αλληλέγγυο μέλλον για τους λαούς της Ευρώπης.

Isabella Adinolfi, *a nome del gruppo EFDD*. – Signor Presidente, onorevoli colleghi, signor Commissario, pur sostenendo lo scopo del nuovo programma, non posso non evidenziare alcuni punti critici che anche il governo italiano ha rilevato e che non mancheremo di correggere nella nuova proposta della Commissione per la programmazione 2021-2027.

Innanzitutto, non mi convince la scelta di incorporare questo nuovo programma da Erasmus+, perché Erasmus+ rimane il programma più conosciuto e più amato nell'ambito delle politiche giovanili europee.

In secondo luogo, bisognava permettere soltanto alle organizzazioni senza scopo di lucro di poter partecipare al programma e riceverne i finanziamenti, altrimenti rischiamo di ritrovarci multinazionali che intraprendono attività di volontariato soltanto per ripulirsi l'immagine, per di più usando soldi pubblici.

Infine, sono scettica sulla presenza della parte occupazionale. Il dramma della disoccupazione giovanile è noto e richiede politiche serie del lavoro. Mischiando i concetti di volontariato e lavoro sviliamo, da un lato, il volontariato e, dall'altro, aumentiamo le occasioni di sfruttamento e sostituzione del lavoro, aumentando inoltre il precariato che invece dobbiamo combattere con convinzione.

Dominique Bilde, *au nom du groupe ENF*. – Monsieur le Président, dès les premières lignes, le ton est donné: c'est pour conjurer la montée de l'eurosepticisme que quelques milliers de volontaires viendront porter la bonne parole et grossir les rangs des ONG qui écument déjà les récifs de la Méditerranée.

Outre son parti pris, l'objectif de cette énième baudruche pompeusement baptisée «corps européen de solidarité» n'est que trop évident. Car, n'en déplaise à la Commission, la tentation de retirer quelques jeunes des chiffres embarrassants du chômage ne date pas d'hier, pas plus que celle de cibler les publics défavorisés. Emmanuel Macron y a déjà cédé cet été en ouvrant le service civique à quelque 5 000 réfugiés par an.

Sans surprise, les jeunes Européens des classes populaires paieront au prix fort cette préférence étrangère, puisque le budget d'Erasmus + s'en trouve amputé.

Reste qu'alors qu'une échéance électorale capitale approche, la France et l'Europe des oubliés auront à cœur de rappeler à Bruxelles qu'elle n'est que tributaire de la volonté des peuples.

Francesc Gambús (PPE). – Señor presidente, señor comisario, estamos debatiendo el establecimiento del Cuerpo Europeo de Solidaridad. El destino quiere que coincida justo dos años después del anuncio del presidente Juncker durante el debate del estado de la Unión.

En mi papel de ponente alternativo del informe de opinión de la Comisión de Medio Ambiente intenté trasladar la necesidad de que los fondos del programa LIFE, que se destinarán a la construcción de este Cuerpo —unos cuatro millones y medio— vayan destinados a actividades del Cuerpo de Solidaridad relacionadas con el medio ambiente. Atenuar los efectos de las temperaturas más extremas, los incendios, las inundaciones, etc. serán tareas importantísimas que llevará a cabo este Cuerpo, recuperando uno de los valores fundacionales de la Unión Europea que hoy tenemos: la solidaridad.

La solidaridad entre europeos no es que en las instituciones nos tapemos las vergüenzas entre los Estados miembros. La solidaridad se expresa, como decía el presidente Juncker en aquel debate, cuando arden los bosques portugueses y los ayudan a apagar aviones italianos; cuando se inunda Croacia y los generadores de luz, son suecos. Si no devolvemos el sentido de comunidad, de pertenecer a algo más grande que nuestro pequeño o gran Estado, si no tratamos de devolver aquella idea de que cualquier impacto que reciba un europeo resonará en los corazones y las almas de todos los europeos, difícilmente podremos recuperar el camino hacia la Unión que idearon sus constructores. Bono dijo una vez que había que pasar de la idea de Europa al sentimiento de Europa. Creo sinceramente, señor presidente, que con este informe vamos en esa buena dirección.

Liliana Rodrigues (S&D). – Senhor Presidente, Senhor Comissário, desejo congratular esta União pelo investimento no reforço do programa do Corpo Europeu de Solidariedade, aberto a todos os jovens da Europa.

Este programa vai possibilitar que jovens europeus prestem apoio a comunidades em situação de necessidade através de ações de voluntariado, estágios ou emprego. Numa época de incerteza, com discursos populistas e xenófobos dentro das nossas fronteiras, a aposta num Corpo Europeu de Solidariedade apresenta-se como fundamental para contrariar este regresso a um passado que deveria envergonhar-nos a todos.

É com estas iniciativas que se consolida a cidadania europeia e que se inspiram os jovens a acreditar neste projeto. Estamos agora a dar-lhes aquilo que eles mais merecem: por um lado, uma oportunidade de trabalho e, por outro, estamos a reforçar neles aquilo que muitos temem, o amor à Europa, o amor ao outro realizado pelo voluntariado.

Sabemos que um em cada quatro jovens europeus participou numa atividade de voluntariado durante os últimos dois meses, o que demonstra bem o espírito de fraternidade da nossa juventude.

E fico particularmente feliz por saber que o meu país, Portugal, é o terceiro país da União com mais candidatos ao Corpo Europeu de Solidariedade. Fortalecer a solidariedade e concentrarmo-nos no futuro, ou seja, na juventude.

Serão eles, jovens de toda a Europa, que irão tornar sólido aquilo que parece ser um projeto desamparado e ameaçado. Digo «parece», porque o desejo de liberdade é mais forte do que os muros e as prisões que se foram erguendo. E serão eles, os jovens, a derrubá-los.

Ajudar os outros é aquilo que nos define como homens, mas também como europeus.

Um bem-haja aos jovens desta Europa.

Patrick O'Flynn (EFDD). – Mr President, the European Solidarity Corps is a scheme dreamt up by Mr Juncker immediately after the United Kingdom voted to leave the European Union. In his State of the Union speech two years ago, Mr Juncker admitted the EU was at a low ebb and sprayed around half-baked ideas for new programmes in the manner of an out-of-control machine gun.

Two years on, one would have hoped that cooler heads would have prevailed, because this is a knee-jerk idea that will not achieve the purpose for which it was devised, which is boosting levels of European consciousness in member nations. But it certainly will risk unfairly crowding out the many excellent youth volunteer schemes that already exist within those nations, and at a cost to European taxpayers running into hundreds of millions of euros. In my own country, the National Citizen Service and the world-renowned Duke of Edinburgh Award Scheme stand to suffer unfair EU-subsidised competition. Perhaps one could coin the phrase 'solidarity dumping' to describe the phenomenon.

I would also like to sound a note of caution about one of the main activities that was envisaged for this scheme, namely to have young, idealistic Europeans working to assist newly-arrived asylum seekers, who are overwhelmingly young men from societies riddled with violence and in which core European values such as gender equality are not well observed. The risks entailed in having untrained European teenagers working in proximity with often traumatised new arrivals should be obvious.

Another weakness of the Corps is that it threatens entirely to smother two pre-existing smaller schemes, namely the European Voluntary Service, and EU Aid Volunteers. In the autumn of 2016, a Commission that felt humiliated by the Brexit vote and alarmed by a public backlash against its approach on immigration and asylum, decided to make up programmes on the hoof. It would actually send out a message that Mr Juncker has calmed himself and is no longer in such a blind panic as he now to pull the plug on this folly. After all, polling evidence indicates that it's not starry-eyed school-leavers who have lost faith in the EU, but rather their more experienced and worldly-wise parents after many years of suffering Commission power grabs that undermine their quality of life, particularly in the fields of monetary policy and migration. This scheme was always more about propaganda than public spiritedness and it should be scrapped.

Franz Obermayr (ENF). – Herr Präsident! Solidarität ist gut, in Freiwilligkeit viel besser, und das Ganze in einem Korps am besten. Der Freiwilligendienst kann für junge Menschen als Bildungs-, aber auch Orientierungszeit durchaus dienen. Gleichzeitig darf es allerdings nicht dazu kommen, dass Freiwillige, sollte ihnen die Aufgabe nicht mehr gefallen, einfach abbrechen können. Schließlich ist auch eine charakterliche Weiterbildung gewünscht. Das ist der Fall, wenn man sich durch schwierige Situationen durchkämpfen muss.

Ein weiterer Aspekt: die Berufsförderung. Auch hier muss differenziert betrachtet werden. EU-subventionierte Löhne dürfen nicht dazu führen, dass Freiwillige als kostenloser Ersatz für reguläre Arbeitskräfte dienen. Anfang dieses Jahres hatte die Kommission eine eigenartige Idee, mit der UEFA einen Vertrag abzuschließen, der Freiwillige des Solidaritätskorps als kostenlose Hilfskräfte für die kommende Fußballeuropameisterschaft vorsah. Schön wohl für die UEFA, schlecht allerdings für die Steuerzahler. Da würde man nämlich ein millionenschweres Unternehmen subventionieren, und das kann doch sicherlich nicht im Sinne eines Solidaritätskorps sein.

Intervenții la cerere

Bogdan Andrzej Zdrojewski (PPE). – Panie Przewodniczący, Panie Komisarzu! Nie będę ukrywał, że z tym programem nie było łatwo. Po pierwsze, na samym początku brakowało podstawy prawnej, z czym Komisja Kultury musiała się zmagać przez okres ponad pół roku. Po drugie, zbieranie tych środków finansowych odbywało się cały czas przy dużej niepewności, co z programem, który w tej chwili jeszcze działał. Na szczęście wszystko dobrze się skończyło, mamy dwudziestoprocentowy wzrost środków finansowych na pracę młodego wolontariatu – z tego bardzo się cieszę. Udało się na komisji uzyskać pewien konsensus pomiędzy różnymi siłami politycznymi, aby program był dobrze zdefiniowany, dobrze opisany i też dobrze rozpropagowany, bo ważne, żeby młodzi ludzie o nim po prostu wiedzieli, umieli z niego skorzystać. Natomiast na koniec powiem tylko jedną rzecz, jeden postulat – trzeba jak najszybciej ustalić nową linię budżetową, nowe warunki finansowe na następną perspektywę, jest to bardzo, bardzo pilne.

Γεώργιος Επιτήδειος (NI). – Κύριε Πρόεδρε, για να δικαιολογήσει την αποτυχία του σε δύο πολύ σοβαρά θέματα, την εργασία των νέων και την παροχή κοινωνικής υπηρεσίας προς τους πολίτες, ο ηγετικός κύκλος της Ευρωπαϊκής Ενώσεως προσπαθεί να δημιουργήσει σύγχυση και να παραπλανήσει τους νέους και αναφέρεται στην ανάγκη της εθελοντικής εργασίας για να προαχθεί δήθεν η αλληλεγγύη. Για το πώς αντιλαμβάνεται ο κύκλος αυτός την αλληλεγγύη δεν έχετε παρά να δείτε την περίπτωση της Ελλάδας, όπου ο λαός είναι εξαθλιωμένος και το ποσοστό της ανεργίας των νέων ανέρχεται σε δυσθεώρητα ύψη. Βεβαίως, η εθελοντική εργασία, όταν εφαρμόζεται σωστά, αποτελεί ένδειξη αλληλεγγύης αλλά για να ασχοληθεί ένας νέος με θέματα και ζητήματα αλληλεγγύης πρέπει πρώτα να έχει εξασφαλίσει τη δική του εργασία, τα προς το ζην αυτού και της οικογένειάς του. Μετά θα βρει ένα τρόπο να εκδηλώσει την αγάπη του προς τις υπόλοιπες ομάδες της κοινωνίας. Για αυτό πιστεύω ότι η συζήτηση που κάνουμε εδώ είναι άνευ περιεχομένου και ότι, όταν το αντιληφθούν αυτό οι νέοι, θα συνειδητοποιήσουν, για μία ακόμη φορά, ότι η αγνότητά τους έχει γίνει αντικείμενο εκμεταλλεύσεως.

Ελευθέριος Συναδινός (NI). – Κύριε Πρόεδρε, οι έννοιες για άλλη μια φορά ευτελίζονται και παραποιούνται. Ενδύετε τη λαθρομετανάστευση με τον μανδύα της αλληλεγγύης εις βάρος των Ευρωπαίων πολιτών! Δεν είναι αλληλεγγύη η προσφορά των νέων ως βορά στις ΜΚΟ, με τον εθελοντισμό ως υποκατάστατο μιας ειδάλλως αμειβόμενης θέσης, παρέχοντας δικαιολογίες σε κάποιους επιτήδειους για πλουτισμό και αρπάζοντας εθνικά και κοινοτικά κονδύλια. Δεν είναι αλληλεγγύη να επιτρέπεις σε δήθεν εθελοντές τρίτων χωρών να εγκατασταθούν στην Ευρώπη με πρόσχημα την εθελοντική εργασία, υπαγορεύοντας τη διευκόλυνση έκδοσης αδειών διαμονής εις βάρος της τήρησης της ασφάλειας, της νομιμότητας και της ισότητας έναντι των διαδικασιών. Δεν είναι αλληλεγγύη να στηρίζεις τρίτες χώρες και να ξεχνάς τους δικούς σου πολίτες που υποφέρουν από τις οικονομικές σου πολιτικές. Τάσσομαι εναντίον κάθε φοβικού ιδεολογικού συνδρόμου και όσων ντρέπονται να αποδεχθούν πως οφείλουμε να προτάσσουμε το συμφέρον των δικών μας πολιτών. Επιτέλους, δείξτε αλληλεγγύη προς την ευρωπαϊκή οικογένεια και όχι προς τον κάθε παράνομο εισβολέα!

Krisztina Morvai (NI). – Köszönöm szépen! Én is egy fogalmat szeretnék tisztázni, ami többször elhangzott itt a vitában, többek között a rapportőr is azt mondta, hogy az Európa-pártiak az Európat támogatók biztos fogják támogatni azt, hogy fiatalok más tagállamban önkéntes munkát végezzenek, de az Európa-ellenesek biztos nem fogják támogatni.

Kedves Rapportőr Asszony, kedves Képviselőtársaim! Mi nem Európa-ellenesek vagyunk, mi az Európai Egyesült Államok tervét ellenezzük. Mi nagyon is szeretjük Európát, az európai értékeket, de mi a nemzetek Európájában hiszünk, és olyannyira szeretjük és fontosnak tartjuk az európai értékeket, hogy meg is védjük őket. Például az én hazám, Magyarország, olyan módon, hogy megvédi a magyar határokat, megvédi a schengeni határokat és nemet mond a tömeges migrációra. Tisztázzuk tehát a fogalmakat: nem Európa-ellenesek vagyunk, Európa-pártiak vagyunk, de ellenezzük mind a tömeges migrációt, mind pedig az Európai Egyesült Államok tervét. Köszönöm!

(End of catch-the-eye procedure)

Tibor Navracsics, Member of the Commission. – Mr President, let me first thank you for the overwhelming support for the draft regulation, and let me also thank again Ms Trüpel for her work and for the collaboration on this topic. The European Solidarity Corps is at the moment a potential, an opportunity, to make European solidarity a reality. I think that, with the legal base and with solid funding, we can implement very successful projects, and I hope that these projects will convince all those MEPs who are sceptical at the moment, or even hostile to this project.

The European Solidarity Corps is not a state-building process, it is not an artificial community. It simply helps young people to find opportunities – either in their own countries or in other EU Member States – to help people who may have been struck by natural disasters or who live in need, or to find friends in communities and to build a network of volunteers who are willing to help and support other people and other communities. That is what the European Solidarity Corps is all about. I do not know why there should be such concern that it is contrary to young people's interests, or something like that. I think it is a good opportunity and I hope that the future will convince you too that it is a good and useful opportunity.

Helga Trüpel, Rapporteur. – Mr President, I want to thank all my colleagues who have supported this new programme, and I would like to stress that there is no risk to Erasmus+. In fact, it is the other way round. As we heard, there is 20% fresh money, so it's about additional possibilities for young people and, as I said before, especially disadvantaged youngsters.

I think this programme represents a very good combination: giving more possibilities to young people in Europe and beyond, with more money and more opportunities for self-development, and at the same time more opportunities to serve their communities in very different fields. This will be another flagship programme, I hope, alongside Erasmus+. So it is not a matter of contradiction or of competition; no, it's the other way round. It's really a win-win situation.

It is very interesting for me, from a political perspective, to hear the arguments against. To the Brexiteers and Ms Morvai I would say that I know, to some extent, you cannot think in terms of supranational democracy. You think that democracy works only in a nation state but, you know, the European Union, for decades has now, has proved that there is a very good combination of local, regional, national and supranational democracy, and that is what I will defend because that is the future. Believe me, we have had such a bad history with nationalism all over Europe and we should not go back to this bad sort of nationalism. Yet when I listen to you, you are so filled with hate and resentment.

When young people work with refugees, it is a very good contribution to solidarity. This is not about mass immigration and so on: it's about solidarity and being responsible for people who are poor, who are in need. The fact that young people are ready to do that, and that we enable them to do it and to develop their capacities, reflects a good European attitude. I like it, and I thank all who support this programme. To get the budget up, and then, hopefully with the next Multiannual Financial Framework, to go beyond one billion would be a good proof of European-ness.

Președintele. – Dezbateră a fost încheiată.

Votul va avea loc marți, 11 septembrie 2018.

Declarații scrise (articolul 162)

Andrea Bocskor (PPE), írásban. – Örülök annak, hogy az Európai Szolidaritási Testület jogi háttere végre elkészült és a program hivatalosan is megkezdheti működését. A program keretében többek között oktatással, egészségvédelemmel, környezetvédelemmel, és katasztrófák megelőzésével kapcsolatos szolidaritáson alapuló projektekre jelentkezhetnek a fiatalok.

A 2018 és 2020 közötti időszakban összesen 375,6 millió euróból gazdálkodhat majd a program, amelynek 90 százalékát önkéntes projektekre, 10 százalékát pedig a program munkavállalási részére különítették el. A program olyan fiatalok számára is elérhető lesz, akiknek egyébként kevesebb lehetőség áll rendelkezésükre, mint pl. a fogyatékkal, vagy elzárt és peremre szorult közösségekben élők, a tanulási vagy egészségügyi problémákkal küzdők számára az Európai Bizottság és a tagállamok egyénre szabott tájékoztatókkal és lehetőségekkel készülnek. Örülök annak, hogy az önkéntességet, az önkéntes projekteket továbbra is támogatja az Európai Unió.

Fontos, hogy motiváljuk a fiatalokat és lehetővé tegyük számukra, hogy minél nagyobb számban kapcsolódjanak be az ehhez hasonló programokba, amelyeknek közösség építő szerepük is van.

PRESIDENZA DELL'ON. DAVID-MARIA SASSOLI

Vicepresidente

20. Program wspierania reform strukturalnych: pula środków finansowych i cel ogólny (debata)

Presidente. – L'ordine del giorno reca la relazione di Ruža Tomašić, a nome della commissione per lo sviluppo regionale, sulla proposta di regolamento del Parlamento europeo e del Consiglio che modifica il regolamento (UE) 2017/825 per aumentare la dotazione finanziaria del programma di sostegno alle riforme strutturali e adattarne l'obiettivo generale (COM(2017)0825 - C8-0433/2017 - 2017/0334(COD)) (A8-0227/2018).

Ruža Tomašić, izjaviteljica. – Poštovani predsjedavajući, kolegice i kolege, različite početne pozicije država članica i danas su važan uzrok njihove nejednake razvijenosti. No u ovom vremenu sveopćeg tehnološkog napretka, u kojem je cijeli svijet, uključujući i njegove najnerazvijenije dijelove, bogatiji nego ikad, u Europi smo trebali puno lakše prebroditi početne nejednakosti. To se nažalost nije dogodilo ili se događa sporo. Zato što slabije razvijene članice na početku svog europskog puta nisu posjedovale dragocjeni *know-how*, a neke od njih nisu razumjele važnost strukturnih reformi. Danas one kao članice Unije koriste razne mehanizme za prikupljanje znanja potrebnih za reforme, ali same reformske procese često nemaju odakle financirati. Svaka prava reforma dugoročno štedi novac jer procese čini bržima, zaposlenike učinkovitijima i obrazovanijima, a usluge građanima boljima, ali njezina provedba košta. Zato je ovaj program potpore strukturnim reformama iznimno važan.

Povećanje financijske omotnice sa 142,8 na ukupni iznos od čak 300 milijuna eura jamstvo je da će program moći poduprijeti reformnska nastojanja svake države članice koja to zatraži. Posebno je to važno u kontekstu nove recesije s kojom će se naša gospodarstva u skoroj budućnosti suočiti. Nema bolje pripreme za krizu od strukturnih reformi i zato članice moramo podupirati u njihovim nastojanjima da ih provedu, a tamo gdje svijest ne postoji trebamo uložiti dodatne napore.

Kad govorimo o novoj recesiji koja je normalni dio svakog poslovnog ciklusa, važno je napomenuti da smo izmijenili i članak 4. uvrštavanjem potpore za pripremu za pristup europodručju među ciljeve Programa. Tako ćemo osigurati da sve članice koje žele pristupiti euru kvalitetno ispune sve kriterije i budu otpornije na krizu kako bismo izbjegli neke teške scenarije kojima smo svjedočili kod prošle recesije.

Moj je osobni prioritet pri radu na ovom izvješću bilo osigurati da se povećanje financijske omotnice ne radi na štetu kohezijske politike koja se ionako nalazi pod velikim udarom. Kohezijska politika ključni je mehanizam za jačanje kapaciteta slabije razvijenih država i smanjenje razlika među članicama te ju moramo sačuvati u postojećem obliku. Zadovoljna sam postignutim rješenjem prema kojemu se povećanje omotnice do 222,8 milijuna eura postiže uporabom instrumenata fleksibilnosti, dok se daljnjih 77,2 milijuna može ostvariti prijenosom sredstava iz proračuna za tehničku pomoć na zahtjev država članica.

Još jedan aspekt ovog prijedloga koji moram istaknuti je uključivanje lokalne zajednice u provođenje reformi. Sukladno ustavnoj i administrativnoj organizaciji pojedine države članice, lokalna i regionalna tijela trebaju biti uključena u reformski proces. Smatram da je to vrlo važno kako bi reforme bile skrojene po mjeri ljudi, a ne birokracije, te da bi njihovo financiranje bilo što transparentnije. Budući da je listopad ove godine krajnji rok za prijavu projekata koji bi iz Programa trebali biti financirani u 2019., osobno sam se angažirala kako bih informirala dionike iz Hrvatske. Potičem, naravno, i sve ostale da u što kraćem roku provedemo opsežnu kampanju informiranja svih dionika kako bi sredstva bila u potpunosti iskorištena.

Želim ovim putem također zahvaliti svim kolegama koji su kroz rad u odborima doprinijeli ovom izvješću i svima koji će ga podržati na glasovanju.

Valdis Dombrovskis, *Vice-President of the Commission*. – Mr President, honourable Members, structural reforms are crucial to modernise our economies, strengthen their performance and resilience and foster real convergence within and across Member States.

The crisis has shown that given the high level of integration of EU economies, reform efforts are a matter of common concern. Your vote tomorrow will be a signal that we stand by Member States in these efforts, and it will be an important step in finalising the package of proposals for deepening economic and monetary union.

Structural reforms not only create an environment that is conducive to investment growth and job creation, they can also help EU economies withstand shocks and contribute to economic and social cohesion. This is why structural reforms are important building blocks for a more resilient economic and monetary union.

Since May 2017 we have been supporting the design and implementation of structural reforms in Member States through the structural reforms support programme (SRSP). This has proven its usefulness, judging from the number of requests from Member States which significantly exceeded the current budget possibilities. This year 24 Member States applied for an amount that was five times the available budget. To respond to the growing demand from Member States we need to increase the funding. At the same time, to strengthen the euro it will be beneficial to provide targeted support to those Member States wishing to adopt the euro, in order to help them to prepare better and facilitate their smooth participation in economic and monetary union. This is why on 6 December 2017 we proposed to increase the budget of SRSP by EUR 80 million.

Throughout the legislative process both the Parliament and the Council have shown a clear commitment to EU support for structural reforms in the Member States. The compromise that we found is a good one. Half of the increase of EUR 80 million will be funded by the global margin for commitments, the other half will be funded through redeployment available from Heading 2, not affecting the rural and development programmes, nor technical assistance. This means that we are fully respecting the commitment from the original SRSP regulation not to provide further financing for the programme at the expense of cohesion policy.

I want to thank the European Parliament, the rapporteur Ms Tomašić, the shadow rapporteurs, and the committee chair, Ms Mihaylova, for the hard work and constructive efforts during the trilogue negotiations.

Honourable Members, by endorsing the political agreement tomorrow you will move Europe one step closer to a more integrated, more resilient and more cohesive economic and monetary union. The swift adoption of this file will also enable us to increase our support for reforms in Member States already as of next year.

Csaba Sógor, *rapporteur for the opinion of the Committee on Employment and Social Affairs*. – Mr President, many Member States struggle with reduced administrative capacities and lack of know-how to implement well-designed public policies. It was the acknowledgement of this fact that led to the establishment of the Structural Reform Support Programme (SRSP) back in 2017.

As a bottom-up tool entailing little administrative burden, the SRSP can play a very important role in implementing reforms that push for convergence, reduce disparities and increase administrative capacity. It can also be instrumental in creating the conditions for smarter and more efficient deployment and absorption of EU funds.

In the time that has passed since its adoption, the programme has already proven to be a popular and useful instrument in Member States. Given the positive initial results, I strongly support both the reinforcement of the programme's budget as well as the Commission's proposal to endow it with its own EUR 25 billion budget in the next Multiannual Financial Framework.

Lambert van Nistelrooij, *on behalf of the PPE Group*. – Mr President, Ms Maletić is not here and I will speak on behalf of the PPE Group in the same time slot. The Structural Reform Support Programme is the new kid on the block. It is a new instrument that started with the support of Parliament. I was one of the rapporteurs in this period. We started with a tiny amount of EUR 42 million, and the success of this programme, the take-up by Member States – 24 of them, as you said – means that these structural reforms are considered necessary, which is exactly what rapporteur Ruža Tomašić told us. It is important to say yes to the second step and start immediately in October with the call, but I must say, Commissioner, your happiness is okay, but you put forward another proposal to take even more money from the performance reserve. I can say that this second step, the second legal proposal here, will be the last on this in this period, and your next step will be in the next MFF. There you have up to EUR 25 billion for a bigger rollout of the idea and of the three instruments that you proposed, so we are very happy, the PPE Group strongly supports it. It is necessary, it works, and it makes Europe better.

Mercedes Bresso, *a nome del gruppo S&D*. – Signor Presidente, onorevoli colleghi, anch'io desidero ringraziare la collega Tomašić per la sua relazione.

Noi sosteniamo la relazione e sosteniamo anche il programma, che ha avuto un buon successo, ma lo facciamo anche con l'esigenza che questa riforma non danneggi in primo luogo i diritti sociali dei cittadini europei e porti a riforme strutturali che siano socialmente responsabili.

Abbiamo bisogno di riforme strutturali che promuovano la crescita sostenibile, oltre alle questioni sociali che ho già detto, e per questo dobbiamo combinare gli sforzi nazionali con il sostegno, quando necessario, anche delle istituzioni europee.

Le riforme strutturali devono essere fatte perché servono a rendere l'economia più forte, ma non possono essere un grimaldello con cui scardinare i diritti dei cittadini. Vanno fatte il più velocemente possibile, ma sempre nel rispetto del principio di sussidiarietà, e vanno coordinate con i programmi e gli obiettivi specifici dei fondi strutturali e quindi delle politiche specifiche dei diversi paesi in base, come dicevo, al principio di sussidiarietà.

Inoltre, è fondamentale che questo programma resti volontario, e cioè a disposizione degli Stati che lo chiedono. Certamente, alla fine di questo mandato, potremo fare un ulteriore approfondimento e valutare la sua efficienza anche per il prossimo periodo di programmazione.

Ivan Jakovčić, *u ime Kluba zastupnika ALDE-a*. – Gospodine predsjedavajući, želim odmah na početku izraziti svoju punu podršku izvjestiteljici na ovim prijedlozima koje je iznijela u današnjoj raspravi i, naravno, podcrtati da ovih 300 milijuna koje imamo u ovoj omotnici zaista mogu iznimno puno pomoći onim državama koje zaista žele reforme jer možda neke vlade ne žele reforme. Ali one koje žele, sigurno će imati podršku u tome, pogotovo kad govorimo o pristupanju euru, znamo za probleme koji su bili kad se pristupalo euru i kad su neke članice pristupale euru. Imamo one koji žele pristupiti euru, ali, naravno, mogu imati i odgovarajuće teškoće u svojim strukturnim reformama. Zato mislim da je iznimno važno da smo na tragu podrške ovom izvještaju. Također želim naglasiti važnost reforme i pomoći lokalnoj i regionalnoj samoupravi jer tamo je život, u općinama, gradovima, u regijama je život, prije svega. I upravo poštujući princip supsidijarnosti i pomoć onim državama koje žele reformirati svoj regionalni i lokalni sustav, mislim da je ova omotnica iznimno važna.

Terry Reintke, *on behalf of the Verts/ALE Group*. – Mr President, dear colleagues, dear Commissioner. Just one and a half years ago in May 2017, we adopted the Structural Reform Support Programme for 2017 to 2020. Back then, one of the main points of critique of this House was the financing of the programme from the Cohesion Policy envelope. Structural reforms are a very wide subject. In the past, they have been used for many different things and many different things have been called structural reforms. The aim of cohesion policy however, and the aim of cohesion money thus, is actually pretty well defined. It means to strengthen economic and social cohesion by reducing disparities in the level of development between regions. Now, nearly one and a half years later, we need to amend the SRSP. But again, no fresh money is being mobilised from the EU budget to fill the financing gap. Instead, again, redeployment shall fix this.

This time, up to EUR 40 million from heading two – so money foreseen for agriculture and natural resources – shall be redeployed. This is not acceptable for my group. Additionally, the outcome of the negotiation leaves one important question unanswered: if money is short, which requests should get support of the programme? We proposed some pretty clear criteria to make the process more transparent, but the compromise in the outcome is rather meaningless and actually leaves a lot of discretion to the Commission to arbitrarily make a choice among the requests for support from the Member States. This is why we cannot support this report in its current form.

Ángela Vallina, *en nombre del Grupo GUE/NGL*. – Señor presidente, estoy absolutamente en desacuerdo con esta propuesta de restar relevancia a la política de cohesión en favor de incrementar fondos en un porcentaje muy considerable para aplicar reformas estructurales que solo están trayendo consecuencias nefastas de austeridad a la mayor parte de la ciudadanía, de la población.

Bajo este bonito nombre de «programa de apoyo a las reformas estructurales» se esconden estrategias de precarización de empleo, privatización de los activos públicos, medidas de competitividad... etcétera; que, como se está demostrando, visten muy bien los datos globales de la economía pero sin llegar verdaderamente al bolsillo de la ciudadanía.

Por si esto fuera poco, la propuesta introducida por nuestro Grupo, el GUE/NGL, para incluir la evasión fiscal y la lucha contra la pobreza en los objetivos del programa ha sido eliminada por el Consejo. Es una demostración más de que lo que le importa a esta Unión Europea son más que nada los grandes números y no cómo está distribuida la riqueza entre la población.

Más política de cohesión y menos reforma estructural. Más distribución de la riqueza y menos concentración del capital.

Rosa D'Amato, *a nome del gruppo EFDD*. – Signor Presidente, onorevoli colleghi, lo scorso anno la delegazione del Movimento 5 Stelle si oppose, sia in sede di commissione che in Plenaria, all'istituzione di questo programma di sostegno alle riforme strutturali.

Su questo specifico testo, che propone l'adattamento dell'obiettivo e l'incremento del budget, ancora una volta non possiamo completamente supportarlo, anche se gli 80 milioni proposti non vengono dalla politica di coesione. Ma intendiamoci: per riforme strutturali, proprio secondo la definizione ripresa nel regolamento in esame, si intendono quelle relative anche al mercato del lavoro, e quindi alla previdenza sociale, alla liberalizzazione e privatizzazione dei servizi, per non parlare del campo dell'istruzione e della formazione. Su queste non siamo e non saremo mai d'accordo.

Siamo invece d'accordo su riforme tipo la semplificazione della normativa degli appalti pubblici o la lotta contro il riciclaggio del denaro, le misure che vanno verso l'inclusione sociale e la lotta alla povertà, come il reddito di cittadinanza.

L'Unione europea, quindi, deve fare attenzione alla direzione politica delle riforme strutturali e a ciò che impone agli Stati membri. È vero: l'adesione al programma è opzionale. Ma siete certi che tutti gli Stati, come ad esempio il governo italiano, attueranno le riforme che avranno l'unica direzione, ossia il bene comune, e non quella di supportare i privati e le lobby? Noi non siamo affatto certi.

Olaf Stuger, namens de ENF-Fractie. – Voorzitter, tijdens het reces kwam ik een meneer tegen in Nederland en die vroeg mij: “Waar komt dat geld van die cohesiefondsen nou eigenlijk vandaan, waar gaat het naartoe en hoe wordt het gecontroleerd?” Toen zei ik: “Nou, op de eerste twee vragen kan ik wel antwoord geven. Dat geld komt van u, u bent de belastingbetaler. De Nederlandse overheid int die belastingen en de Nederlandse regering maakt dat geld over naar de EU, naar Brussel. En Brussel maakt het weer over naar bijvoorbeeld Bulgarije.”

Maar dan wordt het moeilijk. Want wie controleert dat? Dat is niet de Nederlandse regering. Daar heeft deze meneer nog een klein beetje vertrouwen in. Het is niet de EU, daar heeft hij al een stuk minder vertrouwen in. Nee, het is de Bulgaarse overheid die dat doet. Dat is kansloos, niet uit te leggen.

Het is voor mij nog makkelijker om mijn vrouw uit te leggen hoe buitenspel werkt in het voetbal of uit te leggen dat Rocky en Rambo niet dezelfde zijn, maar ook wel weer een beetje. Maar het is niet uit te leggen dat voor een belastingbetaler in Nederland niet de moeite wordt genomen hier in de EU om het geld dat hij verdient en dat uitgegeven wordt in Bulgarije, te controleren.

Louis-Joseph Manscour (S&D). – Monsieur le Président, je remercie notre collègue rapporteure d'avoir tenté de redonner à la matrice de ce programme une base plus proche de la politique de cohésion.

Je ne suis pas pour autant rassuré.

Je m'interroge même sur la raison d'être d'un tel programme, qui plus est lorsqu'il repose financièrement sur la politique régionale. En effet, les objectifs libéraux qu'il poursuit ne sont pas ceux de la cohésion économique, sociale et territoriale auxquels notre Parlement est tant attaché.

J'observe d'ailleurs avec crainte l'amplification de cette dérive avec les propositions sur le prochain cadre financier pluriannuel, dans lequel la Commission propose de doter ce programme d'une enveloppe de 22 milliards d'euros, entérinant ainsi le démantèlement de la politique de cohésion.

Mes chers collègues, il faut se garder de faire le choix d'une Europe qui se détournerait du développement de nos territoires au profit d'une Europe qui incite à la libéralisation des marchés du travail et au démantèlement des systèmes de santé. Voulez-vous faire ce choix? Je ne le crois pas.

Matthijs van Miltenburg (ALDE). – Voorzitter, het is heel goed dat veel Europese landen de weg hebben gevonden naar het steunprogramma voor structurele hervormingen. Dit steunprogramma is een echt Europees succesnummer. Het creëert banen voor mensen, het pakt milieuproblemen aan en het zorgt voor gezonde overheidsfinanciën. Ik ben dan ook blij dat wij het budget verhogen om landen verder te helpen met hun broodnodige hervormingen. Zo kan geld dat we vervolgens vanuit de Europese begroting daar investeren, in die landen, ook daadwerkelijk gaan renderen. Als je het beste met je land en met Europa voor hebt, dan dien je structurele hervormingen te ondersteunen.

De gelegenheidscoalitie van nationalisten, populisten en extremisten die morgen het voorstel verwerpen, stemmen tegen hun eigen landsbelang. Dat heeft heel weinig met vaderlandsliefde te maken, maar dat heeft alles te maken met politieke kortzichtigheid.

Procedura «catch the eye»

Μαρία Σπυράκη (PPE). – Κύριε Πρόεδρε, το πρόγραμμα της στήριξης των διαρθρωτικών μεταρρυθμίσεων έχει παρελθόν και υπάρχει στην Ελλάδα από το 2015, καθώς η χώρα μου υποστηρίζεται στον σχεδιασμό και την εφαρμογή διαρθρωτικών μεταρρυθμίσεων. Όμως πρέπει να τονίσουμε ότι, καθώς αυτό το πρόγραμμα έχει εθελοντικό χαρακτήρα, μπορούμε να δούμε τρεις προϋποθέσεις που θα κάνουν το πρόγραμμα φιλικότερο και αποτελεσματικότερο. Η πρώτη είναι να έχουν οι προτεινόμενες μεταρρυθμίσεις αναπτυξιακό πρόσημο, να δίνουν δηλαδή έμφαση στην άρση των εμποδίων, όπως η γραφειοκρατία και το δυσμενές θεσμικό πλαίσιο, αλλά και στην παροχή διευκολύνσεων σε καινοτόμα χρηματοδοτικά εργαλεία. Η δεύτερη είναι να αποκτήσει η λέξη «μεταρρυθμίσεις» περισσότερο δημιουργικό και λιγότερο επιβλητικό χαρακτήρα. Για παράδειγμα, στην παιδεία, στη δημόσια υγεία, χρειάζονται αλλαγές που θα δώσουν ευκαιρίες και καλές υπηρεσίες στους πολίτες ώστε οι πολίτες να αγκαλιάσουν τις μεταρρυθμίσεις. Η τρίτη είναι να θυμόμαστε ότι ένα κοστούμι δεν κάνει για όλους. Γι' αυτό το πρόγραμμα πρέπει να έχει και εθνικό πρόσημο, να απαντά στις ανάγκες της κάθε χώρας και να τις καλύπτει. Με αυτό τον τρόπο οι μεταρρυθμίσεις θα έχουν αποτέλεσμα και τα χρήματα των Ευρωπαίων φορολογουμένων που φεύγουν από τη συνοχή θα πιάνουν τόπο.

Bogdan Andrzej Zdrojewski (PPE). – Panie Przewodniczący! Polityka spójności jest jedną z najważniejszych. W ramach polityki spójności mamy wiele priorytetów, zarówno te uwagi, które były krytyczne, jak i te, które były pozytywne, są przeze mnie podzielane. To, co mnie najbardziej cieszy w tych deklaracjach, które pojawiły się ostatnio, to to, że pomiędzy tym 2018r. a 2021r. pojawi się pierwszy z prawdziwego zdarzenia monitoring skutków wydawanych środków finansowych w ramach tego priorytetu, i muszę powiedzieć, że ze zdziwieniem przyjąłem, że do tej pory takiego monitoringu precyzyjnego, dokładnego niestety nie było. Jeszcze raz podkreślę, bardzo dobrze się stało, że w tej najbliższej trzyletniej perspektywie Parlament będzie informowany, jakie są efekty wydawania środków finansowych w ramach tego priorytetu.

Krisztina Morvai (NI). – Köszönöm szépen! Kedves Kollégák! Annyira sajnálom, hogy nem tudott ide velem jönni az a taxi gépkocsivezető, aki reggel a repülőtérré vitt Budapestén, egy negyven körüli fiatalember, azt kérdezte tőlem: Krisztina, igaz az, hogy nekünk, a mi korosztályuknak már nem lesz nyugdíjunk? Igaz, hogy ebbe az irányba megy Európa? És azt is kérdezte, hogy igaz az, hogy most már nem lesz társadalombiztosításon alapuló egészségügy? Hogy már csak magán-egészségügy lesz?

És hozzátette, hogy azt beszélük, hogy az öngondoskodás lesz a jelszó. De hát én azt hittem, hogy öngondoskodást folytatok, – mondta –, mikor nyugdíjjárulékot fizetek, meg amikor társadalombiztosítási járulékot fizetek.

Most, hogy itt van ez a vita a strukturális reformok támogatásáról, azért nagyon jó lenne megállni egy percre, és tisztázni, hogy pontosan mit is értünk ezek alatt a strukturális reformok alatt, és biztosítani kellene, hogy az emberek, az európai polgárok azért ebben az abszolút értékrendi jellegű vitában részt vegyenek. Köszönöm szépen!

(Fine della procedura «catch the eye»)

Valdis Dombrovskis, Vice-President of the Commission. – Mr President, honourable Members, thank you for this interesting debate and for the support which many of you have clearly expressed for this amendment. For the European Commission this file is of high priority. It will enable us to increase our support in EU Member States and finalise an important package of proposals for deepening economic and monetary union.

We are grateful that thanks to your engagement and constructive approach on this legislative text, it looks like the Member States will be able to benefit from a higher budget for technical support and for a more targeted support for those who wish to adopt the euro already next year in 2019.

This is a step towards a more integrated, more resilient and more cohesive economic and monetary union and it is a step in the right direction.

Ruža Tomašić, izvijestiteljica. – Gospodine predsjedavajući, evo, vrlo kratko. Dvadeset i četiri države članice su se prijavile i ne vidim razloga zašto ih ne bismo poduprli, pogotovo za neke države članice to znači jako, jako puno. Znamo koje probleme neke države članice imaju, znamo isto da nismo ni nastojali da im pomognemo, nismo ni nastojali vidjeti koje probleme imaju pa kroz ovaj program za potporu mislim da to donekle možemo ispraviti. Još jednom zahvaljujem svima koji su se uključili u raspravu i zahvaljujem svima onima koji će glasovati i podržati ovo izvješće. Hvala lijepa.

Presidente. – La discussione è chiusa.

La votazione si svolgerà martedì 11 settembre 2018.

Dichiarazioni scritte (articolo 162)

Ivana Maletić (PPE), napisan. – Kao izvijestiteljica EPP-a u sjeni za ovo izvješće, drago mi je što je posebno istaknuto da se prioritet pri dodjeljivanju sredstava treba dati državama članicama koje su izvan Eurozone, a kojima želimo pomoći da što prije postignu konvergenciju i ispune kriterije za ulazak u Eurozonu. Time ovaj Program potpore strukturnim reformama postaje dio našeg europskog plana solidarnosti, kohezije i konvergencije u cijeloj Europskoj uniji.

Prijedlogom izmjene uredbe, financijska omotnica Programa potpore strukturnim reformama za razdoblje 2017. – 2020. povećava se na 222,8 milijuna eura. Program je uspostavljen s ciljem jačanja kapaciteta država članica za pripremu i provedbu administrativnih i strukturnih reformi kojima se održava rast. Potporu u okviru programa pruža Komisija na zahtjev države članice, a ona može obuhvaćati razna područja, primjerice javnu upravu, upravljanje prihodima, rast i poslovno okruženje, tržište rada, obrazovanje, zdravstvo i socijalne usluge te financijski sektor. Važno je naglasiti da su države već dosad predale zahtjeve za reforme i projekte reformi za financiranje iz ovog Programa u vrijednosti od preko 132 milijuna eura čime se javila potreba za dodatnim sredstvima programa.

A što se tiče Hrvatske, Vlada je od početka primjene Programa predložila 17 projekata i zahtjeva za pomoć za projekte reformi ukupne vrijednosti od 2,3 milijuna eura.

21. Wpływ polityki spójności UE w Irlandii Północnej (debata)

Presidente. – L'ordine del giorno reca la relazione di Derek Vaughan, a nome della commissione per lo sviluppo regionale, sull'impatto della politica di coesione dell'UE sull'Irlanda del Nord (2017/2225(INI)) (A8-0240/2018).

Derek Vaughan, Rapporteur. – Mr President, can I first of all thank my colleagues on the Committee on Regional Development (REGI) for their cooperation on this report. It is a good time to have such a report because something important is happening. By that I mean of course the discussions on the next MFF and the negotiations on the next cohesion policy regulations, because unfortunately there are still some people who don't see the value of cohesion policy. They want to cut the spending and reduce its influence, but I think in Northern Ireland we have an example where cohesion policy has worked.

Colleagues will recall that, since the Good Friday Agreement in 1998, Northern Ireland has been on a path of peace and we should remember that along that path they have been helped by the European Union. Northern Ireland has benefited from various cohesion policy programmes: ERDF, ESF, the rural development plan, and also fisheries funding. Unfortunately these are likely to go post-2020. But there are also Interreg, and the PEACE Programme and these can – and should – remain, whatever happens post-2020.

Prior to drafting my report, we took a REGI delegation to Northern Ireland. It was a good and interesting delegation. We saw Interreg cross-border projects in Derry-Londonderry, for example health projects where people cross the border to receive health care. We also met and talked to businesses who benefited from cross-border operations. So it brings social and economic benefits. In Belfast we met the Survivor and Victim Support Project and we heard about the excellent work they were doing, and we saw and heard from two community projects funded by the PEACE Programme. Let me remind colleagues that the PEACE Programme in the current round received EUR 270 million.

We saw two centres where people – mainly young people – from both communities came together to learn, to dance, to sing, to enjoy themselves, to play sport and to socialise together. I believe that projects like these are vital if we are to continue to break down mistrust, particularly amongst future generations. I think one of the reasons why this type of project has been so successful is because it has used a bottom-up approach, where people from communities have come together and done things together to benefit them as individuals and to benefit their communities.

Another thing we learned on our delegation was that EU funds are seen as neutral. That kept coming up time after time. So EU funds are accepted because they don't come from the UK, they don't come from the Irish Government, they come from the European Union. As I said, this means all communities have accepted EU funding and have put that funding to good use. That is why one of the key findings of this report is that the PEACE Programme and Interreg must continue post-2020, whatever happens.

Another key recommendation in our report is that the PEACE Programme can be used as a model and used elsewhere where there has been conflict and where there has been mistrust. So we are looking to the future here to say that cohesion policy should continue and this would be another good use for it.

I believe that this is a good report. There have been lots of discussions in the REGI Committee and it has had good support in the REGI Committee. So please, colleagues, let's send a message to the European Union, to the Irish Government and, in particular, to the UK Government, that Interreg and, in particular, the PEACE Programme are so important. We must continue to fund them post-2020, whatever happens.

Corina Crețu, *Member of the Commission*. – Mr President, first and foremost, I would like to congratulate the rapporteur Mr Vaughan on his report. I believe it brings an accurate and some much-needed light to the decisive impact that cohesion policy has had in Northern Ireland.

I had the pleasure back in November of attending an exhibition hosted by the European Parliament on peace and Interreg (European Territorial Co-operation) projects and I have also had the opportunity over the last four years to meet several beneficiaries, and what I witnessed through their stories was a vivid and concrete expression of what cohesion policy can help us to achieve.

As you said, EU investments have helped bring people close together and increased the prosperity of Northern Ireland and its citizens, but most importantly, they have contributed to the economic transformation of a region that was facing many complex challenges. I think it is quite obvious that over the past 20 years, EU funding for Northern Ireland has been both substantial in size and successful in its implementation. This includes bespoke actions and investments from all European structural and investment funds. The ERDF – European Regional Development Fund – alone has provided over EUR 1 billion through regional growth programmes for Northern Ireland. In addition, Northern Ireland and the border region of Ireland benefited from over EUR 2 billion through peace and Interreg funding.

Honourable Members, I am particularly pleased to hear from you that the Regional Development Committee's fact-finding mission to Northern Ireland was enriching and confirmed that the programmes were delivering efficiently on the ground. Whether we are talking about funding the science park in Derry/Londonderry, thus helping small-and medium-sized enterprises and micro businesses to innovate, or about supporting gross community dialogue in Belfast through urban regeneration projects, I think cohesion policy has brought a holistic approach in Northern Ireland which has been instrumental in addressing the multifaceted challenges of the region. As rightly underlined in your report, the peace and Interreg cross-border programmes have been of particular importance, and they are making a vital contribution to long-term partnership, peace and prosperity. I took good note of the report's call for a continuation of funding for the peace and Interreg programmes after 2020 and my message to you is clear: we are on the same wavelength. You all know and we know that the Commission included in its draft cohesion policy package for the next programming period a proposal for a new peace programme – we call it the 'peace+ programme', combining the current peace and Ireland-Northern Ireland cross-border programme. I think this a very tangible sign of the Commission's continuous commitment and of our firm belief that cross-border funding remains paramount for north-south cooperation in Ireland. Thank you for your attention and I am looking forward to our debate.

Andrey Novakov, *on behalf of the PPE Group*. – Mr President, I will begin my speech with the concluding words of the rapporteur, who said that this is ‘one good report’. And indeed, I believe it is a good report, and moreover it is a timely report. Before going into detail, I would like to share a few figures with you. Almost two million citizens in Northern Ireland benefited from EUR seven billion in EU funding from 2007 to 2017. And behind these numbers, behind the statistics, there are people’s lives. People’s lives that have been changed because of EU cohesion policy.

I believe this is one of the textbook examples of how EU cohesion policy is changing the environment. Moreover, this contribution has been done with cross-financing and coordination with the Peace Programme so, yet again, the European Union has shown that it knows how to work to bring back peace – and peace is priceless.

Here, I would like to congratulate Commissioner Crețu, because she dedicated herself to a better-working cohesion policy, and I think that as we approach the end of our mandate, we can show some very good results of what the European Union has achieved with its cohesion policy.

John Howarth, *on behalf of the S&D Group*. – Thank you Mr President. I congratulate my friend, the rapporteur, on an excellent and concise report. It is important to remember that the essence of the Good Friday Agreement is that it provides the framework that enables the different traditions in Northern Ireland to coexist peacefully. The important work reviewed in this report aims to maintain the climate in which peace can continue to evolve. Let us not forget that the Good Friday Agreement was approved of overwhelmingly by people on both sides of the Irish border. Sadly, there are some Brexiteers, like Mr Rees Mogg in the UK Parliament, who want to pick and choose which bits of democracy they respect, and they dismiss the importance of maintaining this agreement after Brexit. To dismiss the agreement is to take peace for granted, and when you take peace for granted, you are on a very slippery slope. So it is vital that the work described in this report continues, even if cohesion policy cannot be the vehicle. If and when Brexit goes ahead, there are other financial instruments in the union that can fill the gap, as paragraph 10 of this report makes clear.

James Nicholson, *on behalf of the ECR Group*. – Mr President, can I first of all congratulate the rapporteur and say that, two decades on from the Belfast Agreement, Northern Ireland has been transformed economically and socially. And there is no doubt that European support has played an important role in terms of economic development and social cohesion.

In recent years, funding from the European Regional Development Fund has supported a vast range of projects, including investment in the development of tourism as well as infrastructure projects. Many projects have benefited from the European Social Fund, helping individuals and families across Northern Ireland, supporting initiatives which have helped to increase skills and reduce economic inactivity. The Peace Programme has supported several big-ticket projects as well but, in my view, the greatest impact is the role it has played on the ground and in communities. So I welcome the fact that the report recognises the important contribution these funds have made to Northern Ireland and I very much agree with the rapporteur and his comments on the bottom-up approach.

Can I also say that, since the referendum result, my party has been very clear: we do not want support of this kind to be disrupted or diminished as a result of Brexit. However, I have to say I am more than disappointed by the report’s suggestion that without these funds the peace process would be put at risk. To me, this is overly simplistic at best, and at worst it risks giving a potential excuse to those who seek to justify terrorism.

I have to ask a question here, maybe to the rapporteur and maybe to the Commissioner. If we decide, or if it is decided, to give funds to Northern Ireland after 2020, and the United Kingdom is no longer part of the European Union and there will be No MEPs from Northern Ireland within the Chamber, who is actually going to represent Northern Ireland? The UK will not be at the Council table, there will be No Commissioner from the United Kingdom, and there will be No MEPs in this House, so that is a very difficult road to go down.

It is an interesting road that needs to be addressed, and it is one I have certainly given some thought to, so it will be very interesting to see how the Commission and the Council actually deal with that problem. However, I congratulate the rapporteur and I thank all those involved very much.

Ivan Jakovčić, *u ime Kluba zastupnika ALDE-a*. – Gospodine predsjedavajući, evo, mogao bih odmah odgovoriti gospodinu Nicholsonu, a to je ako ništa drugo, zadržimo Interreg program koji je poznat na način da financira one prekogranične projekte zemalja članica i zemalja nečlanica. Ujedinjeno Kraljevstvo i Sjeverna Irska neće biti dio Europske unije, ali Interreg program postoji i on može financirati sve ono što smo vidjeli u Sjevernoj Irskoj. A ono što smo vidjeli bilo je impresivno. Zaista, oduševio sam se s onim što smo vidjeli, novac koji je došao iz Europske unije stvorio je mir. Pomirba se nastavlja, vidljivo je da zajednice to žele, one zaista žive na neki način zajedno, upravo zahvaljujući onome što je došlo pomirbom na Veliki petak i Sporazumom od Velikog petka, ali i zahvaljujući financijskim sredstvima Europske unije. *Peace* program moramo nastaviti, ali *peace* program moramo i proširiti. Hajdemo ga proširiti na one zemlje gdje je bilo konflikata, a to je i moja Hrvatska, to je Kosovo, to je Bosna i Hercegovina, to je Makedonija. Imamo razloga *peace* program proširiti, pokazao se uspješnim u Sjevernoj Irskoj, tamo smo imali konflikt, imali smo ga i na Balkanu. Hajdemo ga proširiti jer mislimo da imamo odlične rezultate i trebamo to iskoristiti.

Terry Reintke, *on behalf of the Verts/ALE Group*. – Thank you, Mr President. ‘I have been living here my whole life. I don’t want to go back to how things were before. I cannot do that. I cannot live in this neighbourhood if we go back to how it used to be.’ This was the very simple message from a woman from a heavily segregated area in Belfast whose neighbourhood and community had benefited from peace funds, where a big community centre had been built, and slowly but surely things started to change, things started to develop. She told us about her experiences, about her life, about the history of the place where she grew up. She told us about the violence, the division, the economic devastation. She didn’t have any political agenda. She probably didn’t even have a strong opinion about the European Union. All that she wanted us to know was her story and for her story to be taken into consideration when we take decisions here in the European Parliament.

When we went to Northern Ireland, with a delegation from this Parliament, no matter where we went, no matter whom we talked to, the message was always very similar. The peace funding has played an integral role to build peace in a conflict-ridden area in Europe, not only to rebuild infrastructure and the economy, but also to bring people together who had been segregated and separated for decades. Peace is very hard to build and very easy to destroy. As Europeans we have learnt this lesson over and over again in the past centuries. Now for me, it is very clear, we have to make sure that the peace funding will not be lost. We cannot let this Brexit disaster mess up the peace in Northern Ireland. As Europeans we have a responsibility, a responsibility to protect a hard-earned peace.

Martina Anderson, *on behalf of the GUE/NGL Group*. – Mr President, I commend Derek Vaughan on his report. Cohesion funding has played a huge role in supporting the Good Friday Agreement via aiding thousands and thousands of people who depend on this funding for their businesses, community projects and infrastructure. The British Government says it will guarantee EU funding streams to the north post-2020. However, what if there is No Brexit deal? The civil servants in the north have already identified a shortfall of over 10 million. Even if the British were to deliver on their dodgy guarantees, the British Cabinet – a gang of incompetent fools – say people should keep calm and carry on and ignore the Brexit chaos. MEPs, especially the two unionists from the north of Ireland, need to endorse this report and to vote in favour of it. No washed-out kingdom fixated on its empire of old will ever serve the interests of the people of Ireland, north and south.

The north of Ireland needs a differentiated approach. It needs all strands of cohesion funding to apply to it, not just now, but in the post-Brexit future, and as the only MEP from the north who’s fighting Brexit every day, I deeply appreciate the fact that the north is getting this kind of special financial assistance and financial special status post-Brexit.

Diane Dodds (NI). – Thank you Mr President, and thank you to our colleague Mr Vaughan and indeed the whole Regional Development Committee (REGI) for this report.

Cohesion funds have played a part in consolidating progress in Northern Ireland. This has not been without faults. In respect of innocent victims of terrorism, I would question the reports premise that this has always been viewed as neutral money in how it has been allocated. And in more recent times, community organisations including voluntary and women’s organisations have argued that red tape has curtailed benefits for local people. Of course, it is money that also originates from UK taxpayers as an EU Member State and so our focus going forward must not be on how it is lost, but on how it can be used to bring even better benefits.

The Government has indicated that there will be a shared prosperity fund across the UK post-Brexit. It also wants to agree cooperation accords with the EU to collaborate in specific areas of investment. Moving forward, we will continue to work with our government to ensure that the commitments towards peace and Interreg programmes are honoured. This is necessary and positive work, and we look forward to working in goodwill and cooperation.

Lambert van Nistelrooij (PPE). – Mr President, this is a special report. It is an implementation report that was initiated by Parliament and we produced it at the right moment. We have heard what the implementation will entail: it is very positive and, in this regard, if you look to the future it is extremely important to note that we already have instruments under the Interreg programme going cross-border and working in a very targeted and dedicated way. We could see, especially during our visit, that this works.

Let me say that borders are, in fact, something from the past. We resolved this issue: we waved away the 'old scars' both politically and also in a practical sense. My wish and the wish of the EPP Group is that Mr Barnier – who, I know, already has the Peace+ programme in his toolbox – also resolves it and that people will again feel the contribution of Europe in the future. This is worth talking about.

Good report, Mr Vaughan!

Joachim Zeller (PPE). – Herr Präsident, Frau Kommissarin! Ich hatte die Ehre, im März dieses Jahres die Delegation des Ausschusses für regionale Entwicklung in Nordirland zu leiten. Das Karfreitagsabkommen von 1998 war kurz vor seinem zwanzigsten Jahrestag. Wir hatten viele Gesprächspartner aus der Politik und der Zivilgesellschaft, und mich berührten besonders zwei Dinge: erstens, dass alle Gesprächspartner die bisherigen EU-Hilfen als notwendig und wirksam lobten, um die vorher gewaltsam ausgetragenen Konflikte zwischen den gesellschaftlichen Gruppen in Nordirland zu beenden, dass uns aber auch zweitens alle versicherten, dass der Friedens- und Versöhnungsprozess in Nordirland noch nicht nachhaltig genug und immer noch zerbrechlich ist. Ein harter Brexit ohne Fortführung der EU-Programme in und mit Nordirland wird die alten Konflikte wieder aufbrechen lassen. Das ist die Botschaft, die sie uns mitgaben, und diese Warnung sollten wir sehr ernst nehmen, wie wir ja vor nicht allzu langer Zeit auch bereits in Derry gesehen haben. Vor allem diejenigen, die auf dem Rücken der Menschen und der Schicksale in Nordirland ihre politischen Brexitspielen austragen, sollten das beherzigen.

Procedura «catch the eye»

Stanislav Polčák (PPE). – Pane předsedající, i já bych chtěl poděkovat kolegovi Vaughanovi za předloženou zprávu, která přišla skutečně v pravý čas a je podle mého názoru velmi kvalitní. Důležitost evropských fondů je skutečně patrná zejména právě v té přeshraniční spolupráci a u těchto přeshraničních programů. Politika soudržnosti má odstraňovat určitá znevýhodnění, myslím si, že má také zasypávat staré rány, ať neobživnou nové konflikty, a že má usmířovat komunity. V Severním Irsku jsme byli svědky skutečné změny jak v ekonomice, tak i v sociální soudržnosti a myslím, že ta změna byla pozitivní a bylo by dobré tento výsledek neztratit.

Velmi rád jsem slyšel od paní komisařky, že právě program PEACE+ v tom novém programovacím období by měl zahrnout i přímo ty pohraniční oblasti, to si myslím, že je velmi dobré. Ostatně paní komisařka toho udělala velmi hodně, chtěl bych ji za to ocenit v této oblasti a pro ty přeshraniční fondy v tom novém programovacím období by mělo být místo, protože právě tyto programy nám mají ukázat, jak lze budovat přeshraniční spolupráci, je to myslím důležité zejména pro Balkán.

Izaskun Bilbao Barandica (ALDE). – Señor presidente, quiero expresar mi total apoyo a la continuidad en Irlanda del Norte de los programas de cohesión y especialmente el programa PEACE, que es fundamental para la consolidación del proceso de paz salido del Acuerdo del Viernes Santo.

El PEACE es un ejemplo de cómo la Unión, con compromiso político y financiero, ha contribuido en suelo europeo a la resolución de un conflicto reconciliando comunidades y promoviendo un desarrollo más justo. Por eso, el Brexit no debe impedir que se mantenga este apoyo ejemplar a la paz y a la justicia social desde la Unión Europea.

Esta intervención es, además, un modelo para otras regiones europeas que han vivido graves episodios de violencia — como el País Vasco— porque, aunque el origen y el desarrollo del conflicto irlandés y el terrorismo de ETA no son comparables, sí lo son algunas de sus consecuencias. Aprovechar las experiencias impulsadas por la Unión Europea y el reconocimiento derivado de ellas es muy útil para resolver problemas de convivencia y valores sobre los que los vascos queremos seguir trabajando bien acompañados.

Julie Ward (S&D). – Mr President, ideologically imposed austerity and an ineffective devolution deal from Westminster have left Northern Ireland less economically developed than other regions of the UK for decades. The government's own impact assessments predict a devastating 8% hit to the economic growth of Northern Ireland if the UK leaves the European Union, and others have put the figure far higher.

Two years on from the EU referendum, the government are yet to lay out a single workable plan to maintain the integrity of the Good Friday Agreement, one of the EU's most celebrated symbols of peace. Theresa May's customs plans have unravelled. They are bureaucratic, unworkable and designed to paper over the cracks of a divided Tory Government, rather than deliver a deal that works for the British people. The Conservatives' dirty deal with the DUP and the collapse of power sharing in Stormont, with no imminent sign of its return, further add to the lack of Northern Ireland's democratic voice during the negotiating process.

So it is time for all of us to acknowledge that there is only one way to maintain the full integrity of the Irish border and prevent the economic and social downturn that Brexit will inevitably bring, and that is to stop it. That's what the majority of the people in Northern Ireland want.

PRESIDENZA DELL'ON. FABIO MASSIMO CASTALDO

Vicepresidente

Bogdan Andrzej Zdrojewski (PPE). – Panie Przewodniczący! Cieszy wspólna dość zgodna opinia o sensowności wydanych środków finansowych na poprawienie sytuacji w Irlandii Północnej. Muszę powiedzieć, że przyjmuję to z satysfakcją, natomiast to co martwi, to właśnie ta kolejna perspektywa, która pojawiła się w ostatnich głosach w tej debacie w tej dyskusji, związana oczywiście z brexitem.

Brexit dla Irlandii Północnej jest poważnym zagrożeniem. Warto przy tej okazji, zwracając uwagę na to co osiągnęliśmy do tej pory, spróbować już zastosować określoną receptę na zbliżającą się perspektywę. Poza Wielką Brytanią, Irlandia Północna może być pierwszym poważnym negatywnym beneficjentem braku stosownych porozumień i recept na następną perspektywę, zwracam uwagę właśnie ten mankament.

(Fine della procedura «catch the eye»)

Corina Crețu, Member of the Commission. – Mr President, honourable Members, in the light of all your interventions, it seems we all agree that there is strong consensus about the fact that cohesion policy programmes have been of key importance for the economic and social progress of Northern Ireland. This also means that the implementation of programmes has been successful overall. In particular, the Peace and Interreg (European Territorial Cooperation) projects have demonstrated that cross-border cooperation is not an abstract concept: it is part of the daily life of citizens and it provides a space for people to come together and forge new partnerships. I liked very much what you said – that peace is very easy to destroy, but very hard to build, and we should not take it for granted. I thank you very much for all your interventions.

We will have the opportunity later today during the debate on Mr Hetman's report to discuss further the importance of ensuring strong cohesion in border regions, but we have here a first taste with Northern Ireland. It is undoubtedly one of the most telling examples of what cohesion policy has helped to achieve in border regions and beyond. There are countless examples where European funding has made a real difference to citizens, businesses, researchers, schools and local and regional authorities, and this report recognises that cohesion policy is one of the keys that can unlock our social, economic and cultural transformation. We must strive to defend it, and make every effort to further increase its effectiveness. This is why, as I said, the Commission has proposed a balanced budget beyond 2020 which preserves cohesion policy as a policy which is both strong and for all the regions.

I trust that the findings in your report will underpin your reflection on the future of cohesion policy and that you will give the negotiation of the legislative packages the highest priority so that a new legislative framework can be adopted as soon as possible. This is together with the negotiation of the MFF. We will also respond to the question from Mr Nicholson on how this peace+ programme will be implemented in the future. Let's see how the Brexit negotiations turn out. Thank you once again for all your contributions.

Derek Vaughan, *Rapporteur*. – Mr President, I'll just try to respond to a couple of points and then make a few concluding remarks.

First of all, I would like to thank colleagues for their positive comments right across the Chamber, although I think one or two colleagues didn't quite get the e-mail about what this report is supposed to be about and what it is not supposed to be about. But I think, in general, the comments were very, very welcome.

I particularly welcome the comments from Mr Nicholson and the question he raised, and I think you, Commissioner, partly answered that. We need to look at what Member States – and particularly, maybe, the Irish Government – are saying about how EU funds are administered in the future and how Northern Ireland is represented in those discussions. I also welcomed his comments when he said that Northern Ireland has come a long way. There has been huge economic improvement and tensions have been reduced, but we do know that those tensions still bubble away. When we were there on the delegations, one of the things we were told was that some survey work had been done and since the referendum, attitudes have hardened amongst the community. So I hope nobody gets the impression – and they should not get the view from the report – that No EU funds means a return to troubles. The report isn't saying that, and I wouldn't say that, but what I am saying – and what I think the report says – is that the EU funds have made a valuable contribution to reducing those tensions and conflicts. So I think that is the important point in terms of Mr Nicholson's view.

Therefore EU funds should continue in the future. We should continue to fund Interreg and the PEACE Programme. We have seen for ourselves on our delegation how welcome those funds are and how important those funds are for making a contribution to communities. Whatever happens in the future – deal or no deal, as Ms Anderson said – the UK Government, the Irish Government and the European Union should commit to continuing to operate and fund Interreg and the PEACE Programme.

Ms Dodds is right that nothing is ever important. In the REGI Committee we spend a huge amount of time talking about bureaucracy and simplifying things so we all want to reduce bureaucracy and we also want to make things as simple as possible, particularly for users. But, overall, these funds have been good. They have delivered on the ground. As I said in my earlier contribution, one of the reasons why they have delivered on the ground is because local people themselves have owned it. They have decided how they want to spend the money. They have decided how they are going to spend the money on important things, which are going to impact on their communities.

So, just to conclude, I think it is absolutely vital that these funds continue in the future. I hope everybody in this Parliament, right across the political divide, right across the Chamber, would support this report tomorrow and send a clear message from this Parliament.

Presidente. – La discussione è chiusa.

La votazione si svolgerà martedì 11 settembre 2018.

Dichiarazioni scritte (articolo 162)

Tom Vandenkendelaere (PPE), *schriftelijk*. – Het is duidelijk dat de uitgebreide hulpprogramma's van het Europese cohesiebeleid het laatste decennium hun vruchten hebben afgeworpen in Noord-Ierland. De Europese bijdrage van meer dan EUR 1 miljard tussen 2014 en 2020 via verschillende fondsen zorgt tot op de dag van vandaag onder andere voor:

Blijvende economische groei met de laagste werkloosheidscijfers in tien jaar;

Intensieve begeleiding bij de transformatie van de zware industrie naar een meer dienstengerichte economie;

Duurzame economische activiteiten.

Daarnaast speelt de EU een fundamentele rol in de vredesgesprekken tussen Ierland en Noord-Ierland. Ongeacht de uitkomst van de brexitonderhandelingen moet volgens mij de Europese steun aan Noord-Ierland verzekerd blijven. Noord-Ierland neemt reeds voor een aanzienlijke periode deel aan het ambitieuze Europese project, en de intensieve samenwerking – zeker betreffende de vredesprojecten – moet in mijn opinie dan ook voortgezet worden.

22. Szczególne środki dla Grecji (debata)

Presidente. – L'ordine del giorno reca la relazione di Pascal Arimont, a nome della commissione per lo sviluppo regionale, sull'attuazione di misure specifiche per la Grecia ai sensi del regolamento (UE) 2015/1839 (2018/2038(INI)) (A8-0244/2018).

Pascal Arimont, Berichterstatter. – Herr Präsident, sehr geehrte Frau Kommissarin, sehr geehrte Kolleginnen und Kollegen! Wir alle erinnern uns an das Jahr 2015, das vor allem für unsere griechischen Freunde sehr schmerzhaft war. Im Kontext der schweren griechischen Finanz- und Wirtschaftskrise konnte das Land nämlich die nötigen Kofinanzierungsanteile für die Projekte der Strukturfonds nicht mehr garantieren und gewährleisten. Es waren ganz einfach keine öffentlichen Mittel da. Das hieß ganz konkret: Viele sehr wichtige und bereits begonnene Infrastrukturprojekte in Griechenland standen vor dem Aus, und sogar noch schlimmer: Für den Fall, dass diese Projekte nicht im Rahmen der Förderperiode 2007 bis 2013 abgeschlossen worden wären, hätte Griechenland bedeutende Mittel an die EU zurückzahlen müssen. Wir befanden uns also vor einem absoluten Worst-Case-Szenario. Die Situation drohte sogar noch schlimmer zu werden, wenn diese Zahlungen an die EU hätten geleistet werden müssen.

Es musste daher sehr schnell, sehr klug und sehr zielgerichtet gehandelt werden. Die EU-Kommission schlug daraufhin eine Änderung der allgemeinen Verordnung der Strukturfonds vor: Um dem Land die Nutzung der zur Verfügung stehenden Mittel dennoch zu ermöglichen, verzichtete die EU in der vergangenen Förderperiode auf den ansonsten verbindlichen nationalen Kofinanzierungsanteil. Dadurch konnte Griechenland auf Investitionsmittel wieder zurückgreifen, die ansonsten, wie oben beschrieben, einfach verfallen wären. Zudem bewilligte man Griechenland einen Vorschuss für die neue Förderperiode in Höhe von einer Milliarde, was summa summarum zu einer Hilfsmaßnahme in einem Gesamtvolumen von rund zwei Milliarden Euro geführt hat, einer Summe, deren Einsatz es durch dieses Parlament eingehend zu überwachen galt. Als Sonderberichterstatter war ich im Namen des Parlaments für diese Überwachung zuständig und mehrfach vor Ort, auch in Griechenland, um mit den wichtigen Leuten dort über diese Projekte zu sprechen.

Wir als Parlament haben in diesem Rahmen immer wieder betont, dass diese Hilfsmittel kein Blankoscheck sein können. Sie sollten an die Realisierung und die Fertigstellung dieser wichtigen Projekte gebunden werden – dies auch im Rahmen der Strukturreformen, die Griechenland unbedingt realisieren musste. Genau das wollten wir mit dem heute vorliegenden Bericht sicherstellen. Wir haben demzufolge eingehend kontrolliert, dass die Finanzmittel, diese zwei Milliarden Euro der EU, sinnvoll eingesetzt und genutzt werden. Und was ist das Ergebnis? Das Ergebnis ist: Griechenland hat geliefert. Das Land hat eine Prioritätenliste der wichtigen Projekte erstellt und abgearbeitet. Diese konnten daher fristgerecht beendet werden, ohne dass es zu einem Mittelverfall gekommen ist. Doch nicht nur das: Dieser Bericht zeigt auch, welche Auswirkungen die Regionalpolitik für Regionen und Länder haben kann. Wir konnten feststellen, dass die Projekte der Regionalpolitik dazu beigetragen haben, das Land wirtschaftlich spürbar wachsen zu lassen, die hohe Arbeitslosigkeit zu bekämpfen und Perspektiven für die Menschen zu schaffen. Das war für Griechenland ein regelrechter Erfolg.

In Zeiten der massiven Krise stellten die Mittel aus den Strukturfonds mitunter mehr als die Hälfte der gesamten öffentlichen Investitionen dar. Schätzungen zufolge konnte das griechische Bruttoinlandsprodukt im Jahre 2015 durch diese zusätzlichen Investitionen etwas mehr als zwei Prozent höher ausfallen als ohne diese Mittel. 131 prioritäre Projekte konnten über den gesamten Zeitraum durch diese Hilfsmaßnahmen fertiggestellt werden. Das sind deutlich messbare Zahlen. Solche Zahlen sollten daher den Kritikern der Regionalpolitik zu denken geben. Die Regionalpolitik hat hier einen sehr konkreten Mehrwert geschaffen. Dazu gehören echte Erfolgsgeschichten, und ich erinnere da nur an die geschaffene Verkehrsinfrastruktur sowie an wichtige Investitionen im Bereich Umwelt und Tourismus.

Kolleginnen und Kollegen, dem griechischen Volk konnte durch diese Sondermaßnahmen wirksam geholfen werden. Ja, diese Hilfsmaßnahmen waren ein Zeichen gelebter Solidarität. Wir waren uns im Ausschuss mit großer Mehrheit einig, dass dies Werbung für die europäische Idee und für die Regionalpolitik war und ist. In Zukunft ist darauf zu achten, dass die Investitionen nachhaltig, die Jobs gesichert bleiben und die Lebensqualität gesteigert wird.

Zusammenfassend bin ich davon überzeugt, dass die Entscheidung der EU, Griechenland diese Sonderhilfen zu gewähren, die richtige Entscheidung war. Hier kann ziemlich deutlich veranschaulicht werden, was passiert wäre, wenn wir dies nicht gemacht hätten.

Aber klar bleibt auch: Diese Hilfsmaßnahme ist und bleibt ein Sonderfall. Wir müssen alle sicherstellen, dass sich das Ganze nicht wiederholen wird, weder für Griechenland noch für sonst einen anderen Mitgliedstaat. Vielen Dank an die Europäische Kommission, aber auch an alle Kollegen dieses Hauses, die an diesem Bericht mit mir zusammengearbeitet haben und diese Schlussfolgerungen angenommen haben. Vielen Dank!

Corina Crețu, *Member of the Commission*. – Mr President, honourable Members, allow me to start by expressing the Commission's and my personal condolences to the families and friends of the victims of the devastating fire that hit Greece this summer. I want to assure you that the Commission stands by the Greek people and the public authorities and will explore all possible means of assistance in a spirit of solidarity. I understand that you voted earlier to discuss these issues separately, so we will have this opportunity later.

Honourable Members, I would like to congratulate Mr Arimont on this important report. Actually, the specific measures for Greece adopted in October 2015 which we are discussing today were already a vivid expression of this spirit of solidarity, which is the DNA of cohesion policy. I would like to thank the European Parliament and, in particular, the Regional Development Committee, its chair, Ms Mihaylova, and the vice-chair, Mr Arimont, for their continued support in promoting these measures.

These measures provided crucial liquidity for Greece. A total amount of approximately EUR 2 billion was paid to the country in 2015 and 2016. This includes around EUR 1 billion of additional pre-financing for the 2014-2020 programmes. Another EUR 1 billion paid as a consequence of the increase of the co-financing rate to 100% and the removal of the 95% ceiling for the total advance and interim payments for the 2007-2013 programming period. In times of severe liquidity problems, these measures also alleviated the burden on the national budget. They reduced by approximately EUR 1 billion the amounts needed in national co-financing for 2007-2013. Thanks to the additional liquidity and to the fact that it was put on a special ring-fenced account, Greece was able to restart its payments to beneficiaries of co-financing projects who, in turn, resumed work on this project, thereby initiating new expenditure which could then be reimbursed by the Commission. I note with great satisfaction that Greece managed to complete the important project in the programming period 2007-2013 in the fields of transport, digital infrastructure, entrepreneurship, the environment and social and health care. The completion of this project has triggered the virtuous circle of job creation, economic activity and growth. One of the most obvious examples is the five motorway concessions, part of the main TEN-T (Trans-European Transport Networks) network. By mid-2015, works had stopped and there was a very serious risk that they would not be resumed because of the lack of funds. The liquidity provided through the specific measures has been instrumental to ensuring that in the course of 2017, all five projects were completed. I actually had the pleasure of taking part in the inauguration event for the Tempe Valley tunnel on the Aegean motorway. All the way through the support from the European Parliament was essential, so I would like, once again, to thank you for your contribution, with particular acknowledgement to the honourable Member Arimont for having sponsored these measures and for his thorough report.

Thank you for your attention. I am looking forward to your comments.

Μαρία Σπυράκη, *εξ ονόματος της ομάδας PPE*. – Κύριε Πρόεδρε, σήμερα κλείνουμε εδώ μια προσπάθεια που ξεκίνησε τον Οκτώβριο του 2015 από την Επιτροπή Περιφερειακής Ανάπτυξης, δίνοντας μια σημαντική εξαίρεση στην πατρίδα μου, στην Ελλάδα, με τον κανονισμό (ΕΕ) 2015/1839. Είναι μια σημαντική πρωτοβουλία, καθώς η Ευρωπαϊκή Ένωση έδειξε έμπρακτα την αλληλεγγύη της στην Ελλάδα σε ένα πολύ κρίσιμο σημείο. Είναι σημαντική γιατί η Ελλάδα έχασε το 26% του ΑΕΠ την περίοδο της κρίσης και η ανεργία της εκτινάχθηκε. Είναι σημαντική γιατί, τον Μάιο του 2018, η Ελλάδα ακόμα έχει ανεργία 19,5% σύμφωνα με τη Eurostat και η ανεργία στους νέους για το 2017 ήταν 43,7%. Με την εξαίρεση η Ελλάδα έλαβε συνολικό ποσό ύψους 20,4 δισεκατομμυρίων EUR από τη χρηματοδότηση στο πλαίσιο της πολιτικής συνοχής για την περίοδο 2007-2013. Ήταν, όπως είπατε κυρία Επίτροπε, μια πολύ σημαντική ένεση ρευστότητας σε μια περίοδο που η πολιτική αβεβαιότητα κινδύνευε να τινάξει στον αέρα οποιαδήποτε προσπάθεια απορρόφησης κοινοτικών κονδυλίων. Θέλω να πω εδώ, συνάδελφοι, ένα μεγάλο ευχαριστώ σε όλους σας. Η Ευρωπαϊκή Ένωση έδρασε άμεσα και έδρασε αποτελεσματικά. Η πολιτική συνοχής απέδειξε ότι αποτελεί τον ακρογωνιαίο λίθο της ευρωπαϊκής αλληλεγγύης. Στη νέα εποχή όπου πρέπει να συνδυάζουμε τα χρηματοδοτικά εργαλεία, δεν θα πρέπει να στερήσουμε τους πόρους της συνοχής αλλά να δώσουμε ώθηση σε έργα με προστιθέμενη αξία. Οι εταίροι, οι φίλοι, φαίνονται στα δύσκολα και η αλληλεγγύη δόθηκε έμπρακτα στην Ελλάδα. Σταθήκατε στην Ελλάδα όταν ήμασταν στο χείλος του γκρεμού. Μένει να διδαχθούμε όλοι οι Ευρωπαίοι από την πραγματικά τραγική κατάσταση που βίωσε η χώρα μου και να αναφωνήσουμε όλοι εδώ μαζί ότι δεν θα την επαναλάβουμε ποτέ ξανά.

Mercedes Bresso, *a nome del gruppo S&D*. – Signor Presidente, onorevoli colleghi, innanzitutto, anche da parte del nostro gruppo esprimo la solidarietà alla Grecia e alle famiglie delle vittime del terribile incendio di quest'estate.

Come è già stato ricordato dall'on. Arimont, le misure di aiuto alla Grecia sono state molto importanti e le hanno consentito di ben realizzare un programma di sviluppo. Da un punto di vista politico, abbiamo ribadito come gruppo con forza che questo meccanismo, per quanto straordinario, è effettivamente servito a restituire fiato a un'economia che era stata asfissata da misure di austerità altrettanto straordinarie, sottolineando che le cause della crisi erano molto complesse e gli effetti prodotti sul tessuto sociale ed economico greco molto gravi.

Ci è parso, in definitiva, evidente l'effetto positivo indotto dall'utilizzo accresciuto, grazie ai fondi europei, dei fondi strutturali, soprattutto in un'ottica di lungo periodo e rispetto alle continue messe in discussione del valore dei risultati dei fondi strutturali. In questo senso, proprio per la straordinarietà dell'intervento, e anche per il contributo che può fornirci a meglio comprendere l'impatto di queste politiche sui cittadini, io credo che sia importante continuare a sostenere l'attualità della politica di coesione di fronte ai suoi detrattori.

Νότης Μαριάς, *εξ ονόματος της ομάδας ECR*. – Κύριε Πρόεδρε, τα μνημόνια οδήγησαν τη χώρα μου, την Ελλάδα, σε μία απόλυτη οικονομική καταστροφή, οδήγησαν σε ένα κοινωνικό νεκροταφείο με τεράστιο αριθμό ανέργων, με φτώχεια, με μείωση του ΑΕΠ στο 26%. Ταυτόχρονα, τα μνημόνια επέβαλαν μείωση του Προγράμματος Δημοσίων Επενδύσεων, δηλαδή μείωση των ποσών που έπρεπε να επενδυθούν: εκ των πραγμάτων η Ελλάδα δεν μπορούσε να χρηματοδοτήσει τα ευρωπαϊκά προγράμματα που χρειαζόταν συγχρηματοδότηση διότι η τρόικα έλεγε τότε ότι θα αυξηθεί το έλλειμμα. Αυτό το τεράστιο πρόβλημα το είχαμε επισημάνει εδώ από το 2014 και ευτυχώς υπήρξαν αυτές οι ρυθμίσεις, ευτυχώς υπήρξε αυτή η εξαίρεση που έδωσε τη δυνατότητα να εισρεύσουν αυτά τα κονδύλια των δύο δισεκατομμυρίων EUR. Το συμπέρασμα, κυρία Crețu, πρέπει να είναι το εξής: όταν μια χώρα αντιμετωπίζει πρόβλημα, όπως η Ελλάδα, τότε χρειάζονται εξαιρέσεις. Χρειάζονται ειδικές ρυθμίσεις. Χρειάζεται μια ειδική σχέση της Ελλάδας με την Ευρωπαϊκή Ένωση, με πολλές εξαιρέσεις στην εφαρμογή της Συνθήκης, προκειμένου να μπορέσει να ανασάνει η χώρα, να πάει μπροστά, διότι δεν μπορεί να ανταγωνιστεί μια κατεστραμμένη ελληνική οικονομία τις άλλες οικονομίες της Ευρωπαϊκής Ένωσης. Για αυτό εμείς, ως «ΕΛΛΑΔΑ-Ο ΑΛΛΟΣ ΔΡΟΜΟΣ», προτείνουμε ειδική σχέση της Ελλάδας εντός της Ευρωπαϊκής Ένωσης και εντός της ευρωζώνης.

Искра Михайлова, *от името на групата ALDE*. – Г-н Председател, преди три години имах честта да бъда докладчик по законодателния доклад по отношение на специфичните мерки за Гърция, свързани с подкрепата от структурните инвестиционни фондове, от името на комисията по регионално развитие на този парламент.

Днес проследяваме прилагането на специфичните мерки съобразно Регламент (ЕС) 2015/1839, предназначени да предоставят на Гърция подкрепа в един решаващ момент на недостиг на ликвидност и липса на публични инвестиции. Това прекрасно е отразено в доклада на колегата Аримонт.

Бих искала тук да подчертая важната роля на кохезионната политика като основния инвестиционен инструмент на Съюза за укрепване на конкурентоспособността, икономическия растеж и намаляване на неравенствата, като се има предвид, че европейските структурни инвестиционни фондове представляват най-големият източник на преки инвестиции в Гърция.

Докладът на комисията REGI неизменно подчертава, че структурните фондове имат значително положително въздействие върху брутния вътрешен продукт и социалното, икономическо и териториално сближаване като цяло.

Използвам случая да приветствам факта, че благодарение на финансовите средства от Европейския съюз по този регламент значително е намалял броят на проектите, декларирани като незавършени, а усвояването на структурните фондове значително се е подобрило, като Гърция е първата държава членка, напълно усвоила наличните ресурси и достигнала 100% равнище на усвояване за предишния период.

В допълнение, към март 2018 г. Гърция показва 28% равнище на изпълнение за настоящия програмен период, което я извежда сред държавите членки с най-добри резултати като цяло. Следователно политиката за сближаване чрез тези специфични мерки е изпълнила ролята си.

Същевременно бих искала да подчертая важноста на структурните реформи и очаквам Гърция да продължи да се възползва в пълна степен от възможностите, предоставени от програмата за подкрепа на структурните реформи, с оглед създаване и укрепване на подходяща инвестиционна среда.

Terry Reintke, *on behalf of the Verts/ALE Group*. – Mr President, in recent months the Greek Government has successfully implemented the so-called specific measures for Greece, an investment package that has been adopted in view of the severe economic and financial crisis that not only – but especially – hit Greece.

Many of the measures coming from the European level, namely austerity, have actually not helped the situation in recent years. Quite the contrary, the specific measures for Greece have shown that European policy can help and alleviate the crisis. This is exactly what cohesion policy, and the European Union as a whole, should be about: solidarity. We congratulate the Greek Government, which has made the best use of specific measures offered by the European Union to help Greece out of the crisis. This way the net financial impact of the specific measures amounted to EUR 1.5 billion. The specific measures have thus been a success and extremely helpful.

Finally, I would like to thank the rapporteur, as well as all the shadow rapporteurs, for the very constructive and useful cooperation on this report.

Jean-Luc Schaffhauser, au nom du groupe ENF. – Monsieur le Président, chers collègues, la Grèce, c'est la catastrophe totale, totale.

Entre 2008 et 2016, la production intérieure brute a été divisée quasiment par deux, passant de 360 milliards à 192 milliards d'euros. 40 % des jeunes sont aujourd'hui sans emploi, et bien plus si on tenait compte de tous ceux qui partent. Et pourtant, vous m'entendez bien, nous avons donné à ce pays, ou nous l'avons aidé, pour près de 500 milliards d'euros. Je m'explique: 100 milliards par l'annulation des dettes privées, 100 milliards par le report des différentes dettes, soit 200 milliards de dons; et 300 milliards par le rachat total de toute la dette. Et tout ceci pour un résultat qui consiste à diviser par deux et à détruire économiquement ce pays.

Même un roi fou, complètement fou, n'aurait pas été capable de mener une telle politique. Et pourtant, ce fut notre politique.

Λάμπρος Φουντούλης (NI). – Κύριε Πρόεδρε, θα αντιπαρέλθω όσα είπε προηγουμένως ο συνάδελφος. Πρέπει να αναγνωρίσω στον συντάκτη της έκθεσης αυτής ότι παραδέχεται πως τους σταθερά αρνητικούς ρυθμούς ανάπτυξης των τελευταίων ετών δεν κατάφεραν να τους αντιμετωπίσουν τα τρία μνημόνια που επέβαλαν στην Ελλάδα οι δανειστές. Συνήθως, από τις προηγούμενες κυβερνήσεις, τη σημερινή κυβέρνηση και τους θεσμούς, ακούμε ακριβώς το αντίθετο. Από την άλλη, η στατιστική είναι ο ευκολότερος τρόπος να πεις ψέματα. Η Eurostat μας λέει ότι η ανεργία στην Ελλάδα έχει μειωθεί στο 20% περίπου. Αυτό που δεν μας λέει είναι ότι οι νέες θέσεις εργασίας είναι συνήθως μερικής απασχόλησης και με πολύ χαμηλότερους μισθούς από αυτούς που υπήρχαν προ κρίσεως. Βέβαια, είναι ανεδαφικό να προσδοκούμε επιτάχυνση της ανάπτυξης όταν οι μισθοί έχουν πέσει στα σημερινά επίπεδα και όταν, κατά συνέπεια, η αγοραστική δύναμη των Ελλήνων έχει εκμηδενιστεί. Πράγματι, τα ποσά που δόθηκαν για τις δημόσιες επενδύσεις στην Ελλάδα ήταν σημαντικά. Όμως το μεγαλύτερο μέρος των ποσών αυτών δεν παρέμεινε στη χώρα αλλά κατέληξε στις μεγάλες κατασκευαστικές εταιρείες, πολλές από τις οποίες έχουν έδρα τις λεγόμενες μεγάλες χώρες της Ευρώπης. Θα ήταν πολύ πιο ευεργετικό για τους Έλληνες εάν είχαν δοθεί χρήματα που θα κατέληγαν στην πραγματική οικονομία και βοηθούσαν στη διαμόρφωση ενός οικονομικού περιβάλλοντος που θα ευνοούσε την ανάπτυξη.

Lambert van Nistelrooij (PPE). – Mr President, thank you very much for the opportunity to look back to the moment in 2015 when we were convinced that those projects which were planned and that could not be co-financed, could be fixed in Greece. We did it. And the last two speakers... well I don't know where they were talking about.

This was a specific measure, and there was a deep debate here in the Parliament in the Economic Affairs Committee. They asked 'who is following it?' and we said 'we will appoint a standing rapporteur'. He is now sitting: Mr Arimont. And he did his job, two years later, three years later to see what comes out. And the conclusion is clear: the work was fixed, the work was done. Good results and even with more capacity to perform in the future.

So I was convinced and I am convinced that this is a good measure. Special times, special situation, special measures. We did it.

Κωνσταντίνος Παπαδάκης (NI). – Κύριε Πρόεδρε, τα Ευρωπαϊκά Διαρθρωτικά και Επενδυτικά Ταμεία αποτελούν βασικά εργαλεία της Ευρωπαϊκής Ένωσης για την άμεση και έμμεση ενίσχυση της κερδοφορίας των επιχειρηματικών ομίλων. Αυτό ομολογεί η ίδια η έκθεση που αναφέρει ότι «το 63% του συνόλου των πληρωμών (...) αφορούσε ενισχύσεις για επιχειρήσεις και επιχειρηματικά σχέδια συμβάλλοντας άμεσα στην κερδοφορία των επιχειρήσεων και τη μείωση του λεγόμενου επιχειρηματικού κινδύνου», ενώ το υπόλοιπο 37% «αφορούσε δράσεις κρατικών ενισχύσεων για έργα υποδομών» που έχουν ανάγκη και πάλι οι μεγάλοι όμιλοι για τη διεκδίκηση της δράσης και της κερδοφορίας τους. Άλλωστε, στα χρόνια των ρεκόρ απορροφητικότητας για τα οποία επιτίθεται η κυβέρνηση ΣΥΡΙΖΑ-ΑΝΕΛ και η Ευρωπαϊκή Ένωση, απογειώθηκε η αντεργατική επίθεση και σημειώθηκαν οι μεγαλύτερες απώλειες σε μισθούς, συντάξεις και εργατικά δικαιώματα. Το ΚΚΕ στηρίζει τις διεκδικήσεις του εργατικού λαϊκού κινήματος που απαιτεί να χρησιμοποιηθούν όλα αυτά τα κονδύλια, που έτσι και αλλιώς προέρχονται από τη σκληρή φορολογία των εργαζομένων, για να χρηματοδοτηθούν έργα ζωτικής σημασίας για την ανακούφιση και την ικανοποίηση των σύγχρονων λαϊκών αναγκών.

Procedura «catch the eye»

Stanislav Polčák (PPE). – Pane předsedající, já bych chtěl úvodem poděkovat panu kolegovi Arimontovi za nejen tuto zprávu, ale i za práci, kterou vykonával jako náš zpravodaj právě pro Řecko. Velice si vážím jeho práce. Musím se zeptat: co to vlastně znamená, pokud někomu poskytnete 100% výši příspěvku? Myslím si, že to je skutečně výraz nejvyšší soudržnosti, určité solidarity a sounáležitosti, kterou jsme projevili s řeckými občany. Je to vlastně plná úhrada a je nepochybné, jak poukázala i paní kolegyně Spyraki, že tyto peníze pomohly k růstu řeckého hospodářství, to je naprosto nepochybnitelné, ty výsledky vidíme i dnes. A kdo je nevidí, myslím si, že je slepý. Zaměstnanost: ty peníze pomohly na rozvoj infrastruktury, na pomoc konkrétním podnikům. Toto myslím, že byl příklad té účinné pomoci,

kerátá – nevím, do jaké míry –, byla a může být opakovatelná, ale myslím si, že byla výrazem skutečné evropské soudržnosti.

Δημήτριος Παπαδημούλης (GUE/NGL). – Κύριε Πρόεδρε, θα ήθελα να πω ότι ο κανονισμός (ΕΕ) 2015/1839 πέτυχε εκατό τοις εκατό. Αυτό το ομολογούν οι εκπρόσωποι όλων των πολιτικών ομάδων με τη θλιβερή εξαίρεση της άκρας δεξιάς, η οποία θέλει τη διάλυση της Ευρώπης και δεν πιστεύει στις πολιτικές συνοχής. Αποδεικνύουν οι αριθμοί την επιτυχία και αποδεικνύει η ομοφωνία του Ευρωπαϊκού Κοινοβουλίου την επιτυχία. Δεν επιβαρύνθηκε ούτε ένα ευρώ ο Ευρωπαίος φορολογούμενος αλλά με αυτή την πρόσθετη ρευστότητα, η χώρα μου η Ελλάδα έχει εκατό τοις εκατό απορρόφηση στο πρόγραμμα της προηγούμενης περιόδου. Δεν χάθηκε ούτε ένα ευρώ, είναι πρώτη σε απορρόφηση στην παρούσα περίοδο και ενώ, τον Ιούλιο του 2015, συζητούσαμε για το Grexit της Ελλάδας από το ευρώ, τώρα συζητάμε για το Grexit της Ελλάδας από τα μνημόνια. Αυτή είναι μια ιστορία επιτυχίας όχι μόνο για την πατρίδα μου αλλά και για την Επιτροπή και για το Ευρωπαϊκό Κοινοβούλιο.

Γεώργιος Επιτήδειος (NI). – Κύριε Πρόεδρε, στη σημερινή εποχή, ακόμη και ο πλέον ανενημέρωτος για τα όσα συμβαίνουν στην Ευρώπη δεν δυσκολεύεται να αντιληφθεί ότι ο πάσης φύσεως πλούτος της Ελλάδος ληλατήθηκε και δεσμεύτηκε για εκατό τουλάχιστον ακόμη χρόνια προκειμένου να διασωθούν το ευρώ και οι ευρωπαϊκές τράπεζες. Αυτό βεβαίως διαφεύγει της προσοχής και του συναδέλφου ο οποίος ήδη έχει αποχωρήσει και ορισμένων παρόντων εδώ, οι οποίοι θέλουν να διαστρεβλώσουν τα πράγματα. Είναι γεγονός ότι στην Ελλάδα δόθηκαν κάποια χρήματα. Εάν όμως κάποιος αναλογιστεί τα τοκογλυφικά δάνεια με τα οποία δόθηκαν αυτά τα χρήματα και το γεγονός ότι αυτά τα χρήματα πήγαν είτε σε τράπεζες, είτε σε κατασκευαστικές εταιρείες, είτε σε άλλους επιχειρηματίες για να κερδοσκοπήσουν και να εξαθλιώσουν τον Έλληνα εργαζόμενο, δημιουργώντας συνθήκες εργασιακού Μεσαίωνα, τότε μπορεί να πει ότι είναι σε θέση να λένε όσα λένε διότι προφανώς ζουν σε ένα άλλο παράλληλο κόσμο. Με τα τοκογλυφικά δάνεια τα οποία έδωσαν οι δανειστές στην Ελλάδα έχουν εξαθλιώσει τον ελληνικό λαό και έχουν αφαιρέσει από αυτόν κάθε δικαίωμα στην ελπίδα. Οφείλει λοιπόν η Ευρωπαϊκή Ένωση πολλά στην Ελλάδα και αυτά ακριβώς ζητούμε και όχι τα ψίχουλα των 22 δισεκατομμυρίων για τα οποία συζητείται αυτή τη στιγμή ότι θα δοθούν στη χώρα μου.

Krisztina Morvai (NI). – Elnök Úr! A Bizottságnak a képviselője volt kedves nagyon részletesen elmondani, hogy hát milyen hálás lehet, ugye, Görögország, milyen rengeteg ajándékot kapott az Európai Uniótól. Egy ajándékról elfeledkezett viszont, és ez pedig a tömeges migráció, amit kapott Görögország az Európai Uniótól és Merkel asszonytól. Megdöbbentőek azok a felvételek, amelyeket az interneten lát az ember a görögöknek a szenedéséről.

Azt mondja a Bizottság képviselője, hogy sikerült fellendíteni a turizmust, támogatást adni a szolgáltatásoknak. Igen, de hát aztán mi történt? Mekkora kárt okozott a turizmusnak a szigeteken – és így tovább – a migráció? A szolgáltatásokban sikerült-e számszerűsíteni azt, hogy a migráció okozta kár mennyi is volt a görögöknek, és hogy hogy is áll most a mérleg? Köszönöm szépen!

(Fine della procedura «catch the eye»)

Corina Crețu, Member of the Commission. – Mr President, I would like to thank the House for this opportunity to look back. And, looking back at what we decided together three years ago, I think we can see there is overall unanimity on the fact that the revision of the Common Provisions Regulation and the measures specific to Greece have achieved their goal. They have allowed Greece to address a severe liquidity problem that had occurred at that time, to inject cash and to relaunch investments in the real economy – and all this in a relatively short period of time.

As a matter of fact, Greece was the first state to reach a 100% absorption rate of available funds under the 2007-2013 programming period and it is also among the best-performing Member States in terms of implementation in the 2014-2020 programming period. The good progress so far should be the driver for Greece to continue, and increase even further, efforts to put in place a solid pipeline of new mature projects, which could generate expenditure and ensure a good performance in the years to come.

The Commission has been providing – and will continue to provide – hands-on technical support to the Greek authorities in facilitating the management and implementation of the funds. More generally, I think the specific measures in favour of Greece embody the very essence of cohesion policy, namely championing solidarity between Member States so that regions can grow together, supporting growth enhancing investments to boost the economy. This is exactly what the Commission has tried to reinforce in its post-2020 proposal for cohesion policy by securing a policy for all regions and by making sure that resources are efficiently channelled to where they are the most needed.

On the other issue that was raised, I can assure you that we are standing by the Greek people and the Greek authorities – as well as the Italians – and we are working together to integrate the migrants. That is another issue and I am at your disposal if you would like to talk about it separately, but it is not the subject of this debate.

Pascal Arimont, *Berichterstatter*. – Herr Präsident, sehr geehrte Frau Kommissarin, werte Kolleginnen und Kollegen! Ich werde mich sehr kurz fassen. Ich habe zwar zwei Minuten, aber die werde ich nicht nutzen. Zu den Kommentaren von extrem links und extrem rechts werde ich mich nicht äußern, denn ich teile deren Ansicht absolut nicht. Zudem ging es in deren Kommentaren weder um die Sondermaßnahmen noch um Regionalpolitik, sodass ich das nicht kommentieren muss.

Ich fasse dennoch zusammen, was wichtig ist: Es gab eine Sondersituation. Wir haben mit einer Sondermaßnahme darauf reagiert, und das mit großem Erfolg, mit großem messbarem Erfolg. Ich danke daher allen, die dabei mitgeholfen haben, dies zu verwirklichen. Wir haben in diesen schwierigen Zeiten für Griechenland nicht palavert, wir haben nicht um der Kritik willen kritisiert, wir haben gehandelt. Das war richtig und wichtig. Und deswegen geht mein Dank an alle, die dazu beigetragen haben: Vielen Dank!

Presidente. – La discussione è chiusa.

La votazione si svolgerà martedì 11 settembre 2018.

Dichiarazioni scritte (articolo 162)

Agnes Jongerius (S&D), *schriftelijk*. – De jubelstemming over de situatie in Griekenland zet door. Het laatste steunpakket is verstrekt, het land kan weer op de kapitaalmarkt lenen en de werkloosheid daalt. Uiteraard heeft het cohesiebeleid, waarover wij vandaag spreken, bijgedragen aan deze positieve noot. In die zin onderschrijf ik de door Europa genomen maatregelen om bijvoorbeeld de werkloosheid te bestrijden. Echter, daarmee zijn wij er nog niet. Wij mogen de Griekse bevolking niet in de steek laten. Immers, de jeugdwerkloosheid is met 42 procent torenhoog. De Griekse schuld is, met 180 procent van het bbp, zelfs de hoogste van Europa. Een schuld die, via boekhoudkundige trucjes, nog jarenlang als een strop om de nek van de Griekse bevolking hangt.

Daarom concludeer ik dat er achter de cijfers een enorm leed schuilgaat. En niet alleen in Griekenland. Daarom stel ik, als EMPL-rapporteur van de voorgestelde gemeenschappelijke bepalingen, voor om de EU-voorfinanciering van projecten te verhogen. Ook moeten de minder ontwikkelde regio's meer EU-middelen ontvangen om echt werk te kunnen maken van sociaal beleid. Alleen op deze manier kunnen wij ook in de toekomst blijven bouwen aan een sociaal Europa.

23. Pożary w Mati, region Attyka w Grecji, w lipcu 2018 r.: reakcja UE (debata)

Presidente. – L'ordine del giorno reca la discussione sulla dichiarazione della Commissione sugli incendi scoppiati nel luglio 2018 a Mati, nella regione dell'Attica (in Grecia), e la risposta dell'UE (2018/2847(RSP)).

Corina Crețu, *Member of the Commission*. – Mr President, on behalf of the Commission I would like to express once more my condolences to the families and loved ones of the victims of the recent forest fires in Greece. I would like also to pay tribute to the courage and the outstanding work of the brave firefighters who fought the blaze.

Commissioner Stylianides flew to Greece in the hours following the tragedy and helped in coordinating the EU response. The Union's Civil Protection Mechanism reacted immediately to Greece's request for assistance. Capacities were mobilised and deployed quickly in the affected areas. The response was substantial: first, ground forest-firefighting modules and vehicles from Cyprus; second, Canadair firefighting planes from Italy and Spain and two planes from Romania were deployed; and nine Member States in total made offers.

Helping countries that face forest fires was a top priority this summer for the European Union and it remains a top priority. The Commission's Emergency Response Coordination Centre is working 24 hours a day and is in constant contact with national authorities. We stand ready to help Greece further whenever needed.

With regard to the wildfires in Attica, as Commissioner for Regional Policy I was in direct contact with the Greek authorities from the moment we knew about the fires. I informed the Greek authorities that the Commission was ready to act swiftly to release the first payment as soon as possible. In addition, I highlighted the possibility, should the conditions for assistance from the European Union Solidarity Fund be met, for Greece to benefit from 95% EU co-financing towards reconstruction work supported by cohesion policy. Lastly, I expressed my readiness, after the request from the Greek authorities, to modify Greek cohesion policy programmes to redirect money towards the regeneration of economic activity in the affected areas.

Presidente. – Permettetemi di dire che, dinanzi a questa immane tragedia, non posso che associarmi al cordoglio e alla solidarietà espressi dal Presidente Tajani nei confronti del popolo greco in apertura di questa seduta.

Μαρία Σπυράκη, εξ ονόματος της ομάδας PPE. – Κύριε Πρόεδρε, κυρία Επίτροπε, στην αρχή της σημερινής συνεδρίασης τηρήσαμε ενός λεπτού σιγή για τα θύματα στο Μάτι. Αυτό που συνέβη εκεί δεν περιγράφεται. Άνθρωποι κήκαν ζωντανοί. Μια ολόκληρη περιοχή καταστράφηκε. Μικρές και μεσαίες επιχειρήσεις δεν υπάρχουν πια. Τα σπίτια έγιναν στάχτη. Οι υποδομές εξαφανίστηκαν. Είναι λοιπόν απαραίτητο σήμερα να δράσουμε άμεσα και η άμεση δράση είναι η απόδειξη της αλληλεγγύης. Για το λόγο αυτό, σας καλώ να προχωρήσετε άμεσα και με ευελιξία στη διακίνηση κονδυλίων από το Ευρωπαϊκό Ταμείο Αλληλεγγύης. Είναι απαραίτητο να βεβαιώσουμε σήμερα εδώ ότι όλα τα διαθέσιμα χρηματοδοτικά εργαλεία από τη συνοχή είναι στη διάθεση της Περιφέρειας και της Ελληνικής Κυβέρνησης ώστε να προχωρήσει πάρα πολύ γρήγορα η αντιμετώπιση των συνεπειών σε αυτή την περιοχή. Η περιοχή πρέπει να ανοικοδομηθεί και να ξανακατοικηθεί. Το Μάτι πρέπει να αναστηθεί, να ξαναζήσει με τη βοήθεια της Ευρωπαϊκής Ένωσης. Καλούμε λοιπόν για το λόγο αυτό την Ευρωπαϊκή Επιτροπή να επιδείξει έμπρακτη αλληλεγγύη στην Ελλάδα, όπως έγινε με την Ιταλία στους πρόσφατους καταστροφικούς σεισμούς που έγιναν το 2016 και το 2017. Η Ελλάδα, όπως ξέρετε, είναι μια χώρα που έχει υποστεί, επί πολλά συναπτά έτη, πτώση του ακαθάριστου εγχώριου προϊόντος που έφτασε συνολικά το 25%. Είναι λοιπόν απαραίτητο να έχει και σε αυτή την περίπτωση εξαιρετική μεταχείριση. Τέλος, καλούμε την Επιτροπή να επιτρέψει τον άμεσο αναπροσανατολισμό των κονδυλίων ώστε από το Ευρωπαϊκό Διαρθρωτικό Ταμείο και από το Επενδυτικό Ταμείο να αντιμετωπιστούν τα τεράστια προβλήματα, οι πληγές που άνοιξε η πυρκαγιά. Στο Ευρωπαϊκό Λαϊκό Κόμμα έχουμε ήδη καταθέσει οι ευρωβουλευτές της Νέας Δημοκρατίας, με πρωτοβουλία μου, σχετικό ψήφισμα.

Μιλτιάδης Κύρκος, εξ ονόματος της ομάδας S&D. – Κύριε Πρόεδρε, κ. Επίτροπε, σας ευχαριστούμε για όλα και για την προηγούμενη συζήτηση. Τις συγκεκριμένες δράσεις που ζητούμε από την Επιτροπή για την πρωτοφανή τραγωδία σας περιέγραψε η κυρία Σπυράκη. Εγώ θα δω το θέμα από μία άλλη πλευρά. Ενεήντα οκτώ άνθρωποι έχασαν τη ζωή τους τον Ιούλιο και αυτό συνέβη γιατί σαράντα δύο δημόσιες δομές είχαν καθήκον, μέσα από ένα κουβάρι μπλεγμένων αρμοδιοτήτων, να φροντίσουν να μην καούν. Και όμως, κήκαν. Η σημερινή ελληνική κυβέρνηση δεν κατασκεύασε αυτό το μοντέλο διοίκησης. Για αυτό φρόντισαν τόσες προηγούμενες. Επέλεξε με λάθος κριτήρια τους επικεφαλής. Έκανε μία σχεδόν προσβλητική προσπάθεια επικοινωνιακής διαχείρισης αλλά η ουσία είναι αλλού. Σαράντα δύο δομές, ανάκατα, προσπαθούσαν να προσφέρουν εννέα υπηρεσίες πυρόσβεσης χωρίς κανείς να είναι υπεύθυνος. Αυτό συμβαίνει όχι μόνο στις πυρκαγιές αλλά και στην οικονομία που υποφέρει τα πελαταιακά κυκλώματα, στην καταπολέμηση της διαφθοράς, στην ανάπτυξη. Από την ελληνική κυβέρνηση λοιπόν ζητούμε να δεσμευτεί ρητά ότι, από τις 23.143 αρμοδιότητες των ελληνικών υπηρεσιών και δομών, θα αποδώσουν το 30% μέσα σε μερικούς μήνες σε μοναδικούς υπεύθυνους. Οτιδήποτε λιγότερο δεν είναι αποδεκτό. Θα είναι ταυτόχρονα μια έμπρακτη συγγνώμη, αν και καθυστερημένη, στους συγγενείς των θυμάτων καθώς η κυβέρνηση θα αναλάβει επιτέλους την ευθύνη να μην ξανασυμβεί τέτοια καταστροφή.

Νότης Μαρίας, εξ ονόματος της ομάδας ECR. – Κύριε Πρόεδρε, εκφράζουμε τα θερμά μας συλλυπητήρια στους συγγενείς των θυμάτων, στη μνήμη των οποίων τηρήσαμε πριν λίγο ενός λεπτού σιγή. Θεωρώ ότι δικαιώθηκε η επιμονή μας και η εμμονή μας, σταθερή από την προηγούμενη Τρίτη, να διεξαχθεί αυτή εδώ η συζήτηση διότι το οφέλιμο στην μνήμη των νεκρών μας. Ευχαριστώ το Σώμα που έκανε δεκτή την πρότασή μας. Οι φονικές πυρκαγιές στο Μάτι ανέδειξαν τις τεράστιες διαχρονικές ευθύνες της Ελληνικής Πολιτείας και, ταυτόχρονα, τις ανεπάρκειες και την ανικανότητα της κυβέρνησης Τσίπρα. Ανεπάρκεια και ανικανότητα που οδήγησε 98 συμπολίτες μας στον πύρινο θάνατο, πάνω από 200 τραυματίες στα νοσοκομεία και χιλιάδες σπίτια και επιχειρήσεις στην καταστροφή. Καμιά αυτοκριτική από την κυβέρνηση μέχρι στιγμής, όταν, ακόμη και χθες, στη Διεθνή Έκθεση Θεσσαλονίκης, είχε την ευκαιρία ο Πρωθυπουργός να πει «συγγνώμη». Και όμως, από τον Ιούλιο του 2017 είχαμε καλέσει την κυβέρνηση να αξιοποιήσει τον νέο κανονισμό για τις φυσικές καταστροφές που επιτρέπει την αξιοποίηση του 5% του Ευρωπαϊκού Ταμείου Περιφερειακής Ανάπτυξης για αντιπλημμυρικά έργα, για αντιπυρική προστασία, για αναδόσεις. Κώφευσε η κυβέρνηση στις παρατηρήσεις μας αλλά και στις παρατηρήσεις της κυρίας Cretu η οποία, στις 29 Νοεμβρίου του 2017, στην Ολομέλεια του Κοινοβουλίου στις Βρυξέλλες, ζήτησε από την κυβέρνηση να αντικαταστήσει την στρατηγική της για την αντιμετώπιση φυσικών καταστροφών και επεσήμανε ότι υπήρχαν 1,3 δισεκατομμύρια EUR στη διάθεση της Ελλάδος για να αντιμετωπίσει τα προβλήματα αυτά. Εδώ βρίσκονται οι τεράστιες πολιτικές ευθύνες της κυβέρνησης

Τσίπρα και όμως, αντί να αποπέμψει ο Πρωθυπουργός τον αρμόδιο υπουργό που χειριζόταν το ΕΣΠΑ, τον αναβάθμισε, τον έκανε υπουργό Εσωτερικών. Πρέπει λοιπόν να δοθεί μήνυμα, πρέπει να αλλάξει πολιτική η κυβέρνηση, πρέπει να αξιοποιηθεί όλες τις ευκαιρίες που υπάρχουν με τα διαρθρωτικά ταμεία, να αξιοποιηθεί έναν νέο σχεδιασμό διότι, τελικά, ο Πρωθυπουργός βρήκε ξαφνικά 500 εκατομμύρια EUR και ίδρυσε μια νέα Υπηρεσία. Εδώ είναι η αποτυχία της κυβέρνησης και καλούμε την Επιτροπή να συμβάλει στην αξιοποίηση αυτών των κονδυλίων και φυσικά στην αξιοποίηση των κονδυλίων του Ταμείου Αλληλεγγύης.

Δημήτριος Παπαδημούλης, εξ ονόματος της ομάδας GUE/NGL. – Κύριε Πρόεδρε, εκ μέρους ολόκληρου του ελληνικού λαού, πέρα από κόμματα και παρατάξεις, θα ήθελα να ευχαριστήσω το Ευρωπαϊκό Κοινοβούλιο για την αλληλεγγύη, για το ένα λεπτό σιγής, την Επιτροπή για όσα έκανε και για όσα μας είπε, και την Επίτροπο Creffu και τον Επίτροπο Στυλιανίδη και τον πρόεδρο Juncker. Ο ανθρώπινος πόνος είναι μεγάλος. Ενενήντα οκτώ νεκροί. Ό,τι και αν πούμε τώρα, ό,τι και να κάνουμε, οι νεκροί δεν γυρίζουν πίσω. Το τελευταίο όμως πράγμα που πρέπει να κάνουμε, γιατί δεν μας αξίζει, είναι, πάνω σε αυτούς τους νεκρούς, να αφήσουμε να στήνονται κυνικά παιχνίδια μικροπολιτικής αντιπαράθεσης και καπηλείας. Τι πρέπει να κάνουμε; Να ενισχύσουμε την πολιτική προστασία, και σε εθνικό επίπεδο –και πρέπει να αλλάξουν πολλά στη χώρα από την Ελλάδα– και σε ευρωπαϊκό επίπεδο, δημιουργώντας μια ισχυρή ομπρέλα ευρωπαϊκής πολιτικής προστασίας, γιατί η κλιματική αλλαγή απειλεί ακόμη και τη Σουηδία, γιατί πέρυσι είχαμε επίσης πολλούς νεκρούς στην Πορτογαλία. Πρέπει να επανοικοδομήσουμε το Μάτι, και γρήγορα, με ευρωπαϊκά κονδύλια αλλά χωρίς ιδιωτικές κλειστές παραλίες, χωρίς αυθαίρετη δόμηση, χωρίς τη γραφειοκρατία που περιέγραψε ο συνάδελφος Κύρκος. Αυτά πρέπει να κάνουμε μαζί και ενωμένοι.

Lambert van Nistelrooij (PPE). – Voorzitter, misschien ben ik de eerste niet-Griekse spreker. Natuurlijk vind ik het heel goed dat we gezamenlijk één minuut stilte in acht hebben genomen aan het begin van deze zitting. Wat er gebeurd is bij de mensen en meteen al daarna, zoals ook door de commissarissen aangegeven, gaat het nu om hulpverlening. De eerste, acute hulp is ook goed verleend. In tweede instantie gaat het om opbouw en daar praten we nu over:

solidariteitsfonds en andere herprioritering.

Maar daarachter liggen toch ook wel wat vragen – en die werden ook gesteld, zoals hoe we nu meer aan preventie kunnen doen. Hoe kunnen we nu bewerkstelligen dat er in dit soort situaties minder doden te betreuren zijn? Ik herinner mij het debat dat we hier voerden over de overstromingen door een grote bedding, ook in Griekenland, waarin gebouwd werd! Ja, dat kun je op een gegeven moment ook voorkomen. Je kunt veel meer voorkomen.

Goed dat we een resolutie krijgen. We zullen naar de tekst kijken. Het EVP wil dat graag doen. En ten tweede, in oktober krijgen we een wat breder debat over de juiste balans tussen preventie en curatie, tussen medeleven dat we graag betonen, maar ook het voorkomen van dit soort bijna jaarlijks terugkerende zaken.

Σοφία Σακοράφα (GUE/NGL). – Κύριε Πρόεδρε, για να μην επαναλαμβάνομαι, οι δράσεις που προτείνουμε για την τραγωδία έχουν ήδη περιγραφεί και θα περιέχονται και στο ψήφισμα που θα καταθέσουμε. Κύριοι συνάδελφοι, ο πρόεδρος Tajani, αναφερόμενος στα θύματα των πρόσφατων καταστροφών, τόλμησε, και μίλησε για αναζήτηση και καταλογισμό των ευθυνών. Θεωρώ ότι είναι ύψιστη υποχρέωσή μας να απαντήσουμε σε αυτό το επιτακτικό «γιατί», να καταβάλουμε κάθε δυνατή και δεσμική προσπάθεια για να απαντήσουμε. Πρέπει να απαιτήσουμε, έστω και μια φορά, να καταλογιστούν και να αποδοθούν ευθύνες, κύριοι συνάδελφοι, σε όσους παρέβησαν το καθήκον τους. Σε όσους αμέλησαν να κάνουν το καθήκον τους αλλά και κυρίως σε όσους, εν γνώσει τους, εφαρμόζουν πολιτικές που θέτουν σε κίνδυνο ανθρώπινες ζωές και περιουσίες. Διότι οι πολιτικές λιτότητας που εφαρμόζονται έχουν θύματα το κοινωνικό κράτος, την πρόνοια και την προστασία των πολιτών. Η πυρκαγιά στο Μάτι, με τον τραγικό απολογισμό της, το αποδεικνύει ατράνταχτα. Περικοπές σε προσωπικό και υποδομές πολιτικής προστασίας για τη σωτηρία της Ελλάδας και το βιώσιμο του χρέους. Η ανάγνωση της πραγματικότητας, κύριοι συνάδελφοι, δεν είναι πολιτικό παιχνίδι και καπηλεία. Κύριοι συνάδελφοι, αύριο θα είναι εδώ ο Έλληνας Πρωθυπουργός να συζητήσει για το μέλλον της Ελλάδας. Παρακαλώ, ρωτήστε τον ευθέως τι έφατξε και 98 συμπολίτες του και συμπολίτες μας δεν θα μπορέσουν ποτέ να συμμετάσχουν στο όραμα της Ευρώπης.

Γεώργιος Κύρτσος (PPE). – Κύριε Πρόεδρε, νομίζω ότι υπάρχουν φαινόμενα, όπως το φαινόμενο του θερμοκηπίου, που επιβαρύνουν την κατάσταση για όλους και, ειδικά στην Ελλάδα, έχουμε και την αυθαίρετη δόμηση. Είναι δύο επιβαρυντικοί παράγοντες που μας εκθέτουν σε μεγαλύτερους κινδύνους. Αυτοί οι παράγοντες όμως δεν πρέπει να χρησιμοποιούνται σαν άλλοθι αλλά πρέπει να μας δίνουν κίνητρα για καλύτερη οργάνωση, καλύτερη αποτροπή, καλύτερο συντονισμό όταν εκδηλώνεται το πρόβλημα. Νομίζω ότι στο Μάτι φτάσαμε στους 98 νεκρούς γιατί συνδυάστηκαν, εκτός από τους παράγοντες που ανέφερα, η διοικητική αποδιοργάνωση, που είναι χαρακτηριστικό ιδιαίτερα των τελευταίων ετών, και η μείωση του Προγράμματος Δημοσίων Επενδύσεων. Έχουμε ένα παράδοξο: να μειώνεται το πρόγραμμα δημοσίων επενδύσεων και οι στόχοι να μην επιτυγχάνονται, να είναι τελικά οι δαπάνες ακόμη πιο κάτω και από τους μειωμένους στόχους. Τι με ενοχλεί; Προφανώς θέλουμε την ευρωπαϊκή αλληλεγγύη και προφανώς θα στηρίξουμε κάθε προσπάθεια για να αντιμετωπιστούν οι συνέπειες.

Όμως είχαμε ανάλογη πυρκαγιά στην Πορτογαλία το 2017 και τότε παραιτήθηκε, ζητώντας συγγνώμη, η υπουργός Εσωτερικών. Είχαμε δυστύχημα στη Βουλγαρία με 18 νεκρούς σε αυτοκινητιστικό και παραιτήθηκαν τρεις υπουργοί, ζητώντας συγγνώμη για την κατάσταση του οδικού δικτύου. Στην Ελλάδα έχουμε ένα πρόβλημα, μια τραγωδία, χωρίς πολιτικούς και διοικητικούς υπεύθυνους.

Procedura «catch the eye»

Stanislav Polčák (PPE). – Pane předsedající, já bych chtěl vyjádřit solidaritu s postiženými, oběťmi a pozůstalými. Zároveň mě netěší jak tato debata, která měla být debatou, řekněme, evropskou, se stala debatou poměrně národní a já bych se chtěl tedy do ní zapojit z toho pohledu evropského. Pokud se ocitnete jakožto občan v takto tíživé, svízelné situaci, co očekáváte od svého státu? Nepochybně samozřejmě pomoc a od Unie, která má deklarovat určitou jednotu, určitou pomoc a solidaritu těchto států, tak očekáváte rovněž pomoc. Já jsem přesvědčen, že ta pomoc musí dorazit samozřejmě rychle a účinně. My zde máme specifický fond, Fond solidarity, který poskytuje tuto pomoc. Tento fond byl i činností výboru REGI měněn, podmínky nastaveny v tomto volebním období tak, aby ta pomoc byla skutečně účinná. Já bych se chtěl připojit k tomu volání: „Kdo rychle dává, ten dvakrát dává“, říká jedno přísloví. Buďme skutečně účinní na té úrovni evropské, pomáhejme v prevenci, mějme dostatečnou alokaci v tomto fondu. Ale ta politizace na národní úrovni tady myslím nepatří.

Νίκος Ανδρουλάκης (S&D). – Κύριε Πρόεδρε, θέλω να εκφράσω τα θερμά μου συλλυπητήρια στους οικείους των ανθρώπων που έχασαν άδικα τη ζωή τους. Στην περιοχή Μάτι της Ανατολικής Αττικής, εκατοντάδες οικογένειες καταστράφηκαν. Τα έντονα φυσικά φαινόμενα αλλά και η μοιραία ολιγωρία κρατικών αξιωματούχων οδήγησαν σε τραγικά αποτελέσματα. Όπως το ζήτησα και με ερώτησή μου, η ευρωπαϊκή συνδρομή και βοήθεια πρέπει να είναι άμεση, και στις υποδομές για να αποφύγουμε νέες καταστροφές με τις πλημμύρες του χειμώνα αλλά και στην αποκατάσταση των ζημιών, για να μπορέσουν οι κάτοικοι της περιοχής να ξανασταθούν όρθιοι στα πόδια τους. Φίλες και φίλοι, μετά τις περσινές φονικές πυρκαγιές στην Πορτογαλία, η Επιτροπή παρουσίασε την πρόταση για αναδιοργάνωση του ευρωπαϊκού μηχανισμού πολιτικής προστασίας. Εκεί προβλέπεται ενίσχυση των μηχανισμών πρόληψης αλλά και δημιουργία του rescEU, μιας πανευρωπαϊκής δεξαμενής εργαλείων, όπως πυροσβεστικά ελικόπτερα και αεροπλάνα, ώστε να υπάρχει άμεση παρέμβαση και όχι εθελοντική όπως είναι σήμερα. Είναι όμως λυπηρό αυτό που παρακολουθούμε τις τελευταίες ημέρες, ιδιαίτερα μετά τα τελευταία δραματικά γεγονότα, το Συμβούλιο για μια ακόμη φορά να επιλέγει τη νόθευση της πρότασης της Επιτροπής εισαγάγοντας τιμωρητικές λογικές που θα αποκλείουν, ουσιαστικά, στο μέλλον, χώρες από την χρήση του μηχανισμού που πάμε να δημιουργήσουμε σήμερα.

Νικόλαος Χουντής (GUE/NGL). – Κύριε Πρόεδρε, θέλω να εκφράσω και εγώ τα συλλυπητήριά μου στις οικογένειες των θυμάτων. Αγαπητοί συνάδελφοι, ο τραγικός απολογισμός της φονικής πυρκαγιάς στο Μάτι, αυτό το καλοκαίρι στην Ελλάδα, δεν εξηγείται μόνο από την κλιματική αλλαγή και τις ειδικές καιρικές συνθήκες εκείνη την ώρα σε εκείνη την περιοχή. Υπάρχει ευθύνη των κρατικών αρχών στην αντιμετώπιση της συγκεκριμένης πυρκαγιάς. Υπάρχουν πολιτικές ευθύνες που δεν έχουν αναληφθεί. Εισαγγελικές αρχές στην Ελλάδα ερευνούν τυχόν ποινικές ευθύνες. Όμως εδώ, αγαπητοί συνάδελφοι, έχουμε και την πραγματική διάσταση των μνημονιακών πολιτικών που έχουν επιβληθεί στην Ελλάδα, την περικοπή δηλαδή δημοσίων δαπανών που έχουν αφήσει ακάλυπτες 4 000 θέσεις στο Πυροσβεστικό Σώμα, που έχουν στερήσει από την ελληνική δημόσια διοίκηση σημαντικές υποδομές και μέσα διαχείρισης φυσικών καταστροφών. Η καταστροφή είναι πρωτοφανής σε ανθρώπινα θύματα, σε κατοικίες και σε υποδομές. Έχω ήδη καταθέσει σχετική ερώτηση προς την Επιτροπή, την οποία επαναλαμβάνω με την ευκαιρία αυτής της συζήτησης και σήμερα, προκειμένου να λάβει άμεσα μέτρα για έμπρακτη στήριξη και έκφραση αλληλεγγύης στους πληγέντες από την καταστροφή και για επίδειξη της μέγιστης δυνατής ευελιξίας – υπάρχει το προηγούμενο, αναφέρθηκε – στην ενεργοποίηση κοινοτικών πόρων για να βοηθηθούν οι πληγέντες και οι πληγείσες περιοχές.

Λάμπρος Φουντούλης (NI). – Κύριε Πρόεδρε, κατ' αρχάς θα ήθελα να συλλυπηθώ για ακόμη μία φορά τους συγγενείς των θυμάτων αυτής της ανείπωτης τραγωδίας και να ευχηθώ ταχεία ανάρρωση στους εγκαυματίες, ορισμένοι εκ των οποίων παραμένουν ακόμα νοσηλεύόμενοι. Κανείς δεν αμφισβητεί πως εκείνη τη μαύρη ημέρα οι συνθήκες ήταν τέτοιες ώστε να ευνοήσουν την ταχύτατη εξάπλωση της πυρκαγιάς και να αφήσουν ελάχιστα περιθώρια αντίδρασης στις αρχές. Δυστυχώς όμως, οι αρχές δεν αξιοποίησαν αυτά τα περιθώρια. Αντιθέτως, επέδειξαν εγκληματική αμέλεια και ολιγωρία. Δεν ρυθμίστηκε με ασφάλεια η κυκλοφορία των αυτοκινήτων στις καιόμενες περιοχές και, αντί να εκκενώσουν την περιοχή, έστειλαν ανθρώπους από τη λεωφόρο Μαραθώνος προς το Μάτι, κάτι που οδήγησε σε τόσο υψηλό αριθμό θυμάτων. Ενώ γνώριζαν για τις καιρικές συνθήκες που θα επικρατούσαν, δεν υπήρξε η παραμικρή προετοιμασία. Επιπλέον, την ημέρα της καταστροφής δεν υπήρξε ο απαραίτητος συντονισμός όλων των αρμοδίων. Αρμόδιοι δε, σε επίπεδο Περιφέρειας, είναι ο οικείος περιφερειάρχης και, σε επίπεδο Δήμου, ο κάθε δήμαρχος. Επομένως οι ευθύνες της Περιφέρειας Αττικής είναι τεράστιες, όπως και του Δήμου Μαραθώνος. Δεσμεύτηκαν πυροσβεστικές δυνάμεις στο μέτωπο της Κινέττας, προερχόμενες από την Ανατολική Αττική, με αποτέλεσμα, όταν ξέσπασε η πυρκαγιά στο Μάτι, να μην υπάρχουν επαρκείς δυνάμεις και οι πρώτοι που έσπευσαν να αντιμετωπίσουν την πυρκαγιά να είναι εθελοντές. Αυτό που ζητάμε όλοι οι Έλληνες επιτακτικά είναι να αποδοθούν οι ευθύνες που αναλογούν στους αρμόδιους και ταυτόχρονα να ληφθούν τα απαραίτητα μέτρα ώστε να μην επαναληφθούν τραγωδίες σαν και αυτή στο Μάτι.

Γεώργιος Επιτήδειος (NI). – Κύριε Πρόεδρε, εκφράζω και εγώ με την σειρά μου συλλυπητήρια στις οικογένειες των αδικωμένων στο Μάτι Αττικής καθώς επίσης και εύχομαι ταχεία ανάρρωση σε όσους είναι ακόμη τραυματισμένοι. Η βιβλική καταστροφή, η οποία συνέβη στην περιοχή αυτή που βρίσκεται πολύ κοντά στην Αθήνα, μας έδωσε τη δυνατότητα να αναλογιστούμε ορισμένα πράγματα και, παρά το γεγονός ότι δεν μπορούμε να ασκούμε πολιτική, μικροπολιτική αν θέλετε, επάνω σε πτώματα, ο στοιχειώδης σεβασμός προς η μνήμη αυτών οι οποίοι έχουν πεθάνει μας επιβάλλει να αναλογιστούμε τις ευθύνες και να ζητήσουμε να απαλλαγεί η ελληνική κυβέρνηση από την παθογένεια που τη διακατέχει και την ανικανότητα. Διότι οι ευθύνες της είναι τεράστιες και πρέπει να αποδοθούν και σε αυτήν εν συνόλω αλλά και ατομικά σε εκείνους οι οποίοι είχαν την υποχρέωση να εκτελέσουν την αποστολή που τους ανέθεσε η κοινωνία. Από την άλλη πλευρά, είναι μία πρώτη τάξεως ευκαιρία για την Ευρωπαϊκή Ένωση να δείξει αλληλεγγύη, να συνδράμει οικονομικά την Ελλάδα και να προσπαθήσει να απαλύνει τον πόνο εκείνων οι οποίοι έχουν απομείνει ακόμη ζωντανόι.

Κωνσταντίνος Παπαδάκης (NI). – Κύριε Πρόεδρε, η τραγωδία στο Μάτι, των 98 νεκρών και των εκατοντάδων τραυματιών, ήταν ένα προαναγγελλθέν έγκλημα της διαχρονικής πολιτικής των κυβερνήσεων -και της σημερινής- που υποβαθμίζουν τη δασοπροστασία και την πυρόσβεση, που εμπορευματοποιούν τη γη χωρίς ολοκληρωμένο σχεδιασμό πολιτικής προστασίας. Η Επίτροπος Crețu, στην απάντησή της στους ευρωβουλευτές του ΚΚΕ, κυνικά απέκλεισε το ενδεχόμενο αποζημίωσης των πληγέντων αναφέροντας ότι η αποζημίωση για ζημιές σε ιδιωτικές ιδιοκτησίες δεν είναι επιλέξιμη ούτε στο πλαίσιο του ΕΤΠΑ, ούτε από το Ταμείο Αλληλεγγύης της Ευρωπαϊκής Ένωσης. Δεν είναι επιλέξιμη για την Ευρωπαϊκή Ένωση, με βάση την πολιτική κόστους-οφέλους προφανώς, η αποζημίωση των πυροπαθών, αλλά μόνο η αναζωογόνηση των τοπικών οικονομιών, όπως σημειώνει στην απάντησή της. Φανερώνεται δηλαδή ότι το κριτήριο είναι πάντα το κέρδος και για αυτό δεν επιλέγονται και τα αντιπλημμυρικά έργα, γιατί, μετά την ολοκλήρωσή τους, δεν αποφέρουν προστιθέμενη αξία, όπως λέτε εσείς, στην Ευρωπαϊκή Ένωση. Απέναντι λοιπόν σε αυτά τα ανεπαρκέστατα μέτρα της κυβέρνησης και της Ευρωπαϊκής Ένωσης, μετά τη φονική πυρκαγιά, οι εργαζόμενοι εντείνουν και δυναμώνουν οργανωμένα την πάλη τους για να διεκδικήσουν άμεση αποζημίωση κατοίκων και επαγγελματιών της περιοχής στο εκατό τοις εκατό της συνολικής ζημιάς και ικανοποίηση όλων των άμεσων και πιεστικών αναγκών τους.

(Fine della procedura «catch the eye»)

Corina Crețu, Member of the Commission. – Mr President, it is, of course, very sad to have to discuss this tragedy, but at the same time it is our duty to stand ready with the Member States and help them in these sad moments, and that is what we are doing.

Last year's experience with simultaneous forest fires showed that the current EU Civil Protection Mechanism, based on voluntary offers, has reached its limit. Last year the problems were primarily in Portugal, but also at the same time in France and in other countries, and we have seen a repeat this year with simultaneous fires in Greece, Sweden and Latvia. We have been facing multiple crises in numerous countries at the same time and, as a result, our Member States cannot always provide assistance to other Member States at the crucial moment.

That is precisely why the Commission proposes to strengthen its civil protection system and create the mechanism that we call RescEU. RescEU establishes at European Union level a limited number of well-defined, own-operation capacities as a safety net to be deployed in response to a request by a Member State when existing capacities are overwhelmed. What used to be considered a type of natural disaster affecting only the south of Europe is now present, as you know, in the north too, in Sweden and in Latvia. We have also had wildfires in Greenland, and this means that what has been sensed here is true: climate change is real, it is happening, it is creating new realities on the ground, and we must adapt to them. That is why, as I said, the Commission proposed a new initiative last November to strengthen our collective capabilities to respond to natural disasters, with prevention and preparation as the fundamental pillar.

Through RescEU we want to help Member States to do more on prevention and to foster a culture of prevention. We also want to help Member States, through European funds, to boost their own national capacities in respect of the various risks they face. Trilogues on these proposals started last week, and we need to conclude these discussions by November this year in order to have RescEU up and running by the summer season, which I think is essential.

On what my portfolio covers, as I said at the beginning of the last debate, I was in constant contact with all the authorities – local and regional – and with Members of the European Parliament. We hoped for an assessment of the damage to indicate where we can help, but we are still waiting and it seems that this event is not eligible, according to the legislation agreed and voted by the co-legislators – by the European Parliament and the Council. However, as I said, I am ready to discuss with the Greek authorities the possibility of advance payment and also of changing some operational programmes. We have the envelope for Attica and we can change operational programmes at the request of the Member States if they want to transfer some of the money for reconstruction. We are ready to do whatever is possible

to help, according to the legislation we have in place.

Presidente. – Le proposte di risoluzione, che dovranno essere presentate conformemente all'articolo 123, paragrafo 2, del regolamento saranno annunciate successivamente.

La discussione è chiusa.

La votazione si svolgerà giovedì 13 settembre 2018.

24. Metody reintegracji pracowników na stanowiska pracy wysokiej jakości w następstwie urazów lub chorób (krótka prezentacja)

Presidente. – L'ordine del giorno reca la breve presentazione della relazione di Jana Žitňanská, a nome della commissione per l'occupazione e gli affari sociali, sui percorsi di reinserimento dei lavoratori in impieghi di qualità dopo un infortunio o una malattia (2017/2277(INI))(A8-0208/2018).

Jana Žitňanská, Rapporteur. – Dovoľte mi najprv krátko vysvetliť dôvody, ktoré viedli k tomu, aby táto správa vznikla. Veľmi často, vlastne sme si na to už zvykli, hovoríme o starnutí európskej populácie a zvyšujúcich sa počtoch chronických ochorení či postihnutí. O čosi menej už ale hovoríme o tom, ako veľmi táto zmena ovplyvní spôsob, akým pracujeme a aký vplyv bude mať na pracovné prostredie nás všetkých. Som preto veľmi rada, že som aj medzi kolegami tu v Parlamente našla dostatok vôle sformulovať spôsoby ako tejto výzve aktívnejšie a spoločne čeliť.

Pri príprave správy som sa stretla s mnohými odborníkmi nielen v Bruseli, ale aj na Slovensku. Zaujímal ma pohľad štátnej správy, zamestnávateľov, patientských organizácií. Ďakujem im za cenné rady a odporúčania. Taktiež sa chcem poďakovať všetkým tieňovým spravodajcom, poradcom a sekretariátu Výboru pre sociálne veci a zamestnanosť za vynikajúcu spoluprácu, trpezlivosť, ústretovosť a vecnosť.

Spoločne sme zistili, že prístupy k návratu do práce po chorobe sú často rozdielne, rozdielny je aj spôsob, akým jednotlivé štáty svojim občanom pomáhajú. Napriek tomu existujú prístupy, ktoré môžeme podporovať a zdieľať všetci spoločne. Stále, žiaľ, existujú mnohé prípady, keď veci nefungujú, ľudia sú bez pomoci a štáty, samosprávy či zamestnávateľia potrebné kroky nepodnikajú. Toto je priestor, ktorý by sme mali vyplňať, a verím, že aj táto správa môže byť nápomocná.

Pridaná hodnota našej práce, práce z Európskeho parlamentu, je pomôcť členským štátom rozvíjať predovšetkým preventívne opatrenia, dôsledne uprednostňovať tzv. včasnú intervenciu v prípade, ak sa zdravie pracovníka zhoršuje, a predchádzať tak zložitejším zdravotným problémom. Prevencia je kľúčová.

Na tomto mieste by som tiež chcela spomenúť, že hoci napríklad chronické ochorenia sa nám skôr spájajú s vyšším vekom, hoci ani toto v mnohých prípadoch neplatí, správa nezabúda ani na psychické zdravie, nadmerný stres a duševné problémy. Sú rovnako súčasťou nášho života a tam, kde je potrebné, musíme o nich nahlas hovoriť, pomáhať odstraňovať predsudky a zlepšovať porozumenie o psychickom zdraví.

Správu som nepripravovala len od stola, ale snažila som sa získať pohľad ľudí z praxe, ľudí, ktorí sa sami pokúšali po chorobe alebo s postihnutím vrátiť do práce. Z týchto diskusií mi vyplynula veľká potreba lepšej inštitucionálnej spolupráce všetkých príslušných zainteresovaných strán a tiež potreba individualizovaného prístupu. Pracovná rehabilitácia pracovníkov sa totiž skladá z troch rôznych aspektov: prvý je lekársky, druhý pracovný a tretí sociálny. Úspešná rehabilitácia a návrat do práce zahŕňajú všetky tri a je dôležité, že naša správa tento prístup reflektuje. V správe povzbudzujeme členské štáty, aby si zobrali príklad z osvedčených postupov a prístupov, a zároveň sa snažime určiť oblasti, v ktorých môže Európska únia priniesť pridanú hodnotu a know-how s cieľom ďalej podporovať politiky, ktoré v konečnom dôsledku pomôžu členským štátom umožniť opätovné začlenenie pracovníkov na trh práce.

Rovnako dôležité je pre mňa, že úspešnou praxou návratu do práce po chorobe by sme vedeli omnoho väčšiemu počtu ľudí ako dnes poskytnúť nádej na dôstojnejší a samostatnejší život. Stojíme dnes pred dvomi veľkými úlohami. Tá prvá je skôr technická. Musíme zlepšiť normy, metódy, prevenciu, spoluprácu. Tá druhá úloha je o zmene vnímania. Musíme výrazne skultivovať vnímanie ľudí so zdravotnými problémami či postihnutím väčšinou spoločnosťou. Verím, že táto správa bude jedným z tak potrebných krokov k týmto cieľom.

Procedura «catch the eye»

Michaela Šojdrová (PPE). – Pane predsedajúci, kolegyně a kolegové, já bych chtěla poděkovat naší kolegyni Žitňanské za velmi komplexní zprávu, kterou předložila. Je zřejmé, že návrat do práce je v zájmu jednotlivce i společnosti. Práce má pozitivní vliv na psychiku nemocného člověka a může i posílit, umožnit jeho uzdravení. Navíc člověku umožňuje opětovně se začlenit do společnosti, zajistit si obživu a mít pocit důležitosti, že je v životě ještě potřebný, a to samozřejmě prospívá i jeho rehabilitaci.

Je potřeba zdůraznit možnost využití flexibilních forem práce, práce z domova. Jsem ráda, že tato zpráva obsahuje důraz právě na tyto nové formy práce, které je možné využít při rehabilitaci a umožnění návratu různě zdravotně znevýhodněných osob do společnosti a při jejich začlenění. A ještě bych připomněla začlenění do dobrovolnických činností, protože tam mohou tito lidé najít velmi dobré uplatnění. Takže děkuji a podporuji tuto zprávu.

Olga Sehnalová (S&D). – Pane predsedajúci, vážené kolegyně a kolegové, já bych chtěla v prvé řadě poděkovat kolegyni Žitňanské za zprávu, která se dotýká velmi důležitého a přesto často tabuizovaného společenského tématu, kterým je návrat lidí po dlouhodobé nemoci do práce. Zpráva poukazuje na to, že tato problematika má široké souvislosti nejen pro resocializaci, např. lidí dlouhodobě nemocných, po úrazech s trvalými následky, zaměstnanců s různým druhem postižení, ale i vzhledem k měnící se struktuře pracovního trhu se stárnutím populace. Zpráva zdůrazňuje potřebu individuálního přístupu a podpory zaměstnanců, ale také např. uzpůsobování pracovního prostředí, odstraňování bariér. Není jediný důvod, aby se nad lidmi kvůli jejich zranění či dlouhodobé nemoci zlomila hůl, ať již kvůli fyzickým nebo psychologickým bariérám v jejich prostředí. Jde také o odpovědnost zaměstnavatelů vůči svým zaměstnancům. Děkuji a ještě jednou gratuluji k této zprávě.

Γεώργιος Επιτήδειος (NI). – Κύριε Πρόεδρε, το δικαίωμα στην εργασία του κάθε ατόμου είναι ιερό και αναφαίρετο διότι, με την εργασία του, ένας άνθρωπος όχι μόνο εξασφαλίζει τα προς το ζην για τον ίδιο και την οικογένειά του, αλλά ταυτόχρονα αισθάνεται ψυχική ισορροπία και καταξιώνεται κοινωνικά. Για το λόγο αυτό, πρέπει κάθε κράτος να εξασφαλίζει εργασία για τους πολίτες του, ταυτόχρονα δε, και αξιοπρεπή μισθό και κοινωνικές παροχές. Επίσης, βασική υποχρέωση κάθε κράτους είναι να φροντίζει για την ομαλή επανένταξη στην εργασία όσων έχουν απομακρυνθεί προσωρινά από αυτή, είτε λόγω ατυχήματος, είτε λόγω ασθένειας. Είναι ανήθικο να χρησιμοποιούμε αυτούς τους ανθρώπους μόνο και μόνο για να εργάζονται και μετά να τους ξεχνούμε. Έχουμε υποχρέωση να ενσωματώσουμε στην κοινωνία όλους τους επανερχόμενους εργαζομένους και παράλληλα να δημιουργήσουμε τις προϋποθέσεις εκείνες που θα επιβεβαιώνουν και θα εξασφαλίζουν την ηθική τους αξιοπρέπεια και καταξίωση.

Stanislav Polčák (PPE). – Pane predsedajúci, i já bych chtěl ocenit zprávu paní kolegyně Žitňanské a říci, že tomuto Parlamentu nepochybně sluší brojit proti formám diskriminace, proti vylučování či stigmatizaci určitých osob. Prevence a včasná intervence, to je jedno z témat, které paní kolegyně přednesla. Je tam řada nástrojů, o kterých tato zpráva uvažuje, já se k nim hlásím. Nepochybně přizpůsobení pracoviště, to je jedno z těch nejmenších opatření než daného pracovníka tzv. zatratit. Myslím si, že těch opatření je ještě celá řada, dále např. jde o převelení na jiné pracoviště nebo po dohodě se zaměstnancem mu určit jiný druh práce. Toto je důležité zejména pro naše starší spoluobčany a samozřejmě i pro občany, kteří mají problémy např. s psychickým zdravím. A v té další sadě nástrojů, které jsou uvedeny kapitolou „Návrat do práce“, já bych skutečně zdůraznil opětovné začleňování a individuální přístup ke každému zaměstnanci, který je tímto způsobem znevýhodněn.

Krisztina Morvai (NI). – Elnök Úr! Jó lenne azt hinni, hogy egy munkahelyi üzemi baleset, vagy egy foglalkozási megbetegedés követően a munkaadó azon van, hogy minél inkább, minél jobban reintegrálja a munkavállalóját, a szerencsétlenül járt munkavállalóját, és azt gondolnánk, hogy hát ez a folyamat általában a barátságosság, a szolidaritás, a szeretet jegyében történik.

Jogászként sajnálattal azt kell, mondjam, hogy korántsem ez a tipikus. Sőt az a tipikus, hogy a munkaadók tagadják a felelősséget, és igenis szükség lenne – ahogy kollégám is más összefüggésben mondta – jogi segítségnyújtásra: – „access to justice”, hozzáférésre az igazsághoz – az ilyen jellegű munkajogi jogvitákban is, és általában a munkavállalók jogainak az érvényesítésére – sokszor, ugye, a munkaadókkal szemben –, akár egy jó egyezség elérésére, akár pedig egy effektív jogvitában a jogok érvényesítésére. Köszönöm szépen!

Maria Grapini (S&D). – Domnule președinte, doamna comisar, vreau și eu să subliniez importanța raportului și să felicit raportoarea. Sigur, eu vin din rândul angajatorilor și da, este extrem de complicat, mai ales pentru întreprinderile mici și mijlocii, să susțină costurile unei productivități reduse, pentru că trebuie să recunoaștem că persoanele care nu au capacitate de muncă de 100% nu pot să aibă același randament.

Însă aici este rolul statelor – și trebuie să subliniez că este important să dezvoltăm întreprinderile sociale, să existe politici de compensare, mai ales a întreprinderilor mici și mijlocii care angajează persoane cu capacități reduse de muncă. Mai ales, trebuie să prevenim, pentru că, până la urmă, important este să nu ajungem la un număr foarte mare de oameni bolnavi de stres, de stresul la locul de muncă.

Cred că aici trebuie foarte multă educație și pentru angajatori, pentru a crea locuri de muncă fără a stresa suplimentar angajații, iar pentru cei care nu mai au capacitate de muncă să punem accent pe politici ale statelor membre, dar și ale Comisiei, de susținere a unor programe de compensare a angajatorilor care pun accent pe integrarea și reintegrarea forței de muncă care nu are o capacitate de muncă de 100%.

(Fine della procedura «catch the eye»)

Corina Crețu, Member of the Commission. – Mr President, I would like to thank the honourable Members for these constructive and valuable remarks. The Commission has put inclusive growth and social fairness at the core of its political agenda, and we are working hard to make sure that no one is left behind. I therefore welcome Ms Žitňanská's report, and the Commission agrees that we need effective and concrete measures for workers returning to the labour market after injury and illness.

The prerequisite for successful reintegration into the labour market is ensuring the right to a healthy, safe and well-adapted working environment, as clearly recalled in the European Pillar of Social Rights. European Union legislation on occupational safety and health focuses on the legal obligation imposed on employers to assess all occupational risks on a case-by-case basis and to adapt work to the special needs of individuals. We have to bear in mind that Europe is confronted with an ageing working population with increasing work-related health problems, such as muscular-skeletal disorders and mental health conditions, so we need to face and address this reality.

The European Union Strategic Framework on Health and Safety for the current programming period already proposes a number of measures to address demographic change and the ageing workforce. Besides, the 2017 Commission communication on 'Safer and healthier work for all' has put forward specific preventive and protective measures in accordance with the requirements of sensitive workers. Now, on the reintegration and rehabilitation of workers more specifically, I agree with you that measures allowing early return to work after an accident or disease are needed in order to avoid permanent exclusion. And, you are right, we should see the reintegration process as a new opportunity to benefit from workers' skills, competence and experience. That is why we have the European Social Fund, on which Member States can already rely to help injured workers, for instance, to get back to work more quickly.

For the next Multiannual Financial Framework (MFF) the Commission is going further by proposing to include the health programme as a strand of the European Social Fund plus (ESF+) so health aspects are addressed in all social spending, and vice versa.

To conclude, let me assure you that the Commission will continue, in cooperation with the European Agency for Safety and Health at Work, which is based in Bilbao, to raise awareness, develop practical guidance and promote the exchange of good practices. Once again, I would like to thank the rapporteur for her work. This is an important contribution in defining the steps forward in the effective reintegration of workers recovering from injuries and illness.

Presidente. – Con questo si conclude il punto.

La votazione si svolgerà martedì 11 settembre 2018.

Dichiarazioni scritte (articolo 162)

Dominique Martin (ENF), par écrit. – Le rapport rappelle la nécessité des politiques visant à aider les travailleurs à réintégrer le marché du travail et notamment le fait que la présence de personnes plus âgées au travail entraîne une rotation moindre du personnel, dont la productivité tire parti de compétences et d'expériences plus larges, un meilleur engagement sur leur lieu de travail et des performances parfois supérieures à celles des jeunes travailleurs, notamment en terme de résolution des conflits. Les propositions de ce rapport relèvent du bon sens et vont dans le sens de ce qui est d'ores et déjà pratiqué en France, et ne sera donc pas à l'origine d'un bouleversement de la législation actuelle. Au contraire, il pourra participer à la lutte contre le dumping social des États membres dont la législation actuelle est beaucoup moins contraignante en matière de politique de réinsertion des travailleurs à la suite d'une blessure ou d'une maladie. Pour autant, nous condamnons cette immixtion dans notre législation nationale, immixtion pouvant bloquer des avancées futures que la France pourrait décider.

25. Środki na rzecz zapobiegania mobbingowi i molestowaniu seksualnemu w pracy, przestrzeni publicznej i życiu politycznym w UE, a także zwalczania tych zjawisk (krótka prezentacja)

Presidente. – L'ordine del giorno reca la breve presentazione della relazione di Pina Picierno, a nome della commissione per i diritti della donna e l'uguaglianza di genere, sulle misure per prevenire e contrastare il mobbing e le molestie sessuali sul posto di lavoro, nei luoghi pubblici e nella vita politica nell'UE (2018/2055(INI)) (A8-0265/2018).

Pina Picierno, relatore. – Signor Presidente, onorevoli colleghi, signora Commissario, noi abbiamo lavorato in commissione per più di un anno a questa relazione, e vado particolarmente fiera del risultato che abbiamo ottenuto.

Fiera perché con questo testo, io credo, facciamo un grande passo in avanti nella lotta contro le molestie e il mobbing nei confronti delle donne. Fiera perché, grazie a questo testo, possiamo finalmente portare al centro di questo dibattito e anche dell'opinione pubblica un problema che per decenni è stato minimizzato, per decenni è stato evitato in nome di una presunta possibile diversità di sensibilità, e che invece, grazie a quel movimento globale che è stato denominato «MeToo» e che ha portato al centro la denuncia di tante donne, finalmente è diventata una questione centrale. Ogni giorno donne e ragazze subiscono violenze, subiscono molestie, vengono mobbizzate sul luogo di lavoro, al bar, al cinema, al parco, in palestra, e questo lungo elenco di luoghi potrebbe davvero continuare all'infinito, purtroppo.

E a questi luoghi noi dobbiamo aggiungere, purtroppo, un altro luogo pubblico nuovo, che è il luogo pubblico virtuale, sono i *social network*, sono le *chat*, sono i siti web, sono i *blog*, sono quei luoghi virtuali in cui, purtroppo, le violenze verbali e psicologiche si concretizzano drammaticamente sempre di più.

Allora in sede di commissione FEMM abbiamo voluto porre l'attenzione su queste vicende, su questi nuovi fatti che avvengono, porre l'accento su questo aspetto che appare sempre di più nelle nostre cronache quotidiane. Perché ogni tipo di violenza, ogni tipo di molestia ha delle conseguenze gravissime, ha delle conseguenze psicologiche o fisiche, come dimostrano appunto i casi di suicidio di ragazze che sono state vittime, molto spesso, di *revenge porn* o di bullismo digitale online, e che non ce l'hanno fatta a reggere il peso della vergogna di quello che avevano subito.

È per loro, per tutte le donne che sono state molestate, per tutte le donne che vengono molestate, che stiamo portando avanti questa battaglia. E alla Commissione chiediamo uno sforzo maggiore, signora Commissario, in quanto esecutivo europeo. Noi vogliamo che venga finalmente proposta una direttiva che uniformi la lotta alla violenza di genere, e vogliamo che in questa direttiva ci sia una definizione chiara, omogenea, di quello che significa essere molestata o mobbizzata.

Vogliamo soprattutto una definizione chiara di quello che significa oggi un luogo pubblico perché, come dicevamo prima, le tecnologie hanno modificato questo concetto creando nuove piazze virtuali, dove la violenza verbale non ha più controllo, principalmente perché le persone si sentono praticamente invincibili e impunibili in questi ambienti virtuali, dove ci si può facilmente nascondere dietro un *nickname* per sentirsi intoccabili.

Allora chiediamo anche più educazione, chiediamo maggiore attenzione anche su questo aspetto, perché è proprio dalla scuola, che è il primo luogo pubblico dove i bambini iniziano a confrontarsi con la realtà, con i propri compagni di scuola, che dobbiamo iniziare, educando alla parità di genere, educando all'uguaglianza, al rispetto e alla consapevolezza, perché il rispetto è dovuto a tutti e perché il sesso della persona non la può fare migliore o peggiore di un'altra.

Allora io chiudo ringraziando ancora una volta tutti i colleghi e le colleghe che hanno lavorato a questo testo. Siamo sicuri che ci consentirà di fare un passo in avanti importante.

PRZEWODNICTWO: BOGUSŁAW LIBERADZKI

Wiceprzewodniczący

Przewodniczący. – Dobry wieczór, witam Państwa serdecznie. Witam Państwa zwłaszcza po wakacjach. Rozumiem, że jesteście Państwo pełni werwy do pracy.

Zgłoszenia z sali

Anna Záborská (PPE). – V prvom rade by som chcela poďakovať za prácu pani spravodajkyňi Picierno. Najmä vďaka nej máme pred sebou text, ktorý môžu podporiť všetky politické skupiny. Osobitne chcem vyzdvihnúť, že správa upozorňuje aj na šikanovanie tehotných žien a matiek na pracovisku. Výsledný text je vyvážený, pretože sa opiera o imperatív ľudskej dôstojnosti zakotvený v Charte základných práv Európskej únie, ktorý vychádza z kresťanského chápania človeka. Ak chceme skutočne raz a navždy odstrániť sexuálne obťažovanie a šikanovanie na pracovisku, musíme viac hovoriť o tom, že ako ľudia sme si vo svojej dôstojnosti rovní.

Tento etický postulát je skutočným dôvodom, prečo nikto nemá právo obťažovať alebo šikanovať druhého človeka. Nie Istanbulský dohovor, zákony alebo firemné pravidlá.

Caterina Chinnici (S&D). – Signor Presidente, onorevoli colleghi, le molestie e gli abusi sessuali rappresentano ancora oggi una delle più odiose forme di violenza e di violazione dei diritti umani. Si verificano sul posto di lavoro, come nella vita pubblica e anche nella sfera digitale. Secondo uno studio dell'agenzia FRA, infatti, una donna su cinque di età compresa fra i diciotto e i ventinove anni ha subito molestie sessuali online.

Le istituzioni europee, signora Commissario, devono quindi dare un forte impulso affinché gli Stati membri diano piena attuazione alla Convenzione di Istanbul, armonizzando le proprie normative in materia di violenza di genere per affrontare anche le nuove forme dilaganti di molestie sessuali e di bullismo nello spazio virtuale, che causano alle vittime conseguenze psicologiche di lungo periodo e che in alcuni casi hanno spinto giovanissime vittime a togliersi la vita.

Sono necessarie inoltre campagne educative e di prevenzione nelle scuole per diffondere una nuova cultura incentrata sul rispetto delle donne e per preparare i più giovani a un utilizzo responsabile di Internet e dei *social media*. Sono altresì necessarie forme di collaborazione con i fornitori di servizi Internet affinché adottino misure concrete per proteggere i consumatori e permettere loro di segnalare i casi di abusi e persecuzioni.

Ruža Tomašić (ECR). – Gospodine predsjedavajući, brojne su osobe, pogotovo na internetu, izvrnute zlostavljanju zbog drukčijeg mišljenja, a da bi ih se ponizilo cilja se na njihov spol ili fizička obilježja. Takvo je ponašanje nedopustivo pa edukacijom, prevencijom i adekvatnim zakonskim rješenjima moramo raditi na njegovoj eliminaciji. No s druge se strane pod najezdom radikalnih feministkinja toliko proširuje definicija zlostavljanja i uznemiravanja da svako udvaranje postaje nepoželjno. Čak su i neke svjetski poznate feministkinje progovorile o ovome problemu. Granicu je važno postaviti, mora se znati što je doista za svaku osudu i treba biti zakonski sankcionirano, a što spada u normalnu ljudsku komunikaciju koja u određenom momentu može biti naporna ili dosadna, ali svakako, nije riječ o zlostavljanju. Ne bude li ova granica jasna ljudi će se pod pritiskom loše zakonske regulative i sudske prakse dodatno udaljavati što će ostaviti ozbiljne posljedice na naša društva.

Γεώργιος Επιτήδειος (NI). – Κύριε Πρόεδρε, η σεξουαλική παρενόχληση και η επιβολή, κυρίως στους χώρους εργασίας, είναι μία απαράδεκτη και καταδικαστέα νοοτροπία και πρακτική, η οποία όμως είναι συνυφασμένη με τη φύση του ανθρώπου. Ίσχυε, ισχύει και θα ισχύει και στο μέλλον, εκτός και αν ληφθούν τα απαραίτητα μέτρα. Κυρίως, αυτή η νοοτροπία εκφράζεται και βασίζεται στη φιλοσοφία ορισμένων ανδρών, ότι, ενεργώντας με αυτό τον τρόπο, είτε αυτοεπιβεβαιώνονται, είτε κυριαρχούν επί του θύματός τους. Βεβαίως, αδιαφορούν τόσο για την καταπάτηση των ανθρωπίνων δικαιωμάτων του, όσο και για τη μείωση της προσωπικότητάς του. Πολύ περισσότερο όμως, αδιαφορούν για τα συναισθηματικά και τα ψυχολογικά τραύματα που δημιουργούν στο θύμα τους. Πρέπει λοιπόν να αντιμετωπιστεί αυτό και, για να αντιμετωπιστεί, πρέπει να εκπαιδευτούν οι νέοι άνδρες ώστε να μη θεωρούν ότι αυτή η ενέργεια είτε προσδίδει κύρος, είτε είναι δείγμα επιβολής. Είναι στην πραγματικότητα μία συγκεκαλυμμένη μορφή δειλίας. Εάν δεν κινηθούμε προς αυτή την κατεύθυνση, όσους ορισμούς και αν δώσουμε, όσες αναλύσεις και αν κάνουμε, δεν πρόκειται να επιτύχουμε το επιθυμητό αποτέλεσμα.

Michaela Šojdrová (PPE). – Pane předsedající, kolegyně a kolegové, já považuji za důležité to, aby ponižování pracovníků v žádném případě nebylo tolerováno. Různé formy šikany, mobbingu, ty se vyskytují i v zaměstnávání v rámci veřejné správy či politiky. A já jsem ráda, že Evropský parlament se snaží různé případy, které se i zde vyskytly, řešit. Chci za to poděkovat také naší kolegyni Elisabeth Morin-Chartierové, která se o řešení takovýchto velmi nepříjemných a smutných případů zasadila.

Nakonec v České republice jsme měli ministra, který za ponižování svých zaměstnanců nakonec musel odstoupit, ale nějaké měsíce to trvalo. Za důležité považuji to, aby společnost zůstala citlivá k tomu, co to je ponižování lidí, a tady je potřeba právě prevenci, o které hovořila také předěčnice Anna Záborská, tzn. vzdělávání, etickou výchovu, zkrátka zůstat citlivý k těmto otázkám.

Maria Grapini (S&D). – Domnule președinte, doamna comisar, stimați colegi, vreau să felicit raportoarea și să spun de la bun început că susțin în mod deosebit punctul 17, și anume acela de a avea o directivă, doamna comisar, pentru că, sigur, nu începem noi acum să lucrăm împotriva hărțuirii, dar rezultatele nu sunt și datele statistice care au fost arătate aici și sunt cuprinse și în raport, sigur, nu sunt cele reale, pentru că există o sub-raportare.

Să ne gândim mai ales la mediul rural, la sate, unde femeile suportă violență și nu au curajul să raporteze violența din familie sau violența de la locul de muncă pentru că nu există după aceea posibilitatea de a fi protejate, nu există adăposturi, nu există posibilitatea de a nu se continua în formă permanentă această violență.

De aceea, cred că acest raport este binevenit, dar trebuie să aibă o finalitate. Pe de o parte, să avem programe, programe școlare, educație, este evident, dar trebuie să avem sancțiuni, pentru că orice lucru degeaba îl înscriem într-o directivă sau într-o lege dacă nu vor exista sancțiuni foarte aspre și în situația hărțuirii sexuale, și în situația hărțuirii morale.

Mă bucur că există un capitol cu viața politică, pentru că trebuie să fim corecți cu noi – și în viața politică există hărțuire, și atragem atenția pe această cale liderilor politici.

Pirkko Ruohonen-Lerner (ECR). – Arvoisa puhemies, kiitos esittelijälle hyvästä mietinnöstä ja monista tärkeistä näkökulmista, joita olette ottaneet esiin. Vaikka Suomessa naiset ovat saaneet äänestää yli sata vuotta eri vaaleissa, on meilläkin paljon parantamisen varaa naisten ja miesten tasa-arvossa, myös politiikassa.

Olen toiminut luottamustehtävissä yli kolmekymmentä vuotta. Ennen valintaani Euroopan parlamenttiin toimin kansanedustajana Suomen eduskunnassa kahdeksan vuotta. Virallisesti naisten ja miesten tasa-arvo tunnustetaan, mutta edelleen naisista tehdään politiikassa näkymättömiä. Meilläkin on sovinnesteja, erityisesti vanhempia miehiä, jotka jopa julkiesti väheksyvät ja pilkkaavat politiikassa uransa tehneitä naisia, jopa heidän henkilökohtaisia ominaisuuksiaan, väittäen heitä esimerkiksi kylmiksi, kyynisiksi ja huumorintajuttomiksi.

Miehet suomalaisessa politiikassa lyöttäytyvät helposti yhteisiin harrastuksiin, kuten esimerkiksi golfin pariin ja erilaisiin saunaseuroihin, joissa asioista sovitaan etukäteen miesten kesken. Pelkäänpä, että näin toimitaan monessa muussakin maassa, joten tasa-arvon eteen tehtävä työ ei meiltä lopu.

Krisztina Morvai (NI). – Elnök Úr! Sajnos az úgynevezett politikailag korrekt beszéd annyira elterjedt, és annyira zavaró, hogy sokszor olyankor is legyintenek az emberek, hogy már megint ez a politikai korrektség, amikor nagyon súlyos jelenségekről, és valós jelenségekről van szó: ilyen a szexuális zaklatás is.

Ha nem a politikai korrektségnek a zavaró és hamis világában élénk, akkor például a „Me too” kampánynak lehetett volna olyan következménye – jó következménye, amire kedves kollégám is mellettem itt utalt –, hogy a férfiak kezdtek volna el gondolkodni azon, hogy milyen is lenne a modern világban a korszerű férfiszerep. Hogy egy valódi férfi nem szorul rá arra, hogy zaklasson egy nőt, és egy igazi férfi különbséget tud tenni a konszenzuális, egyetértésen alapuló bókolás, flörtölés, udvarlás, és a megalázás, az erőszak, az emberi méltóságnak a sérelme között. Erről kellene végre beszélni, és végre a férfitársainknak is témává kellene tenni ezt a dolgot. Köszönöm szépen!

Maria Gabriela Zoană (S&D). – Mr President, sexual harassment is a form of violence and it is the most extreme form of gender-based discrimination. Up to 55% of women have been sexually harassed in the EU. This is totally unacceptable and intolerable. We must adopt and ensure the full implementation of legal instruments, including the Istanbul Convention, to eliminate gender-based violence across Europe. Unfortunately, because of the low awareness, social stereotyping, fear and shame associated with talking to other people, women are always reluctant to report these cases.

One point I would like to raise is the importance of education, which I believe should be a fundamental tool in avoiding and eliminating this misconduct, changing mindsets and reducing cultural tolerance of sexism and sexual harassment. Education programmes and debates should be introduced for both girls and boys, as should information about prevention and measures against sexual harassment, and victims’ rights – such as how to seek legal aid – must be extended to our children at an early stage.

(Koniec zgłoszeń z sali)

Corina Crețu, Member of the Commission. — Mr President, on behalf of the Commission, I would like to thank Parliament and, of course, the rapporteur for this excellent report and for keeping this topic high on the agenda.

Unfortunately sexual harassment and mobbing are an unacceptable, yet widespread, form of behaviour in our European society. As has been said, we know this happens everywhere: at work, in schools and universities, on the street, in public transport, online, at festivals and at sport and other events. The world woke up last year with the ‘Me Too’ movement and it was literally a wake-up call. People finally saw the huge extent of sexism, harassment, abuse and violence that women and girls are facing every day in society. Around half of the women in the European Union experience verbal, physical or online sexual harassment. In the case of women in higher management or professional occupations, such as lawyers and doctors, the proportion balloons to 75%.

We have to change the perception in our societies that harassing a woman is normal, acceptable behaviour. We all have this responsibility, whether we are politicians, police officers, teachers, employees or operators of internet platforms. Women should not feel that it is unsafe for them to travel, to go to work, to be out in the street or to be active online. How many of you are ready to go on foot to your hotels tonight when we finish at 11 o'clock? I do not feel safe doing so even though it would be healthy.

Having said this, it is worth reminding you that our efforts to end violence and harassment against women have not just started recently. More than 20 years ago, Parliament was instrumental when we set up the Daphne Programme. Besides, we have been working for decades in the European Union to develop legislation, policy and concrete grassroots actions to prevent violence and to support victims. We have to continue on this path, which includes the European Union’s signing of the Istanbul Convention last year and the current process of conclusion. Having been a Member of the European Parliament for eight years, and now a Commissioner for three years, I can tell you that this journey is slow and long. We in the Commission are working closely with the Council towards EU accession to the Convention, but we really call on those Member States which have not yet ratified it to proceed to do so without further delay.

To conclude, I would like to mention that the Commission has had an anti-harassment policy in place since 2006. It combines prevention and information to all staff, as well as training, with reactive measures to deal with the situation of workplace conflict and harassment. I want to reiterate that the Commission is fully committed to the fight against all forms of gender-based violence, including sexual harassment. Let me be very clear: even a single case of harassment will always be one case too many.

Thank you for your attention and for your hard work. Hopefully, our daughters, our nieces and we ourselves will be safer from now on.

Przewodniczący. – Dziękuję bardzo Pani Komisarz. Bardzo proszę o pozostanie z nami, bardzo Pani potrzebujemy do następnego punktu.

Zamykam debatę.

Głosowanie odbędzie się we wtorek 11 września 2018 r.

Oświadczenia pisemne (art. 162)

María Teresa Giménez Barbat (ALDE), por escrito. – En los últimos tiempos la sensibilización social contra el acoso sexual y psicológico en el trabajo ha aumentado considerablemente. Campañas exitosas, como #MeToo, se han centrado en las víctimas femeninas, pero no debemos asumir que los perpetradores de acoso son siempre hombres o que las víctimas son siempre mujeres. La evidencia internacional muestra que el porcentaje de víctimas masculinas de acoso no es trivial y muy posiblemente supera el 10 % (por ejemplo, el 17 % de las quejas recogidas por la Equal Employment Opportunity Commission de los EE. UU. son hombres; y, según una encuesta francesa citada por la OIT, el 8 % de las mujeres y el 7 % de los hombres informaron de acoso en el trabajo). Los expertos también indican que las víctimas masculinas de acoso tienden a reportar menos sus experiencias debido a los estereotipos sociales, y que faltan estudios centrados en la victimización masculina. El cambio positivo en las actitudes sociales, hacia una menor tolerancia por el acoso y un mayor reconocimiento de los derechos de las mujeres, debe ser aprovechado para extender el reconocimiento a todas las víctimas con independencia de género u orientación sexual. Lamento, en este sentido, que este informe ignore la victimización masculina.

26. Stosunki między UE i państwami trzecimi w zakresie uregulowania sektora finansowego i nadzoru nad nim (krótka prezentacja)

Przewodniczący. – Kolejnym punktem porządku dnia jest sprawozdanie sporządzone przez Briana Hayesa w imieniu Komisji Gospodarczej i Monetarnej w sprawie stosunków między UE a państwami trzecimi dotyczących regulacji usług finansowych i nadzoru nad nimi (2017/2253(INI)) (A8-0263/2018).

Brian Hayes, Rapporteur. – Mr President, I welcome the Commissioner to our discussion this evening. At the outset, I would like to thank all the rapporteurs who worked on this own-initiative report with me over the course of the last number of months, and also to thank my colleagues in the Committee on Economic and Monetary Affairs, who voted for this report in such large numbers just before the summer. I think we have arrived at a good settlement on what is not only a crucially important issue for the European Union and its relationship with third countries but also a crucially important issue for financial stability within the European Union and in the relationships we have with others.

I also want to recognise that this is a forward-looking report, trying to map out, and to achieve a considered view by Parliament about, the future equivalence arrangements that should exist in terms of our relationship with third countries.

I welcome the fact that the Commission in 2017 put forward a review of the equivalence framework. It is right and proper that we should look at our procedures in place, and equally it is right and proper that Parliament should have some role in terms of shaping that review and making sure that we have a meaningful input into its final outworkings.

We in the European Union have worked hard at reducing risk, especially since the crisis: reducing market fragmentation, and also ensuring that we have an international standard in terms of our financial regulation here within the European Union. We have international responsibility for ensuring that the international order, in terms of rule-making and rule-taking, is adopted not just within the European Union, at an inter-institutional level, but also by all Member States of the Union. So having a rules-based system sends a strong message to those members of the international community that have a third-country relationship with us about what we expect in that.

It is also fair to say that, in trying to reach that international best standard, Europe is doing its bit to reduce any of the systemic risks and threats that have been built up over past decades. There is a clear advantage in Europe being a standard bearer for good financial regulation globally and that is something we always need to keep in mind when talking about this issue. We also need to recognise that the existing equivalence regime is really a technical regime in which the Commission has extraordinary power, and we need to recognise that, in many cases, the Commission gets those decisions right on case-by-case deliberation of the issues that come before it, and on a file-by-file basis.

But that's not to say that the framework cannot be improved – it would be a ridiculous position if there were no possibility of the regime for equivalence being improved. What we have tried to set out in this report are areas where we can improve the system in the future: areas of greater transparency in the Commission's dealings with Parliament; how Parliament can assess and analyse some of these decisions; and a monitoring role for Parliament, making sure that decisions are taken by way of delegated acts, making sure that Parliament is fully aware of the circumstances and the position contained in decisions.

I haven't mentioned Brexit because this report is not about Brexit, despite the fact that, when we first embarked on the own-initiative report, people were obsessed by Brexit. This is about setting our house in order, making sure that we have a system in place for the future, and making sure that system is transparent for all, and applies the best possible international standards in our dealings with third countries.

Zgłoszenia z sali

Jonás Fernández (S&D). – Señor presidente, señora comisaria. Europa lleva ya unos cuantos años haciendo un esfuerzo especial para tener un sector financiero estable y seguro. La crisis nos vino a recordar que los bancos y las entidades financieras estaban mal reguladas y mal supervisadas.

Europa lleva años trabajando para tener un sistema financiero robusto que pueda ofrecer servicios a los consumidores y que además sea especialmente estable. Y, por lo tanto, es muy importante que aquellas entidades financieras que provean de servicios al mercado europeo cumplan con una regulación equivalente, con unos controles que puedan ser homologables a la regulación europea.

Y para ello existen los sistemas de equivalencia. Sistemas de equivalencia que la Comisión gestiona pero que tienen que ser más transparentes; tiene que haber un control más estricto por parte del Parlamento Europeo y, además, el modelo tiene que revisarse porque en los próximos meses tendremos que negociar un futuro acuerdo con el Reino Unido, que también lo hace especialmente importante.

Quiero felicitar a Hayes por el trabajo y a esta Cámara que votará mañana un informe muy importante.

(Koniec zgłoszeń z sali)

Corina Crețu, Member of the Commission. – Mr President, on behalf of the Commission I would like to thank rapporteur Hayes for his report on this work. I welcome the large consensus among political groups. Indeed, it is in our interests to have robust international cooperation, matching cross-border business activity in this area. Of course, it increases competition, consumer and investor protection and accelerates innovation in the sector and it helps public authorities ensure financial viability in the European Union.

You know very well, honourable Members, that the European Union financial system is a very open to financial service providers from many parts of the world. The European Union has adopted more than two hundred positive decisions in financial services, covering more than thirty non-EU jurisdictions. You know that that the equivalence process requires that we look at each third country in a regulatory and supervisory framework separately, sector by sector, and we do this in a proportionate and risk-sensitive manner. In this respect I welcome that the report confirms that the equivalence is the most suitable and flexible tool for relations with third countries in financial services.

Of course, it is not perfect, but compared to other alternatives, equivalence preserves the autonomy of EU decision-making and provides powerful incentives for regulatory and supervisory cooperation at international level.

The Commission agrees with the report in the same areas. The European Union framework for third-country equivalence should be further enhanced. In this regard, a number of important proposals were adopted last year. For example, the proposal to amend the European market infrastructure regulation differentiates between the treatment of systematically important third-country centre counterparties and the treatment of non-systematically important ones. The proposal also shows in which circumstances we would need to go beyond equivalence as a last resort.

Finally, we propose to clarify the role of the European Supervisory Authorities in preparing equivalence decisions. We also propose that these authorities assume greater responsibility for monitoring the situation in third countries on with the Commission has taken an equivalence decision.

Now regarding transparency, the Commission agrees that the transparency of the process for granting equivalence can be improved. Over the past three years, we have sought to raise transparency and awareness. For example, in February 2017, we published a staff document to explain our approach. The Commission is ready to come to the Parliament and keep its Members closely informed. Besides, in some of our latest proposals we have put forward the possibility for Parliament and the Council to play a more prominent role in equivalence policy by scrutinising delegating acts which set out detailed equivalence criteria to be applied to the Commission.

Lastly, the Commission agrees that equivalence will play an important role in shaping the European Union's regulatory and economic relations with the UK once it has become a third country. Let me conclude by welcoming once again, the work of all of you and the work of the European Parliament. The Commission now, of course, counts on Parliament and the Council, as co-legislators, to continue moving as swiftly as possible in the coming months to adopt the on-going proposal. Thank you very much for your attention and for your work.

Przewodniczący. – Zamykam debatę.

Głosowanie odbędzie się we wtorek 11 września 2018 r.

Oświadczenia pisemne (art. 162)

Barbara Kappel (ENF), schriftlich. – Äquivalenz ist ein nützliches Instrument zur Förderung der internationalen Regulierungskonvergenz, die zu mehr Wettbewerb auf dem EU-Binnenmarkt unter gleichen Wettbewerbsbedingungen führen, Regulierungsarbitrage verhindern, Verbraucher und Investoren schützen, die Finanzstabilität der EU erhalten und die Kohärenz innerhalb des Binnenmarkts gewährleisten kann. Äquivalenz dient auch als ein Instrument, um eine faire und gleiche Regulierung und Aufsicht zwischen EU-Finanzinstituten und Finanzinstitutionen aus Drittstaaten zu gewährleisten. Äquivalenz funktioniert auch auf Gegenseitigkeit: Andere Rechtsordnungen gewähren EU-Marktteilnehmern Zugang zu ihren Finanzmärkten. Dies gibt europäischen Unternehmen die Gewissheit, dass in den Drittländern, in denen sie ihre Wirtschaftstätigkeit entfalten und ihre finanziellen Güter und Dienstleistungen bereitstellen, europäische Regeln und Bedingungen gelten. Seit der Finanzkrise wurden mehr als 40 neue EU-Finanzvorschriften angenommen. Von diesen 40 neuen Rechtsakten enthalten 15 Drittländerklauseln, die es der Kommission im Namen der EU erlauben, einseitig zu entscheiden, ob die Regulierungsvorschriften in ausländischen Rechtsordnungen als gleichwertig betrachtet werden können. Leider verfügt die Kommission bei der Annahme von Äquivalenzentscheidungen über einen weiten Ermessensspielraum, weit entfernt von jeder demokratischen Kontrolle. Dieser Bericht fordert mehr Transparenz und demokratische Kontrolle. Dies wird Äquivalenzentscheidungen ermöglichen, die sich stärker auf die Prioritäten des Parlaments und der Bürger konzentrieren, und das ist zu begrüßen.

27. Równość językowa w erze cyfrowej (krótka prezentacja)

Przewodniczący. – Kolejnym punktem porządku dziennego jest sprawozdanie sporządzone przez Jill Evans w imieniu Komisji Kultury i Edukacji w sprawie równości językowej w erze cyfrowej (2018/2028(INI)) (A8-0228/2018).

Jill Evans, Rapporteur. – Mr President, there is a Welsh proverb: 'A nation without a language is a nation without a heart' – *Cenedl heb iaith, cenedl heb galon*. It reflects the centrality of the language to people's identity and culture. In the same way, Europe's linguistic diversity is an integral element of European identity, reflected in the motto *Unity in diversity*. The EU has 500 million citizens, 24 official languages, five co-official languages and three alphabets, but some 60 other languages are also part of the EU's heritage, including sign languages, which are included in my report.

The EU has played an important role in supporting linguistic diversity and encouraging the promotion and protection of minority and lesser-spoken languages. This is in Article 22 of the Charter for Fundamental Rights. The Committee on Culture and Education agreed that we must ensure comprehensive EU-level legal protection for regional and minority languages, recognising the collective rights of national and linguistic minorities in the digital world. Because when we go online, we find a world where many languages are at risk of extinction. New technologies like Siri and Alexa are changing the way we live our lives, but are available in just a few languages. As this technology gets more widely used, the speakers of other languages are being left behind.

To help address this problem my report calls on the Commission to bring forward a range of measures, including: allocating the specific area of multilingualism and language technology to the portfolio of one Commissioner; establishing a large-scale, long-term funding programme for research and development and innovation, as well as establishing a European language technology platform, and extending the digital language diversity project; supporting education policies to ensure that the next generation of Europeans will lead the way in this field, as well as encouraging companies to take the business opportunities that this would present.

Our multilingualism is a great asset, an opportunity, and at the same time is one of the EU's greatest challenges. The impetus from my report was a STOA study entitled 'Language equality in the digital age – Towards a human language project' which showed the social and economic consequences of language barriers. In fact, we see the technology gap widening between the large, well-resourced languages and others, even some official languages.

The network of experts on language technologies –META-NET– warns that at least 21 European languages are in danger of extinction in the digital world. So we must act, and urgently. This is a huge opportunity for the EU to demonstrate a real commitment to language equality which will benefit all its citizens, to share ideas and good practice, and I am proud that researchers in Wales, such as in Canolfan Bedwyr at Bangor University, are leading the way.

Finally, can I thank the shadow rapporteurs for their enthusiastic cooperation, my assistant, Cai Elis, for his excellent work on this report, as well as our Group staff, colleagues in the Committee on Industry, Trade and Research, the committee secretariat and all the experts who advised me during the process. It is clear this is an issue of huge interest.

Zgłoszenia z sali

Csaba Sógor (PPE). – A digitális kor körülményei között újrafogalmazódik a nyelvek szerepe, és még hangsúlyosabban felvetődik az egyes nyelvek hasznossága. Ezért nagyon fontos, hogy Európa a nyelvi sokszínűségére értékékként tekintsen, és rendeljen komoly erőforrásokat a nyelvek egyenjogúságának gyakorlati megvalósításához. A modern technológia ma már megoldást kínál erre, az Európai Unió pedig a nyelvi széttöredezettségéből fakadó esetleges versenyhátrányokat az előnyére fordíthatja, globális vezető szerepet töltve be ezen a téren.

A jelentés külön felhívja a figyelmet a mintegy 60 európai regionális és kisebbségi nyelv átfogó jogi védelmének fontosságára, továbbá hangsúlyozza a nemzeti és nyelvi kisebbségek kollektív jogainak elismerését a digitális világban. Rendkívül fontosnak nevezi az anyanyelvi oktatás biztosítását az EU hivatalos és nem-hivatalos nyelveit beszélők számára. Ez az a terület, ahol egyes tagállamok láthatóan nem tesznek meg mindent a nyelvi sokszínűség érvényesülése érdekében, sőt, minden eszközzel akadályozzák azt. Ez a fajta hozzáállás semmiképpen sem segíti az EU-t a céljai elérésében, ezért határozottan EU-ellenesnek tekinthető.

Helga Stevens (ECR). – Voorzitter, ik wil graag de rapporteur feliciteren met haar ontwerpverslag. Het is zeer gedetailleerd en bevat verwijzingen naar gebarentalen, de voorkeuertaal van doven in Europa.

Onze samenleving digitaliseert zeer snel en hierbij is het belangrijk dat onze talenrijkdom behouden blijft. Dit geldt zeker voor gebarentalen waar verdringing dreigt voor sommige kleinere gebarentalen in de EU omwille van schaal-grootte en onvoldoende financiële middelen. We moeten dus manieren vinden om alle doven in de EU te laten deelnemen aan en profiteren van de interne digitale markt in hun eigen gebarentaal.

Vandaar dat ik het verslag over taalgeijkheid in het digitale tijdperk volmondig steun. Alle talen, of het nu gesproken of gebarentalen zijn, moeten gelijkwaardig behandeld worden.

Maria Lidia Senra Rodríguez (GUE/NGL). – Os meus parabéns à relatora pelo seu relatório. Senhora Comissária, o reconhecimento, por parte das instituições europeias, de línguas como o galego e das línguas dos povos que conformam a realidade plurinacional de alguns Estados-Membros é fundamental e não pode depender apenas das decisões dos Estados que nos oprimem também enquanto povos.

A situação no meu país é muito grave. Só 30 % das pessoas com idades entre os 15 e os 19 anos fala o galego, face a 75 % das pessoas com idade superior a 75 anos. Além disso, o galego representa menos de 0,01 % dos conteúdos web.

Na era digital, o galego tem de estar presente na rede em igualdade de condições, para permitir que os falantes de galego possam navegar na rede com total normalidade em galego.

Apoiarei o relatório e pedimos à Comissão que implemente as medidas necessárias para o aplicar. Solicito a este Parlamento que preveja os meios para que todas e todos possamos expressar-nos em sede parlamentária nas nossas próprias línguas, que são chamadas de «minoritárias», mas que, na realidade, são línguas ocultas que foram minorizadas pela imposição à força durante séculos para convertê-las em predominantes.

Algirdas Saudargas (PPE). – Gerb. Pirmininke. Noriu pasveikinti gerb. pranešėją, paruošusią puikų pranešimą. Daugiakalbystė jau seniai įvardinta kaip barjeras Europos skaitmeninės rinkos plėtrai, tačiau iki šiol tik nedidelė dalis Europos Sąjungos valstybių ėmėsi aktyvių veiksmų šiai problemai spręsti.

Per paskutinius dešimtmečius skaitmeninių technologijų vaidmuo visuomenėje įgauna vis didesnę įtaką. Tai veikia ne tik mūsų įpročius, kalbą, bet ir kultūrą bei gyvenimo būdą.

Technologijos yra vienintelis įmanomas būdas patenkinti Europos ir jos daugiakalbės aplinkos poreikius. Džiaugiuosi, kad šis klausimas pagaliau atsidūrė Europos politinėje darbotvarkėje.

Raginu Europos Komisija imtis iniciatyvos ir įgyvendinti pranešime siūlomus veiksmus bei kuo greičiau sukurti Europos gimtosios kalbos projektą – aiškia ir ilgalaikę mokslinių tyrimų, technologinės plėtros ir inovacijų finansavimo programą. Tik taip Europa ilgalaikėje perspektyvoje galės užsitikrinti lyderės poziciją ne tik kalbų technologijų, bet ir dirbtinio intelekto srityje.

Michaela Šojdrová (PPE). – Pane předsedající, kolegyně a kolegové, rozmanitost kultury a tedy také jazyků v Evropě je naší velkou kulturní hodnotou a bohatstvím, které si musíme uchovat. V době, kdy se neustále zrychluje digitalizace a používání těchto digitálních technologií, tak je potřeba také se dívat na to, jak je zajištěn přístup v těchto 24 oficiálních jazycích v Evropské unii, jak je používán. A my jsme zjistili, že oficiální webové stránky Evropské unie v některých případech, v některých programech ještě nedostatečně používají právě oficiální jazyky. Já souhlasím s tím, že pro komunikaci se angličtina nepochybně stane tím hlavním komunikačním jazykem, ale pokud chceme zajistit, aby jazyky těch menších národů, které jsou méně používané, řeckneme na té společné evropské úrovni, aby byly podporovány, pak musíme zajistit i jejich dostupnost na webových stránkách evropských institucí.

(Koniec zgłoszeń z sali)

Corina Crețu, Member of the Commission. – Mr President, on behalf of the Commission, I would like to thank the Parliament for the impressive work done for the initiative on language equality in the digital age and for the enriching views expressed by you, its Members.

The report comes at a time when digital technologies are transforming our society and economy at an unprecedented pace, offering opportunities but also revealing barriers to multilingualism and language equality in the digital age. In highlighting the complexity brought about by language diversity and the fundamental importance of language technologies on the road to achieving language equality, the report provides food for thought for developing future actions.

Language technologies are an essential component of any digital device or service we use nowadays. Continuous research, innovation and deployment in the area of language technologies can therefore bring us closer and closer towards multilingualism at an acceptable cost. Ensuring appropriate technological support for all European languages will also create jobs, growth and opportunities in the digital single market. It will enhance the quality of public services, and reinforce a stronger sense of unity and belonging throughout Europe.

EU funding has already led to a number of results. For example, in the Moses machine translations system, an open research result that has been taken up by the Commission for its in-house system or the modern machine translation project which developed a neural system that automatically improves translations. To leverage the achievements, under the next Multiannual Financial Framework (MFF), we will need to reinforce funding, research and education actions. The Commission has therefore submitted programme proposals for the next Multiannual Financial Framework, seeking funding to continue its work towards technology enabled language equality.

Overall, I would like to remind you that the Commission is committed to working towards an inclusive union offering seamless access to digital services, products and content, irrespective of language or location. Union citizens, businesses and public administrations can enjoy the right to access such services, products and content without discrimination based on language.

I think it is also very important to say that we are focusing on the exchange of good practice in the policy recommendation, as well as funding programmes such as Erasmus+ and Creative Europe.

The Commission has also confirmed the actions of the Council of Europe's European Centre for Modern Languages, aimed, among other things, at supporting teachers working with children from different linguistic backgrounds. Finally, the Commission raised awareness of the importance of language learning through public events like the European Day of Languages on 26 September and the national awards of the European Language Label for innovative language learning projects.

To conclude, I would like to thank the rapporteur, Ms Evans, once again for her valuable work. We share the view that overcoming language barriers in the digital environment is essential for an inclusive society, a vibrant digital single market and for unity in diversity.

Przewodniczący. – Zamykam debatę.

Głosowanie odbędzie się we wtorek 11 września 2018 r.

Oświadczenia pisemne (art. 162)

Dominique Bilde (ENF), par écrit. – Si le multilinguisme est une des richesses de l'Europe, qui est constituée d'États nations souvent séculaires, il ne faut toutefois pas s'illusionner, ce qui est le travers de ce texte, sur les possibilités offertes par les technologies linguistiques pour en relever le défi. Celles-ci ne sauraient en effet remplacer l'apprentissage des langues et, à cet égard, les ambitieux objectifs de Barcelone concernant la maîtrise de deux langues étrangères peinent à se concrétiser. Du reste, les États membres détiennent la compétence exclusive en ce qui concerne leurs stratégies linguistiques, et l'exigence de bilinguisme ne s'impose pas partout uniformément. Car le défaut le plus rédhibitoire de ce rapport est son ingérence dans les compétences des États membres, notamment dans le domaine de l'éducation. Non seulement il est inadmissible d'assimiler les «langues des migrants» à des langues minoritaires européennes, mais il est intolérable de prétendre en déterminer l'usage au sein du système scolaire. Je note enfin qu'avant de s'ingérer dans les politiques linguistiques des États membres, l'Union européenne devrait montrer elle-même l'exemple au sein de ses propres institutions, où le primat de l'anglais ne cesse de s'accroître en dépit de l'imminence du Brexit.

28. Przejrzyste i odpowiedzialne zarządzanie zasobami naturalnymi w krajach rozwijających się: kwestia lasów (krótka prezentacja)

Przewodniczący. – Kolejnym punktem porządku dziennego jest sprawozdanie sporządzone przez Heidi Hautalę w imieniu Komisji Rozwoju w sprawie przejrzystego i odpowiedzialnego zarządzania zasobami naturalnymi w krajach rozwijających się: kwestia lasów (2018/2003(INI)) (A8-0249/2018).

Heidi Hautala, Rapporteur. – Mr President, nobody should deny the urgency of addressing and tackling climate change, which has become a question for the very existence of humanity and our planet. We have increasing scientific evidence that forest cover is the one feasible option we have for combating climate change. Connected with that, we have to care for the soil, with its rich microbial life, which is the basis for life systems.

However, we know that deforestation is currently the number two cause of greenhouse gas emissions. I believe that the EU has done a lot to try to protect forests worldwide, but it can do better. Namely, the EU already has excellent tools, which can be used to assist our partner countries on the way to better development. We have, for instance, the EU Forest Law Enforcement, Governance and Trade instrument, which we call the Flegt Action Plan, and we have linked this with the Voluntary Partnership Agreements, which have proven to be indispensable tools in improving forest governance in partner countries. These Voluntary Partnership Agreements have brought stakeholders – I am talking about civil society, local and indigenous peoples, law-enforcement agents and governments – broadly together to the same negotiating table, to try to solve the difficult issue of deforestation so we can invest more in this important instrument in order to tackle corruption, which is often the cause of deforestation. We can also address the issue of so-called conflict timber just as we have addressed conflict minerals. I want to stress that there is a need for sufficient resources for these mechanisms and that Parliament should do more to secure those resources.

What is urgently needed, however, is a coherent, all-encompassing EU action plan to stop deforestation and forest degradation. This is already several years overdue and I hope very much that the Commission will now take inspiration from this own-initiative report and will urgently open a genuine stakeholder consultation, which in turn will pave the way for the action plan against deforestation and forest degradation. I hope that Commissioner Mimica will continue to support these measures, which are outlined in the report.

There are some striking examples of the fact that voluntary approaches to tackling deforestation in EU policy are not enough. For instance, in the cocoa sector, the EU is responsible for over 60% of global imports of cocoa, and the major part of the global cocoa supply is produced in Côte d'Ivoire and Ghana. However – you may not believe this, but it is true – in Côte d'Ivoire, for instance, 40% of production takes place on illegally converted forest land. I am sure that we, as European consumers, do not want to see this continue. I'm very glad, too, to hear private-sector voices being raised to call for mandatory due diligence in the cocoa supply chains, and, with this report, I hope we can address these requirements at EU level.

Zgłoszenia z sali

Julie Ward (S&D). – Mr President, we need to hold our governments and our businesses accountable for the way they engage with other countries, especially when it comes to preserving natural resources. Indigenous people's rights, and in particular land rights, are almost systematically overlooked. Last December in Kenya, the Sengwer community faced a wave of forced evictions from their ancestral land, despite the fact that their forest is included in the water conservation programme financed by the EU, and some Sengwer were killed in the eviction process.

The EU temporarily suspended its funding and now we need to continue engaging with the Kenyan authorities on the ground to ensure full accountability for the human rights violations that occurred. It is also important that the EU delegation in Nairobi doesn't let the current negotiations drag on, as many people's livelihoods depend on the viability of this project. We need to keep this experience in mind in order to ensure that human rights due diligence, in particular when it comes to indigenous rights, remain at the heart of any future EU engagement with other countries.

Kateřina Konečná (GUE/NGL). – Pane předsedající, bylo mi velkou ctí vypracovat k této zprávě stanovisko výboru ENVI. A v této souvislosti bych chtěla ocenit práci všech stínových zpravodajů a skvělou spolupráci s paní Hautalaovou. Jsem opravdu velmi ráda, že se Evropský parlament nebojí o tématu odlesňování hovořit, ale již je opravdu nejvyšší čas, aby Komise začala jednat. Komise totiž dlouhou dobu čekala na nezávislé studie, které nakonec nepřekvapivě deklarovaly, že EU je jednoznačně součástí problému globálního odlesňování. Vážená Komise, teď, když už konečně víte, co jste měli vědět dávno, vezte prosím i toto: do konce tohoto mandátu Komise očekáváme předložení ambiciózního akčního plánu EU týkajícího se odlesňování a znehodnocování lesů, který by obsahoval konkrétní regulační opatření. Víím, že to bude těžké, ale byli jste to vy, kdo ztrácel čas, zatímco deštné pralesy mizely nebo byly páleny kvůli poptávce na biopaliva do Evropské unie.

Jean-Luc Schaffhauser (ENF). – Monsieur le Président, le rapport Hautala fait un bon constat mais se trompe sur les remèdes. La mondialisation est le problème, pas la solution. Essayer de la réparer avec des rustines réglementaires vertes n'empêche pas sa logique destructrice. La seule et réelle solution est de renoncer à cet absurde libre-échange du marché unique mondial qui repose sur la concurrence par les prix.

L'importation massive de bois et sa transformation en dehors de nos normes environnementales et sociales en Chine et au Vietnam est la véritable source de la déforestation, et le rapport ne s'y attaque pas. 75 % des exportations de bois vont vers la Chine, des bois français également.

L'agriculture écologique est aussi le meilleur moyen de lutter contre la déforestation des forêts primaires, mais elle demande également un protectionnisme dans les pays en voie de développement et chez nous, et ces normes sont absentes de ce rapport.

Nous voterons donc contre ce rapport, malgré ses bonnes intentions.

Maria Arena (S&D). – Monsieur le Président, la déforestation, la dégradation et l'exploitation illégale des forêts peuvent être motivées aussi par des facteurs liés au commerce. C'est pourquoi la politique commerciale de l'Union européenne a un rôle essentiel à jouer.

L'Union européenne est l'un des principaux exportateurs et importateurs de biens. Elle a donc la possibilité d'agir au niveau des normes internationales, contrairement à ce qu'a dit notre collègue de la droite radicale.

Mais plus qu'une volonté, il s'agit d'une obligation. En effet, la Cour européenne de justice a dit, dans le cadre de l'avis qu'elle a émis sur Singapour, que l'Union européenne doit intégrer les objectifs de préservation et d'amélioration de la qualité de l'environnement et de gestion durable des ressources dans le cadre de sa politique commerciale.

Alors, que faire?

Premièrement, se doter d'un cadre réglementaire pour appliquer des obligations de transparence tout au long de l'approvisionnement des produits forestiers à risque; deuxièmement, renforcer le chapitre développement durable avec des mécanismes de sanction.

Alors, lutter contre le changement climatique avec des mesures volontaires est tout simplement irresponsable. C'est pourquoi j'en appelle au sens de la responsabilité de chacun d'entre nous au sein de ce Parlement, pour ne pas soutenir les votes séparés de certains membres de ce Parlement, qui iraient totalement au suicide par rapport au respect climatique.

(Koniec zgłoszeń z sali)

Corina Crețu, Member of the Commission. – Mr President, the Commission welcomes this opportunity today to discuss the challenges forests face in a global context of increased pressure on natural resources. The Commission welcomes the report and warmly thanks the rapporteur, Vice-President Heidi Hautala, for the excellent work undertaken.

Forests are nature's most generous renewable resources. The 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development and the new European Consensus on Development have reaffirmed the urgency to tackle illegal and unsustainable exploitation of forests by supporting better governance. In this endeavour, transparency and accountability – two elements highlighted by this report – show a way forward.

As far as the Commission is concerned, we are strongly committed to tackling illegal logging and trade, and promoting good governance in the forestry sector. Through the EU flagship initiative the Forest Law-enforcement, Governance and Trade Action Plan, we have put forward a comprehensive toolkit to tackle both the illegal production of timber and its consumption. This year marks the first 15 years, so let me briefly recall the significant achievements of the forest action plan.

A key element is the new Timber Regulation. I am pleased to confirm that after more than five years of implementation, there is steady progress in its enforcement. In 2009, the EU concluded its first voluntary partnership agreement with Ghana. As of today, we count 15 agreements, and we recently initiated an agreement with Honduras, and we hope to close this year with Guyana and Vietnam.

Voluntary partnership agreements have been the cornerstone of the forest action plan. An important proof of this is Indonesia which in November 2016 became the first country to export timber to the EU that was licensed through the action plan. Since then, Indonesia has issued close to 40 000 licenses with a total value of more than USD 1 billion. That is about 25% of tropical timber imports into the European Union. Forest law-enforcement, governance and trade and licensing are a significant milestone yet it is only the end of a long journey that involves overall governance improvement, as we see in Ghana. And, most importantly the benefits go beyond forests, contributing to larger EU initiatives such as the protection of indigenous people's rights and environmental defenders.

The Forest Law-Enforcement, Governance and Trade initiative owes part of its success to the engagement of the private sector as you have already said. New alliances are necessary, including with big consumer countries, especially China, and with financial institutions.

The Commission is currently concluding the Forest Law-Enforcement, Governance and Trade work plan for the period 2018-2022, and the European Union has also included environmental crime linked to forests in the priorities of its overall fight against organised crime for 2018-2021.

In the end, I would like to say that the Commission hears your call for more measures to halt deforestations. The EU is already doing a lot through the forest flagship initiative I just mentioned, through the mechanism of the reduced emissions from deforestation and degradation. We will draw the lessons but more needs to be done.

Deforestation is a complex matter requiring a specific approach that involves all the relevant stakeholders, not least in partner countries. We therefore intend to pursue a high level of ambition in the next Multiannual Financial Framework, including through our broad neighbourhood development and international cooperation instruments. It will seek to mainstream environmental protection in a geographical pillar and complement this by targeted thematic actions on sustainable forest management, illegal logging and conflict timber. We look forward to your support.

Przewodniczący. – Zamykam debatę.

Głosowanie odbędzie się we wtorek 11 września 2018 r.

Oświadczenia pisemne (art. 162)

Ivan Jakovčić (ALDE), napisan. – Svi znamo da su šume pluća svijeta, no zašto se onda prema njima ponašamo tako loše da ih krčimo, palimo, nezakonito siječemo? One znatno doprinose ublažavanju klimatskih promjena i prilagodbi na njih te očuvanju biološke raznolikosti. One sprečavaju degradaciju i dezertifikaciju zemljišta i time smanjuju rizik od poplava, odrona tla i suše. One su nužne za održivu poljoprivredu te poboljšavaju sigurnost opskrbe hranom i ishranu.

Upravo iz ovih i mnogih drugih razloga glasao sam za Izvješće o transparentnom i odgovornom upravljanju prirodnim resursima u zemljama u razvoju! Ovo Izvješće traži od EU-a da pruži potporu integraciji ciljeva upravljanja šumama i zemljištem u nacionalno utvrđene doprinose zemalja u razvoju bogatih šumama, te podsjeća na to da se u Pariškom sporazumu od svih strana zahtijeva da poduzmu mjere za očuvanje i poboljšanje ponora, uključujući šume.

Krčenje i uništavanje šuma nije nikakav način kvalitetnog odnosa prema tom prirodnom resursu, a ujedno je nezakonita sječa drva i trgovina drvom jedan od pet najvažnijih sektora kriminala protiv okoliša. Snažno zagovaram poticanje participativnog i zajedničkog upravljanja šumama većim uključivanjem civilnog društva u planiranje i provedbu politika i projekata upravljanja šumama, podizanjem svijesti i osiguravanjem da lokalne zajednice također uživaju koristi od šumskih resursa.

Indrek Tarand (Verts/ALE), kirjalikult. – Käesolev arutelu metsatustumise üle väljaspool EL-i paneb lootusetult ohkama selle üle, mis toimub meie koduriikide metsades.

Asjaolu, et sada aastat tagasi oli Eestis kaks korda rohkem metsa, näitab, et meie metsamajanduse korraldus ning eetika ei ole olnud jätkusuutlik. Seda just viimasel aastakümnel. Aastasadu töötab eestlane selle nimel, et soost saaksid põllud ja võsastikust metsamaa – täna muutub meie mets riigiasutuste dirigeerimisel üheks üüratuks raiesmikuks.

Peaksime lõpu tegema silmakirjalikule praktikale, kus taastuenergiat toodetakse puidu katlas põletamisega, ning veel enam – selle kui keskkonnasõbralikul viisil valminud energiaallika turustamisele teistele riikidele, kellel jäi taastuenergia osakaal oodatust madalamaks. Rääkimata selle keskkondlikust mõjust, on kõrge kvaliteediga puidu tuhaks põletamisel ka oma majanduslik kahjutegur – seda puitu saaks mõnes teises sektoris jätkusuutlikumalt, aga ka suurema kasumiga ära rakendada. Andestamatu on ka metsaraie lohakas läbiviimine rahvusparkides ning väärtuslikel rohealadel, kus see peaks vastama range järelvalve ning läbipaistvuse nõuetele. Ajakirja „Eesti Mets“ 1927. aasta 12. numbris on kirjutatud, et „eks rahvajutt olegi tõsi, et riigikogus jagavat kristlased taevariiki ohtralt tahtjatele ja koondlased jälle metsi. Teadmata alles, missugune erakond hakkab jagama merd?“ Rõhkemgi kui erakonnad vastutavad tänases Eestis tasakaalutu metsaraie eest riigiasutused, kes tegutsevad vastupidiselt oma kohustele.

29. Zwiększanie wzrostu gospodarczego i spójności w regionach przygranicznych UE (krótka prezentacja)

Przewodniczący. – Kolejnym punktem porządku dziennego jest sprawozdanie sporządzone przez Krzysztofa Hetmana w imieniu Komisji Rozwoju Regionalnego w sprawie zwiększania wzrostu gospodarczego i spójności w regionach przygranicznych UE (2018/2054(INI)) (A8-0266/2018).

Krzysztof Hetman, sprawozdawca. – Panie Przewodniczący! Pani Komisarz! Wewnętrzne regiony przygraniczne w Unii Europejskiej stanowią czterdzieści procent jej terytorium i są zamieszkałe przez sto pięćdziesiąt milionów osób. Niestety wciąż borykają się z licznymi specyficznymi problemami które sprawiają, że radzą sobie gorzej niż regiony wewnątrz krajów. Ich potencjał gospodarczy nie jest w pełni wykorzystany. Cieszę się, że Komisja Europejska dostrzegła ten problem i przeprowadziła badanie tych barier prawnych i administracyjnych oraz konsultacje społeczne, których wynikiem jest komunikat na temat zwiększenia wzrostu gospodarczego i spójności w regionach przygranicznych Unii Europejskiej wskazujący dziesięć głównych przeszkód i proponuje rozwiązania dla tych problemów. Chciałbym jednak podkreślić, iż uważam za szczególnie istotne przeprowadzenie podobnego przeglądu dla regionów na granicach zewnętrznych. Musimy bowiem pamiętać, iż rozwiązania zaproponowanych w dyskutowanym obecnie przeglądzie nie możemy w wielu przypadkach w prosty sposób przenieść na te właśnie regiony. Wynika to z ich całkiem odmiennej specyfiki, jak choćby brak strefy Schengen, nieuczestniczenie we wspólnym rynku i wielu innych. Dlatego też chciałbym się zwrócić do Komisji z prośbą o przygotowanie oddzielnej analizy zarówno dla regionów zewnętrznych, jak i regionów morskich. Jestem przekonany, że najpotężniejszym narzędziem przezwyciężenia obciążeń dla rozwoju regionów przygranicznych jest wzajemne zaufanie i wola polityczna wszystkich właściwych organów, w tym zwłaszcza władz lokalnych i regionalnych. Potrzeba do tego zarówno elastyczności, jak i niekiedy wprowadzenia szczególnych uregulowań, aby zapewnić spójność pomiędzy różnymi systemami prawnymi, gdyż często nawet ta sama dyrektywa jest transponowana w odmienny sposób w dwóch sąsiednich krajach. Należy więc podkreślić, że szereg pilnych kwestii wymaga bardziej ukierunkowanych intensywnych działań podejmowanych zarówno na szczeblu państw członkowskich, jak i Unii Europejskiej, które pozwolą władzom lokalnym na bardziej efektywną współpracę. Pracownicy transgraniczni muszą mieć uznawane kwalifikacje, należy ich dobrze poinformować o przysługującym im zabezpieczeniu społecznym. Należy również usunąć bariery dla przedsiębiorców transgranicznych, ponieważ obecnie przedsiębiorstwa prowadzące działalność transgraniczną mają o sześćdziesiąt procent większe koszty niż przedsiębiorstwa prowadzące działalność na terenie jednego kraju. Chciałbym zwrócić uwagę na ogromną pozytywną rolę, jaką w przezwyciężaniu barier odgrywały programy Europejskiej Współpracy Terytorialnej. Chciałbym wyrazić swoje pełne poparcie dla ich kontynuowania, a wręcz wzmocnienia po 2021r. Interreg to program, który dzięki oddolnemu podejściu udowodnił swoją skuteczność w nawiązywaniu współpracy m. in. w dziedzinie zdrowia, edukacji, ochrony środowiska, a także przyczynił się do budowania zaufania pomiędzy lokalnymi społecznościami po dwóch stronach granicy. Doceniając rolę Programu Współpracy Transgranicznej, chciałbym też zwrócić uwagę na nie do końca może jeszcze wykorzystany potencjał europejskich ugrupowań współpracy terytorialnej. Jestem przekonany, że dzięki temu instrumentowi jesteśmy w stanie pokonać wiele problemów, z którymi borykają się obecnie regiony przygraniczne.

Uważam też, że powinniśmy odważnie pogłębiać współpracę przygraniczną, dlatego też wzmocnienie nowych narzędzi zarządzania współpracą transgraniczną uważam za potrzebne i uzasadnione. Na koniec chciałbym podkreślić, że cieszę się, że Komisja powołała punkt koordynacyjny do spraw transgranicznych. Wierzę, że będzie on skutecznym narzędziem dla władz krajowych i regionalnych w zmaganiu się z przeszkodami natury prawnej czy administracyjnej na granicach.

Zgłoszenia z sali

Daniel Buda (PPE). – Domnule președinte, doamnă comisar, doamnelor și domnilor colegi, regiunile transfrontaliere reprezintă o parte esențială a teritoriului european, iar o treime din cetățenii europeni trăiesc în aceste regiuni. Cu toate acestea, ele suferă din cauza obstacolelor de dezvoltare, iar problemele cu care se confruntă acestea sunt, în general, comune.

Prin urmare, se impune un cadru de măsuri care să faciliteze exploatarea acestui potențial prin eliminarea obstacolelor și fructificarea avantajelor existente.

În primul rând, mobilitatea lucrătorilor la nivel transfrontalier reprezintă un factor important în dezvoltarea cooperării, iar statele membre, prin autoritățile regionale, au obligația să faciliteze libera circulație a muncitorilor din aceste regiuni.

Lipsa conectivității este un alt aspect care împiedică dinamizarea activităților la nivel transfrontalier, iar autoritățile din aceste regiuni au rolul de a contribui cu soluții pentru completarea legăturilor lipsă în rețelele de transport.

Autoritățile regionale ar trebui să depună mai multe eforturi în vederea încurajării antreprenoriatului din regiunile transfrontaliere prin crearea de portaluri electronice comune destinate activităților economice de o parte și de alta a frontierelor.

Programele de cooperare teritorială asigură un sprijin semnificativ regiunilor transfrontaliere, iar autoritățile regionale au oportunitatea de a utiliza cât mai mult aceste forme de sprijin.

Maria Grapini (S&D). – Domnule președinte, doamna comisar, sunteți unul dintre membrii Comisiei care cunoaște foarte bine problema dezvoltării regionale și a fondurilor de coeziune.

Sigur, s-au făcut multe lucruri în comerțul transfrontalier și în dezvoltarea economică, dar raportorul a prezentat aici câteva propuneri cu care sunt total de acord. În primul rând, trebuie să simplificăm procedurile – la angajările transfrontaliere, mobilitatea forței de muncă. Se vor putea dezvolta noi întreprinderi mici și mijlocii care, la rândul lor, creează, sigur, locuri de muncă și, până la urmă, aduc un profit la bugetul țărilor respective și, evident, la bugetul Uniunii Europene.

Cred că depinde, sigur, foarte mult și de statele membre, dar nu ar strica să venim cu o experiență din partea Comisiei, cu o procedură, cu un exemplu, și să încercăm să creștem și fondurile care sunt alocate pentru dezvoltarea economică transfrontalieră, pentru că – s-a spus aici – o bună parte din cetățenii Uniunii Europene trăiesc în aceste zone. Și, da, sunt de acord să găsim mijloace și pentru frontierele externe, nu numai pentru frontierele interne. Poate odată și odată și România și Bulgaria vor fi în zona Schengen, să nu mai avem două piețe interne.

Aleksander Gabelic (S&D). – Herr talman, kommissionär Crețu! Sammanhållningspolitiken är nära människor. Tillsammans bygger europeiska regioner infrastrukturer, skapar tillväxt och ger förutsättningar till mer grön innovation. Europeiska regioners gränsöverskridande samarbete utgör ett konkret exempel på det stora mervärdet av Europasamarbetet. Självklart ska vi därför slå vakt om lärdomar och goda exempel från europeiska regioner nu när den nya programperioden förhandlas. Det är därför svårt att förstå varför kommissionen vill riva upp den nuvarande strukturen för sammanhållningspolitiken. Jag tycker precis som kommissionen att vi ska ha ett effektivt EU och jag ser nyttan av existerande samarbete som i dag underlättar för pendlare genom gemensamma transportnätverk, som till exempel mellan Tallinn och Helsingfors, eller som får ungdomar att mötas genom transregionala ungdomsnätverk. Kommissionens förslag att lägga regionsamarbetet vid havsgräns under transnationella program är därför oroande, då exempel som dessa kan gå förlorade.

(Koniec zgłoszeń z sali)

Corina Crețu, Membră a Comisiei. – Mulțumesc foarte mult pentru această dezbatere. Este un subiect care îmi este foarte aproape de suflet. S-au spus foarte multe aici, dar, dincolo de avantajele cooperării transfrontaliere în ceea ce privește crearea de locuri de muncă, creșterea economică, având în vedere posibilitățile de dezvoltare, eu văd și un alt rol al cooperării transfrontaliere mai important decât orice, acela de a vindeca rănilor pe care încă le avem pe harta Uniunii Europene, pe harta continentului nostru.

Am început dezbateră din această seară cu raportul privind beneficiile politicii de coeziune în Irlanda de Nord, un caz foarte clar în care vedem cât de greu se construiește pacea și cât de ușor se poate pierde. În cei aproape 4 ani de când sunt comisar european pentru politică regională am vizitat foarte multe proiecte transfrontaliere și am fost foarte emoționată, de pildă, când am vizitat proiecte dintre Polonia și Germania, între Ślovice și Frankfurt(Oder), de asemenea între Bratislava și Austria de jos și alte proiecte în jurul granițelor, unde acum aproape 30 de ani au murit atâtea mii de oameni în căutarea unei vieți mai bune.

De aceea, facem tot ce putem și am făcut tot ce am putut în această perioadă pentru a îmbunătăți această cooperare transfrontalieră, care uneori merge foarte ușor, în ciuda diferențelor de limbă, alteleori, cum este cazul între Belgia și Franța de pildă, deși e aceeași limbă, din cauza faptului că cele două țări nu se înțeleg să adopte o legislație comună în cooperarea transfrontalieră, aceasta este mai greoaie.

De asemenea, sunt întristată să văd câte proiecte transfrontaliere sunt blocate din cauza orgoliilor unor state. În fond și la urma urmei, acest program Interreg și de cooperare transfrontalieră a fost creat pentru a îmbunătăți comunicarea dintre oameni. Suntem în septembrie 2018 și foarte multe dintre proiectele de cooperare transfrontalieră dintre statele membre sunt blocate, banii sunt necheltuiți pentru că statele membre nu se înțeleg în privința proiectelor asupra cărora să cheltuiască acești bani.

I will continue in English. Thank you very much for this enriching debate. I would also like to thank the rapporteur for this report and for what I see as a very positive approach towards the Commission's initiative in favour of European border regions. I of course share this assessment of the situation faced by border regions and the call for continued attention to be paid to them.

As I said, this is what the Commission is doing. Since the adoption of the communication on border regions in September last year, a number of concrete measures have already been initiated. I have in mind, in particular, the border focal point that was established in January 2018 and is now operational. It coordinates action between the Commission services responsible, but also has a mission to liaise and interact with external stakeholders. This hands-on approach has been reinforced with the launch of online exchange platforms for border stakeholders and institutions, and we have also recently selected ten pilot projects to identify ways in which certain legal and administrative obstacles can be resolved. Besides, we have been carrying out targeted work on specific cross-border issues, be it a recent study on missing rail links, a merging of cross-border healthcare or a regional border workshop for businesses and citizens.

All this work mirrors the Commission's commitment to ensuring that no region is left behind. It also underpins our proposal for the next programming period. As you know, a new legal instrument to resolve border obstacles was proposed by the Commission on 29 May 2018 and is currently being considered by Member States and in Parliament in the relevant committees. The draft proposals for the Interreg Programmes post-2020 also contain elements that will facilitate the prevention and lifting of border obstacles. Notably, it is proposed that each cross-border cooperation programme dedicates at least 15% of its budget to institutional cooperation, including the resolution of legal and administrative issues. Member States will, of course, continue to have a strong role to play in this process. The Commission will support them in their endeavour to improve the socio-economic development of their border regions by making good practices widely available and by ensuring that future cross-border cooperation programmes are tailored to the specific needs of border regions.

To conclude, allow me to make a specific call both to the Council and to you, the European Parliament. I know you were working very hard on our budgetary proposal over the summer, but it is crucial to progress as speedily as possible. Indeed, the future generation of cross-border programmes and the new legal instrument to resolve border obstacles are crucial to further growth and cohesion in our internal border region.

Thank you very much for having this important subject on our agenda. Hopefully we will have the Multiannual Financial Framework as soon as possible in order to be able to start the implementation of the programmes from the first day of the new programming period, from 1 January 2021. We should draw from the lesson that we have now of all the operational programmes in the project being so delayed due to the late adoption of the legislation for the programming period 2014-2020.

Przewodniczący. – Dziękuję Pani Komisarz za te godziny spędzone z nami. Gdyby chciała Pani z nami dalej zostać, bardzo proszę.

Zamykam debatę.

Głosowanie odbędzie się we wtorek 11 września 2018 r.

30. Jednominutowe wystąpienia w znaczących kwestiach politycznych

Przewodniczący. – Kolejnym punktem porządku dziennego są jednominutowe wystąpienia w ważnych kwestiach politycznych (art. 163 Regulaminu).

Agustín Díaz de Mera García Consuegra (PPE). – Señor presidente, el pasado 27 de agosto la compañía danesa Vestas anunció el cierre de su planta de Villadangos del Páramo. Hablo de la supresión de quinientos empleos directos y dos mil indirectos. El cierre da un duro golpe a una comarca leonesa cuya economía y cuyo empleo dependen mayoritariamente de la planta. Además, la comarca está muy afectada por el envejecimiento y la despoblación.

Vestas se ha beneficiado de las ayudas públicas a través de los fondos FEDER. El cierre y el traslado de producción a países extracomunitarios supone la utilización fraudulenta de esos fondos de la Unión —trece millones—. Y la Unión debe vigilar, sancionar penalizar y exigir la devolución de las subvenciones. Es vital garantizar los empleos vinculados a la producción. Toda solución debe pasar por un acuerdo con los trabajadores que no menoscabe su situación laboral, retributiva y geográfica.

Rechazamos, por ilícito, el ERE lanzado. Y, además, pediremos a la Comisión que denuncia esta situación reiterada ante el Tribunal de Justicia de la Unión Europea. Vestas no se puede ni se debe cerrar, señor presidente.

Jonás Fernández (S&D). – Señor presidente, decía que Europa es camino: ya sean los caminos de las calzadas romanas, las vías de peregrinación o las sendas culturales; pero también las redes digitales y las vías ferroviarias. Por eso quiero celebrar la decisión de la Comisión Europea de incluir, aunque con cierto retraso, a Asturias dentro del marco de las redes transeuropeas de transporte, dentro del Corredor Atlántico.

Quiero, por ello, pedir a esta Cámara y al Consejo que tramiten rápidamente esa posición porque necesitamos incluir al conjunto del noroeste de España dentro del corazón de Europa, y hacer también puente con el mundo atlántico. Con la voz unánime de una pequeña región, Asturias, les pido que nos permitan construir esa Europa de todos que está pidiendo la sociedad civil muy activamente en mi pequeña región, en mi querida Asturias.

Urszula Krupa (ECR). – Panie Przewodniczący! Jedną z najbardziej podstawowych form profilaktyki wielu chorób jest mycie rąk bieżącą ciepłą wodą z mydłem. W Parlamencie Europejskim od lipca 2016 r., od kiedy jestem ponownie posłanką, nie ma ciepłej wody w kranie, chociaż w toaletach rozwieszane są szczegółowe informacje jak należy myć ręce. Biorąc pod uwagę, że w parlamencie pracują i przebywają ludzie nie tylko z całej Europy, ale nawet z różnych stron świata, i nawet zakładając, że wszyscy są zdrowi to jednak mogą być nosicielami różnych chorób. Ponadto asystenci myją naczynia w toaletach także zimną wodą, co przeczy podstawowym zasadom profilaktyki, stanowiąc czynnik ryzyka przenoszenia różnych chorób. Na początku kadencji, mojej kadencji, pytałam pana wiceprzewodniczącego o zaistniałą sytuację ponieważ warunki higieniczne nie uległy zmianie. Ponawiam pytanie w trosce o profilaktykę zdrowia pracujących i przebywających tutaj gości.

Jasenko Selimovic (ALDE). – Thank you very much, Mr President. The efforts Macedonian and Greek governments have done regarding the name-related issues are enormous. Just try to imagine how we would react if Luxembourg has been asked to change its name because there is a province of Luxembourg in Belgium. And just try to imagine how we would react if Luxembourg accepted to do it. We would certainly think the demand was almost ridiculous. We would certainly think that Luxembourg has sacrificed itself to the limit of implosion and it showed extreme will to compromise.

The Greek and Macedonian government have found this difficult compromise now. They have found a solution, over-bridging emotional, historical and identity issues on both sides and they have to be helped to finalise the issue. Years have been lost in this conflict and we cannot afford to prolong it. People from both countries have to show maturity to finalise this deal. They have to have the audacity to believe that another future might be possible, and we have to help them in that.

Miguel Urbán Crespo (GUE/NGL). – Señor presidente, España es una excepción en Europa. Es el único país europeo que no ha podido juzgar todavía hoy a su dictadura. Después de cuarenta años de democracia, todavía no se ha podido juzgar al franquismo en nuestro país. Somos una excepción en Europa, porque somos el segundo país del mundo con mayor número de desaparecidos en nuestras cunetas, como en las fosas comunes de Paterna que pudimos visitar el viernes pasado; una excepción en Europa porque no hemos podido juzgar a nuestros torturadores, que se pasean por nuestras calles con medallas.

Nosotros no queremos que les quiten las medallas. Queremos que se les juzgue. Queremos que, tras cuarenta años de democracia, se juzgue al franquismo en nuestro país; que cuarenta años de democracia sirvan, no solo para sacar a Franco del Valle de los Caídos, sino, sobre todo, para sacar el franquismo de nuestras instituciones.

Gilles Lebreton (ENF). – Monsieur le Président, les élections législatives en Suède sont un nouvel avertissement pour l'Union européenne. En obtenant près de 20 % des suffrages, les nationalistes sont devenus des acteurs incontournables de la vie politique suédoise.

C'est avant tout le refus de la submersion migratoire qui explique leur percée. Je me suis moi-même rendu en Suède et j'ai pu constater à quel point l'immigration de masse y est devenue un problème. Il n'est pas étonnant qu'un sursaut démocratique s'y soit manifesté.

L'Union européenne doit écouter le message du peuple suédois et cesser de s'enfermer dans la tour d'ivoire de son mondialisme effréné. Les peuples européens veulent des frontières sûres et non la passoire qu'est devenu l'espace Schengen. C'est Matteo Salvini et Marine Le Pen qui sont aujourd'hui leurs porte-parole, et non Jean-Claude Juncker et Emmanuel Macron. Écoutez-les – pendant qu'il en est encore temps – et transformez avec nous l'Union européenne en Europe des nations. Sinon, c'est l'ensemble de la construction européenne qui disparaîtra.

Σωτήριος Ζαριανόπουλος (NI). – Κύριε Πρόεδρε, δεν υπάρχει πιο κυνική κοροϊδία από τους πανηγυρισμούς της κυβέρνησης ΣΥΡΙΖΑ-ΑΝΕΛ ότι τα μνημόνια στην Ελλάδα τελείωσαν. Κανέναν μνημονιακό νόμο δεν καταργείται. Κάποια ελάχιστα ψίχουλα στην ακραία φτώχεια αλλά δικαιολογούν νέα προνόμια στο κεφάλαιο. Η εποπτεία εντατικοποιείται και διαβεβαιώνει αγορές και επενδυτές ότι η θυσία του λαού καλά κρατεί, ότι μπορούν να επενδύσουν κερδοφόρα. Νέα σφαγή συντάξεων και φοροληστεία με μείωση του αφορολόγητου· ματωμένα πλεονάσματα για δεκαετίες μπροστά και, βέβαια πάντα, μόνιμοι δημοσιονομικοί κανονισμοί και εποπτεία της Ένωσης· κανονισμοί που αποπνέουν μέχρι και βαρβαρότητα και κανιβαλισμό, όπως για παράδειγμα, η έκθεση που θα κληθείτε αύριο να ψηφίσετε και που θεωρεί την αναπηρία και την ασθένεια του εργαζόμενου ως ανεπίτρεπτο κόστος για την επιχείρηση και επιτάσσει δουλειά ακόμη και για ανάπηρους, μέχρι τελικής πτώσης. Τα μνημόνια της Ευρωπαϊκής Ένωσης και των κυβερνήσεων ήρθαν για να μείνουν, αν δεν τα ξηλώσουν οι λαοί με την πάλη τους, αν δεν καταργήσουν τους βασικούς υπαίτιους για αυτά: το κεφάλαιο και τα κέρδη του και την πολιτική του εξουσία.

Pál Csáky (PPE). – Elnök Úr! A Szlovák Köztársaság polgáraként az elemi politikai és erkölcsi játékszabályok betartásának fontosságára szeretném felhívni a figyelmet.

A szlovákiai közvéleményt néhány hónappal ezelőtt sokkolta a hír, hogy országunkban, Európa közepén kegyetlenül meggyilkoltak egy újságíró és menyasszonyát. Pár héttel ezelőtt egy újabb sokkoló hír látott napvilágot, amely szerint a vietnami kommunista kormány a szlovák kormány hivatalos repülőgépet felhasználva csempészt ki egy vietnami állampolgárt a schengeni övezetből úgy, hogy a szlovák fél a lengyel hatóságokat is megtévesztette.

S ha mindez nem lenne elég: néhány napja kaptuk az újabb hírt, hogy az EU korrupció elleni hivatala, az OLAF egy több mint 300 millió eurós csalást fedezett fel Szlovákiában, amelynek során a szlovák vámhatóságok tudatosan alulértékelték az EU-ba importált kínai árukat, hogy ezáltal jóval kisebb vámokat vethessenek ki rájuk.

Elnök Úr, nagyon sajnálom, hogy országom ilyen negatív hírekkel szolgál, s választóim kérésére szeretném elmondani, hogy sokan vagyunk Szlovákiában, akik nem értünk egyet ezekkel a praktikákkal. Köszönöm szépen!

Maria Gabriela Zoană (S&D). – Domnule președinte, pesta porcină africană produce daune importante crescătorilor europeni din Estonia, Letonia, Lituania, Polonia, Ucraina, România și Bulgaria. Conform cifrelor eliberate de Autoritatea Națională Sanitară Veterinară și pentru Siguranța Alimentelor, la ora actuală în România sunt afectate unsprezece județe, fiind înregistrate 826 de focare de pestă, iar numărul animalelor sacrificate a ajuns la 159 645 de capete.

Aș dori să atrag atenția și un semnal de alarmă, în același timp, referitor la pericolul reducerii drastice a efectivelor de porci din Europa din cauza acestei boli, situație care riscă să afecteze securitatea alimentară a cetățenilor Uniunii Europene, motiv pentru care consider că executivul european trebuie să ia măsuri să activeze fondurile de rezervă necesare pentru intervenție rapidă în statele afectate.

Vă readuc aminte că, dacă un stat membru are o problemă, înseamnă că întreaga Uniune se confruntă cu aceeași problemă. Consider, deci, că în situația de față Uniunea Europeană ar trebui să fie mai implicată.

Laurențiu Rebegea (ECR). – Domnule președinte, doamna comisar, proiectul european a fost, la început, o masă rotundă în jurul căreia urmau să stea națiuni egale între ele. Ulterior, a apărut ideea unui superstat, unde puterea efectivă să fie exercitată de suprafuncționari, iar statele membre să devină un fel provincii care să se ocupe de asfaltul și de asfaltarea străzilor. Masa rotundă a devenit, deci, dreptunghiulară.

De curând, s-a emis ideea Europei cu mai multe viteze. Îmi închipui că pe un postament vom avea o masă cu fotolii, mai jos niște bănci ca la cantină, iar în spate și niște locuri în picioare pentru cei care vor aplauda.

La precedentul discurs privind starea Uniunii, președintele Comisiei ne-a promis reformă. În primăvară, ne-a prezentat cinci scenarii de viitor. De atunci, nimeni nu mai vorbește despre reformă, iar „Europa cu mai multe viteze” pare a fi scenariul bazat pe „faptul împlinit”. Am intrat pe linie dreaptă către finalul acestui mandat. Nu pentru prestigiul nostru, ci pentru soarta proiectului european, suntem datori să decidem transparent ce vrem să devenim.

O cheie pentru supraviețuirea Uniunii nu este nici concentrarea puterii, nici segregarea pe criterii geografice. O Uniune prosperă trebuie să se bazeze pe responsabilizarea democratică a națiunilor pentru un viitor comun.

Matt Carthy (GUE/NGL). – Mr President, I want to raise the issue of the Irish humanitarian worker, Sean Binder, and the Syrian rescue swimmer, Sarah Mardini, who at this moment are sitting in separate Greek prisons accused of actions related to their aid work in Greece. These two young people have been working on the island of Lesbos for the last few months for one of the many grassroots organisations based in southern Europe who have had to step into the gap left by the failure of European leaders to provide protection for vulnerable migrants arriving through perilous routes across the Mediterranean.

This arrest, and others like it, has exposed pervasive efforts to put a chill on civil society volunteers working to prevent deaths at sea and give medical assistance and education to those lucky enough to reach a place they see as safe. Sean and Sarah, who herself fled the conflict in Syria, should not be sitting in cells. They should be lauded for their courage and compassion for their life-saving work.

Tonight I ask the European Parliament to join with me in calling for the immediate release of both Sean and Sarah from detention while the investigation is still ongoing, and for an urgent political response against the criminalisation of humanitarian workers.

Zoltán Balczó (NI). – Elnök Úr! A területi autonómia az EU értékei közé tartozik, ugyanakkor vannak olyan országok, amelyek elfojtják az ilyen törekvéseket. Romániában az állam elutasítja a többségében magyarok lakta Székelyföld autonómiájának még a felvetését is, és egyre fenyegetőbben lép fel a magyar lakossággal szemben.

A közelmúltban Beke István és Szőcs Zoltán bírósági ítélete váltott ki felháborodást: a bukaresti táblabíróság pirotechnikai eszközökkel elkövetett bűncselekményekért szabott ki rájuk egy évnél kevesebb, vizsgálati fogságban már letöltött börtönbüntetést. Ugyanakkor a legfelsőbb bíróság bizonyítás nélkül átminősítette a cselekedetüket terrorcselekménnyé, és öt év börtönre ítélte őket. Az Európai Parlament rendszeresen, ezen a héten is foglalkozik a világ különböző helyén elkövetett egyedi emberi jogsértésekkel. Itt lenne az ideje, hogy a tagországainkban előforduló ilyen eseteket is megtárgyaljuk. Köszönöm, Elnök Úr!

László Tőkés (PPE). – Elnök Úr! A Ceausescu-diktatúra korszakára emlékeztető két eset elleni tiltakozásomat fejezem ki, és ezen ügyekben kérem a Tisztelt Ház és az Elnök Úr támogatását.

Amiképpen már július elején jeleztem: közel három évtizeddel a nacionalkommunista rezsim bukása után újból magyar politikai foglyok szenvednek börtönbüntetést Romániában. Beke Istvánt és Szőcs Zoltánt koholt vádak alapján, bizonyítékok nélkül, a magyarság megfélemlítése céljából ítélték öt-öt évi fogságra.

Szintén a magyarellenes kommunista korszak módszerére emlékeztet az a sürgősségi kormányrendelet, mely a magyar nyelvű oktatás elrománosítása céljából a magyar elemi iskolákban magyarul nem tudó román szaktanárookra bízta a román nyelv és irodalom tanítását. Ez a brutális intézkedés – a maga módján – a kisebbségellenes ukrán oktatási törvényre vall.

Kérem, keljenek védelmére az erdélyi magyaroknak!

Maria Grapini (S&D). – Domnule președinte, stimați colegi, doamna comisar, vreau să mă refer la recenta declarație a vicepreședintelui Comisiei, domnul comisar Oettinger. Pentru mine, este surprinzător că un înalt demnitar, un înalt reprezentant al Comisiei, într-un spațiu public, într-o întâlnire oficială, acuză și anunță pericolul de moarte a Uniunii Europene din cauza unor state membre, între care și țara mea, România. Sigur că am fost întrebată acasă ce se întâmplă, care sunt cauzele pentru care domnul comisar pune pe lista celor patru state membre și România.

România, după cum știm, este o țară proeuropeană. Suntem în topul țărilor cu cetățenii care doresc proiectul european. Vreau și cer această explicație domnului comisar, pentru a spune și eu, la rândul meu, cetățenilor de ce România dorește să distrugă Uniunea Europeană. Am fost printre țările fruntașe la participarea programului la Frontex, la toate programele inițiate de Uniunea Europeană. Care este motivul domnului comisar – și eu cred că a fost inadecvată exprimarea domnului comisar, ca să nu spun iresponsabilă, acum, când suntem în preajma alegerilor, doar dacă își face campanie.

Urmează alegerile europene și chiar avem nevoie de o unitate în Uniunea Europeană.

Marek Jurek (ECR). – Panie Przewodniczący! Centrum Monitoringu Wolności Prasy – polskie kolegium społeczne złożone z wybitnych autorytetów dziennikarskich, o długiej historii, dużych zasługach dla obrony wolności mediów wyraziło swoje bardzo poważne zaniepokojenie dyskusją, głosami które się podniosły w belgijskiej Radzie Administracyjnej RTBF – belgijskiej telewizji publicznej, na temat usunięcia transmisji mszy katolickiej z publicznej radiofonii i telewizji. Największą konsternację budzą motywy tych wypowiedzi, mianowicie to, że w ostatnią niedzielę sierpnia w większości kościołów katolickich na świecie czytano piąty rozdział listu do Efezjan świętego Pawła z zawartym tam opisem ideałów małżeństwa chrześcijańskiego.

Otóż dla tych polityków zasiadających w Radzie Administracyjnej RTBF to jest nie do pogodzenia z ich genderowymi kryteriami – to niestety pokazuje w jak poważnym zagrożeniu dzisiaj znalazła się wolność w wielu krajach Europy. Dziękuję polskim dziennikarzom, że jej bronią.

Martina Anderson (GUE/NGL). – Mr President, it is the entitlement and birthright of all of us born on the island of Ireland to be part of the Irish nation. Article 2 of Bunreacht na hÉireann defines citizenship as 'a right to rights', and the right to democratic participation is a crucial element of citizenship. The north of Ireland should continue to have representatives here post-Brexit.

Legal advice by barrister Mark Bassett demonstrates that it is legally possible and permissible for a dedicated Ireland North constituency to be established, and for the two additional MEP seats to be allocated to the north by the Oireachtas, simply by adopting a wider provision in the European Parliament Act 1997. Out of 28 Member States, 22 afford nationals not resident in their Member State the right to vote in European Parliament elections. Currently, Ireland deprives those of us living outside the jurisdiction of the state that right.

With only 200 days before Brexit, no matter what its shade, the people of the north must suffer most. The Good Friday Agreement will be undermined and the decision taken by the EU will continue to impact all of us after Brexit, so strong voices will be needed here in the European Parliament post-Brexit.

Cristian Dan Preda (PPE). – Domnule președinte, i-am auzit în multe rânduri pe domnii Verhofstadt și Bullmann criticând guvernele maghiar și polonez. Pe bună dreptate – și eu consider că Orban și Kaczyński sunt adversari ai statului de drept. Dar poate ar fi bine ca domnii Verhofstadt și Bullmann să se uite și către România, acolo unde partidele cu care s-au înfrățit, PSD și ALDE, fac prăpăd.

Nu cred că domnilor Bullmann și Verhofstadt le place ceea ce, în numele liberalismului și al socialismului, se întâmplă în România: distrugerea independenței justiției, agresarea cu mijloace de forță și cu gaze lacrimogene a unor protestatari pașnici, linșajul public al adversarilor actualei puteri, confiscarea politică partizană a statului.

Le recomand domnilor Verhofstadt și Bullmann să excludă PSD și ALDE din grupurile lor politice, pentru că locul partidelor domnilor Dragnea și Tăriceanu este alături de populiști și de radicali. Nimeni nu înțelege în România cum de familia socialistă și liberală susține persoane, politicieni care merg direct, explicit împotriva statului de drept, direct și explicit împotriva Comisiei Europene și a instituțiilor europene. Locul acestor partide este, din nefericire, alături de radicali și populiști.

Alex Mayer (S&D). – Mr President, penguins can have a tough time in the Falklands because of unlicensed egg collecting, invasive diseases, fishing and getting covered in oil. But now there's another problem hatching – Brexit. Brexit has left the UK overseas territories in a flap, as the islands stand to lose millions in funding from EU conservation projects. Five projects in the South Atlantic are currently funded by the Best scheme, which runs until December 2019. It also means goodbye to LIFE funding, which issues grants of up to four and a half million pounds.

I often say that no one who voted for Brexit, voted to lose their job or to damage the NHS, or for lower food standards or fewer rights at work. The list goes on and on. And today I add to it that no one who voted for Brexit, voted to harm penguins. Hard Tory Brexit means a million penguins, and our nation, risk being left out in the cold.

Csaba Sógor (PPE). – A mai nap az iskolakezdés napja több tagállamban is. Romániában néhány nappal az iskolakezdés előtt született egy olyan miniszteri rendelet, amely jelentős változásokat okoz a kisebbségi nyelven tanuló elemi iskolás gyerekek számára: ezentúl az állam nyelvét nem a tanítójuktól, hanem felsőbb tagozatokon tanító, a kisgyerekek anyanyelvét egyes esetekben nem is ismerő szaktanároktól kell elsajátítaniuk.

A rendelet életbe ültetése megfelelő számú munkaerő hiányában lehetetlen, de ezzel mindenféle szakmai vagy politikai egyeztetést mellőzve az oktatási miniszter teljesen ismeretlen és idegen helyzet elé állított több ezer elemi iskolás kisgyereket. Ez amellett, hogy szakmaiatlan és rosszindulatú döntés, mélyen sérti a kisebbségi nyelven tanuló gyerekeket, azok szüleit és a jól felkészült oktatókat is.

Ez a fajta döntéshozatali folyamat jellemző a román hatóságokra, amelyek nemhogy hatástanulmányt nem készítenek, de az érintettekkel való egyeztetést is mellőzik hasonló döntések meghozatalakor. Az egyetlen megoldás a rendelet visszavonása és az érintettektől való bocsánatkérés lehet.

Juan Fernando López Aguilar (S&D). – Señor presidente, comisaria Crețu, ayer tuvieron lugar elecciones legislativas en un importante país de la Unión Europea: Suecia. Una vez más, dominadas por un asunto que no es secreto para nadie: la migración.

Exactamente lo mismo sucedió en las elecciones austriacas, en las elecciones francesas, en las alemanas, en las italianas, pero sobre todo han estado dominadas por un defecto de política europea en una materia que requiere «Europa» como ninguna otra, más aún que el euro o que la política exterior. Porque el euro no la comparten como moneda todos los Estados miembros de la Unión Europea, ni la política exterior es una cooperación estructurada en la que participen todos los Estados miembros.

En cambio, la preocupación por las migraciones sí lo es, pero lo es sobre todo con la ausencia de respuesta europea. En primer lugar, en cambiar la mirada negativa de la Unión Europea al fenómeno migratorio, pensando distópicamente que puede conseguirse migración cero, negando el fenómeno o cerrando las compuertas.

Pero, en segundo lugar, hay que cambiar la mirada no europea, la que se niega a compartir la responsabilidad. Por tanto, sigue siendo una urgencia que el Consejo desbloquee el Reglamento de Dublín y establezca un cauce, una responsabilidad compartida y el cauce a los visados humanitarios para que los que intenten llegar a Unión Europea no pierdan la vida en el intento.

Michaela Šojdrová (PPE). – Pane předsedající, Evropa čelí migrační krizi a neseme všichni její politické důsledky, které se promítají do výsledků voleb, jak můj předřečník zmínil, ve Švédsku, ale i do nepokojů, např. v Sasku. Kromě migrace z Afriky je to především režim Bašára Asada, který v Sýrii vyhnal z domovů 14 milionů lidí, z toho více než 6 milionů za hranice Sýrie, za pomoci Putina.

Nyní se chystá další útok proti poslední baště povstalců v Idlíbu. Hrozí tedy další zabíjení civilistů. Mezinárodní společenství by mělo reagovat a já se ptám, jestli dokáže zabránit tomuto zlu. Dokážeme pomoci těm, kteří trpí nevinně? A to jsou především dětské oběti války, jsou to sirotci. Moc si přeji, abychom to dokázali a aby mezi těmi, kteří pomohou dětem bez rodičů v Evropě, byla také Česká republika.

Neena Gill (S&D). – Mr President, I rise to demonstrate the solidarity of this House with everyone affected by natural disasters over the summer period, but, as First Vice-President of the Delegation for Relations with India, I want to highlight the plight of the people of Kerala.

Over the summer, devastating flooding has killed more than 500 people, more than a million people have been displaced, and more than 169 medical facilities, including hospitals, have been damaged. Although some people have been able to return to their homes from the relief camps, the water has not receded and the risk of waterborne diseases is high. Cases of rat fever have been reported in five districts. I welcome the EU's support to the Indian Red Cross for immediate relief assistance, but it is imperative that greater support is made available for building medical facilities.

All over the globe we have witnessed the effects of climate change. Therefore, I call for urgent implementation of the EU-India Clean Energy and Climate Partnership. This has to be prioritised by the Commission.

Andrea Bocskor (PPE). – Elnök Úr! 2019 -ben Ukrajnában elnök-, majd parlamenti választásokra kerül sor. A kampány már elkezdődött, s ebben fontos elem az európai és euroatlanti integráció, az európai értékek és a reformok. Ennek ellenére az ukrán parlament a mai napig nem fogadta el az új egységes választójogi kódexet, nem újította meg a már 2014 -ben is lejárt mandátummal rendelkező központi választási bizottságot, nem teremtett tiszta és egyenlő feltételeket az országban élő nemzeti kisebbségek képviselői számára.

2014-ben az ukrán központi választási bizottság úgy szabta át a kárpátaljai egyéni választókerületeket, hogy nem vette figyelembe a hatályos törvényt, mely szerint az egyéni választókerületek kialakításánál figyelembe kell venni a közigazgatási egységek határait, a helyi közösségek érdekeit, illetve tekintettel kell lenni az adott területen élő nemzeti kisebbségekre is.

Remélem, hogy az Európai Parlament nemcsak figyelemmel fogja kísérni az ukrajnai választásokat, de szót emel az olyan diszkriminatív és törvénytelen intézkedések ügyében, mint 2014-ben, amikor megakadályozták, hogy a kárpátaljai magyar közösség egyéni képviselőt juttasson a legfelsőbb tanácsba. Ukrajna nem szűkítheti a nemzeti kisebbségek már meglévő jogait, garantálnia kell a kisebbségi képviselők bejutását a törvényhozó, érdekképviseleti és helyhatósági testületükbe, hisz ez az egyik legfőbb kritériuma a jogállamiságnak. Köszönöm!

Michela Giuffrida (S&D). – Signor Presidente, onorevoli colleghi, nel 1908, cioè ben 110 anni fa, un terribile terremoto distrusse Messina provocando più di 80 000 morti. Per i 40 000 sopravvissuti furono costruite delle capanne, che ovviamente erano d'emergenza.

So che vi sembra incredibile, ma oggi a Messina, a 110 anni di distanza da quella che è stata la più grave catastrofe europea per numero di vittime, nelle baracche vivono ancora 6 400 persone. Interventi e piani di risanamento mai attuati hanno consentito che l'emergenza continuasse, e oggi è addirittura aggravata, perché il tetto di quelle baracche è di amianto, sostanza micidiale vietata dall'Europa già vent'anni fa perché cancerogena. La novità è che ora ci sono persone che si sono ammalate di asbestosi, terribile malattia che consuma i polmoni di chi respira l'amianto, per la quale non c'è cura.

Messina, grande città siciliana, è Europa, anche se a vedere quelle baracche non si direbbe. Il sindaco ha disposto lo sgombero, non ci sono però case per tutti. Adesso bisogna pensare alla salute delle persone e io chiedo, assieme al gruppo consiliare del Partito Democratico di Messina, l'intervento dell'Europa, l'intervento del Commissario alla Salute Andriukaitis e del Commissario Crețu, e che nessuno respiri ancora quella terribile sostanza, l'amianto, che uccide.

Anna Záborská (PPE). – V prvom rade ďakujem Európskej komisii, že sa rozhodla vyhovieť miliónom občanov Únie a zrušiť striedanie času dvakrát za rok.

Chcela by som však využiť túto príležitosť a požiadať pani komisárku Bulc, aby čo najskôr zverejnila návrh príslušnej legislatívy. Už teraz sa totiž stretávam s otázkami občanov, médií, dokonca aj niektorých kolegov, ktorým nie je jasné, čo vlastne zrušenie striedania času bude znamenať. Niektorí očakávajú zachovanie letného času po celý rok, iní presne naopak. Stretla som sa aj s obavou, že sa celkom zruší harmonizácia, čo by znamenalo chaos. Trvalo niekoľko rokov, kým sme sa dostali do tohto štádia vyjednávania. Bolo by na škodu, ak by nepresné informácie alebo ich nedostatok vyvolali v spoločnosti neistotu a nepochopenie.

Preto apelujem na Komisiu, aby v tejto otázke komunikovala jasne a jednoznačne.

Przewodniczący. – Zamykam dyskusję nad tym punktem porządku dziennego.

31. Porządek obrad następnego posiedzenia: patrz protokół

32. Zamknięcie posiedzenia

(Posiedzenie zostało zamknięte o godz. 22.59)

—

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