



**PEŁNE SPRAWOZDANIE Z OBRAD 31 STYCZNIA 2019 R.**

(C/2024/3682)

PARLAMENT EUROPEJSKI

SESJA 2018-2019

Posiedzenia z 30 i 31 stycznia 2019 r.

BRUKSELA

Spis treści	Strona
1. Otwarcie posiedzenia . . . . .	4
2. Wniosek o uchylenie immunitetu : patrz protokół . . . . .	4
3. Kobiety w zarządach – Równowaga płci wśród dyrektorów niewykonawczych spółek (debata) . . . . .	4
4. Wznowienie posiedzenia . . . . .	18
5. Debata z udziałem premiera Finlandii Juhy Sipilä na temat przyszłości Europy (debata) . . . . .	18
6. Wznowienie posiedzenia . . . . .	36
7. Sytuacja w Wenezueli (złożone projekty rezolucji): Patrz protokół . . . . .	37
8. Powitanie . . . . .	37
9. Głosowanie . . . . .	37
9.1. Poprawki do Regulaminu (A8-0462/2018 - Richard Corbett) (głosowanie) . . . . .	37
9.2. Unijny kodeks celny: włączenie gminy Campione d'Italia i włoskich wód jeziora Lugano do obszaru celnego Unii (A8-0368/2018 - Jasenko Selimovic) (głosowanie) . . . . .	38
9.3. Przepisy dotyczące płatności bezpośrednich i wsparcia rozwoju obszarów wiejskich w odniesieniu do lat 2019 i 2020 (A8-0018/2019 - Czesław Adam Siekierski) (głosowanie) . . . . .	38

Spis treści	Strona
9.4. Przystąpienie Republiki Dominikańskiej do Konwencji haskiej z 1980 r. dotyczącej cywilnych aspektów uprowadzenia dziecka za granicę (A8-0451/2018 - Mary Honeyball) (głosowanie) . . .	38
9.5. Przystąpienie Ekwadoru i Ukrainy do Konwencji haskiej z 1980 r. dotyczącej cywilnych aspektów uprowadzenia dziecka za granicę (A8-0452/2018 - Mary Honeyball) (głosowanie) . . . . .	38
9.6. Przystąpienie Hondurasu do Konwencji haskiej z 1980 r. dotyczącej cywilnych aspektów uprowadzenia dziecka za granicę (A8-0457/2018 - Mary Honeyball) (głosowanie) . . . . .	38
9.7. Przystąpienie Białorusi i Uzbekistanu do Konwencji haskiej z 1980 r. dotyczącej cywilnych aspektów uprowadzenia dziecka za granicę (A8-0458/2018 - Mary Honeyball) (głosowanie) . . .	38
9.8. Stowarzyszenie krajów i terytoriów zamorskich z Unią Europejską, w tym stosunki między Unią Europejską a Grenlandią i Królestwem Danii (A8-0480/2018 - Maurice Ponga) (głosowanie) . . .	38
9.9. Sprawozdanie roczne za rok 2017 w sprawie ochrony interesów finansowych Unii Europejskiej – walka z nadużyciami finansowymi (A8-0003/2019 - Marian-Jean Marinescu) (głosowanie) . . . . .	39
9.10. Wdrażanie i funkcjonowanie nazwy domeny najwyższego poziomu „eu” (A8-0394/2018 - Fredrick Federley) (głosowanie) . . . . .	39
9.11. Harmonizacja dochodu narodowego brutto w cenach rynkowych (rozporządzenie DNB) (A8-0009/2018 - Roberto Gualtieri) (głosowanie) . . . . .	39
9.12. Sprzeciw na podstawie art. 106 Regulaminu: genetycznie zmodyfikowany rzepak Ms8, Rf3 i Ms8 × Rf3 (B8-0073/2019) (głosowanie) . . . . .	39
9.13. Sprzeciw na podstawie art. 106 Regulaminu: Genetycznie zmodyfikowana kukurydza 5307 (-SYN-Ø53Ø7-1) (B8-0074/2019) (głosowanie) . . . . .	39
9.14. Sprzeciw na podstawie art. 106 Regulaminu: Genetycznie zmodyfikowana kukurydza MON 87403 (MON-874Ø3-1) (B8-0075/2019) (głosowanie) . . . . .	39
9.15. Sprzeciw na podstawie art. 106 Regulaminu: Genetycznie zmodyfikowana bawełna GHB614 × LLCotton25 × MON 15985 (B8-0076/2019) (głosowanie) . . . . .	39
9.16. Sytuacja w Wenezueli (B8-0082/2019, B8-0083/2019, B8-0084/2019, B8-0085/2019, B8-0086/2019, B8-0087/2019) (głosowanie) . . . . .	39
9.17. Sprawozdanie roczne dotyczące polityki konkurencji (A8-0474/2018 - Michel Reimon) (głosowanie) . . . . .	40
10. Wyjaśnienia dotyczące sposobu głosowania . . . . .	40
10.1. Poprawki do Regulaminu (A8-0462/2018 - Richard Corbett) . . . . .	40
10.2. Sprawozdanie roczne za rok 2017 w sprawie ochrony interesów finansowych Unii Europejskiej – walka z nadużyciami finansowymi (A8-0003/2019 - Marian-Jean Marinescu) . . . . .	44
10.3. Wdrażanie i funkcjonowanie nazwy domeny najwyższego poziomu „eu” (A8-0394/2018 - Fredrick Federley) . . . . .	45
10.4. Sytuacja w Wenezueli (B8-0082/2019, B8-0083/2019, B8-0084/2019, B8-0085/2019, B8-0086/2019, B8-0087/2019) . . . . .	47
10.5. Sprawozdanie roczne dotyczące polityki konkurencji (A8-0474/2018 - Michel Reimon) . . . . .	49
11. Korekty do głosowania i zamiar głosowania: patrz protokół . . . . .	51

Spis treści	Strona
12. Decyzje dotyczące niektórych dokumentów: patrz protokół . . . . .	51
13. Składanie dokumentów: patrz protokół . . . . .	51
14. Przekazanie tekstów przyjętych na niniejszym posiedzeniu: patrz protokół . . . . .	51
15. Kalendarz następnych posiedzeń: patrz protokół . . . . .	51
16. Zamknięcie posiedzenia . . . . .	51
17. Przerwa w obradach . . . . .	51

## PEŁNE SPRAWOZDANIE Z OBRAD 31 STYCZNIA 2019 R.

PRESIDENZA DELL'ON. DAVID-MARIA SASSOLI

*Vicepresidente*

### 1. Otwarcie posiedzenia

*(La seduta è aperta alle 9.02)*

### 2. Wniosek o uchylenie immunitetu : patrz protokół

### 3. Kobiety w zarządach – Równowaga płci wśród dyrektorów niewykonawczych spółek (debata)

**Presidente.** – L'ordine del giorno reca in discussione congiunta sul tema «Equilibrio di genere» l'interrogazione con richiesta di risposta orale al Consiglio su «Donne alla guida di imprese», presentata da Iratxe García Pérez, Sylvia-Yvonne Kaufmann, Evelyn Regner e Anna Hedh (O-000123/2018 - B8-0002/2019) (2019/2513(RSP)).

**Iratxe García Pérez, autora.** – Señor presidente, la falta de representación de las mujeres en las distintas esferas de la vida social, política, económica es el síntoma de una sociedad desigual, es el síntoma de la necesidad de avanzar en las políticas de igualdad entre hombres y mujeres. Fue en el año 2013 cuando este Parlamento se posicionó con respecto a la propuesta de la Comisión Europea sobre la representación de las mujeres en los consejos de administración para incorporar unas cuotas obligatorias de representación de las mujeres en las esferas empresariales, para que también en el ámbito de lo económico tengamos igualdad de representación.

Han pasado cinco años. Han pasado presidencia tras presidencia con un bloqueo en el Consejo, donde los Gobiernos nacionales han sido incapaces de sentarse en la mesa y de entender que avanzar en una Europa más igual es también avanzar en una Europa donde la representación de las mujeres sea una realidad en todas las esferas.

Y ha tenido que haber un cambio en el Gobierno de España para impulsar también un cambio en el Consejo e intentar que por fin haya un acuerdo en este sentido.

Quiero agradecer a la señora Jourová el impulso que me consta que está dando para, desde la Comisión y junto con el Consejo y el Parlamento, posibilitar que podamos terminar esta legislatura con una iniciativa en materia de igualdad que es fundamental.

Porque no nos podemos resignar a que los derechos de las mujeres sigan en retroceso. Porque necesitamos que las mujeres estén representadas en igualdad de oportunidades y, por eso, este Parlamento se tiene que posicionar de una forma muy clara y pedirle a la presidencia rumana que haga un último esfuerzo, que tenemos la posibilidad, que tenemos la capacidad, que hay Gobiernos, como el de España, que han decidido impulsar esta iniciativa, que las mujeres queremos formar parte de la toma de decisiones y que es fundamental para avanzar en una Europa más igual y más justa.

**Heidi Hautala**, *author*. – Mr President, this is a very important moment: it is time to conclude that there is no reason whatsoever not to adopt the directive of 2012 which would make it an obligation for listed companies to reach the minimum 40% share of persons of either sex among their non-executive board members.

I'm very surprised that some Member States should still be referring to subsidiarity. How can they do that? We have European companies that operate not only in Europe but also beyond it, so this should definitely be an issue for European Union competence. Secondly, we know very well that diversity in all its dimensions – and gender is an important dimension of diversity – expands companies' views and perspectives in terms of understanding what's going on in the world and reacting to it in their business strategies. Thirdly, there's no reason whatsoever to say that there are no competent women. That is an excuse for a male-dominated corporate culture in which women are not visible because, perhaps, they do not always share this male-dominated corporate culture and its behaviour patterns. However, it is certain that the competence of women to respond to today's challenges is at least the same as that of men.

There has been ample time for Member States to proceed, in voluntary ways, with measures for diversity and for women on company boards, but still we were in a situation where, in 2017 and 2018, women accounted only for 26.3% of board members in the largest publicly listed companies registered in the EU. There is a huge discrepancy – from 7.4% to 43% – and this discrepancy shows that we need measures at European level to advance towards harmonisation of this important aspect.

I would like to thank the Spanish Government for finally taking a second look at this question. And maybe, with the Romanian Presidency of the Council, we can now finally conclude this matter and can declare, before the European elections, that the European Union is actively promoting a modern cooperate culture which includes contributions from both women and men. There's no reason to say that there are no competent women.

**Melania Ciot**, *President-in-Office of the Council*. – Mr President, it is a great pleasure to join everyone here today for this important debate. I want to begin by saying that gender equality lies at the heart of the Council's vision of social Europe. The Council's commitment to equality between women and men has been strongly affirmed in many declarations, as well as in the legislation that we have developed over the years together with Parliament.

I would also like to recall the European pillar of social rights, which was jointly proclaimed by Parliament, the Council and the Commission in November 2017. Gender equality has pride of place in this document, and I quote 'equality of treatment and opportunities between women and men must be ensured and fostered in all areas, including regarding participation in the labour market, terms and conditions of employment and career progression. Women and men have the right to equal pay for work of equal value'. This commitment of course echoes the EU Treaties and our existing legislation but this issue should not be left aside.

Despite the enormous progress that has been made over the past half century and more, equality in practice continues to elude us. Let me give you an example. There is still a large gender pay gap in Europe. The average gender pay gap is 16.2% according to Eurostat and women's gross hourly pay is still lower than men's. This of course is not equality. We will address the gender pay gap in a set of Council conclusions that we hope to see adopted at the EPSCO Council in June.

In order to deliver on the promise contained in the pillar of social rights, we need continued and determined action on the part of the Commission, the co-legislators and the Member States.

Honourable Members, today you have asked us to comment more specifically on the Commission's proposal for a directive on improving the gender balance on company boards. I regret to say that – as of course you know – there is still a blocking minority in the Council. The most recent meeting on the file took place under the Maltese Presidency in 2017, and the proposal has not been formally discussed by the Council since.

As things stand right now, the file remains blocked. Nevertheless, there is broad consensus in Europe on the need to improve the gender balance on company boards. Although the Member States have different approaches the principle is not contested. In this vein, the Romanian Presidency aims to facilitate discussions at the Council level in order to explore possible ways forward.

I would also like to mention the proposal for a directive on work-life balance for parents and caretakers. Here we have better news. Indeed, I'm glad to say that negotiations between the Council and Parliament led to a provisional agreement at the sixth trilogue, which took place on 24 January. This success was made possible also by the excellent progress that was achieved under both the Bulgarian and Austrian Presidencies.

Facilitating work-life balance is a vital part of social and employment policies. We must do all we can to help our citizens reconcile work and private life. This is all the more important in the context of the demographic situation and labour market changes.

On the one hand, we need to make sure that Europe's highly educated, highly skilled women are able to take advantage of labour market opportunities. This makes obvious economic sense. It is also a matter of equal rights.

On the other hand, European women and men should be able to have children without having to choose between being a parent and having a job. I would like to point out that, more often than not, women are the ones faced with this decision. This is only feasible if workers with families have adequate leave rights and if those rights are extended to both women and men.

Meanwhile, it is also necessary to respect the diversity of the national systems in place. In Europe, it is never the case that one size fits all – least of all in the field of employment and family policy where traditions, economic realities and social assistance vary very greatly between the Member States. We must respect the principle of subsidiarity.

These were some of the considerations we had to address in the negotiations on the work-life balance directive. It was not easy, but I am pleased that we found a solution that raised the minimum standards in Europe, yet gives the Member States the necessary flexibility. I thank Parliament for its cooperation on this file. Thank you for your attention.

**Věra Jourová**, *Member of the Commission*. – Mr President, let me start by thanking the European Parliament for putting the important topic of women's rights and gender equality in the EU on the agenda today.

I am very grateful for your overwhelming support for the Commission's proposal aiming to improve gender balance on the corporate boards of the largest EU listed companies.

I have now been Commissioner for Gender Equality for almost five years. While I am proud of our collective work, in particular about the recent finalisation of the work-life balance package, I remain concerned, as the European Institute for Gender Equality states in its largest and latest Gender Equality Index, that in some areas we are moving at a snail's pace. When we were publishing the latest figures I didn't hide my big disappointment about this slow development, in spite of all the efforts we are investing.

The Gender Equality Index shows that gender equality in decision-making continues to have the lowest score of all domains evaluated in the index, and this despite some national legislation which have been adopted in the meantime. We are all aware of the studies, which clearly show the benefits of diversity on boards – benefits for business and for society alike, of course.

The Commission remains committed to the proposed Women on Boards Directive. Despite their capabilities and educational achievements, women continue to struggle against long-held and systemic entry barriers onto corporate boards and leadership positions.

The proposed directive will enable us to decisively widen the access of talented women to decision-making positions and to accelerate economic growth. With women in power, a snowball effect will be created towards more gender equality.

I would like to recall that this is a flexible and proportionate proposal. It is a good example of subsidiarity-friendly legislation, which offers Member States considerable flexibility in how to achieve the progress. It is also legislation that is gender neutral; it deals with adjustments regarding the under-represented sex in the case of similar levels of qualification, be they men or women. It deals with an overall objective and Member States are free to keep and apply their own existing effective measures aimed at improving gender balance in corporate boards.

According to our figures the states which have the legislation make progress; those states which do not have any legislation are just stagnating.

So we see the positive impact of legislation in many examples.

The Commission's proposal enjoys wide support from the European Parliament, and I want to thank you for this support once again. It also enjoys the support of a majority of the Member States.

In my view, a general approach is within reach. I can only repeat what has been said here also, that there is an important development, which was done by the Spanish Government. I was in Spain recently and there is very strong determination among the members of the government, including the Prime Minister, to move on and to convince also the states which are still opposing this piece of legislation.

Of course, I also rely very much on the Romanian Presidency, which is very determined as well.

I am ready to engage, in the run-up to the March EPSCO Council, with the Member States to try to unblock the negotiations in the Council. The Minister also mentioned here the June Council and, well, we have to have a serious debate about how to tackle the – I would say shameful – issue of the gender pay gap, which is also still very high in Europe. So the Commission trusts the Romanian Presidency will invest substantial efforts in this important dossier and actively pursue the discussions with a view to a possible compromise solution.

**Presidente.** – In questa fase non possiamo più accettare domande «Cartellino blu» per problemi di tempo.

**Agnieszka Kozłowska-Rajewicz**, w imieniu grupy PPE. – Panie Przewodniczący! Pani komisarz! Według dotychczasowych głosów wygląda na to, że wszyscy się zgadzamy – i Komisja Europejska, i Parlament Europejski, i obecna prezydencja – wszyscy popieramy tę dyrektywę. Co więcej, właściwie żadne państwo członkowskie nie kwestionuje celu tej dyrektywy, więc można sobie zadać pytanie: dlaczego jej jeszcze nie ma i dlaczego w niektórych państwach członkowskich obecność kobiet w zarządach, w najwyższych gremiach spółek giełdowych dużych firm to tylko 7 %?

Gdyby argument o subsydiarności był prawdziwy i szczerzy, to państwa członkowskie wprowadziłyby rozwiązania, które zlikwidowałyby tę dysproporcję. Bo przecież nikt o zdrowych zmysłach nie myśli chyba, że taka dysproporcja jak 7 % – 93 % albo 3 % – 97 %, jak to jest w przypadku CEO, wynika z różnicy talentów czy kompetencji. Jest oczywiste, że działają tu inne mechanizmy, na które trzeba zareagować, i najwyraźniej, ponieważ nie ma efektów na poziomie państw członkowskich, ta reakcja musi wyjść z poziomu Unii Europejskiej.

Ja gorąco popieram tę dyrektywę – znakomitą dyrektywę pani komisarz Viviane Reding – i czas najwyższy, żeby to kompetencje, a nie inne czynniki decydowały o powoływaniu ludzi na najwyższe stanowiska. Przypomnę, że ta dyrektywa mówi o przejrzystych zasadach naboru, o tym, żeby nabory na tak wysokie stanowiska miały jasno określone kryteria, żebyśmy wiedzieli, jak ten proces się odbywa, i żeby to nie odbywało się na podstawie wyboru kolegów z kalendarza z lat szkolnych, tylko żeby to były przejrzyste i jasne dla wszystkich procedury.

I chciałabym na koniec jeszcze dodać jedną rzecz: jako przedstawicielka PPE podkreślam, że ponieważ dla kobiet główną przeszkodą w obecności na rynku pracy i w awansie jest kwestia opieki nad dziećmi, kwestia *work-life balance* jest absolutnie kluczowa w tej sprawie, co nie znaczy, że ta dyrektywa nie jest koniecznym, ważnym impulsem dodatkowym, który może sprawę naprawić.

I chciałabym jeszcze tylko pogratulować obecnej prezydencji, że skutecznie zakończyliśmy ostatnie rozmowy trójstronne, i zaapelować do wszystkich grup politycznych, żebyśmy poparli tę dyrektywę w zbliżających się głosowaniach.

**Evelyn Regner**, im Namen der S&D-Fraktion. – Herr Präsident, sehr geehrte Frau Kommissarin! Wir brauchen tüchtige, kluge und fähige Frauen und Männer an der Spitze von Unternehmen, in Aufsichtsräten genauso wie in den Vorständen. Vor sieben Jahren hat die Kommission einen Vorschlag dazu auf den Tisch gelegt. Das Europäische Parlament hat sehr schnell gehandelt. Wir haben festgestellt, wir brauchen objektive Auswahlkriterien, und wir wollen auch praktisch sein. Wir schauen uns an, wie es in den einzelnen Ländern aussieht: Welches Land hat hier schon entsprechende gesetzliche Maßnahmen gesetzt? Welches hat vielleicht auf freiwilliger Ebene entsprechende Fortschritte erzielt? Das heißt, wir haben im Europäischen Parlament sehr praxisbezogen darüber abgestimmt, dass es objektive Kriterien braucht, die dann umzusetzen sind, und dass wir mit der Freiwilligkeit nicht weit kommen. Wir brauchen Verbindlichkeit, und wir brauchen auch einen Sanktionsmechanismus, damit sich hier endlich etwas tut.

Gleichstellung, Gleichberechtigung – das ist etwas, was in der DNS der Europäischen Union ist. Nur durch die Europäische Union haben wir so viele Fortschritte in sehr vielen Ländern, Land für Land für Land, erreicht. Das heißt, es ist etwas Wunderbares für die Unternehmen, für die Wirtschaft, das ist etwas Wunderbares auch für die Männer, und das ist etwas Wunderbares für die Frauen. So, und was ist jetzt passiert? Sehr viele Länder verstecken sich hinter der Rechtsgrundlage. Was soll denn das heißen? Die Rechtsgrundlage ist absolut gegeben, denn nur jene Länder, die letztlich keine Fortschritte in ihrem eigenen Land aufzuweisen haben, verstecken sich.

Daher fordere ich den rumänischen Ratsvorsitz, dessen Vorstoß ich sehr begrüße, auf, hier das Scheinwerferlicht endlich wieder auf das Thema zu lenken, jene Mitgliedstaaten vor den Vorhang zu holen, die sich verstecken. Welche Mitgliedstaaten sind es denn? Das sind Länder wie Ungarn. Da haben wir jetzt einmal nachgeschaut, wie es mit dem Fortschritt aussieht: Da gibt es sogar einen Rückschritt in den Unternehmen. Das heißt, ich fordere den Ratsvorsitz auf, diese Länder endlich vor den Vorhang zu holen und zu sagen, was sie denn tatsächlich getan haben, und allenfalls in einem Rat darüber abstimmen zu lassen. Denn das Europäische Parlament ist hier mit einer sehr starken Position geeint, und ich bin sehr froh, dass Sie diesen Vorschlag jetzt mehr oder weniger wieder auf den Tisch gebracht haben.

**Jadwiga Wiśniewska**, *w imieniu grupy ECR*. – Panie Przewodniczący! Pani komisarz! Pani minister! Sprawa jest naprawdę bardzo ważna. Kiedy popatrzymy na wskaźnik równości płci, to widzimy, że kobiety rzeczywiście są niedoreprezentowane w zarządach spółek, niedoreprezentowane na wysokich stanowiskach. I wtedy rodzi się refleksja: dlaczego tak się dzieje? Przecież kobiety są kompetentne, wykształcone, pracowite, ambitne. Zdecydowanie nie są ani słabsze, ani mniej utalentowane niż mężczyźni. A więc dlaczego jest tak mało kobiet na wysokich stanowiskach? Otóż w mojej opinii jednym z głównych powodów jest to, że kobiety wolniej budują swoją ścieżkę kariery, ponieważ pragną być nie tylko świetnymi pracownikami, ale pragną być również matkami. I ten czas, kiedy wypadają z życia zawodowego, żeby spełnić swoje marzenia macierzyńskie, jest jednym z głównych powodów wolniejszego budowania ścieżki kariery.

Zatem należałoby się zastanowić, co powinniśmy zrobić, żeby kobiet rzeczywiście było więcej na wysokich stanowiskach, ale nie, żeby wprowadzać tam kobiety w sposób sztuczny, nie w sposób mechaniczny, nie za pomocą dyrektyw, tylko zaproponować rozwiązania, które pozwolą łączyć paniom pracę zawodową z życiem rodzinnym. Rzeczywiście potrzebujemy rozwiązań, które pozwolą nam uzyskać równowagę między życiem zawodowym i życiem rodzinnym. I myślę, że takie rozwiązania i poszukanie takiego kompromisu da zdecydowanie dobre efekty.

Eurostat podaje, że luka płacowa w państwach członkowskich jest zróżnicowana. Są kraje, gdzie ta luka płacowa między kobietami a mężczyznami jest bardzo znaczna. Na szczęście Polska jest w piątce państw członkowskich z najmniejszą luką płacową, a w ostatnich latach znacząco wzrosła w Polsce liczba kobiet zajmujących wysokie stanowiska – bez mechanicznej, sztucznej regulacji.

**Izaskun Bilbao Barandica**, *en nombre del Grupo ALDE*. – Señor presidente, comisaria Jourová, muchísimas gracias por todos los esfuerzos y su empeño en estas iniciativas, pero, a la vista del contenido de estas preguntas, a la vista de cómo bloquean en el Consejo esta propuesta para promover la igualdad en los consejos de administración, quiero pedir tres cosas a los Gobiernos europeos: coherencia, visión de futuro y valentía.

Coherencia, porque aquí se nos llena la boca hablando de crecimiento inteligente, de una economía basada en el talento, pero hacemos lo posible por que la mitad del talento disponible, el que aportamos las mujeres, no llegue a donde puede ser más útil. A los consejos. A los centros de decisión. A donde, como demuestran todos los estudios, es más rentable. A donde es un éxito, como lo certifican todas las experiencias implantadas en algunos Estados miembros. Atrévase a mirar esta propuesta desde la perspectiva de la rentabilidad. Ya que les da miedo hacerlo desde la perspectiva de la igualdad, de la justicia y de la igualdad de oportunidades.

Visión de futuro, porque Europa es una de las zonas del mundo más sensibles y activas en políticas de igualdad. Aprovechemos esta ventaja competitiva. Mientras en otros espacios empiezan a pensar en unas ideas que llevamos años manoseando, apostemos por llevarlas a sus últimas consecuencias. Porque, como hemos dicho, además de justo y democrático, es rentable. Toda la ventaja que saquemos a otros en esta operación de sumar talento nos hará más competitivos.



Y, por último, valentía. Hay demasiados hombres pensando en masculino al frente de este bloqueo. Sacúdanse el miedo. Ganarán. Asómense a lo que se pierden: a conciliar, a cuidar de los hijos, de los mayores, a compartir la mágica tarea de transformar una hipoteca en un hogar, en una oportunidad. Van a descubrir que disfrutar de esta parte de la vida les hará más felices. Les ayudará a entrenar su inteligencia emocional. Les conectará con sentimientos, con vivencias, con personas, con problemas, con responsabilidades, de las que llevan siglos huyendo. Estoy convencida de que un mundo con hombres dispuestos a asumir este reto será mucho mejor.

**Ernest Urtausun**, *en nombre del Grupo Verts/ALE*. – Señor presidente, es muy importante que tratemos de desbloquear esta Directiva. Venimos de un mandato en materia de igualdad de género bastante parado, y sería excelente que entre la Comisión y la Presidencia rumana pudiéramos llegar al final del mandato con buenas perspectivas en relación con esta Directiva, que lleva bloqueada desde que se presentó en el año 2012.

Establecer un 40 % de cuotas de mujeres en los consejos de administración es imprescindible. Es imprescindible porque el poder económico es central en la igualdad de género, y además porque es un modelo que ha funcionado. En Noruega ha funcionado de forma indiscutible. No lo ha resuelto todo, pero en las empresas cotizadas hoy hay un 40 % de mujeres.

Y no es un tema que se pueda uno esconder detrás de la subsidiariedad, como hacen muchos Estados miembros. Por dos razones: primera, porque la igualdad de género es un objetivo establecido en los Tratados y el poder económico es un elemento central para avanzar en la igualdad. Y, segunda, porque la disparidad en la Unión Europea es desde el 7,4 en algunos países de presencia de mujeres en los consejos de administración hasta el 43 %. La disparidad es enorme, y por lo tanto necesitamos un marco legal a escala de la Unión Europea que permita armonizar e impulsar esta medida.

Como decía, en Noruega esta ha sido una medida que es absolutamente un éxito. Eso es incuestionable. No lo ha resuelto todo. Y también debemos aprender. Hay dos cuestiones centrales. Primera: una cosa es establecer la igualdad en los consejos de administración y la otra es lograrla en los puestos ejecutivos. Y ahí hay que hacer trabajo también, porque una medida de estas no resuelve la segunda parte, sobre la cual también hay que trabajar.

Y segunda, lo que hemos aprendido de la experiencia noruega es que hay retos de implementación, evidentemente, y por eso en 2013 el Parlamento pidió que hubiera un régimen muy importante de sanciones para aquellas empresas que no cumplieran con ese objetivo, por ejemplo excluyéndolas de los concursos públicos si no cumplían con el 40 % que establecía la Directiva.

Por lo tanto, es una pieza legislativa central para avanzar en la igualdad. Yo desearía que tanto la Comisión como el Consejo trataran de darnos buenas noticias en los próximos meses, porque en esta Cámara creo que el apoyo a este texto es unánime.

**Stefan Eck**, *im Namen der GUE/NGL-Fraktion*. – Herr Präsident, verehrte Kolleginnen und Kollegen! Woran liegt es, dass lediglich 24 von insgesamt 200 Vorstandspositionen in deutschen DAX-Unternehmen von Frauen besetzt sind und sich an der Spitze dieser Konzerne keine einzige Frau befindet? Weil eine Gleichstellung der Geschlechter selbst in der EU immer noch nicht erreicht wurde. Das ist eine Schande! International fällt die Bilanz kaum besser aus: Von den 500 größten Unternehmen weltweit werden gerade einmal 3 % von einer Frau als geschäftsführendem Vorstandsmitglied geleitet.

Dass wir über dieses Thema im Jahr 2019 immer noch diskutieren müssen, ist beschämend und lässt mich ernsthaft an unserer ach so gelobten Fortschrittlichkeit zweifeln. Anscheinend gibt es noch viele Ewiggestrige, die meinen, dass Frauen nur zu Reproduktionszwecken da sind und hinter den Herd gehören, weil sie angeblich für Leitungsfunktionen der Wirtschaft nicht geeignet sind. Wollen wir wirklich noch 40 Jahre warten? So lange würde es nämlich ohne verbindliche Regelungen dauern, bis der Frauenanteil in Vorständen und Aufsichtsräten auf 40 % steigt.

Wir brauchen keine längeren Diskussionen. Diese Welt ist keine Männerwelt, sondern eine Welt für alle Menschen, gleich welchen Geschlechts sie sind. Sagen wir also dem frauenfeindlichen und anachronistischen Denken in den Chefetagen endlich den Kampf an!

**Margot Parker**, *on behalf of the EFDD Group*. – Mr President, the Woman on Boards Directive is not only offensive but it's patronising and condescending to those women that have earned positions at the top through merit. How utterly demeaning for a woman to find out she has been chosen for a position due to a quota and not through her accomplishments. Quotas signal to women that we are inferior and incapable of achieving success. What about women working at lower levels of companies? Quotas do not signify any increased opportunities or promotions, nor equate to more female CEOs. Despite Norway having implemented gender quota laws nearly a decade ago, only 7% of women hold executive roles.

Where do we stop? Where do these quotas stop?

First you set a quota between men and women, and what about the under-representation that may exist amongst women? You could endlessly categorise and endlessly quota. Yet again, I'm afraid, this is more European EU interference.

Companies should have the freedom to choose the most suitable candidate for a job, but under Article 6 and Recital 30 of this Directive, there are calls for sanctions, for fines to be imposed and forced dissolution of companies that do not fulfil the quota requirements. Quotas do not address nor resolve underlying issues of inequality. They are truly counter-productive.

(Applause)

**Stanisław Żółtek**, w imieniu grupy ENF. – Panie Przewodniczący! Widzę, że to feministyczne szaleństwo dalej trwa, chcemy zamienić kobiety w mężczyzn, a mężczyzn – w kobiety. Nie za bardzo rozumiem, czy to jest jakaś choroba, czy coś innego, ale póki to było takie śmieszne (typu jak głosowane ostatnio, że za mało jest kobiet pasących owce i kozy), to można się było tylko z tego śmiać. Ale tego typu dyrektywa, która w przedsiębiorstwach wprowadzi zasadę, że nie kompetencja się liczy, a kwota, ile jest kobiet, ile mężczyzn, jest już groźna. Można by oczywiście zakpić, że co to za problem, paru facetów powie, że są kobietami, i równowaga płci będzie zachowana. Sami to przegłosowaliście przecież i teraz załatwiliście już właściwie sprawę. Ale ta sprawa jest zbyt poważna, żeby tylko na kpinach poprzestać.

Widzimy, że całe istotne prawo w Unii Europejskiej tworzy Komisja Europejska, a Parlament je posłusznie przyklepuje, choć czasami jest niestety z powodu grupy posłów inicjatorem co bzdurniejszych i szkodliwych praw. Te prawa po kawałku nam odbierają wolność osobistą, odbierają wolność gospodarczą przedsiębiorcom, odbierają niepodległość państwom. Te rezolucje, które tutaj Parlament Europejski tworzy w tysiącach – zwykle bezsensowne albo nic niemówiące – mają jeden wspólny mianownik: musi tam być zawarte, że imigranci, homoseksualiści oraz oczywiście feministyczne ruchy są lepsi od obywateli Europy. Musi to być zawarte, to jest naprawdę jakaś choroba. Najwyższy czas wyjść z tej Unii, chyba się jej nie da zreformować. Tu apeluję do innych krajów: śladem Wielkiej Brytanii wyjdźcie z tej Unii, do posłów, żebyście to przygotowali. Stwórzmy nową unię, taką, jaka była w marzeniach założycieli tej, niestety, obecnej. Niech to będzie unia tak samo bez granic, ale taka, która się nie wtrąca do rodzin, nie ośmiesza kobiet wychowujących dzieci, mówiąc, że są kurami domowymi, tak jak tu ostatnio słyszałem. Taka, która się nie wtrąca do gospodarki. Gdzie Komisja Europejska to są posłuszni urzędnicy, a nie panowie nas wszystkich. Taką unię trzeba od nowa stworzyć, nie ma tu innego wyjścia. Mam nadzieję, że jeszcze dożyję tych czasów, bo za dwa lata z tej Unii już się nie będzie dało wyjść, to jest ostatni moment.

**Dobromir Sośnierz (NI)**. – Panie Przewodniczący! Pozwólcie państwo, że postaram się wam coś wytłumaczyć. Proszę o skupienie, mam tylko minutę. Wychodźcie z fałszywych założeń i dochodźcie wskutek tego do fałszywych wniosków.

Po pierwsze, zakładacie się na wstępie, że kobiety mają takie same predyspozycje, kwalifikacje i taką samą ochotę do zajmowania stanowisk kierowniczych jak mężczyźni. Z fałszywego założenia przechodzicie do ubolewania nad tym, że jest nierównowaga w zarządach. Wietrzycie w tym teorię spiskową, jakiś patriarchalny spisek, który uniemożliwia kobietom awans do zarządów spółek. Otóż wstępne założenie jest weryfikowane przez rzeczywistość, przez gospodarkę: skoro kobiety nie są zatrudniane tak samo chętnie, albo same się nie pchają do zarządów, to widocznie albo nie mają takich samych kompetencji, takich samych predyspozycji, albo takiej samej ochoty na podążanie taką ścieżką. Mężczyźni okupiają to na przykład tym, że żyją krócej. Jak zamierzacie naprawić straty mężczyznom, wyrównać sprawę w tym aspekcie? Jeśli rynek pokazuje, że kobiety nie zajmują tyle takich samych stanowisk, to widocznie przyczyna jest gdzie indziej, a nie w spisku mężczyzn.

**Michaela Šojdrová (PPE)**. – Pane předsedající, žijeme v době a ve společnosti, kde nikdo o rovnosti žen a mužů nepochybuje, přesto vidíme, že zastoupení žen na důležitých místech neodpovídá tomu, že tvoří jednu polovinu populace. Zastoupení žen v řídicích a kontrolních orgánech velkých společností kótovaných na burze je skutečně překvapivě nízké. Evropský průměr je 23 % a v některých zemích, jako např. ČR, je to pouze 9 %.

Přestože ženy dosahují stejného vzdělání, dokonce dnes více než polovina absolventů vysokých škol jsou ženy, mají jistě stejné ambice, jsou stejně schopné, tak přesto ženy v těchto rozhodujících orgánech chybí. Je to také díky tomu, že ženy mají svoji nezastupitelnou roli matky a pečovatelky. Do profesní kariéry nastupují později. Žádné kvóty samy o sobě neumožní ženám urychlit jejich kariéru. Ženám pomůže zlepšení podmínek pro to, aby mohly být matkami a zároveň rozvíjet svoji profesní kariéru. Zde vidím jako velmi důležité, aby se naopak Rada zabývala schválením směrnice na sladování rodičovského a profesního života a abychom zde došli ke konsenzu, aby tato směrnice byla členskými státy aplikována.

Chci se zeptat kolegů, kteří zde volají po nutnosti schválení směrnice, co brání jejich členským státům, aby ve své národní působnosti přijaly toto opatření? Např. kolegyně ze Španělska říká: „Schvalte směrnici.“, vždyť i Španělsko již odblokovalo jednání v Radě. Inu, kolegyně, není problém, aby vaše progresivní vláda přijala ve své působnosti takovou regulaci. Myslím, že nic tomu na úrovni členských států nebrání. Chtěla bych vyzvat, aby Evropská komise a orgány veřejné správy šly příkladem a podporovaly ženy do vyšších funkcí.

**Jytte Guteland (S&D).** – Herr talman! Fru kommissionär! Över 65 procent av alla med universitetsexamen inom EU är kvinnor. De har kunskapen, de har erfarenheterna för toppjobben i bolagsstyrelserna. Ändå fortsätter de att bli marginaliserade från inflytande. Det är fullständigt oacceptabelt!

Men det är inte bara orättvist, utan det är dumt också. Det innebär slöseri med kompetens. Sannolikheten för innovationer i jämställda företag är nästintill dubbelt så hög. Dessutom har det länge påvisats att ju fler kvinnor bland de högsta cheferna i börsnoterade företag, desto bättre förutsättningar för finansiella resultat som gynnar företagen. Trots det, fortsätter många medlemsländer och högerpolitiker att konsekvent motarbeta förslaget att minst 40 procent av de icke verkställande styrelseledamöterna ska vara av det underrepresenterade könet. Det är en väldigt märklig politik.

Därför är det med stor glädje som vi noterat att Spanien nu ändrar sig och drar tillbaka sin reservation i ministerrådet. Därför bör Rumänien ta detta på allvar och inte bara ha vackra ord utan agera för att vi ska få rättvisa och bättre möjligheter för innovationer i Europa.

**Czesław Hoc (ECR).** – Panie Przewodniczący! W kwestii kobiet w zarządach spółek oraz ogólnie równowagi płci spojrzmy na trzy najważniejsze instytucje Unii Europejskiej: Parlament Europejski, Komisję Europejską i Radę Europejską. Na 12 dotychczasowych przewodniczących Komisji Europejskiej – ani jednej kobiety. Dalej, na 30 przewodniczących Parlamentu Europejskiego – tylko dwie panie oraz na 78 (78!) przewodniczących Rady Europejskiej – także tylko dwie kobiety. Dlaczego zatem organizacje kobiet nie ukazują tego faktu na forum Parlamentu, dlaczego żaden mężczyzna przewodniczący nie uderzył się w pierś? Czyżby do tego aktu odwagi potrzebna była aż unijna dyrektywa?

Zatem wszyscy są wobec prawa równi. Kobieta i mężczyzna mają równe prawa w życiu rodzinnym, politycznym, społecznym i gospodarczym – tak jest zapisane w Konstytucji Rzeczypospolitej Polskiej. Jesteśmy społeczeństwem kobiet zaradnych, wykształconych, kompetentnych i odpowiedzialnych. Każdy potrzebuje szacunku i sprawiedliwego traktowania, albowiem ma identyczne prawa i równą godność. Tego należy po prostu przestrzegać, to jest nasz współczesny imperatyw aksjologiczny i cywilizacyjny.

**Beatriz Becerra Basterrechea (ALDE).** – Señor presidente, gracias, señora Jourová, siempre por su apoyo, por su fuerza y por su determinación. Hoy, algunos todavía dicen que las mujeres no ocupan puestos de dirección porque deciden no hacerlo. Y, sin embargo, la proporción de mujeres en los consejos de administración de las empresas europeas cotizadas ha pasado del 10 % en 2005 al 22 % en 2015. Luego algo se mueve.

Otros dicen que, si las cosas ya están cambiando, una iniciativa como la propuesta sobre las mujeres en los consejos de administración sería innecesaria. Sin embargo, las mujeres solo presiden el 7 % de los consejos de administración y solo son el 6 % de los directores ejecutivos de las mayores empresas. El techo de cristal existe. El suelo pegajoso existe. Y, desde la Unión Europea, podemos ayudar a romper uno y a limpiar otro. Pero, para ello, es necesario que el Consejo deje de bloquear la propuesta sobre las mujeres en los consejos de administración.

La igualdad en puestos de dirección es positiva para todos. Las empresas con más mujeres en los consejos de administración obtienen mejores resultados. Lo racional, lo eficaz, lo pragmático con principios es la igualdad. Es hora de que el Consejo desbloquee la propuesta sobre las mujeres en los consejos de administración y asuma el liderazgo que piden los europeos. Y yo espero de Rumanía una buena posición al respecto.

**Eleonora Forenza (GUE/NGL).** – Signor Presidente, onorevoli colleghi, ringrazio moltissimo le colleghe del gruppo S&D e dei Verdi per aver presentato queste due interrogazioni orali. Con la relazione sul *Gender mainstreaming*, di cui è stata relatrice la collega Mlinar, abbiamo lavorato nella stessa direzione. Chiaramente dobbiamo essere consapevoli del fatto che stiamo intervenendo su un sintomo di una cultura discriminatoria e stiamo lavorando con un'azione positiva per evitare che questi dati che emergono ancora una volta dagli studi effettuati diventino un vettore di ulteriore discriminazione.

Dobbiamo però essere consapevoli del fatto che questo Parlamento deve dare risposte, non soltanto per quel soffitto di cristallo che riguarda l'1% delle donne, ma per quelle forme di discriminazione e di violenza che riguardano il 99% delle donne; deve combattere ogni forma di discriminazione di genere, di classe, di razza, e credo che questo Parlamento europeo possa dare un suo contributo in questa direzione.

Ringrazio davvero le colleghe per queste interrogazioni orali. Credo davvero, però, che abbiamo moltissimo da fare in una legislatura che, come ricordava il collega Urtasun, dal punto di vista dell'uguaglianza di genere avrebbe potuto fare di più.

**Daniela Aiuto (EFDD).** – Signor Presidente, onorevoli colleghi, nell'ormai lontano novembre 2012, il Parlamento ha votato in prima lettura la proposta di direttiva sulle donne nei consigli di amministrazione, tuttora bloccata al Consiglio.

Questa proposta di direttiva era nata con l'intento di portare maggiore uguaglianza tra donne e uomini nei consigli d'amministrazione delle maggiori società quotate in Borsa, anche se noi siamo consapevoli che vi sarà una reale uguaglianza solo quando si potrà conquistarsela grazie al merito dimostrato sul campo e non grazie a una quota di genere imposta a priori, merito e competenze che noi donne abbiamo – e vorrei rassicurare il collega che ha parlato prima – mi dispiace per lui ma è dimostrato dai dati che le donne laureate sono in percentuale più numerose dei colleghi uomini.

I dati di partenza con cui la Commissione aveva proposto questa direttiva erano inquietanti: solo il 13,7% dei posti era occupato dalle donne. Oggi, quindi, mi chiedo e chiedo alla Presidenza rumena: quali misure intende intraprendere per sbloccare finalmente questa fase di stallo? Mi domando inoltre se saprà farsi portavoce delle richieste delle donne europee, che noi qui rappresentiamo, in seno al Consiglio.

**Seán Kelly (PPE).** – Mr President, it is well known that men disproportionately make up the numbers of corporate boards across the world. According to the European Institute for Gender Equality, in 2017, women accounted for only a quarter of all board members in the largest publicly listed companies registered in the EU. In fact, in 2015, there were more CEOs of Fortune 500 companies named John than there were women. Nothing wrong with John – my own name is Seán, which is the Gaelic form of John.

This proposed directive is not simply about making up a gender balance on corporate boards of directors and non-executive directors; it's about the trickle-down effect this has on the entire company and the economy. One will often find women working in the human resources or communication side of a company, while men are more often in general management as this is seen as more senior. There must be a gender-balanced model of decision making at all levels within the company concerned. If people running the company are primarily comprised of men, how can we expect the company as a whole to represent the whole spectrum of opinions and perspectives? Furthermore, inadequate recruitment practices for board members contribute to perpetually hiring those with similar profiles, i.e., we as humans tend to hire who we are familiar with, so if the board is comprised primarily of men, this leads to more men being hired. This does not make sense. According to the International Monetary Fund, women's economic empowerment boosts productivity, and increases economic diversification and income equality. It makes absolute sense to have more women on boards.

**Sergio Gaetano Cofferati (S&D).** – Signor Presidente, onorevoli colleghi, nelle nostre discussioni ricordiamo spesso come la parità di genere sia un valore fondativo dell’Unione europea, anche se poi nei comportamenti siamo orientati diversamente, come dimostra la discussione di questa mattina. Ciò che sta facendo il Consiglio è semplicemente vergognoso: siamo di fronte a una direttiva votata con una larghissima maggioranza oramai più di 7 anni fa e non succede nulla.

Non è un obiettivo straordinario quello contenuto nella direttiva: la presenza delle donne nei consigli di amministrazione del 40% non ha come corrispettivo, ad esempio, la stessa quota in posizioni apicali: è rimasta aperta e resterà aperta ancora a lungo la questione della differenza di retribuzione, a parità di lavoro, tra uomo e donna.

Dunque, quello che avevamo deciso era un – piccolo – passo in avanti nella direzione giusta ma che è rimasto semplicemente una buona intenzione. Io spero che il Consiglio abbia voglia – e dimostri concretamente di volerlo fare – di camminare nella direzione giusta, che è quella di rispettare e di dare gambe anche alla direttiva che abbiamo votato.

**Κωνσταντίνα Κούνεβα (GUE/NGL).** – Κύριε Πρόεδρε, «Σε μια κοινωνία χωρίς ισότητα, αλήθεια, τι αρμονία και τι ομορφιά μπορεί να επικρατήσει;», αναρωτιόταν ο John Milton. Το ίδιο αναρωτιέμαι κι εγώ. Το γυάλινο ταβάνι που εμποδίζει τη σταδιοδρομία χιλιάδων εργαζομένων γυναικών ανατρέπει τις ζωές τους. Εργαζόμενες με εμπειρία, σπουδές και κατάρτιση αποκλείονται από διευθυντικές θέσεις, αμείβονται λιγότερο, «τιμωρούνται», αν έχουν ή αν θέλουν οικογένεια, δέχονται παρενοχλήσεις διάφορων μορφών. Η πρόταση οδηγίας είναι σίγουρα μια ακόμα ευκαιρία να διορθώσουμε ανισότητες που επικρατούν. Όμως γιατί αργεί η υιοθέτησή της;

Ρωτώ το Συμβούλιο: Ποιες πρωτοβουλίες θα λάβει για να αντιμετωπίσει το φαινόμενο του γυάλινου ταβανιού στις επιχειρήσεις; Πώς σκοπεύει να προαγάγει την ισότητα των φύλων κατά τη διάρκεια της ρουμανικής Προεδρίας;

*(Procedura catch-the-eye)*

**Caterina Chinnici (S&D).** – Signor Presidente, signora Commissaria, onorevoli colleghi, nel 2017, è stato detto, le donne componevano soltanto un quarto dei consigli di amministrazione delle maggiori società europee quotate in Borsa e, ancora oggi, gli approcci adottati in materia dagli Stati membri variano sensibilmente, con conseguenti evidenti disuguaglianze in seno all’Unione.

Il ricorso insufficiente alle capacità di donne altamente qualificate non rappresenta solamente un’inaccettabile discriminazione basata su stereotipi di genere, ma costituisce anche un pregiudizio all’ottimale funzionamento del mercato del lavoro nell’Unione. Per realizzare una migliore parità di genere, è dimostrato che progressi significativi possono essere compiuti attraverso l’adozione di misure legislative che prevedano le cosiddette «quote rosa».

In effetti, nel mio paese, l’Italia, per esempio, con l’introduzione di una specifica legge in materia, in soli cinque anni si è superato il 33% di presenza femminile nei consigli di amministrazione, il che ha generato un effetto positivo su tutti gli indicatori di performance, proprio grazie alla competenza delle donne.

Chiediamo quindi alla Presidenza rumena di definire al più presto i negoziati sulla proposta di direttiva per l’equilibrio di genere nei consigli di amministrazione.

**Maria Grapini (S&D).** – Domnule președinte, onorați membri ai Consiliului, doamnă comisar, un subiect dezbătut, așa cum spunea colegii, de șapte ani. Eu vreau să vă spun următorul lucru, mai ales pentru bărbații care au ridicat aici problema inegalității și pentru bărbații de acasă, care se simt complexați: antropologic, femeile sunt proiectate pentru a fi bune! Bune și în business și acasă, femeile totdeauna au două locuri de muncă, cel puțin două locuri de muncă. Și ca o femeie care am fost în consiliul de administrație și la companii de stat, și la propriile companii, spun foarte clar: femeile pot să ducă această sarcină. Nu există profesii pentru bărbați și pentru femei și sper, doamnă ministru, doamnă comisar, să eliminăm această democrație cu capul în jos, această minoritate din Consiliu care blochează de atâția ani un lucru foarte bun. Mie îmi displace că trebuie să avem o cotă, dar dacă societatea n-a înțeles să valorifice valoarea feminină din societate, cred că trebuie să intervenim, pentru că da, sunt de acord, doamnă comisar, directiva pentru echilibrul între viața privată și viața de familie, precum și ceea ce ați spus dumneavoastră, că există studii relevante, trebuie să fie puse în practică. Toți vom avea de câștigat, toată societatea!

**Νότης Μαρίας (ECR).** – Κύριε Πρόεδρε, η υποεκπροσώπηση των γυναικών και στην κοινωνία και στις βασικές θέσεις και στην οικονομία είναι ένα κοινωνικό φαινόμενο και προφανώς πρέπει αυτό να αλλάξει και φυσικά θα πρέπει οι γυναίκες να εκπροσωπηθούν και στα διοικητικά συμβούλια των επιχειρήσεων. Αλλά η κοινωνική μηχανική, το «social engineering», το οποίο επιχειρεί η Ευρωπαϊκή Ένωση, δεν νομίζω ότι μπορεί να πετύχει στον τομέα αυτό ούτε μπορεί να αναγκαστούν οι επιχειρήσεις να κάνουν κάτι διαφορετικό.

Μπορεί όμως η Ευρωπαϊκή Ένωση να κάνει κάτι άλλο και, επειδή είναι εδώ και ο κύριος Juncker και ακούει, λέω το εξής: 140 δισεκατομμύρια ευρώ τον χρόνο είναι ο προϋπολογισμός της Ευρωπαϊκής Ένωσης. 70 δισεκατομμύρια ευρώ είναι τα κονδύλια της Ευρωπαϊκής Τράπεζας Επενδύσεων. 2,5 τρισεκατομμύρια ευρώ έχει δώσει ο κύριος Draghi. Λέω λοιπόν να μη γίνεται καμία χρηματοδότηση από κοινοτικά κονδύλια ούτε από δάνεια ούτε να αγοράζονται ομόλογα από την Ευρωπαϊκή Κεντρική Τράπεζα, εάν οι συγκεκριμένες επιχειρήσεις δεν έχουν εκπροσώπηση γυναικών στα διοικητικά συμβούλια. Να δείτε πώς αμέσως μόνες τους οι επιχειρήσεις θα αναγκαστούν και θα αλλάξουν την τακτική και θα έχουν εκπροσώπηση γυναικών στα διοικητικά συμβούλια, διότι δεν θα έχουν πρόσβαση ούτε στην οικονομία ούτε στα ομόλογα ούτε βεβαίως στα χρήματα που είναι και από το πρόγραμμα Juncker. Με αυτό τον τρόπο δίνουμε μια απάντηση και αναγκάζουμε τις επιχειρήσεις να έρθουν σε αυτά τα οποία εμείς επιθυμούμε.

**Pina Picierno (S&D).** – Signor Presidente, onorevoli colleghi, constatiamo dal dibattito che si è svolto stamattina in quest’Aula che c’è un’ampia convergenza di questo Parlamento su questa direttiva che, badate, non è nulla di straordinario: è un piccolo passettino che però va nella giusta direzione, perché qui non si sta imponendo la presenza delle donne nei consigli di amministrazione; si sta semplicemente prendendo atto che non si può rappresentare soltanto il 50 % dell’universo maschile all’interno dei consigli di amministrazione, ma si chiede una rappresentanza reale anche della rappresentanza femminile.

E allora dov’è il problema? Il problema è, come al solito, all’interno del Consiglio. Lo dico con molto rammarico e con molta preoccupazione perché, da un lato, c’è un atteggiamento del Parlamento che vorrebbe consentire a queste istituzioni e all’Unione europea di fare dei passi avanti. Dall’altro lato, c’è l’atteggiamento del Consiglio che troppo spesso, Presidente, blocca azioni che vanno nella giusta direzione.

Allora, se è vero che l’uguaglianza è un principio fondamentale dell’Unione europea, bisogna agire!

**Gesine Meissner (ALDE).** – Herr Präsident! Ich freue mich über diese Richtlinie, und ich freue mich über die Debatte, und zwar aus verschiedenen Gründen. Ich denke mal, es ist sehr gut, dass immer mehr Männer auch beteiligt sind, wenn wir darüber sprechen, denn wir müssen das gemeinsam als Gesellschaft schaffen, mehr Gleichberechtigung für die Frauen und mehr Repräsentanz von Frauen in allen Bereichen zu erreichen, weil sie auch wirklich gut genug sind, genauso gut wie die Männer. Der Gender-Pay-Gap wurde angesprochen. Ich weiß, in Deutschland ist er besonders hoch, höher als in anderen Ländern. Wir diskutieren bei uns gerade ein Paritätsgesetz mit sehr unterschiedlichen Ansätzen. Einige Mitgliedstaaten haben schon ein Gleichberechtigungsgesetz für das unterrepräsentierte Geschlecht. Ich denke, es ist eigentlich eine Schande, dass wir immer noch darüber reden müssen; es wäre gut, wir hätten es schon.

Ich habe mich zum Beispiel sehr gefreut über die Kollegin Regner, die sagte, eigentlich ist es in der europäischen DNS, dass es Gleichberechtigung zwischen Männern und Frauen gibt. Und darum hoffe ich auf eine breite Zustimmung dazu. Wir müssen einfach wirklich sehen, dass wir endlich mal zu einem Abschluss kommen.

**Julie Ward (S&D).** – Mr President, it is astonishing to see that this initiative to push for gender balance on the boards of businesses remains blocked in the Council after more than five years. It truly shows how conservative the Member State governments can be. It is worrying that this initiative is so controversial. Pushing for equality at executive level in companies is a policy that, while important, still remains focused largely on privileged women. It’s no wonder we have so much trouble, then, highlighting the narratives of marginalised women.

In the business world, women who find themselves at the intersection of several forms of discrimination face incredible challenges: black, Roma, migrant, disabled or poor women are too often forgotten in political spheres, as well as in the world of work and business. Following the agreement reached last week on the Work-Life Balance Directive, I call on the Presidency to put an end to this shameful situation, and focus all its efforts towards finally finding a consensus with regard to women on boards.

**Ana Miranda (Verts/ALE).** – Senhor Presidente, a igualdade de género para o Conselho é secundária, basta ver uma fotografia do Conselho Europeu. As mulheres que estão nos conselhos de administração, por exemplo, na Espanha, só ocupam 22% dos postos nas empresas cotadas em bolsa.

Só na Suécia se chega aos 36%, mas, em geral, muito longe dos níveis que diz a Europa.

Na passada legislatura, como membro da Comissão da Igualdade de Género, discutimos este tema e é triste ver que, 7 anos depois, estamos aqui de novo num tema que é a imagem pura do não cumprimento das diretivas relativas à igualdade.

**Maria Gabriela Zoană (S&D).** – Mr President, first of all, as a Romanian MEP, I welcome the fact that the Women on Boards directive proposal is one of the priorities of the Romanian Presidency in advancing gender equality. With some Member States changing their position recently, I am confident and I count on the Council to push forward the negotiation.

The reasons for the under-representation of women in business leadership are complex and include prevalent political and corporate cultures and traditional gender stereotypes. The glass ceiling in the business culture not only devalues the contribution of female leadership but also discourages other women from fully developing their potential in professional careers. From my own experience I can tell you that women taking the leadership in the company makes for added value and enterprise growth, prioritising women's needs in shaping the enterprise culture. Therefore, I express my support for the Romanian Presidency continuing the discussion on this directive.

*(Fine della procedura catch-the-eye)*

**Věra Jourová, Member of the Commission.** – Mr President, I am really grateful for the determination, dedication and support of the European Parliament for this course, which has been obvious through the whole debate. I am also grateful for the interest of the media in this topic.

Let me conclude by saying a few words. Next to the clear support which I have already expressed from the Commission side for this piece of legislation, I wanted to tell you that we are not waiting for this to be unblocked in the Council because there is still a lot of work which can be done to support higher or better diversity, and not only in the world of business.

I would like to mention again several statistics. In our society more than 50% are women. We have 62% of university graduates who are women. So one would say that it would be normal if we had at least such an adequate position and representation of women in various spheres of life, but let's just compare these figures. We have 22% of women on boards. We have only 6% of chief executives. Coming a little bit further, to the political sphere, we have only 20% of women in national parliaments. We have some governments in the Member States where there are only one or two women. Recently there was one government where there were no women.

Let's come to a positive example now. I am happy to say that in the Commission we are already tackling the 40% in managerial positions, which is thanks to the continuous strong push and very smart procedure which is guaranteeing fair competition, free of any kind of bias or barriers which we see in many other places.

To react to what Mr Žóltek said here – he is no longer here – believe me, from my position as a woman in the Commission, I still feel very strongly as a woman that I didn't have to become a man to be in such a position and to contribute to the decision-making of the Commission. It's a coincidence that Jean-Claude Juncker is here, but he said very clearly 'at least nine women for the Commission' and I think that all my women colleagues are doing the right job by bringing the perspective of women into decision-making.

So when we compare those figures, we have to say that there is something unhealthy and abnormal in other European societies, and that's why we are working hard to change this. As I said, we are not only waiting for the unblocking of the directive on women on boards. By the way, I would like to ask Ms Parker to read the current version of the directive because you will not find anything there which would indicate that gender itself – to be a woman only – is the qualification. We are inviting fair competition and cooperation. It's good to pay attention to the current version, which we are promoting.

At this moment, half of the Member States already have the legislation so, if we move on with the legislation, we will help the remaining Member States. It's true that the Member States can act themselves. They do not have to wait for the unblocking of this directive because it's up to them to move on this.

In the meantime, the Commission is not waiting. We are doing a lot of non-legislative work. We are supporting the Diversity Charter, where there are now already 10 000 institutions, including the biggest companies. I will name a few of them: Sodexo, IKEA, IBM, Siemens. These are the multinationals which are promoting the idea of diversity, which is advantageous for business in many Member States, including the states where there is no legislation. So in fact they are exporting and spreading this positive corporate culture. We are also funding a lot of projects which promote diversity. So we are doing a lot of things in the meantime. It's something which I call Plan B – not to wait for the adoption of the legislation, but to do a lot of other things. But I have to repeat at the end of my concluding remarks that we still believe that this piece of legislation will be adopted. Again I want to repeat that we trust the Romanian Presidency, that they will do a great job on this.

**Melania Ciot**, *President-in-Office of the Council*. – Mr President, thank you for this discussion. As I said in my opening remarks, the Council commitment to gender equality is real and unwavering. The Romanian Presidency has been organising bilateral talks with the blocking minority in order to seek a possible solution. We have also scheduled meetings at working-party level on the file, but we must not forget that the Presidency is in the hands of the Member States. Under the ordinary legislative procedure, an agreement among Member States requires a qualified majority.

In addition to the work we have undertaken in cooperation with Parliament to advance European legislation, we are also – as I mentioned – preparing a set of conclusions on the gender pay gap and policies to improve the reconciliation of work, family and private life. We hope to see these conclusions adopted at the Employment, Social Policy, Health and Consumer Affairs (EPSCO) Council on 13 June.

Allow me, also, to take this opportunity to inform you that the Romanian Presidency will be hosting the High-Level Group on Gender Mainstreaming in Bucharest in February. We are also looking forward to discussing the topic of gender equality at the informal meeting of the EPSCO ministers in Bucharest in April.

Thank you very much for this opportunity to discuss these important topics here today. By working together, the Council and Parliament, we can end discrimination and unfairness and make equal treatment a reality for all women and men. At this time of turbulence and transition, we face many challenges; however, the future belongs to equality.

**Presidente**. – La discussione congiunta è chiusa.

L'ordine del giorno reca la discussione con il Primo ministro finlandese, Juha Sipilä, sul futuro dell'Europa.

*(La seduta è sospesa per pochi istanti)*

*Dichiarazioni scritte (articolo 162)*

**Vilija Blinkevičiūtė (S&D)**, *raštu*. – Jau 2013 metais Europos Parlamente priėmėme savo poziciją dėl šios direktyvos, kuri galėtų būti labai geras pavyzdys, siekiant užtikrinti lyčių lygybę ir kitose srityse. Europos Sąjungos lygmeniu vis dar nėra užtikrinama lyčių lygybė aukščiausiose bendrovių pozicijose, tačiau turėtų būti išnaudojami turimi gabumai ir kartu skatinama lyčių pusiausvyra visų vidaus rinkoje veikiančių bendrovių valdybose. Sveikintina, kad Ispanijos vyriausybė prieš kelis mėnesius Tarybai pirmininkaujantiai Austrijai pranešė, jog atšauks savo išlygas dėl pasiūlymo, ir pasiūlė aktyviai bendradarbiauti su ES partneriais, kad pasiektų susitarimui pakankamą daugumą. Taigi, raginu šiuo metu Tarybai pirmininkaujantį Rumuniją įtraukti Moterų įmonių valdybose direktyvos klausimą į Tarybos posėdžių darbotvarkę, siekiant kad iki dabartinės Parlamento kadencijos pabaigos būtų rasta išeitis iš šios aklaivietės, į kurią pateko ši direktyva. Labai svarbu užtikrinti, kad lyčių lygybė vėl taptų pagrindine ES diskusijų tema.



**Lidia Joanna Geringer de Oedenberg (S&D)**, *na piśmie*. – Podczas kiedy równość płci jest jedną z podstawowych wartości Unii Europejskiej, kobiety nadal stanowią zdecydowaną mniejszość w zarządach i radach nadzorczych firm pomimo nieustających wysiłków zmierzających ku zwiększeniu różnorodności płciowej w najważniejszych organach krajowych. Obecnie globalnie kobiety zajmują 15 proc. miejsc w zarządach. W Polsce podobnie kobiety zajmują trochę ponad 15 proc. udziału w radach nadzorczych i stoją na czele 6,3 proc. zarządów firm spośród ponad 480 spółek giełdowych z rynku głównego.

W Unii Europejskiej wprowadzenie przepisów dotyczących parytetu w niektórych państwach członkowskich okazało się sukcesem. Jednak z danych zgromadzonych przez Europejski Instytut ds. Równości Kobiet i Mężczyzn wynika, że w 2017 r. kobiety stanowiły zaledwie 25 proc. wszystkich członków zarządów największych spółek giełdowych zarejestrowanych w UE, przy czym odnotowano duże rozbieżności między poszczególnymi państwami członkowskimi, gdzie udział kobiet wahał się od 7,4 % do 43 %. Wyraźnie ukazuje to duże znaczenie unijnej dyrektywy.

Dlatego postawa Rady w tej kwestii jest tak głęboko niepokojąca. Choć Parlament Europejski przyjął swoje stanowisko już w 2013 r., kiedy to poparł inicjatywę Komisji, która starała się rozwiązać kwestię nierówności, nakładając wymóg co najmniej 40 % udziału kobiet w zarządach spółek, dyrektywa jest wciąż zablokowana w Radzie pomimo licznych apeli z naszej strony.

**Daciana Octavia Sârbu (S&D)**, *în scris*. – Din păcate, de ani de zile vorbim despre o legislație la nivel european care să asigure echilibrul de gen în conducerea companiilor, dar lucrurile nu se mișcă. În 2012, Comisia a publicat o propunere de directivă privind îmbunătățirea echilibrului dintre bărbați și femei în rândul administratorilor neexecutivi ai întreprinderilor cotate la bursă, cunoscută de obicei sub numele de „Directiva privind femeile în consiliile de administrație”. Conform propunerii, nivelul de cel puțin 40 % dintre membrii neexecutivi ai sexului subreprezentat în consiliile de administrație ale întreprinderilor ar trebui să fie atins până în 2020 în sectorul privat și până în 2018 în sectorul public (așa-numitul „contingent procedural”). În ciuda presiunilor Comisiei și Consiliului, situația nu avansează deloc. Este nevoie ca, înainte de încheierea acestui mandat, Președinția Română să ia toate măsurile necesare pentru a ajunge la un acord între statele membre și adoptarea directivei.

**Claudia Țapardel (S&D)**, *în scris*. – Egalitatea de gen este o valoare fundamentală a Uniunii Europene, astfel femeile trebuie să beneficieze de aceleași oportunități ca bărbații pentru a ocupa poziții de conducere, atât în sectorul economic și financiar, cât și în cel al transporturilor. Valoarea economică adăugată și antreprenorială pe care femeile o aduc în mod activ ocupând funcții de înaltă răspundere este bine cunoscută. Propunerea din 2012 a Comisiei referitoare la directiva privind participarea femeilor în consiliile de administrație a urmărit să atenueze inegalitățile, impunând o reprezentare de minimum 40 % a femeilor în consiliile de administrație ale companiilor. Deși Parlamentul a adoptat și a sprijinit încă din 2013 inițiativa Comisiei, directiva este încă blocată în Consiliu. Introducerea legislației privind reprezentarea de minim 40 % a femeilor în consiliile de administrație s-a dovedit a fi un succes doar în unele state. Din punct de vedere statistic, femeile încă reprezintă doar un sfert din totalul membrilor consiliilor de administrație, existând discrepanțe mari între statele membre, unde prezența femeilor în consiliile de administrație variază între 7 % și 43 %. Acest lucru arată în mod clar că avem nevoie de o directivă europeană pentru a echilibra ponderea femeilor în funcții executive în orice domeniu de activitate.

**Monika Vana (Verts/ALE)**, *schriftlich*. – Wir brauchen eine frauenpolitische Offensive in Europa. Sowohl die EU-Mitgliedstaaten als auch die Kommission haben Frauenpolitik in die Dunkelkammer verbannt. Dabei liegen zahlreiche, einfach umsetzbare Maßnahmen am Tisch, um rasch für mehr Gleichstellung zu sorgen. Eine Schande, dass die Regierungen der EU-Staaten ihre Zustimmung dazu noch immer nicht gegeben haben! Das Europäische Parlament hat seine Hausaufgaben bereits gemacht. Es ist unfassbar, dass der Frauenanteil in börsennotierten Unternehmen in Österreich im Jahr 2018 von 6 auf 4,8 % zurückgegangen ist. Von 186 Vorständen sind nur neun weiblich. Jetzt sind die Mitgliedstaaten am Zug, Gender Mainstreaming endlich ernsthaft umzusetzen. Es ist offensichtlich, dass dort, wo Maßnahmen getroffen wurden, auch eine Veränderung eingetreten ist. Allerdings muss es auch ernsthafte Sanktionen für Unternehmen geben, wenn sie die Quote nicht erfüllen.

**PRESIDENZA DELL'ON. ANTONIO TAJANI***Presidente***4. Wznowienie posiedzenia***(La seduta è ripresa alle 10.13)***5. Debata z udziałem premiera Finlandii Juhy Sipilä na temat przyszłości Europy (debata)**

**President.** – First of all, I want to thank the Finnish Prime Minister for being here. Thank you very much. It is important for us to hear the different positions of the different countries on the future of the European Union.

For the European Parliament there are two, three or four key points. We want more power for the European Parliament. We want more Europe and not less Europe. We want to strengthen Europe and not to destroy Europe. On the MFF, we are in favour of a change from 1.1 to 1.3. We are in favour of own resources. Immigration is also an important point for the European Parliament. The European Parliament approved the reform of the Dublin rules. We want a decision by the European Council on this.

At the centre of today's debate there are two key points: Brexit and Venezuela. It is important to know your ideas on the future of the European Union. We know the position of the European Commission. There is the position of the European Parliament of course and there are the positions of different Member States. Now it is important to know the position of Finland.

Prime Minister, you have the floor.

**Juha Sipilä, Prime Minister of Finland.** – Mr President, I bring warm regards from very cold Finland. I was in the northern part of Finland, where I live, last weekend, and there was minus 30° and about a metre of snow – a real winter!

It's a pleasure to be here today. The European Parliament has done excellent work in the recent very challenging circumstances. Forward-looking discussions about the European Union are essential for two reasons. In order to realise the vision of the Rome Declaration we need to discuss how we achieve sufficient unity to make decisions and implement them. Secondly, we must debate to discover each other's priorities in relation to the EU's action and budget.

EU countries became familiar to me as an entrepreneur through sister companies around Europe. I remember, in my thirties, travelling to meet the CEO of a big French company. On the plane, I read a guidebook my wife had borrowed from the library for me. It said that you should never ask anything about family when you are in a business meeting with a Frenchman. When I arrived, there was a dinner meeting and the CEO was there with wife and daughter. The first question to me was 'Tell me about your family.' So I understood that we Europeans get along and we have more in common than we may think.

As long ago as the 1920s, a founder of the Finnish Centre Party, Santeri Alkio, wrote that, for the sake of peace in Europe, the continent should consider shifting its politics towards a United States of Europe. He even mentioned a common currency. He was a pioneer in many respects, including this one. Choosing international cooperation and generating peace and economic development have been guiding threads for Finland.

Friends, in recent years we have been given a lesson in populism in Europe. We have seen where it leads to when the solutions for complex issues are provided by simplifying matters. In the end, nobody takes responsibility. There has been such a case in the United Kingdom and the result is there for all to see. Not only Brexit but also populism hit the EU from several fronts. Setbacks on the rule of law, freedom of the press and women's rights are news we would not expect to hear in 21st century Europe.

How can the EU promote its common values in its external policies if it can't do so within the Union? Common values such as democracy and the rule of law have been the foundation of Europe's freedom, security and prosperity. They should unite the Member States. It is essential to bridge Europeans' internal divisions. At the same time, there cannot be any compromise on the rule of law.

Finland warmly welcomes the Commission's rule-of-law proposal in respect of the Multi-Annual Financial Framework (MFF). I am convinced that there is a way to establish a well-balanced mechanism to that end.

Mr President, honourable Members, the cornerstone in terms of Finland's position towards a developing EU, as well as monetary union, is to respect what has been agreed and to ensure efficient implementation. We strongly support the kind of European Union that achieves its credibility throughout concrete action. In 2015, my Government started with a situation where our public deficit was nearly 3.5% relative to GDP. We made 2% painful savings. We implemented reforms, improving public finances, including social and healthcare reform and pension reform.

An internal devaluation of 4% was made for the purpose of boosting employment and growth. We agreed with the unions on a salary freeze and cuts, an extension of 24 hours in annual working time and a decrease in employees' social security contributions, to name but a few aspects. As you might guess, this list was not very popular. However, now, after three years, the public deficit is covered, the state budget is in balance and the employment rate is the highest in 30 years.

With that said, the idea of solving problems of this kind through permanent fiscal transfers is unacceptable for us. The best insurance against economic shocks is a balanced budget and a low debt ratio. Many times over these years, I have come back to a quote from Jean Claude Juncker – 'We all know what to do, we just don't know how to get re-elected after we have done it.' For my part, I am testing this in practice in the upcoming elections in April. Let's see!

My point is that, despite the risk, the Member States must be capable of making decisions and implementing them. Efficient implementation is absolutely the best method of responding to current and future challenges.

We need implementation of the single market and R&D and innovations, implementation of the internal and external security policies, implementation of migration policies, implementation of climate policies. Better implementation is the best tool in fighting populism and in increasing citizens' confidence in the European Union.

Honourable Members, Finland holds the EU Presidency in the second half of this year, so next I will point out some areas that will be on the agenda during our Presidency. These are also topics on which the EU must be able to work more closely together and to 'walk the talk' efficiently.

I'll start with the MFF, which is a key implementation tool for future EU policy. In Finland's view, the overall level of the MFF should be as close as possible to current relative share. The focus needs to be in the areas where the EU is best placed to deliver, such as migration, security, the single market, innovation, digitalisation and climate.

We also see a need to reallocate funding for rural development within the budget. The common agriculture policy helps to provide affordable and safe food to our citizens. It ensures that farmers can make a reasonable living and it promotes jobs in the farming and food industry. At the same time, cohesion policy creates more balanced development between and inside the Member States. I am confident that we will be able to find a balanced compromise between traditional policy areas and new challenges. I am also confident that we can do it during the Finnish Presidency.

Secondly, we need a migration policy with a comprehensive approach. To begin with, the root causes of migration must be addressed more efficiently. In addition to development cooperation and humanitarian aid, trade and investments are needed to create jobs and sustainable development. We must also work hard to develop a more effective return policy. The internal aspect of migration is in our own hands. We should manage migration increasingly throughout direct resettlements from the refugee camps. This would mean less pressure on the EU's external borders and less smuggling. At the same time, management of our external borders should be reinforced.

There is also a need to proceed with the most complicated political issues, including a mechanism on solidarity during crises. It's crucial that we agree on this in advance, not in the middle of a crisis – as we did in 2015.

Thirdly, security and defence cooperation is important and needs to be intensified. Finland has been actively calling for ambitious progress on security and defence cooperation, together too with France. Now we welcome the progress made: the creation of a European defence fund and Permanent Structured Cooperation (PESCO) have been steps in the right direction. Now we should take concrete action on implementation and achieving results.

The EU has also strengthened its capacity for countering hybrid threats. The European Centre for Countering Hybrid Threats, in Helsinki, contributes to the preparedness of NATO and EU countries against these threats. I want to thank the 19 participating countries, of which 16 are EU Member States, for their strong commitment. I would also welcome all the remaining Member States joining the centre.

Fourth, we must improve the single market. We are the best single market in the world. Alongside innovation and trade, this is our best way to create new jobs. A lot of potential exists, especially in services and digital products. Improving the situation is entirely in our own hands. I urge you to find a common mindset in order to pass those 35 proposals which are still under negotiation.

Looking ahead, I hope that the future Commission will take a more holistic approach, within which the single market, digitalisation, industrial policy and external competitiveness are better interlinked. We should aim at forward-looking growth strategy, including, inter alia, data mobility and artificial intelligence. It's also important to enhance competitiveness by implementing the principles of the EU social pillar. For instance, it is crucial to promote equality in working life and to enhance the education level of all citizens.

Fifth, trade policy is also crucial for the EU's competitiveness and new jobs. In respect of free trade agreements, I am pleased with the latest achievements vis-à-vis Japan, Vietnam, Singapore, Mexico and Canada, and with the rapid progress in ongoing negotiations. However, it's harmful if the big players continue to build trade walls. We must do everything we can to prevent the erection of, or tear down, such walls. This is especially the view from smaller countries, to which the damage would be fatal. We must respect and obey the common rules on trade.

And lastly, the EU must take a lead on climate change action.

The report by the International Panel on Climate Change again reminded us of the threat posed by climate change to life on Earth. We can't walk away from science. Besides a threat, I see many possibilities in this global challenge. As an engineer, I tend to think in a solution-based and technology-based way. I am sure that, as the world moves towards low-carbon development, we are in the front line in developing new technologies, and ambitious climate policy will also support job creation here in Europe. We need measures on three fronts: CO<sub>2</sub> emissions, carbon sinks and new technologies.

Last week, Finland hosted a Nordic climate meeting in Helsinki. Nordic countries gave a promise to raise the level of their climate ambition by 2020. The Nordic countries want to catalyse mitigation efforts to limit global warming to 1.5 degrees.

Also in the round-table discussions in the Finnish Parliament, eight Finnish parties set an objective that the EU should achieve carbon neutrality before 2050. That requires tightening the emission reduction obligation for 2030 to at least 55% of the 1990 levels. The EU Emissions Trading System (ETS) is the most cost-efficient way to reduce greenhouse gas emissions. Finland aims to renew the system so that the price of the emission allowances guides operators towards emission reductions more quickly and efficiently.

We have proposed that new sectors, such as heating and cooling of buildings, be integrated into the ETS. Furthermore, we have accelerated the transition towards a circular economy and the bio-economy. The Bio-economy Action Plan should be implemented without delay.

As a small detail, my Government decided not to give any EU Presidency gifts: instead we used the money to offset the emissions caused by air travel during the Presidency.

(Applause)

Second, we need to increase carbon sinks. We have four billion hectares of forest and five billion hectares of fields. It has surprised me to learn how much more agricultural fields could bind CO<sub>2</sub> if we made some changes in farming practices. We have 100 so-called carbon farmers testing new practices in Finland.

Oceans and carbonate minerals too can lock down carbon dioxide, and we also need to plant more forests. In Africa alone, two million hectares of forest are lost every year. That is equivalent to Slovenia's total land area. As the UN Food and Agriculture Organisation's report on the state of the world's forests says, the world response to climate change must focus more on forest.

One concrete step we should take in relation to the EU's external funding is to increase global carbon sinks. Finland has proposed an EU-African forest fund. Forest investments would maximise the impact on climate and rural jobs in Africa.

Third, new technology must be adapted. Even now, we have the technical capacity to capture CO<sub>2</sub> from the air and convert it into other products. The EU needs to invest in research and development and to exploit the huge potential of science, technology and innovation in this area more effectively.

We also have to think of innovative ways – new incentives and market driven methods – to ensure carbon sinks will be increased. My strong message is that we have to do more and faster. We must reduce emissions, increase carbon sinks and adapt new technologies to capture CO<sub>2</sub> from the air or directly from the emission sources.

Fellow Europeans, after the European Parliament elections, the European Council needs to agree on an ambitious and comprehensive agenda. Besides climate change, our focus should be on growth and security, while rule-of-law issues will also remain central.

This is my call for a more united European Union, capable of concrete action and implementation, and of bearing responsibility. This means responsibility for ourselves, for people and their surroundings close to us, for the economy and for the planet. Let's remember that we are all here to safeguard a better future for youth and the generations to come. For our sake and for our common future, we all need a determined, efficient and united European Union.

I cannot highlight more the importance of getting things done. That is why I have underlined the word 'implementation' in this speech so many times. The democratic forces of Europe will win back the trust of the people by making decisions and implementing them, at home and also here in Brussels.

(Applause)

**Jean-Claude Juncker**, *président de la Commission*. – Monsieur le Président, Monsieur le Premier ministre, Mesdames et Messieurs les députés, nous sommes heureux, Jyrki et moi, d'être avec le Premier ministre finlandais, mon ami Juha.

La Finlande est devenue membre de l'Union européenne en 1995. Le hasard a voulu que je sois devenu Premier ministre le même jour, et depuis lors, l'Europe fonctionne parfois. J'ai toujours noté que la Finlande, dès le premier jour de son adhésion, se comportait comme un État membre fondateur, comme si elle avait toujours été là, et certains États membres fondateurs gagneraient à prendre exemple sur elle et à adopter le même comportement.

(Applaudissements)

La Finlande, depuis qu'elle est membre, a toujours fait preuve d'une grande faculté d'écoute. La Finlande et ses gouvernements respectifs savent écouter, et la Finlande entend ce qu'elle écoute et traduit en politiques ce qu'elle a appris en écoutant les autres. Tel fut le cas de tous les Premiers ministres. J'ai commencé avec Paavo Lipponen, j'étais avec mon ami Jyrki, je suis avec toi maintenant, et je verrai Paavo ce soir. Aujourd'hui, j'ai une journée finlandaise. Trois Premiers ministres qui s'adressent à la Commission, c'est rare, mais c'est utile.

La troisième présidence finlandaise point à l'horizon, et ce sera une présidence particulière puisqu'elle interviendra après les élections européennes, avant la nomination de nouveaux présidents de la Commission et du Conseil, avant la nomination du président de la Banque centrale, et ce sera donc une période qui demandera beaucoup de doigté, lorsqu'il s'agit de présider l'Union européenne, comme la Finlande l'a fait lors de ses deux premières présidences.

When it comes to relations between Finland and the Commission, the relations couldn't be better. We are working in full confidence. That was the case when we were establishing the security and defence mechanism. That is the case when it comes to energy and climate, and this is the case when it comes to developing connectivity infrastructure in the border region of Finland.

I would, in the name of the Commission, like to make use of the Finnish Presidency in order to develop the Arctic dimension. This is an important issue because the Arctic region is warming at twice the global average rate of temperature increase. Finland is holding, for the time being, the Presidency of the Arctic Council. I was discussing with my friend Juha when I was in Finland in November the idea of calling during the Finnish Presidency a Summit of the Arctic Council because I think that we have to make sure that the Arctic region is moving to the top of the European agenda.

Aber die finnische Präsidentschaft muss auch sonst vieles leisten. Ich hätte gerne – das wäre mein Wunsch –, dass wir während des finnischen Ratsvorsitzes in Sachen Vertiefung der Wirtschafts- und Währungsunion weiterkommen, die Bankenunion vervollständigen und die Kapitalmarktunion auf endgültige Wege bringen.

Im Zentrum dessen, was unter finnischer Präsidentschaft passieren wird, steht natürlich die mittelfristige Finanzplanung. Das ist ein hartes Stück Arbeit, das ist das Bohren dicker Bretter. Und die finnische Präsidentschaft kann sich vollumfänglich auf die Kommission verlassen, wenn es darum geht, die Fortschritte während der finnischen Präsidentschaft zu erzielen, die es braucht, damit wir beim Europäischen Rat im Oktober dieses Jahres zum Abschluss kommen. Wir müssen diesen mittelfristigen Finanzrahmen in diesem Jahr unter Dach und Fach bringen. Ansonsten verlieren wir wertvolle Zeit, die wir brauchen, um die Programme zu entwerfen, zu entwickeln und umzusetzen.

Auch wäre ich der finnischen Ratspräsidentschaft dankbar, wenn sie im Rahmen des mehrjährigen Finanzrahmens, aber auch in Sachen Vertiefung der Wirtschafts- und Währungsunion die Vorschläge der Kommission auf dem Tisch behielte, die da heißen: ein Instrument zur Stärkung der Strukturreformen und ein Stabilisierungsinstrument, um die Europäische Wirtschafts- und Währungsunion gegen externe Schocks wetterfest zu machen. Der letzte Europäische Rat hat sich diesem Thema vorsichtig wie ein Igel genähert. Aber die Menschen warten darauf, dass wir die Wirtschafts- und Währungsunion so ausstatten, dass sie bei der nächsten Krise besser reagieren kann, als das bei der letzten Krise der Fall war.

Und dann möchte ich mich auch bei der finnischen Regierung bedanken, dass sie zu denen gehört, die in Europa dem Investitionsplan von Jyrki und von mir größte Aufmerksamkeit geschenkt haben. Bis jetzt wurden acht Milliarden Euro an Investitionen aufgrund dieses Planes in Finnland implementiert. Es wäre gut, wenn alle dies so täten.

Ich wünsche Dir, Juha, alles Gute im April, alles Gute für die finnische Ratspräsidentschaft. Macht weiter so!

(Beifall)

**Manfred Weber**, *on behalf of the PPE Group*. – Mr President, I would like to welcome Prime Minister Sipilä to the European Parliament. Prime Minister, you are here at a crucial moment in time. The people have the say for the future of your country in April, and Europe in May, so it is a democratic competition in the next weeks ahead of us.

I start with this because your capital, Helsinki, is for my party, for the European People's Party (EPP), and also for myself, a special place of democracy. We had our Congress there when I was nominated as candidate for my party and practised there what people expect from us – to have competition, to have lively discussions about the future, to present candidates, and then people can choose. People decide about the future, in which direction we should go. The principles of nationalism and European democracy will be at the centre of developments in the upcoming months.

I want to share some points you mentioned in your speech; some considerations on this. First, from the EPP point of view, I fully support what you said on financial discipline. It sounds technical, it sounds market-orientated, it sounds euro-business orientated. But it is absolutely in the interests of our children. Sustainability is the key word when we talk about financial discipline, and the EU will always have the EPP on a national level, and on a European level with us as the EPP, and Jyrki is also working on this on your side. Then it is about this sustainability, because that means future.

The second point I want to mention is an answer to your speeches about the Multiannual Financial Framework (MFF). There, let me be a little bit critical because you started in your paragraph on speaking about the MFF, you started with saying first of all the amount of money must be fixed. That is what we always hear from the national leaders. I think that's the wrong question. A good question is: what are the tasks ahead of us? What is the demand we have in the European Union? Because we hear from a lot of leaders that say we should fix the money but then additionally we need a strong border control, we have to do something on cybersecurity and we have to build up more innovation in the European Union. So if this is a demand for Europe, then the Member States must also be fair with the contribution to the budget. Then we have to put the money on the table we need for giving an answer on the demands on the table. So the starting point is to speak about the demands.

The third point I want to mention in my short contribution today is about, probably the most challenging for all of us, and is what 35 000 school kids told us when there was demonstrating in the last weeks in Europe – Pope Francis is calling it the illness of the earth – and that is climate change. Thank you for your statement on this specific point. I want to only underline the approach towards the climate change challenge, some of the principles we, as the EPP, believe in. One principle is that the solution on climate change, to give an answer is not to forbid things, is not to prohibit things, is not to ban things. It's not to say to the citizen that they cannot go any more on their holidays to Majorca because the CO<sub>2</sub> footprint is too intense. That's not our answer. Our answer is that in the future people will fly to Majorca in a clean airplane. Innovation is the key to give an answer on this. That is what we have to do. We cannot say to the developing countries or to the emerging economies in the world that they have to stop to grow. That they cannot develop anymore. That is not the answer. The answer is that we as Europeans can provide the developing countries with the technologies to have growth without climate impact. That is our answer. So innovation is, for us, a key principle.

The second point I want to underline in the CO<sub>2</sub> field is that we have to do it together with the people. The people must follow the changes. In the car industry we have a lot of people who are concerned about the changes. You see the demonstrations of the Yellow Vests in France, for example. A lot of people here in this room can finance higher energy prices, but outside there are a lot of people who cannot finance higher energy prices. So we have to do the changes in a way that people accept the changes and follow our approach. We have to create winners and not losers in this regard.

Finally on CO<sub>2</sub> and climate change: together, we are strong. We made the Paris Agreement possible. We made the steps already with the CO<sub>2</sub> car emission reduction for example. We are ambitious. We are the owner of this fight against CO<sub>2</sub> on a global level and we can show to our citizens that together we can achieve a lot.

**Jeppe Kofod**, *on behalf of the S&D Group*. – Mr President, I would like to say to the Prime Minister that his country, Finland, is among the world leaders in many areas from clean energy and gender equality to social progress. I think Transparency International only this week named Finland as the third least corrupt country in the world and let us not forget last year's World Happiness Report, according to which Finns are now the happiest people in the world. Coming from Denmark I am a little bit disappointed that you took over our place at that point. Congratulations on this impressive record. Finland clearly demonstrates that small countries can be on top of the world, not only in geographical terms.

But, Prime Minister, in your speech today, besides better implementation, I missed this ambition to be a champion and driver for positive social change in Europe. Where is your ambition to make Europe the world leader in a transformation to a sustainable development model in a just way where all people are included? Where is your ambition to make the lives of Europeans better? What you presented to us today sounded a little bit more like yesterday's neoliberal slogans that led to the deep economic and social crisis in Europe.

Prime Minister, we Socialists and Democrats have an ambitious vision for Europe. We live in times when our Earth and our sources of life are under attack from climate change and pollution. You rightly mentioned that. The air we breathe, the water we drink, the soil our crops are grown in are the future of our children and it is our duty to protect them. But our citizens and our workers are also tired of being the only ones paying for the transformation to a more sustainable way of production. They are outraged to see multinationals polluting our planet and reaping huge benefit, but not paying their fair taxes.

This must change, Prime Minister. We need to change the Stability and Growth Pact to become a true sustainability pact for Europe. Therefore we have drawn up a plan to shift towards more sustainable ways of working, producing, living which go hand in hand with social progress for the people – a just transition – with the United Nations Development Goals as our signpost. Today I call on Finland to join us in this very important battle. We Europeans need to shape globalisation our way, not fall victim to destructive forces. We must be rule-makers, not rule-takers, because we live in times with growing inequality caused by the greediness of some elites and uncontrolled globalisation. The only way to address this is by finally fixing taxation and ensuring good salaries and working conditions for all, based on the Social Pillar. I didn't hear you mention the Social Pillar some of us fought so hard to adopt in the European Union.

Prime Minister, fair taxation is the foundation for European welfare states like the Nordic ones, which we come from, and citizens' trust in democratic government. But are you willing to join us in this battle for fair taxation? Professor Richard Murphy showed in a study last week that the tax gap in Europe is EUR 825 billion, a gigantic amount of money.

Our group has been in the forefront in the fight against money laundering and tax crimes. We call for a minimum corporate effective tax in Europe to stop the race to the bottom on corporate taxation. We call for stricter criteria and a for true tax haven list, which also calls out tax havens right here in the European Union.

What do the people not understand is that while we as citizens have to pay high taxes, internet giants like Google and Facebook pay less than 1% in tax on what they earn in Europe? That is not fair. We need to protect our welfare states. We need to fight, not only for free, but also for fair, competition and for fairness for European citizens who today pay the price of multinationals' tax dodging and we can achieve that. If we achieved that, Prime Minister, your recent project in Finland, – as I understand, the privatisation of hospitals and health care – could not just had been avoided, but public health care could have been strengthened in Finland, for example.

So the status quo is not an option. It's time for radical change to shape Europe for all people and leave nobody behind. Prime Minister, we see forces that are tearing our societies apart, but we need this radical change to social democracy and to more sustainable equality. We are campaigning for that as social democrats in Europe and we hope that liberals and other progressives will also join this fight.

*(Applause)*

**Pirkko Ruohonen-Lerner**, *ECR-ryhmän puolesta*. – Tervetuloa Euroopan parlamenttiin, pääministeri Sipilä. Yhteinen tavoitteemme Euroopan unionissa on varmaankin eurooppalaisen hyvinvoinnin lisääminen. Siksi haluaisin nyt nostaa esille konkreettisia asioita erityisesti maahanmuuton, kansalaisten turvallisuuden, veronkierron estämisen ja väärinkäytösten ilmoittajien suojelun parantamisen.

Pääministeri Sipilä, syksyllä 2015 tarjositte julkisesti hulpeaa yhdeksän makuuhuoneen omakotitaloanne turvapaikanhakijoiden käyttöön. Uutinen tästä levisi myös arabimaiden medioihin, mikä entisestään lisäsi tulijoiden määrää. Monet irakilaiset nuoret miehet ovat sanoneet, että pääministerin tarjous sai heidät tulemaan nimenomaan Suomeen.

Pääministerin esittämän kutsun lisäksi Eurooppaan lähtöä miettivät saivat lehdistä lukea kuvauksia ilmaisista koulutus- ja sairaanhoitopalveluista, puhtaasta ja kauniista luonnosta ja kauniista nuorista naisista, joilla on Al-Arabia-mediaa lainaten "vaaleat hiukset, siniset silmät ja hampaat kuin helmet".



Pääministerin sinänsä sydämellinen kutsu oli vetovoimatekijä, jonka haittavaikutuksista joudumme nyt kärsimään suurten kustannusten, samoin naiseen ja jopa lapsiin kohdistuneiden seksuaalirikosten muodossa. Lisäksi kansalaisten turvallisuuden tunne on heikentynyt. Pääministeri Sipilä, tunnistatteko sen, että avokätisen tarjouksenne seurauksena Suomeen on tullut paljon ihmisiä, joilla ei ole perusteita turvapaikan saamiselle, ja joita ei olisi koskaan pitänyt maahamme päästää.

Lähtömaiden ongelmat eivät ratkea siirtämällä niiden väestö Eurooppaan, vaan ongelmat on ratkaistava niiden lähteellä. Euroopan hyvinvointivaltiot eivät voi toimia koko maailman sosiaalitoimistona.

Suomessa on puhuttu paljon vanhustenhoidon tilasta. Esillä on ollut erityisesti vanhusten asumis- ja hoivapalveluita tarjoavat yksityiset yritykset. Eräs niistä on rahanahneudessaan säästänyt liikaa henkilöstökuluissa ja samalla laiminlyönyt potilasturvallisuutta. Monet yritykset ovat myös vältelleet veroja korkojärjestelyillä ja sijoittamalla valtaosan omistuksistaan veroparatiisisaarille. Vanhustenhoidon lisäksi tapaukset muistuttavat meitä siitä, että tarvitsemme tehokkaampia keinoja veronkierron vastaiseen toimintaan.

On hyvä, että pitkään pinnan alla muhineet epäkohdat tulevat ilmi. Olisi tärkeää luoda toimintakulttuuri, jossa kaikista rikoksista ja rikkeistä, kuten esimerkiksi vakavista vanhustenhoidon laiminlyönneistä, samoin veronkierrosta ja ympäristörikoksista, uskalletaan ilmoittaa valvoville viranomaisille heti kun ne havaitaan. Väärinkäytöksistä ilmoittavia henkilöitä ei tule rangaista vaan heidät tulee nähdä yleisen edun puolustajina. Heille on luotava helppokäyttöisiä ja luottamuksellisia kanavia ilmoitusten tekemiseen. Toivon, että tehokas väärinkäytösten ilmoittajien suojele saadaan pikaisesti lainsäädäntöön kaikissa EU-maissa, myös Suomessa.

**Guy Verhofstadt**, *on behalf of the ALDE Group*. – Mr President, well Prime Minister, as per Jean-Claude Juncker, my start as Prime Minister was also in Finland. You remember that my first Summit was in Tampere. I remember two things from Tampere in 1999: first of all, the reinder on the menu for the Summit, and secondly that we decided there to have a common European migration and asylum policy. We are still struggling with the Member States to have one.

I am pleased that in your intervention, you started with Santeri Alkio who said – and I have a quote from him, it was Nils who helped me naturally, as he is from Finland – ‘the people’s idea of the League of Nations should be urgently taken by Europe to build a United States of Europe’. Whether it was in the 1920s or the 1930s, I don’t know. It was in the 1920s. It is a fantastic project that needs to be built, and certainly in your intervention, and I want to take three points that in my opinion are necessary for that.

First of all, on the eurozone and the governance of the eurozone. I agree with you, we don’t need a reform of the eurozone to replace the homework that Member States have to do with new instruments. They have to do their homework. That’s not at stake. What is at stake is that a single currency, at world level, needs fiscal capacity; needs, based on the official capacity, euro safe assets to be used at world level in order to have more harmonious growth inside the eurozone and an instrument against what we call ‘asymmetric shocks’. All this cannot be done through the homework of the Member States alone. There is something common that needs to be tackled. So I agree with you, but the one doesn’t contradict the other, in my opinion.

My second point is on the single market. You said ‘yes, we have the best single market in the world’. I will rectify it a little bit. We could maybe have the best single market in the world when we also have a single market in the markets of the future – digital, energy, capital. I think there is one good solution: create one regulator at European level and, automatically, we shall see the emerging single digital, energy and capital markets.

My third point is on defence. I think the biggest waste of money for the moment in the European Union is the lack and the non-existence of a real European Defence Union. We are spending half the amount of the Americans on military. We have a budget in Europe on military that is three times bigger than the Russians’ budget, but we are not capable, I think, to do our defence alone and that’s because we have 28 times duplication and that’s why I hope, also, that the European Defence Union will be one of the key priorities of the Finnish Presidency.

**Ska Keller**, *on behalf of the Verts/ALE Group*. – Mr President, Prime Minister I wish to thank you very much for joining in this debate on the future of Europe. And while we're speaking, there are tens of thousands of school students outside in the streets here in Brussels. They've also been marching in Finland. And they show us what really matters – to put people and planet before profit. We should really take them seriously.

So I want to ask you today Prime Minister to commit to the future, to listen to those young people and to invest in the future when it comes to climate protection, to education and to working together as Europeans.

On climate protection, the EU has a huge responsibility and every Member State has to play its role. I'm very happy that you mentioned that you are very committed to that – that you want to go ahead; that you want to have more ambitious climate targets, fantastic! And you've mentioned the important role of carbon sinks as well, and Finland is in the lucky position to have a very large carbon sink at hand. The beautiful Finnish forests are an important natural heritage for your country and also largely due to its forests Finland has become the welfare state that it is today.

But they are also an important factor indeed in the EU climate policy. The Finnish forests capture 27 million tonnes of CO<sub>2</sub> equivalent per year. So it is in our common interest to preserve them, and to manage them sustainably but different from what you said – your government actually plans logging of the Finnish forests, which are not sustainable, which are absolutely excessive, and they will put the huge asset that you have in fighting the climate crisis at risk.

So I hope that after your very good speech today, your government will reverse that position to save the great natural heritage that you have, but also to preserve the carbon sinks, because if we wanted to achieve a net zero carbon economy in Europe by 2050 then we need more forests and not less. And rather than telling other countries that they should grow more forests, it is important that we do something in order to keep our own forests.

So I'm very happy that you've mentioned that you want to have more ambitious targets. We are very much on your side and I am glad to see that you've been doing that in the Nordic Council but I hope that you can also bring that to the EU Council, to your fellow Prime Ministers, to make sure that this goes ahead in Europe. That would be an efficient implementation.

And the young people that I've mentioned – they are also the ones that will run our countries, societies, economies, in the Member States, in the EU, in the not too distant future and I think it is better sooner than later.

And education is a big part of preparing them for the task, and Finland is famous for its education system. Everyone came to Finland to copy Finland's famous school system. But I am sad to see that the current government has been ready to give up its position by cutting almost EUR 1 billion from educational research. But we need more investment into the future, not less.

This is also something that we need to talk about, when it comes to the MFF at European level. The European Union must strengthen the social cohesion in Europe and contribute to the welfare of all its citizens and not just those who have good connections to state or businesses.

So we need to invest in that. We need to invest in the future and there are so many more tasks that the European Union is given all the time and for that we need adequate resources. So we will not accept a shrinking budget and the Finnish Presidency will be key in order to ensure sufficient finances for the European Union because only then it can efficiently implement its tasks.

Mr Prime Minister you also said in your speech how important common values, our rule of law and a united Europe are and you've mentioned the danger of populism. I very much agree with that. However, you have experience in working together with a right-wing populist party – this is news to some of your former allies – and I think you're fully aware of the common challenges that our continent is currently facing.

Nationalists and far right movements all across Europe are gaining support by spreading fear and disinformation and pro-European speeches are wonderful; we need them; they're necessary. But it is by our actions that we truly show where our heart stands and how much our words mean. That's where we show that we are serious, that we are committed to building that better future together.

As Finland's EU presidency takes place this summer, I hope to see that your country will then be on the progressive side leading the way forward for a united, fair and climate-friendly European Union.

**Νεοκλής Συλικιώτης**, εξ ονόματος της ομάδας GUE/NGL. – Κύριε πρωθυπουργέ, σας καλωσορίζω από μέρους της Ευρωπαϊκής Ενωτικής Αριστεράς και της Βόρειας Πράσινης Αριστεράς στο Ευρωπαϊκό Κοινοβούλιο. Συζητάμε σήμερα για ακόμα μια φορά το μέλλον της Ένωσης. Ένα μέλλον που καθορίζεται όμως από τη συνέχιση των ίδιων αδιέξοδων και αντιλαϊκών πολιτικών, των πολιτικών που προωθούν τη φτώχοποίηση και τη διάλυση του κοινωνικού κράτους, που προκαλούν την καταστροφή του περιβάλλοντος, που προωθούν τη στρατικοποίηση αλλά και το φλερτ των κυρίαρχων πολιτικών κύκλων με τον ρατσισμό και τη ξενοφοβία.

Πόσο πιο δυνατά χρειάζεται να το πουν οι λαοί της Ένωσης πως χρειάζεται ρήξη με τις νεοφιλελεύθερες πολιτικές λιτότητας, ρήξη με τις πολιτικές σε βάρος του περιβάλλοντος, ρήξη με τις πολιτικές του κοινωνικού κράτους; Μόλις την προηγούμενη εβδομάδα ξεχυθήκαν στους δρόμους των Βρυξελλών δεκάδες χιλιάδες μαθητές και εργαζόμενοι για αλλαγή της πορείας των πολιτικών για το κλίμα. Στη Γαλλία και αλλού οι εργαζόμενοι εκφράζουν τον θυμό και την αγανάκτησή τους για τις πολιτικές οι οποίες τους φτωχοποιούν. Ακόμα και στη Φινλανδία, που αποτέλεσε παράδειγμα κράτους κοινωνικής αλληλεγγύης, η κοινωνία παρακολουθεί παγωμένη σκάνδαλα που ήταν αποτέλεσμα των ιδιωτικοποιήσεων και της απορρύθμισης στον τομέα της Υγείας: υποστελέχωση σε στέγες ηλικιωμένων λόγω ιδιωτικοποιήσεων, ακατάλληλα φάρμακα στους ηλικιωμένους, αύξηση του κέρδους των εταιριών φροντίδας.

Πριν από δυο χρόνια από αυτό εδώ το βήμα ο Πρόεδρος Juncker αναγκάστηκε να ομολογήσει ότι η Ευρωπαϊκή Ένωση χάνει τον κοινωνικό της χαρακτήρα και κινδυνεύει να γίνει η «Άγρια Δύση» του κοινωνικού ντάμπινγκ. Δεν παραδέχθηκε όμως ποιες πολιτικές οδήγησαν εδώ: οι πολιτικές που παράγουν τη νεανική ανεργία, τη φτώχεια, τις περιφερειακές και κοινωνικές ανισότητες, ενώ ταυτόχρονα λειαινεται το έδαφος για την άνοδο της Ακροδεξιάς, του ρατσισμού και της ξενοφοβίας. Όσοι δεν αναγνωρίζουν την αιτία προφανώς θα συνεχίσουν με τις ίδιες συνταγές και στον ίδιο δρόμο.

Κύριε πρωθυπουργέ, αγαπητοί συνάδελφοι, αυτό που χρειάζεται σήμερα η Ευρώπη είναι κοινωνική δικαιοσύνη και κοινωνική αλληλεγγύη. Χρειάζεται να ανακατανέμεται δίκαια ο παραγόμενος πλούτος για κοινωνική δικαιοσύνη όχι για τις τράπεζες και τις πολυεθνικές. Χρειάζεται έναν άλλο δρόμο ανάπτυξης, που να δημιουργεί μόνιμες αξιοπρεπείς θέσεις εργασίας και πλήρη εργασιακά δικαιώματα: να προασπίζεται τον δημόσιο χαρακτήρα των στρατηγικών τομέων και υπηρεσιών κάθε χώρας: να ενισχύει την κοινωνική προστασία για τους αδύναμους και όχι να διανέμει ευχολόγια χωρίς καμιά δεσμευτική ισχύ, όπως είναι ο περιβόητος ευρωπαϊκός κοινωνικός πυλώνας, ούτε να δίνει πακτωλό χρημάτων στο Ταμείο για την Άμυνα τα οποία αποκόπτονται από τις κοινωνικές δαπάνες, την παιδεία και την υγεία. Πώς να μην διερωτώνται οι πολίτες της Ένωσης γιατί υπάρχουν 38,5 δισεκατομμύρια ευρώ για το νέο Ταμείο για την Άμυνα ενώ κλείνουν τα γηροκομεία στη Φινλανδία;

Η Ένωση χρειάζεται μια τολμηρή πολιτική για την αντιμετώπιση της κλιματικής αλλαγής. Σήμερα η βιομηχανία καθορίζει τις πολιτικές για το κλίμα σύμφωνα με τις δικές της ανάγκες. Οι λαοί όμως απαιτούν πραγματικές λύσεις. Απαιτούν πολιτικές αποφάσεις που να θέτουν φραγμό στην ανεξέλεγκτη και ασύδοτη δράση των πολυεθνικών επιχειρήσεων και δεσμευτικούς στόχους για προστασία του περιβάλλοντος και αντιμετώπισης της κλιματικής αλλαγής –ακόμα πιο φιλόδοξους στόχους από τη Συμφωνία του Παρισιού.

Τέλος, η Ευρώπη χρειάζεται μια πολιτική ασύλου και μετανάστευσης βασισμένη στο διεθνές δίκαιο, στην ανθρωπιστική αλληλεγγύη προς τους πρόσφυγες αλλά και την αλληλεγγύη ανάμεσα στα κράτη μέλη. Χρειάζεται να δημιουργηθεί ένας μόνιμος μηχανισμός για τη φιλοξενία όλων των προσφύγων σε όλα τα κράτη μέλη ανάλογα με τις δυνατότητες του καθενός. Κύριε πρωθυπουργέ, για να γίνουν αυτά χρειαζόμαστε μια άλλη Ευρώπη, την Ευρώπη για την οποία παλεύει η Αριστερά, την Ευρώπη της ειρήνης, της πραγματικής αλληλεγγύης, της κοινωνικής δικαιοσύνης, την Ευρώπη των λαών.

**Rosa D'Amato**, a nome del gruppo EFDD. – Signor Presidente, onorevoli colleghi, gentile Primo ministro, il futuro dell'Unione europea deve passare da un radicale e profondo processo di cambiamento che chiedono sempre di più i cittadini europei. I segnali ci sono tutti: i partiti dell'establishment che si identificano nelle famiglie politiche dei Socialisti e dei Popolari perdono ovunque in Europa e perderanno anche nelle prossime elezioni europee. L'Italia è capofila di questo processo di cambiamento. I cittadini sono stufi di austerità, corruzione, ingiustizie, privilegi e sprechi. Grazie alle risorse messe a disposizione dalla rete si sono uniti e, dal basso, hanno pacificamente conquistato in pochi anni il governo del paese e mandato a casa una casta politica sorda alle esigenze dei cittadini. Le faccio un esempio di cosa comporta questo cambiamento: in Italia, in passato, le manovre economiche erano sinonimo di macelleria sociale in nome della stabilità dei conti pubblici. Oggi invece noi restituiamo risorse e dignità ai cittadini, puntando sullo sviluppo e sull'occupazione. Con la manovra italiana riduciamo il debito attraverso la crescita trainata dagli investimenti e dai tagli agli sprechi, abbiamo tolto i vitalizi ai politici e finanziato il reddito di cittadinanza – che la Finlandia conosce molto bene. Il reddito di cittadinanza è di fatto una manovra economica a sé stante, finalizzata non all'assistenzialismo ma alla

riconversione della forza del lavoro. Il nostro obiettivo è ridurre la povertà, in Italia ci sono oltre 5 milioni di poveri; permettere l'acquisizione di nuove competenze professionali a chi è fuori dal mercato del lavoro e creare quindi occupazione. Gli imprenditori avranno risorse umane qualificate funzionali alle loro esigenze, avranno anche degli sgravi dalle assunzioni; il reddito rilancerà il consumo interno. Vogliamo rendere più forte l'Italia in un'Europa unita e solidale ma anche nel mondo.

Gentile Presidente, l'Europa deve stare attenta ai falsi profeti del cambiamento, però, quelli che davanti ai lobbisti si piegano. Macron, per esempio, oggi annulla il divieto di uso del glifosato in agricoltura. Questo doveva partire nel 2021. I cittadini non sono stupidi, però. Macron fa dietrofront a pochi giorni dal vertice di Aquisgrana con la Merkel e fa un grosso regalo alla tedesca Bayer che ha acquistato la Monsanto, nel 2018. Cambia idea invece di applicare il principio di precauzione che è sancito nei trattati europei. Vogliamo davvero rilanciare l'Europa? Allora smettiamola con l'ipocrisia e cambiamola, davvero! I cittadini vogliono i fatti. L'Europa deve essere protagonista nello scenario mondiale e parlare con una voce forte e unica. Serve, ad esempio, un seggio per l'Unione europea nel Consiglio di sicurezza dell'Onu. Invece, con la firma del trattato di Aquisgrana, Merkel e Macron disegnano la loro Unione del futuro; una superpotenza in cui però i conti sono pagati da 27 e le decisioni, però si prendono in 2, escludendo, con buona pace dei trattati della democrazia, 500 milioni di cittadini europei dal processo decisionale. Io vi ricordo che due debolezze non fanno una forza; un'Europa telecomandata da Berlino e Parigi è esattamente l'antitesi rispetto alle istanze che i cittadini chiedono all'intero continente.

L'Italia è la terza economia dell'eurozona, ma non ambisce a pretese egemoniche, al contrario punta ad essere garante della corralità delle decisioni e del pluralismo. Mai come oggi, è necessario ribadire l'importanza di un asse politico che si opponga a questo indebito accentramento di potere che svuoterebbe di significato il dibattito dentro le istituzioni. A questo dirigismo, noi contrapponiamo la partecipazione e il coinvolgimento dal basso. Tutti devono avere pari dignità a Bruxelles. Le istituzioni europee vengono percepite come distanti dai cittadini, è vero. A questo deficit di democrazia si dovrebbe rispondere non arroccandosi nel palazzo, ma dando il potere di iniziativa legislativa e maggiori poteri di controllo e l'indirizzo politico all'unica istituzione europea direttamente eletta dai cittadini: il Parlamento europeo, appunto. L'Europa vuole cambiare? Allora abbandoni le politiche di austerità che portano a tagli a istruzione, sanità, pensioni e diritti. Invece, nonostante le finte autocritiche di Junker sull'austerità, la strada intrapresa è sempre la stessa. Faccio a tal proposito un appello a tutti voi, colleghi: blocchiamo la macro condizionalità economica. Mettere sanzioni o sospendere i fondi europei a uno Stato membro perché non rispetta il diktat di Bruxelles significa penalizzare ancora di più le regioni e i cittadini. I fondi europei sono risorse fondamentali per lo sviluppo dei nostri territori e per la lotta al dissesto idrogeologico, ad esempio, tagliarli significherebbe colpire loro. L'Europa può cambiare se sta dalla parte dei cittadini e se a loro dà delle risposte e non sberle.

**Mario Borghezio**, a nome del gruppo ENF. – Signor Presidente, onorevoli colleghi, signor Primo ministro, benvenuto in questo Parlamento, sia pure un po' deserto in questo momento. L'enorme simpatia che, almeno dal mio punto di vista, nutrono i popoli europei nei confronti del suo popolo mi impedisce di calcare la mano sul fatto che, cinicamente, potrebbe indurre un esponente, come il sottoscritto, proprio di quei partiti populistici contro cui lei si agita, a dire che tutte le volte che lei dichiara di voler ospitare – persino a casa sua e soprattutto, il che è più grave, nel paese – 20-25 mila immigrati, lei porta acqua al nostro mulino, perché in Europa cresce la consapevolezza – anche da parte di chi sicuramente non è né razzista né xenofobo – che questa immigrazione disordinata è foriera soltanto di insicurezza, di difficoltà di integrazione e di costi spaventosi.

Non sarebbe meglio pensare – come qualcuno intelligentemente e saggiamente dice, anche da certi vertici di questo Parlamento – che bisognerebbe invece impegnarsi in un piano Marshall per l'Africa? La ricetta giusta non è l'accoglienza, non è il tentativo – molto difficile, molto arduo, spesso impossibile – di integrazione – penso, per esempio, delle persone di religione e, soprattutto, di cultura musulmana, difficilmente se non impossibilmente integrabili.

Invece, io avrei voluto ascoltare da chi rappresenta un grande popolo, una nazione ricca come la Finlandia, la disponibilità ad aderire a questo piano Marshall. Ma gli appelli lanciati non vengono casualmente da questa Europa, un po' distratta, un po' demagogica, che non si rende conto della gravità del problema dell'immigrazione e della necessità e del dovere morale e storico dell'Europa di aiutare i popoli africani, non facendo come si è fatto nel passato, finanziando guerre e speculazioni, ma con aiuti veri, magari intessuti attraverso la rete delle piccole e medie imprese, di quelle che sanno fare impresa e che potrebbero risolvere alla radice il problema dell'immigrazione.

Invece lei – mi scusi l'espressione chiara – è stato un po' demagogico, dà l'impressione di avere un approccio demagogico all'immigrazione. Se io fossi finlandese – e io vorrei essere un vero finlandese – le consiglierei di cambiare strada e di seguire l'esempio di quelli che in Europa, con coraggio, magari correndo il rischio di essere accusati di xenofobia, razzismo, eccetera, scelgono la strada giusta, la strada vera, quella dei nostri missionari, che sono andati in Africa e hanno portato cultura, istruzione e crescita.

Segua l'esempio del santo italiano, Don Bosco, che – se fosse vivo oggi, come ha fatto nell'Ottocento, nella povera Italia – agli immigrati metterebbe in mano uno strumento di lavoro, insegnerebbe a lavorare, non a venire a spacciare, a violentare, a fare quello che nei loro paesi, magari, questi ragazzi africani non hanno mai pensato di fare. La colpa degli errori e dei gravi crimini che commettono gli immigrati in Europa è vostra e della vostra demagogia, non di quei popoli.

**Λάμπρος Φουντούλης (NI).** – Κύριε πρωθυπουργέ, η Ευρωπαϊκή Ένωση αντιμετωπίζει μεγάλα προβλήματα. Το κυριότερο όμως είναι η πατερναλιστική αντίληψη που τείνει να εδραιωθεί σε πολλές από τις ευρωπαϊκές κυβερνήσεις και στους ευρωπαϊκούς θεσμούς. Οι ηγέτες της Ενώσεως λειτουργούν σαν να κατέχουν εκείνοι την απόλυτη αλήθεια και προσπαθούν να επιβάλουν την ιδεολογία τους στους πολίτες. Πολλές από τις αποφάσεις των ηγετών είναι μη αναστρέψιμες, δημιουργώντας στους πολίτες την αίσθηση πως ο δημοκρατικός έλεγχος μέσω των εκλογών είναι ανώφελος.

Χαρακτηριστικό και πολύ πρόσφατο παράδειγμα η Συμφωνία των Πρεσπών, η οποία μάλιστα χαιρέτιστηκε από το σύνολο των ευρωπαίων ηγετών. Ο ελληνικός λαός εξέφρασε την ξεκάθαρη αντίθεσή του, όμως η κυβέρνηση Τσίπρα αδιαφόρησε δημιουργώντας τετελεσμένα. Συντασσόμενη η Ευρώπη με τη συμφωνία αυτή, περιφρονεί τη βούληση των Ελλήνων, εμφανίζεται δε ως εχθρική προς τα ελληνικά συμφέροντα. Θα ήθελα να υπενθυμίσω τόσο σε σας όσο και τους υπόλοιπους ηγέτες της Ενώσεως, και ιδιαίτερος στον κύριο Τσίπρα, πως η εξουσία σας πηγάζει από τον λαό και έχει ισχύ μόνο όσο ο λαός συνεχίζει να την εγκρίνει. Σύντομα όμως θα διαπιστώσετε πως η εκ μέρους σας απαξίωση των ευρωπαϊκών εθνών θα αφυπνίσει τους πολίτες και θα τους κάνει να σκεφτούν εθνικά.

**Juha Sipilä, Prime Minister of Finland.** – Mr President, thank you very much for the speeches. I will briefly answer the questions I picked up from the speeches. First of all, thank you, Jean-Claude, thank you, Jyrki, for your kind words and the same applies vice-versa. It has been pleasant to work with the Commission. It's true that it will be a very challenging period of time when our EU Presidency starts. We are forming a new Commission, there will be Parliamentary elections and we will have our own elections before that. There will be multi-annual financial framework (MFF) negotiations, Brexit, the Economic Monetary Union (EMU), and so on. There will be big files on our table.

Jean-Claude, you were also right on the Arctic questions. This is absolutely a key part, including with regard to climate change. We are ready for the Arctic Summit in a few weeks if there are circumstances available to arrange that. Jyrki Katainen's investment fund is an excellent example of how we can create jobs and we have also used this tool in Finland.

Mr Weber, congratulations on your nomination. The EPP meeting in Helsinki was very good for me, also because I met about ten colleagues at the same time in the meeting. I agree with you about the economic principles.

The MFF: I have now discussed with 17 colleagues already the situation regarding the MFF and I'm sure that we will find a compromise during our Presidency.

Climate change: I agree that we have to find a sustainable solution, including so that people can live with the solutions. I emphasise that new technology can do much more than we thought. I talked about the CO<sub>2</sub> capture from the air. There is a small university in Lappeenranta and I saw the prototype. They captured CO<sub>2</sub> from the air and they made other products out of that. The low price of the solar energy is a key solution for that. Think about what kind of possibilities this gives to Africa and for cooperation with African countries.

Mr Kofod, you have learned Finnish in your group. I think that you have some Finnish Members there and there is a good education basis in your group. Finland is the happiest country in the world, but I have to say, at the same time, that we are the best nation to hide it also, if you follow our domestic discussions.

I also mentioned the social pillar in my speech. Our priorities are gender equality. We have been leaders in women's rights in Finland by being the first country in the world to give full political rights to women.

Tax havens: I fully agree with what you say about taxation. It should be everyone's, all the companies, all the countries' and all the citizens' values and the basis for regulations that ensure that we pay taxes where the profit is made and this is absolutely the key principle for that.

Ms Ruohonen-Lerner, maybe I will answer this question in Finnish.

Ehkä tässäkin foorumissa on hyvä sanoa, mistä tuossa taloni luovutuksessa oli kysymys. Kyseessä oli tietämäni iso perhe, joka omassa maassaan oli joutunut vainon kohteeksi kahdesta syystä. Ensinnäkin he olivat auttaneet länsimaalaisia avustustyöntekijöitä ja toiseksi he olivat kristittyjä muslimimaassa.

Näin ei pitäisi olla, että vainotuksi joutuu näistä kahdesta syystä. Tämä perhe oli hengenvaarassa joka ikinen päivä. Me emme voi kuvitellakaan, minkälaisissa olosuhteissa he olivat ennen pakoon pääsyänsä. Tämä perhe oli tulossa talooni ja en voinut kuvitellakaan, että Suomessa voisi ilmapiiri kääntyä sellaiseksi, että tuon päätöksen joutuu perumaan perheen turvallisuuden vuoksi. Poliisiviranomaiset sanoivat, että tuon perheen henki on uhattuna myös Suomessa, jos vien päätökseni loppuun. Valitettavasti he eivät tuohon päässeet, mutta he ovat onnellisesti turvassa muualla.

Mr President, Guy Verhofstadt has already left – he's so busy – so I will jump to Ms Keller's speech on climate change. I have worked a lot on climate-change issues, including at a personal level. I have made a promise that my family will be carbon neutral at the end of next year. I have solar panels at my home, I have an electric car, I have reduced consumption and I have planted trees, so that the end result is carbon neutrality. But it's too easy for one individual to do this, and we need common action in three forms.

We have to lower emissions, and continue on that path, and we also have to increase carbon sinks. There is proof that the Finnish way, a sustainable way, of managing and using the forest is the best way to handle forest, and that also has my strong support. New technology is important too: I am eager to pursue new ways to capture CO<sub>2</sub> directly from the air and use that as a source of other new products; and we also have to plant new trees.

You mentioned that we have experience of cooperating with a populist party, and my message is that populist parties too should take responsibility as part of a government, in the same way that all of us have to carry responsibility and be answerable to the people.

Mr Sylikiotis – I am not sure how to pronounce your name – the famous Finnish left-wing politician Outi Ojala said, in the Finnish Parliament, that the best friend for poor people was a balanced state budget. That is the basis for taking care of everyone, in every country, every day. And that is why, in Finland, social benefits are set at such a high level – besides which, we have equal education for all our citizens.

Ms D'Amato, on the employment rate, I agree that the employment rate is the key to balancing the economy, and all your actions in support of development to that end have my support.

*(Procedura catch-the-eye)*

**Danuta Jazłowiecka (PPE).** – Panie Przewodniczący! Panie premierze! Bardzo dziękuję za pana pełne odpowiedzialności wystąpienie. Przedstawił pan ambitny plan przyszłej fińskiej prezydencji, mówił pan dużo o ochronie środowiska, o gospodarce, o wdrażaniu różnych rozwiązań. Jest pan premierem kraju, w którym funkcjonuje najlepszy europejski, a powiedziałabym nawet światowy, system edukacyjny. Spodziewałam się, że bardzo dużo miejsca poświęci pan edukacji i, mimo że jest to kompetencja państw członkowskich, zaproponuje pan implementację fińskiego systemu edukacyjnego, który dzisiaj najlepiej przygotowuje swoich młodych obywateli do nieprzewidywalnej przyszłości zawodowej.

Unia Europejska w oczach świata jest organizacją, dla której najważniejszy jest kapitał społeczny. Czy zatem w dobie robotyzacji i sztucznej inteligencji właśnie temat przygotowania europejskiego społeczeństwa do zachodzących zmian nie powinien być priorytetem fińskiej prezydencji? Czy Europejczycy przynajmniej w czasie fińskiej prezydencji nie mogliby się uczyć od najlepszych?

**Miapetra Kumpula-Natri (S&D).** – Mr President, I would like to welcome the Prime Minister to the European Parliament. I am very happy to hear that the commitment of the future country of the Presidency is strong.

We see that this global situation and shared global challenges and this common future is important. We see that on the other side of the Channel they are trying to do something else – with a lot of problems in finding solutions for Brexit.

Arvoisa puhemies ja pääministeri, toitte terveisenne myös ilmastotavoitteiden kiristämisen valmiudesta, ja tämä on viesti, jota tämä talo haluaa ottaa mielellään vastaan. Se on juuri samansuuntainen, suurin piirtein samoissa prosenttiluvuissa kuin liikumme, ja näemme, että tässä tavoitteet ovat yhteisiä ja maailma odottaa meiltä tätä edelläkulkijuutta.

Näemme myös, että t&k-panostukset ja oikeudenmukainen siirtymä tuovat meille töitä ja hyvinvointia, ja tähän on hyvä sitoutua. Yhdyn tässä Jean-Claude Junckerin, komission puheenjohtajan, terveisiin, että arktiset asiat ovat tärkeitä. Näissä Suomi ei voi laiskotella. Euroopalle on tärkeä jokainen lähialueensa raja niin etelässä, idässä kuin myös pohjoisessa.

Ja arvoisa puhemies, meillä on täällä parlamentissa jo Välimeren valtuuskunta, ehkä tulevalle kaudelle voitaisiin nyt jo valmistella myös arktisten asioiden valtuuskunta.

**Νότης Μαρίας (ECR).** – Κύριε πρωθυπουργέ της Φινλανδίας, κύριε Sipilä, ήθελα να σας θέσω το θέμα της Κοινής Αμυντικής Πολιτικής της Ευρωπαϊκής Ένωσης. Ξέρετε, χθες είχαμε τη θλιβερή επέτειο των Ιμίων. Τα Ίμια είναι μια περιοχή που ανήκει στην Ελλάδα, δύο νησιά που ανήκουν στην πατρίδα μου. Όμως υπάρχουν οι προκλήσεις και οι αμφισβητήσεις της Τουρκίας. Μάλιστα αυτές τις ημέρες τουρκικά πολεμικά περιπολούν στην περιοχή. Η Τουρκία συνεχίζει τις παραβιάσεις στον ελληνικό εναέριο χώρο και στα ελληνικά χωρικά ύδατα. Απειλεί την Ελλάδα με casus belli σε περίπτωση που η Ελλάδα επεκτείνει τα χωρικά της ύδατα στα δώδεκα μίλια. Ο Ερντογάν θέλει να ανατρέψει τη Συνθήκη της Λοζάνης.

Θέλω λοιπόν μία δήλωση σαφέστατη, πρώτον, στήριξης της Ελλάδας απέναντι στις απειλές του Ερντογάν και της Τουρκίας, δεύτερον, τη θέση σας για να υπάρξει μία πολιτική της Ευρωπαϊκής Ένωσης με βάση την οποία η Ευρωπαϊκή Ένωση θα στηρίζει επιτέλους την Ελλάδα σε περίπτωση αμφισβήτησης των συνόρων της από την πλευρά της Τουρκίας. Να υπάρξει στήριξη της Ευρωπαϊκής Ένωσης στα σύνορα της Ελλάδας, τα οποία είναι και ευρωπαϊκά σύνορα. Και θέλουμε μία σαφέστατη τοποθέτηση από σας, κύριε πρωθυπουργέ, εδώ στο Ευρωπαϊκό Κοινοβούλιο, γιατί θα είναι μήνυμα απέναντι στον Ερντογάν, απέναντι στις απειλές της Τουρκίας.

**Elsi Katainen (ALDE).** – Arvoisa pääministeri Sipilä, olen todella iloinen siitä, että insinöörimiehenä korostatte puheisanne käytännönläheisyyttä ja konkretiaa ja vaaditte sitä myös unionin toimissa. Euroopan unionin yhtenäisyyttä ja myös taloudellista kestäkykyä haastetaan monesta suunnasta ja monella tavalla. Ne pakottavat jäsenmaat arvioimaan aina uudelleen ja uudelleen yhteistyön välttämättömyyttä ja myös omaa panosta, jotta Eurooppa vahvistuisi myös globaalissa kilpailussa.

Arvoisa pääministeri Sipilä, miten mielestänne voitaisiin edistää sitä, että muun muassa ilmastopanokset ja taakanjako maahanmuuttokysymyksissä jakautuisivat mahdollisimman tasaisesti eri jäsenmaiden kesken? Itse ajattelen nimittäin, että sillä olisi suuri merkitys kansalaisten hyväksynnälle ja luottamukselle unionia kohtaan. Ja se vaikuttaa muun muassa kevään EU-vaalien kiinnostavuuteen ja äänestysprosenttiin.

Lopuksi, pääministeri Sipilä, toivoisin, että voisitte seuraavassa puheenvuorossanne oikaista täällä väitetyjä vääriä käsityksiä Suomen metsänhoidon tilasta.

**Klaus Buchner (Verts/ALE).** – Herr Präsident! Sehr geehrter Herr Ministerpräsident, seit über einem Jahr blockiert Ihre Regierung zusammen mit Frankreich und acht weiteren Staaten jeglichen Fortschritt im Kampf gegen den Export von Überwachungstechnik an Diktaturen. Letztes Jahr hatte Ihre Regierung zusammen mit den anderen eine Position gegen den Schutz von Menschenrechten in der *Dual-use-Verordnung* verfasst. Wir im Europäischen Parlament haben dagegen den über 92 % Zustimmung und zusammen mit der Kommission einen Vorschlag geliefert, um die Menschenrechte zu schützen.

Sie führen die folgende Ratspräsidentschaft. Der Rat hat sich bisher komplett verantwortungslos verhalten, während überall auf der Welt Journalisten und Menschenrechtsaktivisten mit unserer europäischen Technologie eingesperrt und getötet werden. Ich hoffe, Sie nehmen Ihre Verantwortung ernst und ändern das.

**Merja Kyllönen (GUE/NGL).** – Arvoisa puhemies, pääministeri ja kollegat, moni eurooppalainen ei tänäkään päivänä koe olevansa osa EU:ta, ja sen vuoksi populistien on helppo hallita pelolla heidän ajatuksiaan. Oikeudenmukaisuus on avain turvallisempaan ja ihmisläheisempään Eurooppaan olipa kyse ihmisten toimeentulosta, työstä tai ilmastonmuutoksen torjunnasta, niin että jokainen voi osallistua omien voimavarojensa mukaan, ei jäädä osattomaksi.

Miten Suomi aikoo omalla puheenjohtajuuskaudellaan edistää oikeudenmukaisuuden ja osallisuuden ratkaisuja, niin että Eurooppa olisi ihmisten kokemana yhteinen meidän oma Eurooppamme, ei vain rahan ja markkinoiden ja talouden Eurooppa?

**Liisa Jaakonsaari (S&D).** – Arvoisa puhemies, ensinnäkin tervetuloa pääministeri Sipilä Euroopan parlamenttiin, tätä on sanottu Euroopan omaksitunnoksi. Täällä ovat niin erittäin paljon esillä aina jatkuvasti ihmisoikeuskysymykset, jotka ovat tänä päivänä erittäin tärkeitä. Olin vähän pettynyt puheenvuoronne talouspolitiikka-osaan koska siinä oli vähän eilisen sävyt. Korostitte kovasti budjettikuria ja samalla Suomi asemoi itsensä jälleen kerran vähän harvenevaan uusliberaalien joukkoon.

Toinen asia johon olin pettynyt, oli tämä maahanmuuttopoliittinen osa, koska siinäkin sävynä oli palautus. Oikeastaan nyt enemmän pitäisi olla keskustelu jo ihan toisessa sävyssä. Varsinkin nyt, kun lähestymme Tampereen, Suomen, Euroopan ensimmäisen maahanmuuttopolitiikan kaksikymmentävuotisjuhlaa, niin jo keskustelun pitäisi olla muissa asioissa kuin pelkästään palautuksessa. Mutta kiitoksia ja komission puheenjohtajalle kiitoksia siitä, että otitte arktisen yhteistyön esille. Se nimittäin on myös alue, jolla Venäjän ja EU:n välit toimivat hyvin ja joka on sen takia arvokas.

**Salvatore Cicu (PPE).** – Signor Presidente, onorevoli colleghi, ho due temi da proporre al Primo ministro finlandese, che ringrazio. Uno riguarda la politica estera dell'Unione europea, ovvero il dramma che un grande popolo, quello venezuelano, sta vivendo e soffrendo in queste ore.

Credo che ci sia necessità di compattezza per i diritti della democrazia, della pace, dell'esigenza che i popoli possano vivere in libertà, per i diritti civili, i diritti delle donne, dei bambini e di un sistema e quindi chiedo al Primo ministro finlandese qual è la sua posizione e se ritiene che Juan Guaidó sia riconosciuto, anche dallo stesso premier finlandese, come Presidente legittimo del Venezuela.

L'altro grande tema è quello dell'antidumping, la concorrenza sleale, l'economia e il commercio internazionale: abbiamo avuto la possibilità di ottenere un grande risultato e un grande riscontro. Le nostre imprese hanno bisogno di maggiore tutela.

**Maria Gabriela Zoană (S&D).** – Domnule prim-ministru, mă bucur că ne aflăm astăzi aici în această postură, dumneavoastră în calitate de premier al Finlandei, eu în calitate de europarlamentar al țării care deține președinția Consiliului Uniunii Europene. Vă spun acest lucru întrucât a provocat un mare scandal politic, dar mai ales mediatic, declarația dumneavoastră potrivit căreia sunteți gata să preluați președinția Consiliului Uniunii Europene direct de la Bulgaria. Sunt convinsă că ați fost indus în eroare de declarațiile Președintelui Johannis, dar, domnule prim-ministru, la nivelul dumneavoastră ar fi trebuit să știți că guvernul are atribuții în exercitarea președinției Consiliului Uniunii Europene în România. Deci singurul actor politic de ale cărui declarații ar trebui să țineți seamă este prim-ministrul României. Sunt convinsă că acum, la câteva luni de la acea declarație nepotrivită, dumneavoastră v-ați schimbat opinia, mai ales că în doar o lună de la preluarea președinției Consiliului Uniunii Europene, România a închis deja câteva dosare importante. Mesajul meu către dumneavoastră este de continuitate. Sper că veți continua și îmi exprim astfel convingerea că veți continua proiectele începute de România la președinția Consiliului Uniunii Europene.

**Ruža Tomašić (ECR).** – Gospodine predsjedniče, poštovani gospodine Sipilä, slažem se s Vama da Unija, želi li u svojoj vanjskoj politici promovirati određene vrijednosti, mora te vrijednosti štititi i u vlastitom dvorištu. No, vrijednosna komponenta ove zajednice ne smije biti predmetom proizvoljnih tumačenja kojima se želi utvrditi okvir koji nameće nekolicina članica s briselskom administracijom.



Vrijednosti bi trebale biti općeprihvaćeno izvorište oko kojega se okupljaju sve članice. Korištenje financijskih mehanizama da bi se prisililo određene članice na usvajanje dominantno liberalnog narativa i zanemarivanje nacionalnog interesa potpuno je neprihvatljivo. Vrijednosti Unije trebale bi nas okupljati i ne smiju biti korištene za pokoravanje neposlušnih s neospornim izbornim legitimitetom.

Naš je slogan „Ujedinjeni u raznolikosti”, ali realnost kaže da smo razjedinjeni u nametnutoj jednoličnosti. Vratimo se priznavanju raznolikosti i supsidijarnosti te radimo na konsenzusu umjesto nametanju.

**Nils Torvalds (ALDE).** – Arvoisa puhemies, ja herra pääministeri, tervetuloa tähän keskusteluun. Yleensä se käydään kyllä tunnuksesta, että on helpompaa nähdä rikka naapurin silmässä kuin malka omassa.

Kaksi asiaa haluaisin tässä nostaa esille, puhuitte tasapainoisesta budjetista ja samanaikaisesti puhuitte myöskin niistä suurista vaatimuksista ja haasteista, joita Euroopalla on edessään. Minun mielestäni tämä asetelma ei oikein mene ikään kuin oikean insinöörin laskuopin mukaan. Me tarvitsemme, niin kuin te myöskin sanoitte, me tarvitsemme tasapainoisia kompromisseja, ja Suomi tulee nyt olemaan näiden tasapainosten kompromissien tekijä puheenjohtajakaudellaan. Toivoisin, että Suomen nykyinen hallitus, joka ehkä ei istu kovinkaan kauan, ottaa tämän asian hoitaakseen oikein tomerasti ja hoitaa sitten asiat maaliin sellaisella tavalla, että me voimme ylpeydellä katsoa Suomen puheenjohtajakautteen.

**Heidi Hautala (Verts/ALE).** – Arvoisa puhemies, tervetuloa pääministeri, puheenjohtaja Juncker sanoi, että Suomesta voisivat ottaa oppia jopa jotkut EU:n perustajavaltiot. Tämä tarkoittaa sitä, että Suomi on aina halunnut rakentaa Euroopan unionia. Nyt haluaisin kysyä Teiltä kahta asiaa. Mikä on Suomen kanta ja miten arvioitte mahdollisuuksia saada aikaan tiettyjen veropäätösten tekeminen määränemmistöllä sen sijaan, että yksikin jäsenvaltio tällä hetkellä voi estää verotukseen liittyvät päätökset? Tämä olisi juuri se keino, jolla voitaisiin kitkeä verovälttelyä ja turvata hyvinvointivaltion rahoitusperusta. Tiedän, että tämä on neuvoston pöydällä ja että Suomi ei ainakaan lähtökohtaisesti ole tätä kovin mielellään halunnut tukea, koska siinä on kyse valtion suvereenisuudesta, mutta oletteko valmiita muuttamaan kantanne tässä?

Toinen kysymys yritysvastuusta, Suomessa on hyvin aktiivinen kampanja sen puolesta, että säädettäisiin tällainen yritysvastuulaki. Kaikki ovat sitä mieltä, että se pitäisi säätää EU-tasolla, jotta kaikki yritykset joutuisivat raportoimaan ja vastaamaan toimintansa ihmisoikeus-, ympäristö- ynnä muista vaikutuksista. Voisiko tämä olla Suomen puheenjohtajakauden painopisteitä?

**Henna Virkkunen (PPE).** – Arvoisa puhemies, arvoisa pääministeri, mukava nähdä Teitä täällä Euroopan parlamentissa ja erityisesti tällaisena vuonna, kun Suomi on kolmatta kertaa valmistautumassa EU:n puheenjohtajuuteen. Euroopan parlamentille on tärkeää kuulla, mitkä ovat Suomen prioriteetit.

Täytyy sanoa, että itse olin vähän yllättynyt ja ehkä vähän pettynytkin siihen, kuinka vähäiselle roolille koulutuksen, osaamisen ja tutkimuksen osuus jäi tuossa puheessanne. Jos ajattelemme sitä, mihin Suomen menestys on perustunut kuluneina vuosikymmeninä, se on nimenomaan pohjautunut siihen, että meillä on hyvä koulutus, hyvä osaamisen taso sekä hyvä tutkimus. Se on nostanut Suomen yhdeksi maailman innovatiivisimmaksi maaksi. Se on juuri se viesti, minkä myös Eurooppa omalle tulevaisuudelleen nyt tarvitsee, jos mietimme sitä, miten Eurooppaan voidaan luoda kestävä kasvua, kuinka pysymme kilpailukykyisenä tällaisessa tilanteessa, kun digitaalinen talous muuttaa maailmaa. Robotisaatio, automatisaatio muuttaa työelämää ja toisaalta edessämme ovat isot globaalit haasteet, joista nostitte perustellusti nimenomaan ilmastonmuutoksen ja sen torjunnan esiin. Tässä tarvitsemme nimenomaan hyvää osaamista, koulutusta, laadukasta tutkimusta. Toivon, että se olisi vahvasti myös Suomen viesti tulevalle puheenjohtajakaudella.

Euroopan parlamentti haluaa nostaa Euroopan tutkimusrahoja viisikymmentä prosenttia. Suomi on yksi niistä maista, joka on nostanut tutkimuksen rahoituksen yhdeksi MFF:n pääprioriteetiksi. Haluaisin nyt vielä vahvistuksen siitä, onko tämä se linja, jota Suomi tulee MFF-neuvotteluissa viemään eteenpäin?

**José Blanco López (S&D).** – Señor presidente, hoy de nuevo asistimos a un debate sobre el futuro de la Unión Europea. Y yo creo que en ese futuro hay dos revoluciones que van a marcar nuestras vidas: la revolución tecnológica o digital y la revolución energética. La Unión Europea tiene que hacer frente, por lo tanto, a estos desafíos.

Al desafío de la revolución energética que va a marcar nuestra vida, nuestra forma de viajar, nuestra forma de consumir, etc. siendo ambiciosa en la lucha contra el cambio climático, que es el gran desafío que tiene la humanidad.

En esta legislatura se han dado pasos muy importantes para poner a Europa como líder de esa transición energética. Como líder para conseguir la descarbonización y conseguir los objetivos de clima. Pero no podemos bajar la guardia, porque el desafío es muy importante y la respuesta tiene que ser constante.

**Elżbieta Katarzyna Łukacijewska (PPE).** – Panie Przewodniczący! Demokracja, praworządność to podstawy, na których zbudowana jest Unia Europejska. Podstawy, które są coraz częściej łamane, ale wartością Unii Europejskiej jest także wspólny rynek, swoboda przepływu usług, osób i towarów. I tutaj także zauważalna jest chęć ograniczenia tych swobód.

Finlandia, pomimo że leży na obrzeżach Unii Europejskiej (aby dotrzeć z Helsinek do Brukseli, ciężarówka potrzebuje pięciu dni), poparła ogólne podejście Rady Unii Europejskiej w sprawie pakietu mobilności. Jednocześnie fińscy posłowie zagłosowali za wyłączeniem transportu międzynarodowego spod zasad delegowania. I tutaj mam pytanie, panie premierze: czy nie uważa pan, że wspierając rozwiązania zaproponowane przez Radę, tak naprawdę ogranicza pan swobody gospodarcze? Nie likwiduje pan barier handlowych, a przecież pan mówił, że należy te bariery likwidować, że jednocześnie może się okazać, że wiele małych i średnich przedsiębiorstw będzie musiało likwidować swoją działalność, a konsumenci, także konsumenci fińscy, zapłacą cenę za wzrost cen usług i towarów.

**Maria Grapini (S&D).** – Domnule Președinte, domnule prim-ministru, sunt de acord cu multe lucruri pe care le-ați spus aici. Ați vorbit de coeziune, de piață unică, ați vorbit de statul de drept și aici vreau să mă refer, domnule prim-ministru, la niște lucruri concrete din țara dumneavoastră. Ați spus că nu trebuie să se facă rabat cu nimic la statul de drept și sunt de acord. Dar cunoașteți că în țara dumneavoastră sunt legi care nu se aplică? Cunoașteți că sunt familii de la care s-au luat copiii, copii la 12 ani care, conform legii finlandeze au dreptul să se prezinte în instanță, să opteze pentru mamă și nu sunt ascultați în instanță? Sunt duși și sunt atrocități în instituțiile care instituționalizează copii, domnul prim-ministru. V-am făcut o scrisoare, nu s-a luat nici o măsură. Cum putem să avem un stat de drept când cetățenii, care sunt europenii, este vorba despre o cetățeană din țara mea, nu au aceleași drepturi ca cetățenii din Finlanda? Și vă rog să-mi răspundeți punctual! Și, sigur, mi-aș dori să nu existe acea condiționalitate la CFM, așa cum o susțineți dumneavoastră, pentru că, iată, se definește diferit și distinct pentru fiecare țară statul de drept.

**Mirja Vehkaperä (ALDE).** – Arvoisa puhemies, Suomen pääministerin Juha Sipilän puhe oli konkreettinen, jämäkkä ja erityisesti Suomen EU-puheenjohtajuuskautta lämmittelevä tulevaisuuspuhe.

Esititte metsäosaamisemme hyödyntämistä. Suomen maapinta-alasta on lähes 70 prosenttia metsiä, joten meillä jos kenellä on osaamista metsien hoidosta ja myöskin kestävästä käytöstä.

Euroopan ja Afrikan metsärahoista on kannatettava sekä ilmastollisesta että työllisyysnäkökulmasta. Tämän salin parlamentaarikkojen ja Euroopan parlamentin katsetta pitäisi kuitenkin kääntää myöskin pohjoisiin arktisiin kysymyksiin. Siellä arktisella alueella, missä itsekin asun, on paljon potentiaalia ja annettavaa Euroopalle. Meillä on rikkaat luonnonvarat, luonto, osaaminen ennen kaikkea, mutta me tarvitsemme myöskin kiperästi ja kiihkeästi Euroopan panoksia tänne arktiselle alueelle. Sitä toivon tulevaisuudessa.

**Juan Fernando López Aguilar (S&D).** – Mr President, I would like to thank Prime Minister Sipilä for being here and making the case for Finland as a happy country after 25 years in the European Union and making up one percent of the total population of the European Union.

You got started talking about history, Prime Minister, and I would like to quote one of the founding fathers, a former Prime Minister of Belgium, Paul-Henri Charles Spaak. He once said it's not true that the European Union is a blend between big and small states: we are all small in relation to the challenges of the world to come. It is just that some countries know this, and other countries don't know it yet.

You spoke of a challenge, namely defence and security, and that is meaningful in view of Finland's neutral past, but you said less about migration. I urge you to overcome the temptation of populism, and to gather up the forces necessary to unblock the Dublin Regulation, as this has been the mandate of the European Union. It takes a common policy and solidarity when it comes to migration, and no country can turn a blind eye to those in need who are knocking on the Union's doors.

**Anneli Jäätteenmäki (ALDE).** – Arvoisa puhemies, pääministeri Sipilä, huomaatte, että olette tervetullut tänne, kun suomalaisilla on niin paljon kysyttävää, että alkaa tuntua, että tämä on eduskunnan kyselytunti, mutta me kuitenkin täällä Euroopan parlamentissa käyttäydymme paremmin kuin suomalaisen eduskunnan kyselytunnilla, emme mölyä.

Kysymykseni koskee sitä, kun korostitte päätösten täytäntöönpanoa. Olen samaa mieltä kanssanne, että yksi suuri puute on se, että tehdään kunnianhimoisia päätöksiä, mutta sen jälkeen jäsenvaltiot eivät näitä pane täytäntöön. Kysyisin, onko vika enemmänkin jäsenvaltioissa? Mitä voitaisiin tehdä, että kotiläksyt tehdään yhdessä? Onko nämä päätökset valmisteltu riittävän hyvin täällä Euroopan unionin neuvoston kokouksissa, siellä pääministerikokouksissakin? Koska tuntuu kummalliselta, että näiden kokousten jälkeen julistetaan tuloksia ja hyvää yhteishenkeä ja sitten, kun mennään kotiin, mitään ei tapahdu. Mitä voitaisiin tehdä? Mitä Te tekisitte, että yhteiset päätökset pistettäisiin täytäntöön?

*(End of catch-the-eye procedure)*

**Juha Sipilä, Prime Minister of Finland.** – Mr President, thank you all for the questions.

We in Finland are used to this kind of questioning. Every Thursday at 4 o'clock in our Parliament is Question Hour. All ministers have to be present and we are used to this. But we give our answer right after each question.

Now I have 30 questions to answer at the same time, so I will conclude with some top-lines.

First education. Education and equal education is very important for Finland. Public school is the best school for rich people and poor people. All the people in Finland, all the kids, go to the same school. We have the best teachers in the world and we have a challenge to educate about one million Finnish people during the next ten years. I think that this same challenge is in every European Union country because of artificial intelligence, because of the changes in work life.

Climate change – thank you for supporting my speech and all the issues I raised with regard to climate change. Arctic issues are very important for Finland. We are especially worried about black carbon, and this is a quite concrete issue where we can negotiate also with Russia and the United States, which are not very keen to support climate change actions. We need also R&B investments, that's true in this sector.

Defence cooperation – Finland has supported defence cooperation from the beginning. I really welcome the progress on that issue. There was a question about Turkey. It's very complicated. It's a NATO country and the rule of law developments in that country worry us a lot – the situation in Greece and Cyprus also.

As for the Romanian Presidency, I have always been sure that Romania will do an excellent job as the Presidency of the European Union, and there has been some proof of that already.

Venezuela – our full support to democratic development and elections. The humanitarian situation in that country is really bad at the moment and I am sure Finland will follow everything that we decide together in the European Union.

There were some – actually quite a few – questions in Finnish. So I will conclude my answers in Finnish.

Ensinnäkin kestävä metsänhoito: Suomessa käytetään puun kasvusta 70-80 prosenttia ja Suomen metsät kasvavat koko ajan enemmän kuin käytämme puuta. Puuta käytetään koko ajan paremmin ja tehokkaammin myöskin sillä tavalla, että hiili sitoutuu pitkäksi aikaa niihin tuotteisiin, joita teemme metsistä ja puista.

MFF:stä kysyttiin täällä useamman kerran. Tulevana puheenjohtajamaana olen aivan varma näiden käymieni kollegakeskusteluiden perusteella siitä, että tulemme löytämään kompromissin, missä tämä perinteinen EU-politiikka ja uudet haasteet pystytään sovittamaan yhteen. Emme ole olleet siellä kaikkein tiukimmassa prosentin liikkeessä vaan meillä on jouston varaa myöskin kotimaisessa kannassamme, ja puheenjohtajana tulemme löytämään siihen ajallaan oikean ratkaisun.

Täytäntöönpanosta puhuin paljon tuossa puheessani. Meillä Suomessa on tapana, että kun yhdessä sovitaan jotakin, varsinkin tällaisella joukolla, niin sitten me teemme osuutemme siitä yhdessä tehdystä päätöksestä välittömästi. Tästä varmasti meillä on tarpeeksi näyttöä.

So implementation is a key issue: when we have carefully prepared our decisions we then implement everything efficiently. I think this is a key message from my speech.

Mr President, thank you very much. It was a pleasure to be here and it was a very interesting discussion.

(Applause)

**President.** – Thank you very much, Prime Minister. Thank you for your answers. I also thank you for your position on Venezuela.

**Presidente.** – La discussione è chiusa.

*Dichiarazioni scritte (articolo 162)*

**Miguel Viegas (GUE/NGL), por escrito.** – Quando se discute o aprofundamento da UEM e da União bancária, a possível fusão entre a Deutsche Bank e Commerzbank está hoje na ordem do dia. Esta fusão criaria um megagrupo bancário com cerca de 2 bilhões de euros em ativos, com uma posição cimeira no plano europeu. Vários analistas recordam que as duas instituições têm tido alguns anos difíceis. O Deutsche Bank, apresentou perdas entre 2015 e 2017 e o Commerzbank realizou uma reorganização de suas atividades através com uma forte redução da sua força de trabalho. Em suma, o baixo nível de fundos próprios de ambas as instituições deixa antever um cenário de alguma reserva. Esta fusão entre estas instituições vai acentuar o problema das grandes instituições financeiras com efeito sistémico que estiveram na base na intervenção pública após a crise financeira. Vai criar um excessivo poder de mercado, potenciando abusos de posição dominante com graves prejuízos para a economia. Em suma irá confirmar mais uma vez o papel do BCE e do Sistema Único de Supervisão como promotores ativos da concentração bancária dentro da União Europeia.

**PRÉSIDENCE: SYLVIE GUILLAUME**

*Vice-présidente*

## 6. Wznowienie posiedzenia

*(La séance est reprise à 12 h 06)*

## 7. Sytuacja w Wenezueli (złożone projekty rezolucji): Patrz protokół

## 8. Powitanie

**La Présidente.** – Nous avons le plaisir d'accueillir en tribune diplomatique une délégation du parlement – Mazhilis – du Kazakhstan présidée par M. Mukhtar Erman. La délégation est ici à Bruxelles pour participer à la 16e commission de coopération parlementaire PE-Kazakhstan. Nous sommes très heureux d'accueillir cette importante réunion qui renforcera notre dialogue et notre coopération.

C'est un honneur de vous avoir aujourd'hui au cœur de la démocratie européenne, et votre présence est le signe de notre engagement commun à promouvoir les droits de l'homme et le pluralisme politique à travers l'état de droit. Au nom de l'ensemble du Parlement européen, je vous souhaite une réunion fructueuse et un bon séjour en Europe.

**William (The Earl of) Dartmouth (EFDD).** – Madam President, I rise under Rule 11(3). According to *Politico*, our distinguished colleague Elmar Brok finds it necessary to generate cash from visitors' groups. It would appear that his salary and payment from Bertelsmann are not sufficient. I therefore propose that we make a collection in Mr Brok's honour.

*(Applause)*

I would like to set the ball rolling by donating five cents – for the benefit of the interpreters, that's five centimes. Perhaps someone else will improve on that.

**Ana Miranda (Verts/ALE).** – Señora presidenta, quisiera plantear una cuestión de observancia basándome en el artículo 22 del Reglamento interno de este Parlamento: «El presidente dirigirá, de conformidad con el presente Reglamento interno, todas las actividades del Parlamento y de sus órganos. Dispondrá de todos los poderes para presidir las deliberaciones del Parlamento y garantizar su desarrollo normal». La intervención de ayer del señor Tajani afirmando que ha hablado con el autodenominado presidente Guaidó para asegurarle el apoyo del Parlamento Europeo avanzándose a un debate y a una votación contraviene el Reglamento interno de esta Cámara, y quiero una respuesta oficial.

## 9. Głosowanie

**La Présidente.** – L'ordre du jour appelle l'Heure des votes.

### 9.1. Poprawki do Regulaminu (A8-0462/2018 - Richard Corbett) (głosowanie)

— *Avant le vote:*

**Fabio Massimo Castaldo, a nome del gruppo EFDD.** – Signor Presidente, onorevoli colleghi, tra emendamenti liberticidi sulla composizione dei gruppi, mai discussi nella commissione competente, e la richiesta di votare con voto segreto su emendamenti che prevedono una maggiore trasparenza di questa Istituzione – segretezza nella trasparenza, bellissimo ossimoro dal punto di vista politico, non finiremo mai di stupirci – questa riforma del regolamento sta diventando una farsa: uno spettacolo triste e indecoroso, che getta discredito sul Parlamento europeo.

Come Vicepresidente, sento il dovere di proteggerne la reputazione; come membro del Parlamento, ho il dovere di far rispettare il volere dei cittadini che chiedono trasparenza; come cittadino europeo, ho il dovere di chiedere che in quest'Aula siano rispettati il pluralismo e la democrazia.

È per questo che chiedo, a nome del gruppo EFDD, ai sensi dell'articolo 188, paragrafo 2, il rinvio in commissione di questo testo, che rischia di diventare un *boomerang* terribile per l'onore e la reputazione di questo Parlamento.

Grazie anche per la grande democrazia che siete riusciti a esprimere in questo contesto.

**Richard Corbett (S&D).** – Madam President, yes indeed, I would like to speak against this. The report before you has been discussed for almost a year in the Committee on Constitutional Affairs. There was a special working group, comprised of one representative from every single political group, which prepared this. It had a high level of consensus, and now it comes to plenary to be voted on and, like any report coming to plenary for vote, it is subject to amendments, and we will vote on those.

It has already been postponed from the December to the January I part-session, then it was postponed from January I to January II. I rather suspect that if we postpone it until February there will then be a proposal to postpone it until March, and then April and then May. This is beginning to sound a little bit like Theresa May!

*(Applause)*

**Elmar Brok (PPE).** – Frau Präsidentin! Der Kollege wird sich eines Tages für die Vorwürfe entschuldigen müssen.

Zweitens weiß ich, dass das die Antwort auf meine Rede zum Brexit gestern war. Das ist immer die Sache: Wenn es unbequem wird, wird jemand persönlich diffamiert. Ich glaube, ich werde niemals die Interessen Irlands und der Europäischen Union preisgeben für solche Leute, von denen Geld anzunehmen moralisch unverantwortlich wäre.

**9.2. Unijny kodeks celny: włączenie gminy Campione d'Italia i włoskich wód jeziora Lugano do obszaru celnego Unii (A8-0368/2018 - Jasenko Selimovic) (głosowanie)**

**9.3. Przepisy dotyczące płatności bezpośrednich i wsparcia rozwoju obszarów wiejskich w odniesieniu do lat 2019 i 2020 (A8-0018/2019 - Czesław Adam Siekierski) (głosowanie)**

**9.4. Przystąpienie Republiki Dominikańskiej do Konwencji haskiej z 1980 r. dotyczącej cywilnych aspektów uprowadzenia dziecka za granicę (A8-0451/2018 - Mary Honeyball) (głosowanie)**

**9.5. Przystąpienie Ekwadoru i Ukrainy do Konwencji haskiej z 1980 r. dotyczącej cywilnych aspektów uprowadzenia dziecka za granicę (A8-0452/2018 - Mary Honeyball) (głosowanie)**

**9.6. Przystąpienie Hondurasu do Konwencji haskiej z 1980 r. dotyczącej cywilnych aspektów uprowadzenia dziecka za granicę (A8-0457/2018 - Mary Honeyball) (głosowanie)**

**9.7. Przystąpienie Białorusi i Uzbekistanu do Konwencji haskiej z 1980 r. dotyczącej cywilnych aspektów uprowadzenia dziecka za granicę (A8-0458/2018 - Mary Honeyball) (głosowanie)**

**9.8. Stowarzyszenie krajów i terytoriów zamorskich z Unią Europejską, w tym stosunki między Unią Europejską a Grenlandią i Królestwem Danii (A8-0480/2018 - Maurice Ponga) (głosowanie)**

- 9.9. Sprawozdanie roczne za rok 2017 w sprawie ochrony interesów finansowych Unii Europejskiej – walka z nadużyciami finansowymi (A8-0003/2019 - Marian-Jean Marinescu) (głosowanie)**
- 9.10. Wdrażanie i funkcjonowanie nazwy domeny najwyższego poziomu „.eu” (A8-0394/2018 - Fredrick Federley) (głosowanie)**
- 9.11. Harmonizacja dochodu narodowego brutto w cenach rynkowych (rozporządzenie DNB) (A8-0009/2018 - Roberto Gualtieri) (głosowanie)**
- 9.12. Sprzeciw na podstawie art. 106 Regulaminu: genetycznie zmodyfikowany rzepak Ms8, Rf3 i Ms8 × Rf3 (B8-0073/2019) (głosowanie)**
- 9.13. Sprzeciw na podstawie art. 106 Regulaminu: Genetycznie zmodyfikowana kukurydza 5307 (SYN-Ø53Ø7-1) (B8-0074/2019) (głosowanie)**
- 9.14. Sprzeciw na podstawie art. 106 Regulaminu: Genetycznie zmodyfikowana kukurydza MON 87403 (MON-874Ø3-1) (B8-0075/2019) (głosowanie)**
- 9.15. Sprzeciw na podstawie art. 106 Regulaminu: Genetycznie zmodyfikowana bawełna GHB614 × LLCotton25 × MON 15985 (B8-0076/2019) (głosowanie)**

PRESIDENZA DELL'ON. ANTONIO TAJANI

*Presidente*

- 9.16. Sytuacja w Wenezueli (B8-0082/2019, B8-0083/2019, B8-0084/2019, B8-0085/2019, B8-0086/2019, B8-0087/2019) (głosowanie)**

— *Prima della votazione:*

**Esteban González Pons (PPE).** – Señor presidente, desde que redactamos la Resolución común hasta ahora, Ronaldo Rodríguez, José Salas, Baptiste des Monstiers, Pierre Caillé, Gonzalo Domínguez, Leonardo Muñoz y Maurén Barriga han sido detenidos en Venezuela. Todos ellos son periodistas que trabajaban para dos medios europeos y que estaban cumpliendo con su trabajo. Por la información que acaba de dar en España el presidente de la Agencia EFE, se encuentran ahora en los calabozos del servicio secreto.

Defendamos la posición que defendamos en esta Cámara, todos —todos— estamos a favor de la libertad de expresión, y todos estamos a favor de que los medios de comunicación puedan informar con libertad, porque todos creemos que la libertad de información es la vida misma de la democracia.

Por eso, de acuerdo con el resto de proponentes de la Resolución común solicitamos que se añada un nuevo apartado después del apartado 4. Un apartado 4 bis, que diría:

«*Condemns the detention of several journalists covering the situation in Venezuela and calls for their immediate release*».

(El Parlamento admite la enmienda oral).

— Dopo la votazione:

**Presidente.** – Es un placer anunciar que el Parlamento Europeo reconoce a Juan Guaidó como legítimo presidente interino de Venezuela.

El Parlamento Europeo es la primera institución europea en hacerlo y pedimos a los Estados miembros y a la alta representante que hagan lo mismo cuanto antes a fin de tener una posición única y fuerte.

**PRÉSIDENCE: SYLVIE GUILLAUME**

*Vice-présidente*

### **9.17. Sprawozdanie roczne dotyczące polityki konkurencji (A8-0474/2018 - Michel Reimon) (głosowanie)**

— Avant le vote:

**Stelios Kouloglou (GUE/NGL).** – Madam President, after Venezuela, there is also another country that is violating human rights – there is no democracy, they are oppressing women and they are cutting dissidents into pieces – and that is Saudi Arabia. I hope we will vote for regime change in Saudi Arabia ...

(Sustained applause)

After all, there is oil there! There is oil!

We have to change the regime.

**La Présidente.** – Ceci clôt l'Heure des votes.

## **10. Wyjaśnienia dotyczące sposobu głosowania**

### **10.1. Poprawki do Regulaminu (A8-0462/2018 - Richard Corbett)**

#### **Explications de vote orales**

**Fabio Massimo Castaldo (EFDD).** – Signor Presidente, soltanto per dichiarare che sono estremamente felice, anche a nome del mio gruppo politico, che il buon senso abbia prevalso all'interno di quest'Aula.

La relazione Corbett, che introduce effettivamente alcune buone misure nel nostro regolamento, era però ampiamente viziata da due rischi mortali, a nostro avviso: da un lato, c'era il problema della trasparenza. Se c'erano emendamenti assolutamente condivisibili in tal senso, c'era anche la volontà del gruppo del Partito popolare di ricorrere al voto segreto. Abbiamo visto che, fortunatamente, questo voto segreto è stato favorevole agli emendamenti che noi abbiamo convintamente sostenuto.

Oltre a questo, c'era ovviamente il tema ben noto dell'enorme abuso di potere, permettendo a una maggioranza di decidere sullo status delle opposizioni. Ma abbiamo visto che non ha raccolto la maggioranza assoluta all'interno dell'emicycle e mi compiaccio che i colleghi abbiano fatto prevalere il principio della rappresentanza democratica e del pluralismo dentro questo emicycle, sconfiggendo chi voleva dare tutto il potere in mano ai gruppi dell'*ancien regime*.



**Bruno Gollnisch (NI).** – Madame la Présidente, depuis 30 ans, je suis le témoin de l'érosion constante des droits de la minorité dans ce parlement de plus en plus caporaliste et de plus en plus politiquement correct, dans cette institution qui ne parle que des droits des minorités, du respect de l'état de droit, de la garantie des libertés et qui la pratique très peu à l'usage interne.

Rien ne manque au rapport Corbett: une infantilisation complète des députés, une culpabilisation du mâle blanc, qui est tout à fait dans la ligne de la théorie du genre; il nous faudra désormais subir des stages pour apprendre que c'est très mal le harcèlement sexuel et signer des déclarations à cet effet; les députés ne pourront plus rencontrer leurs interlocuteurs sans que ceci soit immédiatement rendu public au nom de la transparence. J'ai envie de m'écrier: transparence, que de crimes on commet en ton nom.

Cette assemblée devient une école primaire, et je serai heureux de la quitter.

**Rory Palmer (S&D).** – Madam President, I welcome this report that has been brought forward by my colleague Richard Corbett. I welcome all the recommendations, particularly on the Members' Code of Conduct, but I specifically want to mention the recommendation on parliamentary questions – that they should be answered within six weeks.

In an answer to a question that I asked the Commission about questions last year, it stated that just 32% of written questions to the Commission were answered within that six-week timeframe. Now I don't know where members of the Commission went to school, but I'm sure in anyone's book 32% is not a particularly impressive or acceptable grade.

On this the Commission is going to have to do better. So when these recommendations are discussed in interinstitutional discussions, this is something Parliament I think has to take a strong position on. Questions are an important mechanism for us as Members in holding the Commission to account and seeking information to support our work.

32% last year is not good enough; the six-week limit is important.

**Izaskun Bilbao Barandica (ALDE).** – Señora presidenta, me alegro del resultado de este informe porque me oponía a la limitación que se quería imponer a la constitución de grupos parlamentarios, porque me parece que técnicamente estaba muy mal hecha y que políticamente era una restricción de derechos y libertades que no puedo avalar de ninguna manera.

Creo que técnicamente es una mala propuesta porque los conceptos que se manejaban eran totalmente arbitrarios y tanto la definición de qué significa coherencia ideológica de los grupos como las ideas que se manejaban para medirla no soportaban un mínimo análisis.

Quiero recordar que algunas de las que se sugieren, además, aplicadas a alguno de los grupos que ya existen en esta Cámara conducirían inmediatamente a su disolución, y otras simplemente castigan el principio de libertad de voto y conciencia que nos asiste a todos los parlamentarios.

Por eso, no me gustaría estar en el papel de quien tuviera que explicar realmente una norma que permite este nivel de arbitrariedad, y no me gustaría porque soy demócrata y creo en el Estado de Derecho. Y a quienes no lo son les encantan estas herramientas porque permiten esa arbitrariedad. Cuando se utilizan en Derecho conceptos tan indefinidos, las libertades siempre se utilizan para atacar la democracia.

**Νότης Μαριάς (ECR).** – Κυρία Πρόεδρε, κατ' αρχάς θα ήθελα να δηλώσω, για να γραφτεί στα πρακτικά εντελώς διαδικαστικά, ότι στην έκθεση Selimovic το μηχανήμά μου δεν λειτούργησε. Εάν λειτουργούσε, θα ψήφιζα αρνητικά. Τώρα σε σχέση με τη συγκεκριμένη έκθεση θέλω να πω ότι απέτυχε η προσπάθεια των μεγάλων πολιτικών ομάδων επί της ουσίας να επιβάλουν αυτό το οποίο ήθελαν, δηλαδή να κρίνουν αυτές υπό ποιους όρους θα συγκροτούνται πολιτικές ομάδες, διότι η έννοια της πολιτικής σχέσης (political affiliation) δεν είναι κάτι το οποίο θα ρύθμιζε η ίδια η Ολομέλεια. Αυτό το ανέλυσα και χθες. Από κει και πέρα, πρέπει να υπάρξουν και άλλες βελτιώσεις στον Κανονισμό, ιδίως όσον αφορά τον προληπτικό έλεγχο που ασκεί το Προεδρείο σε σχέση με τις ερωτήσεις, διότι υποβάλλουμε ερωτήσεις και τελικά το Προεδρείο του Ευρωπαϊκού Κοινοβουλίου ελέγχει αν αυτές είναι σωστές και τις απορρίπτει ή όχι. Αυτό είναι κάτι το απαράδεκτο και θα πρέπει να σταματήσει.

**José Inácio Faria (PPE).** – Senhora Presidente, votei favoravelmente as alterações ao Regimento do Parlamento Europeu porque acredito que estar seriamente na política não é estar refém de ideologias ou capturado por grupos de interesse.

É, sim, poder resolver os problemas dos cidadãos e projetar o futuro da União Europeia e dos seus Estados-Membros, cultivando os valores do desenvolvimento humano respeitando a liberdade individual e defendendo a democracia.

Exige-se, por isso, uma maior transparência e disponibilidade de informação sobre as relações mantidas pelos euro-deputados para as atividades de redação dos atos legislativos nos múltiplos contactos desenvolvidos com a sociedade civil.

Temos que descansar os nossos constituintes de que ouvimos todas as vozes, porque ouvir a diversidade de opiniões é acautelar as preocupações dos cidadãos da União Europeia, é garantir que construímos uma Europa sem atropelos e é assegurar que defendemos as causas certas pelas quais fomos eleitos.

Apoiar o secretismo é meio caminho andado para criar as condições favoráveis à corrupção e albergar o tráfico de influências debaixo do mesmo teto da democracia, e para isso não contem comigo.

Por estes motivos, a Europa já sofreu que baste.

**Seán Kelly (PPE).** – Madam President, I am pleased to support the amendments to the Rules of Procedure drafted by my good friend Richard Corbett, despite the fact that there were secret ballots on two votes relating to Amendment 20 of this report.

I want to make it very clear and for it to be on the record that I voted in favour of the mandatory legislative footprint for rapporteurs, shadows and chairs, and indeed for increased transparency on the general expenditure allowance. I consistently publish any meetings I have across all my social media channels and always host visitors in public areas of Parliament where I am visible by all.

We must be committed to transparency and accountability across the EU and its institutions. Transparency builds trust with our constituents and allows them confidently to put their faith in their representatives.

Furthermore, I would like to put on the record that I disagree with having these two secret ballot votes. This is not how we should operate in Parliament. I am proud of the work I do on behalf of my Irish constituents and want to have this known.

Finally, I am pleased to vote in favour of the amendment regarding mandatory anti-harassment training. Having already completed a training myself, I recommend it to other MEPs as well.

**Ангел Джамбазки (ECR).** – Докладът на колегата Корбет е силно противоречив и внесените по него изменения целят ограничаване на демократичната свобода. Изискването политическите групи да предоставят политически декларации, подписани от всички свои членове, в които да декларират своята политическа принадлежност, противоречи на всякакви правила и процедури, които този Парламент постоянно заявява, че защитава. Радвам се, че от текста успяхме да премахнем изискването Европейският парламент да може да оценява дали политическите групи са сформирани според политическата принадлежност на всички партии към едно политическо семейство. Това няма как да бъде доказано и е абсолютно несъстоятелно. За мен това е инструмент, с който големите политически групи, когато са изплашени, че ще загубят надмощието си, отчаяно ще се опитват да задържат това надмощие и да развалят останалите политически групи.

**Andrejs Mamikins (S&D).** – Madam President, I agree that more transparency and accountability in the decision-making is needed. However, I cannot agree with the concept of political affinity for the formation of political groups in the European Parliament. We do not have concrete criteria and parameters for that, apart from the fact that the word 'affinity' does not have any legal force. As we can see from the results, the votes of the Group can be inconsistent and incoherent on some issues. We have the freedom of vote, and this is something our electorate relies on. We represent the citizens and the residents of the European Union to advance their needs, and we cannot do it if we are strictly limited by belonging to the Group. In order not to make the EP dysfunctional and in order that it will continue to be a truly democratic institution, we must continue the practice of free and voluntary Group formation. That is why I abstained.

**Daniel Hannan (ECR).** – Madam President, the debate has tended to focus on the plans here to make life harder for small Groups: Groups that challenge the orthodoxy or represent dissident opinions. No surprise here; I think even my federalist colleagues will admit that this has been the theme of the reforms of this Parliament over some time. Despite all the rhetoric we get about tolerance, there is an intolerance of people who run up against the challenged views on European integration. But I just wanted to draw the House's attention to Amendment 14 of the Parliament's Rules of Procedures, which is a deletion, and one of the lines deleted is this one: 'the application of this rule shall not otherwise detract from the liveliness of parliamentary debates, nor shall it undermine Members' freedom of speech'. That's deleted. I suppose the one argument that could be made is that this House, in its new attitude to free speech, is at least in line with changing *mores* in Europe as a whole. Still, what a sad comment for what is, at the end of the day, a parliament. As the etymology of that word implies, it is a place one ought to be able to talk freely.

**Dobromir Sośnierz (NI).** – Pani Przewodnicząca! Upadła poprawka dotycząca tego, by rządzące większościowe grupy mogły rozwiązywać grupy opozycyjne. Głosowanie nad nią pokazuje, że poparło tę poprawkę kilkaset osób, a więc zagrożenia dla demokracji w Europie nie należy szukać w jakiś małych, marginalnych neofaszystowskich grupkach, tylko tutaj, na tej sali. Myślę, że to jest obłudne, kiedy jednego dnia upominamy się o wolność słowa w Wenezueli, a ograniczamy po raz kolejny wolność słowa na tej sali. Poseł powinien odpowiadać jedynie przed swoimi wyborcami, a nie przed swoimi przeciwnikami politycznymi, bo wszelkie narzędzia kontroli posłów, jakkolwiek demagogicznie się ich tu nie uzasadnia: dobrem, przejrzystością, mową nienawiści itd., mogą służyć jako narzędzie represji. I to jest absolutnie niedopuszczalne.

Mam nadzieję, że historia zakpi z tych, którzy chcą dzisiaj, będąc w większości, kontrolować mniejszość, i po pewnych zmianach, być może, kiedyś jacyś ich przeciwnicy polityczni będą ich gnębić o mowę nienawiści. Na przykład ja uznałbym, że mową nienawiści jest domaganie się przywilejów dla kobiet – to jest mowa nienawiści wobec mężczyzn – albo zwiększanie podatków jest narzędziem ucisku ekonomicznego.

**Stanislav Polčák (PPE).** – Paní předsedající, já jsem hlasoval pro podporu tohoto návrhu. Chtěl bych vysvětlit své hlasování v oblasti urážlivých projevů a navázat na kolegu Sośnierze.

Já jsem osobně hlasoval proti tomuto návrhu, tzn. pro to, aby byla respektována větší svoboda poslanců při jejich projevech. To ovšem neznamená, že by se mělo podle mého názoru mluvit urážlivě. Na druhou stranu chci respektovat názor, který vyslovil Evropský soudní dvůr, i když s ním úplně nesouhlasím.

Pan Sośnierz zde nastoupil za pana Mikkeho. My jsme zde slyšeli od tohoto pána takové množství urážek. Zdá se, že budeme muset být jaksi odolnější vůči těmto výrokům, z tohoto důvodu já jsem nepodpořil tento konkrétní pozměňovací návrh. Budeme muset být odolnější, ale myslím si, že by se mělo v této sněmovně mluvit slušně.

Jinak vítám přijetí pozměňovacích návrhů, které byly uplatněny, a myslím, že pokud jde o lobbying, je dobré ho zkrotit.

**John Howarth (S&D).** – Madam President, I am happy to welcome the proposals in this report as well-intentioned, particularly in the context of meetings with lobbyists. My fear, however, as someone who has worked in the public affairs industry, is that this will prove ineffective, and my further fear is that this will put into the public domain information that is easily distorted by those of less good intentions that will present a false impression of what Members are seeking to do. So I urge the Conference of Presidents to keep this under review.

I would add my view to Mr Palmer's view on the need to produce answers to questions more quickly. On the question of political groups, we all know that Groups like UKIP have abused the rules of this place, and it's right to try to stop them. But my fear is also that that would not produce the result that was intended.

On the question of secret ballots on votes on transparency, please: it's absurd. I support them.

## 10.2. Sprawozdanie roczne za rok 2017 w sprawie ochrony interesów finansowych Unii Europejskiej – walka z nadużyciami finansowymi (A8-0003/2019 - Marian-Jean Marinescu)

### Explications de vote orales

**Michaela Šojdrová (PPE).** – Paní předsedající, řádná zpráva veřejných výdajů a ochrana finančních zájmů EU – tato slova nejsou jen prázdnou frází. Naopak, naším důležitým posláním je pečlivě dohlížet nad řádným a efektivním využíváním peněz všech občanů EU tak, aby byla posílena důvěra občanů.

Pocházím z ČR a podezření ze zneužívání evropských finančních prostředků nás, bohužel, zasahuje až do nejvyšších pater politiky. Proto jsem si vědoma důležitosti boje proti podvodům, ve kterém musíme nadále trvat, a to i přes povzbudivý fakt, že dochází celkově ke zlepšení a klesá počet podvodů a nesrovnalostí. Proto jsem podpořila tuto zprávu.

**Rosa D'Amato, a nome del gruppo EFDD.** – Signor Presidente, la relazione annuale sulla protezione degli interessi finanziari e la lotta alla frode nell'Unione europea mette in evidenza i danni delle grandi lobby che, entrando nelle istituzioni o, viceversa, con il cosiddetto «effetto porte girevoli», esercitano un forte potere di condizionamento se non di corruzione. Inoltre, esprime forte preoccupazione sui controlli relativi agli strumenti finanziari gestiti da intermediari e sul controllo delle sedi legali dei beneficiari. Infine, dichiara che le frodi nel campo dell'IVA intracomunitaria costano all'Unione circa 50 miliardi ogni anno.

Rispetto al generale calo poi delle irregolarità nel 2017, registra un preoccupante dato in controtendenza che riguarda gli aiuti diretti in agricoltura, con un valore medio per ciascun caso di frode aumentato addirittura del 227 %. Possibile che vada tutto bene, tranne in un unico ambito? Non è che forse ci sono lacune nell'individuazione generale delle frodi? Questa domanda è ancora più urgente in considerazione del fatto che alcuni paesi non segnalano alcun tipo di frode. Com'è possibile? Non è che alcuni Stati, timorosi dei controlli sulle proprie leggi di bilancio e quindi sul processo di governance economica imposto dall'Unione europea, preferiscono barare sul monitoraggio anticorruzione, riducendo l'invio dei dati o addirittura non inviandoli affatto? Alla luce di queste falle, come può la Commissione non ritenere necessaria la pubblicazione della relazione sulla lotta alla corruzione? Per quale ragione?

Colleghi, se si vogliono contrastare i fenomeni di corruzione e le frodi per salvaguardare gli interessi dei cittadini europei, bisogna intensificare i controlli e migliorarne la qualità. La Commissione dovrebbe individuare indicatori rigorosi e criteri uniformi che vanno adottati in maniera vincolante da parte di tutti gli Stati membri. Servono azioni di prevenzione e contrasto che siano decise e armonizzate in tutta Europa. È necessario mettere l'OLAF in condizione di poter accedere ai dati e alle informazioni necessarie per effettuare le opportune verifiche.

Dal momento che tutte queste considerazioni sono state in larga parte espresse nella relazione, il mio voto è stato a favore.

**Νότης Μαρίας (ECR).** – Κυρία Πρόεδρε, η καταπολέμηση της απάτης που υπάρχει σε σχέση με τη διαχείριση των κοινοτικών κονδυλίων αλλά και τον ΦΠΑ νομίζω ότι πρέπει να ενταθεί. Σε αυτήν εδώ την αίθουσα έχουμε καταγγείλει το «πάρτι» το οποίο γίνεται από τις διάφορες ΜΚΟ στην Ελλάδα, που πραγματικά έχουν χρησιμοποιήσει τεράστια κονδύλια στο θέμα –υποτιθεται– της προστασίας των προσφύγων αλλά στην πράξη βλέπουμε ότι οι πρόσφυγες τώρα τον χειμώνα κρυώνουν. Εδώ σε αυτή την αίθουσα έχω κάνει συγκεκριμένες καταγγελίες. Ακόμη να έχουμε αποτέλεσμα από την OLAF, ακόμη να έχουμε αποτέλεσμα από την Επιτροπή. Το δεύτερο θέμα είναι οι απάτες στον τομέα της αγροτικής πολιτικής, διότι αυτό που συμβαίνει είναι να βαφτίζονται ξένα αγροτικά και κτηνοτροφικά προϊόντα ως ελληνικά: αυτό που λέμε «ελληνοποίηση». Έτσι έχουμε ελληνοποίηση γάλακτος που εισάγεται από την Αλβανία, ελληνοποίηση κρεάτων που εισάγονται από τα Σκόπια και πρέπει να παρθούν συγκεκριμένα μέτρα. Είχε δεσμευτεί και ο κύριος Oettinger ότι στο θέμα αυτό θα παρέμβει η Επιτροπή. Περιμένουμε ακόμη να ληφθούν μέτρα.

**Bogdan Andrzej Zdrojewski (PPE).** – Pani Przewodnicząca! Wprowadzanie do porządków obrad nowych punktów *ad hoc* bardzo często niestety odbiera szanse na poważną debatę w tych punktach, które zostały zaplanowane wcześniej. Wydaje mi się, że mogą w tej materii istnieć wyjątki, ale stają się niestety regułą.

Dlatego teraz w dużym skrócie dwie uwagi *à propos* sprawozdania w sprawie ochrony interesów finansowych Unii Europejskiej. Pierwsza – do pesymistów, druga – do optymistów. Ta pierwsza jest związana przede wszystkim z malejącą liczbą spraw, nieprawidłowości zgłaszanych w 2017 roku w stosunku do roku 2016; spadło to do 2,58 mld euro. Ale usatysfakcjonowanym tym optymistom chcę zwrócić uwagę na drugą rzecz: w porównaniu do roku 2016 same nadużycia finansowe to 0,5 mld euro, czyli wzrost o blisko 20 %.

**Ангел Джамбазки (ECR).** – Гласувах против доклада на г-н Маринеску, защото смятам, че националният суверенитет е от значение и най-сетне той трябва да бъде уважаван и защитаван. Докладът отчита, че общият брой на нередностите, които са разследвани през 2017 г., 15 213 случая, са с 20% по-малко в сравнение с 2016 г., когато има 19 080 случая, и че тяхната стойност като щети е намаляла с 13% – от 2,97 милиарда евро през 2016 г. до 2,58 милиарда евро през 2017 г.

Въпреки че борбата срещу всякаква корупция е легитимна цел и призивът за по-тясно сътрудничество между държавите-членки на Европейския съюз по отношение на обмена на информация също е легитимна цел и е нещо, което аз и моята група със сигурност подкрепяме, докладът съдържа и някои спорни аспекти, а именно препратките към повече действия на европейско ниво, което би отнело суверенитета на държавите членки, в чиито компетенции влиза борбата с организираната престъпност.

**Andrejs Mamikins (S&D).** – Madam President, the Lisbon Treaty says that Member States must fight against fraud affecting the financial interests of the Union as they do to counter the fraud affecting their own financial interests. Unfortunately, the corruption in the Member States does not stop at their borders, and it has a spill-over effect to the EU. As a result, we lose both citizens' trust in national public administration and in EU institutions. I wish all our national police and investigation authorities would read the report tomorrow, instead of the morning paper. The figures are really alarming. VAT fraud costs the Union around EUR 15 billion annually. OLAF very rarely carries our investigations into irregularities concerning VAT, due to a lack of instruments. Since it's clear that we cannot fully rely on the efforts of 28 or 27 national anti-fraud systems, we need to give more possibilities to OLAF.

**Daniel Hannan (ECR).** – Madam President, the obvious question about protecting the EU's financial interests arises in the context of the EUR 50 billion deficit that will be the consequence of a no-deal Brexit, and it was very clear in this Chamber, listening to the debate yesterday, that that is now the way in which people here want to head. There's a complete unwillingness to show any flexibility that would result in a deal. And yet I was amazed to discover yesterday that, at the same time, the European Commission expects the money to be paid even in the event that there is no deal.

The United Kingdom was happy to sign up to more than any international court would think was a strict liability for the sake of good relations and facilitating a future trade relationship. But if there is no deal, you don't get to tell us what to do anymore.

**Stanislav Polčák (PPE).** – Paní předsedající, já jsem tuto zprávu podpořil, protože za prvé chci ocenit vývoj, který znamená, že méně podvodů a méně nesrovnalostí je právě při nakládání s evropskými penězi. To je myslím, že velmi pozitivní trend, i když občas toto procento v tom meziročním srovnání klesá a někdy trochu stoupá, tak tento trend je pozitivní. Musíme motivovat justici k tomu, aby všechny případy řešila zásadou padni komu padni.

Zároveň bych se chtěl vyjádřit a ocenit pozměňovací návrh, který v této zprávě vyzdvihuje roli investigativních novinářů. Máme zde tragické případy z Malty, ze Slovenska. Já bych chtěl upozornit především na jisté riziko právě propojení moci politické, ekonomické a mediální. Té jsme svědky i v ČR. Když se tyto složky skloubí vzájemně dohromady, tak demokratické brzdy přestávají fungovat. Myslím si, že i na toto by evropské právo mělo pamatovat.

### 10.3. Wdrażanie i funkcjonowanie nazwy domeny najwyższego poziomu „eu” (A8-0394/2018 - Fredrick Federley)

#### Explications de vote orales

**Michaela Šojdrová (PPE).** – Paní předsedající, zprávu o návrhu nařízení týkajícího se domény .eu jsem podpořila. Jeví se možná spíše jako technická záležitost, ale je zde jasný přesah na podporu vizuální identity EU v členských státech a v celkovém internetovém prostředí napříč hranicemi. Internet je v dnešní době spojen i s otázkou ochrany dat a lidských práv a pozice EP na tuto ochranu pamatuje. Také souhlasím s tím, aby byla doména rozšířena na celý evropský hospodářský prostor, protože hospodářské propojení je v tomto prostoru velké a je žádoucí. Je to v zájmu ekonomického růstu EU i členských států.

**Bogdan Andrzej Zdrojewski (PPE).** – Pani Przewodnicząca! Po zakończonej debacie otrzymałem kilka pytań. Przede wszystkim: po co był ten przegląd domen? Oraz: jakie są wnioski tego z przeglądu? Wygląda na to, że debata nie dała wystarczającej odpowiedzi na te dwa pytania.

Podkreślę – sam przegląd był przede wszystkim dlatego, że mamy gigantyczny wzrost samych domen i to tego najwyższego poziomu, czyli tych, które dominują i decydują o jakości funkcjonowania rynku informatycznego, informacji w tej materii.

Ale jaki jest jego efekt? To jest najistotniejsze. Chcę podkreślić cztery punkty. Po pierwsze, usunięcie nieaktualnych wymogów prawnych, także administracyjnych, i sama aktualizacja przepisów. Po drugie, dalsze uwzględnienie i promowanie priorytetów Unii Europejskiej w świecie internetowym, bardziej skuteczne. Po trzecie, złagodzenie obowiązujących kryteriów kwalifikowalności dotyczących rejestracji domen. I po czwarte, na koniec, zniesienie zakazów dotyczących separacji pionowej, to jest przepisów wymagających ścisłego rozgraniczenia między organizacjami zarządzającymi nazwami domen, rejestracjami a podmiotami zajmującymi się ich sprzedażą.

**Seán Kelly (PPE).** – Madam President, firstly, my congratulations to our wonderful colleague Frederick Federley for his work on this report, which I had the pleasure of voting to support.

The .eu top-level domain name is well established in a fast-flowing top-level domain (TLD) market. In a digital landscape that is constantly evolving, it is crucial that the legal framework for the .eu TLD is updated appropriately and that we secure flexible regulation for the future. This will assist in the promotion of EU values, including respect for users' privacy and security, consumer protection, human rights and multilingualism.

To this end, I support an assurance that all residents of EU Member States and organisations established in the EU be allowed to register a .eu TLD.

I particularly welcome the mandatory revocation of a domain name when it has been used in bad faith, and I am also in favour of an assessment by the Commission of possible cooperation between the registry and the EU Intellectual Property Office.

**Andrejs Mamikins (S&D).** – Madam President, I welcome the report drafted by my colleague, Mr Federley, and I voted in favour. Although the .eu top-level domain (TLD) functions well, it is also true that the online environment and market are evolving very quickly, and we should always think one step ahead.

Therefore, the legal framework governing the domain has to be adapted. The .eu domain is also an element of our common online identity. Therefore, we have to be careful with what falls under this domain name. Multilingualism, respect for privacy and security, consumer protection, human rights: yes, all these principles must be upheld for granting this domain name. The European Parliament has to exercise major control over it and should be able to establish the criteria in the procedure for the registry.

**Dobromir Sośnierz (NI).** – Pani Przewodnicząca! To sprawozdanie jest przykładem tego, że Unia Europejska ideologizuje wszystko, czym się zajmie. Nawet głupie dwie literki na końcu domeny potrafi ubrać w jakieś nieprawdopodobne stwierdzenia o ochronie europejskiej tożsamości. Chce uzależniać to od promowania wartości unijnych. Jestem pewien, że nawet jakbyśmy tu o ziemniakach debatowali, to by się okazało, że ziemniak może być narzędziem europejskiej tożsamości i promocji unijnych wartości. Uzależnianie tego, czy ktoś może kupować domenę, od tego, czy tu mieszka, czy nie, czy wyznaje wartości i czy domena będzie służyła wielojęzyczności, jest po prostu żalotne. Znaczy, że jak nie będzie przetłumaczona na ileś języków, to być może nie będzie możliwe wykupienie takiej domeny czy będzie ona odbierana? Naprawdę, jest to wszystko tak smutne, że aż śmieszne, a może tak śmieszne, że aż smutne. Głosowałem przeciwko temu.

**Alex Mayer (S&D).** – Madam President, this report means that, in the event of a no-deal Brexit, the .eu domain name will be lost overnight in the UK. It's something I use and something that the East of England Local Government Partnership Office uses. Sadly, this is an office that is threatened with imminent closure, as EELGA want to pull the financial plug. Now I appreciate the huge financial pressures on local government, but shutting the office is foolhardy, throwing down the drain experienced specialist knowledge, contacts and goodwill. Because Plan A Brexit, Plan B Brexit, hard Brexit, soft Brexit, No Brexit at all: as a region I am sure that we will still want to do business with other European regions. So why put up a 'closed' sign on the east of England?

So today I urge an urgent rethink. We are a global player in life sciences, communications and manufacturing. So let us do the right thing by our region and keep an office where the East meets the rest of the world.

#### **10.4. Sytuacja w Wenezueli (B8-0082/2019, B8-0083/2019, B8-0084/2019, B8-0085/2019, B8-0086/2019, B8-0087/2019)**

##### **Explications de vote orales**

**Xabier Benito Ziluaga (GUE/NGL).** – Señora presidenta, ocho son las Resoluciones que este Parlamento ya ha emitido sobre la situación en Venezuela. Y ocho son las Resoluciones que nada han aportado para solucionar la crisis en Venezuela. Con el reconocimiento del autoproclamado Guaidó, ustedes están validando un golpe de Estado que, para desgracia del pueblo venezolano, tiene visos inevitables de terminar en una intervención militar o en una guerra civil.

Hoy, en vez de marcar un perfil propio, llamando al diálogo y a la paz, como ha hecho el secretario general de las Naciones Unidas, la Unión Europea ha decidido convertirse en el siervo de Trump apoyando su desquiciada política de intervencionismo y sumándose a un imprudente reconocimiento bilateral que no hace más que echar más gasolina al fuego.

Y es curioso que el propio Guaidó haya prometido convocar elecciones en un plazo de seis a doce meses, cuando la Constitución de Venezuela le obligaría a hacerlo en un plazo máximo de treinta días. Aún no es presidente y ya quiere incumplir la Constitución de su país. La UE debe ser un instrumento al servicio de la paz y del diálogo, no de alimentar las guerras.

**Paloma López Bermejo (GUE/NGL).** – Señora presidenta, he votado en contra de la Resolución sobre la situación de Venezuela porque, lamentablemente, nos volvemos a encontrar con una Unión Europea que cruza descaradamente la línea roja del respeto al Derecho internacional.

Hoy, la Unión Europea se subordina una vez más a Estados Unidos y se pone del lado del bloque de la guerra con Trump, Duque y Bolsonaro, que alientan un golpe glorioso y una intervención militar.

Haciendo un alarde de cinismo tratan de justificar su posición apelando a la defensa de los derechos humanos. Esos mismos que se vulneran en Marruecos, Israel y Arabia Saudí con su consentimiento.

Seamos claros: su único interés es el petróleo. A ustedes no les importa mancharse las manos de sangre del petróleo. Si tanto les interesara el pueblo venezolano, retiren las sanciones y el bloqueo.

Hoy la Unión Europea vuelve a perder legitimidad. Mejor harían situándose en el bloque del diálogo constructivo y la paz, y por tanto en el respeto al Derecho internacional, y al lado del Consejo de Seguridad de Naciones Unidas.

**Μαρία Σπυράκη (PPE).** – Κυρία Πρόεδρε, σήμερα το Ευρωπαϊκό Κοινοβούλιο έστειλε ένα σαφές και καθαρό μήνυμα: στη Βενεζουέλα το καθεστώς Μαδούρο σκοτώνει ανθρώπους στον δρόμο, επειδή διαφωνούν με τις απόψεις του. Στη Βενεζουέλα οι άνθρωποι δοκιμάζονται από τη στέρηση βασικών αγαθών και ελευθεριών. Στη Βενεζουέλα διώκονται και φυλακίζονται δημοσιογράφοι. Στη Βενεζουέλα δοκιμάζονται οι αξίες μας, οι ευρωπαϊκές αξίες, αυτές που μας ενώνουν και είμαστε εδώ. Είναι λοιπόν απαραίτητο να πρωτοστατούμε ως Κοινοβούλιο, ζητώντας την αναγνώριση του ενδιάμεσου Προέδρου, της ενδιάμεσης ηγεσίας, που θα οδηγήσει σε ελεύθερες δίκαιες και αξιοπίστες εκλογές. Είναι απαραίτητο να καλούμε το Συμβούλιο να κινηθεί άμεσα και συνεκτικά. Καμία αμφιβολία, κανένας ενδοιασμός, καμία εκλεκτική συγγένεια με το καθεστώς Μαδούρο δεν μπορεί και δεν πρέπει να μειώσει την αποφασιστικότητα της Ευρωπαϊκής Ένωσης. Ευρώπη και Μαδούρο δεν πάνε μαζί. Αυτό πρέπει να το ακούσουν όλοι οι πολίτες της Βενεζουέλας, νιώθοντας τη στήριξη της Ευρωπαϊκής Ένωσης.

**Marina Albiol Guzmán**, *en nombre del Grupo GUE/NGL*. – La Izquierda Unitaria Europea ha votado en contra de la Resolución sobre la situación en Venezuela presentada por el Grupo PPE, socialdemócratas y liberales. Claro. Porque es una Resolución que reconoce a Juan Guaidó, el golpista, como presidente. Y lo hace porque, como todos sabemos, la Unión Europea está preocupadísima por los derechos humanos y por eso financia centros de tortura para migrantes en Libia, construye vallas con concertinas o impide que los barcos de las ONG salgan a la mar para rescatar personas. Está preocupadísima por los derechos humanos, claro, pero en Venezuela.

Otro argumento para reconocer al golpista es el fuerte aprecio que tiene la Unión Europea por la democracia. Y por eso la Unión Europea tiene un acuerdo económico preferencial con un modelo tan democrático como la monarquía absoluta de Arabia Saudí.

El Parlamento Europeo considera que tiene que apoyar a una persona que se ha autoproclamado presidente, así sin elecciones ni nada, porque Maduro es un tirano que mata al pueblo de hambre. No como el presidente de Sudán, con quien la Unión Europea ha firmado varios acuerdos en los últimos meses, que solo tiene dos órdenes de búsqueda y captura por parte de la Corte Penal Internacional por crímenes contra la humanidad.

Además, el Parlamento Europeo está consternado porque, según sus datos, dos millones de venezolanos y venezolanas están exiliados. En cambio, Israel es prácticamente un miembro más de la Unión Europea porque solo hay cinco millones de palestinos y palestinas en el exilio.

Yo creo que queda clarísimo que el apoyo al golpe de Estado en Venezuela no tiene nada que ver ni con el petróleo, ni con el seguidismo de la Unión Europea a los Estados Unidos, ni muchísimo menos con que Venezuela tenga un Gobierno que no sigue sus dictados neoliberales.

**José Inácio Faria (PPE)**. – Senhora Presidente, votei favoravelmente esta resolução sobre a Venezuela, da qual foi um dos subscritores, porque entendo que a União Europeia, que não reconheceu legitimidade da eleição presidencial antecipada de 20 de maio de 2018, não deve esperar mais para reconhecer explícita e unanimemente Juan Guaidó como legítimo presidente interino da Venezuela e deve aproveitar o facto de contar com cinco Estados-Membros entre os 15 países com assento no Conselho de Segurança da ONU para promover um entendimento a que os Estados Unidos, a Rússia e a China não conseguem ou não querem chegar.

Ao contrário do que apregoa Nicolás Maduro, não é o imperialismo que quer novas eleições antes de 2025. Essa é uma exigência dos seus concidadãos que justamente reclamam o regresso da democracia e do Estado de Direito e o fim do narcostado corrupto que obriga milhões a emigrar ou a diariamente cruzar as fronteiras para procurar comida e medicamentos para os seus filhos.

Como disse, e bem, a Alta Representante Mogherini, estas vozes que pedem maciçamente a democracia e a possibilidade de determinar livremente o seu destino não podem ser ignoradas. Entendo também que esta casa não pode deixar de condenar as graves limitações dos direitos civis de Juan Guaidó impostas pelo Tribunal Supremo de Justiça e apelar à libertação imediata dos jornalistas, incluindo um europeu, detidos ontem em Caracas pelo sinistro serviço bolivariano de inteligência nacional.

**Dobromir Sośnierz (NI)**. – Pani Przewodnicząca! Ja wstrzymałem się od głosu. Nie chciałem głosować przeciwko, żeby nie wpisać się tutaj w retorykę obrony komunistycznego reżimu, jaką słyszymy z lewej strony sali. Widać, że nasi „czerwoni” koledzy są dużo bardziej wyrozumiali dla totalitarnych reżimów, jeśli one podzielają ich wartości. I teraz upominają się o legalizm? Ja chciałbym przypomnieć, jak głosowali w sprawie Mołdawii, gdy nakazali rządowi zamach stanu wobec legalnego wyroku sądu. Tak samo w sprawie Sudanu głosowaliśmy za tym, żeby rząd podważał wyroki sądowe. A tutaj nagle tacy legaliści.

Ale nie mogłem też głosować za, ponieważ po pierwsze, jest to totalna hipokryzja, gdy w dniu, w którym po raz kolejny ograniczamy wolność słowa posłów we własnym Parlamencie, pouczamy znowu świat na temat wolności słowa. A po drugie, z zasady nie popieram pisania przez Parlament Europejski rezolucji, w których wiecznie wypowiadamy się na każdy temat na całym świecie, nie znając się na tym naprawdę dobrze. I nie jesteśmy do tego powołani. Parlament powinien stanowić prawo dla Europejczyków, a nie wypowiadać się na bieżące tematy polityczne.



**Georgi Pirinski (S&D).** – Madam President, it should be crystal clear that the only possible way to overcome the present crisis is through dialogue between the government and the opposition. This resolution, which we just passed, goes in exactly the opposite direction, blocking such dialogue – contrary to what the Secretary-General of the United Nations has called for; contrary to what is in this morning's news – that President Maduro is ready to engage in dialogue.

There is a terrible double standard in this resolution. It criticises the government for holding unilateral elections, for not consulting with anybody when they organise them; and then it totally supports another unilateral action by the opposition, declaring Guaido as President.

I find this a terrible fault by this Parliament. In taking such a decision, it is only deepening the crisis.

**Daniel Hannan (ECR).** – Madam President, credit where it's due: the approach of this Chamber to the Venezuelan catastrophe has been exemplary and the leadership of Antonio Tajani has been visionary on this issue.

When I was growing up in South America in the '70s Venezuela was a country that people emigrated to. When Hugo Chávez took over in 1999 the GDP per head was still substantially above the regional average. Now we have seen the worst refugee crisis in the history of the Western Hemisphere – more than 3 million people displaced, inflation touching 10 million% annually.

Extraordinarily, there are people, including some in the Socialist and Communist groups in this House, as we've just heard, who still stand by the discredited tyrannical regime of the Chavista-Maduro clique. How many times do we have to go through this experience before we understand that the problem of socialism is not some glittering implementation. The story is the same every time. It begins with slogans about the people, it ends in tyranny, poverty and oppression.

## 10.5. Sprawozdanie roczne dotyczące polityki konkurencji (A8-0474/2018 - Michel Reimon)

### Explications de vote orales

**Νότης Μαριάς (ECR).** – Κυρία Πρόεδρε, σημαντικός παράγοντας της πολιτικής ανταγωνισμού είναι οι λεγόμενες κρατικές ενισχύσεις και στο θέμα αυτό έχουν γίνει, πραγματικά, σημεία και τέρατα. Έχουν επιβληθεί πολλές διατάξεις και πρόστιμα, με αποτέλεσμα κυρίως η ναυπηγική βιομηχανία να έχει καταστραφεί. Η γνωστή ναυπηγική βιομηχανία στην Ελλάδα, τα Ναυπηγεία Σκαραμαγκά, πρέπει να πληρώσει για κρατικές ενισχύσεις 310 εκατομμύρια ευρώ. Απαγορεύεται μέχρι στιγμής να χιτίζουν εμπορικά πλοία –πού; Στην Ελλάδα! Όταν ο μεγαλύτερος εμπορικός στόλος, έχει ελληνική σημαία! Ταυτόχρονα, μια άλλη εταιρεία, η ΛΑΡΚΟ, αναγκάζεται με απόφαση του Δικαστηρίου να επιστρέψει 135,8 εκατομμύρια ευρώ, με αποτέλεσμα να κλείσει. Θεωρούμε ότι πρέπει να αλλάξει η πολιτική γύρω από τις κρατικές ενισχύσεις: να υπάρξει απαλλαγή στην Ελλάδα, και ιδίως σε αυτές τις επιχειρήσεις να μην επιστρέψουν τα κονδύλια αυτά. Τέλος, να υπάρξει ειδικό καθεστώς. Η ελληνική οικονομία είναι σε κρίση λόγω του μνημονίου. Να υπάρξουν ειδικές ρυθμίσεις και ειδικό καθεστώς για την Ελλάδα στον τομέα των κρατικών ενισχύσεων.

**Alex Mayer (S&D).** – Madam President, this report rightly raises concerns about certain businesses that escape paying their fair share due to mismatches between national tax systems. We need to stop the race to the bottom on corporate tax levels. Likewise, a digital services tax is crucial to ensure that the likes of Facebook and Amazon pay up until there is a permanent solution allowing profits to be taxed where value is created.

Madam President, finally, it's also just been pointed out to me that I may well be the final British MEP to ever speak in this Chamber in Brussels. So let me say that I am proud to be part of the greatest peace and prosperity project of modern times, and good friends never say goodbye. They simply say: 'See you soon'.

**Bogdan Andrzej Zdrojewski (PPE).** – Pani Przewodnicząca! Tym razem roczne sprawozdanie dotyczące polityki konkurencji nie było takie rutynowe jak zazwyczaj. Może dlatego, że poświęcono sporo czasu dwóm bardzo poważnym podmiotom: z jednej strony producentom samochodów ciężarowych, którzy zbudowali kartel podwyższający ceny za te pojazdy na rynku europejskim, a z drugiej strony na przykład firmie Google. Chcę zwrócić uwagę, że ta zgoda na sali co do konieczności potępienia praktyk podnoszenia cen, niezapewnienia konkurencyjności, pomimo pewnej wewnętrznej zgodności bardzo często jest powierzchowna.

Przypomnę także, że polityka konkurencji musi być zorientowana na zapewnienie równych warunków działania wszystkim podmiotom we wszystkich sektorach i że to jest właśnie kamień węgielny europejskiej społecznej gospodarki rynkowej. I w żadnym wypadku nie może być zgody na to, by zamożne podmioty, zamożne osoby w tych warunkach były w jakikolwiek sposób uprzywilejowane.

**Seán Kelly (PPE).** – Madam President, I chose to abstain on this report. While there are some elements in the report that are quite positive, I feel it goes beyond the scope of a report on EU competition policy by calling for the implementation of CCCTB and for the removal of the unanimity principle for votes on tax issues at the Council. Still, I support reports welcoming the Commission efforts to ensure the effective application of competition rules across the EU, and indeed the encouraging of a structured dialogue with the Commissioner for Competition and the efforts of the Commission to maintain close cooperation with Parliament on these matters. Finally, I welcome the call for the Commission to increase support for SMEs and to protect our rights in the event of unfair commercial practices, and indeed the call on the Commission to step up efforts to promote fair competition in the global market. As a Member of the European Parliament's Committee on International Trade, I see these as crucial aspects towards a well-functioning global trading environment and for ensuring a level playing field for EU companies that operate in it.

**Pirkko Ruohonen-Lerner (ECR).** – Arvoisa puhemies, oikeudenmukainen kilpailupolitiikka on tärkeä päämäärä, jota meidän on tavoiteltava, joten oli helppo äänestää mietinnön puolesta. Suuryritykset saavat veroja välttelemällä ja kiertämällä merkittävää ja epäreilua kilpailuetua pieniin ja keskiuuriin yrityksiin nähden. Suuryritykset tuntuvat pelaavan aivan omilla säännöillään hyödyntäessään jopa laittomia valtion tukijärjestelmiä.

Kuten mietinnössä todetaan, veronkierto on haitallista rehellisille veronmaksajille ja julkiselle taloudelle. Se uhkaa myös hyvää hallintoa, makrotaloudellista vakautta ja sosiaalista yhteenkuuluvuutta sekä kansalaisten luottamusta unionin ja jäsenvaltioiden toimielimiin. EU:n sisälläkin on alueita, jotka ovat osallistuneet kilpailua vääristävien edullisten verojärjestelmien luomiseen monikansallisille yhtiöille ja rikkaille henkilöille. Jäsenvaltioiden tulisi luopua näistä vilpillisistä ja haitallisista kilpailukäytännöistä. Komissaari Vestager ansaitsee tunnustusta työstään reilumman kilpailun puolesta, ja siitä, että kilpailulainsäädäntöä rikkoneita suuryrityksiä on sakotettu tuntuvasti.

**Ангел Джамбазки (ECR).** – Гласувах в подкрепа на този доклад, защото съвсем очевидно е, че една голяма част от предприемаческите начинания в Европейския съюз се нуждаят от специална защита. Нуждаем се от връщане на принципите на общия пазар и защита на предприемчивостта и уменията на хората, които искат да работят и да изкарват парите си с честен труд. За пример мога да дам скандалните предложения в т.нар. пакет „Мобилност“, пакет, който пречи на свободната конкуренция, пречи на свободния пазар и се опитва да отнеме бизнеса от едни държави и от едни предприемачи, и да го даде в ръцете на други. В конкретния случай, когато говорим за този пакет, пакета „Мобилност“ или пакета „Макрон“, както е известен, става дума за опита на предприемачите от централната част на Европейския съюз да отнемат без конкуренция, нарушавайки свободния пазар, хляба и бизнеса от предприемачите от Източна Европа, което в случая с моята държава ще означава повече от половин милион емигранти, 500 хиляди човека, което не може да бъде допуснато.

**Stanislav Polčák (PPE).** – Paní předsedající, já bych chtěl vysvětlit své hlasování, které bylo pozitivní ve vztahu k tomuto návrhu zprávy. My jsme se včera při diskuzi k této zprávě shodli na tom, že ten text doznal oproti předchozím letům velmi výrazných pozitivních změn, takže jsem to chtěl ocenit a zároveň vyzdvihnout, že skutečně ve středobodu našich úvah stojí vnitřní trh, hospodářská soutěž. Samozřejmě ten trh, který je otevřený, kde působí jak tržní síly, tak i ochrana zájmů spotřebitelů, kde se chceme vyhnout nekalé soutěži.

Takže toto vše myslím, že ta zpráva postihuje velmi dobře, ale navíc – a to je pro mě velmi podstatné –, vyslovuje myšlenku, že trhy musí být šetrné k životnímu prostředí. To opravdu oceňuji, tento environmentální aspekt. Udržitelnost našich tržních sil v dlouhodobém hledisku, to je skutečně velmi podstatné. Nemůžeme se řídit podle zásady „po nás potopa“ a já opravdu tuto zprávu oceňuji, a proto jsem ji také podpořil.

**11. Korekty do glosowania i zamiar glosowania: patrz protokół**

**12. Decyzje dotyczące niektórych dokumentów: patrz protokół**

**13. Składanie dokumentów: patrz protokół**

**14. Przekazanie tekstów przyjętych na niniejszym posiedzeniu: patrz protokół**

**15. Kalendarz następných posiedzeń: patrz protokół**

**16. Zamknięcie posiedzenia**

*(La séance est levée à 13 h 29)*

**17. Przerwa w obradach**

**La Présidente.** – Je déclare interrompue la session du Parlement européen.

—

*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