

C/2024/4408

11.7.2024

PEŁNE SPRAWOZDANIE Z OBRAD 15 STYCZNIA 2020 R.

(C/2024/4408)

PARLAMENT EUROPEJSKI

SESJA 2019-2020

Posiedzenia od 13 do 16 stycznia 2020 r.

STRASBURG

Spis treści	Strona
1. Otwarcie posiedzenia	4
2. Debata nad przypadkami łamania praw człowieka, zasad demokracji i państwa prawa (ogłoszenie o złożonych projektach rezolucji): patrz protokół	4
3. Środki wykonawcze (art. 112 Regulaminu): patrz protokół	4
4. Akty delegowane (art. 111 ust. 2 Regulaminu): patrz protokół	4
5. Składanie dokumentów: patrz protokół	4
6. Stanowisko Parlamentu Europejskiego dotyczące konferencji w sprawie przyszłości Europy (debata)	4
7. Wznowienie posiedzenia	37
8. Uroczyste posiedzenie – Wystąpienie Jego Królewskiej Mości Abdullaha II, króla Jordańskiego Królestwa Haszymidzkiego	37
9. Wznowienie posiedzenia	39
10. Głosowanie	39
10.1. Skład liczbowy komisji (B9-0039/2020) (głosowanie)	39
10.2. Protokół do Umowy między UE a Islandią i Norwegią dotyczącej kryteriów i mechanizmów określania państwa właściwego dla rozpatrywania wniosku o azyl złożonego w państwie członkowskim lub w Islandii lub Norwegii dotyczący dostępu do Eurodac na potrzeby ochrony porządku publicznego (A9-0053/2019 - Jadwiga Wiśniewska) (głosowanie)	40

Spis treści	Strona
10.3. Umowa UE–Chiny w sprawie niektórych aspektów przewozów lotniczych (A9-0041/2019 - Tomasz Piotr Poręba) (głosowanie)	40
10.4. Wspólny system podatku od wartości dodanej w zakresie procedury szczególnej dla małych przedsiębiorstw (A9-0055/2019 - Inese Vaidere) (głosowanie)	40
10.5. Europejski Zielony Ład (RC-B9-0040/2020, B9-0040/2020, B9-0041/2020, B9-0042/2020, B9-0043/2020, B9-0044/2020, B9-0045/2020, B9-0046/2020) (głosowanie)	40
10.6. Wdrażanie i monitorowanie przepisów o prawach obywateli w umowie o wystąpieniu Zjednoczonego Królestwa (B9-0031/2020) (głosowanie)	40
10.7. Roczne sprawozdanie za rok 2018 dotyczące praw człowieka i demokracji na świecie oraz polityki UE w tym zakresie (A9-0051/2019 - Isabel Wiseler-Lima) (głosowanie)	40
10.8. Sprawozdanie roczne z realizacji wspólnej polityki zagranicznej i bezpieczeństwa (A9-0054/2019 - David McAllister) (głosowanie)	40
10.9. Sprawozdanie roczne z realizacji wspólnej polityki bezpieczeństwa i obrony (A9-0052/2019 - Arnaud Danjean) (głosowanie)	40
10.10. Stanowisko Parlamentu Europejskiego dotyczące konferencji w sprawie przyszłości Europy (B9-0036/2020, B9-0037/2020, B9-0038/2020) (głosowanie)	40
11. Wyjaśnienia dotyczące sposobu głosowania	41
11.1. Europejski Zielony Ład (RC-B9-0040/2020, B9-0040/2020, B9-0041/2020, B9-0042/2020, B9-0043/2020, B9-0044/2020, B9-0045/2020, B9-0046/2020)	41
11.2. Wdrażanie i monitorowanie przepisów o prawach obywateli w umowie o wystąpieniu Zjednoczonego Królestwa (B9-0031/2020)	45
11.3. Roczne sprawozdanie za rok 2018 dotyczące praw człowieka i demokracji na świecie oraz polityki UE w tym zakresie (A9-0051/2019 - Isabel Wiseler-Lima)	49
11.4. Sprawozdanie roczne z realizacji wspólnej polityki zagranicznej i bezpieczeństwa (A9-0054/2019 - David McAllister)	50
12. Korekty do głosowania i zamiar głosowania: patrz protokół	51
13. Wznowienie posiedzenia	51
14. Przyjęcie protokołu poprzedniego posiedzenia: patrz protokół	51
15. Przeinaczanie historii europejskiej i pamięci o II wojnie światowej (debata na aktualny temat)	51
16. Wysłuchania w toku prowadzone na mocy art. 7 ust. 1 TUE w sprawie Węgier (debata)	67
17. Wysłuchania w toku prowadzone na mocy art. 7 ust. 1 TUE w sprawie Polski (debata)	83
18. Wznowienie postępowania przeciwko premierowi Republiki Czeskiej w związku ze sprzeniewierzeniem funduszy UE i możliwym konfliktem interesów (debata)	97
19. Konferencja Stron Konwencji o różnorodności biologicznej (COP15) – Kunming (2020) (debata)	104

Spis treści	Strona
20. Sprawozdanie roczne z działalności Europejskiego Rzecznika Praw Obywatelskich za rok 2018 (debata) . .	118
21. Reforma głównych zasad procedury komitetowej (debata)	128
22. Zatwierdzenie protokołu niniejszego posiedzenia: patrz protokół	133
23. Porządek obrad następnego posiedzenia: patrz protokół	133
24. Zamknięcie posiedzenia	133

PEŁNE SPRAWOZDANIE Z OBRAD 15 STYCZNIA 2020 R.**PRESIDENZA DELL'ON. DAVID MARIA SASSOLI***Presidente***1. Otwarcie posiedzenia***(La seduta è aperta alle 9.08)***2. Debata nad przypadkami łamania praw człowieka, zasad demokracji i państwa prawa (ogłoszenie o złożonych projektach rezolucji): patrz protokół****3. Środki wykonawcze (art. 112 Regulaminu): patrz protokół****4. Akty delegowane (art. 111 ust. 2 Regulaminu): patrz protokół****5. Składanie dokumentów: patrz protokół****6. Stanowisko Parlamentu Europejskiego dotyczące konferencji w sprawie przyszłości Europy (debata)**

Presidente. – L'ordine del giorno reca la discussione sulla posizione del Parlamento europeo sulla conferenza sul futuro dell'Europa (2019/2990(RSP)).

Nikolina Brnjac, *President-in-Office of the Council.* – Mr President, thank you for this opportunity to discuss the project of a Conference on the Future of Europe, which has emerged over the last months and, in particular, to listen to a debate on the Parliament's position.

As Prime Minister Plenković told you yesterday, as far as the Council is concerned, we are starting work to define our position regarding the establishment of the Conference. As you know, the December European Council gave us guidance to this effect. We believe that priority should be given to the implementation of the strategic agenda for 2019-2024, agreed in June last year, and to delivering concrete results for the benefit of our citizens.

The priorities outlined in the strategic agenda closely echo those raised by our citizens, for instance in the citizen consultations and dialogues. The Conference should build on the success of these dialogues over the last two years. Yesterday, my Prime Minister underlined how the Conference could be an opportunity to listen to citizens so that we are better able to meet their expectations.

We think the Conference should contribute to the development of our policies in the medium and long term so that we can better tackle current and future challenges. We also believe the upcoming Conference should be an inclusive process, involving our three institutions in full respect of the interinstitutional balance of our respective roles. Likewise, Member States should equally be involved, including their parliaments. Shared ownership is important.

The European Council asked the Croatian Presidency to work towards defining a Council position on the content, scope, composition and functioning of a Conference on the Future of Europe and to engage on this basis with the European Parliament and the Commission. We are indeed starting this work and I can announce to you that, today in Brussels, ambassadors will have a first informal exchange of views to that end, and that the General Affairs Council on 28 January will discuss the issue.

We will listen to your debate on the Parliament's position and read your resolution attentively. We also look forward to the Commission's input, which we understand will come back next week. Thank you very much for your attention.

Dubravka Šuica, *Vice-President of the Commission*. – Mr President, it is an honour to be here today in the heart of European democracy to discuss the conference on the future of Europe video. As a previous Member of this House, I consider the European Parliament as a close friend. Today I stand before you, honourable Members, still as your friend and now also as your partner in my new role as Vice-President for Democracy and Demography.

Like you, I know how important citizens are to European policy-making: after all we are making these decisions to their benefit. However, we have not always got that right – this must be acknowledged. Now we have an opportunity to reflect with citizens, to listen to them, to connect and engage, to answer and explain, to build trust and confidence in each other between the European Union and citizens. This is an important part of what the Conference on the Future of Europe is about. We are at a key moment in European political history and are facing a unique opportunity, as well as a challenge. Getting this right will have repercussions, not just for the present but for the future. It is up to us all to make this a success.

Honourable Members, let me be very clear: we are no longer politics as business as usual. The old way of doing politics no longer works. Citizens want us to hear them, and we must listen to them and give them the feedback they need. Cooperation and courage are the new keywords in this process. We must be brave and find new creative and innovative solutions to make our democracy work even better for citizens. We must do this together as partners: the Parliament, the Council and the Commission.

To this end, a joint declaration from all three institutions can pave the way for this unique partnership. But partnership does not stop with these three institutions. Member States and their national parliaments must also be involved. Their cooperation will be an asset to this process. To ensure we reach every citizen, especially those who do not always engage directly with us, we rely heavily on cooperation with the Committee of the Regions and the European Economic and Social Committee. I am committed to visiting regions in my role as Vice-President, and I want to hear from citizens from all corners of the European Union.

Shall we stop here, dear colleagues? Certainly not: this is an open process. As the Conference progresses, hopefully, others will join us.

There are two strands to this process. One on policy, with debates clustered around the themes, including the Commission's political priorities and the European Council strategic agenda. The second strand addresses institutional topics such as the election of the President of the Commission and transnational lists. Here, the role of the Commission is that of honest broker. My colleague, Vice-President Věra Jourová, is responsible for following this institutional strand.

The European Commission will adopt its contribution to the shaping of the conference in its Communication on 22 January next week. This Communication is the Commission's contribution to the discussion that needs to be held in the coming weeks between the three institutions aimed at agreeing together on the scope, formal structure and objectives of the Conference. This would be the content of the joint declaration I referred to earlier.

Once the General Affairs Council has discussed the Conference on the future of Europe on 28 January, we will be able to move to the next phase, including to determine the date for the start of the conference, ideally in the first half of 2020. And what better date for this than 9 May — Europe day — which is a date of such importance for all of us?

I can already see the potential for a fruitful partnership with the European Parliament, given the priorities we share. In his role as Vice-President for Interinstitutional Relations, my colleague Maroš Šefčovič, will join us in this work.

Honourable Members, as directly-elected representatives of the citizens, you are crucial to this process, and I welcome the resolution of this House, as well as your commitment not to pre-determine the outcome of the Conference. I believe that pre-determining the outcome would cause more damage to democracy than if it did nothing at all. So no pre-determining from our side.

Honourable Members, by confirming me in my post as Vice-President for Democracy and Demography, you have shown that you have placed your trust in me. Just as it is important to build trust with the citizens, I want to build trust with you, and I look forward to hearing your views.

(Applause)

Presidente. – Cari colleghi, dopo aver ascoltato Consiglio e Commissione e prima di dare la parola ai presidenti dei gruppi, vorrei fare alcune osservazioni, perché sono diversi mesi che stiamo lavorando su questo progetto della conferenza sul futuro dell'Europa e naturalmente sono molto lieto che oggi ci sia questa discussione e che oggi la plenaria del Parlamento voti la risoluzione che darà il via a questo processo.

Come sapete la conferenza nasce da una richiesta del Parlamento europeo che la Presidente della Commissione von der Leyen ha raccolto nel luglio scorso, dopo le elezioni europee, quando è stato chiaro a tutti che alcuni meccanismi della governance democratica vanno rivisti e risistemati, e naturalmente noi vogliamo – questa è l'opinione di tutto il Parlamento – che ciò venga fatto con le istituzioni nazionali ma soprattutto in un percorso di ascolto dei cittadini.

Credo che la risoluzione che oggi voterà la plenaria sarà l'avvio di una stagione di riforma, non predeterminata, ma certamente di grande impulso perché abbiamo bisogno che la democrazia funzioni e soprattutto che la democrazia si renda utile ai cittadini. Credo che questo sia nell'interesse delle istituzioni europee ma, nel suo insieme, dell'Unione.

Ecco perché vogliamo che questo processo abbia al centro i cittadini. Credo che oggi, per questo Parlamento, sia una giornata, da questo punto di vista, importante e condivisa con tutti i gruppi politici, in un percorso di ascolto, di confronto e di dialogo, naturalmente con tutte le istituzioni europee. Avremo successo se le istituzioni europee sapranno camminare insieme.

Io vi ringrazio e do subito la parola a Manfred Weber, presidente del Partito popolare.

Manfred Weber, on behalf of the PPE Group. – Mr President, Madam Vice-President and Council Representative, the starting point for our debate on the conference for the future of Europe is the outcome of the elections last year.

201 million people participated in the European elections. The second largest democracy on the globe. That is the starting point for our debate, so people believe in Europe; people trust in Europe; people want to contribute to the future of Europe.

The key question is now: does my vote count? Does it really have an impact? And there we know an improvement is possible, and that's why the next decade must be a decade of strengthening European democracy.

What are the principles for the working structure for us as the PPE Group? The first and most important point already mentioned is people's involvement. So, to find a way to get in touch with the ideas of our citizens to involve them in the process. The second thing is that Parliament is in the lead. That we are the representatives of the citizens. We are representing the political landscape of the European Union of today – geographically, politically, from the content point of view. We are representing a Parliament where we really respect the free mandate in a very, very positive sense. For me as a group leader, it's always difficult to manage the unity of the group. We have a real free mandate and that's good, and we have, together with the Commission and Council, a good working relationship.

First of all I want to underline that with Dobrevka as Vice-President responsible for the issue, we really can work very strongly together. And another element for these principles is to involve the national parliaments. All of these issues are agreed, but again, the 're-parliamentarisation' of the European Union is for our group, a key element. That is the working structure and then about the direction.

Democracy is based on two principles – on candidates and on a programme. You have this for a mayor, you have this for a chancellor candidate and for us it's also important to implement this on a European level for becoming the Commission President, for example. So the old debates on the Spitzenkandidat concept, last year we failed with this idea, it is still our interest as the PPE and we want to make this Spitzenkandidat process a binding process for the upcoming elections on the European level.

We need a healthy competition between the European parties. That means we have to reflect again on the rules for the European political parties, and we have to consider how to strengthen the rights of this institution – the European Parliament – for example on the key issue, the question of right of initiative for the European Parliament, like all other parliaments have.

So that is what must be the direction for the future. More democratic – people decide. That is the best medicine against the anti-Europeans.

And finally, are we really prepared for the challenges of tomorrow? What can we do under the current Treaty, but also, is there a need for a Treaty change? That is another element which we want to discuss during the conference on the future of Europe. So let's start today, let's work and let's have a new dream for Europe.

Iratxe García Pérez, *en nombre del Grupo S&D*. – Señor presidente, el próximo 9 de mayo se cumplirán setenta años de la Declaración Schuman, que proponía la creación de las primeras Comunidades Europeas. Aquel día comenzaba una aventura política, en el mundo y en la historia. Seis países elegían libremente unir sus destinos para garantizar la paz y mejorar la vida de las personas.

Pero ya decía aquella Declaración que Europa no se haría de una sola vez, sino a lo largo de una evolución constante que debía basarse en la solidaridad. Ahora nos toca a nosotros darle un nuevo empuje para que la Unión Europea sea capaz de garantizar la paz en Europa y en el mundo, y también mejorar la vida de las personas. Hoy en día nuestra Unión se enfrenta a nuevos retos como la emergencia climática, las desigualdades, la digitalización. Pero también, desgraciadamente, los ataques al estado de Derecho, el deterioro de este, y los populismos.

La Conferencia sobre el Futuro de Europa, por ello, es una oportunidad única, que no podemos dejar pasar, para actualizar nuestra Unión mejorando su capacidad de afrontar los retos. Y es también una oportunidad para implicar a la ciudadanía, para escuchar qué espera la gente de Europa y conocer sus propuestas, para que puedan venir también de todos los sectores de la sociedad.

Así fue la primera gran conferencia sobre el futuro de Europa, que se celebró en La Haya en 1948. Por supuesto, hoy tenemos muchos más medios y mecanismos para facilitar la participación de la sociedad civil. Y debemos aprovecharlos. Los Socialistas y Demócratas queremos que este sea un verdadero diálogo con la ciudadanía y que se traduzca en resultados concretos.

Trabajaremos para que haya una amplia participación de toda la sociedad, con un equilibrio de género, de edad y de proveniencia geográfica. Y, además, con todos los niveles de representación: desde lo local a lo europeo. Porque todos tienen algo que aportar. Porque Europa no existe si no existe cada uno de sus pueblos y ciudades, que es donde se aplican al final las políticas que decidimos aquí, en el Parlamento Europeo.

Decía Jean Monnet que no estamos aquí para coaligar Estados, sino para unir a las personas. Algunos parece que no lo tienen claro y siguen empeñados en hablar en clave nacional. No se dan cuenta de que Europa suma. De que juntos somos más fuertes, y de que en un contexto geopolítico cada vez más difícil necesitamos fortalecer nuestro proyecto. Y tampoco estamos aquí para construir un mercado. Queremos construir una comunidad, que es mucho más.

Por eso, es la hora de defender la democracia europea y recordar que debemos mejorar la vida de las personas. Durante demasiado tiempo la Unión ha descuidado el pilar social, y las políticas económicas no han ido acompañadas de medidas sociales. Hemos dejado que crezca la pobreza, y que aumente la desigualdad, y eso solo puede aumentar los populismos.

Hemos dado grandes pasos para avanzar en la Europa de la ciudadanía, y debemos estar orgullosos. El Tratado de Lisboa fortaleció al Parlamento Europeo y, además, ha introducido nuevos instrumentos para la participación ciudadana, pero no es suficiente. Espero que la conferencia sobre el futuro de Europa abra nuevos espacios para enriquecer el debate y para encontrar ideas innovadoras que mejoren nuestra Unión. Debemos perfeccionar el sistema electoral de cara a las próximas elecciones de 2024.

En estos setenta años hemos recorrido un largo camino y, sobre todo, se ha ampliado la familia europea. Empezaron solo seis países y hemos llegado a ser veintiocho. Con gran tristeza despedimos a un miembro, aunque espero que solo sea temporalmente. Veámoslo como una ocasión para repensar el proyecto europeo. Echar la vista atrás para ver el camino recorrido es un ejercicio necesario.

También lo es recordar todo lo que nos une. Pero más importante todavía es ser conscientes de que el futuro está en nuestras manos, de que no podemos caer en la nostalgia, de que cada día estamos construyendo Europa. Esto es una comunidad de destino que nos pertenece a todos y todas, y entre todos y todas debemos marcar el rumbo. Los Socialistas y Demócratas pondremos de nuestra parte para hacer realidad este sueño de Europa.

Dacian Cioloș, *au nom du groupe Renew*. – Monsieur le Président, chers collègues, nous disons souvent à cette tribune que la diversité est un atout de l'Europe. Maintenant, une fois de plus, nous aurons l'occasion de le démontrer. Les élections européennes ont montré que les citoyens européens croient en l'Europe, mais ils veulent une Europe meilleure, différente, une Europe renouvelée. Le premier changement doit être dans la façon d'associer les citoyens à ces processus européens parce que l'Europe n'a pas été créée pour Bruxelles ou pour une élite ou pour une bulle mais pour servir tous les citoyens. La conférence peut devenir une opportunité formidable de renouveler l'Europe si nous avons le courage de sortir de notre mode de pensée procédural et de donner vraiment la parole aux citoyens dans leur diversité.

Pourtant, au cours des années, nous avons souvent laissé se développer le sentiment que l'Europe n'écoute pas, que l'Europe signifie des règles et des contraintes. L'Europe qui construit est souvent cachée derrière des restrictions. La conférence est une chance pour ouvrir les portes de l'Europe aux citoyens et ce n'est pas pour rien que nous avons défendu la date du 9 mai pour son lancement. Nous devons trouver des solutions pour associer de façon régulière les citoyens et pas seulement une fois tous les cinq ans pour les élections.

Bien sûr, j'entends certains États membres qui sont inquiets parce qu'ils ont peur de perdre de leurs responsabilités, mais, j'en suis convaincu, la démocratie participative et la démocratie représentative, à travers le processus parlementaire, sont complémentaires et non pas opposées.

Chers collègues, nous nous donnons deux ans et demi pour présenter des idées qui devraient non seulement rendre le fonctionnement de nos institutions plus efficace et plus lisible, mais également faire en sorte que nos priorités fassent écho aux attentes de ceux qui veulent que l'Europe soit une vraie maison commune. Beaucoup de gens la vivent déjà de cette manière et je pense que nous avons beaucoup à apprendre de leur façon de combiner leurs liens à un territoire et à une culture spécifique mais aussi de ce partage européen puisque l'Europe, c'est les deux à la fois.

C'est la dernière session de nos amis britanniques à Strasbourg cette semaine, et nous venons aussi de célébrer les dix ans du traité de Lisbonne. Je ne fais pas de lien entre les deux événements, mais il est clair que le temps est venu de rafraîchir l'Europe et de l'adapter aux défis d'aujourd'hui car sans le syndrome de la bulle européenne, l'Europe peut se reconstruire de sa diversité et le Parlement européen doit être le promoteur de cette nouvelle vision.

Daniel Freund, *on behalf of the Verts/ALE Group*. – Mr President, I think this debate that we're having today here is the absolute best going away present for Nigel Farage. For his last plenary, what better idea than to dedicate the prime slot of the week to this conference, what I think is a bit his worst nightmare. So it's a shame that he hasn't joined us here today. He would call this the federalist plot, but it's happening right here in the open. It's a public debate. It's a democratic process, and not for some old ideology but because solidarity is stronger than hatred and because cooperation is stronger than nationalism.

While Nigel and the band of lying Brexiteers are driving the UK over the cliff edge, we start a much needed debate on the next steps of European integration, a debate that will lead to a stronger and a more democratic Union and because we think what is needed in a time of climate crisis, of large corporations not paying their taxes, of being squished between a less reliable United States and an ever-stronger China, is not small mindedness, is not national selfishness. We have to unite. We have to cooperate because otherwise we perish, small and alone.

The big challenges of our time we can only face as Europeans, so the proposals that the European Parliament is putting forward today are strong, based on the good examples that we have seen in Ireland, the citizens' assemblies. Our ambition is to have a grand debate with citizens from all across the European Union, with national parliaments, with the EU institutions. I have to say to my colleagues from the Social Democrats and the Conservatives that it's not enough to also bring the social partners, Business Europe, to bring European trade unions to the table, but we also have to include European NGOs in in this debate as well.

I know there are risks in this project – having this debate in 24 languages, possibly not breaking out of the Brussels bubble, maybe not delivering the kind of reforms that citizens expect from us, but I think the worst thing we could do is to not even try. So we have seen in the euro and in the migration crisis that we always get stuck when integration is done only half way. So I think the answer that we have to deliver, is that we give the European Union the tools and the competence to actually address the major challenges of our time. Let's stop letting populists and eurosceptics dominate the debate on European integration. Let's start building a stronger and truly united Europe today, and let's take another step towards a European Federal Republic.

Marco Zanni, *a nome del gruppo ID*. – Signor Presidente, onorevoli colleghi, mi sembra che sia il Parlamento, dall'inizio di questa legislatura, sia la nuova Commissione abbiano puntato molto sull'organizzazione di questa conferenza, facendo percepire che questo sarà un pilastro del programma dei prossimi cinque anni, un pilastro di una riforma dell'Unione europea di cui, con composizioni e *outcome* ovviamente diversi, tutti i partiti e tutti i gruppi ravvisano la necessità.

Io però non credo che questo esercizio sia utile a dare risposte a quello che i cittadini ci hanno comunicato in questi anni e soprattutto con le elezioni di maggio. I cittadini non ci hanno chiesto di organizzare conferenze, di organizzare dibattiti, di organizzare *agorà*, ma sono anni che ci chiedono risposte concrete, che ci chiedono azioni. Allora il problema non è ascoltare i cittadini, sappiamo quello che vogliono, il problema è politico. Il problema è che queste istituzioni non sono state in grado, in questi anni, di dare risposte concrete, di fare politica, di rispondere ai tre grandi problemi che i cittadini europei oggi stanno affrontando, ovvero quello della crisi economica, quello della sicurezza interna e quello dell'immigrazione, che è un tema che a mio avviso manca anche nella risoluzione del Parlamento e che non può essere ignorato.

Io credo che questo tipo di esercizio possa aver senso se, prima di fare proposte, quest'Aula e queste istituzioni saranno in grado di fare una profonda autocritica su quello che hanno sbagliato in questi anni, perché di errori ne sono stati commessi e sono stati errori gravi, che hanno portato il continente a sprofondare, a non contare più nulla sullo scenario politico internazionale.

Se non capiamo che le riforme e la politica portata avanti negli ultimi vent'anni non hanno fatto altro che indebolire gli Stati, indebolire il nostro continente, rendere i nostri cittadini più poveri, qualsiasi proposta che andremo a discutere sarà solo un esercizio di marketing che non avrà nessun senso.

Io credo che l'obiettivo sia capire dove si è sbagliato (e purtroppo le istituzioni, ancora oggi, non hanno fatto una profonda autocritica), capire che, al contrario di quanto diceva il mio collega dei Verdi, il tema non è creare uno Stato federale – quello che non vogliono i cittadini, quello su cui i cittadini, quando sono stati chiamati a esprimersi, si sono sempre detti contrari – ma che si debba ripartire dalle nostre identità, che si debba ripartire dalla consapevolezza che senza gli Stati, senza le nostre nazioni, senza i nostri popoli, l'Europa non esiste.

Ryszard Antoni Legutko, *on behalf of the ECR Group*. – Mr President, I will be talking about the resolution that will be coming from this Chamber and my main point is that everything in this resolution is wrong. It is wrong because Article 48(4) of the Treaty on the European Union states clearly that it is the Council, not Parliament or the Commission, that can convene such a conference. I know that the attitude of this Chamber and of the Commission towards the Treaties has been consistently rather cavalier, but let us at least remember that we are deviating from what the Treaties have stipulated. So the attitude is that the aim justifies the means, the aim being ever closer union justifies the means, even distraining and ignoring the letter and the spirit of the Treaties.

It is wrong because the whole procedure to produce this document was a disgrace. The Committee on Constitutional Affairs (AFCO) excluded two Groups from serious involvement in drafting its opinion and fixed the voting list in advance. Five Groups prepared the document in secret and excluded two Groups from having any input in the draft text. In case you don't know, ladies and gentlemen, this is foul play. This is the tyranny of the majority. This is foul play. It is wrong because it gives the European Parliament the leading role in the process to the detriment of national parliaments, and the democratic legitimacy of national parliaments is far, far greater than that of the European Parliament.

It is wrong because it gives the real power of the conference into the hands of an inner cabal, called the board, which will no doubt include only the representatives of the five political groups. So you have the tyranny of the majority again. It is wrong because it has a predetermined outcome as we have heard this morning. The conference is simply regarded as a springboard for the next great leap forward in European integration, including a transnationalist Spitzenkandidat process and greater competences for the Union at the expense of the Member States, so do not talk about consultation. This will be fake consultations because the aim is already specified. It does not really require much intelligence to predict that all this will exacerbate the divisions in Europe, which are already quite deep and disconcerting. But we should not be surprised. The advocates of ever closer union have always been very good at antagonising people. It is said that human beings learn from mistakes. Maybe they do, but apparently most Members of the European Parliament don't.

Manon Aubry, *au nom du groupe GUE/NGL*. – Monsieur le Président, depuis plus d'un mois, les Français manifestent contre la casse de leur retraite. Hier, 1 200 médecins ont remis leur démission pour dénoncer l'état de délabrement général de nos hôpitaux français.

Partout en Europe, les citoyens se mobilisent contre les conséquences de l'austérité, inscrite au cœur des traités de l'Union européenne. Partout, ils refusent cet avenir individualiste où les systèmes de solidarité sont brisés un à un. La conférence sur l'avenir de l'Europe aurait dû répondre à cette formidable envie de changement. Malheureusement, c'est une procédure rabougrie qui nous est proposée à ce stade, tant sur les objectifs que sur la méthode.

Sur les objectifs, l'Union ne peut se contenter d'un ravalement de façade cosmétique. C'est tout l'édifice qui menace actuellement de s'effondrer et c'est donc toute son architecture qu'il faut repenser, c'est-à-dire qu'il faut oser nommer les choses: changer en profondeur les traités de l'Union européenne. Pourquoi ne pas renommer d'ailleurs cette conférence sur l'avenir de l'Europe en conférence sur le changement des traités européens? Le chantier est immense et on ne pourra pas passer à côté si on veut mettre en œuvre un véritable pacte vert européen, social et écologique. Sortir de la logique du libre-échange, privilégier un pacte de progrès solidaire et durable plutôt que de croissance et de compétitivité, faire l'harmonisation sociale par le haut plutôt que le dumping généralisé.

Sur la méthode, rien ne serait plus désastreux qu'une nouvelle usine à gaz faussement démocratique. Le Parlement doit être le seul chef de file, pas la Commission, qui n'a aucune légitimité populaire pour le faire. Qui peut penser que des agoras de citoyens, composées de deux à trois personnes maximum par État membre et sans réel pouvoir d'impulsion sont suffisantes pour garantir une participation effective des citoyens? Qui peut penser qu'on peut regagner la confiance des citoyens et des peuples européens dans les institutions sans entériner les résultats des consultations par référendum ou procédure équivalente? N'apprenons-nous pas de nos échecs? Pourquoi répéter l'erreur de la convention sur l'avenir de l'Europe en 2002, qui a débouché sur l'adoption malheureuse du traité de Lisbonne contre les volontés des peuples européens exprimées par référendum? Depuis des années, la peur du peuple et le mépris de la volonté des citoyens ébranlent l'édifice européen. Il faut répondre à la défiance grandissante envers les institutions européennes en assumant de remettre en cause les règles du jeu. Derrière son titre grandiloquent, la conférence sur l'avenir de l'Europe risque à ce stade d'accoucher d'une souris. Ce n'est pas ce que nous voulons, au nom de notre groupe de la Gauche unitaire européenne. Les citoyens européens méritent mieux: une réforme profonde et radicale au service des peuples et de la planète, s'appuyant sur un véritable processus participatif. Ne gâchons pas une nouvelle fois l'occasion de redonner du sens à l'idéal initial du projet européen.

Fabio Massimo Castaldo (NI). – Signor Presidente, onorevoli colleghi, signora Commissaria, quest'anno finalmente avremo la possibilità di ricominciare quel serio dibattito su quel cambiamento che, come forza politica, abbiamo tanto richiesto negli ultimi anni.

Tenendo bene a mente il monito amaro, oserei dire traumatico, della Brexit, dobbiamo approfittare di questa preziosa occasione non solo per discutere la nuova agenda europea ma soprattutto per sbloccare le riforme più ambiziose: il pilastro sociale, l'unione fiscale, una gestione veramente solidale dell'immigrazione. Rilanciando, se serve, anche lo strumento della cooperazione rafforzata, ancora poco esplorata, evitando però la farraginosità di un'Europa a troppe velocità.

Non possiamo permettere che venga esclusa a priori la possibilità che questa conferenza porti anche una riforma dei trattati e delle istituzioni, a partire dall'introduzione del diritto di iniziativa per il nostro Parlamento. I cittadini devono essere i veri protagonisti di questo processo e noi, come Parlamento, dobbiamo essere in prima linea nel difendere la loro partecipazione, la loro voce, i loro sogni e le loro speranze.

Colleghi, permettetemi un monito chiaro. Questa conferenza non può e non deve essere un mero esercizio di stile, una foglia di fico mediatica: troppo tempo è già trascorso invano, l'ascesa dell'antieuropeismo è proprio la conseguenza di questa ingiustificabile inerzia.

Il mondo di oggi è pervaso da tre sentimenti: la rabbia, la paura e la speranza. Quale delle tre prevarrà dipenderà solo ed esclusivamente da noi.

Paulo Rangel (PPE). – Mr President, I would like to say that, 10 years after the Lisbon Treaty, it is really time to prepare our Union for the next decade. We need a very, very deep and broad debate and discussion to prepare our institutions and to prepare our Union for the challenge of the future. This is the scope and the reason for organising this conference. What is really different is that this time, we want to use in the preparation all the skills and all the tools that we have available to engage citizens in this debate. This is our goal. But this is what we call participative democracy, this is true. But, be careful: we don't want to mix participative democracy with representative democracy. One thing is to listen and to consult citizens, to engage them, to bring them committed to our debate. Another thing is institutional representation, with all the liberal heavy touch from our rule-of-law states and we should keep these two spheres very clearly separated, even if we have to engage in this project in a manner that we can use all the impulse that citizens will give us. So, my hope is that we can, for the first time, have a process of reform of the European Union where citizens are really heard and where their opinion matters.

IN THE CHAIR: MAIREAD McGUINNESS*Vice-President*

Gabriele Bischoff (S&D). – Frau Präsidentin! Die letzten Jahre hier waren geprägt von Krisendebatten, von Brexit, von lauter werdenden Stimmen der Euroskeptiker und der Rechtspopulisten – nicht nur in diesem Haus. Die höhere Beteiligung bei der Europawahl im Mai letzten Jahres war ein erster Schritt aus dieser Negativspirale. Die Bürgerinnen und Bürger haben durch ihre hohe Wahlbeteiligung deutlich gemacht, dass sie ein Interesse an Europa haben, dass ihnen Europa nicht egal ist. Aber sie haben auch damit ihre Erwartungen an ein handlungsfähiges Europa bekundet. Diese Wahlbeteiligung war kein Automatismus, sondern breite Bündnisse, eine aktive Zivilgesellschaft haben dazu beigetragen, dass es diesmal anders war als bei den anderen Europawahlen.

Die Bürgerinnen und Bürger wollen eine handlungsfähige Union, eine EU, die sie schützt und die sie stärkt. Deshalb ist es wichtig, dass wir mit dieser Konferenz endlich den Blick nach vorne richten, dass wir einen Aufbruch wagen. Aber das wird nur gelingen, wenn wir es richtig machen, wenn wir es richtig und mutig anpacken. Deshalb darf diese Konferenz keine Routineangelegenheit sein, kein *business as usual*. Wir müssen den Mut haben, aus unserer Komfortzone herauszugehen. Wir müssen dahin gehen, wo die Menschen sind, wo die sind, die sich abgehängt fühlen. Das heißt auch: heraus aus den Hauptstädten, hinein in die ländlichen Regionen, hin zu den Arbeitnehmerinnen und Arbeitnehmern, zu den Arbeitslosen, zu den Jugendlichen, zu denen, die Europa kritisch sehen, denen Europa nicht unbedingt ein wichtiges Projekt ist.

Deshalb ist es wichtig, dass die Bürgerinnen und Bürger direkten Einfluss nehmen können – von Beginn an und nicht erst am Ende Ja oder Nein sagen können, wenn alles schon eingetütet ist. Deshalb haben wir deutlich gemacht: Wir sehen in dieser Konferenz zur Zukunft Europas eine große Chance. Wir haben ein institutionelles Plenum, wo auch Vertreterinnen und Vertreter der Zivilgesellschaft mit dem Europäischen Wirtschafts- und Sozialausschuss als Haus der Zivilgesellschaft vertreten sind, wo aber auch der Ausschuss der Regionen da ist. Denn wir brauchen die Bürgermeister, wir brauchen die Landräte, wenn wir diese Debatten wirklich in die Breite zu den Menschen führen wollen.

Deshalb bin ich froh und hoffe und plädiere dafür, dass wir den Mut haben, die ausgetretenen Pfade zu verlassen und etwas Neues zu wagen – zusammen –, um Europa demokratischer, sozialer und handlungsfähiger zu machen.

Guy Verhofstadt (Renew). – Madam President, let's give a common conclusion here. That is that, for the first time – nearly 20 years, I think, after the start of the Convention, the three institutions agree again on the necessity for an in-depth reform of the European Union. This is already an important fact because it is 20 years after the start of the previous Convention and, for the first time, these three institutions say, 'OK, an in-depth reform of the Union is absolutely needed'. I will not contradict or have a debate with Mr Legutko because, in the meanwhile, he is no longer here in the plenary.

The reason why we want this Conference is because there are problems that we recognise in the European Union. When we have Brexit, a big country that is leaving the European Union, it's difficult to say, 'Oh, fantastic, we work well'. No, it's a problem. We have a problem when a big country is leaving the Union and when, five years after the start of the migration crisis, we still don't have a reform of the Dublin Regulation. We have a problem in the European Union when, ten years after the outbreak of the financial crisis, we still do not have a banking union in the European Union. We have a problem. And when Russians and Americans are deciding everything in our neighbourhood – in Syria and in Libya and in Ukraine – well, we have a problem. In fact, the reality is that, on the international stage, we are mocked by Putin, we are blackmailed by Erdoğan, we are bullied by Trump, and mostly we are ignored by the Chinese Government.

That's the reason why we want to reform Europe; not because we say 'we are Europeans and everything is going well', and it's over. No, tomorrow it will be a different world tomorrow, dominated by what I call empires, like China, like India, like Russia, like America. That doesn't mean that we have to become an empire – on the contrary – but we want to defend a Europe in which our children and grandchildren can survive in this new world, which is not the case today.

We have to do it with a new method, not like in the Convention. In the Convention it went from the top down and at the top, with Valéry Giscard d'Estaing, the top was something very impressive and present. We have to do exactly the opposite, not in contradiction, but from the bottom up – going up from the citizens so that we can create. After the generation of Monnet and Schuman and after the generation of Kohl and Mitterrand, we need a third movement, a third movement with, I would say, the vision of the first and with the courage of the second generation.

(Applause)

(The speaker agreed to take two blue-card questions under Rule 171(8))

President. – Mr Rowland, you are lucky today!

Robert Rowland (NI), blue-card question. – I do feel lucky with you, Madam President. Mr Verhofstadt, we're talking about the future of Europe, but one of the key concerns of mine for Europe, and for your future, is your dependence on your geopolitical foe. You mentioned Russia and Putin, but recently the Nord Stream 2 channel pipeline, which will bring gas from Russia into Europe, was completed with the Denmark signing of a further EUR 150 million to complete that. Do you agree with me that Europe has no chance to be energy-independent while it is still reliant on Russia?

Niklas Nienäś (Verts/ALE), blue-card question. – Mr Verhofstadt, you said that you want to enable a bottom-up approach. So, there are some rumours going on that certain parties already agreed on who should be leading the conference and your name was mentioned on that as well, so I wanted to know from you, presented right now here, that those rumours are not true and that the conference itself should decide on who leads the conference.

Guy Verhofstadt (Renew), blue-card answer. – It seems to be a good idea to have a democratic process during this. Let's consult all the citizens in Europe like we did during the elections. That seems to me the best thing to do. Maybe we can ask Mr Sassoli to organise that procedure and maybe I'm a candidate to do that.

To our British friends, I want to say on Nord Stream – that is a good point that has been made, but Nord Stream is proof of what? It is proof of a lack of European Union, it is proof of the fact that a European energy community does not exist in Europe. So if really those people, like those in the Brexit Party, are anxious about Nord Stream, well, they should create the energy community we desperately need and as fast as possible, colleagues.

Christian Allard (Verts/ALE). – Madam President, I would like to talk about not only the problems, what are the opportunities and what are the solutions we could find for the future of Europe. This conference on the future of Europe is a timely democratic exercise. As you heard already if Brexit was about the EU, it was to mute the progressive agenda of the European project.

When the people of Scotland voted to remain in Europe we meant it. Trust us to continue and to promote outward looking, internationalist European values. Those values are firmly at the heart of our vision for Scotland. This conference is needed because we are under attack. We are under a populist attack. Politics doesn't stand still. We either go forward or we go backwards. This conference is the way forward for all Member States, including future Member States. Scotland is a future Member State. No doubt about it.

Let's start by Scotland then other parts of the United Kingdom will follow. Voltaire said a long time ago, we look to Scotland for all our ideas of civilisation. One innovative idea we have developed in Scotland, is to enshrine into law the democratic participation of all people living in Scotland, wherever they come from, whatever their nationality. Wouldn't it be fantastic to also include the contribution of all the people living in Europe to this conference, not only EU citizens.

In Scotland our devolved institutions are based on European laws. The foundation of modern Scotland comes from the EU. Scotland is looking forward to contribute to the debate as a future Member State of the European Union.

(Applause)

Gunnar Beck (ID). – Madam President, in 2000, the EU launched its Lisbon agenda to make the EU ‘the most competitive and dynamic knowledge-based economy in the world by 2010’. As 2010 was approaching references to the agenda were expunged from EU websites and the plan was renamed the Europe 2020 strategy. 2020 has arrived and the most competitive and dynamic knowledge economy, maybe as a moral champion of the world, but it also enjoys the highest consumer income and corporate taxes in the developed world, high unemployment and the lowest growth apart from Japan. For the most integrated countries of the eurozone, economic data are even worse than for the more sensible non-euro EU Members.

The Commission president now proposes a conference on the future of Europe to make the EU more democratic. She mentions an economy for the people. Yet also proposes more taxes and an EU Green Deal for EUR one trillion plus, when EU influence on world climate is minimal. In the name of Europe’s way of life, she’s advocating more non-European immigration to make Europe less European by the day. EU democracy is democracy, neither for nor by the European peoples. Sigmund Freud spoke of ‘Flucht in die Krankheit’ or ‘escape into illness’ to describe a neurotic avoidance of an unsatisfactory reality. Rather than face the struggle to regain health, the neurotic patient is secretly desiring to remain ill. Is there a better diagnosis of the EU today? Faced with a menacing economic truth, the EU Commission is reaching for a narcotic overdose of EU integration to take an extended holiday from reality.

Zdzisław Krasnodębski (ECR). – Pani Przewodnicząca! Przyszłość Europy to nie to samo co przyszłości Unii Europejskiej. Europa istniała zanim powstała Unia –powinniśmy o tym pamiętać – i prawdopodobnie będzie istniała nadal, nawet jeśli Unia przestanie istnieć lub zmieni się w jakąś inną formę współpracy politycznej między narodami europejskimi. Nie ulega jednak wątpliwości, że pamiętając o tej różnicy należy zastanawiać się nad przyszłością i Unii i Europy. Taka dyskusja jest potrzebna, gdyż z jednej strony mnożą się głosy wybitnych myślicieli, zarówno konserwatywnych, jak i lewicowych, że cywilizacja europejska znajduje się w stanie krytycznym, nawet schyłkowym. Z drugiej strony mamy poczucie, że również Unia Europejska wymaga reformy. Jesteśmy za dyskusją otwartą, uczciwą, nie wykluczającą osób o odmiennym zdaniu, na przykład przeciwników dalszej integracji, nie przesądzającą z góry o kierunku proponowanych zmian. Nie możemy dzielić (tak jak niektórzy koledzy, którzy mówią o republice europejskiej) obywateli Europy na złych i dobrych Europejczyków.

Zgadzamy się także co do tego, że do debaty o przyszłości Europy Unii należy włączyć obywateli, jednak wiemy, że nie ma jednej europejskiej sfery publicznej, dlatego powinno się to toczyć na poziomie narodowym. Uważamy również, że dyskusje obywatelskie nie mogą zastąpić debat parlamentów i powinny mieć tylko charakter konsultacji społecznych. Przypominamy też, że zmiana traktatów może się odbyć jedynie zgodnie z art. 48 Traktatu o Unii Europejskiej.

Helmut Scholz (GUE/NGL). – Frau Präsidentin! Die Kommission hat dem Europäischen Parlament eine Führungsrolle in diesem auf zwei Jahre angelegten Debattenraum eingeräumt. Das ist gut so! Und mit der heutigen Entschließung legt das Parlament dem EU-Rat, der Kommission und der europäischen Öffentlichkeit einen konkreten Vorschlag zu Ansatz, Zielen, Formen und Methoden vor, wie gemeinsam mit allen Bürgerinnen und Bürgern eine Neubestimmung europäischer Politik zur Bewältigung so vieler Zukunftsherausforderungen als auch der Alltagsprobleme erfolgen kann.

Nach Jahren schmerzhafter Krisenerfahrung und den Versuchen der Bewältigung gilt es, gemeinsam zu bestimmen, welche Art der EU wir wollen und brauchen, was verändert oder neu erarbeitet werden muss. Ich halte den Kernansatz des Parlaments für überaus wichtig und richtig, von Anbeginn den Souverän, die Bürgerinnen und Bürger, in den Mittelpunkt der Konferenz zu stellen und auf sehr innovative Weise repräsentative Demokratie und die Teilhabe der Bürgerinnen und Bürger am Bestimmen des künftigen Rahmens für EU-Politik in einem permanenten Dialogprozess aufs Engste miteinander zu verzahnen.

Ja, eine Konferenz über die Zukunft der EU heißt zuallererst, den Bürgerinnen und Bürgern mit ihren Wünschen, Erwartungen und Forderungen an die EU Gehör zu verschaffen. Sie selbst sollen entscheiden, welche Themen in Angriff genommen werden müssen, um demokratische Defizite zu beseitigen, neue politische Strategien zu erarbeiten und die Alltagstauglichkeit der Politik auf EU- und nationaler Ebene auf den Prüfstand zu stellen.

Liebe Vertreterinnen und Vertreter von ID und ECR, warum haben Sie Angst vor Bürgerinnen und Bürgern, die ein solidarisches Miteinander auf dem europäischen Kontinent schaffen wollen? Dazu brauchen wir Transparenz und das Nutzen der heutigen modernen Kommunikationsmöglichkeiten. Auch deshalb wird die Konferenz über den Konvent hinausgehen müssen.

Κώστας Παπαδάκης (NI). – Κυρία Πρόεδρε, αλήθεια, από πού και ως πού μιλάτε για το μέλλον της Ευρώπης ταυτίζοντάς το με το μέλλον της Ευρωπαϊκής Ένωσης, μιας Ένωσης των μονοπωλίων, την οποία κάποιοι πρόβαλαν κάποτε ως αιώνια, ως νομοτέλεια; Σήμερα καταγράφονται Μπρέξιτ, φυγόκεντρες τάσεις και αντιθέσεις, ενώ στα ίδια τα κείμενά σας ανησυχείτε για την αναμικτή καπιταλιστική ανάκαμψη. Μεθοδεύετε μια χρυσοπληρωμένη εκστρατεία πλύσης εγκεφάλου, προκλητικού εξωραϊσμού της Ευρωπαϊκής Ένωσης, χειραγώγησης και αντικομμουνισμού, επιχειρώντας να αναχαιτίσετε την εντεινόμενη αμφισβήτηση και έλλειψη εμπιστοσύνης των λαών και της νεολαίας σε αυτήν.

Στήνονται διασκέψεις, δήθεν λαϊκής συμμετοχής, με επιχειρηματικούς ομίλους, ΜΚΟ, λόμπι και εργατοπατέρες. Αντίθετα από ό, τι ισχυρίζεται και η Ομάδα GUE, που συνυπογράφει το σχετικό ψήφισμα ως γνήσιος απολογητής της, η Ευρωπαϊκή Ένωση ούτε αλλάζει ούτε, όπως ισχυρίζονται οι ακροδεξιοί, κάνει λάθη. Υπηρετεί ανεπίστρεπτα το εκμεταλλευτικό σύστημα, είναι αντίπαλος των εργατικών λαϊκών συμφερόντων, διαρκής υπονομευτής της υπεράσπισης συνόρων και κυριαρχικών δικαιωμάτων. Οι λαοί μπορούν να χαράξουν το δικό τους μέλλον με αποδέσμευση από την Ευρωπαϊκή Ένωση, με τον λαό στην εξουσία, για την Ευρώπη του σοσιαλισμού.

Esteban González Pons (PPE). – Señora presidenta, la Unión Europea, queridos colegas, no es fruto de la casualidad, sino un proyecto de paz frente a los horrores de la guerra. Somos la primera generación que no ha sufrido la guerra y somos una generación que ha olvidado la guerra. La Unión Europea hoy es un proceso de paz que se ha detenido y empieza a dar marcha atrás. Europa fue un sueño, pero hoy es una realidad insatisfactoria.

Deberíamos reconstruir el sueño, pero vivimos tiempos en que los políticos no tenemos legitimidad para soñar. Y a los políticos en estos tiempos nos sobran palabras vacías y eslóganes. Por ejemplo, distinguimos entre nosotros y los ciudadanos para dar la impresión de que somos próximos al pueblo, cuando los ciudadanos son los que nos han elegido, cuando en campaña electoral hemos estado hablando con los ciudadanos, cuando nosotros mismos somos ciudadanos y, si no, ¿qué hacemos en este Parlamento? Las asambleas de ciudadanos paralelas a los parlamentos lo único que hacen es deslegitimar a los parlamentos.

Europa no necesita políticos que sueñen. Europa necesita políticos que crean. Políticos que crean en una Unión Europea sin nacionalismos, sin fronteras, sin discriminaciones; que crean que Europa no es solo el Consejo Europeo; que crean que juntos somos mejores; que crean en una Europa federal. Hoy decidimos cómo vamos a trabajar, pero queda por decidir adónde vamos y eso es lo que de verdad importa. En qué Europa creemos, no con qué Europa soñamos.

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

Patrick Breyer (Verts/ALE), blue-card question. – Dear colleague, you said that you don't want the EU Parliament to be delegitimised by Parliament representation. Do you know the concept of a fundamental treaty of society as laid out by Mr Rousseau. The idea that citizens will agree on the kind of government that they want. And do you think that this idea is a threat to representative institutions or would you rather agree that we are elected to represent citizens when they want us to?

Esteban González Pons (PPE), respuesta de «tarjeta azul». – Yo creo en el mandato representativo. Yo creo en el mandato representativo. Entiendo que el Consejo y la Comisión consulten a los ciudadanos porque no son Parlamentos, pero me parece que hay una cierta contradicción en que unos parlamentarios elegidos solo hace seis meses por el pueblo necesiten consultar nada al pueblo.

Domènec Ruiz Devesa (S&D). – Madam President, first of all, I would like to say to our colleagues from the Far right that come to this Chamber every day to tell us what the citizens think, believe, and to tell the rest of us that we are mistaken. But the truth is that you only represent 20 or 25% of the European people. It is the pro-European groups, the ones that support this resolution, that represent more than 70-75% of the vote in the last European election, so let's set the record straight on this matter.

(Applause)

Second of all. It's 10 years after the Lisbon Treaty entered into force. And if you look at the world now, some others have already said it, it is totally different from the world of 2009. At that time we didn't have Brexit; we didn't have the Arab Spring; we didn't have Trump as President of the United States; we didn't have the immigration flows. So unlike some other colleagues that mention Freud and narcotization, we do live in reality. The issue is that you don't recognise reality, the external pressures that as Europeans we are facing and that we have to react with this conference on the future of Europe, that I think has to lead us, because the world is there and we cannot ignore it, towards a political union of a federal sort.

But we are going to do this with the citizens – in a conversation with the citizens and with organised civil society. It's very important that we ensure the participation as well of the organised civil society. I think that we can achieve the maximum implication of ordinary citizens and NGOs in this process, national parliamentarians, and then come up with a set of answers to the policy challenges that we are facing and we cannot ignore. And when we have identified these policy challenges, then we can also provide the right institutional answers.

(The speaker agreed to take a blue-card question under Rule 171(8))

Bogdan Rzońca (ECR), *pytanie zadane przez podniesienie niebieskiej kartki*. – Traktat z Maastricht z 1992 roku przewidywał Unię Obywatelską. Dlaczego przez tyle lat nie udało się zrealizować tego szlachetnego celu? Może poda Pan choć jeden powód.

Domènec Ruiz Devesa (S&D), *blue-card answer*. – I didn't understand the question. The 'Civic Union' – what does it mean?

(The speaker agreed to take a blue-card question under Rule 171(8))

President. – Perhaps you could get together afterwards and resolve that issue? And because the lady at No 29 has asked very nicely for a second question, will you accept – you may understand this one?

Lara Wolters (S&D), *blue-card question*. – I'm just enjoying the way this debate is going at the moment, really. I'm enjoying the blue cards because for the first time, I feel like we're having an actual debate here (*applause*) and I think that's very, very necessary when we're talking about the future of Europe. I just thought I would take the opportunity to give some of my time back to my colleague from the S&D who, very importantly, talked about the involvement of citizens and of NGOs in the future of Europe, and the conference on that. That's a really important topic, so I thought that by doing this, I can give him a little bit more time to talk about that.

Domènec Ruiz Devesa (S&D), *blue-card answer*. – I believe in representative democracy, as my colleague González Pons said before, but I don't see any contradiction with having a permanent consultation with citizens. As elected representatives, we have to be in touch with ordinary citizens and NGOs every single day, and we also have to do this in the context of the Conference on the Future of Europe.

(Applause)

President. – At this point, because we have over 16 catch-the-eye requests, I will now close catch-the-eye. I will try and continue with the blue cards, as has been referenced.

Pascal Durand (Renew). – Madame la Présidente, je crois que vous avez entendu la position du Parlement: elle est quasiment unanime sur la nécessité de réussir cette conférence de l'Europe.

C'est un élément nouveau qui s'inscrit dans un débat souvent trop institutionnel et nous avons là une opportunité extrêmement forte. Madame Šuica, je voudrais rebondir sur un mot que vous avez utilisé et qui fait écho au français que je suis, vous avez parlé du mot «audace» et vous savez que c'est une phrase que le révolutionnaire Danton avait citée au moment où la France était en danger en disant: «De l'audace, encore de l'audace, toujours de l'audace». Eh oui, c'est le moment. L'Europe est en danger, cela a été dit et expliqué, nous sommes vraisemblablement à un carrefour.

Hier, nous parlions du Brexit et d'autres dangers sont devant nous. Sir Winston Churchill disait il y a 70 ans, place Kléber, à la sortie de la guerre, que grands étaient les dangers qui se dressaient devant l'Europe, mais que grande était sa force et qu'il faut qu'elle en ait conscience. Alors c'est vers vous, Madame Šuica, que je me tourne, c'est vers le Conseil. Et je vais tout simplement me baser sur une phrase de Jean Monnet, qui disait lorsque l'Europe a été créée: l'Europe n'est pas là pour coaliser des États, elle est là pour relier des êtres humains entre eux et c'est le moment où nous nous trouvons aujourd'hui. Je regarde donc avec à la fois inquiétude mais aussi avec espérance le Conseil. Je vous regarde, Madame Šuica, et je regarde la Commission. Et je vous demande, au nom de cette institution, qui représente les citoyens et les citoyennes européens, au nom des ONG, qui frappent à la porte de ces institutions, au nom de la société civile, de ne pas gâcher cette opportunité de nous faire enfin travailler ensemble avec la totalité de ceux qui représentent la citoyenneté européenne. Nous devons réussir ensemble ou nous échouons les uns sans les autres.

(L'orateur accepte de répondre à une question «carton bleu» (article 171, paragraphe 8, du règlement intérieur)

Fabio Massimo Castaldo (NI), question «carton bleu». – Chers collègues, très cher Pascal, on a beaucoup travaillé ensemble sur beaucoup de dossiers dans les années passées. J'ai beaucoup apprécié votre discours et je vous pose une question.

On a lu que cette conférence ne pourrait peut-être pas entraîner une réforme des traités. Pensez-vous, comme moi, qu'on devrait justement profiter de cette occasion pour discuter d'une possible réforme du traité? Pour pousser au sein de cette conférence dans ce sens? Pour mettre fin aussi à un certain déséquilibre dans les institutions qu'il est vraiment nécessaire de corriger?

Pascal Durand (Renew), réponse «carton bleu». – Merci beaucoup cher Fabio, je vais répondre tout simplement en ayant écouté ce qu'ont dit le Conseil, la Commission et M^{me} Šuica. Nous ne devons rien préempter, nous ne devons rien nous interdire, nous devons tout simplement essayer de mettre en place le dialogue nécessaire aux solutions. Nous savons qu'il y a des blocages en Europe, nous savons que nous pouvons les dépasser: alors faisons-le, n'ayons pas peur, – je reprends le mot –, ayons de l'audace, n'ayons pas peur des citoyens européens, n'ayons pas peur du dialogue et essayons de réformer, effectivement, ce qui doit l'être.

Gwendoline Delbos-Corfield (Verts/ALE). – Madame la Présidente, nous étudions ce texte sur la conférence sur l'avenir de l'Europe.

En ce mois de janvier 2020, cela a été dit, c'est le dernier mois de nos collègues britanniques au sein de cette assemblée européenne. Nous vivons donc dans ce Parlement les premiers effets du Brexit et le départ du premier des 28 États membres. Nous espérons que ce sera le seul départ, mais qu'en savons-nous? Avions-nous véritablement pensé, il y a dix ans, que ce premier risque de dislocation était possible?

Lors de cette session parlementaire, nous allons aussi étudier et voter une résolution qui rappelle le déclenchement de l'article 7 par la Commission et le Parlement à l'encontre de deux gouvernements des États membres: la Pologne et la Hongrie, suite à de graves violations de l'état de droit. Nous semblons être figés depuis deux ans, sans véritable capacité à réagir face à ces menaces pour notre projet européen. L'Union européenne est donc dans un moment critique.

Cette idée d'une conférence sur l'avenir de l'Europe est une initiative nécessaire et remarquable: on peut féliciter la présidente de la Commission et les commissaires de la soutenir. Mais surtout, le fait que le Parlement européen s'en soit emparée avec autant de détermination et une relative part d'audace est aussi prometteur. Soyons toutefois lucides: si cette conférence est un échec, nous en porterons tous la responsabilité: Conseil, Commission et Parlement. Et cela pourrait être une étape de plus vers la fin d'une Union européenne cohérente garante des droits et toujours plus inclusive.

Conservateurs et sociaux-démocrates, nombre d'entre eux veulent freiner la participation des citoyens. Nous considérons que cela serait une erreur majeure. Nous, parlementaires européens, travaillons ici dans des conditions très privilégiées. Si nous ne permettons pas aux citoyens impliqués d'avoir des conditions semblables, nous nous moquons d'eux. De bons exemples d'assemblées citoyennes en Irlande, en France et dans des régions d'Allemagne doivent nous inspirer. Mon collègue Daniel Freund l'a déjà mentionné. Du temps de travail conséquent, des réunions régulières, des informations pour qu'ils puissent débattre en connaissance de cause, une organisation technique pour les accompagner, cela aura un coût. Intéresser réellement les citoyens et donner un sens collectif à cette conférence ne pourra pas se faire sans et à la fin du processus, les citoyens... *(la Présidente retire la parole à l'oratrice)*

Gerolf Annemans (ID). – Voorzitter, laat ons hier vandaag niet rond de pot draaien. Deze grote conferentie over de toekomst van de Europese Unie is ofwel bedoeld om het verzet tegen altijd maar meer overheveling van nationale soevereiniteit naar de Europese Unie een kans te geven, een debat dat open is en oprecht en dat voeling heeft met wat er de laatste jaren overal in Europa uit alle verkiezingen naar boven is gekomen, namelijk minder Europese Unie en meer voorzichtigheid en vrijheid inzake Europese samenwerking. Ofwel is het een forum, een theatervoorstelling à la het grote debat van Macron waar dat verzet juist opzijgezet wordt en onzichtbaar wordt gemaakt.

Onze vrees is dat laatste, en de meerderheid die hier vandaag een resolutie opdringt, heeft op drie plaatsen in de tekst uitdrukkelijk en ondanks onze amendementen laten opnemen dat de EU, meer nog dan vandaag, principieel zelfs, een *ever closer Union* moet worden. Daardoor wordt uw conferentie in plaats van een debat met het volk een theatervoorstelling, duur en nutteloos, enkel en alleen gewijd aan uw federalistische staatsgodsdienst van steeds meer bevoegdheden. U zou uzelf moeten schamen.

Geert Bourgeois (ECR). – Voorzitter, de werking van de Europese Unie is gebaseerd op de representatieve democratie. Dat betekent dat er twee legitieme vertegenwoordigers zijn van de burgers. Dat zijn de nationale parlementen en dat is dit Parlement. En het is goed om te luisteren naar de burgers, naar de ngo's, naar allerhande organisaties, maar ze zijn nooit representatief. Wat de burgers willen, is politici die keuzes maken, politici die durven te beslissen en die daar verantwoording over afleggen.

Ten tweede, de EU is gebaseerd op de principes van proportionaliteit. Dit werkt in beide richtingen, en we doen dingen samen als dat een meerwaarde biedt. Zo niet, dan houden we dat op het niveau van de lidstaten. Dus méér interne markt, méér mondiale actor, méér grensbewaker, maar géén werkloosheidsuitkeringen, géén minimumlonen: dat is een nationale bevoegdheid.

João Ferreira (GUE/NGL). – Senhora Presidente, aqueles que mandam na União Europeia para continuarem a fazer aquilo que sempre fizeram precisam, pelo menos, de fingir que ouvem aquilo que dizem os povos da Europa – bem podia ser este o lema desta farsa.

Os mesmos que aprovaram tratados nas costas dos cidadãos, os mesmo que proibiram referendos quando os resultados se tornaram inconvenientes, os mesmos que desrespeitaram o resultado de referendos, aparecem agora muito interessados em ouvir a opinião dos cidadãos num processo formatado com conclusões tiradas à partida.

Estamos aqui para discutir o futuro da Europa, sim, e por isso recusamos esta farsa. Estamos aqui para discutir o futuro da Europa, mas sem encenações que pretendem esconder conclusões tiradas à partida. Estamos aqui, sobretudo, para lutar por uma outra Europa, não a Europa neoliberal das multinacionais e dos grupos económicos, mas a Europa dos trabalhadores e dos povos. Não uma Europa militarizada, mas uma Europa de paz. Não uma Europa das imposições dos mais poderosos aos menos poderosos, mas uma Europa de Estados soberanos iguais em direitos.

Estamos aqui para discutir a Europa, e sobretudo estamos aqui para transformar esta Europa.

Carles Puigdemont i Casamajó (NI). – Madam President, when we ask ourselves about the future of Europe, the first thing to solve is what role we should give to citizens. If we don't solve this, in a few years, with other MEPs, the same debate will have to take place and it will be a defeat. Do we want citizens to be uninterested, passive and distant or, on the contrary, do we want their voice to really count and for them to be able to participate directly in European democracy? I don't refer only to the elections of Members and senior positions, but to rehabilitate a mechanism in order to participate in debates and decision-taking. We must update the governance of our democracy. The dissatisfaction that runs through Europe only benefits Europhobic populism. There is a real basis that justifies this dissatisfaction. The alternative cannot be the temptation of Euroscepticism. The future of Europe is not for conformists or sceptics, but exigencies.

(The speaker agreed to take a blue-card question under Rule 171(8))

Dolors Montserrat (PPE), pregunta de «tarjeta azul». – Europa es un proyecto político basado en el estado de Derecho y en el imperio de la ley. Es una comunidad de valores, de la que España forma parte. Europa es el antídoto a su nacionalismo destructivo.

Usted es un prófugo de la justicia, que atentó contra el estado de Derecho y robó dinero público. Esta semana, ha empezado para usted lo que usted más teme. Se le va a aplicar la ley. Inmunidad no es impunidad y nadie en esta Cámara está por encima de la ley. ¿Cuándo va a tener usted el coraje? ¿Cuándo usted va a perder el miedo de hacer frente... (la presidenta retira la palabra a la oradora).

Carles Puigdemont i Casamajó (NI), respuesta de «tarjeta azul». – Señora Montserrat, yo creo que usted debería respetar las normas que este Parlamento ha aprobado. Y usted debe conocer que hay una directiva que impide a los cargos públicos, especialmente si son diputados en ese Parlamento, atacar la presunción de inocencia.

Exactamente, ¿a qué condenas usted se refiere? ¿A qué juicio usted se refiere? ¿A qué delitos usted se refiere que yo he cometido para hacer semejante afirmación en esta Cámara?

Dicho esto, creo que los Estados deben cumplir las leyes, sí. Y el Estado español es el primer Estado de la Unión Europea, el primero, en recibir sanciones por no cumplir las leyes europeas.

Antonio Tajani (PPE). – Signora Presidente, onorevoli colleghi, la prima cosa da fare per tutelare l'interesse dell'Europa è il ritorno alla politica.

La vera grande riforma è quella di avere un'Europa che sia in grado di raccogliere le grandi sfide interne ed esterne. Serve un equilibrio geopolitico differente, serve un'Europa con un'unica politica estera, con un'unica politica di difesa.

Abbiamo visto la debolezza dell'Europa nella crisi mediorientale, nella crisi libica, l'Europa assente nella grande crisi venezuelana e del Sudamerica. C'è un'offensiva cinese alla quale l'Europa ha il dovere di rispondere.

Serve quindi un'azione forte e coesa. Un'azione forte e coesa non significa rinunciare alle identità nazionali, rinunciare agli Stati nazionali, né l'Europa deve essere il pretesto per distruggere le unità nazionali. Le piccole patrie non esistono, esistono le patrie e come tali vanno difese e valorizzate nel contesto di un'Europa politicamente più forte.

Non credo che il problema si risolva con referendum illegittimi, non credo che il problema dell'unità europea si risolva con una sorta di democrazia non rappresentativa che vada contro le volontà popolari, cioè i popoli che hanno scelto i loro eletti.

Ecco perché io credo che debba essere rinforzato il ruolo del Parlamento europeo, al quale deve essere dato finalmente il potere di iniziativa legislativa come accade in tutti i parlamenti del mondo.

Anche in questa conferenza dobbiamo certo dare spazio alla voce dei cittadini ma dobbiamo dare spazio anche alle voci degli eletti, ivi compresi i sindaci e i presidenti delle regioni che siedono nel Comitato europeo delle regioni.

Pedro Silva Pereira (S&D). – Senhora Presidente, a Conferência sobre o Futuro da Europa é uma boa oportunidade para o reencontro dos cidadãos com o projeto europeu, mas três condições têm que ser respeitadas.

Primeiro, é preciso que seja um debate verdadeiramente aberto e participado, onde todos os cidadãos e organizações representativas da sociedade civil possam fazer ouvir a sua voz.

Em segundo lugar, é preciso que seja um debate centrado nas reais expectativas dos cidadãos e dirigido à construção de compromissos políticos viáveis. Não ganhamos nada com querelas institucionais, com um confronto de utopias estéril ou com um debate anárquico onde tudo se discute e nada se decide.

Terceiro, precisamos de um debate conclusivo, que permita às Instituições europeias democraticamente legitimadas tomar decisões e dar passos concretos na direção certa para uma Europa mais justa, uma Europa mais democrática e uma Europa que ofereça mais prosperidade aos seus cidadãos.

Svenja Hahn (Renew). – Frau Präsidentin! Junge Menschen sind die Zukunft Europas. Liebe Kolleginnen und Kollegen, das werden Sie sicherlich genauso wie ich mehr als einmal im Wahlkampf gesagt haben. Und jetzt können wir zeigen, wie ernst wir das tatsächlich meinen.

Denn die Konferenz zur Zukunft Europas ist auch eine Konferenz zur Zukunft der nächsten Generation. Da muss diese nächste Generation auch mitreden können. Ich erwarte vor allen Dingen auch Respekt, genauso viel Respekt vor den Jugendforen wie vor den Bürgerversammlungen. Das ist vor allem auch ein Gruß an die Kollegen der ECR, die Jugendbeteiligung mit ihren Änderungsanträgen am liebsten abschaffen würden.

Ich erwarte aber auch Respekt von diesem Haus und von den nationalen Parlamenten. Schicken Sie vor allen Dingen auch junge Abgeordnete, denn nur, wenn wir junge Menschen auf allen Ebenen der Konferenz einbauen, zeigen wir, dass wir ihren Blickwinkel ernst nehmen, dass wir Respekt vor ihren Meinungen haben und dass sie ganz aktiv selbst ihre Zukunft in Europa mitgestalten können.

Damian Boeselager (Verts/ALE). – Madam President, after listening to this debate, I am even happier that we have a strong resolution in this House, which is basically supporting the future of Europe.

I just want to mention a few points that have been mentioned already to showcase that. We do recognise the problems – and because we recognise the problems, we're trying to find solutions, and the problems as Mr Verhofstadt has said and also Ms O'Brien and others, lie in all the challenges we face with migration, with our social standards, and so on. We cannot address them fully because we are currently blocked in our solutions. That is why we need this conference to go into the future. The second question about the national interest. Yes, currently, we can't defend our national interests because national interests are European interests and that is I think important to understand.

The majority of this House is for the future, and the future can only be obtained if we find a common future for Europe together and that means to have a common vision together that is shared with the citizens, and I hope that with this conference we can go down this path.

(The speaker agreed to take a blue-card question under Rule 171(8))

Katalin Cseh (Renew), blue-card question. – Mr Boeselager, you mentioned that we need a strongly worded resolution on this topic, I completely agree, but just let me remind this House of a later debate we are having about a very strongly worded resolution on Hungary and Poland. This House voted on this and nothing is happening so far. How can we guarantee that this resolution we are voting on will not lead to a similar talking shop, that we can finally achieve results and that this Parliament actually stands up for what has been voted on?

Damian Boeselager (Verts/ALE), blue-card answer. – Ms Cseh, there are two elements that we can use to make sure that this doesn't end up as a talking shop. The first one is that we actually follow up on the outcomes of this debate, so that we have Treaty changes, so that we have procedural changes, so that we go into the regular processes here in this House, and in the other institutions and follow up. The second one is that we don't only go bottom up as Mr Verhofstad said, but that we also play back our results to the citizens and say, 'do you agree? Do you think these are good results?' And only via this accountability, I think will we be able to hold all of us and all politicians accountable.

Harald Vilimsky (ID). – Frau Präsidentin, meine Damen und Herren! Sie wollen hier die Zukunft Europas in die Hand nehmen, scheitern aber bereits an einer erfolgreichen Bearbeitung der Gegenwart und der gegenwärtigen Probleme. Zwei Beispiele: Migration – seit 2015 sind Sie nicht in der Lage, einen entsprechenden Außengrenzschatz auch wahrzunehmen. Zweites Beispiel ist der Bereich Ökonomie, Währung. Wir haben im Währungsbereich eine Nullzinspolitik gegenüber einer Minuszinspolitik. Die Ökonomie ist schwach, und wir schaffen es nicht, hier die Wirtschaft entsprechend anzukurbeln. Wo allerdings hier Erfolg suggeriert wird, indem die zentralen Bereiche zur Seite geschoben werden, das ist die Klimakrise. Sie nutzen das aber, um den Menschen mit einer CO₂-Abgabe noch mehr Geld aus der Tasche zu ziehen.

Woran die Europäische Union allerdings erneut scheitert, ist, einen Standort festzulegen, und Monat für Monat werden 120 Dienstfahrzeuge von Brüssel nach Straßburg mit jeweils nur einem Fahrer beordert und müssen wieder zurückfahren. Erkennen Sie, dass die Zukunft Europas nicht in einer Zentralisierung liegt, die Nationalstaaten sind gut genug und schlau genug, um ihre Probleme weitestgehend selbst zu lösen und hier liegt eine erfolgreiche Zukunft für Europa.

(Der Redner ist damit einverstanden, eine Frage nach dem Verfahren der „blauen Karte“ gemäß Artikel 171 Absatz 8 der Geschäftsordnung zu beantworten)

Claudia Gamon (Renew), Frage nach dem Verfahren der „blauen Karte“. – Herr Vilimsky! Sie haben jetzt überhaupt nicht zur Sache gesprochen. Deshalb möchte ich Sie fragen, was denn dagegensprechen würde, die Bürgerinnen und Bürger der Union hereinzuholen in diese Konferenz und mit ihnen in den Austausch zu kommen, was ihre Vorstellungen zur Zukunft Europas sind, weil Sie sich immer wieder dagegen verwehren, deren Stimmen zu hören, weil die viel weiterdenken würden und viel europäischer denken würden, als Sie es ihnen zutrauen.

Harald Vilimsky (ID), Antwort auf eine Frage nach dem Verfahren der „blauen Karte“. – Frau Gamon! Bei aller Wertschätzung Ihrer Person – Sie sind ja auch neu im Haus –, ich war die vergangene Periode schon hier und war auch Zeuge dessen, dass wir x-fach diskutiert haben über die Zukunft Europas unter Beteiligung von Bürgern, von Interessengruppen, wer immer sich daran beteiligen möchte. Es gibt nur hier keinen Konsens, das Haus scheut sich davor, eine Antwort zu geben. Wir haben seit 2016 fünf Szenarien über eine mögliche Zukunft Europas, und bis heute scheut sich das Haus davor, hier eine entsprechende Festlegung zu treffen. Das ist mein Vorwurf, den ich an dieses Gremium postuliere ... (Die Präsidentin entzieht dem Redner das Wort.)

Jorge Buxadé Villalba (ECR). – Presidente, diez años, presidente, diez años desde la entrada en vigor del Tratado de Lisboa y lo que hemos tenido es una crisis financiera, una crisis inmigratoria, la crisis del Brexit. No hemos sabido resolver ninguno de estos problemas. Está bien que debatamos, por tanto, el futuro de la Unión, pero, cuidado, porque parece ser que la solución es seguir caminando hacia aquello que lo ha provocado, que es la federalización de Europa. Ustedes siguen caminando hacia el precipicio.

A mi entender, la solución debe ser, efectivamente, la de una conferencia libre en la que no se excluyan las opiniones de más del 20 % de este Parlamento, que ha sido excluido directamente de la misma redacción del texto de la propuesta que se lleva al Pleno. ¿Ese es el futuro de la Europa que ustedes quieren? El futuro de una Europa que empieza sancionando a dos Estados miembros y que continúa excluyendo del debate -repito- a más del 20 % de la población europea.

Existen otros europeos que quieren una Europa de naciones libres, de naciones soberanas, que cooperan libremente defendiendo sus tradiciones. Y quiero recordarles también algo que ustedes parecen olvidar: el futuro pasa por nuestras tradiciones y el respeto a nuestra historia, nuestra cultura cristiana.

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

Sven Simon (PPE), Frage nach dem Verfahren der „blauen Karte“. – Ich möchte einer Legendenbildung vorbeugen, die jetzt zwei Redner Ihrer Fraktion hier fälschlicherweise in den Raum gestellt haben: Sie behaupten, dass Sie ausgeschlossen worden seien von der Formulierung dieser Entschließung. Das stimmt nicht. Es war Ihr Wunsch, sich zurückzuziehen. Alle anderen haben das bedauert. Wir hätten gerne eine fraktionsübergreifende Entschließung verfasst – über alle Fraktionen hinweg. Sie haben sich zurückgezogen. Wir haben niemanden ausgeschlossen. Ist Ihnen das bekannt?

Jorge Buxadé Villalba (ECR), respuesta de «tarjeta azul». – Lamento disentir, pero yo formo parte también de esa Comisión de Asuntos Constitucionales y en el primer debate se nos trajo ya una propuesta, firmada por los cuatro grandes grupos, que hablaban de un futuro de una Europa más próxima, más cercana... de la federalización de Europa. Y, a partir de aquí, hagan ustedes enmiendas. ¿Qué enmiendas vamos a hacer si ustedes ya han cerrado el documento?

Yo creo que debatir es empezar a trabajar desde el principio y pensar de verdad en el respeto a nuestros ciudadanos.

Δημήτριος Παπαδημούλης (GUE/NGL). – Κυρία Πρόεδρε, για να γίνει η Ενωμένη Ευρώπη πιο ελκυστική και πιο ισχυρή, χρειάζεται να γίνει πιο δημοκρατική, πιο κοινωνική, πιο οικολογική και πιο δίκαιη. Μόνο έτσι μπορούμε να αποφύγουμε τον κίνδυνο της οπισθοδρόμησης και της επιστροφής σε ένα μαύρο παρελθόν, κάτι το οποίο επιδιώκουν, ανοικτά πια, οι δυνάμεις της αντιευρωπαϊκής λαϊκίστικης ακροδεξιάς. Για να το πετύχουμε, ο διάλογος αυτός, στον οποίο πρέπει να έχει ισχυρό ρόλο το Ευρωπαϊκό Κοινοβούλιο, πρέπει να γίνει όχι μόνο μεταξύ των ελίτ αλλά, κυρίως, με τη συμμετοχή της κοινωνίας των πολιτών. Για τον λόγο αυτό η πολιτική μου ομάδα της Αριστεράς συνοπογράφει αυτό το ψήφισμα, παρότι θα το θέλαμε ριζοσπαστικότερο. Μας εντυπωσιάζει δε όχι μόνο η απόλυτη άρνηση της άκρας Δεξιάς να στηρίξει αυτό το ψήφισμα αλλά και η άρνησή της να δεχθεί τη συμμετοχή των πολιτών σε αυτό τον διάλογο. Γιατί φοβόσαστε τη συμμετοχή των πολιτών;

Ivan Vilibor Sinčić (NI). – Poštovani predsjedavajući, europski narodi i države osuđeni su jedni na druge. Bili smo ovdje i prije Europe, sad kad je Europa, bit ćemo bez obzira što se dogodi s Europskom unijom.

Danas je, inače, Međunarodni dan priznanja Republike Hrvatske, a na današnji dan, slušajući ovdje raspravu, ja sam dobio jedno malo osobno priznanje slušajući velike zagovornike Europe koje sam godinama pratio kako priznaju da su pogriješili, da su provodili politike koje su naletile na zid. Bravo! Priznanje je prvi korak u rješavanju bilo čega.

Europi fali solidarnosti. U Hrvatskoj kad su požari u Dalmaciji, svi skaćemo da pomognemo Dalmaciji. Kad su poplave u Slavoniji, cijela Hrvatska skaće da pomogne Slavoniji. Međutim, u Europi je solidarnost minimalna. Umjesto solidarnosti vi ste ponudili opresiju. Solidarnost ste smanjili svojim pogrešnim zajedničkim opresivnim politikama.

Na primjer, monetarna politika. Sad se Hrvatska gura u eurozonu. Oduzet ćete nam time sve alate izlaska iz krize, politiku tečaja kamatnih stopa. Što će nam se onda dogoditi? Elementi pomoći su nikakvi. Hoćemo izgubiti kao Grčka 25 % gospodarstva? Hoće li naša privreda krepiti kao pas na cesti?

Danuta Maria Hübner (PPE). – Madam President, this two-year conference can be something entirely different from just a podium for popular or populist politicians. We have a chance to initiate an open fully inclusive debate on Europe and its future. It can be a debate of equals that would lead to a permanent mechanism of dialogue on Europe. Independently of its final outcome, this conference is a political process, it can have its own value added: renewing European liberal democracy, keeping European unity, advancing European citizenship, enhancing the feelings of ownership of Europe among our citizens. Such an unprecedented open dialogue can make Europe grow as a democracy caring, with reciprocity, about its citizens.

I see this conference also as a follow-up to what was new in the last European elections. As never before, the 2019 elections generated a common European narrative instead of the traditional separate 28 national stories. These elections proved that our citizens expect more from Europe than in the past. We know that citizens cannot just be offered the option to listen to what we politicians and institutions have to say about globalisation, climate neutrality, green policies, migration, digitalisation, social justice, competitiveness, and so on. They want to participate in responding to challenges, to address them jointly and to tailor these responses to their taste, needs and dreams. We should use this opportunity to learn how to be in listening mode.

(The speaker declined to take a blue-card question)

Maria Grapini (S&D). – Doamna președintă, stimați colegi, trebuie să recunoaștem că propunerea de a avea o conferință a venit din criza în care se află Uniunea Europeană și trebuie toți să ne facem o analiză. Au făcut tot ce trebuie politicienii pentru a discuta cu cetățenii? Poate că dacă făceam mai mult noi, politicienii, că da, și eu cred în democrația reprezentativă, reprezentăm cetățenii, dar ne-am întâlnit noi atât cât ar fi trebuit cu cetățenii să-i consultăm atunci când votăm, când luăm decizii în numele lor?

Și în management, atunci când eșuează o măsură, trebuie să găsești o altă măsură și de fapt, asta se vrea prin această conferință. Evident că trebuie să avem grijă cum integrăm această conferință, acest nou organism, această platformă care vrea să aducă cetățeanul mai aproape de noi cu constituțiile naționale, cu parlamentele naționale. Structura este prevăzută în propunerea conferinței; este importantă implementarea, este important să nu facem o birocrăție nouă, un cost nou și să urmărim efectele.

Da, voi susține această rezoluție și cred că toți trebuie să o susținem pentru că, de fapt, este un mecanism de îmbunătățire a comunicării cu cetățenii.

Charles Goerens (Renew). – Madame la Présidente, ce n'est pas parce que la tâche sera ardue qu'il ne faut pas lancer cette conférence. Non, c'est parce que le moteur de l'intégration européenne est en panne qu'il importe de faire une introspection collective. Disons-le clairement, notre manière de fonctionner va nous conduire tout droit dans la deuxième ligue.

Cette conférence sera l'occasion de s'entendre sur un diagnostic collectif, de nous interroger sur les raisons de notre paralysie, de coaliser les efforts des citoyens soucieux de contribuer à façonner leur avenir, de donner une voix aux déçus et aussi de donner une voix aux jeunes. D'ailleurs, je conseillerais à ceux qui manqueraient d'arguments et de motivation pour cette conférence de s'inspirer des messages qui émanent des jeunes Britanniques déçus par le Brexit.

Patrick Breyer (Verts/ALE). – Frau Präsidentin! Wie schaffen wir es, dass die EU Politik für die Mehrheit der Bürgerinnen und Bürger macht und nicht für Konzerne? Wie dämmen wir Lobbyismus ein? Wie können die Europäerinnen und Europäer bei Bedarf selbst das Ruder in die Hand nehmen durch EU-weite Referenden und direkte Demokratie?

Um das Vertrauen der Bürgerinnen und Bürger in die EU zurückzugewinnen und Europa vor einem Auseinanderfallen oder einer schrittweisen Übernahme durch Nationalisten zu schützen, wie wir sie auch heute gehört haben, brauchen wir eine Fundamentalreform, einen Neustart der EU. Diese Konferenz zur Zukunft Europas wird hoffentlich einige kleinere Verbesserungen bewirken können. Aber ausgerechnet von Vertretern der EU-Organe zu erwarten, sich quasi selbst zu reformieren, das ist wie Frösche zu fragen, wie man einen Sumpf austrocknet.

Lassen Sie uns deswegen den Mut und das Vertrauen in unsere Bürgerinnen und Bürger aufbringen, einen direkt gewählten Bürgerkonvent mit der Ausarbeitung einer neuen EU-Verfassung zu beauftragen und die Europäerinnen und Europäer in einem europaweiten Referendum selbst über die EU entscheiden zu lassen, die Sie haben möchten.

Jordan Bardella (ID). – Madame la Présidente, demain l'Europe sociale, demain l'Europe qui protège, demain une Europe plus démocratique, voilà maintenant plus de 30 ans que les responsables politiques nous chantent la même chanson et qu'ils font miroiter aux peuples européens des promesses jamais tenues. Les meilleures intentions du monde n'y feront rien: aucun projet européen légitime et durable ne verra le jour tant qu'il ne reposera pas sur une coopération libre entre les nations et donc sur le respect des souverainetés de chacun.

L'Union européenne n'est pas seulement critiquable dans sa structure, elle l'est aussi et surtout dans sa politique. Protection des peuples face à la mondialisation sauvage, défense de leur identité, intelligence artificielle, révolution technologique ou encore environnement et écologie, votre modèle européen nous a tout fait rater. Nous devons concurrencer l'Amérique, la Chine, la Russie ou l'Inde, nous sommes en réalité réduits à l'impuissance. J'ose émettre un souhait: que cette conférence sur l'avenir de l'Europe soit enfin le moment d'un changement de cap radical mais je ne me fais guère d'illusions.

(L'orateur accepte de répondre à une question «carton bleu» (article 171, paragraphe 8, du règlement intérieur)

Ben Habib (NI), blue-card question. – Mr Bardella, would you agree with me that the name of this conference is a misnomer? It really ought to be 'the future of the European Union', not 'the future of Europe'. And would you also agree with me that the conference could actually be dispensed with, because the future of the European Union is actually quite dire and will dissolve quite soon?

Jordan Bardella (ID), réponse «carton bleu». – Je ne confonds pas l'Europe et l'Union européenne. Je pense que l'Europe est un continent, qui a inventé les nations, qui contient en son sein, peut-être les plus belles et les plus vieilles nations du monde, mais qu'en tout cas, l'Union européenne, qui s'est construite depuis maintenant un peu plus de 30 ans, est en train de détruire les nations. Je me réjouis d'avoir vu le peuple britannique reprendre sa liberté, mais en tout cas, nous ne pouvons pas imaginer une coopération européenne sans la puissance britannique et je crois qu'il faudra quand même continuer à envisager des partenariats entre une nouvelle forme de construction européenne et la nation britannique.

Roberts Zīle (ECR). – Prezident! Ja pilsoņi redz, ka neskatoties uz Eiropas zaļo kursu tiek pieņemti likumi, kas protekcionisma vārdā katru otro mēnesi liks dzenāt tukšas kravas automašīnas pāri visai Eiropai, viņi diez vai tic Eiropas vērtībām.

Kad arvien ciešāk Savienības piekritēji cīnās ap Eiropas Savienības budžetu, kas īstenībā ir viens procents no GNI jeb divdesmit reizes mazāks kā ASV Federālais, un reizē samazina kohēzijas resursu, tad jau tā sarežģītā demogrāfiskā situācija nozīmēs jaunu cilvēku aizplūšanu no Eiropas perifērijas uz bagātākām valstīm, padarot atšķirības starp Eiropas valstīm vēl lielākas. Arī tam pilsoņi neticēs. Kad prasība palielināt Eiropas suverenitāti globālajā līmenī robežojās ar to, ka dažas lielākas valstis vienpersoniski varēs pārstāvēt globālajā līmenī Eiropu, arī tas neiepriecina pārējo valsts pilsoņus. Un visbeidzot, ja pilsonim Eiropas Parlamenta vēlēšanās Pan Eiropas sarakstos būs kandidāti, par kuriem vairāk kā deviņdesmit procentu gadījumā viņi, neko nebūs dzirdējuši, arī tas viņus neiepriecinās.

Mēs varam samaitāt to, kas mums pašlaik ir labs Eiropā, nevis sasniegt ko citu. Paldies.

Nikolaj Villumsen (GUE/NGL). – Fru formand! EU er elitens projekt. EU tilgodeser de multinationale selskaber og de rigeste. Det sker på bekostning af klimaet, af miljøet og af lønmodtagerne. I stedet har vi brug for et ligeværdigt demokratisk samarbejde, der sætter borgerne, naturen og klimaet i centrum. Derfor er der behov for en grundlæggende debat om, hvordan vi samarbejder i Europa. Vi har ikke brug for en forudbestemt debat, hvor konklusionen altid er mere centralisering, mere ureguleret marked. Vi har brug for en åben og reel involvering af borgerne, af civilsamfundet og af de nationale parlamenter. Derfor stemmer vi for dette beslutningsforslag. Vi er aldrig bange for at spørge borgerne. Vi vil også gerne sende et klart signal til EU-Kommissionen om, at hvis ikke der her bliver en reel involvering af borgerne – hvis ikke der bliver en reel folkelig inddragelse – så kommer borgerne aldrig til at tilgive det.

Richard Tice (NI). – Madam President, the future for the United Kingdom is bright, full of opportunity, as we have the political certainty of leaving the EU in just two weeks' time. The opportunity to run our country as we want, not as the EU tells us. The opportunity to be a high-growth, low-tax, smartly regulated economy that competes on the world stage without unnecessary bureaucracy and protectionism. The opportunity to run a sensible, fair immigration policy that works for our economy, for our people. The opportunity to use state aid for our strategic industries and businesses. Our employment levels are at record highs, our unemployment at record lows, especially for our young people. I suggest to you, Madam President, the opportunity for the remaining EU27 countries can too be bright, if you reform, follow our lead and take back control.

(Applause from certain quarters)

Othmar Karas (PPE). – Frau Präsidentin, Frau Kommissarin, meine sehr geehrten Damen und Herren! Wir sind uns ja wohl hoffentlich in der Mehrheit einig, dass unsere Zukunft eine starke, effiziente, glaubwürdigere Europäische Union benötigt.

Und die Europäische Union sind wir alle: Bürgerinnen und Bürger, Gemeinden, Regionen, Nationen und die europäische Gemeinschaft. Machen wir daher die Zukunft zu unserem Freund! Machen wir die Bürgerinnen und Bürger zu unseren Verbündeten! Stellen wir die Zukunft Europas und die Rolle der Europäischen Union in der Welt parteipolitisch außer Streit!

Die Zukunft benötigt eine Stärkung der europäischen Demokratie, keine Entscheidung ohne das Europäische Parlament, die Beseitigung der Einstimmigkeit im Entscheidungsprozess, ein europäisches Wahlrecht mit europäischen Listen, das Initiativrecht, die Budgethoheit, Eigenfinanzierung, europäische Volksabstimmungen. Die Zukunft benötigt eine europäische Regierung, die dann Sprecherin des Kontinents in der Welt ist und über eine gemeinsame Außen-, Sicherheits- und Verteidigungspolitik verfügen muss. Unsere Zukunft benötigt europäische Antworten auf die *global challenges*, unsere Zukunft benötigt einen Binnenmarkt ohne Barrieren, unsere Zukunft benötigt ein Budget, das der Größe der Aufgaben, der Anzahl der Bevölkerung Europas entspricht und in die Zukunft investiert.

Und daher sage ich Ihnen: Die Zukunft benötigt Dialog, europäisches Bewusstsein, gemeinsames Handeln. Wir als Parlamente müssen dafür bereitstehen. Wir mit unserer einen Million Besuchern, mit einer erhöhten Wahlbeteiligung und mit unseren Verbindungsbüros und Stakeholdern. Gehen wir die Sache gemeinsam an!

Giuliano Pisapia (S&D). – Signora Presidente, onorevoli colleghi, sono passati ormai quasi ottant'anni da quando Altiero Spinelli ed Ernesto Rossi, confinati in un'isola dal regime fascista, scrissero il manifesto di Ventotene.

Oggi più che mai sentiamo il bisogno di rinnovamento e di concretezza. La conferenza sul futuro dell'Europa ci offre un'opportunità unica, e forse l'ultima, per rispondere alle richieste di cambiamento e di partecipazione non solo nei grandi centri urbani ma anche nelle campagne e nelle periferie, ascoltando anche chi è contrario, chi è critico, chi non condivide l'attuale sistema dell'Unione europea.

Per questo è indispensabile una struttura capace di trasformare le idee in risultati concreti, è indispensabile l'impegno delle istituzioni europee a realizzare, anche con la modifica dei trattati, le principali proposte che emergeranno dalla conferenza, altrimenti rischiamo di sprecare una delle ultime chance di cambiamento, e forte sarà il rischio di un vero e proprio boomerang, di un passo indietro del Parlamento e dell'Unione europea.

La via da percorrere non è facile né sicura, ma deve essere percorsa e lo sarà, lo faremo con convinzione e con passione.

Dita Charanzová (Renew). – Paní předsedající, konference o budoucnosti Evropy by neměla řešit nic menšího než naši společnou budoucnost. A kudy se dál ubírat by měli říci ti nejpovolanější – občané, Evropané. Jsem proto ráda, že jsme se k tomuto kroku odhodlali. Slyšela jsem v uplynulých letech i zde volání po změně. Neslyšela jsem snad žádného kolegu, který by řekl: všechno funguje perfektně, změň není potřeba. A proto je dobře, že teď i my politici vlastně jdeme s kůží na trh. Jdeme si vyslechnout to, co bychom měli dělat jinak, lépe. Totiž to, co platí mnohdy zde v bruselské bublině, nemusí a často není dobře vnímáno občany našich zemí. Evropa se mění, mění se svět, máme zde nové výzvy technologické, bezpečnostní, environmentální. I na to musíme hledat odpovědi. To nejhorší, co bychom měli dělat, je nedělat nic, pokračovat v zajetých kolejkách. Pro mnohé by to asi bylo řešení nejpohodlnější, ale řešení krátkodobé a řešení špatné.

(Řečnice souhlasila s tím, že odpoví na otázku položenou zvednutím modré karty (čl. 171 odst. 8 jednacího řádu))

Damian Boeselager (Verts/ALE), blue-card question. – Ms Charanzová, I am very happy that you mentioned meaningful citizen participation again, and so my question – because this has been discussed a lot here – is how would you see meaningful citizen participation with the maximum amount of people? How would you organise that?

Dita Charanzová (Renew), odpověď na otázku položenou zvednutím modré karty. – Kdyby to bylo jen na mně, já bych tam chtěla mít jenom občany, chtěla bych tam mít mladé lidi. Já je slyším, když cestuju po regionech, po České republice. Oni se chtějí zapojit, jenom jsme jim neukázali tu cestu. Takže pojďme si s nimi sednout my politici, instituce, Evropská komise, zástupci národních parlamentů a pojďme je poslouchat. Ale pro mě tou hnací silou musí být naši občané.

Scott Ainslie (Verts/ALE). – Madam President, Brexit should serve as a dire warning to all of us as to what happens when ordinary people see the EU as distant, unaccountable and out of touch. It becomes terrifyingly easy for well-financed, far-right demagogues, aided and abetted by the populist gutter press, to turn people against it and whip up Eurosceptic fear.

In the UK, it's too late. The damage has been done. But it would be an absolute tragedy if the EU didn't learn lessons from the calamity that is Brexit. So, if the conclusions of this conference are to be worth the paper they're written on, the voices of citizens and civil society must be heard loud and clear. This process cannot be reduced to a tokenistic rubber-stamping exercise.

It's worrying that powerful lobbyists and big businesses find it easy to influence the politics of any government anywhere, while NGOs and ordinary citizens are too often muted and kept in the cold. At this vital Conference on the Future of Europe, it is absolutely critical that we seize this chance to amplify citizens' voices of all Europeans, which I and my country – as proud Europeans – look forward to continuing to contribute to doing.

(Applause)

President. – Just briefly, Ms Huhtasaari, you are the next speaker but you also indicated to ask a question, which I'm not going to allow. I'm afraid that I'm subject to the rule of time, and my advisers tell me that I need to discontinue the blue-card system. I apologise for that, but we do have a formal sitting at 12 and we need to prepare the Chamber, so you have to accept my ruling on this for now, and perhaps you could discuss this procedure at a future time. Thank you for your cooperation and participation.

Niklas Nienäb (Verts/ALE). – Madam President, sorry, but I have to challenge your decision on the blue cards, because we have one hour in between the end of this debate and the next debate. I see your point that you have to discuss in the Chamber, but you have enough presidents to do that without one, and I think that you can continue this debate. We have seen so far that this debate really lived through the usage of blue cards. Therefore, I want to challenge your decision on discarding the debate by taking a decision in this plenary to continue with the usage of the blue-card system.

(Applause)

President. – I love the blue-card system and I think it works. However, I cannot allow this debate to roll into the noon formal sitting. Maybe you and your Groups would take on board how good this debate has been and how interactive, and talk afterwards about how we might continue the process. But for now, I do not have one hour's flexibility – I wish I did, but I don't. So please, accept my ruling, and we will proceed with the debate and take on board my comments about, perhaps, reform for the future. Now, Ms Huhtasaari – and without interruption – you have one minute.

Laura Huhtasaari (ID). – Arvoisa puhemies, totalitarismissa yhteistyötä tehdään vain niiden kanssa, jotka ovat samaa mieltä. EU:n tulevaisuushankkeen kannanmuodostuksessa ID-ryhmämme on sivuutettu. EU:n tulevaisuushankkeessa torjuttaviksi uhkatekijöiksi on määritelty nationalismi ja brexit. Kenelle ne ovat uhka? Eivät ainakaan kansalle eikä kansallismielisvaltioiden suvereniteetille. Sen sijaan ne ovat uhka EU:n sosialistiselle suurvaltaprojektille ja EU-johdolle, jonka mielestä sosialismia pitää kokeilla vielä kerran.

Brexit on aiheuttanut paniikkireaktion, jonka myötä täältä on riistetty meppien paikoilta meppien omat liput. Täällä keskustellaan siitä, että pitäisi ottaa kansalaiset keskusteluun mukaan, mutta se ei ilmeisesti tarkoita kaikkia. Sanotte koko ajan, että populistista ei oteta keskusteluun, mutta kansalaisia otetaan.

Just you wait – the future belongs to... *(The President cut off the speaker)*

Derk Jan Eppink (ECR). – Voorzitter, Europa staat inderdaad op een kruispunt. De resolutie van de meerderheid is duidelijk: u wilt een soevereine EU-staat met een eigen regering, eigen belastingen, een eigen leger. Dat maakt lidstaten tot provincies.

Europese conservatieven hebben een ander Europa voor ogen, namelijk een gemeenschap van soevereine staten, samenwerking tussen staten – dat is heel belangrijk –, meer macht terug naar de lidstaten en uiteindelijk afschaffing van de loodzware bureaucratie die wij hebben. Wij gaan dus een parallel proces lanceren met een competitief en concurrerend project en we gaan daarmee in de lidstaten in debat met de bevolking. Ook vinden wij dat de bevolking haar eigen mening moet kunnen uitspreken in referenda.

Dus, vraag het de burgers, niet allerlei ngo's en dergelijke, mensen overal in schimmige posities, maar direct aan de burgers. Laat hen zich uitspreken over de toekomst van Europa in plaats van gesubsidieerde organisaties.

Claire Fox (NI). – Madam President, this is the best debate I've listened to in this Chamber. Well-chaired, Madam McGuinness. There's been some honest reflections, and even Guy Verhofstadt has shown humility: to quote him, he said 'we have a problem'. You do.

With all this talk about citizens' assemblies and consultations, there's a danger that it is superficially bringing citizens into the decision-making process, but is really stage-managed tokenism. Actually, European citizens do speak out; they do debate freely all the time, without the help of bureaucrats. European citizens often shout their opinions loud and clear, in national elections, and in referenda, but they're often dismissed by people here. When EU citizens dare criticize the EU institutions or eurozone austerity policies, many MEPs here in unpopular institutions and political parties put their hands over their ears or spit out insults. 'You're populist', they say, 'you're far right'. I'm actually on the left! 'You're manipulated,' they say to voters, 'by misinformation or demagogues'. In other words, you can't be serious about consulting citizens if you demonise those citizens unless they sycophantically act as cheerleaders for the EU.

(Applause)

You seem to want to create ... *(The President cut off the speaker)*

Vladimír Bilčík (PPE). – Madam President, I very much welcome this discussion, and I also welcome the resolution for which I hope we can gather the widest possible support in this House. It is important: we need a strong start for this conference, and we don't need it just in this House – we need it especially beyond the confines of this House. Indeed, the conference should bring results for improving our institutions, and also our decision making.

But, more importantly, I hope that the conference carries something more, and that is the emotion: the emotion which we saw in the run up to the last European elections, when voters' participation increased in unprecedented numbers across the EU Member States. And we need to carry this emotion; we need to carry the increased trust of our citizens in Europe's future, and we need to do it through their participation in this conference. This is essential, and I just want to respond very quickly to the remarks from the far-right corner of this house. This is going to be a conference on Europe's future. Article 19 is very clear. I believe we should engage all of those in the EU candidate countries who are ready to work with us, who are ready to join us. This is the opportunity to make this a conference on Europe's future; to make this a conference on a stronger Europe in the world.

Simona Bonafè (S&D). – Signora Presidente, onorevoli colleghi, con le ultime elezioni europee i cittadini ci hanno dimostrato che vogliono ancora credere nel progetto europeo, purché l'Europa cambi.

Da soli oggi, chiusi nei nostri Stati, non andiamo da nessuna parte. Le crisi internazionali ai nostri confini sono solo l'ultimo campanello di allarme della necessità di un'Europa con una voce sola, ma è l'ultima chiamata per cambiare l'Europa.

Abbiamo il dovere di aprire, con questa conferenza, una nuova fase costituente, un'opportunità di rilancio per puntare su un'Europa più democratica, con un ruolo centrale per il Parlamento europeo, ma anche un momento di apertura e di ascolto per tornare ad appassionare i cittadini e parlare dei loro bisogni e delle loro aspettative.

Serve allora una conferenza dinamica e pragmatica, che sappia imprimere alle istituzioni europee un cambio di passo vero in termini di efficacia e credibilità.

Ma attenzione, colleghi! Dobbiamo evitare una discussione fine a se stessa, dove ai propositi non seguono i fatti, perché altrimenti da opportunità la conferenza diventa carburante per il motore dell'antieuropeismo, e non ce lo possiamo permettere.

President. – Just briefly, when people are speaking really fast, I get a flashing light from the interpreters, so say less rather than more, and then you'll be within your time. A small piece of advice.

Claudia Gamon (Renew). – Frau Präsidentin! Mit der Konferenz zur Zukunft Europas lösen wir ein Versprechen ein – ein Versprechen, dass Europa in Zukunft besser funktionieren muss. Ich bin sehr froh darüber, dass wir die nächsten zwei Jahre die Bürgerinnen und Bürger Europas vor den Vorhang holen werden, um sie zu fragen, was ihre Erwartungen an ein gemeinsames, starkes Europa der Zukunft sein könnten. Die zentrale Frage wird sein: Was ist unsere Vision eines gemeinsamen Europas? Und auch an die Bürgerinnen und Bürger: Was ist eure Vision, wie die Zukunft Europas aussehen kann?

Wichtige Reformen scheitern ja oft an Angst – Angst davor, dass die Bürgerinnen und Bürger etwas vermeintlich nicht haben wollen. Aber meine Erfahrung aus vielen Gesprächen ist, dass die Bürgerinnen und Bürger der Union viel weiterdenken, viel mutiger denken, als es ihnen ihre Regierungschefs vielleicht jetzt schon zutrauen würden. Und deshalb: Nehmen wir diesen Mut mit und treffen wir auch Entscheidungen, die wesentlich und entscheidend sein werden dafür, dass Europa besser funktioniert!

Wir haben so viele Herausforderungen, denen wir uns hier jeden Tag stellen, wie die Klimakatastrophe. Wie sollen wir denen entgegentreten, wenn nicht in einem verbesserten, gemeinsamen und stärkeren Europa? Ich hoffe doch, dass wir diese Konferenz auch als Anlass nehmen, um diesen Spirit des Gemeinsamen auch weiter zu tragen in die nächsten Jahre, und für mich bedeutet das: Auf in die Vereinigten Staaten von Europa!

Niklas Nienaa (Verts/ALE). – Madam President, I think we have seen so far in this debate that we do face a crisis in Europe, and I think we have seen not just after the election, but already before, that there are two possibilities. Do we want less Europe or more? The Far Right have so far expressed their vision of this, but we, with a big majority of people who said we want more Europe, have won this election. So therefore, we now need to decide: how much more Europe do we want? And I think this question should be answered by the public, by everyone, by sitting together and answering this question.

And yes, the answer to this question can be that we want less, that the people want less Europe. But I say let us take the risk, because so far, I know that we have the better arguments. We know that Europe has brought unity of East and West, that it has brought freedom, that it has brought peace and prosperity. And so I see all the good arguments on our side, and I know that we will win this debate.

Talking of debate, let us continue to have a good debate in this plenary and make this the first European public sphere.

Mara Bizzotto (ID). – Signora Presidente, onorevoli colleghi, quest' Europa va cambiata e rivoltata da cima a fondo. Non abbiamo bisogno di più Europa ma di un'Europa completamente diversa e nuova.

Basta con l'Europa schiava delle banche e delle multinazionali. Basta con l'Europa dei burocrati, delle lobby e della finanza. Quella della von der Leyen sarà la solita ministra riscaldata, la solita Europa dominata dalla Francia e dalla Germania, dalla Merkel e da Macron.

L'Europa che noi vogliamo è l'Europa dei popoli, della libertà e della vera democrazia. L'Europa che vogliamo costruire deve fermare l'immigrazione clandestina, sconfiggere il terrorismo islamico, tutelare il *made in Italy*, difendere le nostre imprese e i nostri lavoratori.

Questa è la grande rivoluzione democratica che noi porteremo avanti con la schiena dritta e con la forza di chi rappresenta veramente la volontà del popolo italiano.

Jane Alison Mummery (NI). – Madam President, the hallmarks of British society are politeness, respect and modesty. But as those who sought to hijack the Brexit agenda have found, we continue to be no simple 'nation of shopkeepers'. When our values, democracy and sovereignty are threatened, the 'bulldog spirit' rises in our blood and the fightback starts.

This is what happened in the recent election, which was convincingly won by Boris Johnson. The British public saw three years of delay, bullying, plotting and platitudes for what it was: a betrayal of British democracy.

So as this stage of the Brexit saga draws to a close, I trust that lessons have been learned to help a future UK-EU relationship. I trust that the EU hierarchy now realises the British people will not be taken for fools or pushed around moving forward. I sincerely hope we can find a route to effective cooperation and friendship.

Above all, I hope the EU can finally accept the choice of the British people to leave the EU. I think Lech Wałęsa summed up the situation well when he... (*The President cut off the speaker*)

Ελισάβετ Βόζεμπεργκ-Βρυονίδη (PPE). – Κυρία Πρόεδρε, πριν τέσσερις ημέρες, δώδεκα νεκροί μετανάστες προστέθηκαν στην τραγική λίστα θυμάτων μεταξύ Τουρκίας και ελληνικών νησιών. Είκοσι άνθρωποι διασώθηκαν με υπεράνθρωπες προσπάθειες του Ελληνικού Ναυτικού, ενώ δυστυχώς άλλοι τόσοι αγνοούνται. Οι ροές μεταναστών συνεχίζονται αμείωτα, παρά τις κακές καιρικές συνθήκες, και η Τουρκία εξακολουθεί, κατά τη συνήθη πρακτική της, να περιφρονεί το διεθνές δίκαιο. Το νέο σχέδιο ασύλου, που έχει προ μηνών εξαγγελθεί, δεν έχει ακόμη προωθηθεί.

Για ποιο μέλλον της Ευρώπης συζητούμε σήμερα; Δεν υπάρχει μέλλον χωρίς τη συμμετοχή όλων των χωρών στην αντιμετώπιση των κορυφαίων κοινών ευρωπαϊκών προβλημάτων. Η έμφαση στη φύλαξη των εξωτερικών συνόρων, που άλλωστε είναι μέλημα και κάθε κράτους μέλους, είναι μεν σημαντική αλλά δεν αρκεί. Απαιτείται δίκαιη και ίση κατανομή προσφύγων σε όλες, ανεξαιρέτως, τις χώρες της Ευρωπαϊκής Ένωσης με τα κριτήρια που έχουμε θέσει. Σήμερα δεν ακούσαμε τίποτα για αυτό. Πώς ονειρευόμαστε μια ενωμένη Ευρώπη, όταν κάθε κράτος μέλος ακολουθεί διαφορετική πολιτική ιδίων συμφερόντων; Όταν χώρες έχουν κλείσει τα σύνορα και αρνούνται να αναλάβουν ευθύνες; Ας είμαστε ρεαλιστές και ειλικρινείς, συνάδελφοι. Δεν μπορούμε να μιλάμε για το μέλλον μιας Ευρώπης χωρίς αλληλεγγύη στην πράξη. Το μεταναστευτικό απειλεί τη συνοχή και τα θεμέλια της Ευρωπαϊκής Ένωσης, και η διαχείρισή του κλονίζει την εμπιστοσύνη των πολιτών στις αξίες μας. Έχουμε καθήκον και υποχρέωση να αντιδράσουμε άμεσα και έμπρακτα αλλά κυρίως σοβαρά και υπεύθυνα.

Katarina Barley (S&D). – Frau Präsidentin! Die Europäische Union ist nach wie vor der Garant für Frieden, für Freiheit und für Wohlstand auf diesem Kontinent. Die Errungenschaften für die Bürgerinnen und Bürger sind zahllos. Aber die EU ist nicht perfekt. Sie ist *work in progress*, sie verändert sich ständig, und das muss sie auch. Sie muss demokratischer werden, sozialer, ökologischer, und sie muss vor allem die Distanz überwinden, die viele Menschen zu ihr empfinden.

Diese zweijährige Konferenz zur Zukunft Europas ist eine Chance. Entscheidend wird sein, dass die Bürgerinnen und Bürger nicht nur gehört werden, sondern dass sie auch Entscheidungen treffen können, die Gewicht haben. Wir sind uns bewusst, was das bedeutet, und wir verpflichten uns dazu: ein klares Mandat der Konferenz, Gesetzesinitiativen anzusetzen, auch Änderungen der Verträge. Deswegen ist es wichtig, dass erstens die Konferenz klare Ergebnisse liefert und dass zweitens die Bürgerinnen und Bürger umfassend einbezogen werden. Nur über umfassende Kommunikation währenddessen und danach und völlige Transparenz kann Vertrauen gestärkt werden, und das ist die Aufgabe des Parlaments.

Caroline Voaden (Renew). – Madam President, millions of people in my country don't really understand how the European Union works. They associate the EU with mythical rules on bent bananas and banning bagpipes, because of a right-wing media that has spread lies and disinformation for decades. But beware: we are not the only ones. Brexit is a cautionary tale, and it could have happened to many of you.

This conference on the future of Europe is an ambitious project, and it needs to be if it is going to secure the future of this unique union of nations. I believe that people want to feel involved, enfranchised, represented and consulted. We are the democratically elected representatives of the European people and for them to have a proper say, this House must have legislative initiative. The Council must become more transparent. People must understand the reason that progress is not being made. Migration is a classic example, because national governments are blocking Council.

Colleagues, cooperation between peoples, nations and cultures is the future. Going it alone is not the answer, and the citizen's voice is the most important one of all.

(Loud applause)

Anna Deparnay-Grünenberg (Verts/ALE). – Frau Präsidentin! Auch für uns Grüne steht die Konferenz zur Zukunft Europas für die Frage: Wie wollen wir künftig leben?

Wie wir die ökologischen, sozialen und wirtschaftlichen Belange ausbalancieren wollen, können wir ja nur herausfinden, wenn wir uns mit den Bürgerinnen und Bürgern Europas in einen gemeinsamen großen Austausch begeben. Partizipation steht nämlich im Zentrum einer nachhaltigen und regenerativen Kultur, die wir dringend brauchen, um den Klimawandel zu begrenzen und den Verlust der Artenvielfalt zu stoppen.

Wie soll denn zum Beispiel konkret vor Ort die Mobilitätswende aussehen, wie unsere Ernährung, wie schaffen wir es, eine Wirtschaft zu ändern, damit sie mehr dem Gemeinwohl dient? Solche Transformationsprozesse sind tiefgreifend, und sie können nur wirken, wenn sie auf eine breite demokratische Basis gestellt werden.

Deswegen freue ich mich ausdrücklich, dass das Parlament heute diese Einladung ausspricht. Macht mit! Wir wollen Europa gemeinsam gestalten, und wir müssen Europa fit für die heutige und für die künftigen Herausforderungen machen. Welches Europa brauchen wir eigentlich dazu? Wie wollen wir künftig leben?

Ann Widdecombe (NI). – Madam President, it was Madame García Pérez who reminded us at the beginning of this debate that the European Union started with six countries. The vision then was that it would be a loose alliance of sovereign nations in a trading agreement with some sort of political cooperation, with a totally noble ideal that that would somehow promote peace. And if that had remained the vision, and was still the vision, I venture to say that I don't believe that Britain would now be leaving.

But that did not happen. Co-operation morphed into domination. Sovereignty morphed into a superstate. And that is why Britain is going, and I believe that when we have made a big success of being a competitor on your doorstep, others will follow us. And therefore if you want a future – not for Europe, but for the European Union, which is a different thing – learn the lessons of what has happened in the UK.

(Sustained applause)

Angelika Niebler (PPE). – Frau Präsidentin, Frau Ratsvertreterin, Frau Kommissarin, liebe Kolleginnen, liebe Kollegen! Die Konferenz zur Zukunft Europas ist eine wichtige Konferenz, weil wir in der Tat in der Europäischen Union doch erheblichen Reformbedarf haben. Für mich ist ein Thema wichtig, nämlich unsere parlamentarische Demokratie zu stärken. Und wenn ich von parlamentarischer Demokratie spreche, dann meine ich den Spitzenkandidatenprozess. Wir haben ja heute viel über Bürgernähe gesprochen und darüber, wie wir die Bürger einbinden. Ich stelle fest, dass seit der letzten Europawahl viel Vertrauen bei den Bürgerinnen und Bürgern verloren gegangen ist. Wir haben über 200 Millionen Menschen, die an der Europawahl teilgenommen haben, und unsere Menschen hatten eine klare Erwartungshaltung, dass diejenigen, die bei dieser Europawahl als Spitzenkandidaten antreten, am Ende dann auch Verantwortung in der Kommission übernehmen. Wir wissen alle, dass es anders gekommen ist, und ich glaube, wenn wir unseren Bürgern auch wieder Vertrauen zurückgeben wollen, dann müssen wir wirklich an der Reform dieses Spitzenkandidatenprozesses arbeiten.

Für mich ist die Herzkammer der Demokratie hier das Europäische Parlament. Hier werden die Entscheidungen getroffen, hier müssen wir uns austauschen und diskutieren. Ich finde es gut, dass wir hier Bürgerinnen- und Bürgermeinungen breit in den Prozess einbinden, aber am Ende des Tages müssen wir im Europaparlament entscheiden. Das ist unsere Aufgabe, dafür sind wir auch gewählt worden. Ich würde mich sehr freuen, wenn im Zuge der Debatte auch in der Konferenz über die Zukunft Europas gerade die parlamentarische Demokratie mit Initiativrecht und dergleichen entsprechend gestärkt werden würde.

Klára Dobrev (S&D). – Madam President, let us be brave. Let us talk bravely. Let us start building the United States of Europe.

(Applause)

Europe has achieved a lot in the past decades, but it's not enough. The world is changing, so Europe must change too. The threats, the challenges, became global, so the European Union has to become a global player. I do understand that changing – especially changing ourselves – is always frightening, but I would say that fear is a bad advisor. So that's why I say: let us start to build a stronger, more federal and more democratic Europe. I call for an alliance of the brave. Let us build a United States of Europe, and I promise that the next generation are going to be proud of us in exactly the same way as we are proud of the founding fathers of the Union.

(Applause)

Cristian Ghinea (Renew). – Doamnă președintă, doamnă comisar, dorim să implicăm cetățenii în această Conferință, dar nu trebuie să fie o implicare formală. Există o metodă de a-i implica pe cetățeni într-un mod consistent – se numește juriu cetățenesc – și vă recomand, doamnă comisar, să folosiți această metodă.

În același timp, vreau să răspund provocării colegului de la Grupul Verzilor, Niklas Nienass. ... *(răspunzând afirmațiilor lui Niklas Nienass)*... Dragă Niklas, eu mi-aș dori ca Guy Verhofstadt să conducă această Conferință, mi-aș dori să avem un lider, și puternic, la această Conferință, și haideți să o facem împreună.

Ați văzut astăzi, la această dezbateră, discursul lui Guy a fost cel mai ascultat – poate cel mai interesant moment al acestei debateri. Până și colegii de la partidul Brexit, cărora o să le simțim lipsa foarte curând, au ascultat atent. Noi, toți, am ascultat cu atenție. Haideți să-l promovăm pe Guy Verhofstadt la conducerea acestei Conferințe, ca să avem o dezbateră reală la nivel european.

Tomas Tobé (PPE). – Fru talman! Kommissionären! De problem som Europa står inför löses inte genom att man går iväg ifrån samarbete, genom att man lämnar det europeiska samarbetet. Men det handlar inte heller om att skapa Europas Förenta stater. Det handlar i stället om att sätta fokus på de samhällsproblem som kräver mer svar.

Vi behöver bekämpa terrorismen och den gränsöverskridande brottsligheten bättre tillsammans i Europa. Vi behöver mer av en gemensam invandringspolitik. Vi behöver säkerställa att vi får en modern och effektiv klimatpolitik, tala mer gemensamt med en utrikespolitisk röst och stärka vårt försvarsarbete.

Om detta borde konferensen om Europas framtid handla. Inte om hur vi ser på valsysteem eller hur vi ska ändra befogenheter inom vårt samarbete, utan om ett politiskt ledarskap som löser de samhällsproblem som Europa står inför. Det är det som i förlängningen kommer att kunna säkerställa att vi får ett ökat stöd för det europeiska samarbetet. Låt nu inte ytterkanterna i politiken här i Europa vara de som sätter agendan, utan låt *voice of reason* vara det som styr detta. Jag är helt säker på att vi då kommer att få ett starkt stöd för det som Europa behöver.

Javier Moreno Sánchez (S&D). – Señora presidenta, señorías, la construcción europea ha sido y sigue siendo un proceso constituyente, abierto y transparente al servicio del destino común que compartimos todos los europeos. Diez años después de la entrada en vigor del Tratado de Lisboa, la celebración de la conferencia nos brinda una gran oportunidad para construir directamente con los ciudadanos el futuro de Europa a través de un diálogo participativo y representativo a nivel europeo, nacional, regional y local.

Son muchas las ideas que debatiremos, pero creo que el pleno respeto por parte del Consejo al proceso del *Spitzenkandidat*, el derecho de iniciativa legislativa de este Parlamento, del Parlamento Europeo, y la eliminación del derecho de veto de los Estados en el Consejo, con el paso a la mayoría cualificada, deberán estar en el corazón de las discusiones.

Espero que las instituciones europeas trabajen conjuntamente, y con los ciudadanos, para lograrlo con valentía política.

Maite Pagazaurtundúa (Renew). – Señora presidenta, señorías, somos más que unos Estados miembros. Somos más que personas aisladas. Está claro que estamos viviendo un tiempo convulso, que necesitamos mejores reglas y que los grandes problemas, los grandes desafíos, no son nacionales. Son transnacionales. Y nuestra oportunidad está aquí, en la Unión Europea.

Por eso tenemos que mirar lo peor y lo mejor desde que caminamos juntos. Pero no vamos a poder hacerlo si nos dejamos cegar por el veneno de los nacionalpopulismos. Claro que tenemos algo que aprender del *Brexit*: el populismo. Claro que tenemos que aprender del ultranacionalismo. Ayer se nos dijo aquí que se quiere un mecanismo europeo de autodeterminación. Para balcanizarnos, para cegarnos. Para poder destruir Europa.

Necesitamos ser fuertes, efectivamente. Necesitamos poner a la ciudadanía en el centro del sistema y necesitamos que la inteligencia artificial sea humana. Necesitamos, tal vez, ser tan fuertes que podamos llegar a una nueva convención. Necesitamos ciudadanía europea, no destruir Europa. No más fronteras.

Sven Simon (PPE). – Frau Präsidentin, meine sehr geehrten Damen und Herren! Diese schöne Debatte hat gezeigt, dass wir zehn Jahre nach dem Vertrag von Lissabon eine Reform der Verträge brauchen. Das oberste Ziel dieser Konferenz über die Zukunft Europas muss es sein, die Handlungsfähigkeit der Europäer zu stärken. Und dann haben wir in der Debatte auch ganz schön gesehen, dass wir noch nicht die richtige Art und Weise in diesem supranationalen Gebilde gefunden haben, wie wir den demokratischen Prozess organisieren.

Ich fand die Debatte, die wir heute geführt haben, sehr schön. Es ging um direktdemokratische Elemente, es ging um parlamentarische Demokratie. Eines sollten wir nicht tun: Wir sollten keine Spaltung herbeiführen zwischen den Bürgern da und dem Parlament hier. Das Parlament kann schlauer werden durch diese Konferenz, und wir sollten die Menschen beteiligen. Aber am Schluss haben wir in Europa nach 300 Jahren gelernt, dass parlamentarische repräsentative Demokratie das beste Mittel ist, Demokratie zu organisieren.

Unabhängig vom Ausgang der Konferenz halte ich es für wichtig, dass wir eine europäische Öffentlichkeit herstellen, und dieses Parlament muss die Plattform für diese Öffentlichkeit sein. Deshalb hat eine fraktionsübergreifende Gruppe heute einen Brief geschrieben – auch an Sie, Frau Präsidentin –, dass wir diese Plenardebatte reformieren. Wir sollten da vorne stehen als Rednerinnen und Redner, uns gegenseitig anschauen, hier unten sitzen, dass wir eine lebendige Debatte haben, die auch in den Medien übertragbar ist.

Brando Benifei (S&D). – Signora Presidente, onorevoli colleghi, la conferenza sul futuro dell'Europa apre un ambizioso processo di dialogo tra le istituzioni e i cittadini, che deve essere ben strutturato.

L'obiettivo è quello di far emergere una proposta di riforma dell'Unione sulla base di istanze e bisogni concreti. Bisogna porre l'accento sui contenuti e dare all'Europa la possibilità di occuparsene, partendo da temi che hanno un impatto tangibile sulla vita delle persone, come la tassazione, la lotta ai cambiamenti climatici, le politiche sociali ma anche la politica estera, argomento alla ribalta in questi giorni.

La nostra risoluzione mette nero su bianco l'impegno del Parlamento europeo affinché le conclusioni della conferenza siano rispettate, abbiano un seguito effettivo tramite specifiche misure legislative, tramite la modifica dei trattati, perché abbiamo bisogno oggi della federazione europea.

Il Parlamento deve esercitare un ruolo di guida, che credo sia la migliore garanzia contro il rischio che la conferenza si trasformi invece in una vetrina politico-elettorale di qualche leader, oppure sia usata per vidimare accordi intergovernativi al ribasso. Lo dobbiamo impedire e lo impediremo, per difendere davvero il futuro dell'Europa.

Gilles Boyer (Renew). – Madame la Présidente, lorsque comme moi et comme d'autres, nous sommes nombreux sur ces bancs à découvrir ce Parlement, le premier défi est de comprendre comment il fonctionne et si nous, nous avons parfois des difficultés, c'est dire à quel point la distance est grande pour que les citoyens européens s'approprient le fonctionnement de nos institutions.

Dans notre intérêt commun, l'un des premiers objectifs de cette conférence devrait être, à mon avis, d'apporter de la clarté à notre fonctionnement et cela commence par la clarté au moment le plus emblématique, c'est-à-dire au moment des élections européennes, qui est celui où les citoyens sont le plus sensibilisés à nos questions. En mai dernier, le mécanisme des *Spitzenkandidaten* (candidats têtes de liste) a été présenté comme un progrès démocratique, mais à lui seul – et les événements l'ont démontré – il ne suffit pas. En revanche, il trouvera toute sa pertinence si, dans le même temps, les citoyens européens peuvent se prononcer sur des listes transnationales et donnent ainsi clairement mandat à une personnalité européenne pour tenter de réunir une majorité autour de son nom.

Des listes européennes pour des élections européennes, c'est, je crois, un bel objectif.

Karlo Ressler (PPE). – Madam President, the European Union today is significantly different from what it was only a decade ago when the Lisbon Treaty entered into force. We are witnessing truly unprecedented technological and economic, but also demographic, changes. This clearly affects the way we live, the way we work and the way we communicate, but it also has an impact on the demand for a more active role for our citizens in our democracy.

This is why we have the responsibility to offer new and innovative ways for Europeans to be included more in the decisions that matter to them. Since young Europeans are often the ones who really lead the transformative trends in our societies, they can certainly offer a unique point of view.

I'm also glad that Vice-President Šuica will lead the Commission's work on the conference. This is because, for its success, it is really crucial to understand all the European diversities and to include the special perspectives of our citizens coming from all corners of Europe. Because of that, it is really important to include all those perspectives. This conference should certainly not be a box-ticking exercise. We have to be constructive, we have to be inclusive, and we have to adapt Europe for the new world and for the new generations.

(Applause)

Heléne Fritzon (S&D). – Fru talman! Kommissionär! Demokratiska värderingar, grundläggande rättigheter, klimatomställning, social rättvisa, jämlikhet och jämställdhet. Det är precis dessa viktiga frågor som framtidsdebatten om Europa ska handla om. En konferens om Europas framtid där man också måste vända sig till den unga generationen.

Jag blev glad i dag när jag kunde lyssna till en livlig debatt där flera av våra unga, också nyvalda, parlamentariker har deltagit i framtidsdebatten. Det är bra. Framtidsdebatten måste handla om det viktiga som stärker Europa. Vi måste visa engagemang och beslutsamhet. Vi måste hålla ihop ett Europa där vi lyfter fram hoppet, där vi ger den unga generationen hopp om Europas framtid.

László Trócsányi (PPE). – Tisztelt Elnök Asszony, Biztos Asszony! Az Európai Unió jövőjéről szóló konferencia esélyt ad arra, hogy az Európai Unió a megrendült bizalom visszaszerzése érdekében lépéseket tegyen, és így lendületet, új lendületet kapjon az európai építkezés. Fontos a részvételi demokrácia, de ügyeljünk arra, hogy egymásra ideológiai nézeteket ne erőltessük. Ezért óvakodjunk, nehogy ideológiai misszionáriusok rátelepedjenek a konferenciára. Számunkra egyszerre kell fontosnak lenni a tradíciónak és a megújulásnak. Nem feledhetjük az alapító atyák és a kereszténydemokrácia szellemiségének megőrzését, de az olyan új kérdésekre is választ kell keresnünk, mint az európai életmód tartalmi meghatározása. Európai identitás csak a tagállami identitások elismerése és tisztelete mellett épülhet ki. A konferencia csak akkor lehet sikeres, ha elfogadjuk, az Európai Unió egy olyan érték- és érdekközösség, amelynek pillérei alulról felfelé ívelnek és jelmondata: Egység a sokszínűségben. Már csak ezért sem fogadható el az Európai Egyesült Államoknak az eszméje.

Włodzimierz Cimoszewicz (S&D). – Madam President, the Conference on the Future of Europe comes at the best possible moment. In the last quarter of a century, the world has changed significantly. The economy, technology, communications and the share of power in global relations – all that is new.

Dangerous climate change and the demographic explosion in many regions create an urgent need to act. Europe must adapt itself to the new reality, and Europeans have to understand this situation. The Conference can and should diagnose the problems and prescribe the remedies. The basic condition of success is unprecedentedly broad participation of the citizens of the EU.

Conferences, *agoras*, consultations – all that is necessary, but it is not sufficient. We should make full use of communication online. I believe that the best way is to have pan-European consultative referenda with the participation of millions of people. It would strengthen democracy, make the people active citizens and give them satisfaction from having had a say.

Eva Maydell (PPE). – Madam President, the idea of reconnecting with our citizens is an essential tool, and not a recreational toy, and no one should be playing with it. We should ask our citizens what Europe they envisage, and we should do it sincerely, honestly, and truthfully. If we say that we need to hear from them, then we must be ready to listen and also to implement. It has been the biggest direct democracy exercise of Europe for the last decade, and we cannot initiate it with a prepared vision for the end and final results.

We all know that, in some capitals, treaty changes are being drafted. Projects like a Europe of various speeds or blockages like the one of North Macedonia may not be what the people want. They may not be happy to simply play the role of a rubber stamp. The preparation of those conferences should be focused not on assigning posts and inventing mechanisms to steer the public debates, but on how to hear what our citizens have to say and implement that. Perhaps those old habits are exactly the reason why we have to reconnect with our citizens today.

(Applause)

Raphaël Glucksmann (S&D). – Madame la Présidente, pendant trop longtemps dans les institutions européennes a dominé cette idée que l'on pouvait faire l'Europe sans les peuples, non pas contre les peuples – laissons cette rhétorique aux nationalistes –, pour les peuples, certes, mais sans eux.

Cette logique a atteint ses limites et nous sommes aujourd'hui au bord du gouffre. Alors oui, 100 fois oui, cette conférence pour refonder l'Union européenne est plus que nécessaire, mais il faut que les citoyens soient directement impliqués dans ces travaux, il faut que le débat sorte des institutions pour irriguer l'ensemble de nos sociétés. Comment renforcer notre démocratie européenne, comment construire une armée commune, comment établir une fiscalité commune? Ces questions et tant d'autres doivent être débattues et tranchées en impliquant le maximum de citoyens. Il ne s'agit pas simplement de consulter mais de co-construire.

Alors, chers collègues, cette conférence doit marquer un nouveau départ, pas simplement par ses conclusions, mais aussi dans sa méthode. Dans sa méthode même, elle doit ouvrir l'ère d'une citoyenneté européenne active et non plus passive, l'ère d'un véritable débat public transnational. Soit nous démocratisons, soit nous mourrons, alors démocratisons.

Daniel Buda (PPE). – Doamna președintă, viitorul Europei reprezintă, fără discuție, o preocupare a noastră, a fiecăruia dintre noi. Apreciez astfel că este binevenită soluția prin care se pun bazele Conferinței privind viitorul Europei. Cetățenii europeni trebuie să aibă posibilitatea să dezbată despre cum va arăta ziua de mâine în Europa, dar și să își poată exprima propria viziune despre acest subiect.

Societatea civilă și toate părțile interesate la nivel european, național, regional și local trebuie să contribuie la consolidarea viitorului european, respectând, în același timp, un set de valori inalienabile și indestructibile, modelând, de asemenea, Uniunea Europeană așa cum ne-o dorim. Fie că vorbim de mediu și climă, de sectorul economic și social, drepturile și libertățile cetățeanului european trebuie să fie garantate.

Tinerii sunt, în același timp, cei mai afectați de deciziile care se iau într-un fel sau altul. Tocmai de aceea trebuie să li se creeze spațiul necesar unde aceștia să își poată exprima opiniile, precum și să își prezinte soluțiile pentru viitorul lor și al Europei.

Miapetra Kumpula-Natri (S&D). – Madam President, I hope that the Parliament – the great majority here – is ready to prepare the future of Europe openly and not behind closed doors. We even invite citizens to participate and to be listened to, firstly in a citizens' agora and in an additional agora for young people, who will be the most affected by the future of Europe. There are very good signals of people's will to participate. In last summer's elections, participation, especially among young people, increased by over 12%.

So what kind of future? For example, in the Nordic countries we value security and foreign policy and see good opportunities to be a more serious global player. We have a strong commitment to climate action, we value social fairness and we hate ongoing tax frauds. We know that citizens also want to raise practical issues that make their lives easier and better, but that the lack of common regulation hinders this.

Dialogue gives people more of a voice to raise topics and issues between elections. This conference needs to look at the democratic aspect of the future of the EU, and the *Spitzenkandidat* system must be clear well before the next elections.

Geoffroy Didier (PPE). – Madame la Présidente, la conférence sur l'avenir de l'Europe sera-t-elle un «machin» de plus dont Emmanuel Macron a le secret pour préparer sa future campagne présidentielle ou une avancée concrète au service des peuples? L'avenir le dira.

Si vous voulez une avancée concrète, en voici une: nous avons été élus le 26 mai, notre mandat dure cinq ans, et pourtant le travail véritablement structurant ne commence que cette semaine, soit huit mois après notre élection. Que de temps perdu avec des installations successives d'institutions.

Pour améliorer l'avenir de l'Europe, je propose concrètement qu'à partir de la prochaine mandature, la Commission et le Conseil de l'Union soient installés dans les quatre semaines après l'élection des députés et qu'ainsi, à partir du 1^{er} juillet et non du 1^{er} janvier suivant, l'ensemble des institutions soient pleinement opérationnelles et puissent ainsi commencer leur travail au service des peuples.

Mesdames, Messieurs, nous n'avons pas été élus pour nous engluer dans la tuyauterie, nous l'avons été pour réparer l'image que les peuples peuvent avoir de ce très beau projet qu'est l'Europe.

Catch-the-eye procedure

Radan Kanev (PPE). – Madame la Présidente, j'ai décidé aujourd'hui de m'exprimer en français car je voudrais vous faire part de mon indignation contre l'idée d'une Europe à plusieurs vitesses, dont le président Macron est le promoteur principal. Les pays européens peuvent en effet suivre des trajectoires de développement à des vitesses différentes et cela peut même arranger les bureaucrates et les administrations. Cependant, notre débat ne concerne pas le bien-être des gouvernements. Il doit être centré sur les citoyens européens, il concerne les peuples de l'Europe et même les peuples des pays associés comme la Macédoine du Nord ou l'Albanie. Les peuples ne se meuvent pas à des vitesses différentes dans leur effort d'atteindre la liberté, la prospérité et l'état de droit. Promouvoir une Europe stratifiée est une erreur, et une telle politique produira des effets pervers.

Juan Fernando López Aguilar (S&D). – Señora presidenta, cuando en 2009, por fin, entró en vigor el Tratado de Lisboa, el entonces presidente del Consejo, señor Van Rompuy, anunció en esta Cámara que sería el Tratado con el que viviríamos el resto de nuestras vidas. Y, sin embargo, diez años después, al arrancar la Comisión von der Leyen pone en marcha una Conferencia sobre el Futuro de Europa, de la que puede venir una reforma de los Tratados

¿Cuál es la razón? Pues que, coincidiendo con el Tratado de Lisboa, la Unión Europea se sumerge en la peor crisis de su historia. Gran recesión, exasperación de las desigualdades, aplicación del artículo 7 a dos Estados miembros, un Estado miembro que abandona la Unión -el Brexit- y, sobre todo, en este Parlamento, incremento del número de escaños que representan nacionalismo excluyente y supremacista y populismo reaccionario.

Este Parlamento no tiene ningún déficit de legitimación democrática. Es la única institución directamente electiva. No tiene déficit de competencias, aunque puedan ser reforzadas. Es un parlamento legislativo, pero debe aprovechar la oportunidad de la Conferencia para reconectar con la ... *(La presidenta retira la palabra al orador)*

Valter Flego (Renew). – Poštovani predsjedavajući, mislim da je ova Konferencija o budućnosti Europe fantastična prilika da čujemo kakvu zaista Europu građani žele. Ono što je važno iz njihovih potreba, iz njihovih želja, mi ćemo doći do ideje koju trebamo napraviti, a to je kako promijeniti, kako reformirati ovu Europu. Postavlja se pitanje kako ćemo moći mjeriti uspjeh Konferencije. Mislim da na dva načina. Prvi definitivno jesu zaključci koje će trebati provesti, a drugo je broj građana koji će se uključiti u tu konferenciju. Zato je važno maksimalno motivirati građane, zato je važno nadoknaditi im troškove putovanja, ali i uključiti nevladine udruge, uključiti maksimalno sve zainteresirane strane i ne pitati građane jednom u pet godina kakvu Europu žele, već sada u sljedeće dvije godine maksimalno im dati glasa, a nakon toga djelovati.

Joachim Stanisław Brudziński (ECR). – Pani Przewodnicząca! Na początku chciałbym nadmienić, że od początku tej debaty, od godziny dziewiątej rano jestem tutaj na miejscu i przysłuchuję się wszystkim głosom, wszystkie głosy przyjmuję z szacunkiem, niektóre z rozbawieniem. Co najbardziej mnie rozbawiło? Ano Wasze stwierdzenie – zwracam się tutaj do lewej strony sali – jak ważne są dla Was głosy obywateli Unii Europejskiej. A jakie są fakty? Osoba, która najczęściej z nas wszystkich tutaj zebranych uzyskiwała głosów w bezpośrednich wyborach, była premier rządu polskiego pani Beata Szydło. Waszą decyzją, decyzją Waszych rodzin politycznych nie została przewodniczącą komisji. Inny z moich kolegów, profesor Krasnodębski, Waszą decyzją nie został jako przedstawiciel grupy ECR wiceprzewodniczącym Parlamentu Europejskiego. To mnie rozbawiło. Rozbawiło mnie również stwierdzenie, że przyszłość Europy zależy od tego, jakie będą decyzje w sprawie czołowych kandydatów na przewodniczącego Komisji albo czy przewodniczącym tej konferencji zostanie pan Verhofstadt. Padały tutaj nazwiska ojców założycieli. Warto przypomnieć słowa jednego z nich: „Przyszłość Europy – tak...”. *(Przewodnicząca odebrała mówcy głos)*

Marc Botenga (GUE/NGL). – Voorzitter, ik denk dat er hier mensen zijn... *(maakt zin niet af)*... Ik hoor van rechts dat er vertrouwen is in de Europese Unie. Ik hoor dat ook van enkele socialisten en enkele groenen. Ik wil toch herhalen dat één op de twee burgers niet gestemd heeft tijdens de laatste Europese verkiezingen. Er is een democratische crisis binnen de Europese Unie, en u bent die aan het onderschatten. Waar komt die crisis vandaan? Op het moment dat de Fransen tegen de Europese grondwet hebben gestemd, heeft u hen genegeerd. De Nederlanders deden hetzelfde: ze werden genegeerd. Toen de Ieren tegen het Verdrag van Lissabon stemden, moesten ze opnieuw gaan stemmen. Daarna kregen we de Grieken die stemden tegen het besparingsbeleid: platgewalst. En dan staat u verbaasd dat de Britten geen sociaal alternatief zien in deze Europese Unie. Die crisis gaat u niet oplossen met een conferentie van enkele establishmentpolitici, misschien zelfs geleid door Guy Verhofstadt. Zo gaat het niet lukken.

(End of catch-the-eye procedure)

Dubravka Šuica, Vice-President of the Commission. – Madam President, honourable Members, first of all, let me thank you for this very vivid and fruitful debate. I have listened carefully to today's points and taken note of your views. It is my role to listen to you.

The start date of the Conference is yet to be confirmed, but the listening process itself has already started. We are already reflecting and engaging with as many actors as possible. We will need the cooperation of the Commission representation offices and the European Parliament liaison offices in the Member States, who already do tremendous work to bring the European Union closer to its citizens.

We need them, now more than ever, to lead our efforts. Let us remember how this feeds into other areas of my work as Vice-President for Democracy and Demography. We want to hear from all people of all ages and, of course, from the young. I thank the younger Members of Parliament for today's debate.

I also have to thank Pascal Durand, Daniel Freund and Ruiz Devesa Domènec for mentioning NGOs. Of course, we haven't forgotten NGOs. They will be included, and that was our idea from the beginning. We also have to take care of the older generation, whom we wish to encourage in their active contribution to our society and economy.

Of course, this concerns not only NGOs or older people, but also minorities, entrepreneurs, students, regional and local authorities, mayors and everyone who can say something on the structure, scope and the content of the Conference.

These views will feed into my work on demography. We want to provide real and workable solutions for our citizens. Our democracy is in need of creative and innovative solutions. The results of this process – whatever they are – must be tangible, must be implemented and must be based on the feedback we receive from our citizens.

As I already said, this is no longer business as usual. We must be brave and embrace the innovative nature of this process. Not everything needs to be known in advance, but we are providing the solid structure necessary for full citizen participation, both online and in person. I want to ensure that every voice is heard and listened to, and that we follow up on it accordingly. It is vital that this process remains open and transparent. I do not want to pre-empt what the citizens have to say, on the contrary, I want to be surprised by them.

I'm sure that, together, we can also surprise the citizens. But we, the European Parliament, the European Commission and the European Council, we can do this only by working closely together as real partners. I want to thank you once again for this fruitful debate.

Nikolina Brnjac, *President-in-Office of the Council*. – Madam President, to conclude, I wish to thank you for the very useful debate we had today. I have listened carefully to your views on this important subject and taken note of Parliament's position on the Conference on the Future of Europe.

This process, which requires long-term vision, should focus on the topics and policies that will continue to be at the forefront of our citizens' preoccupations in the years to come, especially of the youth. Let me assure you that our part of the Presidency will continue working towards a definition of the Council position on the Conference on the basis of which to engage with this House and the Commission.

As stated by President Sassoli and Vice-President Šuica, cooperation among other institutions will be key to making the most of this idea. I am confident that I can count on your cooperation to find together the right formula so that this initiative can be launched on a shared basis to deliver results for our citizens. Thank you very much once again for your attention.

President. – I have received three motions for resolutions tabled in accordance with Rule 132(2) of the Rules of Procedure.

The debate is closed.

The vote will take place shortly.

Written statements (Rule 171)

Εμμανουήλ Φράγκος (ECR), γραπτώς. – Η Διάσκεψη για το μέλλον της Ευρώπης πρέπει να λάβει υπόψη της την επιτακτική ανάγκη για ενίσχυση της δημοκρατικής νομιμοποίησης και αποκατάσταση της εμπιστοσύνης των πολιτών στη διοίκηση. Επαναλαμβάνουμε ότι η Ευρώπη του μέλλοντος πρέπει να φροντίσουμε να παραμείνει μια Χριστιανική Ευρώπη. Πρέπει να παύσουμε να εδελουφλούμε στα κρίσιμα ζητήματα. Η μαζική λαθρομετανάστευση, που αλλοιώνει την ευρωπαϊκή ομοιογένεια και τον ευρωπαϊκό τρόπο ζωής, πρέπει να αντιμετωπιστεί άμεσα και αποτελεσματικά, εάν αυτή είναι η Ευρώπη που θέλουμε: μια Ευρώπη με ισχυρή γεωπολιτική θέση και ενεργό ρόλο στη διεθνή σκακιέρα· μια Ευρώπη που θα ηγείται στο παγκόσμιο εμπόριο και στην οικονομική ανάπτυξη και σταθερότητα· μια Ευρώπη των πολιτών, που θα είναι σε θέση να προστατεύσει τα κυριαρχικά της δικαιώματα από ένκομες ενέργειες τρίτων κρατών· μια Ευρώπη με περισσότερη δημοκρατία και με μεγαλύτερη αυτονομία των μελών της, και όχι μια συγκεντρωτική και ολιγαρχική Ένωση. Εμείς αυτήν την Ευρώπη θέλουμε και γι' αυτήν την Ευρώπη θα αγωνιστούμε.

Carlos Zorrinho (S&D), por escrito. – É muito importante que o Parlamento Europeu se pronuncie hoje, de forma determinada e oportuna, e através de uma resolução consensualizada de forma abrangente, sobre os objetivos e as metodologias a adotar na Conferência sobre o Futuro da Europa.

Esta Conferência, embora seja promovida pelo Parlamento Europeu, pela Comissão e pelo Conselho, e envolva o Comité das Regiões e o Comité Económico e Social, tem que mobilizar os Governos e os Parlamentos nacionais e regionais, as organizações da sociedade civil de toda a União Europeia e, em particular, os cidadãos, reforçando o seu sentido de pertença ao projeto europeu e dando-lhes voz, não apenas para avaliar as decisões dos órgãos democráticos representativos mas, também, para propor e exigir prioridades, medidas e soluções concretas.

Depois de múltiplos debates e reflexões que não geraram o impulso reformador necessário na União Europeia, a Conferência que se propõe lançar em 9 de maio e realizar até 2022 tem que ser acompanhada pela concretização de políticas fortes de convergência e coesão, traduzidas no Pacto Ecológico Europeu, no Programa Plurianual de Financiamento e numa arquitetura da zona euro que reforce os recursos próprios da União e o seu posicionamento num mundo cada vez mais competitivo.

(The sitting was suspended at 11.58)

PRESIDENZA DELL'ON. DAVID MARIA SASSOLI

Presidente

7. Wznowienie posiedzenia

(La seduta è ripresa alle 12.06)

8. Uroczyste posiedzenie – Wystąpienie Jego Królewskiej Mości Abdullaha II, króla Jordañskiego Królestwa Haszymidzkiego

Presidente. – Care colleghe e cari colleghi, abbiamo l'onore di avere con noi oggi in Aula Sua Maestà il Re Abdullah II di Giordania, che torna al Parlamento europeo dopo esserne già stato ospite alcuni anni fa. È un grande onore per noi.

Abdullah II, *King of the Hashemite Kingdom of Jordan.* — *Bismillah ar-Rahman ar-Rahim.* Mr President, honourable Members, Your Excellencies, my friends, thank you all. It is an honour to speak before the European Parliament once again. As I look around this historic Chamber, I see it holds many hundreds of people. But in truth, there are with us today millions more, from different countries, histories, and perspectives. So we who are gathered here have two things in common. First is our responsibility to these millions – the people who have entrusted us with their hopes and fears. And second, we are all very fortunate, for a life spent in the service of others is a life fully lived – but only if we live up to the expectations of the millions of people with us in this hall today.

If we falter, the most vulnerable pay the highest price – the young men and women who look to their future and see nothing; bewildered refugee mothers, clutching their children, with no place to call home; or anxious fathers who cannot find jobs to provide for their loved ones. And the many who feel side-lined, their identity under threat.

The defining feature of the past decade has been people finding their voices. millions across the world have poured onto the streets, marched, occupied, sat down, sat in, tweeted, podcast, hashtagged what they want, loud and clear. And they all want the same thing: a fair chance, a fighting chance.

Dear friends, people around the world have voiced their desired destination but are looking to us to guide them along the path; looking to us to foresee and prepare for the obstacles ahead. This calls for several ‘what if?’ questions. And these questions are not merely a whimsical or a theoretical exercise – especially in my region, where worst-case scenarios don’t lie comfortably within the realm of the hypothetical but often wander too closely to the borders of our reality. Furthermore, what happens in the Middle East has a way of making itself felt everywhere around the world. So let me start with our region’s deepest wound.

What if the world gives up on the two-state solution of the Palestinian-Israeli conflict? Seventy-plus years of conflict have played havoc with hopes for justice. Today, one-staters are actively seeking to impose an unthinkable solution on the region and the world: one state, propped up by structural inequalities, with Palestinians as second-class subjects; one state turning its back on its neighbourhood, perpetuating divisions among peoples and faiths worldwide.

Five years ago, I stood in this Chamber and spoke of the dangers of failing to move forward with peace, and today, I must say frankly that the dangers have grown: violence continues; settlement-building continues; disregard for international law continues. I’ve said it countless times and in countless ways, but I will say it again and again: a more peaceful world is not possible without a stable Middle East. And a stable Middle East is not possible without peace between Palestinians and the Israelis.

(Applause)

What if Jerusalem, a city that is close to my heart personally and of great historical significance to my family, remains disputed? Can we afford to rob Christians and Muslims alike of the spirituality, peace and coexistence that this city symbolises, and instead allow it to descend into political conflict? Now fast forward to the most recent standoff between the United States and Iran. What if, next time, neither side steps away from the brink, dragging us all towards untold chaos? An all-out war jeopardises the stability of the entire region. What’s more, it risks massive disruptions of the entire global economy, including energy markets, but threatens a resurgence of terrorism across the world.

And I ask you another ‘what if?’: what if Iraq fails to realise the potential and aspirations of its people and slips back into an erratic, 17-year cycle of recovery and relapse – or worse yet, conflict? Iraq is home to 12 per cent of the world’s proven oil reserves. But more importantly, it is home to over 40 million people, who have suffered through four decades of war, crippling sanctions, occupation, sectarian conflict, and the terror of ISIS. Today their future rests on a fragile peace. And I, for one, will not abandon our brothers and sisters there.

Now what if Syria remains hostage to global rivalries and spirals back into civil conflict? What if we see a re-emergence of ISIS and Syria becomes a staging-ground for attacks against the rest of the world? Syria may be out of the headlines, with its suffering out of sight and out of mind, but the crisis is far from over. Over the past nine months, more than half a million people have been displaced, many of them already refugees. Do any of us in this hall want to see another Syrian refugee crisis unfold, with all its horror and heartbreak? Or another innocent child washed up upon your shores? I know I speak for everyone here when I say: absolutely not.

And let me ask you: what if Libya collapses into an all-out war, and ultimately, a failed state? What if Libya is the new Syria, just much closer to the continent you all call home? And let me say again: what if Arab governments fail to create the more than 60 million jobs our youth will need in the coming decade? And if we fail, wouldn’t we in fact be creating a perfect setting for extremist groups? We make their job of recruitment easier if we leave behind a trail of vulnerability and hopelessness. Can we afford to let the region’s young people live without hope?

My friends, let this reflection upon ‘what if?’ scenarios be a productive exercise, one that can pre-empt countless tragedies and safeguard our people along their journey. My faith in God reinforces my optimism and my belief in the strength and resilience of humanity. There is always a better and much more united version of us around every corner. The Holy Qur’an teaches us that ‘Those who endure in patience and put their trust in their Lord’ will enjoy the greatest rewards.

Patience is hard in a world that never seems to slow down, where people make split-second decisions and expect instantaneous results. Leadership, however, demands the very opposite: reflection, wisdom and the long view. More than ever, we need patient politics. Because we all have a responsibility to safeguard our people’s long-term interests and welfare; to react to rapidly unfolding events with measured responses, not knee-jerk reactions. Because politics is not a game where the fastest win. Sometimes, the faster we go, the farther away we end up from the finish line.

My father, the late King Hussein, taught me that peace-making is always the harder – but the higher – path. And a tough road is best walked with our friends: friends like you and the people of Europe, so that together we can reach the future that both our peoples aspire to and that they and our whole world deserve.

(The House accorded the speaker a standing ovation)

Presidente. – Ringraziamo il Re di Giordania, interlocutore privilegiato dell’Unione europea e grande amico del Parlamento europeo.

Abbiamo ascoltato le Sue parole, la Sua passione per raggiungere la pace tramite il confronto e il dialogo. Abbiamo tanto lavoro da fare insieme e credo che l’inizio di questo anno dimostri ancora di più la necessità del lavoro che dovremo fare insieme.

(La seduta è sospesa alle 12.20)

VORSITZ: RAINER WIELAND

Vizepräsident

9. Wznowienie posiedzenia

(Die Sitzung wird um 12.30 Uhr wieder aufgenommen.)

10. Głosowanie

Der Präsident. – Als nächster Punkt der Tagesordnung folgt die Abstimmung.

(Abstimmungsergebnisse und sonstige Einzelheiten der Abstimmung: siehe Protokoll.)

10.1. Skład liczbowy komisji (B9-0039/2020) (głosowanie)

10.2. Protokół do Umowy między UE a Islandią i Norwegią dotyczącej kryteriów i mechanizmów określania państwa właściwego dla rozpatrywania wniosku o azyl złożonego w państwie członkowskim lub w Islandii lub Norwegii dotyczący dostępu do Eurodac na potrzeby ochrony porządku publicznego (A9-0053/2019 - Jadwiga Wiśniewska) (głosowanie)

— *Nach der Abstimmung:*

Marcel Kolaja (Verts/ALE). – Mr President, my point is a bit moot, but I just wanted to ask if you could wait a bit before everybody gets seated and you get their attention, because there was a lot of noise here and what you said couldn't be heard.

10.3. Umowa UE–Chiny w sprawie niektórych aspektów przewozów lotniczych (A9-0041/2019 - Tomasz Piotr Poręba) (głosowanie)

10.4. Wspólny system podatku od wartości dodanej w zakresie procedury szczególnej dla małych przedsiębiorstw (A9-0055/2019 - Inese Vaidere) (głosowanie)

10.5. Europejski Zielony Ład (RC-B9-0040/2020, B9-0040/2020, B9-0041/2020, B9-0042/2020, B9-0043/2020, B9-0044/2020, B9-0045/2020, B9-0046/2020) (głosowanie)

10.6. Wdrażanie i monitorowanie przepisów o prawach obywateli w umowie o wystąpieniu Zjednoczonego Królestwa (B9-0031/2020) (głosowanie)

10.7. Roczne sprawozdanie za rok 2018 dotyczące praw człowieka i demokracji na świecie oraz polityki UE w tym zakresie (A9-0051/2019 - Isabel Wiseler-Lima) (głosowanie)

10.8. Sprawozdanie roczne z realizacji wspólnej polityki zagranicznej i bezpieczeństwa (A9-0054/2019 - David McAllister) (głosowanie)

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

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

— *Vor der Abstimmung über Änderungsantrag 76:*

Daniel Freund (Verts/ALE). – Herr Präsident, ich würde hier gerne einen mündlichen Änderungsantrag einbringen, um Straßburg durch Brüssel zu ersetzen. Das ist der Sitz der Mehrheit der EU-Organe, und ich glaube, es ist wichtig, den Bürgern ein starkes Signal zu senden, dass sie ernst genommen werden und dass am Ende der Bürgerforen ein Treffen in Brüssel stattfindet und nicht in Straßburg.

Der Präsident. – Herr Kollege Freund, ich hätte Sie jetzt unterbrochen. Begründungen sind nicht zulässig.

(Das Parlament beschließt, den mündlichen Änderungsantrag nicht zur Abstimmung zu stellen.)

Damit ist die Abstimmungsstunde geschlossen.

ELNÖKÖL: JÁRÓKA LÍVIA

alelnök

11. Wyjaśnienia dotyczące sposobu głosowania

11.1. Europejski Zielony Ład (RC-B9-0040/2020, B9-0040/2020, B9-0041/2020, B9-0042/2020, B9-0043/2020, B9-0044/2020, B9-0045/2020, B9-0046/2020)

A szavazáshoz fűzött szóbeli indokolások

Billy Kelleher (Renew). – A Uachtaráin, leis an gComhaontú Glas don Eoraip, beidh gach Ballstát ábalta aistriú chuig sochaí íseal-charbóin. Ach níl ann ach túsphointe. Vótáil mé i bhfabhar an Chomhaontaithe. Leis an bplean docht seo, beimid ábalta stádas ísealcharbóin a bhaint amach. Chun é sin a dhéanamh, caithfidimid trí rud a dhéanamh:

Uimhir a haon: Tacú le pobail aistriú cóir a dhéanamh chuig sochaí ísealcharbóin.

Uimhir a dó: Cinntiú go bhfuil na rialtais sásta na cinntí deacra a dhéanamh anois.

Uimhir a trí: Cinntiú go n-oibríonn gnó príobháideach leis na rialtais.

Níl a lán ama fágtha chun an pláinéad a shábháil. Ba cheart eagla an domhain a bheith ar gach duine sa seomra seo mar gheall ar na tinte uafásacha san Astráil. I mo thír féin, tá stoirmeacha móra ann faoi láthair.

Mar fhocal scoir, caithfidimid misneach a thabhairt do dhaoine – misneach gur féidir linn teacht slán as seo. Gan dóchas, géilleann daoine. Molaim go gach duine anseo, óráid a thug Jacinda Ardern, Príomh-Aire na Nua-Shéalainne, roimh an Nollaig. Thug an óráid seo misneach dom gur féidir linn ár bpláinéad, agus ár dtodhchaí, a shábháil.

Antony Hook (Renew). – Madam President, today we have voted on perhaps the most important action the European Union will ever take. The European Green Deal marks a necessary effort to stop climate change and protect biodiversity for good. The framework for action must be agreed at a European and international level. Pollution never has, and never will, stop at national borders. It takes every individual, every local community, to act.

In my home town of Faversham, air pollution is three times in breach of legal limits, and the government in which our own MP is a minister permits it to continue. Local councillors and the community are pushing our own environmental projects: we have become a plastic-free town. If you give communities power, they will fix their problems. Europe's new Green Deal promises prevention of environmental damage that harms us now and endangers our children's future. We cannot go on destroying nature. We can use new technology to make a greener, cleaner future.

Jackie Jones (S&D). – Madam President, the climate and environmental emergency is one of the most important challenges facing humanity, and all states and players worldwide must do their utmost to fight it. Europe urgently needs a new sustainable economic model that has to fit for the 2020s, meaning that it must combine social and environmental progress, reduce inequalities and improve the well-being of all, leaving no person and no place behind.

The European Green Deal spans across the EU from Romania to Ireland. But guess what? The UK's geographical area is right there: a big land mass that requires consideration if we are to really tackle the climate crisis. Wales was the first country in the world to declare a climate emergency, and we want to work with our neighbours. We have to, and we want to. The European Green deal must put all of Europe on the path to long-term sustainable growth, prosperity and well-being. The EU as a global leader in climate action, and the European Green Deal must ensure that environmental, economic and social policies are developed to secure just transition and to pave the way for positive and sustainable social, industrial and economic change. Wales will do its part, whether it's inside the EU or outside.

Manuel Bompard (GUE/NGL). – Madame la Présidente, mes chers collègues, notre Parlement a proclamé il y a peu l'état d'urgence écologique et environnementale. Il est donc maintenant nécessaire d'agir à la hauteur de l'urgence que nous avons décrétée ensemble.

Or, s'il affiche des intentions intéressantes, le texte que vous nous avez proposé au vote ne prend pas les mesures à la hauteur de l'urgence de la situation. Prenons quelques exemples: l'objectif de réduction de 55 % des émissions de gaz à effet de serre était déjà celui de la mandature précédente. Il est insuffisant, il faut aller au moins à 65 % de réduction des émissions de gaz à effet de serre d'ici à 2030 si on veut contenir le réchauffement climatique.

Le texte refuse d'engager la réforme profonde et nécessaire de la politique agricole commune, alors que le texte présenté aujourd'hui par la Commission ne permet pas d'engager la transition écologique de l'agriculture. Le texte refuse de dénoncer la politique commerciale de l'Union et les accords de libre-échange. Bref, sur tous ces points, ce texte est insuffisant: je ne peux donc malheureusement pas le soutenir.

Jessica Stegrud (ECR). – Fru Talman! "We do not have all the answers yet. Today is a start of a journey, but this is Europe's man on the moon moment." Stora ord från kommissionens ordförande Ursula von der Leyen. Men att lova en månlandning, i detta fall en koldioxidneutral kontinent, utan att berätta hur det ska gå till, vilka konsekvenserna blir eller ens vilka effekter som uppstår, det är inte seriöst – det är populism.

Att investera i en sak innebär nämligen att man avstår från att investera i en annan. Att lägga tusentals miljarder på odefinierade klimatåtgärder, det är att avstå från investeringar i till exempel säkerhet, sjukvård eller i andra tekniska utvecklingsområden – grunden för framtida tillväxt och välstånd. Att ni dessutom vill lägga ner koldioxidfri kärnkraft visar att ni i er strävan mot månen inte ens kan plocka av er era ideologiska skyglappar.

Nej, vad EU behöver är politiker som tar ansvar, sätter realistiska mål och är tydliga med konsekvenserna. Därför röstar jag i dag nej till parlamentets förslag.

Michaela Šojdřová (PPE). – Paní předsedající, pozice Evropského parlamentu k Zelené dohodě je velmi důležitá. Já jsem očekávala, že bude ambiciózní a zároveň racionální. Bohužel je více ambiciózní než racionální, proto jsem se nakonec ve výsledném hlasování musela zdržet. Já jsem se soustředila na dvě témata, a to je zemědělství. Je důležité, že pro udržitelné zemědělství je uznáno, že může být dosaženo pouze tím, že zajistíme zemědělce pro plnění cílů Zelené dohody. Oceňuji, že ta rétorika neobviňuje zemědělce za stav našeho životního prostředí, ale naopak poskytuje nové příležitosti, jak zemědělci mohou bojovat proti klimatickým změnám. V této oblasti tedy návrh je přijatelný. Nepřijatelné pro mě nakonec bylo hlasování o pozměňovacím návrhu, který se týká jaderné energie. Naštěstí i tato zpráva uznává subsidiaritu a možnost tedy energetického mixu pro členské země. Ale nebyl přijat pozměňovací návrh, který uznává jadernou energii jako důležitou pro boj proti změnám klimatu, a proto jsem se nakonec zdržela.

Irena Joveva (Renew). – Gospa predsednica, glasovala sem za resolucijo o evropskem zelenem dogovoru, ker natančno povzema stališče Evropskega parlamenta. Gre za uravnotežen predlog, da bi dosegli podnebno nevtralnost, zaščitili okolje in dosegli zdravo, kakovostno življenje znotraj zmoglosti planeta.

Predlog je torej uravnotežen med zelenimi cilji soočanja s podnebnimi spremembami, pravičnim prehodom na zeleno energijo in ekonomskimi priložnostmi. Ključno je zagotoviti sodelovanje med vsemi deležniki, torej državljanji, regijami, lokalnimi skupnostmi, strokovno javnostjo, civilno družbo in gospodarstvom.

Resolucija povezuje doseganje podnebno nevtralne družbe s prenovitvijo industrijske in SME strategije. Poudarja vodilno vlogo Evropske unije in poziva k aktivni spodbudi preostalega sveta. Na zeleni dogovor moramo gledati kot na nujni ukrep in hkrati tudi ekonomsko priložnost ter s tem navdihniti tudi druge države onesnaževalke, da bomo preprečili ali vsaj ublažili prihodnje uničujoče posledice podnebnih sprememb.

Stanislav Polčák (PPE). – Paní předsedající, já jsem podpořil tento návrh usnesení. Cíl je jasný, směr je nepochybně správný. Pro naši Unii to představuje velmi významnou výzvu, stejně jako pro mnohé země, stejně tak pro Českou republiku. Máme stále mnohé regiony, které nejsou připraveny na tuto změnu, na cíle, které jsme představili. Já jsem přesvědčen o tom, že to představuje rovněž výzvu, jak modernizovat evropskou ekonomiku a ekonomiku národních států. To, co ovšem mě na tom trápí, je, že některá hlasování, která prošla, podle mého názoru jsou škodlivá ve výsledku. Že nebyla podpořena jaderná energetika, to mě mrzí. Musím říci, že mě také překvapilo, že Parlament nechce vyčíslit dopady jednotlivých plánovaných opatření. Toto všechno jsou zklamání, která za normálních okolností bych

projevil minimálně zdržením se či hlasováním proti. Já jsem ovšem tento negativní názor nechtěl vyslat, a tudíž jsem podpořil tento návrh. Musíme pamatovat na škody, které jsme způsobili na planetě a začít je odstraňovat, proto jsem tento návrh podpořil.

Veronika Vrecionová (ECR). – Paní předsedající, já jsem dnes nepodpořila rezoluci k Zelené dohodě pro Evropu, i když řadu návrhů, které Komise předložila, podporuji, například zvyšování biodiverzity, ochranu půdy, lesů atd. Ale v některých oblastech jdou návrhy do extrémních pozic, které nepovedou ke stanovenému cíli, ale naopak budou znamenat extrémní zátěž pro občany našich zemí. Zajímalo by mě, zda ti, kteří to dnes podpořili, se ptali svých voličů, zdali budou souhlasit s několikanásobným zdražením elektrické energie či tepla, které s sebou tyto návrhy bohužel přinesou. Zdali jste se ptali také svých voličů, zda souhlasí s tím, že řada stávajících pracovních míst zanikne. Myslím, že všechny tyto negativní důsledky před svými voliči zatajujete. A když se podívám na protesty a stávky v některých členských zemích kvůli nepatrnému zdražení benzínu, tak by mě zajímalo, jak chcete před veřejností hájit návrhy, které jste dnes podpořili.

Alexandra Louise Rosenfield Phillips (Verts/ALE). – Madam President, the EU needs to tackle the climate crisis right now. The European Green Deal is a major policy tool to help us finally address inequalities across Europe through the transition to a zero-carbon continent. This is why I'm so proud of the important role that we Greens have played. The European Parliament is finally addressing the need to respect our planetary boundaries, to phase out fossil fuel subsidies, and to ensure that women are at the heart of any green deal. But the work on the green deal is far from over. As Greens, we will keep pushing the Commission to implement a genuine green deal that integrates social protections, raises environmental ambitions and, crucially, engages people on this journey through citizens' assemblies.

Mick Wallace (GUE/NGL). – Madam President, there are many positive points in the European Green Deal resolution. Paragraph 20, for example, seeks to ensure the cost of building renovations will not be borne by the most vulnerable. There are concrete measures on the circular economy and important references to microplastics and support for upskilling workers.

However, I couldn't support the resolution as a whole. Too many red lines are crossed, it completely undermines the fight for real emergency level action on both the climate and inequalities, it completely ignores Mercosur, it praises gas as a transition fuel – which is madness, it refuses to call for a new common agricultural policy (CAP) proposal and this is the CAP from the Green Deal. The CAP is doing serious damage and by spending EUR 60 billion of taxpayers' money on subsidies that mostly fund factory farms, while family farms are being destroyed and high nature value farms are struggling to survive. It also rolls back on Parliament's current unconditional position on 55% emission reduction by 2030, qualifying this with an impact assessment.

Clare Daly (GUE/NGL). – Madam President, while we in the European Union are better than a lot of the world's economies in terms of dealing with climate issues, it doesn't mean that we are good enough. I voted against the resolution because it falls pathetically short of what is actually necessary to deal with the scale of the crisis before us. For me, it represents the fact – and some of the votes on the amendments show – that we talk the talk but aren't prepared to tackle the vested interests who are responsible for the greater scale of emissions. The rejection of the amendment which pinpointed the top 100 companies responsible for 71% of the global emissions; the fact that we celebrate a so-called Just Transition Fund, but spend multiples of that amount on a common agricultural policy (CAP) programme which subsidises bad environmental practice; the fact that we facilitate natural gas, the emissions from which are now outweighing the benefits of reduction in coal, and we spend billions on the military and arms industry, which is developing a very serious impact on our carbon footprint. The very fact that we're here is a pathetic insult to the type of action that we need to deal with the scale of the emergency.

Andreas Glück (Renew). – Frau Präsidentin! Wir sind nicht mit allem einverstanden, was heute bei der Entschließung zum Grünen Deal verabschiedet und beschlossen wurde. Trotzdem wollten wir diese Entschließung nicht ablehnen, denn insbesondere wir als direkt gewählte Vertreter der Europäischen Union müssen uns insbesondere bei Fragen des Klima- und Umweltschutzes einbringen.

Insbesondere jedoch die kritische Haltung in der Entschließung zum europäischen Zertifikatehandel, wenn es darum geht, diesen auf den Fahrzeugbereich, auf den Verkehr und auf Gebäude auszuweiten, können wir nicht nachvollziehen. In allen Bereichen, die in dem CO₂-Zertifikatehandel organisiert sind, werden wir die Zwischenziele erreichen, in allen Bereichen, die nicht im CO₂-Zertifikatehandel organisiert sind, werden wir die Ziele nicht erreichen. Wir haben hier also ein sehr, sehr wertvolles Werkzeug, und unserer Meinung nach sollte der CO₂-Zertifikatehandel eben auf die Bereiche sowohl der Gebäudewärme als auch des Verkehrs ausgeweitet werden.

Milan Brglez (S&D). – Gospa predsedujoča, glasoval sem za evropski zeleni dogovor, ker je nujen, čeprav v njem manjka jasno razvidna socialna dimenzija in ostaja znotraj netrajnostnega in nespremenjenega načina ekonomskega razmišljanja.

Opozarjam, da bo brez ustrezne solidarne in socialne dimenzije evropskega zelenega dogovora tako EU, torej Evropska unija, in socialna demokracija izgubila podporo ljudi. Ker če bo ta koristil le nekaterim ter stroške razdelil med vse ljudi, je jasno, da bo prišlo do upora ljudi, ki jih je zelo težko prepričati. Vendar je še čas, da popravimo to s posebno resolucijo o socialni dimenziji evropskega zelenega dogovora.

Joëlle Mélin (ID). – Madame la Présidente, nous tenons à rappeler ici à quel point nous sommes résolument engagés pour que nos nations soient à l'avant-garde du combat pour l'environnement. Cela est vital pour l'homme et la biodiversité.

En revanche, il ne nous est pas possible d'admettre que le tout-écologie présente un caractère aussi contraignant sur les politiques souveraines nationales et que le présent texte confie à l'Union européenne des pouvoirs exorbitants et de nature totalitaire.

Nous avons constaté à quel point un certain jusqu'au-boutisme bureaucratique et idéologique a sous-tendu la totalité du texte. Nous avons donc déposé une résolution alternative pour donner à ce projet du pacte vert européen une résonance beaucoup plus responsable, cohérente et réaliste, tout particulièrement au regard des centaines de milliards d'euros mobilisés.

Force est de constater que de nombreux groupes dans cette assemblée continuent de soutenir un consensus mou qui, à terme, selon nous, sera très préjudiciable pour les Européens sur le plan social et économique. C'est donc en toute conscience et responsabilité au regard de la haute idée que nous avons de l'écologie que nous nous sommes abstenus.

Daniel Hannan (ECR). – Madam President, 50 years ago lions, tigers and wolves were all endangered. Today lions remain under pressure, tigers have flat-lined and wolves have rebounded. Why? Because broadly speaking lions live in poor countries, tigers live in middle-income countries, and wolves live in rich countries.

The best thing that can happen to the environment is market capitalism. It was Karl Marx who taught that nature was a resource to be exploited, a doctrine that found brutal realisation in the smokestack industries of the Eastern bloc. Soviet Communism turned Lake Baikal into a sewer and the Aral Sea into a desert, and poured so much oil into the Volga that ferry passengers had to be told not to throw their cigarettes overboard.

Reforestation, increase in biodiversity, reintroduction of endangered species, these things are overwhelmingly happening in countries that have opened their markets to the world and have become wealthy enough to be able to afford them. The clue is in the name. If you want conservation, back the Conservatives.

(Laughter)

Alexandr Vondra (ECR). – Paní předsedající, Zelená dohoda pro Evropu přináší skvělé věci, jak čistit ovzduší, jak šetřit zdroje, jak revitalizovat lesy, jak zadržovat vodu v krajině. Ale zároveň výsledný text je příliš radikální, klade nerealistické cíle a já jsem ho podpořit nemohl, protože ten redukční cíl na rok 2030 je absolutně nerealistický a zdroje, které Evropská komise zde včera slibovala ve výši 1 miliardy EUR ročně na celou EU z rozpočtu, je doslova směšná částka jako „plivnutí do Kanady“. A dva pozměňovací návrhy, které jsme předkládali na podporu jaderné energie, která by tomuto přechodu mohla pomoci, např. lidem, kteří jsou odkázáni na dálkové topení, tak tyto návrhy neprošly, a já jsem proto hlasoval proti této rezoluci.

Ангел Джамбазки (ECR). – Г-жо Председател, колеги, убедено гласувах против т. нар. Европейска зелена сделка. Не само защото това е странният документ на някакъв нов култ, който върви уверено към сериозно психологично заболяване, а заради тежкото лицемерие, което идва, струи от този документ.

Как смеете да гласувате за зелена сделка, като само преди месец гласувахте за това хиляди празни камиони да се разкарват нагоре-надолу из Европа, да горят нафта, само и само да бъде откраднат бизнесът на българските превозвачи и на останалите източни превозвачи? Кое е честното: да гориш нафтата или да гласуваш фикции, свързани с новия култ?

Тази зелена сделка предполага унищожаване на въглищните централи в Източна Европа. Нови стотици хиляди хора ще останат без работа, но същевременно залата не подкрепя запазването на най-екологичното производство на електрическа енергия, именно — атомната. Тоест, тази зала забранява въглищата, атомната енергия, газа и остават само перките и пчеличките. Това е безумие! Същевременно цялата инфраструктура, цялото производство се изнася в Китай, Европейският съюз се деиндустриализира. Не мога да го разбера, тук трябва да говорят психолози.

Neena Gill (S&D). – Madam President, I strongly support the European Green Deal. The scale of the challenge is such that we need wholesale revolution, not just in what governments do, but it is also very important what we get citizens to do. The burden and the cost must not fall on those with the least resources or least income.

We need to ensure that the populists do not exploit the fear that people have around the change, and the onus is on us to make sure that the people understand the importance not only of their work continuing, but also the sustainability of the planet. I'm pleased that, with my work in the Committee on Economic and Monetary Affairs (ECON), I've been able to lead on some of these issues for the financial services sector and bring in my report on benchmarks, which address this, but I'm very pleased to have voted for this and supported this.

11.2. Wdrażanie i monitorowanie przepisów o prawach obywateli w umowie o wystąpieniu Zjednoczonego Królestwa (B9-0031/2020)

A szavazáshoz fűzött szóbeli indokolások

Jackie Jones (S&D). – Madam President, I'm strongly in support of this cross-party motion for a resolution on citizens' rights within the withdrawal agreement, and I express my commitment to supporting and fighting for EU rights in Wales, and across the UK of course, after Brexit.

A new decade may have begun, yet the old ties refuse to be broken. With good reason. The EU and UK citizens' rights are human rights. Human rights are universal and protected not only at the EU level, but at many levels. The rule of law is a key point there. The EU has a solid record on protection of human rights. Don't step away from this. We need the EU to step up to protect the EU and UK citizens' rights now more than ever. Send a clear message, a resounding message, throughout Europe that this Parliament sees and hears the difficulties EU and UK citizens face without an automatic registration system. Now act to protect those rights, please.

Antony Hook (Renew). – Madam President, three million people from the EU 27 are part of our community in the UK. They include many of our teachers, nurses, doctors and farm, care and construction workers. They are our friends and neighbours. They are some of our spouses or parents of British people. I am appalled by the bureaucratic and threatening way in which the UK Government is choosing to treat European citizens. It deeply offends British peoples' sense of fair play.

What kind of government makes people who have lived somewhere for years, contributing to society under laws that said they always could, now ask for permission to stay? What kind of government asks them to produce documents they do not have, and gets so many applications wrong that 90% of appeals succeed, and then refuses to give them a document to prove their status? It's the government of Boris Johnson, in power on a minority vote and leading us from four years of stagnation into disaster.

(Applause)

Judith Bunting (Renew). – Madam President, it saddened me today in Parliament that we've had to pass a resolution to ensure the rights of the many EU citizens in the UK and of British citizens living abroad. Whilst I welcome that we passed this resolution, these rights should never have been put at risk by the British Government because of Brexit.

The very first thing that Theresa May should ever have done was to guarantee the rights of European citizens living in Britain. It would have been a strong negotiating position and taken away years of unnecessary stress and uncertainty. Now, we have a shoddy scheme, which depends on a PDF as a proof of settlement status, rather than any physical document or card. A PDF, we all know, can be doctored easily, so employers and landlords are, justifiably perhaps, concerned about forgery, which, once again, will lead to unfair discrimination. I hope that the British Government will listen to people's worries about this, as well as concerns passed in the resolution today.

But British citizens are also worrying about their right to stay in European countries where they have made their homes. I would like to thank those Member States who are already offering generous terms of settlement to those UK citizens who have taken residence in their country. I urge those states who have not yet declared their intentions to do so and to make their decisions known in good time.

John Howarth (S&D). – Madam President, the resolution makes reference to the Withdrawal Agreement as a balanced document. It is not a balanced document. If it was, we would not need to be passing the separate votes that are documented today. The reality is that European Union citizens have right to be fearful because the system in the United Kingdom that the Home Office operates is institutionally racist and institutionally xenophobic. Anyone who has ever had to deal with casework on this subject will know that. It is also a mistake to end freedom of movement. It is the greatest grab back of rights to the state from the individual since 1688. UK citizens who migrated to the European continent to make their lives see their life decisions made under one regime fundamentally altered under this regime by a decision of a minority of the British population and that is a great shame. It suggests in this resolution that these matters should be addressed before the Withdrawal Agreement is voted on. I don't believe that that will happen so my support for that agreement is unlikely.

Jane Brophy (Renew). – Madam President, I voted for this resolution concerning the 3.2 million citizens resident in the UK from the EU and the 1.2 million UK citizens resident in the EU.

Last year, the UK Home Office suggested that people who had not applied to formalise their status by 30 June 2021 could theoretically be deported. This has generated considerable anxiety.

This resolution stresses that Europeans living in the UK need to be issued with a physical document as proof of their right to reside. Not having physical proof has left EU citizens exposed to a massive risk of future discrimination. The upcoming European Parliament decision on whether to consent to the withdrawal agreement will depend on final assurances given by the UK on citizens' rights. Finally, I voted for this resolution because it also encourages the 27 EU Member States to adopt measures that provide legal certainty for UK citizens in the EU.

Barbara Ann Gibson (Renew). – Madam President, I remain absolutely convinced that the decision by the UK to leave the European Union is a huge mistake. However, if we are to leave, it is absolutely essential that the rights of EU citizens are protected, both those living in the UK and UK citizens living in other countries.

Today's resolution on citizens' rights, and the overwhelming support of the European Parliament, was a clear message to the UK Government that their current approach is simply not good enough. There is nothing to be gained by treating people as bargaining chips. I am personally heartbroken and heartbroken for our country that we will leave the EU, but I was pleased to vote for a resolution that safeguards the rights of citizens in this process.

Claire Fox (NI). – Madam President, I voted against this resolution because, whilst I constantly have argued since the referendum in 2016 that those EU citizens who wish to live in the UK should have their rights guaranteed and criticised the Tory government for not doing so, they should be offered settled status, this motion criticises the government for the wrong reasons and says the process should be put down as declaratory, which obviously puts the burden of proof on the government, not citizens, and is ridiculous. This deprives a nationally sovereign government of having control over monitoring what happens in its own borders. I also think this motion has been politicised churlishly by including within it the idea that freedom of movement is a great tragic loss for the UK because to note this just spits in the eye of those who have explicitly voted to leave the European Union with one key issue being freedom of movement. Not wanting freedom of movement is not about being xenophobic, it is not about hostility to people from European countries moving to or working in the UK. That is divisive scaremongering. It is about control of borders. That is a key part of sovereignty and the decisions about which citizens have both full rights and full duties and many people become British citizens from European countries because they want to enjoy those rights and duties, and I welcome them as friends and allies.

Stanislav Polčák (PPE). – Paní předsedající, já musím říci, že lituji, že Britové odcházejí z našeho společenství. Mohli jsme být silnější, možná, že některé jiné státy se radují – Rusko a další velmoci světové politiky. Na druhou stranu, přivítal jsem, že je učiněna dohoda s Británií a takovýto odchod považuji za daleko lepší řešení. Ta dohoda, jak se říká v návrhu usnesení, je spravedlivá a vyvážená. Já mám za to, že práva občanů v přechodném období budou touto dohodou pokryta. Pokud jde o budoucí období, u toho bych se rád zastavil. Je důležité říci, že v dohodě se deklaruje závazek řešit i toto budoucí období spravedlivě, vyváženě. Je to bohužel pouze deklaratorní závazek a je důležité, abychom pamatovali na práva občanů EU na britských ostrovech i v tom budoucím období, která zatím pokryta nejsou. Já bych byl rád, kdybychom pamatovali i na Skoty, na obyvatele Severního Irsku, ale to už je asi daleko složitější. Každopádně je dobré, že bylo dosaženo dohody a s ohledem na výše uvedené jsem podpořil tento návrh usnesení.

Martina Anderson (GUE/NGL). – Madam President, before 31 January 2020, when I will be kicked out of the EU against the democratically expressed wishes of the people in the north of Ireland who voted to remain, I want to take this opportunity to thank the MEPs who voted for this resolution today and for your steadfast support for the Good Friday Agreement and all of its parts.

This resolution deals, importantly, with the rights of Irish citizens in the north of Ireland to enjoy access and exercise our EU rights where we reside. As part of last week's Stormont deal to establish the Executive, the British Government committed to change its immigration rules. Irish citizens born in the north will now be able to exercise their EU family reunification rights, addressing the Emma DeSouza case.

However, Britain did not get the name 'Perfidious Albion' for nothing. They still deny Emma, and all of us born in the north of Ireland, Irish citizenship. My final warning to my fellow MEPs is this: beware of Perfidious Albion, a country you cannot trust that never keeps its word. Britannia will always, always, waive the rules.

Mick Wallace (GUE/NGL). – Madam President, clearly the rights of over 3 million EU citizens in the UK and over 1 million UK nationals in EU countries must be safeguarded and adequately monitored by the Commission and the proposed UK independent national authority. Obviously, those rights provided for under the Good Friday Agreement must also be safeguarded.

We should also acknowledge the threat to the rights of all EU and UK citizens by the neoliberal ideology of the EU. The EU's cap on national borrowing, as laid out in the Stability and Growth Pact and the Fiscal Compact, is a grinding austerity policy that has completely undermined rights to education, food, health and housing, as well as rights to decent work, fair wages and social security. In Ireland, even if we had a government with the mindset to tackle our terrible housing crisis – which we don't have at the moment, they would be hampered by the fiscal rules. Likewise, our road infrastructure has been built not by the state but by public-private partnerships (PPPs), costing twenty times the money that it would cost if the state were allowed to borrow it itself. But, sadly, the EU feeds the private sector with its policies.

Clare Daly (GUE/NGL). – Madam President, I have to say I will miss both our colleagues here from Sinn Féin, Martina, but also the colleagues from the Brexit Party. I think the place is going to be poorer for all of their absence.

But I supported this motion simply from the point of view of protecting the provisions and the citizens' rights enshrined in the Good Friday Agreement. We've had our Taoiseach Leo Varadkar and Boris Johnson celebrating the resumption of the Northern Ireland Assembly and telling us that the Good Friday Agreement is now back working again. I suppose the point I want to make is that if the Good Friday Agreement is working then what that means is that all of the people of Northern Ireland have to continue to have a birth right to identify themselves to be accepted as Irish or British or both as they choose and as set out in that Good Friday Agreement. Irish people living in Northern Ireland who haven't sought British citizenship cannot and should not have that citizenship foisted upon them.

Ilhan Kyuchyuk (Renew). – Madam President, two-and-a-half weeks prior to Brexit, we need to examine the implementation of citizens' rights in the UK withdrawal agreement, because there's a sense of uncertainty for millions of EU citizens – especially for those applying for 'settled' status. There are many unquantified issues on how the rights of both the remaining 27 Member States in the UK and UK citizens in the EU could be applied after the withdrawal. The EU 27 citizens, for instance, should – as a matter of urgency – be provided with proof of their rights to reside in the UK after the end of the transition period, and the British Government needs to stop creating anxiety and threatening EU citizens with deportation. These announcements are not productive and only generate additional turmoil. Prime Minister Johnson wants to agree on a positive future relationship by the end of December 2020 based on an ambitious free-

trade agreement, but he has to know that the level of free movement granted for EU citizens after Brexit would be a key factor in deciding the degree of future cooperation.

Juan Fernando López Aguilar (S&D). – Señora presidenta, después de años de negociaciones agónicas hemos votado la posición del Parlamento Europeo para proteger los derechos de los ciudadanos después de la retirada del Reino Unido.

Lo hemos hecho con tristeza, porque vamos a echar de menos a nuestros amigos británicos europeístas, pero no vamos a echar de menos a los escaños del nacionalpopulismo supremacista y reaccionario que han provocado el *Brexit*.

Pero el mensaje es claro: reciprocidad. La Unión Europea tratará a los británicos que residen en Europa dependiendo del modo en que el Reino Unido trate a los europeos establecidos en el Reino Unido. Y esto lo digo pensando en los británicos -treinta mil- que residen en Canarias, al mismo tiempo que en los trabajadores que en España cruzan la verja hacia Gibraltar -diez mil cada día-, manteniendo la dignidad del trabajo en un rincón donde ondea la bandera británica.

Pero lo que me importa subrayar es que hay todavía mucho trabajo por hacer para asegurar lo que no está claro y deberá ser despejado: la participación del Reino Unido en la libre circulación, la política de asilo y refugio, la cooperación policial y judicial contra el crimen y la garantía de la seguridad, tanto de los británicos como de los europeos, frente a amenazas que compartimos.

Daniel Hannan (ECR). – Madam President, a lot of this debate seems to have taken place in a parallel universe, one that barely intersects with the reality of what's happening.

I was a regular and repeated critic of Theresa May's grudging attitude and her slowness in recognising the rights of settled EU nationals. But the system is now up and running and is working far better than the reciprocal systems of any Member State that I can think of among the 27.

It's simply not true that people are denied – there's no mechanism to deny people status. They can be asked for more proof. But all of these urban myths that we keep hearing – some of which came to me as a constituency MEP, and when I looked into them, they turned out not to be as they first appeared – are serving to unsettle and alarm our friends and neighbours from EU Member States.

When I hear my Liberal Democrat colleagues in particular demanding written forms, or physical forms of ID, when they oppose ID cards as a party, and when I hear them criticising the UK Government without a word of criticism for Member States that have failed to reciprocate, I have to wonder what their motives really are.

Martin Horwood (Renew). – Madam President, can I enlarge on my vote just now for this Parliament's resolution on the British Withdrawal Agreement, including its frank criticism of the UK's inadequate and arbitrary settled status scheme, which is already unfairly treating our EU 27 friends, neighbours, colleagues and family members in the UK. And can I pay tribute to Guy Verhofstadt, who has won many fans in the UK for his relentless focus on citizens' rights during this process – including those of Brits in the remaining EU Member States.

In paragraph 20, the resolution recognises the many UK citizens who don't want to lose their European citizens' rights, and calls for this lost to be mitigated. This could mean associate individual EU citizenship, which I would strongly support. If the idea of international citizens' rights for foreign nationals seems odd, there is a successful example – and it's Britain. We have conferred citizens' rights on Irish citizens in Northern Ireland and across the UK, and give other citizens' rights – including voting rights – to citizens of Malta, Cyprus and other Commonwealth countries. So it can be done, and it would prevent this unique deprivation of rights from existing European citizens.

Jiří Pospíšil (PPE). – Paní předsedající, já jsem podpořil dnešní usnesení, považuji to dnešní hlasování za mimořádně důležitě. Dali jsme tím jasný politický signál, že v rámci uspořádání po brexitu jsou pro nás práva občanů zemí EU, kteří žijí na půdě Velké Británie, mimořádně důležitá. Je to silné politikum a do budoucna, až budeme řešit jejich konečnou podobu, tak je třeba říci, že vedle ekonomické spolupráce a výhod je zachování volného pohybu osob a hlavně občanů zemí EU žijících ve Velké Británii jasnou politickou prioritou. Já jsem z České republiky, 35 000 Čechů žije dnes trvale ve Velké Británii a pro nás je jaksi politickou nutností vyjednat v konečné fázi takové podmínky, aby tito lidé mohli důstojně dále žít na půdě Velké Británie. Takže děkuji za ten dnešní apel a rád jsem jej podpořil.

Matthew Patten (NI). – Madam President, I voted against the resolution on the Withdrawal Agreement for two really basic reasons. The first is that it was hypercritical of the UK in terms of the processes that it has put in place in terms of welcoming our friends who want to settle in the UK. But, in fact, the UK is way ahead of the other 27 Member States. It's really important that rights are reciprocated for UK citizens and this resolution didn't reflect that.

The second thing is that this resolution, in its debate and proposal in terms of freedom of movement, completely ignores the referendum that we had in 2016. The ability for the UK to control its own borders is absolutely central to Brexit, and this resolution completely fails to recognise that fact. In fact, this resolution is really just a very naked ploy to sabotage the Brexit vote that we have in Brussels at the end of this month, where the Withdrawal Agreement will be decided – its final fate decided – by you, my colleagues, the MEPs here. That's why I voted against this resolution.

Neena Gill (S&D). – Madam President, I voted for this resolution on implementing citizens' rights in the Withdrawal Agreement. I believe it gives clarity as to what happens in transition and what happens afterwards. As we've already heard, there are 3.5 million EU citizens in the UK who each have their own personal stories and situations, but they have one thing in common: they want to ensure a safe future for themselves and their families.

The UK Government has done everything possible to make things difficult. It has failed to provide a system that gives them full guarantees, or physical documents that would enable them to prove their status to prospective employers or landlords. Now this is a huge concern in my constituency of the West Midlands, and this is not hearsay. I have case-work that proves some of the awful experiences that EU citizens have had, and we forget that the EU migrants contribute GBP 2 300 more to the UK Exchequer than the average adult.

But what is truly shocking is that the UK Government doesn't seem to be as concerned about the plight of 1.2 million UK citizens living in the EU as the EU is about protecting its citizens' rights. I hope that for those who are in this position, the Labour MEPs will continue to stand up for their rights until the very end.

11.3. Roczne sprawozdanie za rok 2018 dotyczące praw człowieka i demokracji na świecie oraz polityki UE w tym zakresie (A9-0051/2019 - Isabel Wiseler-Lima)

A szavazáshoz fűzött szóbeli indokolások

Younous Omarjee (GUE/NGL). – Madame la Présidente, nous devons déconstruire les mécaniques qui, dans le monde, conduisent aux violations des droits humains et observer que les politiques néo-libérales ne peuvent tenir debout qu'adossées à des pratiques autoritaires et, en définitive, à une forme de violence retenue comme mode de gouvernement. Néo-libéralisme et autoritarisme marchent ensemble. Cela est vrai dans le monde, mais c'est vrai aussi en France où nous voyons comment le pouvoir actuel brutalise avec férocité des mouvements sociaux et où nous voyons avec une certaine forme de stupeur comment le pouvoir étouffe les mouvements qui pourraient venir contrarier les sombres projet néo-libéraux. Aujourd'hui, en France, la mort peut être au rendez-vous pour des manifestants pacifiques, quand les violences policières se multiplient et quand elles sont utilisées pour le maintien de l'ordre des armes dites de guerre, qui sont pourtant interdites dans nombre de pays d'Europe. Aujourd'hui, en France, les droits des justiciables, des syndicalistes et des journalistes reculent, et avec eux les libertés individuelles pourtant consacrées par notre Constitution et par la charte des droits fondamentaux.

Tout cela inquiète, et on se demande: de principes en principes attentés, de valeurs en valeurs niées, d'excès de pouvoir en excès de pouvoir autorisés, quelle France peu à peu est en train de se mettre en place?

Michaela Šojdrová (PPE). – Paní předsedající, Evropská unie je a musí zůstat tím, kdo bude prosazovat lidská práva ve světě. Obchodní zájmy a dohody musí zapojit také tu podmínku lidských práv, nemůžeme je obětovat obchodním zájmům. Proto je důležité, aby EU využívala jak sankcí, tak pozitivních motivací a pobídek, např. v rámci rozvojové pomoci, a podpořila ty vlády, které se snaží prosazovat lidská práva ve svých zemích. Jsem ale velmi zklamaná, že nebyl přijatý pozměňovací návrh, který hovoří o situaci křesťanů, kteří představují velkou většinu náboženských skupin čelících diskriminaci, násilí a smrti, a nebyla přijata výzva na jejich ochranu. Opravdu nevím, jak Evropský parlament myslí vážně ochranu lidských práv, když svoboda náboženského vyznání je jedním z hlavních lidských práv. A tento návrh byl odmítnut, proto jsem nakonec hlasovala proti návrhu usnesení.

Clare Daly (GUE/NGL). – Madam President, human rights are supposed to be universal and indivisible. They're not supposed to be instrumentalised. But that's exactly what we have in the European Union: instrumentalising human rights to advance foreign policy issues; to give out about the countries we don't like – or, more particularly, the ones that the United States don't like.

This was summed up graphically by the brazen illegal extradition assassination of Major General Qasem Soleimani and former parliamentarian Iraqi General Abu Omar Mahdi al-Mohandes, and the absolute silence of the European Union in the face of that made me ashamed that we would have the audacity to talk about human rights anywhere else. These were army officers with a record against ISIS, executed in the sovereign territory of Iraq, in a civilian airport in which I have been.

Can you imagine what we would have been saying if the United States' Chief of Staff had been assassinated in Heathrow Airport by the Russians? I can tell you: we'd have been saying quite a lot, and this is the problem with this report. We talk to talk, we condemn the people we don't like, and we say nothing about human rights violations at home. As my colleague said, the violent brutality of the French state against innocent protesters, and the irony that we talk about democracy while our Catalan colleagues are sitting in jail rather than taking their seats here with us. It is an absolute disgrace, which is why I voted against it.

Tatjana Ždanoka (Verts/ALE). – Madam President, I also do not support the persistent willingness of the European Union to teach all the others how to behave in the field of human rights. We will have the right to be a teacher only when becoming champions, not self-declared human-rights defenders.

But nevertheless, I voted in favour of this resolution by reason of just one paragraph: very important and mentioning that the problem of mass statelessness must be solved by 2024, not only outside but also within the European Union. And mass statelessness is a huge problem for my country, Latvia: every tenth resident of Latvia is stateless, deprived of a number of rights, including the right to vote in local elections (we recommend this for those who will stay in the UK and in the European Union after Brexit). These people were declared to be stateless just by reason of origin, despite the fact that the majority of them are local natives. By the way, in this resolution, the reason for discrimination by origin is not mentioned, and it is a shame.

Jiří Pospíšil (PPE). – Paní předsedající, já jsem podpořil tuto zprávu. Já osobně považuji agendu lidských práv za důležitou agendu EU. A já si myslím, že je dobře, že se jí nezabýváme pouze na území členských států EU, ale šíříme ji i všude ve světě. Zprávu jsem podpořil, ale mám k ní jednu připomínku. Pokud nemá zůstat pouze prázdným dokumentem, slovy na papíře, je dobře, aby Evropská komise z této zprávy vycházela a promítla závěry této zprávy do své každodenní zahraniční politiky. A velmi se přikláním k tomu, abychom opravdu u těch zemí, kterým poskytujeme určité výhody, benefity, ekonomickou pomoc, brali ohled na to, jaký stav lidských práv v dané zemi je. Protože pokud budeme poskytovat ekonomickou podporu a pomoc plošně i těm zemím, které zkrátka vědomě a flagrantně lidská práva porušují, pak takovéto zprávy, které zde píšeme, nemají žádný smysl a zůstávají pouze na papíře.

11.4. Sprawozdanie roczne z realizacji wspólnej polityki zagranicznej i bezpieczeństwa (A9-0054/2019 - David McAllister)

A szavazáshoz fűzött szóbeli indokolások

Michaela Šojdrová (PPE). – Paní předsedající, já jsem tuto zprávu podpořila, domnívám se, že je správné, aby Evropská unie budovala svoji obrannou a zahraniční politiku ve vztahu k multilateralismu, ve vztahu k NATO, to je nepochybně náš hlavní bezpečnostní garant. NATO nadále bude hrát hlavní roli, většina členských států je součástí NATO. Měla jsem jisté výhrady k té části, která se týká role Evropského parlamentu, který by měl posilovat svoji roli jako třetí pilíř této politiky. Domnívám se, že bychom měli respektovat v této oblasti vedoucí, řekněme úlohu, roli členských států a Rady. Nicméně je dobře, že Evropský parlament tuto svoji pozici k obranné politice přijal.

Veronika Vrecionová (ECR). – Paní předsedající, děkuji za slovo a za možnost, že mohu vysvětlit svůj postoj k výroční zprávě, kterou jsem nemohla podpořit. Na jedné straně ta zpráva velmi výstižně popisuje hrozby a výzvy, kterým musí Evropská unie a její členské státy čelit. Ať se jedná např. o asertivní chování politiků Ruska ke svým sousedům, hybridní hrozby nebo kybernetické útoky. S rostoucím napětím na Blízkém východě bych však chtěla varovat před smazáváním jasných hranic mezi tím, kdo je zlý a kdo je dobrý. Kdo je původcem konfliktu a kdo na něj pouze reaguje. Kdo má za cíl zničit jiné státy a kdo chce naopak pouze přežít a prosperovat. V tomto ohledu by měla EU svou politiku na Blízkém východě změnit. Měla by jasně pojmenovat stávající vedení Íránu jako největší hrozbu a naopak Izrael jako našeho partnera. Měla by pomáhat občanům Íránu, kteří touží po změně, a to mi zde bohužel chybí.

Guido Reil (ID). – Frau Präsidentin, liebe Kolleginnen und Kollegen! Ich habe gegen den Bericht gestimmt, weil ich ganz grundsätzlich gegen den EU-Beitritt der Westbalkanländer bin. Schon der EU-Beitritt von Rumänien und Bulgarien und die daraus resultierende Freizügigkeit hatten verheerende Auswirkungen für meine Heimat im Ruhrgebiet. Diese Freizügigkeit hat uns Kriminalität, Prostitution, Schwarzarbeit und Sozialbetrug beschert. Gerade dieser Sozialbetrug und diese ausartenden Sozialkosten für die Städte des Ruhrgebiets, die völlig pleite sind, sind verheerend. Das sage nicht nur ich, das sagen die SPD-Oberbürgermeister von Duisburg, Gelsenkirchen und Dortmund. Was wir brauchen, ist weniger Freizügigkeit, und nicht mehr Freizügigkeit.

12. Korekty do głosowania i zamiar głosowania: patrz protokół

(Az ülést 14.45-kor felfüggesztik)

Puhetta johti HEIDI HAUTALA

varapuhemies

13. Wznowienie posiedzenia

(Istuntoa jatkettiin klo 15.03)

14. Przyjęcie protokołu poprzedniego posiedzenia: patrz protokół

15. Przeinaczanie historii europejskiej i pamięci o II wojnie światowej (debata na aktualny temat)

Puhemies. – Esityslistalla on seuraavana ajankohtainen keskustelu Euroopan historian vääristymisestä ja toisen maailmansodan muistamisesta (2019/3016(RSP)). Ilmoitan jäsenille, että tässä keskustelussa ei anneta pyynnöstä myönnettäviä puheenvuoroja, eikä myöskään hyväksytä sinisen kortin kysymyksiä.

Manfred Weber, *representative of PPE Group.* – Madam President, this debate is not about history. It's about our future, because neglecting historical facts means ignoring the future. More than 40 million deaths in World War II remind us 'never again'. To start this war was the most terrible crime in history. Nazi Germany started the war and caused terrible crimes against humanity. Every German politician has to assume the responsibility of our country. But every politician, inside and outside of Europe, also has the responsibility not to play with history. I cannot – and we, as the EPP – cannot accept Putin's attempt to rewrite history.

To be clear, the Soviet Union was attacked by Nazi Germany. Russia suffered tremendously during World War II, but to be clear, the Hitler-Stalin Pact was an agreement between two devils, two terrible dictators. The Hitler-Stalin Pact was the beginning of a raid on several European countries: Poland, Finland, Estonia, Lithuania, Latvia and Romania. The Hitler-Stalin Pact meant, for millions of European citizens in large parts of Europe, decades of oppression, fear, suffering and dictatorship. The Hitler-Stalin Pact was a crime against peace, freedom and democracy.

More than 80 years after this Treaty, we, as the European Parliament, clearly say 'never again'. Today's EU and today's NATO are the children of liberty, democracy and freedom for Central and Eastern Europe. We stand as one for solidarity in Europe. We remember history to safeguard our common future.

(Applause)

Nikolina Brnjac, *President-in-Office of the Council*. – Madam President, honourable Members, thank you for this opportunity to discuss an important topic indeed. I have heard and I acknowledge the concerns voiced by Mr Weber, and I'm aware of the statement referred to and of the reaction by the Polish authorities. I would like to use this opportunity to express my sympathy for all World War II victims. It is important to remember Europe's past if we want to build its future.

The topic of today's discussion thus prompts a reflection on how Europe can learn from history and especially from one of its darkest chapters. As highlighted also by the European Parliament's resolution of September last year, the authoritarian and totalitarian regimes which emerged across Europe in the last century remain a dark chapter in our continent's history.

The Second World War led to unprecedented levels of human suffering, both for the militaries and for civilian populations. Ten of millions of victims were deported, tortured, murdered under totalitarian regimes in Europe. Remembrance of the wars that ravaged Europe and its people should always prevent us from overlooking these horrors.

For this reason, it is essential to find ways to strengthen our common values and the general principles on which the European Union is founded: respect for human dignity, freedom, democracy, equality, the rule of law and respect for human rights.

Fortunately, most of the younger generations in Europe have not suffered under totalitarian regimes. Yet there is now a risk that we are taking these common values and principles for granted. Europe's tragic past should continue to serve as moral and political inspiration to face the challenges of today's world. The common values that have enabled the longest period of peace in Europe must remain a cornerstone of our democratic society and need to be safely guarded and constantly nurtured.

The experience of the two world wars taught us not to focus on differences but to create a common space to live, study and work. Most European societies have been learning over several generations the value of inclusiveness and tolerance. Despite these positive developments, Europe, unfortunately, did witness war, conflict and destruction in the 1990s, and here I speak of my home country's direct experience, still quite fresh in our memory. However, this is an additional reason why we should all deeply respect the peace and security that the EU project has brought to our continent and why we should continue promoting its achievements outside its borders.

Today our societies are facing different kinds of challenges: xenophobia, nationalism, populism, disinformation or violent radicalisation, just to name a few. These very complex issues cannot be solved with simplistic, quick-fix solutions. The Union must be vigilant and ready to fight propaganda which promises such solutions. Not only can these promises never be fulfilled, they also discredit our democratic institutions and authorities. They seek to divide our societies into us and them, friends and enemies. This undermines democratic and open political debate. Radicalisation and violent extremism gain ground. We all need to step up our efforts to prevent intolerance, racism and xenophobia.

Madam President, honourable Members, I would like to conclude by stressing that our societies need to remember their own history in order to learn from the past and not repeat the mistakes for which they might have been responsible.

Věra Jourová, *Vice-President of the Commission*. – Madam President, I would like to thank you and the honourable members for this debate. Our collective history and how we commemorate and share it is fundamentally important for Europe's present and future. As the now-famous quotation goes 'everyone is entitled to his own opinion, but not his own facts'. The Commission's role here is to talk about the facts. The European Commission fully rejects any false claims that attempt to distort the history of the Second World War or paint the victims, like Poland, as perpetrators. The Commission will not tolerate these attacks on Poland and stands in full solidarity with Poland and the Polish people.

The EU evolved out of the ashes of the Second World War and the holocaust and, in the context of the Cold War, these memories are the foundation of the European project and our responsibility for the future. These historical facts are not open for debate. The Hitler-Stalin Pact, signed by the Foreign Ministers of Nazi Germany, Ribbentrop, and the Soviet Union, Molotov, on 23 August 1939, paved the way for the Second World War. The Nazi-Soviet alliance enabled the attack on Poland by Nazi Germany on 1 September 1939 and, subsequently, Soviet troops on 17 September. These events marked the beginning of the Second World War and these are the facts.

We also must recall the occupation of the Baltic countries and Bessarabia, events hard to imagine without the existence of the treaty dividing the continent by a zone of influence of the evil regimes. We must highlight the horrors committed by both regimes without equating them – in particular, the unimaginable tragedy of the organised genocide by Nazi Germany, the holocaust, which consumed the lives of millions of Jews, and other atrocities that cost the lives of millions of Poles, Roma and many other nationalities.

Yes, history is complicated and we cannot forget about the role that the Soviet soldiers played in the crucial part of the war when Stalin and Hitler became enemies. It is a fact that Soviet soldiers were first to push out the German soldiers from Central and Eastern Europe after immense sacrifices by the peoples of the Soviet Union. It is a fact that they played a key role in liberating the Nazi concentration camp in occupied Poland, Auschwitz-Birkenau. We will commemorate the 75th anniversary of this event on 27 January.

Even after the war, many people from Central and Eastern Europe continued for decades to suffer under the totalitarian rule of communist regimes, regimes that were often installed without support and against the will of the local population. The European Union has established 23 August as the official day of the memory of the millions of victims of totalitarian regimes. The Commission is committed to contributing, in line with its responsibilities, to the promotion of the memory of crimes committed by totalitarian regimes in Europe and the Commission encourages the Member States to consider the possibility of adhering to this Europe-wide day in the light of their own history.

It is our duty to preserve the names of the millions persecuted and keep their memories alive and also to study diligently the root causes and behaviour of the totalitarian regimes, especially because today, 81 years after the opening of this dark chapter in European history, our common values of human dignity, fundamental rights, rule of law and democracy are challenged again by extremists, nationalists and divisive rhetoric and actions.

We have to recognise those facts to understand our own history and build a better future. The dream of the European Union was formed right after the war, with the clear aim to create new, strong foundations for long-lasting peace in Europe. This is why it is important for Europe to be very clear on these matters. Distortion of historical facts is a threat to our democratic societies and must be challenged wherever possible. Organised and targeted dissemination of distortions and disinformation is something we have to oppose and reject. I myself will work under my mission to strengthen the European democracy to allow us to live in freedom from these threats. Honourable Members, ladies and gentlemen, I look forward to the debate.

Sandra Kalniete, *PPE grupas vārdā*. – Cienītā sēdes vadītāja! Šī gada 8. maijā Eiropa svinēs septiņdesmit piekto gadadienu kopš Otrā pasaules kara beigām. Šo uzvaru kaldināja sabiedrotie – Amerikas Savienotās Valstis, Lielbritānija, Francija un Padomju Savienība.

Kremlim ļoti gribētos šo uzvaru piesavināties kā savējo, taču to traucē darīt patiesība, ka 1939. gadā PSRS vienojās ar nacistisko Vāciju par Eiropas pārdali, kas atbrīvoja rokas Hitleram uzbrukt Polijai, iekarot Rietumeiropu, atstājot Lielbritāniju vienatnē cīnīties ar agresoru.

Faktiski no 1939. gada 1. septembra līdz 1941. gada 22. jūnijam Staļins bija Hitlera sabiedrotais, kas Padomju Savienību padara līdzatbildīgu par Otrā pasaules kara izraisīšanu. Un Putina mēģinājumi šos vēsturiskos faktus sagrozīt, šo patiesību nevar izdzēst no vēstures, tāpat kā no vēstures nav izdzēšami karā ierauto tautu upuri, ciešanas un posts. To mums Eiropā vienmēr jāatceras. Paldies.

Jens Geier, *im Namen der S&D-Fraktion*. – Frau Präsidentin, verehrte Kolleginnen und Kollegen! Ich greife einen Satz von Ihnen auf, Frau Jurovová: „Niemand hat das Recht auf eigene Fakten“, und nach alledem, was wir schon gehört haben, würde ich diesen Satz von Ihnen gerne doppelt unterstreichen.

Ich möchte an der Stelle noch mal daran erinnern, warum wir hier sitzen. Die Keimzelle der Europäischen Union, der Beginn der Zusammenarbeit der europäischen Völker war der EGKS-Vertrag. In dessen Präambel können wir bis heute lesen, dass dieser Vertrag, der eigentlich im Wesentlichen erst mal nichts anderes war als die Einrichtung einer Freihandelszone für Kohle und Stahl, von den Vertragsparteien in der festen Überzeugung geschlossen worden ist, dass ein Handeln und Kooperieren miteinander und der Aufbau von gemeinsamen Institutionen friedensfördernd sind. Wie erfolgreich dieses Modell ist, können wir daran sehen, dass wir eben hier nicht nur über Kohle und Stahl reden, sondern über sehr viel mehr.

Wenn wir aber das Recht auf die eigenen Fakten verhindern wollen, brauchen wir europäische Öffentlichkeit. Das kann man nicht beschließen, dafür muss man etwas tun. Durch die Verteidigung von Medienfreiheit, wenn Zeitungen verboten werden, wenn Journalistinnen und Journalisten bedroht oder getötet werden oder wenn öffentlich-rechtlicher Rundfunk in den Staaten, wo das vorhanden ist, auch bedroht wird, dann müssen wir uns als demokratische Politikerinnen und Politiker zu Wort melden und diesen Anfängen wehren.

Charles Goerens, *au nom du groupe Renew*. – Madame la Présidente, la gestion du passé est toujours une affaire fort délicate. Elle peut paraître délicate, elle est souvent laborieuse, mais en tout cas elle est indispensable. Et je crois que Jean Kahn, qui a été à l'origine de l'Observatoire européen des phénomènes racistes et xénophobes aurait pu nous en dire un mot. Malheureusement, il nous a quittés entretemps. Il avait été en charge de faire l'inventaire de toutes les aberrations qui sont encore contenues dans les manuels d'histoire aujourd'hui – c'était plutôt à la fin des années 90 – et l'une des plus grandes aberrations a été une citation dans un manuel d'histoire autrichien prétendant que l'Autriche avait été la première victime du IIIe Reich: une histoire à dormir debout.

Voilà ce qui arrive lorsqu'on ne traite pas des questions du passé et lorsqu'on n'a pas le courage de les aborder. En effet, nombreux sont ceux qui participent à la désinformation et qui déforment les réalités historiques, soit en ignorant les preuves historiques irréfutables, soit en refusant de s'y référer ou en omettant de les nommer. Le deuxième cas est encore pire que le premier. On pourrait encore trouver des circonstances atténuantes pour expliquer la bêtise, mais la mauvaise foi est inacceptable. Que pouvons-nous faire face aux négationnistes? Que pouvons-nous opposer aux assassins de la mémoire, comme les appelle Pierre Vidal-Naquet? Je crois que nous pouvons faire une chose, même si elle n'aura pas d'effet immédiat: comme les témoins et les rescapés nous ont presque tous quittés, nous allons devoir remplacer le devoir de mémoire par un devoir d'histoire. Et je voudrais, pour terminer, citer un exemple dont nous devons nous inspirer: la République fédérale d'Allemagne, la version des anciens *Bundesländer*, a eu le courage d'affronter son passé, et cette République fédérale d'Allemagne l'a fait de façon courageuse, sans voiler quoi que ce soit dans les manuels d'histoire et dans les médias publics. Dans les nouveaux *Bundesländer*, tel n'a pas été le cas. Si vous regardez les résultats de l'AfD aujourd'hui, je crois que les efforts investis dans l'apprentissage de l'histoire ne sont pas vains.

Reinhard Bütikofer, *on behalf of the Verts/ALE Group*. – Madam President, I want to thank Commissioner Jourová for having Poland's back in this public discussion. Recently, we have been having an increasing number of historical debates, and it's not easy dealing with these topics. It's not our role and it's not our responsibility to exonerate anybody from their historical record.

Historical truth is not at the disposal of the powerful, nor at the disposal even of parliamentary majorities, but we must defend the facts as we best know them. That also applies to Soviet aggression, to Soviet suffering and to the role of appeasement in the run-up to the Second World War. But when a victim is being turned into the perpetrator of a crime, we have to speak up, and if a wolf cries wolf, we should call it out.

I believe that these kinds of conversations are rarely just about the past. Shifting historical blame can easily be a first step in the direction of identifying a target for more than just rhetorical aggression. Europe should beware.

Alessandro Panza, *a nome del gruppo ID*. – Signora Presidente, onorevoli colleghi, purtroppo sono molte le distorsioni storiche in Europa sulla Seconda guerra mondiale: non possiamo non parlare, ad esempio, della Resistenza in Italia.

Premessa: il mio intervento non è contro la Resistenza in Italia, anzi, non si vuole fare demonizzazione, però è doveroso fare alcune precisazioni. In Italia non ci fu un solo gruppo di partigiani a combattere contro il regime fascista ma ci furono gruppi comunisti, socialisti, cattolici, conservatori e repubblicani. Eppure, nonostante questo, nel mio paese sembra esserci una narrativa consolidata e distorta secondo cui solo una compagine è stata autrice della lotta al nazi-fascismo. Sull'onda di questo alcune associazioni, anche finanziate con soldi pubblici, invece di spiegare dettagliatamente e obiettivamente la storia, non perdono occasione per schierarsi politicamente con la sinistra, in questo caso in Italia.

Durante la guerra civile, svoltasi tra il '43 e il '45, efferati delitti vennero commessi da entrambe le compagini. Però su quelli commessi dai fascisti c'è ampio e giusto risalto, su quelli commessi dai partigiani è come se fosse caduto un manto di impunità e di dimenticanza. Prendiamo per esempio la storia di Rolando Rivi, un quattordicenne seminarista assassinato dai partigiani, o le oltre 2 600 donne violentate e uccise senza un equo processo, con la sola scusa di essere amiche dei fascisti.

Eppure oggi è più facile nascondersi dietro un «Bella Ciao» qualsiasi, come ha fatto indegnamente qualche Commissario all'interno di quest'Aula, quando si sa invece, com'è noto, che «Bella Ciao» non era l'inno dei partigiani.

Concludo, Presidente, citando un grande giornalista italiano di sinistra, scomparso pochi giorni fa: «Tutti sanno queste cose o le hanno sentite dire e nessuno osa riportarle e raccontarle per paura di essere additato come fascista». Grazie per la sua onestà intellettuale, Giampaolo Pansa.

Puhemies. – Täytyy jossain määrin nyt kuitenkin muistuttaa puheenvuorojen pituudesta ja ehkä vielä kerran se, että näissä ajankohtaiskeskusteluissa ei yleisesti hyväksytä sinisen kortin kysymyksiä eikä myönnä puheenvuorolistan ulkopuolisia puheenvuoroja. Kyse ei ole nyt tästä aiheesta, vaan siitä, että tämä on ajankohtainen keskustelu.

Anna Fotyga, on behalf of the ECR Group. – Madam President, I wholeheartedly thank all of you for adopting the September resolution on common remembrance, which is a very balanced and factual one.

Since the very beginning, both parties to the Hitler-Stalin Pact used lies, smear campaigns and cheating to discredit their opponents and victims. Well after advancing the holocaust, Hitler accused Jews of waging the Second World War. Months after committing a war crime on more than 20 000 Polish members of the elite in Katyn and elsewhere, Stalin informed Polish Generals Sikorski and Anders that they had been released and had escaped to Manchuria. Later, during the negotiations for ending the Second World War in Potsdam, there was yet another war crime perpetrated against Poles and Lithuanians: the so-called Augustów roundup.

Unfortunately, in his smear campaign against Poland and other countries, President Putin uses exactly the same methods as both parties to the Hitler-Stalin Pact. Moreover, he is engaged in glorifying Stalin's activity and using it as contemporary policy. We have to raise this issue.

Kateřina Konečná, za skupinu GUE/NGL. – Paní předsedající, druhá světová válka byla největším selháním lidstva. Krach na newyorské burze znamenal nejen problémy bank a továrníků, ale hlavně uvrhl do bída a hladu desítky milionů lidí, kteří se jako tonoucí chytali každého stébla, které by jim dalo naději na lepší život. V Evropě to byl bohužel fašismus a nacismus. Zatímco fašisté v Itálii a ve Španělsku a nacisté v Berlíně provolávali slávu svým krvelačným diktátorům, bylo Československo v Mnichově zrazeno vlastními spojenci. Evropa selhala – přihlížela porušování dohod, nepomohla anti-fašistům ve Španělsku a prodala nacistům Československo. Trestem za tato selhání byly např. Osvětim, Dachau, Terezín, Lidice. Miliony mrtvých a zničený kontinent.

V poslední době je módní zaměňovat příčiny a následky. Nevezme se na této módní vlně a nepřepisujme podle toho historii. Mějme úctu k těm, kteří padli, abychom my tady dnes mohli žít. Zločinec musí zůstat zločincem a osvoboditel osvoboditelem.

Λευτέρης Νικολάου-Αλαβάνος (NI). – Κυρία Πρόεδρε, καταλαβαίνουμε την ανησυχία σας, γιατί, παρά τις αντικομμουνιστικές αποφάσεις του Ευρωπαϊκού Κοινοβουλίου, την εκστρατεία ψέματος, διαστρέβλωσης της Ιστορίας, την προκλητική εξίσωση του κομμουνισμού με το τέρας του φασισμού, και τα δισεκατομμύρια ευρώ για προγράμματα φρονηματοποίησης της νεολαίας, δεν έχετε καταφέρει να ξαναγράψετε την Ιστορία. Για αυτό, κρατάτε για μήνες την αντικομμουνιστική μηχανή σε ψηλές στροφές: με το κατάπτυστο αντικομμουνιστικό ψήφισμα του Σεπτεμβρίου 2019 και με αλληπάλληλες συζητήσεις αντικομμουνιστικού χαρακτήρα σε κάθε Ολομέλεια. Ο αντικομμουνισμός είναι στο DNA της Ευρωπαϊκής Ένωσης. Οι λαοί το ξέρουν και το βλέπουν το αποτέλεσμα αυτής της πολιτικής: αποθράσυνση φασιστικών και εγκληματικών ομάδων, ανάμεσά τους και η υπόδικη ναζισ-

τική Χρυσή Αυγή στην Ελλάδα, απαγορεύσεις κομμουνιστικών κομμάτων σε χώρες της Ευρωπαϊκής Ένωσης, όπως στην Πολωνία και στις χώρες της Βαλτικής, με περιορισμό της δράσης των κομμουνιστών, με περιορισμό της συμμετοχής τους στις εκλογές, με διώξεις αγωνιστών, με ξήλωμα ιστορικών μνημείων. Δεν θα τα καταφέρετε! Όσο και αν πασχίζετε να βαφτίσετε την ημέρα της αντιφασιστικής νίκης σε ημέρα της Ευρώπης, η αλήθεια θα λάμψει! Γιατί φέτος συμπληρώνονται εβδομήντα πέντε χρόνια από το τέλος του Δεύτερου Παγκόσμιου Πολέμου, τότε που τον χιτλεροφασισμό τον τσάκισε η πάλι των λαών, με επικεφαλής τους κομμουνιστές, τη Σοβιετική Ένωση και τον Κόκκινο Στρατό. Το μέλλον των λαών δεν συμβιβάζεται με την καπιταλιστική εκμετάλλευση, με τη φτώχεια, τον πόλεμο και την προσφυγιά. Ο σοσιαλισμός είναι το μέλλον!

Andrzej Halicki (PPE). – Pani Przewodnicząca! Jestem z Polski. Jako inicjator tej debaty chciałbym bardzo serdecznie w imieniu polskiego społeczeństwa podziękować Parlamentowi i wszystkim politycznym frakcjom za solidarność, bo tej solidarności naprawdę potrzebujemy. Chciałbym podziękować Radzie Europejskiej i pani komisarz za bardzo jednoznaczny i silny głos, bo musimy być razem wtedy, kiedy podejmowane są próby fałszowania historii, bo na to nie ma zgody. Ale to nie jest debata o historii, to jest debata o Unii Europejskiej, o naszej wspólnocie, o bezpieczeństwie, bo ci politycy, którzy akceptować chcą totalitaryzmy, czy to stalinizm, czy nazizm, sami chcą budować rządy autorytarne i w taki sam sposób wykorzystywać siłę na zgnębienie milionów, bo tyle ofiar przyniosły te pozogi w zeszłym stuleciu Europejczykom.

Polityk, który lekceważy historię i który akceptuje totalitaryzmy, nie może nazywać siebie Europejczykiem i musimy razem być solidarni i dać silny odpór i silny głos przeciwko takim tendencjom.

Leszek Miller (S&D). – Pani Przewodnicząca! Kiedy 30 lat temu Zjazd Deputowanych Ludowych Związków Radzieckiego potępił pakt Ribbentrop-Mołotow – pakt, który Stalin w telegramie do Ribbentropa określił jako „krwią zcementowaną przyjaźń pomiędzy obu krajami” – wydawało się, że ten rozdział historii jest zamknięty. Dziś następuje próba rewizji tamtych ocen, w tym także fałszowania prawdy historycznej w odniesieniu do Polski. Udział mojego kraju w walce przeciwko Hitlerowi nie może być kwestionowany. Polacy w żadnym znaczeniu nie współpracowali z Niemcami, walczyli z nimi na wszystkich frontach, zorganizowali silny ruch oporu i podziemną administrację. Ponieśli też największe straty.

Najnowsze płynące z Moskwy insynuacje, że obozy koncentracyjne w Polsce budowano nieprzypadkowo, lecz dlatego że sprzyjał temu społeczny klimat, są skandalicznym przejawem złej woli i arogancji. W Polsce przed wojną zamieszkiwała największa w Europie społeczność żydowska i ten fakt miał decydujące znaczenie dla Trzeciej Rzeszy. To on spowodował, że tu właśnie powstały liczne niemieckie nazistowskie obozy zagłady.

Pojawiające się próby fałszowania historii i pamięci o II wojnie światowej wymagają zdecydowanego sprzeciwu.

Nicola Beer (Renew). – Frau Präsidentin, sehr geehrte Kolleginnen und Kollegen! Ich bin als Vizepräsidentin für das Haus der Europäischen Geschichte zuständig. Orte wie dieser werden immer wichtiger in einer Zeit, in der die Lektionen aus der Geschichte nicht nur vergessen, sondern verfälscht werden und böartige Geschichtsklitterungen nicht nur in Internetforen an der Tagesordnung sind.

Deswegen möchte ich Sie anlässlich des Gedenkens an den Zweiten Weltkrieg auf ein Thema aufmerksam machen, das mir sehr am Herzen liegt: Antisemitismus. Eine verfälschte Darstellung jüdischer Geschichte machte erst die Verfolgung und grausame Ermordung von sechs Millionen Jüdinnen und Juden möglich. Heute, 75 Jahre danach, finden solche Verfälschungen wieder in Form von Verschwörungstheorien den Weg in unsere Gesellschaft. Die BDS-Bewegung erinnert mit dem Boykott jüdischer Waren an die „Kauft nicht bei Juden“-Schilder. Jüdische Bürger werden wieder mit Karikaturen verhöhnt, die Geschichte Israels wird verdreht, sein Existenzrecht gelehnt – oder das einseitige Abstimmungsverhalten bei den Vereinten Nationen, wo regelmäßig dem Antisemitismus autoritärer Staaten in die Hände gespielt wird.

Um auch camouflierten Antisemitismus zu erkennen, brauchen wir Schulungen. Das lehrt uns das Agieren von Beamten, gerade von Richtern im Zweiten Weltkrieg. Lassen Sie uns deshalb gemeinsam als Parlament, als Kommission und Rat die Anwendung des Verhaltenskodexes zur Bekämpfung illegaler Hassreden im Internet und der Antisemitismusdefinition der Internationalen Allianz für Holocaust-Gedenken durchsetzen!

Nicolaus Fest (ID). – Frau Präsidentin! Jeder, der sich ein bisschen mit Geschichte auskennt, weiß, dass die Äußerungen Putins historisch falsch waren und dass die Polen jedes Recht haben, hierüber empört zu sein.

Aber ich denke dennoch, das ist keine Debatte, die hierhergehört. Das ist eine Debatte für Historiker und Feuilletonisten. Es ist keine Debatte für Politiker, von denen vor allem bei den Grünen und bei den Linken, die heute leider nicht hier sind, viele noch nicht einmal ihr Geschichtsstudium erfolgreich beendet haben.

Politiker werden gewählt – und da oben sehe ich viele Leute, die wahrscheinlich eben nicht den Anspruch haben, dass hier über Geschichte debattiert wird – Politiker werden gewählt, um die Zukunft zu gestalten, nicht um über die Vergangenheit zu diskutieren, auch wenn das natürlich immer interessant ist.

Wir sollten auch nicht wie der pawlowsche Hund auf jede Provokation Putins reagieren, und über dessen Äußerungen Debatten hier im Europäischen Parlament ansetzen. Wie gesagt, ich verstehe die Empörung der Polen, aber das Europäische Parlament ist das falsche Forum für solche Geschichtsdebatten.

Dace Melbārde (ECR). – Cienītā sēdes vadītāja! Komisāres kundze, kolēģi! Pēc izglītības esmu vēsturniece, tāpēc ar prieku turpināšu šīs debates. Pagājušā gada 13. oktobrī Kremļis ar salūta zalvēm vēstija par septiņdesmit piekto gadadienu kopš Rīgas atbrīvošanas, ignorējot to, ka 13. oktobris ir izdomāts datums, jo reālas cīņas Rīgā ar vācu armiju nenotika, faktiski Sarkanā armija atkārtoti Latviju okupēja.

Tāpat Lielā Tēvijas kara varoņstāstā tiek noklusēts Staļina – Hitlera pakts, PSRS un nacistiskās Vācijas sadarbība pirmos 22 kara mēnešus un Polijas, Baltijas valstu valstiskuma iznīcināšana, kurai sekoja masu deportācijas, tā vietā, lai atzītu un nosodītu PSRS līdzatbildību kara izraisīšanā un neatkarīgu valstu iznīcināšanā.

Kremlim nepatīkamu vēstures faktu izgaismošana kā, piemēram, 2017. gadā NATO izveidots video materiāls par nacionālo partizānu pretošanos padomju režīmam Baltijā, tiek nosaukts par Rietumu atbalstu nacisma atdzimšanai. Kolēģi, mums svarīga Otrā pasaules kara atcere balstīta uz profesionālu, objektīvu vēstures vērtējumu, priekšplānā izvirzot kara upuru un totalitārismu pretinieku godināšanu, nevis kara un varmāku glorificēšanu!

Özlem Demirel (GUE/NGL). – Frau Präsidentin! „Nie wieder Faschismus, nie wieder Krieg!“ Das war der Schwur von Buchenwald. Dem fühlen wir Linken uns verpflichtet. Doch Rassisten und Faschisten, die das Leben bedrohen, Säbelraseln, Aufrüstungswahn und Krieg sind wieder bittere Realität.

Aus unserer Menschheitsgeschichte wissen wir um die Wucht des Faschismus, um die Brutalität eines Weltkrieges und um die Wichtigkeit eines antifaschistischen Widerstandes. Im September letzten Jahres aber meinte die Mehrheit in diesem Hause, Hitlerdeutschland und die Sowjetunion gleichsetzen zu können. Wer diese Geschichtsklitterung bedient, jede politische Alternative zum Kapitalismus mit der Totalitarismustheorie brandmarkt, der hat tatsächlich nichts, aber auch gar nichts aus der Geschichte gelernt. Der wird auch nichts aus der Geschichte lernen und immer und immer wieder dieselben Fehler machen.

Nein, liebe Kolleginnen und Kollegen, der ehrenvolle Kampf der Roten Armee hat uns von der dunkelsten Geschichte befreit. Wer die Geschichte nicht kennt, kann seine Zukunft nicht gestalten. Mein Dank gilt der Roten Armee, mein Dank gilt den Widerstandskämpferinnen und -kämpfern, und mein Dank gilt allen alliierten Verbündeten, die uns heute unsere freie Zukunft ermöglicht haben.

Antoni Comín i Oliveres (NI). – Señora presidenta, el proyecto europeo nacido después de la Segunda Guerra Mundial, del cual nosotros somos los herederos y que tenemos la responsabilidad de seguir impulsando, empezó a andar porque previamente las democracias liberales habían ganado a los regímenes totalitarios en aquella guerra horrible. El proyecto europeo se construyó sobre la derrota del nazismo y del fascismo. Es imposible comprender el proyecto europeo al margen de los valores de la democracia, del Estado de Derecho y de los derechos humanos que aquellos regímenes vulneraron sistemáticamente.

España, en cambio, no ha construido su democracia sobre la derrota del franquismo. El dictador murió en la cama y su herencia cultural sigue hoy muy viva. Demasiado viva. La transición española no tuvo mucho que ver con la ruptura que sí hicieron países como Alemania o Italia en los años 40 o Portugal en los años 70, que hoy son democracias asentadas y que sí rompieron con sus regímenes totalitarios previos. Y comprender esto es imprescindible para entender las raíces profundas de la deriva autoritaria en la que está embarcado hoy el Estado español.

Hoy el nacionalismo español considera que para defender la unidad de España está justificado atropellar los derechos fundamentales. Y la cúpula judicial es muy buen ejemplo de ello. Es un nacionalismo heredero, en buena medida, del nacionalismo franquista, que es el tipo de nacionalismo contra el que se ha construido la Unión Europea.

Esteban González Pons (PPE). – Señora presidenta, el señor que me ha precedido en el uso de la palabra está perseguido en España por los jueces por robar, robar dinero público. Y, sin embargo, se puede expresar libremente en este Parlamento. ¿Creen ustedes que España es un país autoritario si una persona que ha robado -y la persiguen los jueces por robar- habla libremente en este Parlamento? Más libertad, es imposible.

En este año vamos a celebrar el 75.º aniversario de muchas cosas. Entre otras cosas, del final de la Segunda Guerra Mundial. Pero la Segunda Guerra Mundial no terminó en el año 45. La Segunda Guerra Mundial terminó cuando cayó el Muro de Berlín, cuando el Ejército Rojo se retiró de los países de Europa del Este, cuando derrotamos, al mismo tiempo, al fascismo, al nacionalismo, y, sí, al comunismo.

Brando Benifei (S&D). – Signora Presidente, onorevoli colleghi, sul tema della memoria in questa legislatura il Parlamento europeo non ha dato buona prova di sé.

A settembre, contro la volontà del mio gruppo, si è deciso comunque di portare al voto una risoluzione che ha finito per essere percepita, da parte dei nostri cittadini, al di là del testo, non come una condanna dei totalitarismi ma come un'equiparazione del nazismo alla estremamente varia esperienza storica, anche in Europa, del pensiero e della politica socialcomunista.

Nonostante le mediazioni abbiano reso il testo confuso ma sostanzialmente innocuo in termini di conseguenze, molti si sono sentiti ugualmente offesi. Con loro mi scuso, perché questa Istituzione non è riuscita a dare un messaggio di una memoria condivisa.

Lasciando la storia agli storici, io dico che dobbiamo partire da ciò che su questi temi ha unito veramente il Parlamento europeo, con limpidezza. Il 25 ottobre 2018 abbiamo chiesto nettamente agli Stati membri di mettere al bando le organizzazioni neofasciste e neonaziste, ancora orgogliose della dittatura e del nostro passato.

È ora di farlo, e voglio dire al collega Panza della Lega che «Bella Ciao» è la canzone della Resistenza, non solo in Italia. La nostra Europa è nata dalla Resistenza e dal sacrificio che lui oggi ha denigrato in quest'Aula.

President. – I will say this in English because you might listen to me. You spoke so fast that the interpreters could not follow you, so I'm very sorry. Next time, a little bit slower, please. Thank you anyway.

Michal Šimečka (Renew). – Vážená pani predsedajúca, pokusy Ruska o prepisovanie dejín naozaj nie sú ničím novým a je to, bohužiaľ, úplne bežná súčasť Putinovej propagandy: nielen vo vzťahu k paktu Ribbentrop – Molotov, ale napríklad aj k roku 1968. Napriek tomu však nemôžeme ako Európska únia a ako Európsky parlament tento Putinov pokus prejsť mlčaním. Musíme znovu a jasne zopakovať historický fakt, že cynická spolupráca dvoch totalitných režimov viedla k nezmerným hrôzám, utrpeniu nielen v Poľsku, ale aj v iných okupovaných štátoch. Už len z úcty k obetiam nemôžeme mlčať a musíme stáť solidárne s Poľskom a inými štátmi, lebo ide o naše spoločné dejiny. Projekt európskej integrácie je historickou odpoveďou na mocenský cynizmus a utrpenie, ktorého symbolom je práve tento pakt. Ak dnes dovoľíme Putinovej propagande, aby spochybnila tento kritický bod našich spoločných dejín, tak to bude začiatok konca nášho projektu.

Angelo Ciocca (ID). – Signora Presidente, onorevoli colleghi, è giusto: no alle distorsioni della storia. No alle distorsioni anche, però, del presente.

La gente si chiede che cosa questa costosissima Europa ha cambiato dalla Seconda guerra mondiale ai giorni nostri, 2020. E purtroppo la risposta è nulla, nulla è stato cambiato: nella Seconda guerra mondiale vi erano le guerre con i missili, coi carrarmati, e vi erano appunto i conflitti tra gli Stati membri europei. Nel 2020 esistono le guerre economiche, le guerre commerciali e i conflitti tra gli Stati europei. Conflitti continui ci sono oggi, conflitti continui c'erano prima.

Lo vediamo anche sullo scenario drammatico della Libia: la posizione dell'Italia da una parte, la posizione della Francia dall'altra, e l'inesistente Europa che sposta lo sguardo rispetto alla guerra in Libia. Se evitare le guerre per l'Europa e per il progetto europeo è spostare lo sguardo, non è sicuramente la strada giusta.

Conflitto sull'etichettatura alimentare, conflitto addirittura sull'ora legale. Però finalmente è arrivato l'illuminante Presidente Sassoli, che toglierà i conflitti degli Stati membri togliendo le bandierine dei paesi fondatori di questa Europa dai banchi di questo Parlamento.

Voglio ricordare al Presidente chi paga questo carrozzone: sono i popoli europei e sono i paesi di questa Europa.

Reinhard Bütikofer (Verts/ALE). – Frau Präsidentin! Ich habe eine Frage zur Geschäftsordnung: Wäre es parlamentarisch zulässig, einen Redner, der sagt, es habe sich zwischen dem Zweiten Weltkrieg und heute nichts geändert, einen Spinner zu nennen?

Puhemies. – Tässä keskustelussa ei myönnätä sinisen kortin puheenvuoroja. Oliko tämä työjärjestyspuheenvuoro vai oliko tämä sininen kortti? Valitettavasti tämä jää nyt tähän.

Izabela-Helena Kloc (ECR). – Pani Przewodnicząca! Pani Komisarz! Ostatnie próby ponownego napisania historii drugiej wojny światowej przez prezydenta Władimira Putina nie są zaskoczeniem. Musimy jednak zachować czujność. Polska wraz z innymi krajami Europy Środkowej i Wschodniej jest świadkiem i ofiarą nazizmu i komunizmu. Sojusz tych dyktatorskich systemów spowodował dziesiątki milionów ofiar i straty materialne na niewyobrażalną skalę, dlatego będziemy wciąż przypominać wszystkim naszym przyjaciołom w Europie, że wolna, pokojowa i dostatnia Unia Europejska jest możliwa tylko dzięki wyzwolonym państwom, najpierw od czarnej, a później czerwonej zarazy. Flirtowanie z tymi ideologiami może mieć nieprzewidziane katastrofalne skutki. Każdy entuzjasta prezydenta Putina musi mieć to na uwadze. Zbliżenie jest możliwe tylko wtedy, gdy wolność i prawda są wzajemnie cenione. W przeciwnym razie wpadnie każdy entuzjasta Putina w tę samą starą pułapkę czerwonego cara jak wiele pokoleń myślicieli i polityków. Fundamentem relacji wzajemnych nie może być polityka historyczna, jaką prowadzi obecnie prezydent Rosji. Wymaga ona pełnego potępienia.

Sandra Pereira (GUE/NGL). – Senhora Presidente, é clara a estratégia da direita. Mobilizando a maioria no Parlamento Europeu, tenta promover o anticomunismo através da reescrita da História, difundindo as mais reacionárias concepções e falsificações.

Mas a História não se reescreve nem a verdade se altera. Não há mentira que aqui possam bradar que esconda o conluio dos grandes monopólios alemães com Hitler ou as coniventes responsabilidades das grandes potências capitalistas, como o Reino Unido ou a França, que abriram caminho ao início da Segunda Guerra Mundial.

Não há mentira que aqui vociferem que apague o papel contundente e decisivo dos comunistas e da União Soviética na derrota do nazi-fascismo, com os imensos custos, humanos e materiais, para a União Soviética, que nenhum outro país suportou.

Uma cortina de fumo que escapa ao debate sobre como as políticas da União Europeia promovem retrocessos de dimensão civilizacional, atacando direitos sociais e laborais, a soberania nacional e a democracia, e que estão, como no passado, na origem do recrudescimento de forças de extrema-direita e de cariz fascista.

Andrius Kubilius (PPE). – Madam President, today's issue is not about our understanding of history. We know very well our history and the tragedies of our history which were brought about also by Stalin. Today, we are having this debate because we were very much surprised by the recent performance of Mr Putin, by his Soviet-type propaganda attack on real history, by his strange attempts to convince everyone that Poland was guilty by itself, that Hitler and Stalin divided her and occupied her. Today we're standing together for the defence of the true history of Europe and we are standing together with Poland against this Kremlin propaganda attack.

I will end with a very simple statement. Mr Putin, you will not succeed in your attempts to divide Europe on the history issue. We are standing for the truth because truth makes you free, and that is the strength of Europe. We would like to wish the same sense of real truth and freedom upon the ordinary Russian people. The history lesson is very simple: the truth, in the end, wins. It will win also in Russia – I hope soon.

Massimiliano Smeriglio (S&D). – Signora Presidente, onorevoli colleghi, la Seconda guerra mondiale è stata scatenata dai nazionalsocialisti per affermare in Europa e nel mondo una dittatura razziale e antisemita, votata alla Shoah, cioè alla soluzione finale, la sparizione di etnie, religioni e idee politiche considerate nemiche. Contro questo pericolo si sono coalizzate forze diverse e, coalizzandosi, hanno vinto, hanno sconfitto il demone nazista.

Non è mai saggio comparare e costruire similitudini tra vicende storiche diverse e farlo per calcoli politici. Piuttosto imparare dalla storia significa cogliere gli elementi degenerativi, l'humus culturale che ha condotto alla Shoah, coglierli nel presente, e oggi il senso comune alimentato da forze di estrema destra è intriso di razzismo e antisemitismo. La nostra democrazia deve battersi oggi contro il pericolo di un nuovo fascismo.

Dovremmo dedicare questo dibattito ai milioni di persone torturate e uccise ad Auschwitz perché è lì, tra quei forni crematori, che è nata la necessità storica dell'Unione europea, contro il nazionalismo e il razzismo che sono demoni della nostra Europa.

Cristian Ghinea (Renew). – Doamnă președintă, vin din România, o țară care a suferit atât din cauza fascismului, cât și a comunismului și dați-mi voie să nu mulțumesc Armatei Roșii, așa cum spunea colega mea Demirel de la Grupul de Stânga mai devreme. Nu mulțumesc Armatei Roșii. Armata Roșie a crotopit, nu a eliberat România, Armata Roșie a omorât și a violat oameni în România.

Acest Parlament a votat o rezoluție prin care indică Pactul Ribbentrop-Molotov ca fiind una dintre cauzele izbucnirii războiului. Așa este, acest pact a permis regimului nazist să invadeze Polonia și să înceapă războiul. O parte din teritoriul României a fost, în același timp, invadată de Armata Roșie. Aceea a fost o epocă a ticăloșilor, de care trebuie să ne despărțim. Germania a dezavuat regimul nazist, domnul Putin ridică în slăvi regimul comunist. De aceea domnul Putin este un ticălos. Îmi declar solidaritatea cu Polonia în fața acestei noi agresiuni retorice.

Gilles Lebreton (ID). – Madame la Présidente, la majorité actuelle du Parlement européen est antirusse. Dans son désir d'attaquer la Russie par tous les moyens, elle a cédé à la tentation de réécrire l'histoire de la Seconde Guerre mondiale dans la résolution qu'elle a votée le 19 septembre 2019. Elle y écrit, en effet, que «la Seconde Guerre mondiale a été déclenchée comme conséquence immédiate du tristement célèbre pacte de non-agression germano-soviétique Molotov-Ribbentrop». Certes, ce pacte a existé. Il illustre les crimes dont l'URSS s'est rendue coupable tout au long de son histoire et qu'il faut dénoncer. J'ai moi-même rendu hommage à Tallinn aux 80 000 Estoniens victimes du communisme. Mais dire que ce pacte a été la principale cause de la Seconde Guerre mondiale est une déformation de l'histoire que je refuse d'accepter.

Laissez aux historiens le soin d'écrire l'histoire, mes chers collègues, cette histoire qui jugera durement votre tentative de manipulation.

Ангел Джамбазки (ECR). – Г-жо Председател, г-жо комисар, колеги, разбира се, моите симпатии са на страната на Полша и на полския народ. Полша беше окупирана от две враждебни сили и беше разделена. Полският народ, истинските им родолюбци и патриоти, се бориха с тяхната „Армия Крайова“ да защитят полската независимост и своето отечество и те трябва да бъдат поздравени.

Но когато говорим, уважаеми колеги, за фактите от Втората световна война, не трябва да премълчаваме престъпленията на болшевишките режими. И ще ви напомня някои от тях, защото те се премълчават от хората в лявата част на залата, които още веят знамената с червените петолъчки.

Нека ви напомня за българския моторен кораб „Струма“, със 767 евреи български моряци на борда, потопен от съветска подводница в Черно море. Нека ви напомня, между другото, че България е единствената държава, която спаси своите евреи по време на Втората световна война. Нека ви напомня за македонската Кървава Коледа, когато престъпният болшевишки режим на Тито изби без съд и присъда 25 хиляди българи и изсели други 130 хиляди българи, веейки червеното знаме с петолъчката. Тези престъпления трябва да бъдат напомнени, порицавани и осъждани. Вечна слава на българските герои в Македония, срам и позор за техните убийци!

Niyazi Kizilyürek (GUE/NGL). – Madam President, if our aim is to learn from the past, the first thing to recall is that nationalism, irredentism, racism and fascism mean war. Adolf Hitler pursued his war policies with these ideological tools.

The great historian, Eric Hobsbawm, is accurate when he says that the real reasons for the Second World War are two words: ‘Adolf’ and ‘Hitler’. Unfortunately, some are referring to the Molotov-Ribbentrop Pact as the main reason for this war and forget that almost all nations were involved in appeasement policy. Distortion of history only condemns us to repeat our past mistakes. For a perpetual peace, we have to learn from our own misdoings, look critically into our own history and struggle against nationalism, racism and anti-Semitism.

The construction of a common European identity should not be based on otherisation of any kind. We cannot demonise others in order to construct our own identity. What we need is to struggle against nationalism, and we need to be self-aware about our own dark pages.

Radosław Sikorski (PPE). – Pani Przewodnicząca! Głosy zarówno ze skrajnej lewicy, jak i skrajnej prawicy pokazują, że ta debata zainicjowana przez posłów Platformy Obywatelskiej i Polskiego Stronnictwa Ludowego jest bardzo potrzebna. Ja w odróżnieniu od niektórych kolegów dziwię się, że prezydent Putin zmienił zdanie, bo gdy na Westerplatte oddawał hołd Polsce jako pierwszemu krajowi napadniętemu przez Hitlera, niczego takiego nie mówił. Gdy 7 kwietnia 2010 r. oddawał hołd pomordowanym polskim jeńcom wojennym, też nie obwinił Polski. A przypominę, że Adolf Hitler także uważał, że to Polska zaczęła wojnę od prowokacji gliwickiej, która była ewidentnie operacją Abwehry. Zapytuję zatem pana prezydenta Rosji, czy naprawdę chce mówić jednym głosem z ówczesnym kanclerzem Niemiec. To zły pomysł. Myślę, że powinien zejść z tej drogi.

Juozas Olekas (S&D). – Gerbiama Pirmininke, esu lietuvis, esu kairysis, bet taip pat esu gimęs deportacijos lageryje. Todėl šiandien džiaugiuosi, kaip ir kairė, ir dešinė sako žinantys fašizmo nusikaltimus. Mes lietuviai smerkiame, nes taip pat paaukojome beveik 200 000 mūsų piliečių žydų, bet Stalinas, Stalino komunistai, dar prieš įžengiant naciams į Lietuvą jau buvo ištrėmę iš Lietuvos keliasdešimt tūkstančių mūsų piliečių, o po karo ištrėmė dar kelis šimtus ir nužudė. Todėl kai kalbama apie vieną autoritarinį režimą, žudantį žmonės – negalime pamiršti kito. Ir jeigu norime sukurti demokratinę Europą, tai turime apie tai kalbėti. Ir man atrodo labai svarbu tiems mūsų kolegoms čia, Europarlamente, kurie to nežino, kad jie tą sužinotų ir kad mes galėtume kurti demokratinę ir laisvą Europą.

Ivars Ijabs (Renew). – Cienītā sēdes vadītāja! Krievijas propagandas centieni sagrozīt Eiropas 20. gadsimta vēsturi ir patiesībā daļa no plašākas stratēģijas. Tie ir mēģinājumi graut Eiropas vienotību, atsviežot mūs visus pagātnē. Un Baltijas valstīs tas izklausās, jo īpaši briesmīgi, kad mēģina attaisnot Molotova-Ribentropa paktu un pamatot Baltijas valstu okupāciju un Polijas sadalīšanu. Šāda propaganda balstās galējā nacionālismā, ārējo ienaidnieku meklēšanā un lielvaru ietekmes sfērās.

Tieši aizsardzībai pret šādiem dēmoniem savulaik tika izveidota Eiropas Savienība, bet šodien arī dažās Eiropas Savienības valstīs pieņemtas spēkā autoritāri populistiski, kuriem šāds politikas stils šķiet pievilcīgs. Mēs nedrīkstam ļaut autokrātijai šķelt Eiropu, tādēļ Eiropas Savienības līmenī ir daudz skanīgāk jāstāsta, tas vēstures stāsts, kas ir balstīts Eiropas Savienības pamatvērtībās – cilvēktiesībās, demokrātijā un jebkura totalitārisma noliegumā.

Eiropas vēstures nams Briselē tam ir labs piemērs, tomēr ar to noteikti nav pietiekami. Paldies!

Teuvo Hakkarainen (ID). – Arvoisa puhemies, kommunismi, natsismi, islamismi, neidän ovat samaa uskontoa, hyvin verisiä. Ja siitä meidän pitäisi ottaa pikkusen oppia täällä Euroopassakin, että ei päästetä tuommoisia valtaan.

Mutta Suomen historiasta sen verran, että täällä ei ole käsitelty talvisotaa, jonka Suomi kävi täysin yksin tuota vasemmiston kehumaa puna-armeijaa vastaan. Ja se johtui täysin Stalinin ja Hitlerin etupiirijaosta. Siinä Suomi laitettiin Venäjän tai Neuvostoliiton alaisuuteen. Keskenään jakoivat sen, mutta Venäjä ei siinä onnistunut, koska Suomi sisukkaana kansana pisti vastaan. Nyt Venäjällä kirjoitetaan historiaa siihen tyyliin, että Suomi aloitti. Pieni Suomi aloitti tuon sodan, vaikka etupiirijako oli tehty jo sitä ennen, niin historiaa kirjoitetaan näin. Tästä pitäisi oppia.

Kosma Złotowski (ECR). – Pani Przewodnicząca! Oficjalna rosyjska narracja historyczna o przyczynach i przebiegu drugiej wojny światowej to seria monstrualnych kłamstw. Mają one na celu nie tylko odwrócenie uwagi od odpowiedzialności Związku Sowieckiego za wywołanie tego konfliktu, ale przede wszystkim są obliczone na skłócenie współpracy międzynarodowej. Szczególnie oburzające są zarzuty sformułowane pod adresem Polski, która była pierwszą i największą ofiarą zmyślenia Hitlera ze Stalinem. II wojna światowa nie wybuchłaby bez zawartego w sierpniu 1939 roku paktu Trzeciej Rzeszy i Związku Sowieckiego. Żadne kłamstwa Władimira Putina tego faktu nie podważą. Jeśli jakiś naród lub państwo nie potrafi wziąć odpowiedzialności za własne zbrodnie, ale przerzuca ją na ofiary tej zbrodni, nie może być wiarygodnym partnerem na arenie międzynarodowej. Kłamstwa Kremla na temat najnowszej historii Europy mówią wiele o tym jaka jest dzisiaj Rosja, ale nie mówią nic o tym, kto odpowiedzialny jest za piekło drugiej wojny światowej.

Александър Александров Йорданов (PPE). – Г-жо Председател, категорично трябва да се осъдят опитите на Путин да отрича вината на Съветския съюз за началото, но и за случилото се след края на Втората световна война.

Българската трагедия започва в началото на септември 1944 година, когато Съветският съюз ни обявява война. Руснаците и комунистите наричат тази война „освобождение“. Това е лъжа, Съветският съюз налага в България престъпен комунистически режим. Избити са десетки хиляди българи — елитът на нацията. Отворени са концлагери, провежда се незаконен Народен съд.

Днешна Русия, като приемник на Съветския съюз, дължи извинение не само на Полша и балтийските държави, но и на България. Призовавам обединена Европа да не допуска отделни държави да флиртуват с днешния режим в Кремъл. Необходимо е да се противопоставим на руската хибридна война срещу Европа. Надявам се, че няма да има европейски лидери, които тази година на девети май да бъдат на т. нар. „Парад на победата“ в Москва.

Петър Витанов (S&D). – Г-жо Председател, през септември миналата година в тази зала се прие резолюция за значението на европейската историческа памет за бъдещето на Европа, където за виновник за Втората световна война е обявен пактът „Рибентроп – Молотов“, а комунизмът и нацизмът са приравнени.

В резолюцията изобщо не се споменават понятията фашизъм, антифашизъм и антифашистка съпротива. Да, ние не трябва да отричаме пагубния ефект на пакта от 1939 г., но не бива да игнорираме изцяло историческите факти като сключените съглашателски споразумения между нацистка Германия и Великобритания, Франция, Дания, Полша, Литва, Латвия, Естония, както и позорното Мюнхенско споразумение, предопределяло по-нататъшната агресия на Хитлер.

Тук въпросът не е за Русия и руската пропаганда, а за нас самите. Пренаписвайки историята, ние нанасяме удар върху собствената си достоверност. Директният трансфер на история към политика води до подмяна на историческата истина и директно към реваншизъм, който вече е видим в много страни в Европа. Той оправдава престъпленията, които нацизмът извърши срещу човечеството, и насърчава възраждането на неонацизма, на който ние в Европа категорично трябва да се противопоставим.

Urmas Paet (Renew). – Austatud istungi juhataja! Teise maailmasõjani viinud sündmused ja Teine maailmasõda olid väga traagilised kõigile Euroopa rahvastele. Genotsiid, holokaust ja mitme Euroopa riigi iseseisvuse kaotus aastakümneteks Nõukogude okupatsiooni tõttu. On terve rida Euroopa riike, kelle inimesed kannatasid nii Natsi-Saksamaa kui ka Nõukogude okupatsiooni ja repressioonide all. Seetõttu on täiesti kohatu – nüüd aastakümneid hiljem – püüda õigustada diktaatorite Hitleri ja Stalini kuritegusid ja kokkuleppeid ning püüda otsida neile justkui õigustust. Paljud Euroopa rahvad kaotasid oma iseseisvuse aastakümneteks ja kaotasid ka kümneid või sadu tuhandeid inimesi. Ja sellest karmist kogemusest tuleb õppida. See põlvkond inimesi on meie seast kadumas, kel on isiklik mälestus sellest, mis nendele kuritegudele eelnes ja kuidas see võimalikuks sai, mis Euroopa ühiskondades muutus. Seetõttu on eriti oluline, et ka uutele põlvkondadele jõuaks kohale mõistmine, mis Euroopa juhtus ja mis võimaldas nii Hitleri kui ka Stalini juhtitud režiimidel kuritegusid teha. Ja sellele ei aita kuidagi kaasa katsed ajalugu ümber kirjutada ja õigustada nende diktaatorite sooritatud

kuritegusid.

Marco Dreosto (ID). – Signora Presidente, onorevoli colleghi, la peggiore forma di distorsione storica è il silenzio.

Per mezzo secolo l'Italia e l'Europa hanno voluto dimenticare cosa è successo a migliaia di italiani costretti ad abbandonare le loro case e i loro beni in Istria, a Fiume e in Dalmazia. I libri di storia hanno ommesso le decine di migliaia di italiani brutalmente assassinati nelle foibe carsiche dai partigiani titini.

Oggi molti vogliono continuare a dimenticare: comunisti del terzo millennio continuano a chiamare fascista Norma Cossetto, giovane studentessa di lettere e filosofia violentata brutalmente dai partigiani jugoslavi per la sola colpa di essere italiana; spettacoli teatrali come «Magazzino 18» di Simone Cristicchi sono boicottati dai centri sociali e dalla sinistra e film come «Red Land» hanno difficoltà a trovare spazio nelle sale e nei palinsesti televisivi.

«Prigionieri del silenzio» si intitola un libro di Giampaolo Pansa, giornalista italiano recentemente scomparso, che rompe il silenzio nella sinistra italiana per parlare proprio di questi temi. «Prigionieri del silenzio» sono coloro a cui, come ha ricordato il nostro Presidente della Repubblica Sergio Mattarella, la distorsione della storia ha perfino precluso il conforto del ricordo e della memoria.

Raffaele Stancanelli (ECR). – Signora Presidente, onorevoli colleghi, voglio approfittare di questo interessante dibattito sulla distorsione della storia europea per ricordare anche io Giampaolo Pansa, uno dei più apprezzati giornalisti italiani, deceduto domenica scorsa e che non apparteneva alla mia parte politica: un giornalista di sinistra.

Pansa ha avuto il coraggio di andare controcorrente, rileggendo alcune delle pagine più controverse della storia italiana del Novecento. Il suo saggio del 2003 intitolato «Il sangue dei vinti», nel quale raccontava i crimini compiuti dai partigiani comunisti dopo il 1945, gli è costato l'accusa di revisionismo da parte della sinistra e di alcune forze politiche che amano definirsi democratiche. In realtà non si trattò affatto di revisionismo ma della corretta narrazione di fatti accaduti a cavallo e dopo la Seconda guerra mondiale.

La destra italiana è stata per decenni tenuta lontana dall'esercizio delle responsabilità di governo a causa di una *conventio ad excludendum* fondata sull'utilizzo della storia a fini politici. Noi vogliamo che questo non accada più.

Eugen Tomac (PPE). – Doamnă președintă, ne-am reunit în această dezbateră tocmai pentru că Președintele Putin este nemulțumit de activitatea noastră. Anul trecut, printr-o rezoluție, am condamnat înțelegerea dintre cei doi tirani, Hitler și Stalin, înțelegere care a culminat cu anexarea Țărilor Baltice, ocuparea Poloniei și, bineînțeles, a țării mele, România. Prin această înțelegere secretă, țara mea și-a pierdut teritoriile care niciodată nu au mai fost înapoiate.

Nu vorbesc acest lucru din manuale. Eu sunt unul dintre cei care s-au născut într-un teritoriu anexat de URSS și astăzi, românii din Basarabia sunt supuși acestui sistem de propagandă pe care Putin îl apără. Am spus-o tot timpul către politicienii ruși, către cei de la Moscova: această propagandă trebuie să înceteze. Răspunsul lor a fost să primesc o interdicție de intrare în Federația Rusă. Trebuie să luptăm mai departe pentru adevăr, trebuie să luptăm pentru a ne păstra vie memoria înaintașilor noștri.

Domènec Ruiz Devesa (S&D). – Señora presidenta, la verdad es que este debate me parece oportuno porque ha habido un intento de falsificar la historia y, desgraciadamente, esto ocurre con mucha frecuencia.

Esta misma mañana, en la Cámara, la señora Widdecombe, del partido del *Brexit*, ha dicho que el proyecto original de la Unión Europea era una asociación de libre cambio y que, si no hubiéramos avanzado en la integración, el Reino Unido seguiría con nosotros. Bueno, es una clara falsedad. El proyecto de integración europea ha sido, desde el principio, de carácter supranacional y la Declaración de Schuman decía, precisamente, ya en el año 1950, que era el primer paso para una federación para Europa.

Pero este debate también pone de relieve que, cuando vemos la historia desde nuestra perspectiva nacional, siempre vemos las atrocidades que cometen los otros y tendemos a oscurecer las que han cometido nuestros antepasados. Por eso lo que necesitamos es una historia europea compartida, que ponga de relieve las tragedias y las cosas buenas que hemos hecho todos los europeos.

Petras Auštrevičius (Renew). – Gerb. Pirmininke, Komisare, kolegos, istorija tampa politikos įrankiu, kada ja naudoja šovinizistai ir nacionalpopulistai, siekiantys ją perrašyti. Rusijoje istorija naudojama siekiant nuteikti šalies gyventojus prieš Europos valstybes, taip pat nukreipti piliečių dėmesį nuo dabartinių problemų. Istorijos iškraipymas neįmanomas nepašalinus tiesos ieškotojų. Šį penktadienį Rusijoje bus skelbiamas teismo nuosprendis organizacijos „Memorial“ istorikui ir žmogaus teisių kovotojų Jurijui Dmitrijevui. J. Dmitrijevas savo gyvenimą paskyrė Stalino represijų aukų atminimo išsaugojimui. O jų yra milijonai. Jo dėka Karelijos regione buvo atrastos masinės stalinizmo aukų kapavietės. Netrukus valdžia paskleidė gandą, kad atrastose kapavietėse palaidotos ne sovietinio teroro aukos, bet suomių nužudyti Raudonosios armijos kariai. Pateikus melagingus kaltinimus J. Dmitrijevas buvo netrukus suimtas. Tai bandymas ištrinti stalinizmo nusikaltimus ir Putinas perima tai kaip Stalino veiklos metodus. Vertinant šį ir kitus istorijos iškraipymo atvejus tampa akivaizdu, kad Molotovo-Ribentropo pakto šmėklų gerbėjai siekia manipuliuoti ir XXI amžiaus istorija.

Ačiū

Zbigniew Kuźmiuk (ECR). – Pani Przewodnicząca! Pani Komisarz! We wrześniu 2019 roku w 80. rocznicę wybuchu II wojny światowej Parlament Europejski przyjął rezolucję jednoznacznie wskazującą, że pakt o nieagresji podpisany 23 sierpnia 1939 roku przez nazistowskie Niemcy i Związek Sowiecki, znany jako pakt Ribbentrop-Mołotow, oraz załączony do niego tajny protokół dodatkowy, w którym oba totalitarne reżimy podzieliły Europę i terytoria niezależnych państw na swoje strefy interesów, był bezpośrednią przyczyną wybuchu tej wojny. W rezultacie tego paktu Polska została zaatakowana przez Niemcy 1 września 1939 roku, a 17 września przez Związek Sowiecki zaatakowane zostały także inne kraje Europy Środkowo-Wschodniej.

W reakcji na tę rezolucję obecny prezydent Federacji Rosyjskiej Władimir Putin już kilkakrotnie w publicznych wypowiedziach kwestionował te historyczne fakty, próbując obciążać także mój kraj, Polskę, odpowiedzialnością za wybuch II wojny światowej. Parlament powinien po raz kolejny potępić rosyjskie próby fałszowania historii i tuszowania popełnionych zbrodni przez sowiecki totalitarny reżim i zobowiązać Komisję do zdecydowanego przeciwdziałania tego rodzaju staraniom.

Peter Pollák (PPE). – Vážená pani predsedajúca, o pár dní, presne 27. januára, si pripomenieme 75. výročie od oslobodenia koncentračného tábora v Osvienčime. Tábora, kde nacisti zabili milióny nevinných ľudí, a to len kvôli tomu, že mnohí uverili alebo minimálne nič neurobili voči diablovi, Adolfovi Hitlerovi, najmä jeho myšlienkam o nadradenej rase. Neexistuje žiadna nadradená rasa. Neexistuje žiadny podradný človek. Milióny ľudí zomreli len kvôli tomu, že boli Rómovia či Židia. Ak by Hitler vyhral vojnu, ja by som tu dnes nebol, lebo som Róm. Je hanbou tohto parlamentu, že aj v tejto miestnosti sedia ľudia, ktorí popierajú holokaust. Vážení fašisti, holokaust sa stal. Nevymýšľajte si a neprekrúcajte tragické udalosti počas druhej svetovej vojny. Počas druhej svetovej vojny zomierali ľudia aj kvôli tomu, že mnohí boli ticho. My dnes nemôžeme byť ticho. Dnes nemôžeme byť ticho vtedy, keď fašisti prekrúcajú minulosť a hlásia nenávisť. Nemôžeme byť ticho, nemôžeme akceptovať akúkoľvek nenávisť kvôli inakosti. Pretože nenávisť je cestou do pekla.

Ruža Tomašić (ECR). – Poštovana predsedavajuća, Drugi svjetski rat ostavio je neizbrisiv trag na Europi. Danas, iako sjedimo za istim stolom i živimo u miru i međusobnom uvažavanju, ne trebamo zaboraviti da prije a ni poslije tog rata naše pozicije nisu bile jednake.

Neki su imali imperijalističke ambicije, neki su u suradnji s njima vidjeli rješenje svog nacionalnog pitanja. Neki su se od tih ambicija branili, a neki su bili obično „topovsko meso“. Na kraju krajeva, nismo svi imali ni iste osloboditelje. Jedni su doista oslobođeni terora od zapadnih, demokratskih sila, a drugi su nanovo zarobljeni od komunista. Drugi svjetski rat obuhvaća niz lokalnih sukoba koji su imali potpuno drukčiju povijesnu podlogu.

Kad sve to uzmemo u obzir, jasno je zašto je sjećanje na taj rat ponešto drukčije diljem Europe. Ono što je najvažnije je da zločini i zločinačke ideologije budu osuđeni i da se jasno ogradimo od svakog totalitarizma, bilo nacističkog, fašističkog ili komunističkog.

Rasa Juknevičienė (PPE). – Gerbiama Pirmininke, aš noriu pradėti linksmiau. Visų pirma noriu padėkoti Rusijos prezidentui Putinui už tai, kad jis padarė didžiulę reklamą mūsų inicijuotai ir priimtai Europos Parlamento rezolucijai. Antra, Putinas rėmėsi Rusijoje vis dar įslaptintų archyvų medžiaga, naudojo juos kaip informacinio karo įrankį. Siūlau prezidentui Putinui ne selektyviai, bet visiškai atverti Stalino laikų archyvus. Turime žinoti, kaip Stalinas atsisakė priimti žydus iš Hitlerio okupuotos Lenkijos 1939 m. Putinas galėtų nurodyti grąžinti Lietuvai 1991 m. pavogtus KGB archyvus. Norime žinoti, kaip Maskvos kalėjime buvo nužudytas antisovietinio pasipriešinimo vadas lietuvis Jonas Žemaitis. Pasaulis turi žinoti, kaip 1944 m. Raudonajai armijai buvo leista žaginti moteris, naikinti civilius vos peržengus Karaliaučiaus krašto sieną. Kaip pjaustė nėščią moterų pilvus ir traukė iš jų negimusius naujagimius. Tačiau vietoje to mes matome Kremliaus skatinamą Stalino garbinimą. Totalitarizmas prasideda nuo melo. Mūsų priedermė – ginti tiesą, kad apgintume iškovotą taiką.

Lucia Ďuriš Nicholsonová (ECR). – Vážená pani predsedajúca, v dvadsiatom storočí priniesli nacistické, ale aj komunistické režimy masové vraždy, genocídu, deportácie a obrovské straty na životoch. Mali by byť dostatočným varovaním pre budúce generácie, ale nie sú. Aj v mojej vlastnej krajine vymenili neofašisti svoje ľudácke uniformy za obleky a premiestnili sa do parlamentu – aj sem do Európskeho parlamentu. Politik, ktorý otvorene propaguje komunizmus, zločineckú ideológiu, je šéfom parlamentného výboru pre vzťahy s Európskou úniou. Hanbím sa za to. Ale zároveň chcem, aby to bol pre nás všetkých budíček. Preto musíme začať riešiť skutočné príčiny podpory extrémistov, a to je korupcia, nedostatočná mediálna gramotnosť, neuspokojivé vzdelávanie o histórii a v neposlednom rade aj naša tolerancia k politikom, ktorí majú pochybnosti o holokauste a šíria bludy a nenávisť, ktorá je základom pre epidémiu extrémizmu.

Michaela Šojdrová (PPE). – Paní předsedající, dovolu mi připomenout, že pakt Molotov-Ribbentrop byl vlastně demonstrací toho, jak mají totalitní režimy k sobě blízko. Napadení Polska z obou stran, Německem i Sovětským svazem, v září 1939 nám dává právo považovat také Sovětský svaz vlastně za agresora, a to přesto, že nakonec zásadně přispěl k porážce Německa a přinesl také velké lidské oběti. Ruský prezident Putin a i někteří čeští komunisté zpochybňují skutečnou podstatu paktu Molotov-Ribbentrop. A navíc obviňují Polsko, že vlastně bylo agresorem, protože se ve 30. letech spojilo s Německem. To je lež.

Je voudrais répondre à M Lebreton, qui est parti, que nous ne sommes pas antirusses. Nous voulons dire que nous sommes contre les mensonges historiques du président Poutine parce que nous ne voulons pas que les guerres et les dictatures se répètent en Europe et nous voulons transmettre ce rappel aux générations futures.

Javier Zarzalejos (PPE). – Señora presidenta, cuando hablamos del pasado desde una institución política, no podemos olvidar que no somos historiadores. Pero sí somos producto de la historia. Y para ser fieles a esta historia no podemos olvidar —recordando el verso del poeta argentino Jorge Luis Borges a propósito de Buenos Aires— que a Europa no le unió el amor, sino el espanto. El espanto del Holocausto, de la destrucción. El espanto del nacionalismo supremacista, que hoy todavía cuenta con herederos en esta Cámara que se permiten dar lecciones a una democracia ejemplar como la española. El espanto del nazismo y del comunismo. El espanto de Molotov y von Ribbentrop.

Por eso tenemos que estar vigilantes ante los intentos de distorsión de la historia europea. Ante los intentos de blanquear el crimen masivo de los campos de exterminio nazi o del Gulag soviético. Porque el sufrimiento de los europeos a manos de estos regímenes criminales no es negociable. Ese sufrimiento de los europeos es la materia misma de la que está hecha esta Unión como proyecto de paz y libertad.

Věra Jourová, Vice-President of the Commission. – Madam President, I'd like to thank the honourable Members for their views. Allow me to repeat, in conclusion, that if one Member State were singled out in efforts to distort its historical role, the European Commission would always protest and counter disinformation and fake information, while preserving freedom of the press and media pluralism.

Hannah Arendt famously noticed 'the ideal subject of totalitarian rule is not the convinced Nazi or the convinced Communist, but people for whom the distinction between fact and fiction and the distinction between true and false no longer exist'. I want to fulfil my mission to build up the resilience of our democratic systems by strongly focusing on education, plurality of media and, in particular, by keeping close to the facts and evidence. Only through clear and loud action can we keep the distinction between true and false.

Allow me to express hope that, with the approaching a 75th anniversary of the end of the worst war in the history of humanity, we will not see the multiplication of efforts to distort history of the event and to mask victims as perpetrators.

ΠΡΟΕΔΡΙΑ: ΔΗΜΗΤΡΙΟΣ ΠΑΠΑΔΗΜΟΥΛΗΣ

Αντιπρόεδρος

Nikolina Brnjac, *President-in-Office of the Council*. – Mr President, we need to learn a lot from our history in these times in which our common values are fragile and need to be upheld. The future of Europe should be based on our common values, mutual understanding of our tradition and shared awareness of the history of Europe, including totalitarianism. Thank you very much once again for your attention.

Πρόεδρος. – Η συζήτηση έληξε.

Γραπτές δηλώσεις (άρθρο 171 του Κανονισμού)

Dominique Bilde (ID), *par écrit*. – Il est tout à fait à propos d'évoquer les déformations de l'Histoire au sein d'un Parlement européen qui, dans ce domaine même, s'est particulièrement illustré. On peut avoir des avis divergents sur le déroulement du dernier conflit mondial, et il est évident que le totalitarisme, quel qu'il soit, doit susciter de notre part la condamnation la plus ferme. Mais charge à nous également de reconnaître sans passion et sans parti pris à qui l'Europe doit véritablement sa libération du joug nazi: c'est-à-dire à l'ensemble des forces alliées, aux États-Unis et à la Russie éternelle, qui du haut de ses quelque vingt-sept millions de morts, aura payé la victoire au prix fort. À ce titre, la résolution du 19 septembre 2019, texte éminemment politique et sans nuances, ne grandit en rien notre institution. Il a du reste été largement commenté en Russie, jusqu'au président Vladimir Poutine lui-même, compromettant durablement nos relations avec cette grande puissance, désormais incontournable sur la scène internationale. La vérité historique s'accommode mal des querelles idéologiques ou de nos préjugés. Mieux, elle doit relever du seul débat des historiens, loin des divisions et clivages partisans.

Elżbieta Kruk (ECR), *na piśmie*. – Niedawno przegłosowaliśmy rezolucję PE potępiającą pakt Ribbentrop-Mołotow jako przyczynę niemieckiego najazdu na Polskę i rozpętania II wojny światowej. Przypomnieliśmy bohaterską walkę Polaków z dwoma agresywnymi totalitaryzmami – narodowym socjalizmem i komunizmem. Nie spodobało się to najwyraźniej pułkownikowi KGB, prezydentowi Władimirowi Putinowi.

Dziś powracamy do walki o pamięć wskutek wojny informacyjnej, którą Putin wytoczył Polsce i państwom Europy Środkowej i Wschodniej. Należałoby w związku z tym zapytać prezydenta Putina, gdzie ćwiczyli niemieccy czołgiści, nim Hitler wypowiedział traktat wersalski i Niemcy mogli posiadać czołgi? Gdzie sztuki dowodzenia oddziałami pancernymi uczył się Heinz Guderian? Kto zapewnił władzę Hitlerowi, zakazując sojuszu komunistów z socjaldemokratami w 1932 roku, choć to mogło raz i na zawsze pogрузić NSDAP? Czyż nie bolszewicka Rosja, czyż nie Stalin?

Izraelski dziennikarz Eldad Beck tak podpowiada Putinowi temat wystąpienia w Jerozolimie podczas V Światowego Forum Holokaustu: „75 lat temu Związek Radziecki aresztował Sprawiedliwego wśród Narodów Świata Raoula Wallenberga. To coś, o czym powinien mówić prezydent Putin, jak i o innych zbrodniach antysemickich popełnionych przez Sowietów przed, podczas i po II wojnie światowej”.

Kłamliwie słowa Putina przeniosły „wojnę historyczną” na forum PE. Może wreszcie doczekamy się potępienia zbrodni komunistycznych ZSRR, którego spadkobierczynią jawi się putinowska Rosja.

Bronis Ropė (Verts/ALE), raštu. – Istorijos perrašymas negali ir neturi būti politinė veikla. Ilgus dešimtmečius Sovietų Sąjunga naikino istorinius pastatus, kontroliavo švietimo sistemas, diegė naujas vertybes propagandinio meno, literatūros pagalba bei užtikrino griežtą cenzūrą. Baugindama ji stengėsi valdyti žmonių gyvenimus ir mintis. Šiandien Kremlius, pasitelkdamas tuos pačius sovietinės propagandos metodus, imasi perrašyti istoriją – nurodydamas nukabinti atminimo lentas, kontroliuodamas universitetuose dirbančius žmones, neretai pasitelkdamas ir politikams paklūstančią teisėsaugą – kaip tai daroma sausio 13-osios bylos atveju. Pasitelkiami visi turimi kanalai – tikintis, kad kartojant tas pačias mintis – jos prigis visuomenėje. Todėl šiandien ypač svarbi mūsų reakcija. Ar mes leidžiame Kremliui valdomai žiniasklaidai laisvai skleisti propagandą Europos Sąjungos valstybėse, ar ne. Ar mes atveriamė kelius paslėptus tikslus turintiems „kultūros projektams“ ir, pagaliau, ar mes dalyvaujame antrojo pasaulinio karo minėjimo renginiuose Rusijoje ir nuleidę galvas tylime, kai mums teigiama, kad Molotovo-Ribentropo paktas ir Europos pasidalinimas buvo strategiškai svarbus žingsnis.

16. Wysłuchania w toku prowadzone na mocy art. 7 ust. 1 TUE w sprawie Węgier (debata)

Πρόεδρος. – Το επόμενο σημείο στην ημερήσια διάταξη είναι η συζήτηση επί των δηλώσεων του Συμβουλίου και της Επιτροπής σχετικά με τις εν εξελίξει ακροάσεις σύμφωνα με το άρθρο 7 παράγραφος 1 ΣΕΕ σχετικά με την Ουγγαρία (2019/2986(RSP)).

Nikolina Brnjac, President-in-Office of the Council. – Mr President, respect for the rule of law, a pillar of our common values, is at the very heart of our Union. It directly influences the daily lives of our citizens and the environment in which our businesses operate. Shortcomings in this area make our societies and our Union more vulnerable, both internally and externally. The very fabric for our societies rests on democracy, the rule of law and fundamental rights. These elements are interlinked, interdependent and mutually reinforcing. One cannot exist without the others.

Article 2(1) procedures are ongoing. One regarding Poland, and the other regarding Hungary. Concerning the procedure with regard to Hungary, which was triggered by the recent proposal of the European Parliament in September 2018, two hearings took place last semester at the General Affairs Council on 16 September and 10 December 2019.

The first hearing was general in scope and covered all the issues raised in the European Parliament's recent proposal. The second hearing focused on specific topics: freedom of expression, including media pluralism, academic freedom and independence of the judiciary, as laid down in the standard modalities for hearings as referred to in Article 7, approved by the Council. Last July, the Finnish Presidency updated the Parliament on this procedure and conveyed the Parliament's views during Hungary's first hearing.

Ahead of this first hearing on 4 September, together with representatives from Croatia and Germany, the Finnish Presidency also met the chair of the LIBE Committee and rapporteur for this file. On 10 December, right before the second hearing, an informal exchange between the ministers and the European Parliament took place. On that occasion, Parliament had the opportunity to present its recent proposal and views on the recent developments in Hungary.

To conclude, during the Croatian Presidency, it is our intention to continue to keep the Parliament regularly informed on the developments concerning the Article 7 procedure regarding Hungary.

Věra Jourová, Vice-President of the Commission. – Mr President, honourable Members, thank you for including on today's agenda a debate on the situation in Hungary. It is essential that all EU institutions contribute, within their respective roles, to upholding the rule of law in the EU. In November, President Ursula von der Leyen recalled in this House that the rule of law is our foundation and can never be compromised. We must ensure that it is respected and upheld everywhere, with every country treated equally. She added that we must focus on dialogue and prevention but never hesitate to take all necessary measures.

As regards the situation in Hungary, the Commission has already explained on different occasions that it shares an important number of concerns expressed by the European Parliament in its recent proposal triggering the Article 7 procedure. The Commission has also made very clear that, whatever position the Council will be taking on the Article 7 procedure, it must ensure a fair handling of the reasoned proposal put forward by the European Parliament. Most recently, the Commission stressed this again during the hearing of Hungary in the General Affairs Council on 10 December. Let me briefly update you on developments in Hungary that have occurred in a number of areas covered by the European Parliament's reasoned opinion.

In the area of the rule of law, new legislation with substantial changes to the structure and functioning of the judicial system was adopted on 10 December without public consultation or consultation of the Venice Commission. We are assessing that legislation. On 10 September 2019, the Hungarian Supreme Court issued a judgment declaring unlawful an order by a district court judge requesting a preliminary ruling of the Court of Justice. This may have an impact on the EU preliminary reference mechanism. The National Judicial Council is still facing difficulties in counterbalancing the power of the President of the National Office for the Judiciary, who is in charge of the management of the judicial system.

In the area of media pluralism, last December, six international organisations of journalists and media published a report stating that, since 2010, the Hungarian Government has systematically dismantled media pluralism, in particular because media ownership is concentrated in the hands of the Government and the media market is distorted by state advertising. And further developments raised concerns. The impact of the merger of more than 400 media outlets into one single holding has been analysed by a report published in July by the Centre for Media Pluralism and Media Freedom (CMPF). This report concluded that the establishment of this merger will exacerbate the overall risk to media pluralism in Hungary. The report pointed to the government decision to exempt the merger from the scrutiny of both the National Competition Authority and the Media Authority.

As regards academic freedom, you will be aware that the Central European University had to relocate its US-accredited academic programmes from Budapest to Vienna. Also, a new law on the financing of research has been criticised by the national and international scientific community because it detached 15 academic research institutes from the independent Hungarian Academy of Sciences.

The Commission is following closely all these developments and has already shown that it is determined to use all the instruments at its disposal to address the concerns raised by certain measures adopted by the Hungarian authorities. In particular, the Commission has launched a number of infringement proceedings against Hungary. These relate to the rights of civil society organisations, academic freedom and the rights of migrants and asylum seekers. The Commission is also using other instruments such as the European Semester. On 9 July 2019, the Council, following a Commission proposal, recommended that Hungary strengthen judicial independence and reinforce its anti-corruption framework, including by improving prosecutorial efforts and access to public information.

To conclude, I would like to recall that the Commission remains available to engage with the Hungarian authorities on resolving rule-of-law issues. This is a matter of common interest for the EU, the Member States and citizens.

Roberta Metsola, *fisem il-grupp PPE*. – Sur President, ergajna qeghdin niddiskutu s-saltna tad-dritt. Huwa ta' thassib li dan is-sugġett qieghed jerga' jqum.

Il-pożizzjoni tal-Partit Popolari Ewropew dejjem kienet ċara u konsistenti, ma' kull pajjiż. Irridu li s-saltna tad-dritt tkun imharsa dejjem, f'kull żmien, b'mod ċar u bi proċeduri trasparenti. Hekk konna nemmnu u hekk jibqa' t-twemmin taghna. Ghalix minghajr ir-rule of law l-istituzzjonijiet jiġġarrfu, il-protezzjoni taċ-ċittadin titmermer, il-fiduċja fil-pajjiż tonqos.

Iċ-ċittadinanza Ewropea tfisser ċittadin protett bid-drittijiet tieghu garantiti u dan huwa l-qofol ta' dak li hija l-Unjoni Ewropea. U ghalhekk din l-Unjoni, dan il-Parlament ghandu jkun l-ghassies tas-saltna tad-dritt. Ahna rridu nkunu fuq in-naħa taċ-ċittadini Ewropej, fuq in-naħa tas-sewwa, fuq in-naħa tal-ġustizzja u ma' dan m'ghandux ikun hemm kompromessi, la minn xi pajjiż u lanqas mill-Unjoni Ewropea u l-istituzzjonijiet tagħha.

Il-Kummissjoni Ewropea, min-naha taghha, trid ukoll tibqa' thares il-valur tas-saltna tad-dritt. Qatt m'huwa accettabbli li xi pajjiż jiggarrantixxi s-saltna tad-dritt u oħrajn le. Il-valuri li fuqhom hija mibnija l-Unjoni Ewropea għandhom jibqgħu jgħaqqdu lill-pajjiżi flimkien u, filwaqt li nassiguraw dan, irridu li jissahħu l-mekkanizmi li bihom is-saltna tad-dritt tkun imharsa. Il-metodi li huma wżati bħalissa ma jagħtux fiduċja neċessarja liċ-ċittadini Ewropej. Hemm bżonn ta' bidla, bidla li ma tistax tistenna. Hemm bżonn li jiddaħhal mekkanizmu ta' skrutinju li jkun japplika għall-pajjiżi kollha bl-istess mod, bl-istess kejl.

Biex nikkonkludi, kull pajjiż għandu jkun taht il-lenti kontinwament. Hekk inkunu verament qegħdin nirrappreżentaw dawk li eleggawna. Hekk inkunu qegħdin niproteġu liċ-ċittadini tagħna kontra min jipprova jnawwar is-saltna tad-dritt.

Sylwia Spurek, *on behalf of the S&D Group*. – Mr President, 17 months have now elapsed since the procedure against Hungary under Article 7 was triggered. Has it changed the situation in Hungary? Back then, the European Parliament claimed that Hungarian authorities were limiting the freedom of media, the judiciary and universities, denounced its corruption and violations of minority rights.

In the Committee on Civil Liberties, Justice and Home Affairs (LIBE), we are now working on a report on the situation in Hungary, but even without that report, the situation is clear. Hearings held under Article 7 brought no progress. Of course, this is not only a problem in Hungary because, likewise, Article 7 is ineffective with regard to the situation in Poland. Let's face it, the European Union now has no capacity to quickly restore the rule of law in its Member States. This is why the time has come for a new mechanism. To begin with, let's tie the extent of the country's compliance with the rule of law to EU funds.

Ramona Strugariu, *on behalf of the Renew Group*. – *(start of speech off mike)* Mr President, I came here with the thought of actually saying that, while we welcome the hearings organised by the Council, we are concerned about the lack of involvement of the European Parliament and about the next steps in the procedure, and so on, but I really don't want to talk about procedure. I have changed my mind. I want to talk about the fact that it is a disgrace what you are doing to your own country, Mr Orbán. It is a disgrace what you are doing to the place that Hungary deserves in Europe. It's a disgrace what you are doing to media freedom, to academic freedom, to artistic freedom, to civil society, to all kinds of freedom. You know, nobody made anyone join the European Union. It is a choice towards progress and a commitment to European values that your country made and you disrespect this choice. You disrespect it.

Hungary grew and developed so beautifully using and with the help of European money. So did Poland. And now you are literally building empires of hate, of disinformation and of manipulation using European money. You are a disgrace and, by all means, if we don't have enough procedure then we should make procedure. If we don't have legislation then we should make legislation, and take every measure needed to prevent you and anyone embarrassing their own country in this way.

Perhaps just a last thought for the Council: you know, sincere cooperation and transparency do not hurt, particularly if they serve the best interests of the citizens and of the Union and European values.

(Applause)

Gwendoline Delbos-Corfield, *au nom du groupe Verts/ALE*. – Monsieur le Président, en tant que rapporteure du Parlement sur le dossier de la Hongrie, je voudrais rappeler que la présidence finlandaise a fait un travail sérieux, déterminé et courageux. J'espère un comportement équivalent de la présidence croate.

La procédure prévue à l'article 7, paragraphe 1, du traité de l'Union européenne concernant la Hongrie doit continuer. Nous avons été inquiets à un moment que la situation soit extrêmement figée. Grâce aux auditions organisées par la présidence finlandaise, nous avons vu une petite évolution, simplement une petite évolution. Nous invitons aujourd'hui les présidences croate et allemande à poursuivre le bon travail effectué par les Finlandais. Ces auditions étaient une première étape importante, parce que ce n'était pas facile pour des pairs d'évaluer un autre État membre et, bien sûr, nous avons innové d'une manière assez spectaculaire. Nous devons continuer sur ce chemin-là. Une autre audition est peut-être envisageable, notamment sur la question de l'utilisation des fonds de l'Union européenne, qui pourrait être un prochain sujet. Madame Jourová, vous avez évoqué la question de l'indépendance des médias. Serait-il possible que les fonds européens aient été utilisés pour permettre la concentration des médias en Hongrie? C'est une question que nous devrions nous poser.

Je voudrais aussi, et je me dois de le faire, rappeler ici, comme l'a dit M^{me} Strugariu, que nous avons aussi un problème institutionnel. Le Parlement n'est toujours pas reçu de manière officielle lors de ces auditions: nous pouvons là aussi nous améliorer.

Cette résolution, que nous allons voter demain, évoque deux procédures: l'une déclenchée contre la Pologne, l'autre contre la Hongrie. Il y a une injustice de traitement dans les deux cas. Dans le cas de la Pologne, la Commission est entendue. Dans le cas de la Hongrie, nous –le Parlement– n'avons pas encore été entendus de manière officielle, et les réunions informelles ne sont pas satisfaisantes. Cela ne peut pas continuer: vous êtes en train de créer un précédent qui permet de ne pas instaurer une égalité entre nos trois institutions, et cela doit cesser.

Jérôme Rivière, *au nom du groupe ID*. – Monsieur le Président, dans cette affaire de mise en œuvre de l'article 7 contre la Hongrie, la Commission n'a de rôle que pour assurer le secrétariat du Conseil, parce que c'est bien aux nations souveraines et à elles seules qu'il appartiendra de trancher ce débat, qui n'est en rien juridique mais bel et bien politique.

Alors que le Parlement européen s'est précipité pour enclencher une procédure contre un État membre dont les dirigeants sont démocratiquement élus, les rageux fédéralistes qui n'en peuvent plus des succès électoraux successifs de Viktor Orbán voudraient agir dans cet hémicycle, mais les traités ne le permettent pas. Le Fidesz avec son Premier ministre a réalisé le plus gros score lors des élections européennes, près de 50 % des voix. Cet acharnement contre la Hongrie est en vérité né du refus légitime, intelligent et courageux de Viktor Orbán de refuser la politique suicidaire de répartition de migrants dans l'Union européenne. La loi «Stop Soros» n'est qu'un mauvais prétexte: vous voir protester contre cette loi, qui renforce la transparence relative au financement des ONG, montre votre absolue mauvaise foi. À longueur de textes et de motions, vous dénoncez la supposée ingérence de la Russie dans la vie politique des nations, et alors que cette loi hongroise met en œuvre une solution concrète de transparence, vous la trouvez antidémocratique. Les peuples n'en peuvent plus de votre mauvaise foi et de votre projet totalitaire qui souhaite les mettre au pas pour obéir à des intérêts financiers sans patrie, et cette procédure est vouée à l'échec.

En attaquant conjointement la Pologne sur un fondement juridique différent, mais, en vérité, parce qu'elle refuse aussi votre projet de subversion migratoire, vous avez par avance condamné votre vilaine procédure, et je m'en réjouis.

Nicola Procaccini, *a nome del gruppo ECR*. – Signor Presidente, onorevoli colleghi, c'era una volta un governo legittimato da elezioni democratiche. C'era una volta la libertà di autodeterminazione, il diritto di proteggere le proprie frontiere, di amare le proprie radici religiose e culturali, ma venne il guardiano rosso dei trattati, Frans Timmermans, armato di socialismo, burocrazia, arroganza, e venne l'articolo 7.

Questa storia si svolge in Ungheria o in Polonia, ma potrebbe accadere ovunque. *Unum castigabis, centum emendabis*: con l'uso politico dell'articolo 7 si vuole colpire un popolo per educarne cento.

Chi siede tra questi banchi non avrà mai la presunzione di considerarsi superiore alla propria gente, ma pensiamo di conoscerla, e allora ve lo dico prima: preparatevi a un nuovo procedimento ex articolo 7 non appena anche in Italia, al suo popolo, verrà data la possibilità di votare.

Malin Björk, *för GUE/NGL-gruppen*. – Herr talman! Jag är stolt över att Europaparlamentet har tagit ställning i frågan om utvecklingen i Ungern; att vi har tagit ställning för rättsstatlighet, för demokrati och för mänskliga rättigheter.

Under Fidesz styre har vi sett hur mediefriheten har inskränkts. Vi ser hur frivilligorganisationer och civilsamhället förföljs och hur den akademiska friheten angrips – det är första gången som ett universitet har behövt flyttas. Vi ser hur regeringen attackerar migranters rättigheter och att hemlöshet förbjuds och kulturinstitutioner styrs och stöps om. Vi ser också nu hur domstolarnas frihet inskränks genom den nya lagen som har trätt i kraft i år.

Jag tycker att det också är värt att nämna NY Times granskning som visar att Ungerns användning av EU:s jordbruksstöd är fullt av korruption och profiterande oligarker, och används av Fidesz för att stärka partiets makt. Man kan ju fråga sig: vad är målet? Jo, låt oss tala klarspråk. Det är att strypa varje form av opposition, att strypa medborgarnas engagemang, och detta är, precis som har sagts här tidigare, en helt oacceptabel utveckling. Det kan inte kallas demokrati och det kan inte kallas att respektera rättsstaten.

Det finns massor med medborgare i Ungern som vill ha en annan utveckling. De som står upp för mänskliga rättigheter, för migranternas rättigheter, för hemlösas rättigheter, för kvinnors rättigheter, för HBTQ-personer och för demokrati och rättsstat. Och med alla dem kämpar vi sida vid sida.

Men det här är också en europeisk fråga. Ska Ungern, som en icke-fungerande demokrati, sitta och stifta lagar för oss andra i rådet, lagar som ska gälla i våra enskilda länder? Nej, så kan vi inte ha det. Vi är tacksamma över att det finska ordförandeskapet har tagit tag i artikel 7-förfarandet mot Ungern. Men precis som i fallet med Polen så rör det sig inte framåt – tvärtom: utvecklingen går åt fel håll.

Vi vill se att kommissionen gör mer. Vi vill också se en mekanism som är effektiv vad gäller att bevaka rättsstaten, och inte minst, nu när vi förhandlar om den fleråriga budgetramen, det är då vi ska ställa de tuffa kraven. Det ska inte gå en enda euro till dem som inte respekterar demokrati och mänskliga rättigheter.

Laura Ferrara (NI). – Signor Presidente, onorevoli colleghi, tra i valori comuni su cui si fonda l'Unione europea, lo Stato di diritto rappresenta il baluardo del rispetto delle libertà civili e dei diritti fondamentali, in un contesto di separazione e limitazione dei pubblici poteri.

Un governo che tenta di conservare e di rafforzare il proprio potere minando l'indipendenza dell'ordine giudiziario, la libertà di espressione o la libertà accademica non può nascondersi dietro la giustificazione di essere stato eletto democraticamente.

Quando ciò accade, a essere danneggiati non sono soltanto i cittadini, che subiscono una compressione dei propri diritti: viene meno anche la credibilità delle istituzioni nazionali ed europee e la fiducia nella cooperazione tra Stati per il raggiungimento di obiettivi comuni.

Da anni si discute di violazioni di valori europei in diversi Stati membri, come nel caso dell'Ungheria, ma la procedura prevista dall'articolo 7 è lontana dall'offrire un rimedio efficace. Le difficoltà nel conseguire le maggioranze richieste per l'adozione di sanzioni, infatti, rendono questo procedimento sostanzialmente non funzionante e inadeguato allo scopo che si prefigge. Lo sa bene anche il governo di Orbán, così sicuro della propria impunità da continuare la deriva autoritaria intrapresa.

Come richiesto dunque in più occasioni, auspico che venga istituito un meccanismo europeo imparziale che, sulla base di indicatori obiettivi, sia in grado di offrire, paese per paese, effettive e adeguate modalità di monitoraggio e intervento, sia per la prevenzione delle violazioni gravi dello Stato di diritto, della democrazia e dei diritti fondamentali, sia per l'applicazione di sanzioni efficaci quando le violazioni siano state già accertate.

Livia Járóka (PPE). – Tisztelt Elnök úr! Őszintén sajnálom, hogy a Magyarországról szóló vita egy állandó napirendi ponttá vált az Európai Parlamentben. Nemcsak azért, mert eljárásjogilag a Parlamentnek már semmi szerepe nem lenne a hetes cikkelyes eljárásban, hanem azért is, mert az egész vita nem valós tényekről, hanem egy politikai boszorkányüldözésről szól.

A Parlament önálló társjogalkotó. Nem értem, hogy hogyan kérdőjelezzük meg a Tanácsnak is az ilyen jellegű függetlenségét. Vádak hangzanak el, de a tényekre szinte senki nem kíváncsi. A vádaskodókat nem érdekli, hogy a magyar alaptörvény biztosítja a bírói függetlenség intézményét. Nem érdekli, hogy Magyarországon a zéró tolerancia elvét hirdettünk a korrupció ellen. Nem érdekli, hogy Magyarország adta a romastratégiát az Európai Uniónak. Nem érdekli, hogy az itt ülő képviselők többsége a baloldali médiából tájékozódik. Abból a baloldali médiából, amit állítólag ellehetlenített a kormány. Nem érdekli őket a kormány által összeállított 160 oldalas jogi tényanyag sem.

Itt állunk egy újabb határozati vitának a közepén, ami az EU-szerződés betűjével és szellemiségével ellentétes. Agresszív politikai támadásokkal nem lehet jogvitát rendezni. Mi ezt megtanultuk a kommunizmus alatt. Köszönöm.

(A felszólaló hozzájárul egy „kékkártyás” kérdés megválaszolásához (az eljárási szabályzat 171. cikkének (8) bekezdése))

Sophia in 't Veld (Renew), *blue-card question*. – Dear colleague, first of all, a small correction. We're not actually having a debate on Hungary; we're having a debate on the attitude of the Hungarian Government, which is not the same. The title is very precise. I was referring to the statement by a colleague.

I have a question, though, if you'll allow me. You keep repeating the same thing, saying that we are making allegations. Dear colleague Szájer, can I ask my question? Can I? You keep repeating the same allegation, namely that we are informed by the left-wing media. I'm not really sure what left-wing media are, but never mind.

Do you include in the left-wing media three successive EPP-led European Commissions? The Venice Commission? The OECD? Need I go on? They're all independent institutions – they're not left-wing or right-wing – if anything, they are indeed EPP-controlled – the Council, the European Parliament, in the majority – left-wing, right-wing, part of your Group: where are the left-wing media you're referring to?

Livia Járóka (PPE), *blue-card answer*. – Only about five NGOs have been giving you information. I know this because I worked with you on the Sargentini report. That's why you took out the Roma parts from it, because you realised that it was all lies. These media are giving you wrong information. I invite you all to come to Hungary and see it with your own eyes.

Katarina Barley (S&D). – Herr Präsident! Erst gestern hat der Generalanwalt des Europäischen Gerichtshofes mal wieder die Verurteilung Ungarns beantragt, und das ist sicherlich ein neutrales Organ, wie vielleicht auch die Kollegin Járóka anerkennt. Dieses Mal, weil Orbáns Gesetz zur Gängelung von NGOs gegen die europäische Charta der Grundrechte verstößt.

Es ist gut, dass wir in diesen Zeiten den Europäischen Gerichtshof haben, denn, seien wir ehrlich, das Artikel-7-Verfahren sowohl gegen Polen als auch gegen Ungarn steckt in einer Sackgasse. Als die Eltern der Europäischen Union dieses Verfahren erfunden haben, hielten sie es nicht für möglich, dass gleich zwei Mitgliedstaaten der Europäischen Union von grundlegenden Prinzipien und Werten der Union abweichen würden.

Genau das ist passiert, und zwar nicht erst seit gestern, und, sehr geehrte Kollegin Metsola, nein, die EVP ist nicht schon immer kohärent an der Seite der Rechtsstaatlichkeit gewesen, sondern gerade wenn es um den Fall Ungarn ging, hat sich die EVP jahrelang geweigert, dort die klaren Worte zu finden, die es gebraucht hätte.

Wir haben den Europäischen Gerichtshof, aber wir dürfen uns darauf nicht ausruhen. Wir brauchen mehr Maßnahmen, wir müssen vor allen Dingen verhindern, dass sich diese Regime die Unterstützung ihrer Bevölkerung mit Wohltaten durch europäische Fördergelder erkaufen. Deswegen müssen wir im nächsten mehrjährigen Finanzrahmen klare Regelungen, finanzielle Sanktionsmöglichkeiten finden. Wenn man europäische Werte aufkündigt, dann hat das eben auch Konsequenzen.

Richtig ist aber auch: Die Bevölkerung ist nicht die Regierung. In Ungarn gibt es haufenweise gute Demokraten, und es gibt viele, viele Europafreunde. Ihnen müssen wir helfen, an ihrer Seite müssen wir stehen, und ihnen müssen wir hier eine Plattform geben.

Anna Júlia Donáth (Renew). – Tisztelt Elnök úr! Ahogy több kollegánktól is hallottuk, a magyar kormány egy évtizede lopja az EU-s pénzeket, rombolja az Európai Unió egységét és építi le a jogállamiságot. Az EU eddig nem tett valódi lépéseket, hogy ezt megállítsa. Tovább utalja az EU-s forrásokat, amit aztán a saját gazdagodásukra, és hatalmuk kiépítésére használnak, iskolák, kórházak és munkahelyek helyett. Az az eljárás, amiről most beszélünk, eddig egyáltalán nem pacifikálta a magyar kormányt, sőt Orbán Viktor az EU minden következmény nélküli fellépését bátorításnak tekinti.

Aki odafigyel Magyarországra, pontosan tudja, hogy amióta az eljárásról szóló vitákat folytatjuk, legalább egy újabb egész Sargentini-jelentésre való rombolást hajtottak végre hazámban, és ez már nem csak a jogállamiságról szól. Annyira megszokták a következmények nélküliséget, hogy a miniszterelnök már attól sem retten vissza, hogy szalonrasszista megjegyzéseket tegyen a magyarországi cigányságra. Úgyse lesz következménye, mondja ő, és addig nyugodtan mondhatja, amíg az EU vezetésének a teljesítménye nem mutat mást.

Végképp szembemennek az európai értékekkel, amíg mi a sokadik vitát tartjuk itt, anélkül, hogy az államok vezetőit tömörítő Európai Tanács érdemben hozzászólt volna a magyar kormány ellen indított eljáráshoz. Nem a büntetés szigor, hanem az elkerülhetetlensége lenne a visszatartó erő. Én azt kérem, hogy végre cselekedjünk ez ügyben. Köszönöm.

(A felszólaló hozzájárul egy „kékkártyás” kérdés megválaszolásához (az eljárási szabályzat 171. cikkének (8) bekezdése))

Sven Simon (PPE), *Frage nach dem Verfahren der „blauen Karte“*. – Frau Kollegin! Ganz wichtig ist es in der Debatte, dass wir unterscheiden zwischen Fakten und politischen Behauptungen. Und deshalb wäre es ganz wichtig, in einem solchen Redebeitrag konkrete Fakten und am Recht orientierte, an der Rechtsstaatlichkeit orientierte konkrete Beispiele zu benennen, die belegt sind. Das ist ganz wichtig. Stimmen Sie mir da zu?

Anna Júlia Donáth (Renew), *„kékkártyás válasz”* – Ahogy már rengeteg mindenkitől hallhattuk, tele van tényekkel az asztal. Pontosán tudjuk különböző riportokból, hogy mi történik. El lehet jönni Magyarországra, lehet érezni a saját bőrünkön is, hogy mi történik.

Nem lehet különválasztani azt, hogy mik a tényállások és mi a politika, ugyanis nem csinál mást a magyar kormány, minthogy túlpolitizálja azt az ügyet, és különböző jogszabályokra egyenként mutogat a különböző tagállamokból, hogy itt is létezik, meg ott is létezik, csak éppen abban az összességében, amiből egy rendszert építettek ki Magyarországon, ilyen sehöl sem létezik. A jogállamiságot lépten-nyomon építik le, és ahhoz tényleg ott kell élni, hogy az ember a bőrén érezze azt, hogy a szabadság egyre jobban fogy.

Bocsánat, ez igenis politika addig, amíg kétharmados többséggel fenntartják ezt a rendszert, addig ez nem tud nem politikai döntés lenni, „...” *„(az elnök megvonja a szót a felszólalótól)”*

Alice Kuhnke (Verts/ALE). – Herr talman! Vad är syftet med artikel 7 om medborgarnas rättigheter fortsätter att förtryckas, samtidigt som övriga länders regeringar väljer att inte ingripa? Hur allvarlig måste situationen bli innan EU sätter ner foten? Vad ska behöva hända innan EU:s stats- och regeringschefer gör det som parlamentet kräver? Är det så att problemet egentligen handlar om att medlemsländernas regeringar är så rädda för att själva bli granskade? I så fall är det rent hyckleri.

EU måste agera nu, annars kommer vi alla att förlora det förtroende som väljarna har gett oss.

Πρόεδρος. – Πριν δώσω τον λόγο στον επόμενο ομιλητή, θα ήθελα να πω δυο πράγματα: Πρώτον, επειδή βλέπω μια αυξημένη διάθεση για γαλάζιες κάρτες, όπως και αιτήματα για «catch-the-eye», στην όντως σοβαρή συζήτηση, θα δέχομαι μία γαλάζια κάρτα από κάθε ομιλητή – από αυτόν που θα σηκώσει πρώτος τη γαλάζια κάρτα. Επίσης, σημειώνω ότι ζητούν γαλάζια κάρτα συνάδελφοι που έχουν ταυτόχρονα ζητήσει τον λόγο με τη διαδικασία «catch-the-eye». Λάβετε υπόψη σας ότι θα το συνοπλογίσω αυτό ως κριτήριο. Αν κάποιος κάνει χρήση της γαλάζιας κάρτας, ενδεχομένως να μην προτιμηθεί για τη διαδικασία «catch-the-eye».

Tom Vandendriessche (ID). – Voorzitter, de strafprocedures van de Europese Unie tegen lidstaten als Hongarije en Polen gaan helemaal niet over inbreuken op de onafhankelijkheid van pers en gerecht. Anders zou een land als België met zijn gesubsidieerde media en zijn politiek benoemde rechters al lang vervolgd zijn. Waar het wel over gaat, is dat zij baas in hun eigen land willen blijven. Zij willen hun soevereiniteit, hun vrijheid en hun identiteit bewaren. Wie kan ze ongelijk geven? Deze Europese Unie biedt immers geen oplossingen, noch voor de eurocrisis, noch voor de migratiecrisis. In plaats van subsidiariteit en samenwerking kiest deze elite voor een superstaat en dwang. Landen die niet plooiën, bestraffen ze. Jullie maken Europa kapot met deze Europese Unie van dictaten en bureaucraten. Met brexit vertrekt al een eerste land. Hoeveel landen zullen nog moeten volgen voor jullie eindelijk beginnen te luisteren naar de mensen?

Peter Lundgren (ECR). – Herr talman! Sverigedemokraterna har en avvikande mening rörande artikel 7-förfarandet mot Polen och Ungern, och den står vi fortfarande bakom.

Vår avvikande mening utgår fortfarande från att vi betraktar Ungern som en suverän, demokratisk stat som måste ges rätt att inom sin demokratiska process bestämma själv. Vi betraktar denna reaktion från Europeiska unionen och från en lång rad olika länder som överdriven och smått hysterisk. Vi ser inte alls att demokrati, mänskliga rättigheter eller rättsväsendets oberoende skulle vara hotade i Ungern. Det ungerska folket måste få möjlighet att på egen hand, inom ramen för den demokratiska processen, bestämma hur dess land ska styras.

EU gör allt man kan för att förminska den nationella stoltheten. Det har gått så långt att man till och med vill förbjuda nationella symboler i kammaren, så som till exempel en flagga på bordet. Jag tycker att det är helt befängt. Jag är och kommer alltid att vara stolt svensk, jag kommer att fortsätta bära nationella symboler, oavsett vad EU säger till mig.

Nu vill jag att ni lyssnar noga, allihopa. Ni alla här inne är nationellt folkvalda för att representera era nationella väljare och ska vara stolta över det.

Claire Fox (NI). – Mr President, I would like to pay tribute to my friend, the brilliant English philosopher Roger Scruton, who sadly died this week. Before Christmas, he was awarded the Hungarian Order of Merit in recognition of his contribution to liberating East European countries. Part of that struggle for freedom for countries like Hungary and Poland was regaining their sovereignty from USSR domination. How ironic, then, that these Article 7 proceedings are being used against Hungary for daring to assert its democratic sovereign decisions today. This time it is the EU, not the Soviet Union, acting as a bully, deploying soft authoritarian tactics. I personally wouldn't vote for Fidesz or Orbán, but the Hungarian electorate did, in huge numbers.

I personally am passionate about free speech and press freedom, but unlike some hypocrites in the EU who regularly censor ideas they dub as hateful, I genuinely respect diverse decisions made by diverse electorates around Europe, even if I don't agree with them. You say diversity is an EU value, but you ban diversity of opinion. You say liberal freedom is an EU value, but you illiberally deny free choice politically. You launch witch-hunts against those who don't conform.

Paulo Rangel (PPE). – Senhor Presidente, ao Conselho e à Comissão também os meus cumprimentos. Gostaria de lembrar o essencial. A União Europeia é um clube de democracias que se regem pelo respeito pelos direitos fundamentais, pela separação de poderes e pelo Estado de direito – a *rule of law* –, e por isso é fundamental que, sempre que haja uma falha, uma quebra neste princípio do Estado de direito, e neste respeito por estes pilares das nossas democracias, sempre que isso exista, haja um mecanismo para poder averiguar se os Estados-Membros da União cumprem ou não cumprem este princípio.

É verdade que hoje há problemas com a Hungria, que há problemas com a Polónia, que há até problemas com Malta, mas também é verdade que o artigo 7.º não está a funcionar como era devido. E por isso é fundamental que, neste debate, nós sejamos capazes de defender um mecanismo que possa monitorizar e que possa verificar o cumprimento das regras do Estado de direito em todos os Estados-Membros sem fazer qualquer discriminação e sem dar aso a qualquer ideia de que há uma perseguição individual deste ou daquele.

E dito isto, eu espero que os governos húngaro e polaco possam dar passos positivos e dar sinais que nos dispensem até de aplicar o artigo 7.º.

Csaba Molnár (S&D). – Tisztelt Elnök úr! Képviselőtársaim! Aki eddig naivan azt hitte, hogy az Orbán-kormányt elítélő Sargentini-jelentés után Orbán Viktor majd beletapos a fékbe és leáll, azt hiszem, már elismerheti, hogy tévedett.

Épp ellenkezőleg: az történt, hogy az Orbán-rendszer padlógázzal nyomja tovább. Csak a Sargentini-jelentés elfogadása óta Orbán megszüntette a Tudományos Akadémia függetlenségét, rátámadt a bíróságokra, kivézeteti a független színházakat, tovább folytatja azt, hogy pártebereket nevez ki az elvileg független intézmények élére, és most már éppen azt hallani, hogy Budapesttől és az ellenzéki vezetőségű önkormányzatoktól el szeretné venni az uniós támogatásokat.

És közben persze tovább lop, lop és lop. Ez a fő programja. A saját strómanja, Mészáros Lőrinc az elmúlt néhány évben egyszerű falusi gázszerelőből Magyarország leggazdagabb emberévé vált. Nagyobb vagyona lett pár év alatt, mint a brit királynőnek. Itt tartunk! Orbán Viktor illiberális elefántként tör-zúz az európai értékek között, és közben azokkal az európai uniós pénzekkel zsarolja és fenyegeti és támadja a magyar embereket, amit az Unió nem neki szánt, hanem valamennyi magyar polgárnak.

Remélem, most már senkinek nem mondok újdonságot ebben a teremben, amikor azt mondom, hogy Orbán nem fog leállni. Orbán nem fog visszafordulni, addig legalábbis biztos, amíg mi csak a sajnálatunkat fejezzük ki, meg aggódalmuknak adunk hangot, meg egyre hosszabb jelentéseket írunk. Orbán Viktor civilizált európai megoldásokból és dolgokból nem ért. Ő abból élt, igazi keleti despota módjára, hogy ha valaki jó keményen ráüt a kezére, és azt mondja, hogy eddig és ne tovább, ez nem a te pénzed, ez a magyar emberek pénze, nem bánhatsz vele a sajátodként! Tettek kellene! Orbánt és kormányát végre meg kell büntetni, mert csak így lehet megvédeni a magyar embereket. Ez Magyarország érdeke, a magyar emberek érdeke, és ez az Európai Unió érdeke is.

Romeo Franz (Verts/ALE). – Herr Präsident! Menschen mit Romno-Hintergrund in Ungarn sind massiver Diskriminierung ausgesetzt. Kinder aus Roma-Familien werden in separaten Klassen weggesperrt, die Lehre ist mangelhaft. Die Kinder können nach Ende der Schulzeit kaum lesen und schreiben. Damit werden ihnen jegliche Bildungschancen geraubt. Erst letzte Woche hat ein Gericht in Debrecen diesen Familien Schadenersatz für die institutionelle Segregation ihrer Kinder zugesprochen – zu Recht und ein Beweis für den institutionellen Rassismus in Ungarn, den die Orbán-Regierung zu verantworten hat.

Aber wie reagiert Herr Orbán? Statt Kinder zu schützen, forciert er ihre Ausgrenzung. Er stellt die Rechtsprechung in Frage und schürt erneut Rassismus oder Antiziganismus. Herr Orbán, hören Sie auf, gegen Minderheiten, Migrantinnen und Migranten oder Andersdenkende zu hetzen!

Und Sie, liebe CDUler, seien Sie endlich glaubwürdig und schließen Sie Orbáns Fidesz aus Ihrer Fraktion aus! Und an die Staats- und Regierungschefs der EU: Nutzen Sie das Artikel-7-Verfahren, um Herrn Orbán in die Schranken zu weisen!

(Der Redner ist damit einverstanden, eine Frage nach dem Verfahren der „blauen Karte“ gemäß Artikel 171 Absatz 8 der Geschäftsordnung zu beantworten)

Livia Járóka (PPE), blue-card question. – Mr President, I would like to thank my colleague for accepting this blue card. You know that we work together very closely on the Roma. Therefore, I would like to ask you, Mr Franz: can you tell me another country that has done more for the European Roma than Hungary? Please, tell me another country that has done more for the European Roma than Hungary.

Romeo Franz (Verts/ALE), Antwort auf eine Frage nach dem Verfahren der „blauen Karte“. – Liebe Livia, das ist die falsche Frage. Ich würde mir wünschen, dass das, was ihr sagt, die Wahrheit wäre. Aber wir haben Beweise und Fakten. Gerade vor ein paar Tagen hat dieses Urteil eines Gerichts es doch offen gezeigt. Das kannst du doch nicht abstreiten, das ist doch die Wahrheit. Lass uns doch über die Fakten und Beweise reden und darüber, wie wir diese Situation für diese Menschen tatsächlich verändern können. Das machen wir beide doch, das versuchen wir doch zu machen.

Aber wir können das nicht auf Lügen oder irgendwelchen Hirngespinnsten aufbauen, sondern müssen die Beweise nehmen und dies tatsächlich versuchen aufzuarbeiten und zu verändern. Das ist doch unser Ansatz, den wir haben.

Ангел Джамбазки (ECR). – Г-н Председател, колеги, това, което се случва, именно наказателните процедури срещу Унгария и Полша, разбира се, са лов на вещици. Лов на вещици, защото народите на Полша и на Унгария са избрали суверенно своите суверенни правителства. Това е волята на народите в Полша и в Унгария.

Истинската причина да не ги харесвате, уважаеми колеги от ляво (тези от вас, които се гордеят повече с червената петолъчка, отколкото с националното си знаме), е че вие не харесвате политиката на Полша и на Унгария по отношение на нелегалната миграция, по отношение на еднополовите бракове, по отношение на джендър пропагандата, по отношение на акциите на г-н Сорос. Това, всъщност, вие не харесвате и го правите под формата на една чисто тоталитарна и болшевишка диктатура.

Вие отричате свободата на унгарския и на полския народ да изберат своите правителства и да знаят как да се управлява Полша и Унгария. Не вие, а те ще решат как да се управляват Полша и Унгария. Знам, че част от вас се срамуват от националната си принадлежност, но нека ви кажа — много империи са се опитвали да заличат нашето национално чувство и не се успели, и вие няма да успеете.

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

Katarina Barley (S&D), *blue-card question*. – Mr Dzhambazki, do you agree with me that it is more the way that autocratic or totalitarian dictators work to try to get all the institutions in one country under your control, to have no one who is of a different opinion to yourself? And do you agree that that is exactly what is happening in Hungary?

Ангел Джамбазки (ECR), *отговор на въпрос, зададен чрез вдигане на синя карта*. – Неуважаема колега, точно това става не в Полша и Унгария, в Полша и в Унгария поляците и унгарците избират своите правителства. Това става тук, в тази зала.

Когато вие не сте съгласни с нас, вие ни обвинявате и не ни давате да се изразяваме и ни наричате с различни имена. Ето това е тоталитаризъм! Ето това е потъпкване на свободата на словото! Ето това е новият лъв либерален болшевизъм!

François-Xavier Bellamy (PPE). – Monsieur le Président, chers collègues, nous sommes tous ici d'accord pour dire que défendre l'état de droit est fondamental. Mais de quoi s'agit-il ici, de quoi s'agit-il en Hongrie? Les élections sont-elles libres? Oui. Y a-t-il des partis d'opposition, y a-t-il un pluralisme politique? Oui. La presse a-t-elle le droit de critiquer le gouvernement? À ce que je sache, il n'y a pas eu de journaliste assassiné en Hongrie et certains n'avaient pas ici la même énergie il y a quelques semaines, lorsque nous défendions l'état de droit, précisément. Le gouvernement a-t-il été légitimement élu? En effet.

Alors maintenant, nous pouvons continuer ainsi, nous pouvons continuer sans faits et de manière gratuite d'insulter le choix qu'ont fait les électeurs hongrois. Il est tout à fait possible ici d'avoir des désaccords politiques avec M. Orbán et c'est tout à fait légitime, mais nous n'avons pas le droit de transformer des désaccords politiques en critiques sur l'état de droit sans galvauder de manière dramatique ce que doit être la préservation de ces principes fondamentaux pour l'Union européenne.

(L'orateur accepte de répondre à une question «carton bleu» (article 171, paragraphe 8, du règlement intérieur))

Róza Thun und Hohenstein (PPE), *question «carton bleu»*. – Première question: est-ce que les élections sont vraiment libres s'il n'y a pas de médias libres? Deuxième question: est-ce qu'il faut assassiner un journaliste pour prouver qu'il n'y a pas de liberté dans les médias? Troisième question: même s'il est élu par la majorité des électeurs, est-ce que le gouvernement peut agir contre le droit, contre la démocratie, contrôler le système judiciaire, les médias qui devraient être libres, etc.?

François-Xavier Bellamy (PPE), *réponse «carton bleu»*. – Chère collègue, trois réponses. La première, il y a des médias qui critiquent le gouvernement en Hongrie et ces médias existent bien et ils sont même lus et écoutés, heureusement. La deuxième, oui quand on assassine un journaliste, il se passe quelque chose de dramatique et il n'y a pas aujourd'hui de procédures contre Malte au titre de l'article 7 et c'est un problème bien sûr. Et troisième remarque: vous m'avez dit, Madame, vous m'avez insulté pour la prise de parole que je viens de faire, vous avez parlé de honte. Je dis que ceux qui organisent aujourd'hui la fracture entre les peuples européens au nom de ces principes qu'ils revendiquent alors qu'ils les trahissent précisément par les procédures qu'ils démontrent sans faits, ceux-là, oui c'est vrai, devraient... *(Le Président retire la parole à l'orateur)*

Birgit Sippel (S&D). – Herr Präsident! Und wieder Ungarn! Proteste der Opposition, Aufschreie in der Kulturlandschaft der internationalen Öffentlichkeit – völlig egal. Wie früher herrscht in Ungarn nur eine Partei, nur eine Meinung.

Künftig will die Regierung mitentscheiden, wie viel Geld kommunale Bühnen bekommen und wie Intendanten bestimmt werden. Der neue nationale Kulturrat wird für die strategische Lenkung der Kulturbranche zuständig. Wir dürfen nicht naiv sein. Die politische Kontrolle von Kulturinstitutionen grenzt an Zensur. Abweichende Meinungen sollen keine Plattform finden, das ist Gehirnwäsche im Schonwaschgang sozusagen.

Und dennoch keine klare Reaktion von Kommission und Rat. Die immer neuen antidemokratischen Entwicklungen in Ungarn sind ein Skandal, den unsere Bürgerinnen und Bürger völlig zu Recht nicht mehr akzeptieren wollen. Deshalb ist es Zeit für klare Konsequenzen!

Molly Scott Cato (Verts/ALE). – Mr President, the developing rapprochement between Britain's new government and Hungary's President Orbán should ring alarm bells for all democrats. First we have conservative adviser Tim Montgomery call for a special relationship between London and Budapest, and then Orbán praises Johnson as one of the bravest European politicians.

With the government opposing any parliamentary oversight of the process of negotiating our future relationship with the EU, are we seeing the UK on the way to becoming a fake democracy on the Hungarian model?

Since 2010, Orbán's Government has attacked media freedom, limiting access to certain sympathetic journalists. Johnson is threatening to abolish the BBC licence, boycott the Today Programme and castrate the lobby system that holds government to account. This government is politicising media relationships as never before.

Orbán endorses Brexit because it represents a move towards authoritarian government and illiberal democracy. Johnson's Tories have fallen over themselves to roll out the red carpet for the Hungarian leader. This is deeply worrying, not only for the UK, but also for the EU.

Jeroen Lenaers (PPE). – Voorzitter, de EU is geen toevallig samenwerkingsverband of een simpele rekensom van kosten en baten. Wij zijn een waardengemeenschap, en iedereen die meedoet moet die waarden respecteren: menselijke waardigheid, vrijheid, democratie, rechtsstaat en respect voor mensenrechten. Want zonder die gedeelde waarden als fundament voor onze samenwerking kan die samenwerking in Europa nooit toekomstbestendig zijn. Dat is precies de reden waarom we zo scherp moeten blijven op die waarden in alle landen van de EU. En dit Parlement heeft anderhalf jaar geleden – en wij hebben dat gesteund – vastgesteld dat die waarden gevaar lopen in Hongarije, en die zorgen zijn de afgelopen anderhalf jaar niet weggenomen. Het is daarom goed dat we dit debat vandaag hebben en dat we morgen over die resolutie kunnen stemmen. Maar het echte gesprek moet in de Raad plaatsvinden, en dat gebeurt te weinig: landen durven elkaar niet voldoende aan te spreken. Dus laat dit ook een oproep zijn aan de regeringsleiders. Laat zien dat ook voor jullie de rechtsstaat, mensenrechten en democratie meer zijn dan alleen campagnemateriaal en mooie praatjes.

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

Robert Biedroń (S&D), pytanie zadane przez podniesienie niebieskiej kartki. – W pełni popieram wypowiedź mojego kolegi, ale mam pewien dylemat, jakies rozdzielenie jaźni, bo z jednej strony Pan mówi w imieniu swojej grupy politycznej, że trzeba bronić wartości europejskich, że trzeba rozmawiać, a z drugiej strony są koledzy i koleżanki z Węgier, którzy tym wartościom zaprzeczają. Czy Państwo w swojej własnej grupie rozmawiacie na ten temat i macie jasne stanowisko po której stronie stoicie, czy nie macie?

Jeroen Lenaers (PPE), blue-card answer. – Mr Biedroń, it's not my job to solve your dilemmas. You can do that yourself, I think. We are discussing this in our Group, we are discussing this in our family, and we will discuss this in the future. This is all that I have to say to you about it. You take care of your Group. Good luck with your Maltese colleagues. We will discuss it in our Group.

Evin Incir (S&D). – Herr talman! Orbán fortsätter att intensifiera sina attacker på demokratin, rättsstaten och de grundläggande rättigheterna i Ungern. Under tiden som EU har misslyckats med att komma vidare med frågan, har läget i landet försämrats drastiskt. Om det fanns ett EU-pris i kreativitet skulle ungerska Fidesz-regeringen och deras vänner i PiS i Polen vinna överlägset för sina kreativa metoder att konstant bryta mot EU:s grundläggande värderingar och lagar.

Det är tydligt att artikel 7-förfarandet har kört fast. Det är dags att vi inför en ny gemensam EU-mekanism för demokrati, rättsstat och grundläggande rättigheter. Samtidigt måste vi även gå vidare med skarpa förslag om sanktioner. Om medlemsstater vägrar att respektera EU:s grundvärderingar, som anges i artikel 2, ska de heller inte kunna få tillgång till de gemensamma ekonomiska stöden.

Våra medborgare kommer inte att fortsätta att acceptera att pengar från EU missbrukas och används till attacker på våra gemensamma värderingar.

Loránt Vincze (PPE). – Tisztelt Elnök úr! A közös értékek betartása és a jogállamiság társadalmunk alappillérei. De az, hogy ez hogyan válik társadalmi normává, és hogyan lehet ellenőrizni, már vitára ad lehetőséget. Ilyen kérdéseket boncolgató eszmecsere né lehetnének a tanúi, ha a Parlament ezzel a témával nézne szembe. De nem ezt teszi.

A Magyarország ellen indított hetes cikkely szerinti eljárást melegíti ismét olyan megállapítások mentén, amelyek nem illeszthetők szabályokba. Az eljárást a Parlament indította, de a Tanácsnak kell lefolytatnia. Az intézmények hatásköreit nem lehet egymásba helyezni. Nem kellene megengednünk, hogy a szerződéseket meghaladó törekvéseket fogalmazzon meg.

A határozattervezet a közös európai értékek aláadását, a kölcsönös bizalmat, és az Unió hitelességét félti. Eddig két közép-kelet-európai ország ellen indult eljárás, és úgy teszünk, mintha más tagállamok a vizsgált kérdésekben teljesen rendben lennének. Attól tartok, hogy az Unió keleti felében éppen az egyes tagországokkal szemben tapasztalt kettős mérce rendíti meg a polgároknak az Unióba vetett bizalmát. Ez ellen kellene fellépni, tisztelt Kollégák.

Kati Piri (S&D). – Mr President, it was almost one and a half years ago when the European Parliament asked the EU Member States to launch the Article 7 procedure against the Hungarian Government, and all we have seen since then is one and a half years of hesitations in the Council, pushing the hot potato from one presidency to the other. Prime Minister Orbán is not hesitating. He continues to undermine judicial independence, to destroy media pluralism and to incite xenophobic sentiments, and as a European Union, we let him do it.

The Council continues to block progress on Article 7. I urge the Croatian Presidency to take the Article 7 process forward seriously and make it a strong priority. And colleagues, I wonder whether the Fidesz delegation, by the next plenary, will be sitting at the far right where they actually belong.

Sokan, sokan Magyarországon hisznek még demokráciában, hisznek még az Európai Unióban, és mi mellettük állunk.

Balázs Hidvéghi (PPE). – Tisztelt Elnök úr! Köszönöm szépen a szót. Képviselőtársaim! Először is nézzük meg, hogy miért is van most – mondva csinált indokkal – napirenden itt Magyarország és Lengyelország ügye. Azért, mert a baloldali frakciók ezt szabták feltételül annak, hogy decemberben a máltai újságíró-gyilkosságról itt szó eshessen. A máltai gyilkosság szálai a szocialista miniszterelnökhöz vezettek, de ennek ellenére szégyenletes módon az európai baloldali frakciók csak úgy egyeztek bele az erről szóló vitába, ha januárban napirendre kerül Magyarország és Lengyelország.

A Magyarország ellen felhozott vádak hamisak. Magyarországon szabad és független az igazságszolgáltatás, a tudomány és az oktatás világa. A szólásszabadság él és virul, és kifejezetten sokszínű a sajtó. Ki kell mondani világosan: Magyarországnak politikai vitája van a balliberális erővel. Ez a politikai vita Európa jövőjéről szól, a nemzetállamok szuverenitásáról, a bevándorlásról és az európai keresztény kultúra védelméről. A baloldal pedig visszaél a jogállamiság fogalmával akkor, amikor egy politikai vitában az eltérő álláspontot képviselőt jogi eljárásokkal akarja büntetni. Köszönöm szépen.

(A felszólaló hozzájárul egy „kékkártyás” kérdés megválaszolásához (az eljárási szabályzat 171. cikkének (8) bekezdése))

Katalin Cseh (Renew), „kékkártyás kérdés” – Köszönöm szépen. Milyen ritka pillanat, hogy egy fideszes politikus vállalja a vitát. Magyarországon ez azóta nem sikerül, amióta Önök kormányoznak. Egy nagyon egyszerű kérdésem lenne Önhöz: ha Orbán Viktor és a Fidesz szerint minden rendben van Magyarországon a jogállamisággal, akkor miért ellenkeznek ennyire az ellen, hogy jogállamisági garanciákhoz kössék az EU-s pénzeket? Ön szerint ez nem ér fel egy beismerő vallomással? Köszönöm szépen.

Balázs Hidvéghi (PPE), „kékkártyás válasz” – Pont arról van szó ebben a vitában, hogy a baloldali erők visszaélnék a jogállamiság fogalmával, politikai fegyverre degradálják, hiszen nem hajlandók elfogadni semmilyen más politikai véleményt vagy álláspontot a sajátjukon kívül. Önök a tolerancia és a demokrácia ellenségei ennek következményeképpen.

Akkor beszélhetünk jogállamiságról, hogyha mindenkire egyforma feltételekkel vonatkoztatjuk, amit erről mondunk, és mindenkit egyformán vizsgálunk. Jelen pillanatban nem ez a helyzet, politikai boszorkányüldözésre használják ezt a témát.

Raphaël Glucksmann (S&D). – Monsieur le Président, chers collègues, il y a plus d'un an et demi, le Parlement votait le déclenchement de l'article 7. Depuis ce moment solennel, les gouvernements hongrois et polonais continuent à enfreindre un à un les principes de l'état de droit.

Depuis ce jour, le Conseil organise des auditions, demande des explications, requiert des éclaircissements, questionne des experts et... et rien du tout. Rien, ou pire que rien, puisque les fonds européens continuent à enrichir les proches de M. Orbán grâce à des appels à projets biaisés. Pour être clair, notre argent enrichit ceux qui foulent aux pieds nos principes. Nous ne serons pas pris au sérieux tant que nous n'utiliserons pas le levier budgétaire. Frappons là où ça fait mal, conditionnons l'accès aux fonds européens au plein respect des règles démocratiques.

À Varsovie, à Budapest, partout, des ONG, des jeunes, des étudiants se mobilisent, des partis politiques s'allient pour défendre la démocratie et jusque-là, nous, nous les laissons seuls dans leur combat. Il est temps de montrer que nous sommes plus que des paillasons sur lesquels M. Orbán et ses amis peuvent joyeusement s'essuyer les pieds.

Il ne s'agit pas ici d'une bataille politique entre groupes, il s'agit d'une bataille pour la démocratie européenne.

Christophe Hansen (PPE). – Monsieur le Président, l'état de droit implique la primauté du droit sur le pouvoir politique dans un État. C'est l'un des piliers fondamentaux du fonctionnement de nos démocraties et de la communauté de valeurs que représente l'Union européenne. Gouvernants et gouvernés sont tenus de l'observer.

Hier encore, l'Avocat général de la Cour de justice européenne a rajouté une autre bûche sur le bûcher de l'état de droit en Hongrie. Il stipule que la loi hongroise sur le financement des ONG serait contraire au principe de la libre circulation des capitaux, contraire au respect de la vie privée et contraire à la liberté d'association.

Cette procession d'Echternach inversée à la sauce hongroise, un pas en avant deux pas en arrière, n'est tout simplement pas acceptable. La défense de l'état de droit ne peut connaître qu'une seule direction dans tous les États membres, indépendamment de la couleur politique au pouvoir. C'est cela la conviction et le message qu'un véritable chrétien-démocrate devrait porter et défendre bec et ongles.

Bettina Vollath (S&D). – Herr Präsident! In Wahrheit ist es erschütternd, dass es im Hinblick auf den Sargentini-Bericht von 2018 hier im Europäischen Parlament keinerlei angemessene Reaktion seitens Ungarns oder seitens des Rates gegeben hat. Stattdessen betreibt die ungarische Regierung weiterhin offen Verletzung von Unionsrecht und wird immer mehr zu einer Scheindemokratie mit eingeschränkter Pressefreiheit, ohne unabhängige Gerichtsbarkeit, eine Universität wird vertrieben, NGOs werden schikaniert, und der Rat schaut zu.

Die Entwicklungen in Ungarn und Polen stillschweigend hinzunehmen, heißt nichts weniger, als unser gemeinsames europäisches Projekt aufzugeben. Als S&D-Fraktion fordern wir daher den Rat und die Kommission auf, nicht nur das Artikel-7-Verfahren mit der notwendigen Seriosität fortzuführen, sondern auch das Gesetz abzuschließen, mit dem die EU-Förderungen an die Einhaltung von Rechtsstaatlichkeit geknüpft werden.

Διαδικασία «catch-the-eye»

Enikő Győri (PPE). – Tisztelt Elnök úr! Az Unióban világosak a szabályok, és az intézmények közötti munkamegosztás. Önök a baloldalon ezt most fel akarják rúgni. A baloldali-liberális kezdeményezésű határozattervezet két helyen is ellentmond a szerződéseknek. Az egyik, hogy formális jelenlétet kíván magának az EP a Tanács ülésén. Erről mind a Tanács, mind az EP jogi szolgálatainak a képviselők előtt titkolt állásfoglalása kimondja, hogy uniós jogba ütközik.

A másik, hogy a hetedik cikk szerinti eljárást olyan területre is kiterjesztené, amely nem képezi a Sargentini-jelentés tárgyát. Ez tehát semmilyen jogi eljárásban nem állna meg. Kérdezem, hogy ezek után Önök milyen alapon akarják kioktatni Magyarországot jogállamiságból?

Biztos asszony, sajnálatosnak tartom, hogy ehhez a Bizottság asszisztál. Kérem, ne keverjék a jogot és a politikát. Mindig pártatlan forrásból tájékozódjanak. Ha mindenkire egyformán vonatkozó jogállamisági vizsgálatot kezdeményeznének, abban partnerek lennénk. A horvát elnökségtől pedig azt kérem, hogy minél előbb zárja le ezt az eljárást. Köszönöm.

Juan Fernando López Aguilar (S&D). – Señor presidente, hace diez años, Viktor Orbán llegó al gobierno en Hungría con una abrumadora mayoría de premio electoral y, desde entonces, la situación no solamente ha empeorado sino que se ha cronificado. Una y otra vez regresa la cuestión de Hungría al Parlamento Europeo.

En aquel entonces presidí, como presidente de la Comisión LIBE, como soy ahora, la primera delegación que estudió el impacto de sus medidas sobre la libertad de expresión, la libertad académica y la protección de las minorías. Pero ahora se suman la insolidaridad ofensiva para con el resto de los Estados miembros en materia de migraciones, asilo y refugio y alegaciones de corrupción en el manejo de fondos europeos. Y todo, invocando la mayoría. Y hay que recordar que nunca fue verdad que la democracia sea simplemente el gobierno de la mayoría. Y ninguna victoria electoral permite desvincularse de los valores y principios europeos. La democracia no es el gobierno de la mayoría sin más, sino la protección de las minorías y el atenerse a las reglas de juego, al Estado de Derecho.

Por eso le decimos a la Comisión que claro que tiene todo el apoyo del Parlamento Europeo, no solamente para impulsar el procedimiento que inició este Parlamento Europeo, sino para llevar a todas sus consecuencias la vinculación del acceso a los fondos europeos al pleno cumplimiento de las reglas del Estado de Derecho y la protección de la democracia y los derechos fundamentales.

Ruža Tomašić (ECR). – Gospodine predsjedavajući, Europska unija nema budućnost ako ne prizna suverena prava svake države da vodi autonomnu politiku u područjima koja nisu u isključivoj nadležnosti Unije.

Nijedan odgovoran državnik neće ugroziti nacionalnu sigurnost kako bi udovoljio Bruxellesu. Ova je Unija klub s određenim pravilima. Kako postoje oni koji ta pravila gledaju ponekad zaobići, tako postoje i oni koji nameću svoja tumačenja.

Nemojmo smetnuti s uma da su, kad su financije pa i ljudska prava u pitanju, brojne države članice zaobišle europska pravila, neke i u više navrata, ali nijedna nije bila stigmatizirana ili kažnjena na način kako se želi sankcionirati Mađarsku i Poljsku. Pitanje je zašto.

Milan Zver (PPE). – Spoštovani predsedujoči. Vsi, ki smo že več let v Evropskem parlamentu, lahko sledimo večletnemu pogromu nad madžarsko vlado, ki jo vodi Viktor Orban. Madžarski premier je v tem hramu demokracije vselej neposredno odgovarjal in zavračal obtožbe.

Na Madžarskem ni tveganja za hujše kršitve evropskih vrednot, zato predložene resolucije, ki je polna arbitrarnih ocen, ne podpiram. Dejstva demantirajo resolucijo. CEU še vedno deluje, a brez privilegijev, medijski prostor je bolj pluralen kot v drugih državah članicah, po *Justice Scoreboard* se uvršča Madžarska v zgornjo polovico Unije.

So pa države v Uniji, v katerih ubijajo novinarje, koruptivno črpajo evropska sredstva, perejo denar za teroriste in pa nezakonito zaprejo vodjo politične opozicije. Pa se osrednje evropske institucije ne zganejo. To so dvojna merila in to ne prispeva k trdnosti Unije.

(Λήξη της διαδικασίας «catch-the-eye»)

Didier Reynders, *Member of the Commission*. – Mr President, I would like to come back to certain issues raised during this debate. On a positive note, let me recall that the Hungarian Government has decided not to push through the controversial reform establishing a separate administrative courts system. However, new legislation was adopted in December introducing structural changes to the functioning of the justice system. In particular, it relates to the appointment of judges to the Supreme Court, introduces new possibilities for the public administration to challenge final judgments before the Constitutional Court, and reorganises the courts hearing administrative cases.

We are analysing this new legislation. At this stage, I would only regret that such reform has been carried out at a fast pace without consulting the Venice Commission and without public consultation. I note that the new legislation does not intend to address the existing concerns about the increasing challenges that the independent National Judicial Council faces in balancing the powers of the administrative authority managing the judiciary. These challenges have led the Council to adopt the country-specific recommendations on judicial independence already mentioned by Vice-President Jourová.

The fact that the President of this administrative authority resigned in November to become a member of the Constitutional Court does not resolve the structural concerns related to the possibility of arbitrary decisions in the management of the judicial system.

Another issue that the Commission is analysing relates to the judgement of the Supreme Court of 19 September, declaring unlawful an order by a district court judge requesting a preliminary ruling of the European Court of Justice. The implications of this judgment, including for possible disciplinary proceedings, call for a careful assessment because the very functioning of the EU legal system requires that national courts have unimpeded access to the European Court of Justice.

I've heard a lot of comments about Roma discrimination. The European Union's Racial Equality Directive prohibits discrimination on grounds of race and ethnicity in education. The Commission has initiated an infringement procedure against Hungary regarding segregation of Roma peoples in mainstream education and is closely monitoring the steps being undertaken by Hungary to remedy this situation.

The Commission has zero tolerance towards fraud with the EU budget and expects the same level of commitment from Member States, which are mainly responsible for the management of some three quarters of the budget. The Commission conducts audits when there are reasons to do so and can take the necessary measures to protect the EU budget.

The European Anti-Fraud Office plays a key role in this regard, and you know the Commission has proposed a regulation on the protection of the EU budget in case of generalised deficiencies as regards the rule of law in a Member State.

It is a tool to protect the EU budget and ensure sound financial management. The reasoning is simple. In order to control the use of EU funds and to protect the EU's financial interests against corruption and fraud, each Member State needs an independent justice system, effective investigation and prosecution services, and an effective functioning of public authorities implementing the Union budget. If these functions are endangered by a generalised rule of law deficiency in a way which affects, or risks affecting, the Union's financial interests, the Union would be empowered to suspend, reduce or restrict access to EU funding in a proportional manner.

The proposal is currently being examined by Parliament and the Council of the European Union and, if adopted, could make an important contribution to the protection of the EU budget.

I have heard also, Mr President, calls for a new rule of law mechanism. I can assure you that the Commission is working on a comprehensive European rule of law mechanism as a matter of priority. It will cover all Member States and provide a synthesis of significant developments related to the various competences of the rule of law, including for example, systemic problems with a process for enacting laws, lack of effective judicial protection by independent and impartial courts, the capacity to fight corruption, and issues in relation to media pluralism. This will allow us to identify and prevent, early on, rule of law-related issues.

To conclude, I regret that I cannot report improvements of the situation in Hungary since the tabling of the European Parliament's original proposal.

I hope that the debate today will help the Hungarian authorities to further reflect on the concerns expressed. The Commission stands ready to engage with the Hungarian authorities on resolving issues.

Nikolina Brnjac, *President-in-Office of the Council*. – Mr President, let me assure the Honourable Members once again that the Presidency and the Council, as a whole, attach great importance to upholding the rule of law and the protection of the fundamental rights. It is the joint responsibility of the EU institutions and the Member States to respect, protect and promote our common values. The Presidency will pay particular attention to the views expressed here today during this debate. As the rapporteur noted, the Finnish Presidency regularly informed the European Parliament about the Article 7 procedure regarding Hungary. Let me reiterate our intention to continue with this practice. The Presidency will also report to the Council about its contact with the European Parliament on its recent proposal.

Πρόεδρος. – Έχω λάβει, σύμφωνα με το άρθρο 132 παράγραφος 2 του Κανονισμού, μία πρόταση ψηφίσματος.

Η συζήτηση έληξε.

Η ψηφοφορία θα διεξαχθεί την Πέμπτη 16 Ιανουαρίου 2020.

Γραπτές δηλώσεις (άρθρο 171 του Κανονισμού)

Romana Tomc (PPE), *pisno*. – Vladavina prava v Evropski uniji je na preizkušnji. Na Malti je zaradi korupcijskih škandalov odstopil predsednik vlade, zaradi enakih razlogov je padla tudi romunska vlada. Na Slovaškem so ubili novinarja, češki premier naj bi zlorabljal evropska sredstva. V Španiji in Franciji pretepaajo protestnike. Težave z zagotavljanjem neodvisnega sodstva ima tudi Poljska, očitki Madžarski se vlečejo že dlje časa, tudi Slovenija je v tej rizični skupini, saj Vlada RS zavrača uveljavitev sodb Ustavnega sodišča.

Način, kako se na ravni EU spopadamo s težavami, povezanimi z vladavino prava, je nesprejemljiv. Posebej v Evropskem parlamentu je očitno, da so postopki politično motivirani, saj so vedno sproženi s strani nasprotne politične opcije. Odlika demokracije je, da spoštujemo drugačna mnenja. Vendar morajo biti osnovni okrevi jasni.

Zavzemam se za to, da spremljanje delovanja pravne države poteka sistematično in z enakimi kriteriji, pri čemer je potrebno upoštevati zgodovinski razvoj in pravico države, da v okviru skupnih načel ohranja svojo suverenost.

István Ujhelyi (S&D), *írásban*. – Annak, hogy csak írásos formában rögzítem álláspontomat a magyarországi jogállamiságról szóló vitában, egyértelmű oka van: jelezni akartam, hogy a 7-es cikkely alapján indított eljárás lassú és körülményes, az újabb parlamenti vita pedig újdonságot nem hoz, csak ismételt színpadot szolgáltat az illiberális Európa-ellenességnek. Eredménynek tartom, hogy a végső parlamenti állásfoglalás – tiltakozással összhangban – érdemi kritikát fogalmaz meg a 7-es cikkelyes eljárás eredménytelenségével kapcsolatban.

Fontos azonban továbbra is rámutatni, hogy az Európai Parlament másfél évvel ezelőtt kétharmados többséggel fogadta el azt az állásfoglalást, amely megállapította, hogy Magyarországon fennáll a veszélye az uniós értékek súlyos és rendszerszintű sérülésének. Az Unió intézményei azóta csak forró krumpliként dobálják az ügyet. Annak idején kevesen voltak nálam elszántabbak és harciasabbak, amikor az Európai Parlament által elfogadott – és általam is megszavazott – jogállamisági jelentés mellett érvelni kellett. Nem volt olyan fideszes és habzó szájjal hazaáruló közeg, ahova nem mentem volna el és ne szembesítettem volna a hangoskodókat a parlamenti dokumentumban rögzített tételek igazságával. Ebben még az sem tántorított el, amikor fenyegetően felakasztottak egy engem ábrázoló bábut egy fára. Álláspontom nem változott, most is megszavaznám az Orbán-kormány bűneit rögzítő jelentést. Az újabb kirakati vita helyett azonban az eljárás érdemi folytatására és az Orbán-kormánnyal szembeni konklúziók levonására van végre szükség.

17. **Wysłuchania w toku prowadzone na mocy art. 7 ust. 1 TUE w sprawie Polski (debata)**

Πρόεδρος. – Το επόμενο σημείο στην ημερήσια διάταξη είναι η συζήτηση επί των δηλώσεων του Συμβουλίου και της Επιτροπής σχετικά με τις εν εξελίξει ακροάσεις σύμφωνα με το άρθρο 7 παράγραφος 1 ΣΕΕ σχετικά με την Πολωνία (2020/2510(RSP)).

Nikolina Brnjac, President-in-Office of the Council. – Mr President, as already expressed today in the previous debate, we cannot stress enough the importance of the issue being discussed here, and the essential place of democracy, the rule of law and fundamental rights in our societies. The EU strategic agenda for 2019-2024 recalls that the rule of law is a key guarantee that our common values are well protected and complied with.

As to Article 7(1), the procedure regarding Poland which was triggered by the Commission: three hearings took place in June, September and December 2018 and at the General Affairs Council. Subsequently, the Council was kept regularly informed about the developments in Poland. In the course of 2019, relevant updates on the state of play were provided and discussed at the General Affairs Council in February, April, July, September and December.

The Croatian Presidency will ensure that the General Affairs Council remains seized of this highly important matter. At the same time, we hope that the ongoing dialogue at a political level between the Commission and Poland will bear fruit. Today, we will take careful note of the intervention from the Commission, as well as of the outcomes of your debate.

Věra Jourová, Vice-President of the Commission. – Mr President, I would like to thank Parliament for having included in the agenda the state of play as regards the rule of law in Poland. It is essential that all EU institutions contribute within their respective roles to upholding the rule of law in the EU. I am aware that Parliament has followed the situation in Poland very closely and that you have been regularly updated by the Commission. Last December, Commissioner Reynders had the opportunity to debrief the Committee on Civil Liberties, Justice and Home Affairs (LIBE).

Today, the Commission's intervention will focus on the most recent developments. Let me start with developments in the Court of Justice of the European Union. On 5 November 2019, the Court of Justice, in full support of the Commission's position, ruled that by lowering the retirement age of ordinary court judges and by granting the Minister of Justice discretionary power to prolong their active service after reaching the new retirement age, Poland had introduced unjustified discrimination based on gender and breached the principle of judicial independence and irremovability of judges under Article 19(1) of the Treaty on the European Union.

On 19 November 2019, the Court of Justice issued a preliminary ruling concerning the independence of the newly created disciplinary chamber of the Supreme Court. The Court of Justice held that it was for the Polish Supreme Court to assess whether the new disciplinary chamber was independent and provided a number of precise elements to be taken into account.

On 5 December, the Polish Supreme Court, based on the criteria set out by the Court of Justice of the European Union, ruled that the disciplinary Chamber of the Supreme Court did not meet the requirements of EU law on judicial independence and was not, therefore, a court within the meaning of EU law or of national law. We have observed a number of reactions from the Polish authorities criticising the Supreme Court ruling. In this regard, I would emphasise that respecting judgments that apply a preliminary ruling from the Court of Justice is of key importance for the uniform application of EU law.

As regards disciplinary proceedings, the Commission decided on 10 October 2019 to refer Poland to the Court of Justice in relation to the new disciplinary regime. In particular, the Commission considered that the new disciplinary regime did not provide the necessary guarantees to protect judges from political control of their judicial decisions.

The situation continues to be very serious. Despite the preliminary ruling of the Court of Justice and the judgment of the Supreme Court, ordinary court judges who seek to implement these rulings are subject to disciplinary proceedings and the disciplinary chamber continues to operate in full. These developments create a risk of irreparable damage for judges, who may become subject to a final decision taken by a disciplinary chamber which has been found not to be independent.

The continued operation of the disciplinary chamber, combined with the launching of new disciplinary proceedings, increases the chilling effect on the Polish judiciary. Polish judges who consider sending preliminary references to the Court of Justice are particularly affected. For these reasons, yesterday the Commission decided to make a request for interim measures in the context of ongoing infringement proceedings for the Court of Justice to suspend the functioning of the disciplinary Chamber of the Supreme Court. These measures are urgent and needed in this specific case.

The Commission stands ready to continue the dialogue with Poland on the rule of law situation with a view to finding constructive ways forward to resolve the issues at hand.

Another important recent development relates to a draft new law governing the functioning of the judiciary and currently being discussed in the Polish Parliament. The draft legislation touches upon matters such as the independence of the judiciary, further raising the Commission's concerns in this area. For this reason, on 19 December, I sent a letter to the Polish President, the presidents of the Sejm and the Senate, and to the Polish Prime Minister on this draft legislation. The aim of the letter was to recall that the Commission wants to work with the Polish authorities to strengthen the rule of law by preventing problems and by working towards resolving them when they arise. In the letter, I encouraged the Polish authorities to consult the Council of Europe's Venice Commission on this draft legislation and called on all state bodies not to take forward the proceedings on the new draft legislation before carrying out all the necessary consultations with all stakeholders. I underlined that any legislative development must comply with the requirements underpinning the EU legal order and should not lead to a further deterioration of the rule of law situation in Poland.

The Commission welcomes the fact that the President of the Senate has requested an opinion from the Venice Commission, which visited Poland on 9-10 January and is due to provide an opinion on the draft law. The Commission stands ready to engage in a constructive dialogue and is in regular contact with the Polish authorities with a view to finding constructive ways forward to resolve the issues at hand.

Roberta Metsola, *on behalf of the PPE Group*. – Mr President, Poland's place is at the very heart of the European Union. Poland is the beating heart of Europe. Poland joining the European Union meant that we could start to move past five decades of historical division and suppression. It meant hope for Poland and hope for Europe. Polish citizens are European citizens, just as Polish judges are European judges.

Being a Member State of the European Union is about both rights and responsibilities. It is both give and take. We share history, and we must share a future, and it is because of that shared future that we cannot be silent when the rule of law is under threat in Poland or anywhere. We cannot be silent when an electoral majority is used as an excuse to justify the unjustifiable. We cannot be silent when Polish justice is put under threat, and we will not be silent. The term 'rule of law' is not a phrase bandied about that means nothing. It means freedom; it means equality; it means rights. Ultimately, it means Europe. Without the protection of the rule of law, our Treaties risk becoming nice words printed on expensive paper, and without a truly independent judiciary, there cannot be rule of law.

Before this is spun as a partisan manoeuvre, let me be absolutely clear: standing up for the independence of judges to perform their function without fear or favour is not an attack on the Polish state, or far less on the Polish people. It is about protecting the European way and about protecting the people of Poland.

Finally, let me salute the courage of the Polish judges who are with us here today.

(Applause)

We will not let you down. We will not let Poland down. We will not let Europe down.

(Sustained applause)

VORSITZ: OTHMAR KARAS*Vizepräsident*

Juan Fernando López Aguilar, *en nombre del Grupo S&D*. – Señor presidente, vicepresidenta Jourová, comisario Reynders, hoy mismo hemos podido escuchar aquí, en la sede del Parlamento Europeo, el testimonio dramático de jueces y magistrados polacos de carne y hueso, al borde de las lágrimas, denunciando los abusos, las intimidaciones y el acoso que padecen como consecuencia de su función jurisdiccional, que reclama independencia, tal y como consagra el Derecho europeo.

En apenas dos años hemos visto una sucesión atropellada de, al menos, hasta tres iniciativas legislativas de la misma apisonadora mayoría en el *Sejm*, en el Parlamento polaco. Insisto en que ninguna democracia es simplemente el gobierno de la mayoría y menos cuando esa mayoría se sustenta sobre un premio electoral de mayoría que no se corresponde con el pluralismo de la sociedad polaca.

Polonia es un gran país. Es el de mayor territorio y población de la gran ampliación de 2004. Su Constitución primera, de 1791, es incluso anterior a la primera Constitución francesa del periodo revolucionario y, sin embargo, la preocupación de este Parlamento Europeo con el estado de Derecho en Polonia está justificada y viene una y otra vez a nuestra discusión. Lo ha puesto de manifiesto el Tribunal de Justicia: sentencias que ponen claramente de manifiesto que la Oficina Judicial y la Cámara Disciplinaria que sustituye al Tribunal Supremo son incompatibles con el artículo 19 y el 47 de la Carta de los Derechos Fundamentales de la Unión Europea, que también es vinculante desde que entró en vigor el Tratado de Lisboa, también para Polonia.

Por tanto, el mensaje es claro. Hay que decirles a los jueces y magistrados y a los abogados y jueces procedentes de toda Europa que se manifestaron este fin de semana, este domingo, en Polonia: «No están solos, no estáis solos». El Parlamento Europeo apoya la independencia de la justicia, los derechos fundamentales y la democracia. Y el Parlamento Europeo exige de la Comisión que vincule el acceso a los fondos europeos al cumplimiento estricto de las reglas del estado de Derecho, la democracia y los derechos fundamentales.

Michal Šimečka, *on behalf of the Renew Group*. – Mr President, I guess you can be pretty sure that something pretty serious is happening when judges are taking to the streets to protest. And, indeed, it is serious: we have an EU Member State government – one of the biggest EU Member States governments – conducting a ruthless intimidation campaign against judges who are simply trying to protect their independence from political control. And more than 40 of them – and some of them here – have been targeted by disciplinary proceedings and smear campaigns orchestrated also with the help of the Ministry of Justice.

Let's be absolutely clear on this: this kind of repression of independent judges is without precedent in the history of the European Union. And if this new legislation is passed, it could even happen that judges could be fired for interacting with or implementing the European Court of Justice rulings, which constitutes quite a blatant and clear challenge to the idea of the European Union as a community of law and common values.

Unfortunately, in the Article 7 proceedings so far, the Council has been acting in a fairly opaque and timid fashion, unlike the Commission, which has thankfully acted with this request for an interim measure. But national governments can no longer duck their responsibility when it comes to protecting European values: as has been said, Polish judges are European judges, and the situation in Poland is a European problem. Without judicial independence, there is No - European Union.

(Applause)

Terry Reintke, *on behalf of the Verts/ALE Group*. – Mr President, I was also one of the people who had the pleasure and the honour today to speak with the representatives of the Polish judges, lawyers and prosecutors. To be honest, there was one sentence said in that meeting that impressed me a lot, and that I wanted to repeat here in this Parliament. One of the representatives said: 'I swore an oath on the Polish Constitution when I started my job, and with all I do I'm trying to stay true to this oath and defend the rights of Polish citizens'.

To me, this really encapsulates what kind of people we have to protect in situations like this: these are the kind of people that defend the rule of law, defend our democracies, and are the backbone of our democracies and of the systems that all of us have been profiting from in the past. Judges, prosecutors and lawyers are one of the fundamentals of this tripartite system, and that is why protecting them really also means protecting the separation of powers, and thus our democracy. Indeed – and colleagues have mentioned it – what we have seen in Poland in the past years is an organised campaign against that very important backbone, and the Commissioner has mentioned the latest developments in this field.

This Parliament and the EU institutions have taken steps in order to defend the rule of law and European citizens in Poland, but I believe that the Article 7 procedure has actually proven to very often come too late and be too inflexible to meet all these attacks that have been happening. I think we need to have a more holistic vision, and the rule of law mechanism that is going to be proposed is one of the instruments that we need, together with budgetary measures and, of course, enabling civil society, enabling these representatives to work together.

Let me finish by saying that I really hope the Croatian Presidency is going to follow the Finnish example in standing up for the rule of law, but just be assured that – no matter what is going to happen – this Parliament will continue to stand up for the rule of law and democracy in the future.

Jaak Madison, fraktsiooni ID nimel. – Austatud istungi juhataja! Ma seekord räägin oma emakeeles – eesti keeles. Esiteks ma soovin jõudu meie Poola kolleegidele. Loodame, et peate ilusti vastu. Eelmisele kõnelejal tahaksin öelda, et see Poola kohtunik, kellega teie rääkisite ja kes oli lubanud oma vandega kaitsta Poola õigussüsteemi, pidi küll oma vande andma Nõukogude Liidu ajal Poolas, kui Poola oli Nõukogude Liidu poolt okupeeritud. Vastasel korral ei saaks teda ju uue seaduse järgi vallandada. Seega ta ei töötanud mitte Poola, vaid kommunistliku režiimi nimel, ja te võite öelda siin „Häbi!“, aga õppige ajalugu! Teiseks tahan öelda, et kolm kuud tagasi olid Poolas valimised ja 43% inimestest toetas konservatiivset erakonda Poolas. 43%! See on fakt. Neil on tugev mandaat reformideks. Kolmandaks, kui me räägime „rule of law“ st ehk õigusriigist ja väärtustest, ma veel lõpetuseks ütlen, ja olge palun härrasmees ja ärge segage vahele, te võite ka vaikida ja siis kõneleda. Ma tahan öelda, kui me räägime väärtustest, et enne oli siin debatt II maailmasõja teemal ja ma kuulsin mitmeid kõnelejaid, kes avaldasid austust kommunismile, Nõukogude Liidule ja Punaarmeele selle eest, kuidas nad päästsid maailma. Ma küsin, kas see on tõesti kooskõlas euroopalike väärtustega, et kiidetakse režiimi, kes tappis Katõni metsas 20 000 Poola ohvitseri? Kas need on Euroopa väärtused? Mõelge selle üle!

(Sõnavõtja nõustus vastama sinise kaardi küsimusele (kodukorra artikli 171 lõige 8))

Mikuláš Peksa (Verts/ALE), otázka položená zvednutím modré karty. – Pane kolego, já bych Vás chtěl požádat po tom, co jste tady všechno zmiňoval, jestli byste nemohl počkat ještě na ten příští bod, kde budeme projednávat trestně stíhaného českého premiéra Andreje Babiše, který, dle výroku slovenského soudu, býval spolupracovníkem komunistické tajné služby a býval v KSČ. V tuto chvíli zasedá v rámci Evropské rady a v tuto chvíli přispívá i svým hlasem k tomu, že právě takové problémy, jaké vidíme v Polsku a v Maďarsku, není možné řešit. Tak bych Vás chtěl poprosit, jestli byste tady mohl počkat a být podobně vokální, jako jste byl v tomto případě.

Jaak Madison (ID), blue-card answer. – Unfortunately, they haven't attributed my speaking time for the next session, but I will be in the House so I will try to get my speaking time with a blue card or catch-the-eye. So I think it's a very good idea, and thank you for reminding me.

Beata Szydło, w imieniu grupy ECR. – Panie przewodniczący! Sądy w Polsce są niezależne i wolne. Polska jest krajem praworządnym. W Polsce sędziowie mogą protestować i nikt nie wyprowadza przeciwko nim sił porządkowych. Każdy, kto twierdzi inaczej, kłamie.

Wiedzą o tym wszyscy Polacy siedzący na tej sali, łącznie z sędziami, którzy zostali tutaj zaproszeni. Przed czterema laty, dokładnie za kilka dni minie ta niechlubna rocznica, polska opozycja zorganizowała debatę przeciwko Polsce. 19 stycznia 2016 roku miałam zaszczyt jako premier polskiego rządu reprezentować moją ojczyznę tutaj w czasie debaty w Parlamencie Europejskim w Strasburgu. Rozmawialiśmy wtedy o sytuacji w Polsce, o reformach, o tym wszystkim co jest konieczne do zrealizowania, a czego podjął się obdarzony zaufaniem w demokratycznych wyborach przez obywateli rząd Prawa i Sprawiedliwości. W ciągu tych czterech lat przeprowadziliśmy bardzo wiele reform społecznych, gospodarczych, administracyjnych. Polacy to docenili i ponownie nam zaufali, ponownie obdarzyli nas mandatem zaufania, aby stworzyć rząd i kontynuować te rozpoczęte reformy. W ciągu tych czterech lat udało się dużo dobrego zrobić, ale Polacy wciąż oczekują tego, żeby przeprowadzić wszystkie reformy, łącznie z reformą wymiaru sprawiedliwości, bo wymiar sprawiedliwości ma służyć obywatelom, a nie chronić jakieś określone przywileje, które określona grupa chce zatrzymać.

Wielokrotnie polski rząd, w tym również ja tutaj właśnie przed czterema laty, tłumaczył dlaczego konieczne są reformy wymiaru sprawiedliwości, tego wymiaru, który nie został zreformowany jako jedyny w okresie transformacji i można powiedzieć, że do tej pory jest reliktem komunistycznego państwa w demokratycznym państwie członkowskim Unii Europejskiej. Wie o tym Komisja Europejska, wiecie o tym Państwo również tutaj w Parlamencie, bo wielokrotnie o tym rozmawialiśmy i dlatego właśnie podjęliśmy się tych reform. Te zmiany wprowadziliśmy zgodnie z polską konstytucją, zgodnie z prawodawstwem europejskim, ale przede wszystkim zgodnie z wolą Polaków, bo to jest nasz suweren. Zawsze byliśmy otwarci na dialog i zawsze byliśmy otwarci na wyjaśnienia, ale żeby ten dialog mógł być prowadzony, musi być wola z obydwu stron, a mam wrażenie, że Komisja Europejska i Parlament Europejski po prostu tego nie chcą ... (Przewodniczący odebrał mówczyńni głos)

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

Radosław Sikorski (PPE), pytanie zadane przez podniesienie niebieskiej kartki. – Pani premier Szydło stwierdziła, że wszystko co się dzieje w Polsce, jest zgodne z konstytucją. Nie wiemy, czy jest zgodne z konstytucją, bo pani premier Szydło jest tą osobą, która wydała polecenie niepublikowania wyroków Trybunału Konstytucyjnego, i od tego zaczęło się łamanie w Polsce konstytucji i łamanie w Polsce praworządności. Jest także osobą, która nie jest bezstronna w tej sprawie, gdyż to w jej sprawie toczą się przypadki takie jak 26 przesłuchań Bogu ducha winnego Sebastiana K., więc bardzo sugeruję rządzącym...

Der Präsident. – Herr Kollege, ich muss Ihnen sagen, die „blaue Karte“ ist dazu da, um eine Frage zu stellen, und nicht, um sich an der Debatte zu beteiligen. Es tut mir leid.

Do you want to give an answer? – but it was not the question.

Beata Szydło (ECR), odpowiedź na pytanie zadane przez podniesienie niebieskiej kartki. – Panie Przewodniczący! To nie było pytanie, ale pan Sikorski w tej chwili skłamał i właściwie powinnam go podać do sądu, bo przeciwko mnie nie toczą się żadne postępowania sądowe – to jest po pierwsze, panie Sikorski. I niech pan czyta ze zrozumieniem. Jest pan kłamcą i jest pan niegodny tego żeby mieć mandat z nadania Polaków.

Der Präsident. – Frau Kollegin, ich würde sehr aufpassen mit derartigen Wortmeldungen, wo der eine dem anderen etwas unterstellt. Deshalb führen wir hier die Debatte über die Rechtsstaatlichkeit in Polen. Das ist das Thema. Und die Einleitung hat die Frau Kommissarin ja bereits abgegeben.

Κωνσταντίνος Αρβανίτης, εξ ονόματος της ομάδας GUE/NGL. – Κύριε Πρόεδρε, αν και είμαστε επιφυλακτικοί με τις παρεμβάσεις της Ευρωπαϊκής Ένωσης σε κράτη μέλη, καθώς εμείς στην Ελλάδα έχουμε πικρή εμπειρία με τα μνημόνια και με την Τρόικα, στη συγκεκριμένη περίπτωση της Πολωνίας, συμφωνώ, και συμφωνούμε σαν ομάδα, στη σύνταξη προσωρινής έκθεσης που θα αφορά όχι μόνο το δικαστικό σύστημα αλλά και όλα τα θεμελιώδη δικαιώματα που βρίσκονται σε κρίση τη στιγμή αυτή που μιλάμε. Αυτή ήταν εξ αρχής η θέση της ομάδας μας αλλά και ολόκληρου του προοδευτικού τόξου, όπως ακούσατε εδώ. Αυτή τη στιγμή, στην Πολωνία, υποβιβάζεται στο σύνολό της η δικαστική εξουσία προς όφελος της εκτελεστικής, και βρίσκεται υπό κίνδυνο η ανεξαρτησία των δικαστών — τους ακούσαμε σήμερα. Σκοπεύουν να καταστήσουν παράνομη ακόμα και την προσφυγή στο Ευρωπαϊκό Δικαστήριο. Στεκόμαστε δίπλα στους δικαστές στη συγκεκριμένη τους μάχη, όπως και αυτοί πρέπει να είναι αλληλέγγυοι στο δίκιο των εύαλων ομάδων για την ελευθερία του τύπου, για το δικαίωμα του συνέρχεσθαι και του συνεταιρίζεσθαι, τα δικαιώματα των εργαζομένων, τα δικαιώματα των γυναικών, των ανθρώπων που βρίσκονται σε κίνδυνο. Αυτή την Ευρώπη θέλουμε. Αυτή την Ευρώπη θέλουμε και όχι την Ευρώπη του φόβου, του σκοταδισμού, του περιορισμού των δικαιωμάτων. Καλή τύχη στους δικαστές.

Der Präsident. – Ich muss mich bei Ihnen entschuldigen, dass ich aufgrund der „blauen Karte“ schon einen Schritt weiter war. Nach den Fraktionssprechern treten wir nun in die Debatte der individuellen Mitglieder ein.

Andrzej Halicki (PPE). – Panie Przewodniczący! Pani Szydło! W demokracji suwerenem jest prawo, konstytucji trzeba przestrzegać, a nie ją łamać. Nikt nie daje prawa żadnej partii politycznej, nawet rządzącej, do łamania konstytucji, do łamania traktatów, bo ta debata nie jest o Polsce, ta debata jest o ochronie praworządności i ochronie Unii Europejskiej. I polscy sędziowie, tylko dlatego że chcą wykonywać prawo i działać zgodnie z traktatami, nie mogą być wyrzucani, nie mogą być dyscyplinowani. Unia ma prawo reagować i ma obowiązek reagować wtedy, dlatego dziękujemy Komisji za aktywność. Ale też chciałem powiedzieć jako szef polskiej delegacji PPE działającej w ramach Europejskiej Partii Ludowej: oczywiście, że jesteśmy za rezolucją, która chroni i wzmacnia Unię, bo to są nasze obywatelskie także oczekiwania. Bez praworządności nie ma wolności.

Sylwia Spurek (S&D). – Mr President, we are seeing in Poland today the perpetual carnival of destruction of the Polish judiciary. I've been observing this process for years as a deputy Commissioner for Human Rights and now as a Member of the European Parliament – the dismantling of the Constitutional Tribunal, control over the National Council of the Judiciary, monopoly to appoint judges, the Supreme Court. Now we are seeing the proposed muzzle law, which will make it possible to limit judges' independence even more. There is no doubt that all these changes are in complete violation of the rule of law and I am sorry to say that the actions undertaken by the civil society so far, the protests of judges and the triggering of the procedure under Article 7 have all been insufficient. This is why the time has come for further steps. It is necessary to suspend the operations of the Supreme Court's disciplinary chamber and it is high time to tie the country's compliance with the rule of law to EU funds.

Sophia in 't Veld (Renew). – Mr President, first of all, I would like to thank the European Commission for its determined intervention, but in the direction of my Polish colleagues from the ECR Group, you justify your purge of the judiciary by referring to Communists. Well, apart from the fact that that's already 30 years ago and some of the judges are actually rather young, what strikes me about this is that some of the parties in your group, like, for example, the Dutch Forum for Democracy, is using the exact same language in my country to attack to the judiciary there. We've never had any Communists in power, so it is a very clear pretext to grab power over the judiciary.

What also strikes me is that you're going straight against the interest of your people. The Polish people are amongst the most pro-European in the whole European Union, but if you don't recognise the European Commission, the authority of the European Court of Justice, the decisions of this House, or indeed the EU treaties then we're talking about a *de facto* 'Polexit'. Now, did you tell your voters that before you went to the elections? Or did you lie to them? Please turn around, come back into the fold, respect European values and keep Poland firmly in the heart of the European Union.

(Applause)

(The speaker agreed to take a blue-card question under Rule 171(8))

Anna Zalewska (ECR), pytanie zadane przez podniesienie niebieskiej kartki. – Szanowna Koleżanko, używa pani sformułowań, o których nie ma pani zielonego pojęcia. Proszę podać jakikolwiek przykład czystki sędziów w Rzeczypospolitej Polskiej, w wolnym, suwerennym kraju. Proszę podać przykłady łamania jakichkolwiek wartości europejskich. Tak, Polacy kochają Unię Europejską, i tak, chcą zmian w wymiarze sprawiedliwości. Proszę podać konkretnie jeden przykład i proszę pana przewodniczącego, żeby rzeczywiście każdy z państwa, który się wypowiada, nie mówił tylko tytułami gazet, ale podawał konkretne przykłady, takich przykładów po prostu nie ma.

Sophia in 't Veld (Renew), blue-card answer. – Ms Zalewska, you don't have to take my word for it. You can take the word for it from the Polish judges who are sitting in the public gallery. If you don't listen to the judges, who have who have sworn loyalty to the Polish Constitution, you might actually listen to the impartial opinion of the European Court of Justice. If you don't recognise the European Court of Justice, you cannot be a member of the European Union.

Tineke Strik (Verts/ALE). – Mr President, last weekend judges from over 20 European countries gathered in Warsaw to support their Polish colleagues in their fight to protect the independence of the judiciary, and they were supported by many Polish citizens who demand European action.

We applaud the Commission's call to the Court of Justice to impose an interim measure on the Polish Government to stop the disciplinary chamber. Yet as we know, this procedure covers only one of the many threats to the Polish rule of law.

While judges from all over Europe speak out against these dangerous reforms and violations, our government leaders remain silent. There are no recommendations to the Polish Government, no regular hearings and no legal steps taken, such as interstate complaints. These are all measures that the Council can take without unanimity.

My question to the Council, and through the Council to the other Member States, is a simple one. How far does the Polish Government need to go before you will start actively defending our European values?

(The speaker agreed to take a blue-card question under Rule 171(8))

Joachim Stanisław Brudziński (ECR), pytanie zadane przez podniesienie niebieskiej kartki. – Nie chciałbym, aby Państwo odnieśli wrażenie, że to jest wojna polsko-polska, dlatego nie będę odnosił się do tych nadpobudliwych moich kolegów z Platformy Obywatelskiej, ale zadam pytanie wszystkim przedmówcom z innych grup i z innych państw. Gdzie Państwo byliście, gdy za rządów tych, którzy dzisiaj siedzą w tych ławach, służby specjalne wkraczały do redakcji tygodnika „Wprost”? Gdzie byliście, jak była akcja „Widelec”, kiedy zatrzymywano Bogu ducha winnych kibiców? Gdzie byliście, kiedy były prowokacje policyjne i rozbijano marsze niepodległości? Gdzie była wtedy Komisja Europejska?...

Der Präsident. – Ich möchte nur noch einmal betonen, dass wir hier beisammensitzen, um die Erklärung des Rates und der Kommission über die laufenden Anhörungen nach Artikel 7 Absatz 1 des EU-Vertrags zu debattieren. Die Grundlage ist der Bericht der Kommission, und diese Grundlage hat Fakten aufgezeigt, die wir jetzt hier debattieren. Daher komme ich zur Antwort auf die Frage des Herrn Kollegen, und dann gehen wir in der Debatte weiter.

Tineke Strik (Verts/ALE), blue-card answer. – I can't reply to this question, because it's completely arbitrary. What we are discussing here is the threat to the rule of law in Poland. A real democracy recognises the separation of powers and the checks and balances that we need in order to respect not only the majority, but also the minorities, and the rights of everyone in a country. Now this is under threat, and I would really hope that the Polish people – and especially Polish politicians – really look into the facts and look at the rule of law and the rules of the European Union to see where they are falling short.

Maximilian Krah (ID). – Herr Präsident, meine Damen und Herren Kollegen! Ich bin praktizierender Rechtsanwalt in Deutschland, und selbstverständlich werden die Richter durch das Justizministerium ernannt. Gewaltenteilung bedeutet, dass der Richter frei ist in seiner Entscheidung des Einzelfalls. Aber es heißt doch um Gottes Willen nicht, dass die Richter sich selbst aussuchen, wer Richter wird, wie die Verfahrensordnungen der Gerichte sind usw.

Das ist eine polnische Besonderheit, dass die Richter aus sich selbst heraus ihre Kollegen, ihre Präsidenten und ihre Nachfolger bestimmen. Und es ist die alte Praxis, die jetzt überwunden ist, die die Gewaltenteilung aushebelt. Gewaltenteilung heißt: Der Richter ist an das Gesetz gebunden, aber sie heißt nicht: Er beruft sich selbst, er befördert sich selbst, und er kontrolliert auch noch selbst, ob er sich an die Regeln hält. Das ist der Unterschied.

Insofern bin ich schwer beeindruckt, wie hier im Namen der Gewaltenteilung gefordert wird, genau diese Durchbrechung der Gewaltenteilung durch die alte Regel aufrechtzuerhalten. Und ich hoffe, die polnische Regierung hält durch.

Der Präsident. – Nachdem wir derzeit mehrere „blaue Karten“ zur selben Zeit haben, die immer sehr spät mit Handzeichen abgegeben werden, möchte ich Sie bitten, das elektronische System zu verwenden, damit ich die Reihenfolge kenne und auf der anderen Seite auch noch weiß, wer die Frage stellen will, um in diese eher aufgeheizte Debatte eine spezifische Ordnung einzubringen.

Jadwiga Wiśniewska (ECR). – Panie Przewodniczący! Pani komisarz Jourová powiedziała, że zachęca władze polskie do konsultowania się z Komisją w zakresie zmian w systemie sprawiedliwości. Otóż pani komisarz Jourová, chciałabym Pani powiedzieć, że Unia Europejska to nie związek republik państw członkowskich, tylko związek państw, które chcą realizować wspólną misję, ale każde państwo jest suwerenne i zgodnie z traktatami każde państwo zachowuje kompetencje, jeśli chodzi o wymiar sprawiedliwości.

Polacy to dumny, praworządny i demokratyczny kraj i z całą pewnością nie zasługujemy na to, żeby tutaj w Parlamencie Europejskim dobre imię Polski było szargane. Dlaczego zatem tak się dzieje? Dlatego, że mamy taką opozycję, która postawiła sobie za cel donoszenie na Polskę i budowanie fałszywych informacji wokół Polski. To jest przykład dezinformacji, szkodenia swojej ojczyźnie. Popatrzcie państwo, że wszystkich krajów członkowskich są ludzie z różnych partii politycznych, ale żadna opozycja w stosunku do swojej ojczyzny nie zachowuje się w sposób tak haniebny jak przedstawiciele koalicji tak zwanej europejskiej.

Szanowni Państwo, jeśli nie wiemy o co chodzi, to jeszcze proszę państwa o to, że chcecie sprawdzić, jak daleko możecie się posunąć w zawłaszczaniu kompetencji krajowych, bo chcecie wejść na drogę prowadzącą do federalizacji i dziwię wam się, bo wy wróćcie do Polski, jak się będziecie tłumaczyć z tego, że żądacie powiązania funduszy z praworządnością ... (Przewodniczący przerwał mówczyjni) ... gdy ta praworządność złamana.

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

Elżbieta Katarzyna Łukacijewska (PPE), pytanie zadane przez podniesienie niebieskiej kartki. – Zawsze Państwo się domagacie konkretów, więc ja chciałam zadać konkretne pytanie. Proszę mi wskazać konkretne ustawy i konkretne zapisy ustawy waszej reformy sądownictwa, które usprawniają i reformują wymiar sprawiedliwości w Polsce, tak aby naprawdę szanował trójpodział władzy, był zgodny z konstytucją i służył Polakom.

Jadwiga Wiśniewska (ECR), odpowiedź na pytanie zadane przez podniesienie niebieskiej kartki. – Gdyby Pani posiadała umiejętność czytania ze zrozumieniem, to to pytanie dzisiaj nie padłoby, bo zapewniam Panią, Pani europoseł, że wszystkie proponowane przez nas ustawy właśnie usprawniają system sprawiedliwości, a w Polsce, proszę Pani, system sprawiedliwości bardzo często był opresyjny w stosunku do obywateli, dlatego wymagał usprawnienia. Prawo i Sprawiedliwość zwyciężyło dwukrotnie, dlatego, że umówiliśmy się z Polakami, że zreformujemy wymiar sprawiedliwości.

Sira Rego (GUE/NGL). – Señor presidente, jueces perseguidos por exigir el respeto al estado de Derecho, establecimiento de zonas libres de personas LGTBI, criminalización de la educación sexual en las escuelas, persecución de la libertad de expresión y del derecho a la información. En definitiva: vulneración de derechos humanos.

Es dramático que esto esté sucediendo en un país de la UE. Conviene que seamos exigentes, y no solo para que el Gobierno polaco no quede impune y cumpla con la Carta de los Derechos Fundamentales de la UE, sino también con el papel que juega esta Cámara a la hora de normalizar el discurso de odio de la extrema derecha. No olvidemos que contar con la ultraderecha para poner a una presidenta de la Comisión Europea es normalizar a la extrema derecha. Que aprobar las políticas racistas de la Europa fortaleza es integrar el relato de la extrema derecha. Que reescribir la historia, negar y criminalizar las luchas antifascistas es una concesión a la extrema derecha.

No seamos cómplices de quienes quieren devolvernos a la etapa más oscura. Recuperemos el espíritu de la Europa antifascista.

Esteban González Pons (PPE). – Mr President, as a lawyer, I am deeply moved by the march of Polish judges last Saturday. We ask the Polish Government to respect the Polish Constitution, which is a European constitution too; to respect Polish judges, who are European judges too; to respect the Polish judiciary system, which belongs to the European system too – the same thing we ask of every single country, no matter if it is from east, west, north or south. We are defending the right of the Polish people to have an independent justice system they can believe in. We are not attacking the Government of Poland, but defending the people of Poland. If we have to choose between this Polish Government and the Polish people, trust me: we know on which side we will stand. To conclude, to my colleagues in the ECR Group: sincerely, do you realise how much your government is damaging your country?

(The speaker agreed to take a blue-card question under Rule 171(8))

Ryszard Czarnecki (ECR), pytanie zadane przez podniesienie niebieskiej kartki. – Chciałbym powiedzieć, że polscy obywatele, o których Pan mówił – i za to dziękuję – sześciokrotnie spowodowali, że wybory wygrało Prawo i Sprawiedliwość, także za taką troskę dziękujemy. Chciałem Pana zapytać, bo Pan tutaj powołuje się na Unię Europejską, która jest dla nas też bardzo ważna, jesteśmy państwem członkowskim. Jak Pan by skomentował fakt, że Pański kraj – miał do tego oczywiście prawo – odrzucił wyrok Trybunału Sprawiedliwości Unii Europejskiej w sprawie katalońskich parlamentarzystów?

Esteban González Pons (PPE), *blue-card answer*. – Mr Brudziński, I have two words: one in English, and another one in Spanish. In English: you are lying. In Spanish: *está mintiendo*. The Spanish Supreme Court accepts the sentence of the European Supreme Court, so there is an absolute difference. The Spanish Supreme Court respects the rule of law. You are lying, and you are a liar.

(Cheers and applause)

Katarina Barley (S&D). – Herr Präsident! Gestern hat die EU-Kommission beim Europäischen Gerichtshof beantragt, er möge die von der PiS kontrollierte Disziplinarkammer für Richterinnen und Richter sofort aussetzen – ein wichtiger Schritt. Ich hoffe, dass die Kommission genauso entschlossen und vor allem auch schnell handeln wird, sobald das jüngste Antirechtsstaatsgesetz beschlossen worden ist. Das wird heute im Senat debattiert.

Im Senat übrigens hat bei der letzten Wahl die PiS ihre Mehrheit verloren. Und dann sieht man, was passiert in solchen Regimes, wenn man die Macht verliert: Der Senatspräsident wird seitdem mit einer Schmutzkampagne überzogen.

Am Wochenende sind Tausende, vor allen Dingen Juristinnen und Juristen, auf die Straße gegangen – mutige Menschen. Und hier haben wir sehr mutige Menschen – Richterinnen und Richter und Staatsanwälte –, die hierhergekommen sind. Ich habe Frau Szydło hoffentlich richtig verstanden, dass diesen Menschen, die hierhergekommen sind, als Resultat davon, dass sie hier mit uns gesprochen haben, keinerlei Konsequenzen drohen, wenn sie nach Polen zurückkommen. Da nehme ich Sie beim Wort. Und ich bin gespannt, was Sie zu den vielen Richterinnen und Richtern sagen, die bereits jetzt Konsequenzen erleiden müssen, weil sie zum Beispiel europäisches Recht anwenden wollten.

Was zurzeit in Polen passiert, ist hochdramatisch. Es ist nichts weniger als ein Angriff auf das Fundament der Europäischen Union. Denn die Regierung will es Richterinnen und Richtern de facto verbieten, europäisches Recht anzuwenden.

Und wenn hier immer von Kommunismus die Rede ist: Warum haben Sie dann bitte für das Verfassungsgericht jemanden nominiert – Stanisław Piotrowicz – der in den 80er-Jahren als Staatsanwalt im Kommunismus damals Oppositionelle verfolgt hat? Das müssen Sie mir dann bitte auch mal erklären.

Patryk Jaki (ECR). – Panie Przewodniczący! W nawiązaniu do przedmówczyni, skoro nasz reżim jest taki zły, ponieważ dostał za małe poparcie, to co powiedzieć o Pani partii, reżimie, który dostał dwa razy mniejsze.

Ale wracając do najważniejszych kwestii, to jest charakterystyczne, że Państwo mówicie bardzo dzisiaj ogólnie, że w Polsce jest łamane prawo. Nikt z Państwa nie powiedział na czym konkretnie polega to, że w Polsce jest upolityczniony wybór sędziów, a wiecie Państwo dlaczego? Dlatego, że gdybyście to zrobili, to zaczęłyby powstawać pytania, na przykład pytanie do Pani komisarz Jourovej, w jaki sposób u Pani w Czeskiej Republice są wybierani sędziowie? Proszę to powiedzieć i porównać z Polską, i wtedy wszyscy zobaczylibyście Państwo, na czym polega to jedno wielkie kłamstwo. Dobrze, że Pani z Niemiec również się wypowiadała, bo Pani mówi, że u nas jest upolityczniony wybór sędziów. Czy Pani wie, że w Polsce sędziowie wybierają sędziów? A wie Pani, jak wybierani są sędziowie w Niemczech? Całkiem niedawno poseł prosto z Bundestagu został sędzią. I wy mówicie nam bezczelnie, że w Polsce jest upolityczniony wymiar sprawiedliwości, a w Niemczech nie? To jest szczyt cynizmu, powiem więcej, mówicie o wolności do manifestacji. Czy wiecie, że ci sędziowie, którzy tutaj siedzą, mieli ochronę polskiej policji, jak protestowali? A teraz niech wypowiedzą się sędziowie francuscy i prawnicy francuscy, jak siłą byli wyprowadzani z sądu apelacyjnego we Francji. I co, i u nas jest łamana praworządność, a we Francji nie? Przecież to jest śmieszne i Państwo bardzo dobrze o tym wiecie. Polska wam przeszkadza dlatego, że nie trzyma się już niemieckiej nogawki, że wstaje z kolan, nie zgadza się na przyjmowanie takiej liczby migrantów, jak Państwo chcecie, nie zgadza się na przyjmowanie takich ilości technologii, po prostu chce być suwerennym, podmiotowym państwem i to wam przeszkadza.

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

Anna Júlia Donáth (Renew), *blue-card question*. – Mr Jaki, I know you are really good – like your Hungarian friends – on pinpointing other Member States, but let's get back to the Polish issue.

Today, as you are well aware because you were there, the Polish judges presented in Parliament the changes to the Polish court system. Elements of these are against EU law, as confirmed by the European Court of Justice – such as the disciplinary courts. My question is this: what public consultation preceded the adoption of the law? According to the judges, there was none. Will your government amend the law according to the European Court of Justice decision, or will you follow your Hungarian Government friends and ignore the Court's decision, like always?

Patryk Jaki (ECR), *odpowiedź na pytanie zadane przez podniesienie niebieskiej kartki*. – To jest zresztą charakterystyczne, że Pani mówi coś o łamaniu prawa, a nie wskazuje Pani żadnych konkretów. Ale bardzo dobrze, że Pani wspomniała o wyroku TSUE, bo kolega hiszpański zarzucił mojemu koledze z kolei, że kłamie w sprawie hiszpańskiej. Skoro tak, skoro twierdzenie, że będziecie przestrzegać wyroków TSUE, to ja zadaję pytanie, kiedy wypuścicie kolegę z więzienia. Proszę bardzo, przestrzegacie, proszę bardzo, powiedzcie kiedy.

Jeroen Lenaers (PPE). – Voorzitter, het was een historisch beeld in Warschau zaterdag: rechters uit meer dan twintig landen die met hun Poolse collega's de straat op gingen tegen de uitholling van de rechtsstaat. Het geeft aan hoe nijpend de situatie is, want met het aannemen van de muilkorfwet wordt een nieuwe stap gezet in het slopen van de onafhankelijkheid en de vrijheid van meningsuiting van rechters in Polen. En een rechtsstaat kan niet functioneren zonder onafhankelijke en onpartijdige rechtspraak. Een lidstaat waar Vrouwe Justitia haar blinddoek wordt afgepakt en ze voortaan door de bril van de zittende macht moet kijken, kan nooit de bescherming bieden die de samenleving verdient, kan ook nooit binnen de EU samenwerken met andere landen op basis van wederzijds vertrouwen. Dus, volledige steun voor de aanpak van de Europese Commissie. Wij zullen de Poolse rechtsstaat blijven beschermen. Wij zullen de Poolse rechters niet in de kou laten staan, want hun strijd is een strijd van ons allemaal.

Birgit Sippel (S&D). – Herr Präsident! Demokratie in Polen in Gefahr! Dort verabschiedete das Parlament trotz massiver Proteste ein Gesetz zur weiteren Disziplinierung von Richtern. Diese müssen mit Geldstrafen, Herabstufung oder Entlassung rechnen, wenn sie Entscheidungen eines anderen Richters, Gerichts oder einer Kammer infrage stellen. Völlig zu Recht wird hier von einem „Maulkorberlass“ gesprochen.

Die heutigen Debatten folgen vielen anderen Debatten der letzten Jahre, und ganz ehrlich, ich fühle mich wie im Film „Groundhog Day“ oder zu Deutsch „Und täglich grüßt das Murmeltier“. Wie lange noch will der Rat untätig zuschauen und sich auf intransparente Anhörungen berufen, die zu nichts führen? Und wie lange noch will sich die Kommission mit Vertragsverletzungsverfahren oder offiziellen Briefen begnügen? Nutzen Sie endlich alle Instrumente für ein demokratisches und rechtsstaatliches Europa, bevor es dafür zu spät ist!

Frances Fitzgerald (PPE). – Mr President, without our values – the values of human rights, freedom of expression, democracy and, crucially, the rule of law – the European Union cannot exist. These very values guide our work here in the Parliament day after day, and are the very essence of what makes us Europeans. That's why we're having this discussion here today, because in Poland these values and principles are sadly at risk through the actions of the current government.

Action taken to change the situation through the initiation of the Article 7 procedure has regrettably shown little progress. There are two options on the table. I sincerely hope, firstly, that the Polish Government changes course and takes action to respect the judiciary as outlined in the Commission's recommendations of December. I urge them to do so and to stop the denial we're seeing here today. However, should this not occur, the second option must be advanced: the Council must take forward the Article 7 procedure and make effective use of it.

A holding pattern is no longer acceptable, and I stand with the Justices from across Europe who, upon seeing and injustice happening, move to the fore to stand up for the rule of law – the rule of law that is worth protecting.

Włodzimierz Cimoszewicz (S&D). – Mr President, the government ruling Poland continues demolishing the rule of law. In December, the lower chamber of the Parliament adopted a bill which opens the way to punishing the judges who implement the verdicts of the Court of Justice of the EU. If that happens, judiciary independence will become non-existent. The Speaker of the Senate, who came to Brussels to discuss the issue with Ms Věra Jourová, was officially accused by the government of damaging the basic interests of Poland, and the attorney-general publicly commented on the possibility of accusing the speaker of unconstitutional activity.

At risk is not only the rule of law, but – later on – also democratic rights and freedoms. The situation requires urgent and decisive action by this Parliament, the Commission and the Council. It is a test of the credibility of these institutions.

Jiří Pospíšil (PPE). – Pane předsedající, já trochu netradičně budu reagovat nejprve na pana kolegu Jakiho, který zde zmiňuje justici v České republice. Pane kolego, já jsem byl v České republice 5 let ministrem spravedlnosti a měl jsem na starosti reformu české justice. Měli jsme podobné problémy jako vy s komunistickými soudci. A nikdy jsme v naší reformě nesáhli třeba k tomu, abychom účelově snižovali věk odchodu soudců do důchodu. Nikdy jsme nedělali účelové politické změny, jako děláte vy v Polsku, i když jsme měli podobné problémy v naší justici. Takže prosím nezmiňujte Českou republiku a snažte se prosím vaši justici reformovat řádně ve stylu principů právního státu. Paní Jourová to nemá jednoduché, musí nyní komunikovat s vaší vládou a já držím paní Jourové pěsti, aby přesvědčila polský parlament, že je možné reformovat postkomunistickou justici a přitom respektovat principy právního státu. My jsme to v České republice udělali a je kolegové na vás, abyste naplnili principy právního státu a přitom měli efektivní nekomunistickou justici.

Robert Biedroń (S&D). – Panie Przewodniczący! Drogie Prawo i Sprawiedliwość, mam dla was złą informację dzisiaj. Jeszcze wolne sądy nie zginęły, póki my żyjemy. Żebyście nie wiadomo jak krzyczeli, żebyście nie wiadomo ile kagańców próbowali narzucić, jakiegokolwiek smycze próbowali wprowadzać, to polskie społeczeństwo będzie tak długo wychodziło na ulice, jak długo będzie trzeba, w obronie konstytucji, w obronie praworządności, w obronie ładu konstytucyjnego, i tę solidarność także będziemy pokazywali tu w Parlamencie Europejskim, bo wasze działania, wasza elita, bo dużo mówicie o elitach, jest zagrożeniem nie tylko dla praworządności w Polsce, ale dla całej Unii Europejskiej. Dlatego ostrzegam was, jeżeli będziecie kontynuowali tę drogę, to będziecie jeszcze bardziej osamotnieni i zbliżać się będziecie w kierunku Białorusi i Rosji, bo do takich samych manipulacji sięgacie w Polsce, jak tam w Białorusi i w Rosji. Mówicie dużo o elitach, ale kto tworzy dzisiaj elitę? To wy w Polsce stworzyliście nową neokomunistyczną elitę. Macie media publiczne w swoich rękach, macie parlament, macie prezydenta, macie swoich przedstawicieli w sądach, dlatego naszej solidarności nigdy nie złamiecie.

Siegfried Mureşan (PPE). – Mr President, I am from Romania, and in Romania the previous government attempted to weaken the judiciary to affect the rule of law. We saw how people decisively – big numbers – came to the streets to defend the rule of law and they came out with the European flag in their hands, expecting that the European Union and the institutions of the European Union would stand by their side. So what did we do? The President of the country convoked a referendum and the people spoke loud and clear. More than 85% of the people said: we want a strong judiciary, we do not want overnight, un-transparent changes to the judiciary, we do not want mass pardoning and mass amnesty. So this is why, from the European Parliament here in Strasbourg, I say to the people of Poland: we hear you, we stand with you, we defend you. And I say the same to the judges in Poland: it's our duty; we will fulfil it; we will stand with you to defend European values in every corner of Europe. Any attempt to weaken the judiciary, any attempt to intimidate judges, is unacceptable, and the European Parliament will fight strongly.

(The speaker agreed to take a blue-card question under Rule 171(8))

Róża Thun und Hohenstein (PPE), pytanie zadane przez podniesienie niebieskiej kartki. – Szanowny Panie Kolego! Użył Pan bardzo wyraźnych i mocnych słów i ja mam pytanie, jak przystało na błękitną kartę. Chciałam się zapytać, jak nazwałby Pan używanie dyscyplinarek, dyscyplinowanie sędziów, de facto prześladowanie ich – powiem konkrety: jeden z nich jest tutaj na galerii, nazywa się Waldemar Żurek, sędzia Juszczyzyn, Tuleja, Markiewicz, który takich dyscyplinarek ma chyba pięćdziesiąt pięć – za stosowanie prawa europejskiego, wyroku Europejskiego Trybunału Sprawiedliwości oraz za zadawanie pytań prejudycjalnych do Europejskiego Trybunału Sprawiedliwości. Jak by Pan to nazwał?

Siegfried Mureşan (PPE), blue-card answer. – Whenever politicians want to appropriate all power, then they want to neutralise any form of opposition. They will attack opposition; they will attack an independent judiciary; and they will just want judges and prosecutors under their control. It's always a bad sign when politicians and governments want to limit the independence of the judges, of the judiciary. Never should judges obey politicians. The judiciary is an independent power in the State, and this is how it should be.

(Applause)

Bartosz Arłukowicz (PPE). – Panie Przewodniczący! Mieliście dzisiaj niewielki przykład tego, jaka ekipa dzisiaj rządzi Polską. Wrzask, agresja i taka tempa propaganda, która się leje od rana do nocy, ale tak naprawdę to nie o Polsce dzisiaj debata. Ta debata jest dzisiaj o przyszłości Europy, o przyszłości i bezpieczeństwie naszych dzieci, ich wolności, bo jeśli dopuścimy, żeby gdziekolwiek w Europie rozgościło się bezprawie i łamanie konstytucji, to będzie nasza wina. Jeśli my dopuścimy do tego, żeby gdziekolwiek w Europie łamano kręgosłupy, niszczone niepokornych sędziów tylko dlatego, że nie chcą słuchać partyjnych kacyków, to będzie nasza wina. Jeżeli my tutaj pozwolimy żeby gdziekolwiek w Europie pozwalano na obwinianie niewinnych i uniewinnienie winnych, to będzie nasza wina. Jeśli my tutaj w Europie pozwolimy na to, żeby tego typu propaganda zalewała nas codziennie, to my przegramy Europę i są tacy, którzy mówią, że tego typu ludzie grają w orkiestrze Putina. Szanowni Państwo, to nie jest już orkiestra kameralna, to jest orkiestra symfoniczna, która wkracza do naszej Europy, do naszego domu.

Spontane Wortmeldungen

Tomáš Zdechovský (PPE). – Pane předsedající, vážení kolegové, nikdo z vás nemůže říct ani slovo proti mně, že bych byl zaujatý proti Polsku. Já osobně jsem přítel Polska a vždycky budu hájit česko-polské přátelství. Ale po pravdě musím říct, že když jsem si přečetl návrh vaší soudní reformy, tak mně naskočil mráz na zádech. Já Polsko nikterak nesrovnávám a nikterak nesoudím. Velmi často jsem se vás i zastával, ale pojďme využít této debaty nikoliv k tomu, abychom se tady rozdvojili a bojovali spolu, ale abychom si sedli k jednomu stolu a začali o té reformě debatovat. Tady to přece není o tom, že chceme někoho zahrnout do kouta nebo kritizovat, ale chceme tady prostě jednoznačně říct, že některé kroky ve vaší reformě jsou za tou červenou linií, kterou jsme ani my v České republice nepřekročili.

Ben Habib (NI). – Mr President, Poland is one of the greatest nations in Europe, and indeed in the European Union. It has a long history of democracy. In fact, it practiced a form of democracy before any other modern nation in the European Union.

Poland fought for 45 years for its freedom against the USSR. It is not for an institution which has, itself, appointed a political court – the ECJ has 28 political appointments amongst it, or for an institution which has a government in the form of the Commission that is entirely unelected, to hold to account the Law and Justice party, which has been elected twice to govern Poland on its manifesto, including the reform of its judiciary.

So what I have to say to the Law and Justice party is this: do not put up with the ignominy of this institution. Polesit. You will find a friendship in the United Kingdom. We will support you.

(Applause from certain quarters)

Beata Kempa (ECR). – Panie Przewodniczący! Panie Biedroń! Póki co, to Panu bliżej do Białorusi i do Rosji, bo ci, którzy Pana popierają w wyborach, to są ci, którzy są bezpośrednimi ich spadkobiercami i ich, powiedzmy sobie, pseudowartości. Dostyc tego!

Po drugie, kto z Was przeczytał ze zrozumieniem chociaż jedną ustawę reformującą sądy? Założę się, że nikt. Po dzisiejszej debacie uważam, że tak się nie stało. Pani komisarz Jourova! Mówi Pani, Państwo to mówicie, że trzeba słuchać sędziów. Kiedy Pani przyjedzie do Polski i porozmawia z osobami poszkodowanymi przez wymiar sprawiedliwości? Są ich tysiące, tysiące. Ostatnie ofiary to chociażby człowiek, który obrzucił tylko niechący błotem, i został zamordowany. Wie Pani, co zrobił sędzia? Powiedział, że bili tak, że nie chcieli zabić. Czy Pani wie, że ja jestem również poszkodowana jako poseł na Sejm? Spalono mi biuro poselskie. Oprawca chodzi nadal na wolności, a ja z moim mężem codziennie drżymy o to, czy nie podpali naszego domu. I takich ludzi są tysiące, Pani komisarz Jourova. Kiedy Pani przyjedzie do Polski, porozmawia z tymi, którzy są poszkodowani przez wymiar sprawiedliwości? I tyle mam Pani do powiedzenia. Dajecie sobie Państwo wmówić... *(Przewodniczący odebrał mówczyni głos)*

(Ende der spontanen Wortmeldungen)

Didier Reynders, *Member of the Commission*. – Mr President, let me address some issues raised during the debate, at least about the rule of law in Poland. I would like to come back to yesterday's decision of the College of Commissioners to request the European Court of Justice to take interim measures in the context of ongoing infringement proceedings, to suspend the functioning of the Disciplinary Chamber of the Supreme Court. As Vice-President Jourová explained, despite the preliminary ruling of the Court of Justice and the judgment of the Supreme Court, ordinary court judges who seek to implement these rulings are subject to disciplinary proceedings, and the Disciplinary Chamber continues to fully operate. In view of the risk of irreparable damage faced by judges in Poland, I instructed the Commission's Directorate-General for Justice already in December to closely monitor the situation and to prepare the necessary to enable the College to take the decision on interim measures, which was taken yesterday. It was urgent and needed.

Regarding the new draft law currently under legislative process in Poland, the Venice Commission is due to provide an opinion. It is important that the recommendations of the Venice Commission are fully implemented in the legislative process. The Commission has invited Polish authorities not to take forward the proceedings on the new draft legislation before carrying out all the necessary consultations. The opinion of the Venice Commission will also feed the Commission assessment.

I also again heard calls for a new rule-of-law mechanism. I can reassure you that the Commission will work on a comprehensive European rule-of-law mechanism as a matter of priority. It will cover all Member States and provide a synthesis of significant developments related to the different competences of the rule of law, including, for example, systemic problems with the process for enacting laws, lack of effective judicial protection by independent and impartial courts, the capacity to fight corruption, and issues in relation to media pluralism. This will allow us to identify and prevent early on rule-of-law-related issues.

I want to insist, after some remarks, that each justice system is different and must always be looked at in a comprehensive manner. You cannot single out one specific provision from one Member State and compare it with a provision of another Member State without looking at the context of the legal system and the whole system of checks and balances in that Member State. As held by the Court of Justice in its rulings, although the organisation of justice in the Member States falls within the competence of the Member States, the fact remains that, when exercising that competence, the Member States are required to comply with their obligations deriving from EU law. The rule of law is our foundation and can never be compromised. We must ensure that it is respected and upheld everywhere.

To conclude, the Commission will continue to monitor the situation in Poland very closely and remains ready to engage in a constructive dialogue with the Polish authorities. The introduction of infringement proceedings does not exclude dialogue. I will be in Zagreb at the informal ministerial meeting of Justice and Home Affairs Ministers on 23 and 24 January. I invite the Polish Minister of Justice, Mr Zbigniew Ziobro, to take advantage of this opportunity and to engage with me in a constructive dialogue.

Nikolina Brnjac, *President-in-Office of the Council*. – Mr President, let me assure you once again that the Presidency and the Council as a whole attach great importance to this issue. We believe that only a joint effort by the European Union institutions and the Member States alike will allow the Union to effectively ensure that the rule of law remains the cornerstone of our common project. As I said, the General Affairs Council has discussed the situation in Poland over the last two years, and our Presidency will make sure that it remains seized of the matter.

Regarding the question on dealing with the Article 7 procedure in respect of Poland in the Council, you are aware that the Presidency cannot pre-judge the Council's deliberations, nor the outcome of its procedure. All the recent legislative developments in Poland are being followed, so that the Council can have a full and up-to-date picture of the situation on the ground for its future considerations.

Der Präsident. – Zum Abschluss der Aussprache wurde ein Entschließungsantrag von fünf Fraktionen zu den laufenden Anhörungen nach Artikel 7 Absatz 1 EUV zu Polen und Ungarn eingereicht.

Die Aussprache ist geschlossen.

Die Abstimmung findet am Donnerstag, 16. Januar 2020, statt.

Schriftliche Erklärungen (Artikel 171)

Joachim Stanisław Brudziński (ECR), *na piśmie*. – Na forum Parlamentu Europejskiego musi wybrzmieć wyraźnie: Polska jest krajem, gdzie przestrzega się zasad praworządności oraz chroni publiczne manifestowanie poglądów politycznych. Mówię to nie tylko jako poseł, ale również jako były minister spraw wewnętrznych. Niedawno bez incydentów odbył się marsz tych, którzy bronią się przed demokratyzacją wymiaru sprawiedliwości. Choć był on w kontrze do obecnej władzy, to przebiegał spokojnie i miał należytą ochronę policji. Podobną ochronę miały marsze pokrzywdzonych przez wymiar sprawiedliwości, którzy demokratyzację sądownictwa popierają. Polska policja nie jest polityczna. Według badań CBOS z marca zeszłego roku jej pracę docenia 75% Polaków. 90% moich rodaków uważa, że w Polsce żyje się bezpiecznie.

Tymczasem stan naszej demokracji oceniają posłowie z takich krajów jak np. Niemcy, gdzie polityk partii rządzącej, tak jak w Polsce, staje się członkiem trybunału konstytucyjnego. Tam nie budzi to kontrowersji, a u nas nazywa się upolitycznieniem. Podobnie dziwi ton polityków francuskich. Cała Europa widziała ludzi włączonych po ulicach i bitych podczas manifestacji antyrządowych. Dlaczego traktujecie Polskę jak kraj drugiej kategorii, który ma się tłumaczyć? Apeluję do opozycji, by nie wciągała Europy w wewnętrzne spory. Rozmawiajmy o krajach „starej Unii”, gdzie płoną auta. Rozmawiajmy o tych, gdzie giną dziennikarze. Bądźmy w debacie uczciwi.

Leszek Miller (S&D), *na piśmie*. – Przestrzeganie praworządności w państwach członkowskich ma fundamentalne znaczenie, ponieważ sprawny i niezależny system sądowniczy Unii Europejskiej daje każdemu obywatelowi gwarancję jednakowej ochrony prawnej niezależnie od tego, w którym państwie członkowskim się znajduje (*civis Europaeus sum*).

Podstawowym ogniwem tego systemu są sądy krajowe, które wraz z trybunałem sprawiedliwości stanowią klucz do pogłębiania integracji europejskiej i integracji przez prawo. Prawo, którego znaczenie i istota wykracza poza stosowanie i wykładnię traktatów (art. 19 ust. 1 zdanie drugie TUE) oraz przesądza o autonomicznym charakterze unijnego porządku prawnego. W tym kontekście każdy aspekt funkcjonowania Unii Europejskiej oraz lojalnej współpracy państw członkowskich wymaga bezwzględnego zapewnienia niezawisłości sędziowskiej, by sąd każdorazowo potrafił obiektywnie i bez obaw przed ewentualnymi sankcjami ocenić, czy w danym przypadku prawo unijne znajduje zastosowanie i jak właściwie zapewnić jego efektywność.

W Polsce niestety od dłuższego czasu dochodzi do coraz bardziej zuchwałych prób podporządkowania wymiaru sprawiedliwości rządzącej większości. Z naruszeniem prawa zwasalizowano Trybunał Konstytucyjny, rozbudowano system instytucjonalnego dyscyplinowania sędziów, a ponadto proponuje się przepisy ograniczające swobodę orzekania sędziów i stosowania przez nich prawa UE. Dlatego uważam, że Parlament Europejski nie może pozostawać bierny i musi zająć jasne stanowisko, gdyż jedynie Unia ma jeszcze jakąkolwiek możliwość powstrzymania autorytarnych zapędów bezwzględnej większości sejmowej w Polsce.

18. Wznowienie postępowania przeciwko premierowi Republiki Czeskiej w związku ze sprzeniewierzeniem funduszy UE i możliwym konfliktem interesów (debata)

Der Präsident. – Als nächster Punkt der Tagesordnung folgt die Aussprache über die Erklärungen des Rates und der Kommission zur Wiederaufnahme des Strafverfolgungsverfahrens gegen den Ministerpräsidenten der Tschechischen Republik aufgrund der missbräuchlichen Verwendung von EU-Mitteln und potenzieller Interessenkonflikte (2019/2987(RSP)).

Nikolina Brnjac, President-in-Office of the Council. – Mr President, honourable Members, let me first assure you that the Council attaches great importance to making sure that EU funds are used according to the rules and that expenditure respects the principle of sound financial management.

I am aware of allegations, including in the media, against the Czech Prime Minister regarding a possible conflict of interest in respect of EU subsidies from the European Structural and Investment funds. I also understand that the Czech authorities are further investigating the case.

You will understand that it is not for the Council to comment on ongoing national investigations. Let me therefore stress here that it is important to let the judicial instances do their work properly.

I'm also aware that the Commission, as they indicated in the plenary in December, has conducted an audit, and I will listen to what the Commission will tell us today.

Let me assure you that we agree that it is of the utmost importance that strong mechanisms are applied to protect the Union's financial interests and to make sure that the money is spent in an appropriate and lawful way.

The Council has therefore strongly supported different initiatives that strengthen the protection of the Union's financial interests, such as the creation of the European Public Prosecutor's Office, which will become operational later this year, or the Directive on the Fight against Fraud to the Union's Financial Interests by means of Criminal Law.

While I cannot provide any Council views on specific cases of fraud or corruption allegations, I will carefully listen to your debate.

Virginijus Sinkevičius, Member of the Commission. – Mr President, honourable Members thank you for the opportunity for the Commission to present the state of play in this matter. Let me start by making three points very clear. First, the Commission has zero tolerance for fraud or misuse of EU funds. Second, the Commission always diligently follows up on information or complaints with respect to conflict of interest in all Member States. Third, the Commission has been and is taking broad and coordinated action with respect to alleged conflicts of interest in the Czech Republic.

What are the facts, and where are we in the audit procedure? The Commission services carried out audits in the Czech Republic in January and February 2019. These audits relate to the European Regional Development Fund, the European Social Fund and the European Agricultural Fund for Rural Development. They are currently at different stages of the procedure. The audits for the European Social Fund and the European Regional Development Fund are now in the follow-up stage. The final audit report provided to the Czech authorities does not represent the final step of the audit process for the European Regional Development Fund and the European Social Fund. The contents of the final audit report should therefore remain confidential until the procedure is closed. This means until the Commission has taken a final position as appropriate, in relation to the follow-up that the audit team will give to it. For the rural development investment measures, the Commission has communicated its letter of findings to the Member States, including preliminary conclusions and recommendations to avoid any situation of conflict of interest in the future. The contradictory procedure is ongoing, and the next step is a bilateral meeting with the Czech authorities. For all funds, the whole procedure until adoption of possible financial corrections can take up to 24 months.

Confidentiality of the audit is a basic principle and of utmost importance. The Commission must ensure a fair and robust process. Former Commissioner Oettinger and now Commissioner Hahn have shared preliminary information with the Committee on Budgetary Control of this House, in camera. Under the confidentiality rules, I will therefore not comment on the substance of the audit findings today. Let me assure you that, while the audits go on, the EU budget is fully protected. No payments from the EU budget under the European structural and investment funds are being made to projects that could potentially be concerned by alleged conflict of interest. In relation to the Rural Development Fund, the Commission is not reimbursing to Czech authorities the amounts related to projects that could be potentially concerned by the alleged conflict of interest.

Let me now say a few words on the Stork's Nest project. The Commission and the European Anti-Fraud Office (OLAF) have reacted promptly to investigate potential fraud with respect to EU funding for the Stork's Nest project. In December 2017, OLAF finalised its investigation. It recommended to the Commission to recover the full subsidy. OLAF also recommended to the competent Czech judicial authorities to take into account all of the findings in the ongoing national judicial investigation. The Czech authorities withdrew the project from EU financing and recovered the funds from the beneficiary. Consequently, there was no impact on either the EU or the national budget. The ongoing national judicial investigation is the exclusive competence of the Czech authorities.

Finally, as regards the situation in other Member States, the Commission will equally follow up on allegations of non-resolved conflicts of interest in other Member States. In addition, the Commission is providing support to all Member States to correctly implement measures aimed at avoiding conflicts of interest.

Tomáš Zdechovský, *za skupinu PPE*. – Pane předsedající, pane komisaři, představitelé Evropské rady, tahle debata je sice mířená směrem k auditům a vyšetřováním, ale nicméně, pojďme ji pojmut trochu obecněji. Pojďme si říct, co je princip Evropské unie. Několikrát jsme byli ujištěni panem komisařem Hahnem, že všem je měřeno stejným metrem. Já vám řeknu zkušenosti, jak to probíhá třeba v České republice, když dojde k pochybení v čerpání evropské dotace. Ihned je zahájena finanční kontrola, ihned dojde k nárokování platby zpět a ihned dojde k tomu, že pokud jste porušil zákony České republiky, tak začnete být trestně stíhán. Ale to není prostě tenhle případ.

My jsme udělali nějaké nové nařízení, na kterém se mimochodem podílel ve funkci ministra financí i pan premiér Andrej Babiš, a toto nařízení, najednou když se týká jeho osoby, tak jej nemůžeme vynutit. Rada řekla, že se nebude míchat do probíhajícího vyšetřování, to my očekáváme, ale my chceme od Rady jednoznačné stanovisko, zda opravdu se může premiér – s ohledem na auditní zprávu a na důvěrné informace, které byly v souvislosti s ní poskytnuty některým médiím, – spolupodílet na vyšetřování a na přijímání nového rozpočtu. A to je to, co by měla tato debata ukázat. Jinak podle rozvrhu jsem měl mít minutu a půl, tak nevím, jestli tomu opravdu tak bylo.

Lara Wolters, *on behalf of the S&D Group*. – Mr President, in November, over 200 000 people took to the streets in a demonstration against Prime Minister Babiš in Prague, and afterwards Mr Babiš insisted that that demonstration – as well as the investigation by the European Commission – are all part of an undemocratic plot against him. I disagree with that ridiculous conspiracy theory. The Commission is doing its democratic and its legal duty, and more particularly, its duty towards the Czech citizens that are demanding justice.

The leaked Commission audit of December is dry and factual, and it establishes that Mr Babiš is in a clear conflict of interests, as he's using taxpayer money to enrich himself. The millions in question have to be paid back, and we need that new rule of law mechanism that's been proposed to ensure the independence of the national bodies that the EU has to rely on. Let's stand up for Czech citizens today, and let's make the EU budget autocrat-proof.

Dita Charanzová, *za skupinu Renew*. – Pane předsedající, kdo mne zná – a řada těch kolegu zde dnes sedí –, ví, že jsem se nikdy nebránila konstruktivní debatě o jakémkoliv tématu. Ovšem má-li být debata konstruktivní, musí být postavena na solidních základech. A tato podmínka zde dnes splněna není. Nemáme víc než dojmy, předsudky, možná osobní animozitu a především přenášíme domácí politickou bitvu z České republiky na unijní půdu. Pojďme si shrnout, o čem se bavíme. Co se týče auditu – a pan komisař to tady řekl – probíhá standardní komunikace mezi Českou republikou a Evropskou komisí. V ostatních otázkách probíhá standardní práce českých orgánů činných v trestním řízení, probíhá standardní proces na úrovni české justice. Ctíme presumpci nevinu. Protože bez ohledu na to, k jakým závěrům zde dnes dojdeme, tyto procesy pobeží dál.

Za takovéto situace je pro mě tento bod zcela irrelevantní na programu, postrádající smysl a opodstatnění. Proto mi nezbývá než konstatovat, že debata nese politický podtext a že bohužel byla vyslyšena úporná snaha některých mých českých opozičních kolegů. Že se ale Evropský parlament nechává vtáhnout do vnitrostátního politického soupeření, považuji za nevhodné a z hlediska věrohodnosti naší práce za krajně nešťastné.

Viola Von Cramon-Taubadel, *im Namen der Verts/ALE-Fraktion*. – Herr Präsident, liebe Kolleginnen und Kollegen! Die Situation in der Tschechischen Republik ist beunruhigend. Eine der reichsten Personen in Tschechien, Andrej Babiš, entscheidet über die Politik dieses Landes, und er stimmt gleichzeitig im Europäischen Rat über die Agrar- und Strukturpolitik ab, die ihn reich gemacht hat. So etwas nennt man klassischerweise Interessenkonflikt.

Aber wir sollten uns nicht täuschen lassen. Herr Babiš ist nicht die Ursache des Problems, er ist nur ein Symptom. Dennoch: Er lähmt das Land, er hat überall seine Finger drin. Neben der Politik übernimmt er nach und nach auch Medien und eine Reihe von Wirtschaftssektoren. Darüber hinaus hat er auch starke wirtschaftliche Interessen in anderen EU-Ländern, von Ungarn angefangen über die Slowakei bis nach Deutschland. Dennoch: Er ist nur einer von vielen Oligarchen, die dank der EU-Gelder reich geworden sind.

Das Schockierende daran ist, dass wir nicht einmal genau wissen, in welchem Ausmaß Babiš und andere Oligarchen vom Haushalt der Europäischen Union profitieren. Denn weder die Kommission noch die Mitgliedstaaten haben ausreichende Informationen, um nachverfolgen zu können, wo genau die Gelder aus dem Agrarhaushalt oder den Strukturfonds eigentlich landen.

Wir brauchen dringend mehr Transparenz. Wir brauchen ein neues System, um diesen Missbrauch und diese Fehlallokation von EU-Subventionen zu stoppen. Ohne klare Regeln im Fall von Interessenkonflikten, ohne Regeln für die Offenlegung von Eigentumsverhältnissen und ohne starke Konditionalität werden wir dieses korrupte System weiter am Leben erhalten.

Aber auch ohne politischen Druck, um die verschachtelten Firmengeflechte auf dem Bodenmarkt zu entwirren und die wirklich dahintersteckenden Landeigentümer ans Licht zu bringen, werden wir dieses Problem nicht lösen.

Die Demokratisierung und das Ende des Kommunismus haben in vielen Ländern zu enormen Veränderungen beim Landbesitz geführt, und leider zeigt sich, dass oft nicht die tatsächlich im Agrarsektor tätigen Menschen am meisten von den Privatisierungen profitieren, sondern es war die wirtschaftliche und die politische Elite. Sie hat die Regeln bestimmt, und sie hat sich am Ende am Staatseigentum bedient. Und die EU macht diese historische Ungerechtigkeit noch schlimmer, weil in diesen Ländern ein Großteil der Zahlungen an nur sehr wenige Landeigentümer geht und nicht an diejenigen, deren Existenz eigentlich mit den Agrarsubventionen erhalten werden sollte.

Ivan David, *za skupinu ID*. – Pane předsedající, nejsem příznivec premiéra České republiky Andreje Babiše, ale záleží mi na demokracii. Premiér Babiš vystudoval privilegovanou fakultu pro zahraniční obchod, vstupem do komunistické strany a spoluprací s tajnou službou splnil podmínky pro zastupování České republiky v zahraničí. Jako znalec prostředí se v průběhu velké privatizace po roce 1989 zmocnil obrovských výrobních kapacit, nejdříve v chemickém, pak v potravinářském průmyslu a zemědělství. Později koupil významnou část českých médií. Díky obratnému profesionálnímu marketingu a neschopnosti konkurenčních politických stran se se svým politickým projektem ANO (anglicky YES) dostal hned na první pokus v roce 2013 do českého parlamentu a do vlády. Následující volby s velkým předstihem vyhrál a stal se premiérem. Jeho firmy získaly evropské dotace ve velkém rozsahu.

Politická konkurence se s porážkou nikdy nesměřila. Donutila premiéra zákonem vložit jeho firmy do svěrenského fondu. Standardní miliardář prosazuje vlastní zvýhodnění pomocí korupce politiků a jejich stran. Premiér založil firmu, která s evropskými dotacemi zřídila zábavní podnik. Zřejmě tím neeticky obešel pravidla. Ale to ať posoudí nezávislý soud. Mediální pronásledování premiéra Babiše a pouliční shromáždění proti vládě podporovaná premiérovou opozicí stojí jistě mnoho peněz. Preference premiérové strany však nepoklesly, spíše naopak. Nové volby by opět s převahou vyhrál.

Skutečnou příčinou současného stavu je systém Evropské unie, který umožňuje korupci prostřednictvím dotování soukromých podniků. Místo hospodářské soutěže nastupuje soutěž o dotace, které jsou nástrojem zajišťujícím závislost na systému EU, a tím jeho udržování. Řešení možných trestných věcí na politické platformě je také typicky totalitní praktika. To je to, co se tady nyní provádí.

Younous Omarjee, *au nom du groupe GUE/NGL*. – Monsieur le Président, Monsieur le Commissaire, disons-le sans détour, il y a de la corruption sur les fonds européens. En tant que président de la commission du développement régional, je veux dire qu'une lutte implacable doit être menée contre la corruption sur les fonds structurels car il y a de la crédibilité de notre politique et il y va aussi de la confiance dans les institutions européennes. Et dans cette lutte, vous nous trouverez et vous me trouverez à vos côtés, comme vous me trouverez et vous nous trouverez à vos côtés pour que des suites soient données aux affaires de conflits d'intérêts et aux présomptions de fraude, sinon de corruption, en Tchéquie.

Nous nous sommes dotés d'un Parquet européen pour améliorer cette lutte. La chef du Parquet européen M^{me} Kövesi vient d'être nommée, et qu'apprenons-nous? Que ses moyens ne sont pas à la hauteur de la lutte qui doit être menée, c'est pourquoi nous devons travailler à l'indépendance budgétaire du Parquet européen. Ce dernier ne sera pleinement indépendant et ne pourra viser ses objectifs que s'il a les moyens qui lui sont donnés pour pouvoir mener cette lutte essentielle contre la corruption sur la PAC et sur les fonds structurels pour protéger notre budget européen.

Monika Hohlmeier (PPE). – Herr Präsident, Herr Kommissar, liebe Ratspräsidentschaft, liebe Kolleginnen und Kollegen! Zunächst einmal ist diese Diskussion, liebe Kollegin Charanzová, keine intern tschechische Diskussion, und das wird, glaube ich, meinen Wortbeitrag neben dem von der Kollegin Von Cramon-Taubadel auch erklären.

Mir geht es nicht um die Frage, wie die Justiz innerhalb Tschechiens im Detail vorgeht. Wir bestreiten keine Ermittlungen und keine Justizverfahren, aber ich habe zwei Fragen, und da bitte ich die Kommission und den Rat um Unterstützung.

Erster Punkt ist: Europäische Fördergelder dürfen keine oligarchischen Strukturen fördern, das heißt, wir müssen sowohl das Thema „Interessenkonflikt“, den Artikel 61, als auch eine – ich nenne es jetzt mal so – „Antioligarchen-Gesetzgebung“ innerhalb unserer europäischen Institutionen fördern und klarstellen.

Und das Zweite, was wir klären müssen, ist: Wie viele europäische Fördermittel darf eine einzige Person innerhalb eines Jahres und innerhalb eines MFR erhalten? Denn wir werden sonst unglaublich, wenn eine Person 100, 200, 300, 400 Millionen bekommt und andere Personen vielleicht gerade mal 5 000. Dann ist das Ungleichgewicht zu groß.

Evin Incir (S&D). – Herr talman! Återupptagandet av åtalet mot Tjeckiens premiärminister för förskingring av EU-medel är viktigt. Våra skattebetalares pengar ska inte användas till fusk och fiffel. Gör man det, ska man veta att negativa konsekvenser väntar runt hörnet.

Men problemet är stort. Det är därför det är viktigt att vi även pratar om det stora problemet med korruption som finns i många delar av EU. Vad Tjeckiens premiärminister har gjort är tyvärr bara ett exempel. Korruption, fusk och förskingring av pengar förekommer i många delar av EU. Vi vet också att det hindrar utveckling och mänskliga rättigheter. Därför är det av yttersta vikt att Europeiska kommissionen tar sitt uppdrag som granskare på största allvar.

Jag vill se ett Europa som är fritt från korruption och fusk. Europa ska bygga på rättvisa och gemenskap. Våra gemensamma resurser ska användas för dessa ändamål och inte hamna i fickan på giriga och korrupta personer. Här måste nolltolerans vara målet. Det är endast så vi behåller förtroendet och håller ihop EU.

Ondřej Knotek (Renew). – Pane předsedající, rád uvedu na pravou míru. Pan premiér Babiš inicioval vznik protikorupčního hnutí ANO v roce 2011. Lidé ho volí, protože tvrdě pracuje a je nezkorumpovatelný. Dotace, která je předmětem stíhání, proběhla v roce 2008, avšak podněty k trestnímu řízení přišly až v roce 2016. Z původních jedenácti obviněných už zůstávají již jen dva. V září 2019 bylo dokonce stíhání pana premiéra zastaveno. Nejvyšší státní zástupce ale potřeboval nějaké informace doplnit a zastavení stíhání zrušil.

Řízení o střetu zájmů je mezi Komisí a členským státem. Jasně bylo řečeno, že politizace tohoto řízení je celé věci značně neprospěšná. Pan premiér postupoval podle zákona, převedl společnosti do svěrenského fondu. Je zde ale rozpor ve výkladu pojmu „střet zájmů“. Tak ať to řeší odborníci a ne opoziční politici. Závěrem, půda Evropského parlamentu byla nešťastně využita k přenesení domácí politické situace a ti, co tak činí, poškozují EU v očích českých občanů.

Mikuláš Peksa (Verts/ALE). – Pane předsedající, ono je poměrně obtížné navázat po těch debatách o Polsku a Maďarsku ještě něčím novým. Bohužel myslím si, že Andrej Babiš by měl být takovým tím posledním budíčkem, který nám připomene, že je opravdu načase se zdvihnout, protože ta situace, to nastavení našich mechanismů pro kontrolu finančních toků v rámci Evropské unie prostě není dobré. Ta cesta, jakou Andrej Babiš obešel evropské nařízení o střetu zájmů, je v zásadě velice primitivní. On prostě převedl své firmy do svěrenského fondu, který ovšem kontroluje skrze své příbuzné a může ho v podstatě kdykoli zrušit. Tohle je v podstatě velice banální trik a primitivní akce salónního podvodníka.

Ale podívejme se na tu druhou část. Andrej Babiš je majitelem jednoho z největších hospodářských uskupení v rámci České republiky a přijímá velmi významnou část evropských dotací. Tyhle peníze používá k šíření svého vlivu v rámci České republiky a k udržování své pozice. Tady Evropská unie přímo financuje skrze firmu Agrofert jeho politickou kampaň do Poslanecké sněmovny ČR, do Evropského parlamentu i do dalších institucí. Tohle je problém, protože ten stát pak funguje jako advokát Andreje Babiše a bohužel neochraňuje pouze jeho, ale ochraňuje i další spřátelené byznysmeny nebo politiky nebo jak je chcete nazvat, kteří působí podobným způsobem v dalších zemích. V Evropské radě, bavíme-li se o jakýchkoli závažnějších opatřeních, potřebujeme jednomyslnost, a bohužel pokud se ti oligarchové navzájem kryjí, tak se nám to nikdy nepovede dosáhnout.

Hynek Blaško (ID). – Pane předsedající, občané České republiky jsou už unaveni neustálým probíráním premiéra Babiše. Upozorňuji, že čím častěji se jeho kauzy řeší, tím více mu přibývá volebních preferencí. Ponechte prosím českým obecným soudům, aby rozhodly. Není zde na půdě Evropského parlamentu nikdo, kdo by mohl ukázat na Babiše a říci: „Jste vinen.“ Toto je vnitřní záležitostí České republiky a jejích soudů včetně voličů. Skutečně nejsou důležitější témata na půdě tohoto Parlamentu?

Tento Parlament prosazuje genderovou vyváženost. A proto mně nezbyvá než požádat o ustavení komise, která se bude zabývat činností předsedkyně Evropské komise von den Leyenové, na které ulpěl rovněž stín podezření, že vše, co dělala na ministerstvu obrany Spolkové republiky Německo, nebylo čisté a také, že je ve střetu zájmů. Komise by měla tento stín podezření buď odstranit, nebo potvrdit a na základě výsledků šetření by měla předsedkyně přijmout politickou odpovědnost.

Luke Ming Flanagan (GUE/NGL). – Mr President, it was said earlier by one Member here, I think it was Ms Charanzová, that there are prejudices at play here. There are no prejudices from me, I can guarantee you.

All I want, if money has gone astray, is that the money is returned. It has nothing to do with prejudice at all. People scrimp and scrape money together to pay their taxes, and it ends up coming here. We've got to make sure that that money goes back to the right people.

I believe the proposed cuts in the MFF to agriculture and rural development were made possible because European citizens don't believe the money is going to the right people. This just adds to that. We cannot monitor every last cent of CAP money once it ends up in the nation state. However, we can create the architecture under the current review process to make sure that it is as difficult as possible for the money to go astray – whether that be legitimately or illegitimately – because currently there's money going astray, and it's actually legal to do it. We've got to nail that too – big subsidies to people who should not get it.

Siegfried Mureşan (PPE). – Mr President, the EU budget is money paid in by the people of the European Union. This is why it is our duty, as Members of the European Parliament, to defend it, to spend it with care, and to make sure that it is well spent. Any conflict of interests or misuse of EU funds is unacceptable – even more so if it is done by a prime minister. This is an attack upon the people's money. It's unacceptable.

What do we have to do? The first thing is that we have to recover the money and make sure that all amounts under investigation are returned to the EU budget. This is why we have the European Anti-Fraud Office (OLAF) and this is why we have created the European Public Prosecutor: to be strong, to be independent, and to be active in exactly such cases. It is important that the companies of Mr Babiš – and I underline this – return those amounts, and not the citizens of the Czech Republic as a whole. If there was any criminal offence, we must make sure that it is duly investigated. Beyond the judicial consequences, there is of course also the political responsibility which belongs to the party of Mr Babiš and to his group in the European Parliament, the Renew Group.

Bogusław Liberadzki (S&D). – Panie Przewodniczący! Odnoszę takie wrażenie po wysłuchaniu wystąpienia urzędującej przewodniczącej Rady, że Rada uznaje, że nie jest to sprawa Rady, a weźcie sobie ten problem gdzieś tam. Pan komisarz przedstawił wielką procedurę, która trwa jak z tego wynika wiele lat, dotyczy kilku pozycji wielu funduszy i na końcu mówi, że procedury to jeszcze potrwać do 24 miesięcy. Więc pierwsza refleksja – za długo, i z instytucji podstawowych trzech okazuje się, że Parlament Europejski tylko się upomina. Ja chciałbym mieć jasność, tu nie chodzi o politykę, chodzi po prostu rzetelnie o pieniądze, tak jak pani przewodnicząca Hohlmeier powiedziała, są one *used* albo *misused*, czyli są niewłaściwie używane i mają być zwrócone, i to nie powinny czeskie sądy rozpatrywać, ale instytucje europejskie. Natomiast wysłuchaliśmy od pana pośa Davida, że premier Babisz jest nadzwyczaj uzdolnionym, być może najbardziej uzdolnionym biznesowo premierem w Unii Europejskiej.

Joachim Kuhs (ID). – Herr Präsident! Ich bin sehr dankbar, auch der Kommission gegenüber, dass sie eine so zurückhaltende Stellungnahme abgegeben hat zu diesen Vorwürfen und diesen Fragen, die sich hier in dem Fall Babiš ergeben, wo verschiedene Ermittlungen stattfinden. Diese Ermittlungen sollten wir doch erst einmal abwarten, bevor wir Vorverurteilungen vornehmen. Wenn wir das nämlich nicht tun, dann setzen wir uns automatisch dem Vorwurf aus, wir würden hier eine Neiddebatte führen, und das wollen wir doch nicht.

Wir wollen uns doch auch nicht darüber ärgern, dass Herr Babiš vielleicht einige konträre Punkte anspricht, dass er zur Grenzsicherung, zur Migration, zum Bürokratieabbau oder zur Beibehaltung der Tschechischen Krone anderer Meinung ist als die EU. Wir sollten uns wirklich hier in dieser ganzen Sache neutral verhalten und die Ermittlungen abwarten. Wir sollten uns höchstens fragen, ob die Regeln, die wir uns gegeben haben, noch passen oder ob wir vielleicht sogar diese Subventionen komplett abschaffen sollten.

Petri Sarvamaa (PPE). – Mr President, Council, Commission, I really ask you to listen very carefully to what I will say. This is extremely harmful to the European Union. This is extremely damaging to the public image of the Union.

Theoretically speaking, the Babiš case is not even the only one of such huge proportions. We only know what happened inside one country, and we know that he is an oligarch. But it's really not about Babiš, is what I wanted to say. I want to say this: if the financial regulation Article 61 is not a sufficient base, then we have to change it, and we have to change it fast. We need true powers for the European Union to bring an end to this, and EPO deserves all the needed resources to do that.

Angelika Winzig (PPE). – Herr Präsident, geschätzte Kolleginnen und Kollegen! Betrug und Korruption dürfen in unserer EU keinen Platz finden. Das sind wir vor allem unseren Steuerzahlerinnen und Steuerzahlern schuldig.

Nur eines möchte ich schon bemerken: Herr Kollege David hat jetzt den Saal verlassen, aber wenn er schon pauschales Unternehmersbashing betreibt – hier geht es um einen Interessenkonflikt zwischen Politik und Unternehmertum. Für mich als Unternehmerin und Politikerin ist es ganz klar, dass ich weder öffentliche Förderungen während meiner Funktionsperiode in Anspruch nehme noch mich an irgendwelchen öffentlichen Ausschreibungen beteilige.

Für einen Politiker darf das Strafrecht einfach nicht die moralische Instanz sein. Auch unser Bundeskanzler Kurz würde es nicht gutheißen, wenn wir in seiner Fraktion diese Doppelgleisigkeit fahren würden.

Ja, jetzt heißt es rasch aufklären, Transparenz einfordern und – wenn Rückzahlungen zu machen sind – diese auch rasch zu erledigen. Und über die politische Konsequenz werden ohnedies die Bürgerinnen und Bürger Tschechiens in der Zukunft entscheiden.

Franc Bogovič (PPE). – Spoštovani predsedujoči, transparentno črpanje evropskih sredstev je naša skupna stvar. To ni stvar posamezne države, še posebej ne, če se o posameznih primerih razpišejo tudi v časopisih, kot je New York Times, kar je bilo primer za gospoda Babiša.

Sredstva za kmetijstvo in razvoj podeželja niso sredstva za bogatenje oligarhov, ampak so sredstva, ki so namenjena za družinske kmetije. In nepravilno porabljen oziroma pridobljen denar mora biti enostavno vrnjen.

Podpiram tudi predlog, ki ga je pripravil prejšnji komisar Hogan, da v bodoči finančni perspektivi omejimo zgornji znesek in da je ta znesek toliko majhen, da bo prišel prav res za razvoj družinskih kmetij, ne pa da bodo ta denar koristili ali najrazličnejši oligarhi ali kraljeve družine.

Na takšen način mi ne bomo dobili zaupanja evropskih volivcev. V kolikor bo šel denar v takšne roke. Zato – denar mora biti transparentno porabljen, nepravilno prejet denar pa vrnjen.

Jiří Pospíšil (PPE). – Pane předsedající, považuji za logické, že Evropský parlament projednává kauzu Andreje Babiše, pokud on je jedním z největších odběratelů evropských dotací v České republice. Jsou to evropské peníze, peníze evropských daňových poplatníků, a proto je logické, že zástupci evropských zemí, evropští poslanci, chtějí o tom vést debatu. Není přece normální, aby jeden z nejbohatších Čechů čerpal peníze určené pro chudé regiony a pro malé a střední podniky. Pane komisaři, já Vás žádám a vyzývám, abyste dohlédl na to, že celá věc bude řádně došetřena. Zadruhé Vás žádám, zveřejněte co nejdříve auditní zprávy. Občané v České republice chtějí přesně vědět, co v těchto auditních zprávách je. A mají na to plné právo. Mají právo vědět, co jejich premiér dělá, jak porušuje zákon a zda tedy je ve velkém střetu zájmů. O tom, zda je trestně odpovědný, o tom rozhodne česká justice, nikoli my. A prosím, udělejte

vše pro to, aby nikdy podobná kauza nenastala. Aby oligarchové už nikdy nečerpali evropské peníze.

PRESIDENZA DELL'ON. FABIO MASSIMO CASTALDO

Vicepresidente

Procedura «catch the eye»

Michaela Šojdrová (PPE). – Pane předsedající, věřte mi, že jako česká poslankyně opravdu nemám zájem na tom, že se opakovaně tady projednává střet zájmů českého premiéra. Je mi to líto. Na druhou stranu naprosto chápu kolegy v Evropském parlamentu, že požadují kontrolu nad evropskými prostředky. Audit Evropské komise totiž opakovaně konstatoval střet zájmů českého premiéra a neoprávněné čerpání prostředků EU jeho firmami. Pan komisař konstatoval, že peníze za Čapí hnízdo byly vráceny do evropského rozpočtu, že tedy nenastala žádná škoda ani EU, ani České republice. Ano, pane komisaři, ale já si velmi dobře pamatuji na to, kdy první slova českého premiéra k této kauze byla tato: „Já o tomto projektu nic nevím, já s tím nemám nic společného.“ A teprve po vyšetřování, pod velkým tlakem si pan premiér vzpomněl. Evropský parlament není soud, my nesoudíme, my jenom chceme opravdu důsledné prošetření, protože evropský rozpočet musí být pod kontrolou a musí být čerpán pouze oprávněnými osobami.

(Fine della procedura «catch the eye»)

Virginijus Sinkevičius, Member of the Commission. – Mr President, let me conclude first of all by stressing very clearly that the Commission has zero tolerance for fraud or misuse of EU funds. I know this House fully supports the Commission in its fight against corruption in the structural funds. We need to ensure that public money is properly spent.

Let me recall that the Commission presented a proposal in May 2018 on the protection of the Union's budget in cases of generalised defiance as regards the rule of law in the Member States. The proposal provides for a mechanism to reduce or suspend EU funding in cases of defiance of the rule of law. For instance, the following situations may lead to misuse of the EU funds or would prevent the application of the control mechanism in case of misuse of funds: threats to the independence of the judiciary system, arbitrary or unlawful decisions by public authorities, limited availability and effectiveness of legal remedies, failure to implement judgments, or limitations on effective investigation, prosecution or sanctions for breaches of law. The Commission's top priority is to protect the EU budget. The Commission has zero tolerance for fraud or misuse of EU funds.

With respect to the allegations of conflicts of interests in the Czech Republic, the EU budget is fully protected. No payments from the EU budget under the European structural and investment funds are being made to projects that could potentially be concerned by the alleged conflict of interests. In relation to the Rural Development Fund, the Commission is not reimbursing the Czech authorities for the amounts related to projects that could be potentially affected by alleged conflict of interests. With respect to the reopening of the prosecution, the ongoing national judicial investigation is the exclusive competence of the Czech authorities. As the Czech authorities withdrew the product from EU financing, there was no impact on the EU budget. The Commission is committed to keeping the Parliament informed.

Nikolina Brnjac, President-in-Office of the Council. – Mr President, let me reiterate the importance the Council attaches to the protection of the Union's financial interests and to the need to make sure that money is spent in an appropriate and lawful way. The investigation into individual cases in allegation is the task of the national prosecutor and judges, and of the European Anti Fraud Office – and, soon, also of the European Public Prosecutor's Office. I have taken careful note of your concerns, as well as the indicators provided by the Commissioner.

Presidente. – Le proposte di risoluzione, che dovranno essere presentate conformemente all'articolo 132, paragrafo 2, del regolamento, saranno annunciate successivamente.

La discussione è chiusa.

La votazione si svolgerà durante la tornata di febbraio 2020.

Dichiarazioni scritte (articolo 171)

Tanja Fajon (S&D), *pisno*. – Glas čeških državljanov proti predsedniku vlade Babišu, ki je obtožen velikih finančnih zlorab EU sredstev, je najglasnejši klic za demokracijo v zgodovini samostojne Češke. Moramo mu prisluhniti. Argument Babiša, da ne bo odšel, ker je trmast, je nezrel, izjava, da Evropska komisija ni primerna avtoriteta, pa podcenjujoča.

Če je Evropska komisija zadostna avtoriteta za dodelitev denarja, je dovolj dobra tudi, da skupaj z računskim sodiščem preverja njegovo porabo in opozarja na zlorabe. Pozivam vas, da ne glede na politično barvo podpremo državljane, ki zahtevajo takojšen odstop premierja Babiša, in da podpremo Evropsko komisijo, ki zahteva vračilo subvencij.

To je edina prava pot k prevzemanju odgovornosti in edina možnost, če želimo ohraniti transparentnost in demokracijo, ki jo Češka zasluži.

19. Konferenca Stron Konvenciji o róznorodnosti biologiczneje (COP15) – Kunming (2020) (debata)

Presidente. – L'ordine del giorno reca la discussione sulla dichiarazione della Commissione sulla Conferenza delle parti (COP 15) della Convenzione sulla diversità biologica (Kunming 2020) (2019/2824(RSP)).

Virginijus Sinkevičius, *Member of the Commission*. – Mr President, in November, this Parliament declared the climate an environment emergency. The devastating bush fires in Australia, the recent fires in the Amazon and Siberia, the droughts in Europe last summer, as well as the dramatic decline in pollinators – this all sadly illustrates the need to act.

The European Commission has taken it seriously, and one of its first decisions has been to launch the European Green Deal, the new agenda for sustainable growth in the European Union, tackling the most serious climate and environmental challenges of our times. This Commission wants the European Union to lead on both climate neutrality and the road to the Conference of the Parties to the Convention on Biological Diversity (CBD) in Kunming in October 2020, where the world is to agree on the post-2020 global biodiversity framework.

I welcome the fact that the European Parliament fully supports this ambition. For the European Union, it means leading by example and therefore developing our own European commitments. The European Union Biodiversity Strategy 2030, which we will adopt by March 2020, will include proposals for such EU commitments and will set out our ambition for Kunming, including on global targets. Preparations for this strategy are currently going on at full speed within the Commission, and the resolution which you will adopt tomorrow will be an important input and inspiration for our own reflections and upcoming decisions. We failed twice to achieve our past ten-year biodiversity targets; we cannot allow ourselves to fail again.

Science is perfectly clear that we need a holistic approach for transformative change to address the climate and environment emergency. This should be the spirit for our preparations for CBD COP15, as well as for our work under the European Green Deal. As regards the post-2020 global biodiversity framework, we fully support the European Parliament's demand for a stronger implementation mechanism and strengthen tools for accountability.

We need a systemic and regular cycle for reviewing implementation of the committed actions and progress in reducing the pressures on biodiversity. We should agree on one or a small number of clear overarching long-term goals, similar to the 1.5-degree objective for climate change, in order to maintain political support through the period. We should also kick-start the cycle immediately. Parties should respond to the global framework by 2021, allowing a stocktaking of actions and commitments at COP16 in 2022, at least for the most important issues.

Finally, the monitoring and indicator framework should include headline indicators that are common across parties and hence allow an assessment of the national contributions to achieving the global targets. A stronger implementation and review mechanism will boost work under many environmental agreements. Let me highlight, in this context, the synergies with our important work on international ocean governance, and in particular with our ongoing negotiations on a new international treaty under the UN Convention of the Law of the Sea to protect marine biodiversity in the high seas.

It is essential to ensure the means of implementation. The European Union and its Member States collectively lived up to the international commitment to double international biodiversity financing to developing countries. We need financial flows from all sources to benefit nature and biodiversity more, including by mobilising domestic resources. Let me stress three further important aspects in this context. First, the world still spends much more on subsidies that are harmful to biodiversity than it spends on pro-biodiversity action. We need much more progress on phasing out the subsidies and reshaping them to ensure that they are compatible and supportive to biodiversity conservation.

Secondly, restoration of ecosystems is typically more expensive than conservation. The quicker we protect the remaining valuable nature and we address the drivers of biodiversity loss, the less we will need to restore, if possible, and the cheaper it will be.

Finally, we need to massively scale-up investments in climate-resilient, nature-based solutions which multiply benefits for biodiversity, climate-change mitigation and adaptation, food security, and finally, of course, health.

For the European Union, leading by example means that we should make strong commitments to better protect and climate-proof the biodiversity-rich areas, to restore degraded ecosystems in nature across rural and urban landscapes, to sustainably use and manage our agricultural, forest and ocean resources, and to integrate biodiversity across policies and sectors, including in our outermost regions and territories.

We need to make sure that we deliver on our commitments, this time by creating the adequate enabling environment, from full implementation and enforcement of the EU's nature legislation to potentially developing new legislation for restoring nature, mainstreaming biodiversity and providing adequate financing.

The next multiannual financial framework will be crucial in this regard. We need to guarantee that adequate resources are provided for the protection, restoration and sustainable use of ecosystems through the core EU funding instruments, such as the common agricultural policy, cohesion and regional funds, Horizon Europe, the external action financial instrument and LIFE. We need to ensure that such funding leverages private funding through investEU.

We need to ensure a just transition where the necessary transformational change do not leave anyone behind. This means we have to support, for example, our farmers, forest managers and fishermen and women along this transition. We also need to avoid exporting the damage of biodiversity outside the European Union by consuming unsustainably produced and traded products. This is why the future EU biodiversity strategy will need to address sustainable consumption and production, a reduction of the EU's ecological footprint and the integration of biodiversity into our trade policy.

We also need to engage much better with our international partners and various stakeholders. For example, we need to work with businesses and financial actors with the tools to account for their biodiversity dependency and impacts, so that they can take the right measures to support and contribute to biodiversity.

The window of opportunity to achieve our global biodiversity vision to live in harmony with nature is narrowing fast, and the next years will be crucial. Knowing the time it takes to get to implementation, this Commission is very aware of its responsibility during its five-year mandate. You can count on our full commitment to work hard and achieve our common objective.

Agnès Evren, au nom du groupe PPE. – Monsieur le Président, l'ONU a proposé lundi de protéger 30 % de la planète d'ici 2030.

Pour la COP 15, 17 objectifs sont ainsi avancés pour valoriser le vivant, réduire notre impact sur la nature ou encore relier climat et biodiversité, qui sont les deux faces d'une même pièce: celle de la survie de notre planète. Je souscris à la totalité de ces objectifs. Contrairement à ceux d'Aichi, qui sont restés des vœux pieux hélas, cette ébauche présente enfin des objectifs précis et chiffrés avec des moyens de suivi.

C'est aussi ce que nous défendons dans notre résolution, mais allons encore plus loin: nous souhaitons que ces objectifs soient juridiquement contraignants afin qu'ils ne restent pas lettre morte. Faisons de la COP 15 l'équivalent de l'accord de Paris pour le climat et, dès maintenant, agissons concrètement sur le territoire européen.

J'invite la Commission européenne dans la stratégie qu'elle présentera en mars à prendre elle-même de tels objectifs contraignants et à intensifier les efforts dans l'ensemble de ses politiques. Augmentons nos zones protégées, développons un soutien accru à la recherche et à l'innovation, soutenons massivement nos agriculteurs, nos pêcheurs et notre secteur forestier dans la transition vers des pratiques plus durables. La responsabilité revient également aux États membres, mais aussi à chaque collectivité territoriale. N'attendons pas octobre, c'est maintenant qu'il faut agir.

César Luena, en nombre del Grupo S&D. – Señor presidente, gracias. Gracias, señor comisario, por su exposición. En primer lugar, quisiera hacer un recordatorio a modo de agradecimiento, a la hora de hablar de la lucha contra el cambio climático, pero también de la protección mundial de la biodiversidad, a los científicos y los activistas. Creo que este Parlamento tiene que darles las gracias, porque gracias a ellos existe el nivel de concienciación y también de compromiso político actual de la ciencia y de los ecologistas.

Miren, les voy decir rápidamente unos datos. Desde 1900 la abundancia promedio de especies nativas en la mayoría de los principales hábitats terrestres ha disminuido —escuchen— en al menos un 20 %. Más del 40 % de las especies de anfibios, casi el 33 % de los corales de arrecife y más de un tercio de todos los mamíferos marinos están amenazados; el 10 % de los insectos también. Esto es la sexta extinción masiva de especies.

¿Qué opinan los ciudadanos de la Unión Europea? Pues, según las últimas encuestas, el 96 % dice que es necesario proteger la naturaleza y que esa responsabilidad es de todos. Por tanto, proteger la vida en nuestro planeta y responder a las demandas de los ciudadanos han sido las prioridades con las que los socialdemócratas nos hemos acercado a esta Resolución.

Y les voy a decir de forma muy rápida siete puntos. La transición ecológica, señorías, tiene que ser justa. Debemos impedir que se creen nuevas desigualdades. Segundo, fiscalidad ambiental. No me cansaré de decirlo en esta Cámara. Necesitamos recursos suficientes. Un nuevo modelo fiscal verde. El que contamina más tiene que pagar más. Deforestación —y esto es muy importante—: la Unión Europea tiene que legislar para conseguir cadenas de suministro libres de deforestación. Tenemos que luchar contra la tala ilegal de los bosques. El acuerdo —lo ha dicho también la ponente del Partido Popular— que se adopte en China tiene que ser vinculante, porque, si no, no habremos conseguido nada. Es muy importante el incremento de las áreas protegidas, al 30 % en 2030, al 50 % para 2050. Y, por último, también, reducir el porcentaje de pesticidas. Alcanzar un porcentaje —mejor dicho— para la reducción de los pesticidas.

Señorías, no tenemos otro planeta. Este es el planeta en el que la especie, los seres humanos estamos y en el que vivimos y, por tanto, también desde el punto de vista de nuestra especie, tenemos que ayudar al planeta en la protección de la biodiversidad. Es muy importante que la Resolución que salga mañana sea potente para ir a China con una voz unida y fuerte en protección de la biodiversidad.

María Soraya Rodríguez Ramos, en nombre del Grupo Renew. – Señor presidente, señor comisario, Europa, la Unión Europea, se enfrenta a retos ambientales sin precedentes y la pérdida de biodiversidad es uno de ellos. Como ya se ha dicho, estamos asistiendo a una situación realmente de emergencia porque el 73 % de los ecosistemas terrestres en la Unión Europea y el 40 % de los ecosistemas marítimos se encuentran en una situación de degradación y de riesgo. De hecho, podemos estar entrando en una etapa que podemos denominar la sexta extinción masiva -y lo dice la Agencia Europea de Medio Ambiente-, porque el número de especies que se extinguen día a día es el mayor que ha existido a lo largo de la historia de la humanidad.

Por lo tanto, tenemos grandes retos. Tenemos que afrontarlos, y es lo que el Parlamento quiere hacer con esta Resolución, pedirle a la Comisión una mayor ambición en la nueva estrategia de protección de la biodiversidad y que esa mayor ambición en nuestra estrategia europea sea la carta de presentación en la próxima reunión de la COP 15 en China. Objetivos jurídicamente vinculantes para proteger las zonas naturales, el 30 % en 2030, la mitad del planeta en el 2050; objetivos jurídicamente vinculantes para restaurar zonas enormemente degradadas y hábitats degradados en peligro de extinción.

Para ello también debemos tener más presupuesto. No se puede tener más ambición con menos presupuesto. Un 10 % del nuevo marco financiero tiene que estar asociado específicamente a la protección de la biodiversidad y, desde luego, tenemos que trabajar conjuntamente con todos los agentes que tienen que ver con los elementos decisivos para la protección de la biodiversidad. Los agricultores, los pescadores son socios.

Ningún objetivo del Acuerdo de París, del Pacto Verde Europeo, lo conseguiremos si no somos ambiciosos en esta nueva estrategia de la biodiversidad.

Ville Niinistö, *on behalf of the Verts/ALE Group*. – Mr President, the world's biodiversity is reeling and it's manmade. We are not just destroying living conditions by increasing climate change, but also through the overconsumption of resources, overexploitation and the way we are producing our livelihoods – that is affecting the whole future of biodiversity and the flora and fauna of this planet. The world's top scientists are warning that even a million species will disappear from the planet by 2030 if we don't act and change our behaviour.

So it's obvious that the COP meeting on biodiversity has to be a similar meeting as Paris was for climate. We need legally binding targets because none of the previous targets we've had globally have been met. So we need implementation, we need a legally binding process, so that all countries will increase their protected areas and will change the way their economies work. That's why in the European Parliament and in the Green group we want to push for a 30% target for both marine and terrestrial protection that will also affect and apply to European Union countries. That's what the Commission should work on so that we also, as the first big actor in the COP meeting, will say that we are prepared to do this within Europe – make it legally binding. We need to restore also areas that are damaged. This is a big part of protecting diversity and reversing the state of biodiversity. That also has to be included in the targets.

Finally, I would like to mention a totally different big ethical challenge that has to do with human technology – that applies to gene drives. There are companies and organisations developing a technology that can wipe out fauna – a whole population of mosquitoes, for example – if it's prematurely put into nature and we Greens want a moratorium on this technology so that it's not used in a way which has harmful consequences that are totally unknown and could be totally unprecedented.

(Applause)

Aurelia Beigneux, *au nom du groupe ID*. – Monsieur le Président, mes chers collègues, la COP 15 qui se déroulera en octobre devra fixer des objectifs pour les dix années à venir concernant la biodiversité.

Il ne faut pas se voiler la face concernant les bouleversements climatiques: l'activité humaine est évidemment responsable. Mais justement, plutôt que de systématiquement moraliser les citoyens et agir uniquement par le biais fiscal, n'est-ce pas plutôt le politique qu'il faut blâmer? Nous constatons amèrement que ni le changement de modèle économique, ni la remise en cause des traités de libre-échange, ni la nécessité de rétablir les frontières internes et externes à l'Union européenne n'apparaissent comme vos priorités dans la protection de l'environnement.

Oui, nous sommes responsables de nos modes de vie et de nos modes de consommation, mais nos efforts individuels sont toujours bien peu de choses s'il n'y a pas de changement majeur en rupture avec l'idéologie dominante. Il y a urgence: nous assistons à la disparition d'espèces qui subissent directement l'impact des phénomènes climatiques et environnementaux. La situation des pôles et de l'Australie nous le rappelle tristement.

La santé de nos compatriotes est menacée par la pollution de l'air, par la pollution des eaux, par la pollution des terres, par des logiques de rendement et par la pression du pouvoir financier. Pourquoi culpabiliser le citoyen qui a besoin de son véhicule pour travailler, alors que les compagnies maritimes, qui produisent plus de CO₂ que le transport automobile, n'ont aucune obligation de réduire leurs émissions?

Grâce à des traités votés ici même, on importe des marchandises mal produites à l'autre bout du monde. Grâce à des traités votés ici même, on permet l'extension de l'usage des OGM ou l'utilisation de pesticides que l'AECG nous offre sur un plateau, comme l'atrazine.

Vous dites défendre la biodiversité, mais vous me répondez que l'abattage rituel ne pose aucun problème, eu égard à la liberté de culte. On ne demande pourtant aucune garantie sur le sort du bétail exporté. L'écologie doit être réelle et pas seulement de l'affichage. L'écoblanchiment et les mondanités ne font que dédouaner les véritables responsables des troubles de notre époque.

Alexandr Vondra, *on behalf of the ECR Group*. – Mr President, I think that the protection of the biodiversity is key and the time for this debate is timely organised because, just today, the World Economic Forum has published a report about the terrible biodiversity losses all over the world. The problem is that it's not so much in Europe. It's outside of Europe. The papers which are being prepared here in this building, beyond some important recommendations and measures such as to protect the habitats, to contain the borders, how to revitalise the forests, are, unfortunately, also filled with many regulatory socialist measures, which I think, at the end, would not be so helpful and could bring, on the contrary, a lot of harm. As an example, there are these iconic carnivores with a problem to cope with mankind: lions, tigers and wolf. So lions and tigers, because they are living in underdeveloped countries, they have the problems, while the wolf, in northern countries, including Europe, is now protected and extending its range, expanding its numbers. Take the steps which would bring good and not harm.

Silvia Modig, *GUE/NGL-ryhmän puolesta*. – Arvoisa puhemies, luonnon monimuotoisuus on paitsi itseisarvo, myös olennainen elementti ilmastonmuutokseen sopeutumisessa. Mitä vahvempi biodiversiteetti, sitä parempi on planeettamme sopeutumiskyky edessä olevaan väistämättömään lämpenemiseen. Meidän on tunnustettava, että käsillämme on hätätila. Luonnon monimuotoisuus heikkenee hälyttävää vauhtia. Siksi on surullista ja uskomatonta, että EU epäonnistui niin pahasti biodiversiteetin tavoitteissaan vuodelle 2020.

Palauttaminen on tärkeää, mutta ensin meidän on pystyttävä lopettamaan sen heikkeneminen. Jotta pystymme lopettamaan monimuotoisuuden heikkenemisen, on meidän puututtava juurisyihin. Ne löytyvät niin maa- kuin metsätaloudesta ja maankäytön muutoksista. Yhteisen maatalouspolitiikan on uudistuttava vastaamaan sekä Pariisin sopimusta että biodiversiteettitavoitteita. Maataloustukien uudistus ei nyt esitetyssä muodossa tätä tee. On siirryttävä luonnonmukaisiin viljelytekniikoihin ja pois monokulttuuriviljelystä.

Metsätalous on myös aivan keskeinen elementti. Metsissämme elää 80 prosenttia lajeista ja se, miten me metsiämme käytämme, on aivan olennaista monimuotoisuudelle. Paljon puhutaan metsäkadosta ja tilalle tarjotaan metsittämistä, mutta metsittäminen ei ole kuitenkaan ratkaisu monimuotoisuuden heikentymiselle. Laji voi kuolla sukupuuttoon vain kerran ja tällä hetkellä sukupuutto uhkaa ennätysellisen suurta määrää lajeja. Uuden 2030 strategian tulee sisältää sitovia ja mitattavissa olevia tavoitteita ja suojelualueiden määrää on kasvatettava vähintään 30 prosentin tasolle ja palautettava vähintään 30 prosenttia heikentyneistä ekosysteemeistä 2030 mennessä.

Eleonora Evi (NI). – Signor Presidente, onorevoli colleghi, questa risoluzione rappresenta in maniera cristallina la drammatica portata dell'emergenza ecologica che stiamo vivendo.

È davanti agli occhi di tutti quanti noi come il declino della natura a livello globale sia senza precedenti nella storia umana, con l'accelerazione del tasso di estinzione di una miriade di specie e la minaccia di estinzione che riguarda ormai un ulteriore milione di specie di animali e piante.

I fenomeni meteorologici atmosferici estremi, provocati dai cambiamenti climatici in atto, rendono ancora più deleterio l'impatto sulla perdita di biodiversità. È pacificamente riconosciuto come l'attuale *trend* abbia conseguenze devastanti per l'intero genere umano ed è tale da pregiudicare il conseguimento dell'80 % degli obiettivi di sviluppo sostenibile, con incrementi enormi dei livelli di povertà, insicurezza alimentare e danni alla salute umana.

Dinanzi a tutto ciò, il minimo che possa fare l'attuale Commissione europea per la prossima COP 15 in Cina e nel varo della nuova strategia UE sulla biodiversità per il 2030 è farsi interprete del superamento della logica degli impegni volontari, giungendo alla fissazione dei più ambiziosi *target* giuridicamente vincolanti in materia di tutela di biodiversità e servizi ecosistemici.

Jytte Guteland (S&D). – Herr talman! Utrotningen av djur- och växtarter har ökat i en takt vi inte tidigare skådat, och vi står inför en mycket allvarlig ekologisk kris. Cirka en miljon – ett helt ofattbart antal – djur- och växtarter riskerar att utrotas. Det här är det allvarligaste vi har sett sedan dinosaurierna dog ut.

Förlusten av biologisk mångfald får förödande konsekvenser också för oss människor. Jag tänker på när bina dör ut; vad händer då med matproduktionen, med vår möjlighet att försörja oss på den här planeten? Samtidigt fortsätter vi att se en hög användning av bekämpningsmedel, inte minst inom jordbruket, och vi vet att det är en av orsakerna till den kris vi upplever.

Vi måste verkligen minska mängden kemikalier i vår miljö och omedelbart sätta stopp, för att vända den utveckling vi ser. Vi vet att den intensiva användningen är farlig. Vi vet också att hormonstörande ämnen är särskilt farliga för våra ekosystem och för oss människor, och de finns i vår vardag, hela tiden. Inte minst våra barn, vi har ett här, upplever detta i sin vardag. Det påverkar vår hälsa oerhört. Vi måste sätta ambitiösa reduktionsmål för bekämpningsmedel.

Jag är mycket stolt över det arbete som har gjorts, och vår grupps prioriteringar är väl förankrade i den här resolutionen inför COP15. Jag är glad över att vi har som mål att få till stånd bindande mål för biologisk mångfald. Det kommer vi att kämpa för.

Presidente. – Grazie, collega, e un saluto anche al Suo bellissimo bambino, che ci ha fatto compagnia per questo intervento.

Pascal Canfin (Renew). – Monsieur le Président, Monsieur le Commissaire, nous discutons ce soir de votre stratégie sur la biodiversité en Europe pour 2030. C'est très bien, mais il y a déjà une stratégie européenne, pour 2020, et elle a totalement échoué. Aucun des objectifs de protection de la nature en Europe que nous nous étions fixés ne sera tenu. Par conséquent, si vous revenez vers nous dans quelques semaines, fin février, avec une stratégie, avec de grands chiffres, de belles intentions, mais sans aucun élément concret législatif contraignant qui nous permettra de changer la donne, ce sera une stratégie sympathique mais une stratégie inutile. Et ce que l'on attend concrètement, c'est 30 % de l'ensemble du territoire européen qui soit protégé pour laisser la nature tranquille contre les impacts de l'activité humaine. Ce que l'on souhaite, c'est un objectif de réduction contraignant chiffré de l'utilisation et des risques des pesticides en Europe. Ce que l'on souhaite, c'est que vous reveniez enfin avec une méthode d'évaluation de l'impact de ces pesticides sur les abeilles. Cela fait plusieurs mois que le Parlement européen vous a posé la question, nous attendons toujours votre nouvelle proposition. Et puis c'est aussi protéger la nature en dehors de l'Europe. Nous, le continent européen, nous sommes le plus impactant au monde, de par notre consommation, sur les forêts tropicales. Revenez avec une proposition concrète de lutte contre la déforestation importée. C'est tout ce que nous voulons. Si nous n'avons pas cela, Monsieur le Commissaire, ce sera une stratégie pour rien.

Marie Toussaint (Verts/ALE). – Monsieur le Président, 75 % de l'environnement terrestre et 66 % de l'environnement marin sont menacés. Un million d'espèces sur huit est en voie d'extinction. En détruisant la biodiversité, nous nous autodétruisons. L'avenir de l'humanité est menacé par ces États qui saccagent les forêts présentes sur leur territoire ou par ces multinationales pour qui le pétrole peut ruisseler à flot tant que le profit ruisselle avec. Depuis trop longtemps, seul l'argent se joue des frontières.

C'est désormais l'impératif écologique qui doit dépasser les logiques nationales si nous voulons défendre notre avenir commun. Au lieu de continuer à piller la nature comme si nous pouvions l'exploiter sans limite, nous devons enfin la considérer comme un commun planétaire qui a le droit de se régénérer. Il ne s'agit pas ici que d'un changement philosophique: nous devons donner un statut juridique à la nature pour protéger réellement le vivant. L'année qui vient sera cruciale pour l'avenir de la planète: l'ONU a appelé à préserver 30 % de la surface du monde. Si nous voulons que la COP 15 ne soit pas un échec comme la COP 25 le fut, l'Europe doit prendre les mesures qui s'imposent, ré-ensauvager l'Europe et reconnaître les écocides et les droits de la nature.

Sylvia Limmer (ID). – Herr Präsident, sehr geehrte Kollegen! Wer von uns will das nicht: saubere Luft, saubere Flüsse, eine intakte Umwelt und den Schutz der heimischen Flora und Fauna. Da bin ich sofort bei Ihnen, in einer vernünftigen Art an den entsprechenden Rahmenbedingungen mitzuwirken. Wobei natürlich gleich hier heftige Diskussionen anstehen dürften. Für mich ist der Mensch Teil unseres Ökosystems, während man bei vielen grün-linken Forderungen schon mal ins Grübeln gerät, ob da nicht der Gedanke Pate stand, ohne die Menschheit wäre sowieso alles viel besser.

Mich treibt Grundsätzlicheres um: Umweltschutz war gestern, heute wird lieber scheinheilig das Klima gerettet – mit fatalen Folgen für die Umwelt, was die Klimaendzeitjünger wenig kümmert. Dass der Klimareligion Landschaftsschutz und vor allem viele Waldflächen für Windindustrieanlagen zum Opfer fallen, quittieren Gretas Truppen mit erstaunlichem ökologischen Gleichmut. Ebenso, dass viele Flächen dabei dauerhaft versiegelt werden, was sie nicht davon abhält, mit verlogener Inbrunst eine bessere Zertifizierung von Produkten ohne Entwaldung zu fordern. Darf ich lachen?

Einerseits wird die Übernutzung der Meere beklagt, eine Beeinträchtigung von Küstenregionen beweint, andererseits schwadroniert der Grüne Deal von der großen Bedeutung der Meere für den Bau von Offshore-Windindustrieanlagen. Und diejenigen, die einst ein Verbot von Cadmium und Blei in Solarmodulen oder Schwefelhexafluorid nicht verhindert haben, greinen heute über den Einsatz von Pestiziden und sind auch die Gleichen, die nicht im Mindesten mit der Wimper zucken, wenn für den Abbau von seltenen Erden – in Batterien zum Beispiel – hochradioaktives Thorium und andere toxische Abraumprodukte in China anfallen, und jammern stattdessen in altbewährter Manier über die angeblichen Belastungen für die biologische Vielfalt durch den Klimawandel. Ich darf an dieser Stelle daran erinnern, dass die Evolution und die Veränderung der Biosphäre seit jeher die Regel und nicht die Ausnahme waren.

Wenn wir nun diesen politischen Spießgesellen, die für sich beanspruchen, die Inhaber der reinen Lehre zu sein, über den Weg trauen, dann machen wir den Bock zum Gärtner. Ich jedenfalls tue das nicht.

(Die Rednerin lehnt eine Frage nach dem Verfahren der „blauen Karte“ von Sarah Wiener ab)

Manuel Bompard (GUE/NGL). – Monsieur le Président, mes chers collègues, le dernier rapport de la plateforme intergouvernementale sur la biodiversité est alarmant: plus d'un million d'espèces animales et végétales, soit une espèce sur huit, sont aujourd'hui menacées de disparition. C'est la sixième extinction de masse qui est en cours.

Pourtant, nos dirigeants ne sont pas à la hauteur. Les objectifs décidés en 2010 ne seront pas réalisés. Dès lors, les décisions de la COP 15 seront déterminantes. Pour être crédible, l'Union européenne doit prendre des mesures fortes et entraîner l'ensemble de la communauté internationale. Je vous en propose deux.

D'abord sur les pesticides: selon les scientifiques, l'agriculture intensive est l'une des causes majeures de perte de la biodiversité. Les pesticides à large spectre, comme le glyphosate, sont en particulier pointés du doigt. Notre Parlement doit maintenant décider de leur interdiction avec un calendrier précis permettant de déployer les alternatives.

Ensuite, à propos des organismes génétiquement modifiés utilisés pour préserver les cultures des pesticides: nous avons interdit en 2001 les techniques qui existaient alors, mais les grands industriels cherchent à contourner notre réglementation en introduisant de nouveaux OGM, qui font pourtant courir un même danger sur notre environnement. Il est temps que notre Parlement leur barre la route en prononçant leur interdiction.

June Alison Mummery (NI). – Mr President, while the upcoming UN biodiversity conference aims to build a common future for all life on Earth, when it comes to Britain's seas, the EU's attitude is little more than take, take, take.

Just look at the vast amounts of biodiversity killed in British waters by Dutch electric pole fishing – a method banned by the Chinese for being too efficient. Or the super trawlers working in the Channel – gigantic factory ships which scoop up whole shoals of fish together with anything else in the area, such as the under strain sea bass and highly intelligent dolphins.

These death trawlers are blamed for nearly wiping out whole fisheries in East Africa and destroying the incomes of some of the poorest people. These are only two small examples of the EU putting profit before biodiversity.

Until the EU takes action to stop practices which threaten the environment of its backyard, it has no right to lecture anyone else. The fact is, actions speak louder the words and the people are watching.

Norbert Lins (PPE). – Herr Präsident, Herr Kommissar, liebe Kolleginnen und Kollegen! Biodiversität und Klimaschutz müssen Hand in Hand gehen. Wenn wir in Paris ambitionierte Ziele für den Klimaschutz gesetzt haben, ist es nun an der Zeit, einen klaren Fahrplan für mehr Biodiversität zu gestalten. Dafür brauchen wir ein starkes Signal der EU in Kunming. Dazu gehört, sich weltweit für eine nachhaltig geführte Land- und Forstwirtschaft einzusetzen, denn diese leistet einen großen Beitrag zu Artenvielfalt, Lebensräumen und Ökosystemen und hat das Potenzial, die Auswirkungen des Klimawandels einzudämmen.

Ich halte es dagegen nicht für sinnvoll, Ziele um der Ziele willen zu setzen und Symbolpolitik zu betreiben. Bei allen Maßnahmen – ob national, europaweit oder international – muss bessere Rechtsetzung das oberste Gebot sein. Zum Beispiel muss eine Schutzgebietsausweitung auf 30 % einer ordentlichen Folgenabschätzung unterzogen werden. Deshalb plädiere ich für die Vernunft des Hauses, sich für sinnvolle Maßnahmen auf Basis von umfassenden Folgenabschätzungen einzusetzen.

Sándor Rónai (S&D). – Tisztelt Elnök úr! Nap mint nap láttuk a tragikus eseményeket, hogy milyen veszteségeket szenvedett el a bolygónk az ausztráliai tűzvész kapcsán. Azt mondják, hogy az emberi tragédiák és áldozatok mellett mintegy egymilliárd állat halt meg a tűzvészben. A drasztikusan csökkenő élőhelyek következtében pedig akár újabb fajok is kipusztulhatnak. A katasztrófa ráadásul hatással van az egész világra. A bozóttűz füstje körbeszállta az egész Földet. Új-Zélandon sötétre színezte a hegyeket takaró havat, a légkörre pedig az egész bolygón hatással lehet.

Ez figyelmeztetés kell, hogy legyen nekünk, európaiaknak is. Bárhol a világon okoz pusztulást a klímakatasztrófa, az mindenkire, ránk, európaiakra is hatással lehet. A mi életünkre és az európai fajok fennmaradására is veszéllyel lehet. Csak Ausztráliában ... *(az elnök megvonta a szót a képviselőtől)* élőlényt veszélyeztet a kihalás. A mi felelősségünk az, hogy megakadályozzuk és megőrizzük a bolygónk biológiai sokszínűségét. Az, hogy sokfélék vagyunk, egy olyan érték, amelyre minden áron vigyáznunk kell.

Nicolae Ștefănuță (Renew). – Domnule Președinte, eu de obicei vorbesc despre păduri în Parlamentul European, dar azi voi vorbi despre orașe, pentru că 68 % din populația mondială o să locuiască în zone urbane până în 2050. Știm că schimbările climatice cresc frecvența valurilor de căldură. Știm că vom avea variații mult mai mari ale precipitațiilor.

În cazul unui oraș care se confruntă și cu un nivel mare de poluare – așa cum este Bucureștiul nostru – soluțiile ar putea fi: crearea unor păduri urbane, realizarea unei centuri verzi, încurajarea grădinilor verticale și a acoperișurilor verzi. Ideea unui oraș inteligent trebuie să cuprindă și partea de sustenabilitate, pentru că trebuie să avem ecosisteme naturale corectate prin coridoare ca semințele să se răspândească ușor. Așa că avem nevoie de investiții europene în acoperișuri verzi, în parcuri, în grădini private, în fațade verzi, care ar putea crea spații suplimentare pentru cetățeni.

Domnule Președinte, dragi colegi, orașele ar trebui integrate în natură, nu invers. Natura este parte din viața noastră, nu e doar o destinație de vacanță.

Martin Häusling (Verts/ALE). – Herr Präsident! Wir befinden uns mitten im sechsten großen Artensterben, diesmal vom Menschen verursacht. Wir bedrohen eine Million Arten, und ich finde, jetzt ist es höchste Zeit, etwas zu tun, und die UN-Ziele sind wirklich gut.

Nur müssen wir uns auch in Europa Ziele setzen, zum Beispiel in der Gemeinsamen Agrarpolitik. Die Landwirtschaft in Europa trägt mit ihrer intensiven Art der Bewirtschaftung auch zum Artensterben bei. Wir müssen ganz klare Ziele formulieren, dass wir Pestizide reduzieren, aber auch, dass wir die erhöhten Stickstoffeinträge reduzieren. Wir tragen auch Verantwortung dafür, dass wir 20 Millionen Hektar von Soja importieren und damit die industrielle Landwirtschaft in Europa fördern. Auch da müssen wir grundlegend etwas ändern.

Wir sollten jetzt auch nicht dem Urteil unterliegen, 30 % Prozent Schutzgebiete sind gut und 70 % können Schmutzgebiete sein. Nein, wir müssen auch die Land- und Forstwirtschaft insgesamt extensivieren.

Und lassen Sie mich noch einen Punkt sagen: Wir haben einen Antrag eingebracht, dass wir ein Moratorium für *Gene Drives* brauchen. Diese Killergentechnik, die brauchen wir nun wirklich nicht.

Ivan David (ID). – Pane předsedající, především je třeba říci, že Evropská unie jako celek není smluvní stranou Úmluvy OSN o biologické rozmanitosti. Smluvními stranami je 193 zemí OSN. Iniciativa Evropské komise je jen dalším ambiciózním projektem s cílem vytáhnout obrovské peníze na mlhavě definované projekty. Má-li být chráněna přírodní rozmanitost a mírněno zhoršování klimatických změn, neměla by se Evropa pouštět do projektů, jako je smlouva EU s Mercosurem, která povede k dalšímu nevratnému ničení pralesů pro chov dobytka a pěstování plodin na vývoz. Útočiště pro divokou přírodu ničí chamtivost nadnárodních koncernů a přelidnění s vyčerpáním zdrojů. V prosinci zde byla většinou poslanců schválena průmyslová těžba ryb z řeky Gambie za nepatrnou úplatu, která domorodcům a divoké přírodě rozhodně nepomůže. Tak vypadá péče o přírodní rozmanitost v praxi.

Petros Kokkalis (GUE/NGL). – Mr President, Mr Commissioner, today this House overwhelmingly voted in favour of the Commission's communication on the European Green Deal. In this proposal, the Commission promises to analyse the findings of the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change (IPCC) report on oceans and propose measures in the maritime area. A week ago, a report published in the Journal of Advances in Atmospheric Sciences confirmed that in the past 30 years the oceans are heating 450% faster than they were in the previous 20 years. The oceans, of course, retain 90% of the excessive anthropogenic heat in the atmosphere. The amount of excess heat absorbed by the oceans in these past 25 years equals 3.6 billion Hiroshima bombs.

As far as we know, the oceans are home to somewhere between half a million and 10 million marine species – in fact, the greatest habitat of biodiversity on our planet. In our resolution today we urge the Commission to give the Green Deal a blue dimension. I ask you, Commissioner, to finally put together a true European Blue Deal. It's high time we took care of the high seas.

Michal Wiezik (PPE). – Vážený pán předsedající, ochrana biodiverzity znamená ochranu podmínek pro život. Je to největší výzva, před kterou stojíme, od zachování biodiverzity sme existenčne závislí. Pre zachovanie biodiverzity evidentne nerobíme dosť. Naša činnosť je dôvodom krízy biodiverzity. Šieste masové vymieranie spôsobujeme my – tým, že berieme, meníme a ničíme prírodu. Nevyhnutnou podmienkou na záchranu je prísna ochrana prírodných ekosystémov a populácií voľne žijúcich druhov. Musíme vyčleniť dostatočne veľké územia, kde nebudeme rúbať, poľovať, chytať ryby alebo budovať infraštruktúru. Musíme vyčleniť územia, kde bude mať príroda priestor, a musíme ich vyčleniť rádovo viac než doteraz. Som rád, že rezolúcia o ochrane biodiverzity s týmto počítá v prípade starých lesov a pralesov, no úprimne, akosi radi navrhujeme pravidlá pre svet, no zabúdame na domáce úlohy. Skvostné pralesy máme aj v - Európe, avšak sme mizerní ochrancovia. Vyhubenie druhov a kolaps biodiverzity sa nedá vrátiť späť. Musíme riešiť tento problém s najvyššou vážnosťou. Ide o život.

Eric Andrieu (S&D). – Monsieur le Président, chers collègues, je veux ici partager avec vous quelques éléments.

En 40 ans, la moitié des récifs coralliens a disparu. En 30 ans, la moitié des forêts a été abattue. Un million, oui, un million d'espèces disparaîtra dans les dix prochaines années. Les raisons, nous les connaissons: la dégradation des habitats souvent orchestrée par les hommes, la surexploitation des ressources, le changement climatique ou encore la pollution. Nous sommes tous responsables dans nos mauvaises habitudes quotidiennes, mais nous sommes aussi responsables de ce désastre ici, collègues au Parlement européen, avec certaines de nos décisions, comme par exemple celle des accords commerciaux avec le bout du monde, guidés davantage par le profit immédiat que par la préservation de l'environnement et de notre écosystème.

Si nous, êtres humains, continuons à nous comporter comme si nous étions la seule espèce sur Terre, nous finirons par être la dernière espèce avant une disparition bien méritée. Il est grand temps de comprendre que nous sommes un élément d'un tout et que si nous ne préservons pas la biodiversité, nous ne survivrons pas. C'est aussi simple que cela.

Irena Joveva (Renew). – Spoštovani predsedujoči. Ohranjanje živiljenja na zemlji je odvisno od ekosistemov, ti pa so odvisni od ohranjanja biotske raznovrstnosti med živimi organizmi.

Že leta se soočamo z grožnjo izumrtja milijonov živalskih vrst, s pretirano uporabo kmetijskih površin, pesticidov, onesnaževanjem. In rezultat? Zemlja postaja biološko in genetsko vse bolj siromašna. Pogosto pozabljamo, da je ravno biotska raznovrstnost temelj našega gospodarstva, sredstev za preživetje, zdravja, varne hrane in navsezadnje kakovosti življenja.

Zadnje ocene učinkov dosedanje Strategije biotske raznovrstnosti EU niso ravno obetavne. Stopnja izumrtja ogroženih vrst še vedno narašča. Čas je, da to spremenimo in ta resolucija je dober temelj, na katerem lahko Komisija oblikuje novo, uspešno strategijo. Dokažimo svetu, da je varovanje in vzdrževanje narave ob sočasni gradnji varne, vključujoče in trajnostne družbe mogoče.

Tilly Metz (Verts/ALE). – Herr Präsident! Wir sind nicht nur in einem Klimanotstand, wir sind auch in einem Biodiversitätsnotstand. Ist Ihnen schon aufgefallen, dass es auf dem Lande immer stiller wird? Die Vögel verstummen, und die Insekten verschwinden. Das sechste große Artensterben hat also längst begonnen, und wir machen einfach weiter wie bisher, *business as usual* auf Kosten der nächsten Generation. Die Natur brauchte Millionen Jahre, um die Artenvielfalt und komplexe Ökosysteme zu entwickeln. Es scheint, die Menschheit wird nur ein paar Jahrzehnte brauchen, um sie zu vernichten.

Und doch wissen wir genau, was wir tun müssten: klare Ziele zur Reduktion der Pestizide, kein Import von genetisch manipulierten Pflanzen, keine riesigen Monokulturen mehr. Wir müssen Naturschutzzonen erweitern, den Wald, unsere Gewässer und überhaupt alle Ökosysteme schützen. Ohne den Schutz und die Wiederherstellung auch der Artenvielfalt gibt es auch für die Menschen keine Zukunft.

Mick Wallace (GUE/NGL). – Mr President, the Irish National Parks and Wildlife Service report submitted to the UN Convention on Biological Diversity last year, also blames the pollinator decline on the obsession with intensive agriculture, the loss of hedgerows, and monocultures, including commercial forests made up of fast-growing coniferous species of low biodiversity value. This part of the report, in fact, accurately describes Irish government policy and its complete disregard for biodiversity. Hedgerow cutting was extended in the 2018 Heritage Act. The Irish government, and indeed the EU, still rewards intensive farming to the detriment of high-value nature farms and the Irish government's obsession with, and over-dependence on, sitka spruce violates the basic principles of biodiversity. We need legally binding biodiversity targets at global and EU level and sufficient funding for these under the next EU long-term budget. We also need better enforcement of EU nature protection laws. We've got to care, Commissioner, or things will stay the same and get worse.

Daniel Buda (PPE). – Domnule Președinte, biodiversitatea reprezintă conceptul care subsumează valorile esențiale ale vieții umane. În același timp, ea furnizează beneficii nu doar pentru noi, ci și pentru generațiile viitoare. Factorul uman determină, însă, o scădere considerabilă a acesteia, cu efecte grave pe termen mediu și lung.

Schimbările climatice sau încălzirea globală, în general, reprezintă elementul distructiv pentru aceasta. Acordul Verde European își propune să reprezinte un instrument și un mecanism prin care statele membre să fie determinate, printre altele, să concureze la păstrarea biodiversității. Cu toate acestea, statele membre trebuie să înțeleagă că este nevoie să vină cu o finanțare adecvată și suficientă pentru atingerea acestor obiective.

Agricultura trebuie să fie privită ca partener în această luptă pentru menținerea biodiversității. De asemenea, fermierii trebuie să fie sprijiniți financiar pentru ca practicile lor agricole să fie conforme cu obiectivele de mediu. Aceștia nu pot face mai mult cu bani mai puțini. Nu în ultimul rând, cercetarea și inovarea în conservarea și restaurarea biodiversității trebuie să fie sprijinite adecvat.

Caroline Voaden (Renew). – Mr President, it doesn't matter where we sit in this House or where we put our cross on the ballot paper. It doesn't matter about the colour of our skin or the language that we speak. The biodiversity we have inherited is a precious resource that we all share and that we simply have to protect for our children and our grandchildren. The hideous fires in Australia, in which half a billion animals are thought to have perished, should serve as a wake up call to all of us. We must take serious action now to set concrete binding targets to protect nature, reduce carbon emissions and address the climate emergency. The EU's biodiversity targets set for 2020 will not be met. Let's try and do better before COP 15 with the 2030 targets. As I prepare to leave this House for the last time tomorrow, I implore you Commissioner and all my fellow MEPs, to be radical, be passionate, be strong, stand up to the money men and the vested interests, the oil barons and the chemical giants. We only have one planet. I won't be here to fight for it but you will, make sure you do.

(Applause)

Grace O'Sullivan (Verts/ALE). – Mr President, the COP meeting in China is biodiversity's Paris Agreement moment. People have finally realised the urgency of the climate crisis, but have come to also understand that climate, and the biodiversity crisis are intertwined.

As an ecological educator, I have always liked explaining by example. If we don't protect biodiversity, the time will come when children won't know what it is to pick a wild flower, and we'll only know butterflies and ladybirds in picture books.

This is the EU's moment to prove its commitment to stopping the huge destruction of habitats and the decline in species globally. This process cannot be completed without addressing the issue of agriculture and fishing.

Today we voted on a resolution on the European Green Deal. Probably the EU's most ambitious environmental policy ever, but we know not enough is being done in regards to reforming the way we farm and fish in Europe. We must get serious. We must get COP on, and we must have action.

Radan Kanev (PPE). – Mr President, the protection and conservation of biodiversity is essential not only for the production of food, fuel and medicines, but also for a healthy life and sustainable local family business. We need to bring together biodiversity and climate protection as part of a long-term, nature-friendly economic development. The European Commission has to guarantee the biodiversity objectives, effectively monitoring key projects funded by the European Union. In my home country, Bulgaria, the Natura 2000 safeguard mechanisms are practically not implemented due to inadequate governmental policies in the field of tourism, transport, energy, agriculture and forest protection. The recent failure with Struma highway, Natura 2000 mismanagement and the case of Pirin National Park are only some of many problems. We need strong examples to show that there is political will to achieve the EU goals and to provide strict control and monitoring of EU policies.

Pierre Karleskind (Renew). – Monsieur le Président, chers collègues, puisque, en ce moment nous sommes beaucoup en train de regarder vers l'Australie, regardons d'un peu plus près puisqu'il y a autre chose qui brûle.

Regardons un peu plus près sous la surface de l'eau, regardons cette grande barrière de corail qui brûle sous nos yeux. Hausse de la température, activités humaines, pollution chimique et biologique, plastique en tous genres, tous ces éléments ont des effets dévastateurs sur cette grande barrière.

Plus globalement, selon l'IPBES (plateforme intergouvernementale scientifique et politique sur la biodiversité et les services écosystémiques), ce sont deux tiers du milieu marin qui ont été significativement modifiés par l'action humaine. Mais sous l'eau, ça passe relativement inaperçu, alors regardons de plus près. Portons des objectifs ambitieux pour reconstruire la biodiversité marine, portons l'ambition de 30 % d'aires marines protégées, portons autant d'ambition pour 100 % de notre océan, cet océan qui agit comme une éponge depuis des décennies, mais qui commence à s'épuiser.

Deux points de la résolution sont particulièrement urgents: que l'Union européenne, première zone maritime du monde, fasse de l'océan l'une de ses priorités, et également que toutes les parties à la convention reconnaissent l'océan, comme dirait ma collègue Catherine Chabaud, comme un bien commun de l'humanité. Notre avenir en dépend.

Jutta Paulus (Verts/ALE). – Herr Präsident, meine Damen und Herren! Ich habe hier etwas mitgebracht: Das ist der Bericht „Die Umwelt in Europa – Zustand und Ausblick“. Den gibt es natürlich auch online und selbstverständlich in allen EU-Sprachen. Darin sind die Daten der letzten fünf Jahre zusammengetragen, die die Europäische Umweltagentur über die Umwelt in Europa erhoben hat.

Ich sage es gleich: Es sieht nicht gut aus. Unsere Naturschätze sind in keinem guten Zustand. Besonders beunruhigend ist, dass die Allerweltsarten zurückgehen. Ich habe schon ewig kein Rebhuhn mehr gesehen, eine Lerche hört man auch nur noch ganz selten. Die Kernbotschaft, die in diesem Bericht steht, ist: Wir müssen endlich aufhören, Biodiversität und Artenschutz getrennt von anderen Politikfeldern zu betrachten und mit ein paar Millionen zu unterstützen, während wir gleichzeitig viele Milliarden in naturzerstörendes Wirtschaften stecken.

Deshalb bin ich froh, dass dieses Parlament morgen eine starke EntschlieÙung zur Biodiversität beschließen wird, wo viele wichtige Punkte drin sind. Ich hoffe, dass sich diese Grundsätze dann auch wiederfinden, wenn wir über die Gemeinsame Agrarpolitik sprechen oder wenn wir über Haushalt sprechen. Denn wir brauchen diese Mittel, um den Zustand der Umwelt in Europa zu verbessern.

Inese Vaidere (PPE). – Godātais sēdes vadītāj! Godātie kolēģi! Mans mazdēls ir ļoti aizrāvēs ar ornitoloģiju, zina stāstīt vai par katru no vairākiem simtiem lidoņu. Tādēļ man sāp sirds par to, ka, iespējams, viņš neredzēs ne melno stārķi, ne Filipīnu ērgli, nedz arī kādu citu.

Pasaulē ik dienu izzūd aptuveni 150 augu, putnu, dzīvnieku un insektu sugas, galvenokārt cilvēka darbības rezultātā. Uzskatu, ka nozīmīgam darba virzienam jābūt intensīvās lauksaimniecības, pesticīdu un herbicīdu izmantošanas mazināšanai. Mums ir jāatbalsta bioloģiskā lauksaimniecība un tīra pārtika bez ĢMO.

Tad pirmkārt, tiks uzlabota dzīvnieku un augu veselība, veicināta bioloģiskā daudzveidība.

Otrkārt, šādi audzēti produkti ir gan veselīgāki, gan arī garšīgāki.

Treškārt, tas ir ekonomiski izdevīgi, jo pieprasījums pēc tīras pārtikas pasaulē palielinās.

Noteikti sagaidu bioloģiskajai daudzveidībai vērienīgu atbalstu, un adekvātu finansējumu no Eiropas Savienības budžeta.

Michèle Rivasi (Verts/ALE). – Monsieur le Président, depuis dix ans, notre compréhension et notre connaissance de l'interdépendance entre la faune, la flore et les humains ont progressé, mais les destructions continuent à une échelle et à une vitesse jamais connues.

On en a parlé, un million d'espèces sont menacées d'extinction selon les chiffres de 2019 de l'IPBES, qui est un groupe de scientifiques internationaux. Nous sommes entrés vraiment dans une période de point de bascule. L'urgence climatique réclame de s'attaquer à cette perte de biodiversité et à ces facteurs dus à l'homme, qui mettent en danger le devenir de l'humanité. Et quand je parle de devenir de l'humanité, je me dis que la perte de biodiversité impacte les peuples autochtones. Personne ne parle de ces peuples autochtones, et pourtant ils entrent dans la sauvegarde de la biodiversité et ils jouent un rôle crucial.

En même temps, cette perte de biodiversité entraîne des conséquences sur les pays en voie de développement, sur la souveraineté alimentaire et sur la santé des populations.

L'Europe doit donc porter une position claire et forte à Kunming en Chine fin 2020, et nous avons le devoir de préserver ce vivant, de replanter les forêts, de dépolluer les océans et de privilégier une agriculture saine sans OGM et sans pesticides.

Pascal Arimont (PPE). – Herr Präsident, sehr geehrter Herr Kommissar! Ich möchte den Verlust der Artenvielfalt an drei Zahlen und einem Insekt festmachen. Die Zahlen sind 84, 76 und 15. 84 % der europäischen Kulturpflanzen hängen von natürlicher Bestäubung durch Insekten ab, um 76 % ist die Anzahl dieser Fluginsekten innerhalb von 30 Jahren zurückgegangen, und bis zu 15 Milliarden Euro des jährlichen landwirtschaftlichen Ertrags der EU sind direkt auf Bestäuber zurückzuführen. Das ist dramatisch, und zwar in vielerlei Hinsicht.

Und zu diesen Insekten gehört auch die Biene. Sie zu schützen, ist daher nicht nur aus Gründen des Tierschutzes, der Artenvielfalt oder des ökologischen Gleichgewichts, sondern auch wirtschaftlich sinnvoll. Die Biene stirbt aus vier Gründen: erstens Varroamilbe, zweitens Klimaerwärmung, drittens Monokulturen und viertens Pestizide und vor allem Neonikotinoide.

Die Varroamilbe kriegen wir Imker in den Griff, beim Klimaschutz haben wir, glaube ich, unsere Hausaufgaben heute Morgen mit dem neuen Grünen Deal noch gut gemacht. Meine Vorschläge zur Monokultur und zu Pestiziden: erstens landwirtschaftliche Familienbetriebe verstärkt unterstützen. Diese bringen Vielfalt auf die Felder, retten die Biene und den Berufsstand des Landwirtes. Zweitens Neonikotinoide verbieten, Pestizide verringern und nach Alternativen forschen. Denn stirbt die Biene, stirbt der Mensch. Ich weiß nicht, wie es Ihnen bei diesem Satz geht, Herr Kommissar, aber ich würde dies gerne verhindern.

Sarah Wiener (Verts/ALE). – Herr Präsident, sehr geehrter Herr Kommissar, liebe Kolleginnen und Kollegen! Wir haben viel gehört über Biodiversität. Ich möchte jetzt in dieser knappen Minute das Augenmerk auf ein besonderes Biodiversitätsthema lenken, auf das größte Ökosystem, nämlich den Dreck unter unseren Füßen, den Boden. Der Boden ist das letzte Paradies unter unseren Füßen und hat so viel mikrobielle Funktionen: Wasserreinigungs-, Speicherfunktionen, er füttert die ganze Welt, sodass ich denke, es wird wirklich an der Zeit, wieder über Bodenrichtlinien, über Bodenschutz und über Humusschutz zu reden. Denn ohne Boden wird alles nichts sein.

Ein Nebenfakt ist, dass wir sehen, was alles am Boden verbraucht wird, wie er erodiert, wie er verweht wird, wie das bakterielle Leben abnimmt. Genau das Gleiche passiert in unserem Darm. Also die Krankheit des Bodens hängt auch mit unserer eigenen Krankheit zusammen in unserem Darm, der das größte Ökosystem unter den Menschen ist.

Meine Minute ist um. Ich möchte nur den Hinweis geben: Bitte schützen Sie den Boden und den Darm aller Menschen.

Μαρία Σπυράκη (PPE). – Κύριε Πρόεδρε, Επίτροπε Sinkevičius, είναι προφανές από τα στοιχεία και τα δεδομένα ότι χρειαζόμαστε επείγοντως μια νέα δεσμευτική στρατηγική για τη βιοποικιλότητα. Οι πυρκαγιές στον Αρκτικό Κύκλο, στον Αμαζόνιο και στην Αυστραλία επανέφεραν στο προσκήνιο με τον πιο δραματικό τρόπο την ανάγκη να υιοθετήσουμε δεσμευτικούς στόχους για τη διατήρηση και την αποκατάσταση της βιοποικιλότητας. Με αυτό το όπλο οφείλουμε να εμφανιστούμε στην COP15 στην Κίνα, με αυτό το όπλο οφείλουμε να θέσουμε όλες τις δυνάμεις του πλανήτη ενώπιον των ευθυνών τους και να ζητήσουμε μια συμφωνία δεσμευτική, ανάλογη με αυτή του Παρισιού. Προηγουμένως όμως οφείλουμε ως Ευρωπαϊκή Ένωση να αναλάβουμε τις ευθύνες μας, με επαρκή χρηματοδότηση από τον νέο προϋπολογισμό, με την προστασία της βιοποικιλότητας, με την υποστήριξη των καθαρών τροφίμων και των παραγωγών τους, αλλά και με την εμπλοκή των επιχειρήσεων. Οι καλές πρακτικές για την προστασία της βιοποικιλότητας από επιχειρήσεις, όπως είναι το Business for Nature, που εφαρμόζεται και στην Ελλάδα, μπορούν να αποτελέσουν τον οδηγό μας.

Klaus Buchner (Verts/ALE). – Herr Präsident! Viele Arten von Tieren, Pflanzen und anderen Organismen werden durch den massiven Einsatz von Chemikalien ausgelöscht, aber auch, weil wir ihnen immer mehr von ihrem Lebensraum nehmen.

Eine weitere Ursache für das Artensterben bleibt allerdings oft unbeachtet. Das ist die Funkstrahlung, deren Intensität ständig zunimmt. Langjährige Forschung hat gezeigt, dass die Strahlung zum Beispiel bei Bienen und bei anderen Tieren die Orientierung stören kann, sodass sie zwar von zu Hause wegfliegen, aber nicht mehr nach Hause finden. Mäuse werden manchmal schon in der fünften Generation irreversibel unfruchtbar. Ähnliche Beobachtungen haben wir bei anderen Tierarten gemacht.

Wenn wir den Mobilfunk weiter wie geplant ausbauen, werden viele Arten von Tieren und Pflanzen unwiederbringlich von dieser Erde verschwinden.

Nuno Melo (PPE). – Senhor Presidente, a União Europeia deve fazer dos oceanos uma das prioridades da sua estratégia em matéria de biodiversidade. De resto, no meu país, a maior parte do nosso território é precisamente mar. A biodiversidade e ecossistemas saudáveis, incluindo os oceanos, que absorvem mais de 25% das emissões de CO₂ e são o principal fornecedor de oxigénio, são fundamentais para alcançar os objetivos do Acordo de Paris e reforçar as capacidades de resiliência e de adaptação da União Europeia em relação às alterações climáticas, que reduzirão o oxigénio dos oceanos até 4% em 2100. E os efeitos desta diminuição de oxigénio serão dramáticos para os habitats e as economias costeiras que dependem dos oceanos.

Assistimos a um milhão de espécies em risco de extinção, à degradação das zonas costeiras ou ao aumento das ilhas de plástico, que no Pacífico Norte têm já dezassete vezes o tamanho de Portugal.

Termino, Senhor Presidente. Precisamos de uma política de plástico zero nos oceanos, salvar os oceanos, de provar que queremos ganhar a batalha da biodiversidade.

Peter Liese (PPE). – Herr Präsident! Wir müssen weltweit und natürlich auch in der Europäischen Union, mehr für den Artenschutz tun. Deswegen werden wir morgen als EVP dieser Entschließung zustimmen, und ich bedanke mich bei allen, die geholfen haben, natürlich vor allen Dingen für die EVP bei Agnès Evren.

Ich möchte aber davor warnen, dass wir, wenn wir über Biodiversität reden, immer nur die einfachen Lösungen favorisieren – mehr Schutzgebiete, überall 30 %, strengere Vertragsverletzungsverfahren. Lassen Sie uns auch über neue Ideen nachdenken – bessere Vernetzung und – was Kollege Jahr in der Agrarreform vorgeschlagen hatte – Anreize zur Renaturierung, zum Beispiel Wiederbewässerung von Mooren.

Das müssen wir stärker unterstützen, und wir müssen – leider muss ich das auch sagen – auch manchmal eine Abwägung treffen. Manchmal bringt europäisches Artenschutzrecht heute schon Konfliktsituationen, zum Beispiel mit der menschlichen Gesundheit, wenn man versucht, den Verkehr aus den Städten herauszubringen, dann haben wir da manchmal Probleme. Deswegen Abwägung und vor allen Dingen keine einseitige Beschimpfung der Landwirte, wie das im Änderungsantrag 1 geschieht. Das bringt uns wirklich nicht zum Ziel. Wir müssen gemeinsam arbeiten und nicht konfrontativ.

Procedura «catch the eye»

Ljudmila Novak (PPE). – Spoštovani predsedujoči. Indijanci pravijo, da je zemlja naša mati, zato moramo z njo ravnati zelo skrbno. Če z njo ne ravnamo skrbno, se nam to zelo maščuje. In to spoznavamo iz dneva v dan.

Dejstvo je, da so številne živalske in rastlinske vrste izginile, zato moramo ukrepati. Hkrati pa morajo biti ti ukrepi življenjski. Zato, da se ljudje ne smejo jeziti zaradi teh pretiranih administrativnih ukrepov.

Vsaka živalska in rastlinska vrsta na tem planetu ima svoj pomen, ima svoj namen. Čeprav se včasih jezimo na žuželke, pa vendar so zelo pomembni sodelavci pri opravevanju.

Evropska komisija ima izredno veliko in pomembno nalogo – kako zaščititi živalske in rastlinske vrste, pa hkrati tudi zadovoljiti potrebe ljudi. Kmetje niso za vse krivi. Tudi naše potrošništvo je veliko krivo za onesnaženje.

VORSITZ: RAINER WIELAND

Vizepräsident

Robert Hajšel (S&D). – Vážený pán predsedajúci, náš život na tejto planéte je ohrozený. Hrozba spočíva nielen v klimatických zmenách, ale aj v upadajúcej biodiverzite. O tejto hrozbe svedčia nielen nedávno horiace pralesy v - Amazónii alebo požiare v Austrálii či nedávno na Sibíri, ale aj obrovský úbytok včiel a ďalšieho hmyzu, s ktorým sa naša generácia normálne stretávala pri návšteve do prírody a boli súčasťou nášho života. Ale planétu máme len jednu a my musíme začať konať teraz, ale rozumne, a musíme prestať s výrubmi lesov, musíme prestať používať nebezpečné pesticídy, nikotínoidy, aj rozširovať chránené územia. A preto je správne, že tu debatujeme a zajtra prijmemé túto rezolúciu. Musíme vyzvať členské štáty k väčšiemu úsiliu a zároveň vyčleniť na to dostatočné peniaze a urobiť tieto záväzky aj právne záväznými. Musíme teda na to vyčleniť peniaze aj z rozpočtu, ale aj z iných horizontálnych programov Európskej únie.

João Ferreira (GUE/NGL). – Senhor Presidente, o objetivo de travar a perda de biodiversidade até 2020 fracassou. O ritmo de extinção de espécies não abrandou, e pelo contrário acentua-se, e o número de espécies animais e vegetais em risco de extinção é colossal.

As repercussões sobre os ecossistemas e sobre as comunidades humanas serão graves. Neste quadro não chega recauchutar estratégias falhadas, nem proclamar objetivos ambiciosos mas destituídos de meios realistas e bastantes para a sua consecução.

O que se prevê ao nível do próximo Quadro Financeiro Plurianual, Senhor Comissário, está longe de ser animador também a este nível. A solução não passa também por formas de apropriação privada e de mercantilização da natureza e dos seus recursos, que apenas acentuam o problema.

A destruição e fragmentação de habitats, as alterações climáticas, a introdução de espécies exóticas invasoras no ambiente estão entre as causas da perda de biodiversidade, causas inseparáveis do modelo económico vigente dominante e das políticas que o sustentam. Atacar de forma consequente estas causas, em última instância, exige pôr em causa este modelo e estas políticas.

(Ende der spontanen Wortmeldungen)

Virginijus Sinkevičius, *Member of the Commission*. – Mr President, I wish to thank Members for their contributions and support for an ambitious biodiversity policy within the European Union and globally. I can only agree with Mr Luena, when he said we have only one planet and no 'Planet B'. We have a huge responsibility to implement the transformative change that is required to put nature on the path to recovery by 2030.

For the benefit of all people, yes, we need to be ambitious. We will need to explain very clearly to citizens and stakeholders why we need to change our patterns of consumption and production, highlight the benefits for well-being, health and for the economy, and ensure a just transition.

Let me reassure you that I have taken good note and listened carefully to your call for legally-binding targets, to your comments on pesticides, sustainable agriculture, deforestation and gene-drive organisms. We are still discussing the biodiversity strategy internally, but action-oriented targets should be about integrating biodiversity across policies and sectors, including agriculture, forestry and fisheries, and about protecting and restoring nature. Of course, this should be evidence-based and well assessed.

I am particularly grateful to Mr Kokkalis, Ms O'Sullivan, Mr Melo and Mr Karleskind for raising the important role of oceans – not only for biodiversity but also for mitigating climate change. As the Commissioner for Environment, Oceans and Fisheries, I am particularly sensitive to this topic, and I can reassure you that I will make sure that our Green Deal will also be a blue deal because, as you know, green without blue is only yellow.

I'm looking forward to collaborating with the Parliament on implementing the European Green Deal on shaping an ambitious European Union 2030 Biodiversity Strategy and on preparing for a successful Biodiversity COP15 in October in Kunming. I am looking forward to the resolution that you adopt tomorrow. It will guide us when we finalise and adopt our biodiversity strategy over the coming weeks.

Der Präsident. – Gemäß Artikel 132 Absatz 2 der Geschäftsordnung wurden sechs Entschließungsanträge eingereicht.

Die Aussprache ist geschlossen.

Die Abstimmung findet am Donnerstag, 16. Januar 2020, statt.

20. Sprawozdanie roczne z działalności Europejskiego Rzecznika Praw Obywatelskich za rok 2018 (debata)

Der Präsident. – Als nächster Punkt der Tagesordnung folgt die Aussprache über den Bericht von Peter Jahr im Namen des Petitionsausschusses über die Tätigkeit des Europäischen Bürgerbeauftragten im Jahr 2018 (2019/2134(INI)) (A9-0032/2019).

Ich möchte Sie auch an dieser Stelle daran erinnern, dass Sie sowohl in üblicher Weise als auch mithilfe des elektronischen Systems um die Möglichkeit zur spontanen Wortmeldung sowie zur Verwendung der „blauen Karte“ ersuchen können. Gebrauchsanleitungen liegen am Eingang des Plenarsaals aus.

Peter Jahr, *Berichterstatter*. – Herr Präsident! Wir haben diese Woche sehr intensiv darüber diskutiert, dass die europäischen Institutionen näher an den Bürger rücken müssen. Wir wollen einen europäischen Konvent etablieren, damit die Bürgerinnen und Bürger mitentscheiden können, wie sich die Europäische Union weiterentwickeln soll und wie es hier weitergehen soll – Stichwort: Demokratisierung, Stichwort: Transparenz.

Aber, liebe Kolleginnen und Kollegen, wir sollten bitte nicht vergessen: Mit dem Europäischen Bürgerbeauftragten haben wir eine Institution, die ganz nah am Bürger ist, und näher am Bürger, könnte man fast sagen, geht dann gar nicht. Man kann mit dem Bürgerbeauftragten direkt in Kontakt treten, man kann ihm schreiben, man kann sogar sagen, man kann ihn, wenn man will, anfassen.

Man soll dabei auch immer wieder beachten und feststellen: Die Bürgerbeauftragte ist für die Bürgerinnen und Bürger da und nicht für den Rat, nicht für die Kommission und nicht für das Europäische Parlament. Das heißt, als Bürgerbeauftragte muss man auch manchmal bei den Institutionen anecken, bei der Kommission, beim Rat, und trotzdem muss man intensiv zusammenarbeiten.

Ich beglückwünsche die Bürgerbeauftragte, Emily O'Reilly, zu ihrer Arbeit und ihren konstruktiven Bemühungen, auch diesen Spagat, wenn man so will, hinzukriegen, mit uns zusammenzuarbeiten und die Interessen der Bürgerinnen und Bürger zu beachten. Es geht ja darum, die Qualität der Verwaltung der Europäischen Union und den Zugang sowie die Qualität ihrer Dienste für die Bürgerinnen und Bürger zu verbessern.

Vor allem möchte ich hier die Arbeit von Frau O'Reilly in Sachen Transparenz im Rat loben, bei welcher Sie – das würde ich ausdrücklich sagen – vom Parlament intensiv unterstützt worden sind. Dies hat andererseits beim Rat für weniger Freude gesorgt. Aber Transparenz und der Zugang der Öffentlichkeit zu Dokumenten des Rates ist von wesentlicher Bedeutung, und man kann wirklich sagen, da könnte sich der Rat mindestens zwei Scheiben beim Europäischen Parlament abschneiden – nicht mehr und nicht weniger.

Transparenz verlangen wir vom Rat, das ist das, was wir machen, das soll der Rat dann auch durchführen. Es ist wichtig, dass Legislativverfahren der Europäischen Union gegenüber der Öffentlichkeit stärker rechenschaftspflichtig gemacht werden, und es ist auch wichtig, dass wir das den Bürgerinnen und Bürgern näherbringen können. Wir fordern den Rat als eine der beiden Instanzen der europäischen Gesetzgebung auf, nicht wie ein diplomatisches Forum aufzutreten, sondern – wie in den Verträgen gefordert – seine Arbeitsmethoden an die Standards einer parlamentarischen Demokratie anzupassen.

Mir war es eine Freude, an dem Bericht zu arbeiten. Wir hatten eine gute Zusammenarbeit unter oder mit den Berichterstattern. Wir haben einen guten Bericht angefertigt, wir haben dafür gesorgt, dass er – ich nenne es immer so – entpolitisiert worden ist, dass er eine breite Mehrheit erreichen konnte. Das war dann wirklich auch so, dass der Bericht im Petitionsausschuss mit 28 Stimmen dafür, einer Gegenstimme und einer Enthaltung angenommen wurde. Also auch ein gutes Zeichen für die Arbeit des Petitionsausschusses, wenn man so will, auch ein gutes Zeichen der Zusammenarbeit zwischen Petitionsausschuss und der Bürgerbeauftragten. Ich wünsche mir, dass das in diesem Jahr so weitergehen kann.

Emily O'Reilly, *European Ombudsman*. – Mr President, good evening everybody and thank you to Mr Jahr and to the shadow rapporteurs for your work on this report.

It is always a great pleasure to present the annual reports of my office to Parliament. However, this year is particularly significant, as I am presenting our work to a new Parliament, with many new Members and which four weeks ago voted confidence in me and in that work by electing me for a second mandate. I am very grateful for that trust and I intend fully to live up to it.

I also very much welcome the presence of Commissioner Šefčovič at this debate, which comes at the very beginning of this Commission's mandate and I wish it well in the vital work it does for everyone in Europe and also for many beyond our borders,

Honourable Members, as Ombudsman I am the bridge between citizens and the EU administration when problems arise and complaints are made. The complaints come from individuals, civil society organisations, businesses, journalists and often from Members of this Parliament. We apply not only EU law in our analysis, but also the principles of good administration, seeking a just outcome for citizens who are often overwhelmed by the at times technocratic nature and distance of the EU administration. We are not advocates, but we try to create a balanced playing field between the often powerless complainant and the very powerful institutions.

The year 2018 saw a strong increase in complaints that fall within my mandate, and this continued in 2019. This is not because the EU administration lowered its standards, but because many more people became aware of the work of my office and what it has achieved and can achieve.

I am grateful to the EU institutions, agencies and bodies for their cooperation in this work. The vast majority of cases are dealt with through a strong collaborative engagement with the administration and it is important to acknowledge that. Yes, I highlight problems, because that is my job, but I also witness all of the good work of EU officials and have indeed publicly and tangibly acknowledged it through an awards scheme introduced to showcase and praise their work and to share good practice throughout the administration. As in previous years, accountability and transparency related inquiries made up the highest proportion of my office's work.

In 2018, I also used one of the Ombudsman's infrequently used powers: that of submitting a Special Report to the European Parliament. This was only the second time I had done so since my first election as Ombudsman.

In 2013, I told Parliament that this power should be used very rarely and only in particularly serious cases where an institution does not act upon Ombudsman recommendations. That Special Report concerned an inquiry into the accountability of the Council of the EU, notably through the lack of transparency of the legislative processes used for discussing and amending draft EU legislation.

The public has a right to know how their governments contribute to shaping that EU legislation. Without that right being exercised, the 'blame Brussels' culture will continue with national Ministers obscuring their own role in the making of laws that affect their citizens.

I was very grateful to receive the overwhelming support of the Plenary for my proposals. While these recommendations have met some resistance from larger Member States, I welcome the growing coalition of governments in Council that have publicly expressed support for such changes. At the moment, it is 10 Member States and I hope that the current Presidency and the following German Presidency will take up this issue of importance to European democracy and indeed legitimacy.

As the European Ombudsman, I also coordinate the European Network of Ombudsmen – which consists of 96 offices in 36 European countries, with the European Parliament's Committee on Petitions also being a member. The 2018 annual conference took place in April in the European Parliament in Brussels, with Michel Barnier as keynote speaker, and I am very grateful for the highly professional support of Parliament in helping us make the event such a success.

At the start of the Ombudsman's new five-year mandate, it is important to ask and to examine what role it should play within the architecture of the EU in 2020 and beyond. If the Von der Leyen Commission is going to be the 'geopolitical' Commission, and become more involved in migration issues, foreign policy, defence cooperation and in tackling the global climate crisis – alongside several EU agencies – then who will provide oversight of this work?

This Parliament will provide the democratic oversight, of course, and the Ombudsman must also provide oversight of an EU administration which arguably is more directly hands on and on the ground than ever before. Whether it is Frontex coordinating forced return flights for migrants, or EASO interviewing asylum seekers in the Greek islands, or the European Defence Agency trying to envisage the technology required for a 21st century battlefield, the EU is changing and so the Ombudsman must also adapt in order to keep pace with that change.

However, the reality is that the Office consists of fewer than seventy (70) posts. We are receiving record numbers of complaints and dealing with more and more complex cases. The lack of resources of my Office has already been recognised by Parliament in the annual budgetary process and in the ongoing revision of the Ombudsman statute. However, I do ask that this issue is discussed further and in a more comprehensive way, and especially with the Commission and Council, and I hope we can find an agreed way forward.

It is in the interest of all of us, that the Ombudsman's office is fully equipped and resourced for the 21st century. We must be able to fulfil our role under the EU treaties, in line with the expectations of European citizens, and in this new 'geopolitical' world.

Maroš Šefčovič, *Vice-President of the Commission*. – Mr President, Madam Ombudsman, I am very pleased to be here tonight and to have the opportunity to discuss with you the annual report of the activities of the European Ombudsman in 2018 and the report of the Committee on Petitions (PETI). Let me start by congratulating the rapporteur, Mr Peter Jahr, the coordinators of the PETI committee and its members who have been involved in this valuable work.

As every year, these reports provide all EU institutions, agencies, bodies and offices with the views of Parliament on the issues that it considers as being noteworthy and important. As far as the Commission is concerned, I would like to assure you that the Commission is very much committed to ensuring good administration in our relations with the citizens, associations and businesses with whom we interact. This is a fundamental part of our work, and we attach great importance to the quality of these relations.

The Commission is indeed dedicated to the values of service, independence, responsibility, accountability, efficiency and transparency, and it strives to put the citizens' right to good administration into practice and to avoid instances of maladministration. The cooperation with the European Ombudsman is key in this respect, especially as around two-thirds of European Ombudsman inquiries, namely 58.2% or 285 inquiries in 2018, concerned the European Commission. We are indeed the institution with the most direct administrative dealings with the citizens.

Every year, the Commission agrees with around three-quarters of the European Ombudsman's proposals, be they proposals for a solution, suggestions for improvement or recommendations. Thus, in most cases where the Ombudsman issues recommendations, proposals for a solution or suggestions for improvement, the Commission and the Ombudsman agree in the end. This explains why, at the end of the day, only around 6% of the inquiries end with finding of maladministration. In other words, the Ombudsman, after diligent inquiries, in an overwhelming majority of cases, closes complaints with no conclusions of maladministration on the side of the Commission, either because there was indeed no instance of maladministration or because a satisfying outcome could be achieved.

The Commission's high standards of good administration have been highlighted by the European Ombudsman, notably on the occasion of the European Ombudsman award for good administration. In 2019, the Commission won the overall prize, which recognises initiatives having a visible and direct positive impact on the lives of people in Europe and beyond for its work on the reduction of plastic pollution and awareness-raising about single-use plastics. It also won several awards in different subcategories.

The Commission is also aware that it has to continue to pave the way, assess, improve even more and, where necessary, correct its administrative practices. This is why the Commission will pursue the very constructive relationship it has built with the Ombudsman over the years, first and foremost in the interest of the European citizens and other interested parties. I look forward to the debate tonight with the Honourable Members, and I thank you already for your attention.

Cristian Terheș, în numele grupului S&D. – Domnule președinte, domnule comisar, doamnă O'Reilly, ca raportor din umbră al acestui raport, pot să vă spun că este o ușurință să lucrez pe un raport de activitate a unei persoane atunci când persoana respectivă este foarte activă și foarte profesionistă în ceea ce face. Ca raportor din umbră din partea S&D al activității doamnei O'Reilly în 2018, am fost impresionat de profesionalismul, curajul și dedicația dănei în a apăra interesele cetățenilor Uniunii Europene în raport cu diverse instituții, lucru dovedit și de faptul că a fost realeză în această poziție.

Transparența, responsabilizarea oficialilor europeni, accesul la informații și documente au fost câteva domenii în care doamna O'Reilly a fost foarte activă și în care a venit cu soluții adecvate. În acest sens, doamna O'Reilly a venit cu propuneri concrete privind asigurarea unui grad cât mai înalt de transparență la nivelul tuturor instituțiilor europene. Transparența este un element fundamental al statului de drept și solicit noii Comisii Europene să țină cont de propunerile doamnei O'Reilly în acest sens. În activitatea din 2018, doamna O'Reilly a dovedit curaj și determinare în a ține piept stabilimentului, scoțând la lumină faptul că la nivelul cel mai înalt al Comisiei Juncker au fost încălcate flagrant regulile și procedurile în numirea fostului Secretar General al Comisiei Europene, domnul Martin Selmayr.

După legea din România, ca o paranteză, o asemenea faptă ar fi fost catalogată ca o faptă de corupție, iar cei vinovați ar fi fost trimiși în judecată, cel puțin pentru abuz în serviciu și conflict de interese. Este lipsit de credibilitate, și mă bucur că avem un comisar astăzi de față la această dezbateră, ca diverși oficiali de la nivelul Comisiei Europene să țină lecții sau să facă morală statelor membre despre domnia legii și lupta anticorupție, când ei înșiși sfidează regulile, așa cum a făcut Comisia Juncker.

O încurajez pe doamna O'Reilly să fie la fel de curajoasă și dedicată în tot ceea ce face, pentru a apăra interesele cetățenilor Uniunii Europene, iar din partea noastră, atât ca membri ai Comisiei PETI, cât și ca eurodeputați, o asigurăm de întregul nostru sprijin.

Good job and good luck, Ms O'Reilly.

Yana Toom, *on behalf of the Renew Group*. – Mr President, I don't want to repeat what has been said before. I want to, but I don't have time so I will not.

We all know that Emily O'Reilly has done an excellent job and I congratulate her on her re-election. However, this election has shown that there are some procedural problems. It will be our task in the Committee on Petitions to change or clarify the election procedure for the next term. It should be in line with the principles that the Ombudsman stands for: clear, transparent and fair. There should be rules on campaigning for, as we all know, this campaign, unfortunately, was kind of dirty sometimes, and we of course need a very clear timeframe so as not to put those candidates who are acting according to the rules into a vulnerable position in comparison with others.

After the adoption of this report tomorrow, we also need a vision for the future. I agree with what was said by my colleagues from the PPE and S&D Groups, but I would like to highlight another thing. There are still things which have to be done regarding good administration in EU institutions, and the procedure behind Commission responses is one of them. When we send citizens' complaints about Member States and possible infringements to the Commission, the Commission asks the national authorities about this. They ask the possible infringer whether they are breaking EU law, and the answer is of course always, 'no'. What is interesting is that the Commission is normally satisfied with this answer and we receive answers from the Commission saying that there is no problem and no infringement. This means that we are not standing on the side of the citizen who is complaining and who is in an unequal battle with European bureaucracy. This needs to be changed. The same applies to the 'EU Pilot' where we can submit individual complaints about possible infringements. The process is not transparent. The documents of closed files are not openly available and getting them is a big problem. I would like to see a more proactive and more transparent approach, and of course I look forward to cooperating with the Ombudsman further and hopefully to solving this problem.

Gilles Lebreton, *au nom du groupe ID*. – Monsieur le Président, j'estime que l'Union européenne est mal placée pour donner des leçons de morale ou de respect des droits de l'homme. En effet, ses institutions violent les règles de déontologie les plus élémentaires. C'est notamment le cas de la Commission de Bruxelles et de la Banque centrale européenne, comme le prouve le rapport 2018 de la Médiatrice européenne.

Page 9, la Médiatrice dénonce, en effet, la manière dont la Commission européenne a nommé son secrétaire général, l'Allemand Martin Selmayr en février 2018. Elle dénonce, à cette occasion, «quatre occurrences de mauvaise administration, dont la création d'un état d'urgence fictif pour pourvoir le poste». J'en déduis que j'avais raison de dénoncer l'illégalité de sa nomination, aussi bien dans cet hémicycle que dans la commission des affaires juridiques. Hélas, il a fallu 16 mois pour m'entendre et se débarrasser de Selmayr. Suite à ce scandale, la Médiatrice a demandé qu'une procédure détaillée soit mise en place pour la nomination du secrétaire général. Hélas, elle souligne dans son rapport que «la Commission s'est refusée à mettre en place une telle procédure». Le manque de transparence subsiste donc.

Page 13, la Médiatrice épingle également la Banque centrale européenne et plus précisément son président Mario Draghi, auquel elle reproche d'avoir adhéré à une organisation privée, «le Groupe des 30», qui réunit notamment les directeurs des grandes banques privées. Malgré ces remontrances, Draghi est resté membre du Groupe des 30. La Médiatrice en déduit de façon très inquiétante que cela est de nature à faire douter de l'indépendance de la Banque centrale européenne par rapport aux lobbies financiers.

La Médiatrice confirme ainsi la réalité de ce que je ne cesse de dénoncer: l'Union européenne manque de transparence et d'éthique.

Kosma Złotowski, w imieniu grupy ECR. – Panie Przewodniczący! Szanowny Panie Komisarzu! Szanowna Pani Rzecznik! Chciałbym Pani pogratulować ponownego wyboru na stanowisko Europejskiego Rzecznika Praw Obywatelskich, bo to najlepszy możliwy wyraz uznania dla dotychczasowej Pani pracy. Również to sprawozdanie wystawa Pani aktywności w 2018 roku jak najlepsze oceny. Grupa ECR oczywiście w pełni ten tekst popiera.

Początek kadencji to jednak o wiele lepsza okazja, aby mówić o przyszłości niż o przeszłości. Chciałbym bardzo poprosić, aby zwróciła Pani szczególną uwagę na problem braku przejrzystości procesu decyzyjnego w ramach negocjacji trójstronnych, tzw. trilogów. Niestety ta procedura staje się karykaturą tego, czym powinna być. Najbardziej jaskrawym tego przykładem są prace nad pakietem mobilności, w których miałem okazję uczestniczyć. Wrażenie deficytu demokracji w Unii Europejskiej to wina braku transparentności przy tworzeniu prawa europejskiego. Jestem przekonany, że Europejski Rzecznik Praw Obywatelskich powinien przyrzeć się praktyce jego tworzenia ze szczególną uwagą.

Αλέξης Γεωργούλης, εξ ονόματος της ομάδας GUE/NGL. – Κύριε πρόεδρε, οι τελευταίες εκλογές κατέδειξαν και πάλι τη δυσπιστία των πολιτών απέναντι στην Ευρωπαϊκή Ένωση. Είναι λοιπόν επιτακτικό να αποκωδικοποιήσουμε το μήνυμα που μας στέλνουν οι λαοί της Ευρώπης και να αναγνωρίσουμε την ανάγκη να προσπαθήσουμε περισσότερο· να προσπαθήσουμε περισσότερο προς την κατεύθυνση της απόλυτης λογοδοσίας και διαφάνειας των θεσμών, ώστε να καταφέρουμε να καταπολεμήσουμε κάθε φαινόμενο κακοδιοίκησης και να εξασφαλίσουμε την τήρηση των αρχών του κράτους δικαίου. Μόνον έτσι οι πολίτες θα μπορέσουν να πεισθούν και να ταχθούν υπέρ της ευρωπαϊκής ολοκλήρωσης. Δεν αρκεί λοιπόν να ανοίξουμε την πόρτα για να ακολουθήσουν πολλοί, αλλά επιβάλλεται να ρίξουμε και άπλετο φως. Εν κατακλείδι, οι πολίτες θα πρέπει να γίνουν γνώστες και κοινωνοί της όλης διαδικασίας. Διαφάνεια δεν είναι οι πολίτες να μπορούν να πληροφορηθούν πλήρως για ό,τι συμβαίνει αλλά να πληροφορηθούν κατά τρόπο εύληπτο και κατανοητό, για να μπορέσουν να συμμετάσχουν αποτελεσματικά σε κάθε στάδιο της νομοθέτησης. Στον αγώνα αυτό, σύμμαχο έχουμε τη Διαμεσολαβήτριά μας Emily O'Reilly που, για ακόμα μια χρονιά, υπηρετεί τη θέση αυτή με απόλυτη προσήλωση. Κυρίες και κύριοι της Επιτροπής και του Συμβουλίου, μην την αγνοήσετε.

Mario Furore (NI). – Signor Presidente, onorevoli colleghi, mi congratulo innanzitutto con la Mediatrice O'Reilly per la sua rielezione e la proficua attività svolta a salvaguardia della buona amministrazione.

Ringrazio inoltre il collega Jahr per il lavoro compiuto sulla relazione, il cui contenuto trovo nel complesso condivisibile, fatta eccezione per il paragrafo sulla BCE che, a mio avviso, si pone in netta antitesi con la tutela dei principi di pubblicità e trasparenza inerenti ai processi decisionali a livello UE.

Tra gli aspetti positivi del testo, invece, di particolare efficacia rilevo il riconoscimento del diritto di accesso del pubblico ai documenti degli organi UE come diritto inalienabile da garantire a tutti i cittadini. Un diritto oggi, però, fortemente compromesso dal quadro normativo, e faccio riferimento al regolamento (CE) n. 1049/2001, le cui disposizioni, risalenti a quasi un ventennio fa, non rispecchiano più l'attuale situazione giuridica né la prassi istituzionale impiegata oggi in materia. Mi trovo pertanto pienamente in linea con la richiesta di procedere a una sua revisione.

Altrettanto positivi appaiono i passaggi nei quali viene evidenziata la necessità di adottare norme molto più rigorose ed i più elevati standard etici per impedire... *(il Presidente interrompe l'oratore)*

Der Präsident. – Herr Kollege Furore, Sie haben noch Redezeit.

Mario Furore (NI). – ... Mi trovo pertanto pienamente in linea con la richiesta di procedere a una sua revisione.

Altrettanto positivi appaiono i passaggi nei quali viene evidenziata la necessità di adottare norme molto più rigorose e i più elevati standard etici per impedire conflitti di interessi e porte girevoli presso tutte le istituzioni UE, garantendo così il rispetto del dovere di integrità.

È compito della Commissione von der Leyen far sì che i casi di cattiva amministrazione, comportamenti anti-etici e violazioni normative, come quelli riscontrati in passato nelle vicende Selmayr e Barroso, non abbiano più a ripetersi, operando una decisa inversione di tendenza nel segno della buona amministrazione, della piena trasparenza e dell'integrità morale.

Der Präsident. – Wir haben bestimmte Redezeiten hier im Haus. Es hilft nichts, wenn man sich die Dinge aufschreibt und die Sachen dann in doppelter Geschwindigkeit herunterliest. Herr Kollege, Sie sind neu im Parlament, die Frau Kollegin Evi ist schon eine ganze Weile dabei. Sie saß früher an der Stelle, und sie weiß genau, dass es Kollegen gab, die ich auch schon ermahnt habe. Vielleicht ziehen Sie sie mal zu Rate, was angemessen ist, wenn Sie künftig Redezeiten haben.

Jude Kirton-Darling (S&D). – Mr President, the EU Ombudsman plays a vital role in our European democracy, improving administration and ensuring that the ethics of our institutions are upheld, and I was delighted to see Emily O'Reilly re-elected in December. Emily, you've been an exemplary case of somebody who has advocated for transparency and good governance and, at a time when many of us – or many of our countries – are questioning the EU, and on the eve of our departure, your work on opening the black box of decision-making is needed more than ever.

This is my last speech in the European Parliament, representing my beautiful and diverse home region, the North East of England. It's been an honour; it's been a privilege. I hope at some point somebody else will sit in this seat representing my home. But, in the meantime, we're going and I'd like to thank my current staff, Paul Ugo, Carla, Matt, Max and Malcolm, for their dedication and hard work during the most testing of times, and my previous staff as well. So from us, the British delegation in the Committee on Petitions, all we have to say is good luck and good night.

(Loud applause)

Der Präsident. – Es ist normalerweise nicht meine Aufgabe, aber Sie waren sehr bewegt gerade. Sie sagten, Sie sind für den Nordosten Englands gewählt. Meine Heimatstadt Gerlingen hat eine Partnerstadt im Nordosten, Seaham. Ich möchte Sie bitten, die besten Grüße nach Seaham mitzutragen.

Marie-Pierre Vedrenne (Renew). – Monsieur le Président, Monsieur le Commissaire, Madame la Médiatrice, merci au rapporteur pour son travail.

La confiance des citoyens en l'Union européenne passe notamment par davantage de transparence. Des avancées ont eu lieu dans nos institutions, par exemple dans le domaine commercial. La Commission européenne doit continuer à publier les documents de négociation et le Conseil rendre publics les mandats. Des améliorations sont possibles, nous l'avons tous souligné, et elles sont nécessaires. Le Conseil, spécifiquement, doit garantir plus de transparence dans son fonctionnement. Nous devons également mettre toute notre énergie pour qu'un accord soit adopté au plus vite pour la mise en place du registre de transparence commun obligatoire et juridiquement contraignant pour les représentations d'intérêt.

Rapprocher les citoyens des institutions européennes, c'est lutter efficacement contre l'euroscpticisme. En ce sens, nous devons tous poursuivre notre travail et renforcer la stratégie lancée par la Médiatrice pour accroître sa visibilité. Vous pourrez compter sur mon soutien.

Eleonora Evi (NI). – Signor Presidente, onorevoli colleghi, innanzitutto rivolgo anch'io le mie congratulazioni alla Mediatrice O'Reilly per la sua rielezione. Il suo lavoro è stato sicuramente molto apprezzato da questo Parlamento.

Come è apprezzato – ed è stato riportato correttamente, in maniera molto buona – il lavoro svolto nell'arco del 2018 nella relazione che stiamo discutendo questa sera, una relazione che chiede nuovamente, come avevamo già fatto nella relazione dello scorso anno, che un registro per la trasparenza possa essere finalmente introdotto in maniera obbligatoria e giuridicamente vincolante, affinché sia in grado di superare le pesanti lacune vigenti sull'attività lobbistica.

Servono norme molto più rigorose per l'attività delle lobby e per impedire i conflitti di interesse, ma anche significative modifiche per rendere tutti i processi decisionali realmente trasparenti e improntati alla piena *accountability*. Se la Commissione von der Leyen vuole davvero fare un cambio di passo rispetto alla scia di sfaceli compiuti dalla precedente Commissione Juncker, faccia proprie queste richieste e agisca di conseguenza.

Mi trova invece in dissenso – e questa è l'unica nota negativa di questa relazione – il paragrafo della stessa incentrato sulla BCE: contrariamente a quanto indicato nel testo, io ritengo che debba essere netto il divieto per i membri della BCE di partecipare a forum a porte chiuse, specie se organizzati da o se tra i partecipanti figurano banche sottoposte alla vigilanza della stessa BCE.

Alex Agius Saliba (S&D). – Sur President, l-ewwelnett nixtieq nifrah lill Emily O'Reilly illi għet ikkonfermata bhala l-Ombudsman Ewropew. Dan huwa vot ta' fiduċja fil-hidma pożittiva illi wettqet sabiex l-Uffiċċju tal-Ombudsman jibqa' wiehed aċċessibbli għaċ-ċittadini Ewropej.

Sodisfatt illi f'dan ir rapport annwali l-Ombudsman Ewropew tkellmet dwar suġġett importanti hafna għalija: dak tat-trattament tal-persuni b'diżabilità taħt l-iskema kongunta tas-Sigurtà f'każ ta' Mard.

Naqbel ukoll perfettament mar-rakkomandazzjoni lill-Kummissjoni sabiex jiġi rivedut ukoll il-provvediment ta' din l-iskema sabiex b'hekk ikun konformi wkoll mal-Konvenzjoni tal-Gnus Magħquda għall-persuni b'diżabilità.

Naqbel ukoll mar-rakkomandazzjoni dwar iż-żieda fl-aċċessibilità għall-persuni neqsin mid-dawl fi proċeduri ta' selezzjoni ta' kandidati f'uffiċċji Ewropej. Hemm bżonn illi mill-aktar fis jiġu implimentati teknoloġiji ta' assistenza għall-kandidati li jpoġġu għal testijiet li jsiru bil-kompjuter.

Qabel nagħlaq, nixtieq nirringrazzja lil Jude illi kienet il-koordinatriċi tagħna fi hdan il-kumitat, fi hdan il-Grupp tas-Socjalisti, u d-Demokratiċi tal-impenn u d-dedikazzjoni li dejjem uriet. Ha nimmissjawha hafna.

Brando Benifei (S&D). – Signor Presidente, onorevoli colleghi, il Parlamento europeo, con la sua relazione annuale, si congratula ancora una volta con Emily O'Reilly e tutto l'ufficio del Mediatore europeo per l'eccellente lavoro svolto.

I cittadini europei hanno trovato nel Mediatore un prezioso alleato, che da anni si batte per assicurare la qualità dell'amministrazione dell'Unione, la trasparenza delle sue decisioni, l'accessibilità e la qualità dei servizi alla popolazione.

Vorrei rivolgere dunque un sincero augurio di buon lavoro a Emily O'Reilly per il suo nuovo mandato, un forte messaggio di incoraggiamento a portare avanti con determinazione le sue importanti iniziative – su tutte il miglioramento dei meccanismi decisionali del Consiglio – e a opporsi sempre con fermezza a ogni episodio di cattiva amministrazione, come ha fatto nel caso della nomina di Selmayr a Segretario generale della Commissione.

Posso dire con orgoglio di aver collaborato in questi anni con il Mediatore per bloccare la pratica vergognosa dei tirocini non retribuiti all'interno delle istituzioni dell'Unione europea. Adesso dobbiamo fare un ulteriore sforzo: batterci per mettere al bando gli stage e i tirocini non pagati in tutti i paesi membri dell'Unione.

Spontane Wortmeldungen

Jiří Pospíšil (PPE). – Pane předsedající, já bych chtěl na závěr té debaty konstatovat, že podporuji tuto zprávu a jsem rád za jeden konkrétní článek, který možná bude vypadat pro kolegy, jako že není podstatný, že je formální, ale praxe z České republiky ukazuje, že je velmi důležitý. A to je článek 47, kde jsou stanoveny podmínky pro výkon funkce ombudsmana. Nestrannost, odbornost, nezávislost na politických funkcích, ale také morální zdatnost. Někdo to může považovat za pouhou formalitu, ale my jsme teď v České republice byli svědky velké veřejné debaty, kdy prezident republiky navrhl nového kandidáta na ombudsmana, významnou profesorku trestního práva, u které se však ukázalo, že v 70. letech spolupracovala s komunistickými prokurátory, kteří poslali na smrt některé politické vězně v České republice, třeba doktorku Miladu Horákovou. A ta velká společenská debata bohužel relativizovala morální provinění této kandidátky. Nakonec tedy odstoupila a já jsem rád, že v Evropě držíme jasnou linii, že ombudsman nesmí být pouze odborně zdatný, ale také morálně zdatný. Je to mimořádně důležité.

Juan Fernando López Aguilar (S&D). – Mr President, I use this speaking time to add my voice to the appreciation of the very meaning of the institution of ombudsman, or ombudsperson, as some say, and particularly to congratulate you for your recent re-election by the plenary of this European Parliament. You have five years to go. It's an appreciation of your work enhancing greater transparency and access to documents, although the regulation has yet to be updated. The work has been blocked by the Council, despite the efforts by the Committee on Civil Liberties, Justice and Home Affairs (LIBE), which I chair.

There is also much work to do in order to make sure that conflicts of interest are no longer there, that revolving doors are out of the scene, that your inquiry on certain practices of certain industries, in particular, pharmaceutical industries, are compliant with the UN Convention on persons with disabilities, and, finally, that the code of good administration is upgraded into a real European regulation.

(Ende der spontanen Wortmeldungen)

Maroš Šefčovič, *Vice-President of the Commission*. – Mr President, first, I would like to thank the honourable Members for their statements and comments. I think that Mr Terheş has just started what was, as I have seen it, universal high praise for the great work done by Ms O'Reilly, which we in the Commission fully share.

To Ms Toom, I just would like to tell and to reassure her that if it comes to infringements and EU pilot procedures, I'm very much looking forward to our discussion in the Committee on Petitions (PETI), for which I just got an invitation, where we can go into more depth and discuss how we can improve our cooperation in this field as well. I also would like to inform the honourable Members of this House that on Tuesday, the Commission appointed a new Secretary-General fully following the procedure and, I believe, selecting a highly competent and exemplary professional and good European, Ms Juhansone, who I'm sure will be an excellent Secretary-General.

I would also like to add that the Commission clearly and constantly strives to ensure a very high level of good administration and we are going to work with you in that regard to make sure that the rights which are enshrined in Article 41 of the EU Charter of Fundamental Rights will be fully respected and enjoyed by our citizens. Therefore, citizens, companies and associations with whom we have interaction can fully expect that they will get an open, accessible and properly managed administration from our side in the European Commission. I would like to also stress the fact that our daily exchanges with the Ombudsman help us to do it better every day, and that we jointly want to provide citizens with very high administrative standards, which are based on the principles of non-discrimination, courtesy, impartiality and consistency – a few of the points you also highlighted in your interventions.

Your resolution and the report of the Committee on Petitions on the annual report on the activities of the European Ombudsman stress areas where our institutions do well and where they can improve and I would just really like to promise you that in the coming weeks, the Commission will examine your resolution and will reply, as in the past, to all the issues which you raised and which concern the Commission.

I would also like to use this opportunity to thank Ms Kirton-Darling and Mr Corbett, who I see there as well, and all the UK colleagues and friends for their dedication, for their hard work. I just want to thank you and I want to tell you that we will miss you.

Der Präsident. – Frau Griffin, Sie möchten zur Geschäftsordnung sprechen.

Theresa Griffin (S&D). – Maroš thank you for everything that you did in terms of the Green New Deal and energy poverty, and I would just like to say that we would like a definition of energy poverty from you and your colleagues in this mandate.

But seriously, thank you so much for everything that you did for vulnerable citizens.

Der Präsident. – Frau Kollegin, das war weit jenseits der Geschäftsordnung, aber nachdem sich so ein bisschen Abschiedsstimmung breitmacht, habe ich Sie nicht unterbrochen.

Emily O'Reilly, *European Ombudsman*. – Mr President, it's very inspiring to listen to the support and the ideas that come from Parliament at this time. I look forward very much to further discussions with you over the coming months and years.

Could I begin with Ms Kirton-Darling: it's not often that an Irish person expresses sadness at seeing British people leave, but in this case I do want to say how sad we are, and also want to thank you for your wonderful cooperation and support with my office, and with the Ombudsman institution generally over the last number of years. I have to say, I was particularly impressed over the last few months, in particular in the last year, when things must have been so stressful for all of you. The diligence and the integrity with which you continue to do your work and take an interest in things here, and even in this small office, when there were so many bigger things clamouring for your attention. I wish you all of the very best and we will miss you, and thank you.

Could I say, just taking up some of the points that were made.

Thank you Mr Terheş for your comments, for your work and for your praise for my work and the work of the colleagues.

Ms Toom, thank you for taking note of issues that arose in relation to the election procedure, the Rules of Procedure. It won't be my problem in five years' time, but there is an important conversation to be had in relation to the election of the European Ombudsman.

In relation to the case involving the former secretary, the appointment of the former Secretary-General of the Commission: yes, the outgoing Commission, the last Commission, did reject the recommendation. But as Vice-President Šefčovič has just noted, this time it was different, and the appointment of the new Secretary-General has been pretty much in line with the recommendations that we made in our investigation.

Mr Złotowski: the trilogues – yes, we have investigated that in the past, it's unfinished business, and we shall be going back to see what is happening there.

Mr Georgoulis: yes, citizens' participation is absolutely vital, and particularly for the legitimacy of the EU, and that underpins so much of the work that we do.

I agree with Mr Furore, the right of access 1049/2001 is an old regulation, but even short of revising it, there is still an awful lot we can do to have more recommendations accepted, more documents made accessible to the people whom we serve.

Council transparency – yes, our big piece, work in progress, but I can see progress and I note in particular that from an issue that was somewhat marginal and somewhat within the Brussels and Strasbourg bubble, it is now becoming more mainstream.

Ms Evi, thank you for all your great support. Transparency again: the ECB, all of these agencies and institutions – we need to open them up to greater public scrutiny into greater accountability.

The comments in relation to disability, to assisted technology; we certainly take them on board, and we take those particular issues a particularly seriously.

I was very pleased to see just last week, the EEAS advertising for paid traineeships, and that arises out of the joint work of my Office and with many people from the Parliament, led by Mr Benifei. So, many ideas there.

Thank you again for your support and for once again re-electing me and trusting me with this very important Office.

Peter Jahr, *Berichterstatter*. – Herr Präsident! Die Zusammenarbeit in den letzten Jahren zwischen Frau O'Reilly und dem Petitionsausschuss war gut. Man könnte fragen: Ist alles in Ordnung in der Europäischen Union? Nein. Man kann aber auch fragen: Ist es uns gemeinsam gelungen, etwas zu verbessern? Dann würde ich sagen: Ja. Das heißt, wir sollten da weitermachen, wo wir aufgehört haben. Es ist noch viel zu tun, packen wir es an. Ich sage Ihnen: Der Petitionsausschuss wird Sie ausdrücklich unterstützen in den Dingen, die vor uns liegen – es ist erwähnt worden –, ob es um mehr Transparenz geht, um das Wahlrecht und andere Dinge. Da werden wir gemeinsam die Dinge gestalten.

Ich möchte noch einmal betonen: Ich bedauere auch außerordentlich, dass unsere Kollegin Kirton-Darling den Ausschuss, das Parlament verlassen muss. Ich habe als Koordinator der EVP einige Koordinatoren der S&D-Fraktion erlebt. Ich würde mir ein paar mehr von Ihrer Sorte wünschen, und es tut mir wirklich leid, dass Sie durch eine aus meiner Sicht falsche Entscheidung in Ihrem Heimatland das Parlament verlassen müssen. Aber bleiben Sie uns gewogen. Denken Sie daran: Es gibt auch im Europäischen Parlament ein paar vernünftige Abgeordnete, und der Kontakt muss ja nicht abreißen.

Für morgen wünsche ich uns eine gute Abstimmung über den Bericht. Der Bericht hat es wirklich verdient, eine riesengroße Mehrheit zu bekommen, auch damit wir dann einen besseren politischen Rückhalt haben, um weiterzuarbeiten.

Der Präsident. – Die Aussprache ist geschlossen.

Die Abstimmung findet am Donnerstag, 16. Januar 2020, statt.

Schriftliche Erklärungen (Artikel 171)

Valdemar Tomaševski (ECR), raštu. – Nors šiandien diskutuojame apie Europos ombudsmeno veiklos ataskaitą už 2018 m., bet verta atkreipti dėmesį į kelis dalykus, kad ateityje ši svarbi piliečiams funkcija atneštų jiems kuo daugiausiai naudos. Emily O'Reilly turėtų būti pasveikinta atlikus puikų darbą ir dėjus konstruktyvias pastangas gerinti ES administravimo kokybę ir piliečiams teikiamų jos paslaugų prieinamumą ir kokybę. Dėl šių priežasčių turėtų būti remiamos Europos ombudsmenės pastangos sudaryti geresnes sąlygas piliečiams dalyvauti ES politikos formavimo procese. Kiekvienas naujas ombudsmenas taip pat turėtų toliau stebėti, kaip naudojamos Europos piliečių iniciatyvos priemonė (ECI), be kita ko, stebinti, kaip įgyvendinamas peržiūrėtas ECI reglamentas. Taip pat verta raginti Europos ombudsmenę toliau bendradarbiauti su nacionaliniais ombudsmenais naudojant Europos ombudsmenų tinklus. Be to, pabrėžia, kad reikia plėtoti tokius bendradarbiavimo tarp įvairių nacionalinių ombudsmenų būdus, kurie padės piliečiams veiksmingai kovoti už savo teises. Būtent tokie veiksmai turėtų tapti prioritetu Europos Parlamento rekomendacijose ombudsmeniui.

21. Reforma głównych zasad procedury komitetowej (debata)

Der Präsident. – Als nächster Punkt der Tagesordnung folgt die Aussprache über die Erklärung der Kommission zur Reform der allgemeinen Grundsätze des Ausschussverfahrens (2019/2974(RSP)).

Auch hier und erneut möchte ich Sie daran erinnern, dass Sie sowohl in üblicher Weise als auch mit Hilfe des elektronischen Systems um die Möglichkeit zur spontanen Wortmeldung sowie zur Verwendung der „blauen Karte“ ersuchen können. Gebrauchsanleitungen liegen am Eingang zum Plenarsaal aus.

Maroš Šefčovič, Vice-President of the Commission. – Mr President, first I would like to thank you for the opportunity to discuss the comitology framework with you.

The Treaty of Lisbon introduced the differentiation between delegated and implementing acts and, on this basis, the co-legislator adopted the Comitology Regulation. It lays down the mechanisms for control by Member States over the Commission's exercise of implementing powers. The regulation also provides for the right of Parliament and the Council to be fully informed of the draft implementing acts submitted by the Commission to the committees of Member States. It also provides for a scrutiny right to address situations in which the Commission may have exceeded its implementing powers.

I think that it's fair to say that the regulation is fulfilling its purpose. Why? Because, in 2018, the committees provided opinions on 1 633 draft implementing acts. There was no negative opinion and there were 32 so-called 'no opinion' cases in 2018. This 'no opinion' means that there is no qualified majority in favour or against draft implementing acts in the committee because of either the contrasting positions of the Member States or abstentions. In specific cases, the Appeal Committee must be consulted in such no-opinion scenarios. In 2018, this was the case for 12 draft implementing acts in the areas of health and consumer policy. In all of these 12 cases, the Appeal Committee also delivered a no, or lack of, opinion. It is precisely this very limited number of cases that have led to discussions, mainly because they have so far occurred in the politically sensitive areas of the authorisation of genetically modified food and feed and, to a lesser extent, in relation to the approval of active substances for plant protection products. When the Appeal Committee also delivers no opinion, the Commission may adopt the implementing act proposed. Indeed, the logic of the Comitology Regulation is only blocked from adopting an act if there is opinion in the Committee against it. This has been a guiding principle in comitology from the very beginning and ensures efficient implementation.

As regards the 12 implementing acts in the areas of health and consumer policy, the respective substantive legal framework, not the Comitology Regulation, actually obliges the Commission to take the decision based on the procedural requirements and solid evidence gathered. In these cases of a lack of qualified majority in the Committee, the Commission has therefore been legally bound to take, at times, very unpopular decisions.

The Juncker Commission therefore decided to propose, as a priority, to change these rules and put forward targeted amendments on the functioning of the Appeal Committee, with the objective of allowing for greater accountability on the part of the Member States in the decision-making process. The proposed amendments were the following: first, to calculate the qualified majority out of Member States which are present or represented and which do not abstain – and that means not all of the Member States; second, to provide for the possibility for a second referral to the Appeal Committee at ministerial level to address the problematic issues a second time; and, third, to make individual Member States' representatives' votes at Appeal Committee level public – this is what we discussed a few minutes ago – and to provide for the possibility to refer the matter to the Council for a non-binding opinion and overall political guidance.

Where do we stand with this proposal? Overall, there was practically no progress over the last close to three years. On the Council side, there has been no support whatsoever for this proposal. On the Parliament side, the lead Committee on Legal Affairs has not yet presented a draft report and only some opinion-giving committees supported the proposal.

I therefore welcome today's debate because it gives us the opportunity to collectively take stock of the situation. We have, however, to be realistic and frank. Unless there is a bold move that would help unblock this file, it is unlikely that progress will be made any time soon. The new Commission will factor this and your views today into ultimately deciding on how to proceed in the framework of the assessment of all pending proposals, ahead of the adoption of the Commission 2020 work programme. In any case, the Commission intends to continue to use all existing means to encourage Member States to take on their responsibility in the comitology process and to come to the solutions with Member States that find the widest possible support in the committee.

Let me also refer to some concrete steps we are taking to improve the transparency of comitology, which I believe are also very important for this House. I will soon launch a new, modernised comitology register. The new public register will not only provide access to all draft implementing acts, but will also allow more user-friendly access to information on committees and their meetings. I will also work jointly with you and the Council to make sure that the non-binding delineation criteria between delegating and implementing acts that we agreed on last year will actually facilitate negotiations and bring benefits.

The Commission is fully committed to respecting the criteria when preparing legislative proposals and during legislative negotiations. In parallel, we must also jointly advance negotiations on the outstanding alignment of acts that still make reference to the regulatory procedure with scrutiny. We were very successful here in agreeing on the first package last year, but work needs to continue on the remaining parts of the package.

I'm looking forward to hearing your views on this file because I believe it would help us in finalising the work on the Commission work programme for this year.

József Szájer, *on behalf of the PPE Group*. – Mr President, I would like to thank the Vice-President of the Commission for his words. I would like to say that at the end of the last mandate, surprisingly, we had some progress, especially in the area of realignment in the comitology area. However, we did not get this specific dossier through. The Committee on Legal Affairs (JURI) is just in the process of starting to consider this.

However, the Committee on Constitutional Affairs (AFCO), the Committee on Industry, Research and Energy (ITRE), the Committee on International Trade (INTA), the Committee on Environment, Public Health and Food Safety (ENVI), and the Committee on Economic and Monetary Affairs (ECON) have provided opinions on the proposed regulation. These opinions underline the importance of keeping the comitology framework as it stands, since it's working properly, but they also agree that the transparency aspect should be further enhanced.

The JURI Committee is basically focusing on this request from the other committees, especially in the area of political transparency and accountability. In a number of high-profile cases, however, according to the present procedure, in the absence of a clear position from the Member State, the political responsibility for taking a final decision falls upon the Commission, which without clear political backing from the Member State, is an undesirable situation.

This is what the reform presented in 2007 was intended to remedy in full agreement with the general aim of the proposal. We have to face the fact, however, that taking into account the kind of resistance that most Member States show against it in the Council, the future of this reform is at least highly unpredictable and non-favourable.

I particularly regret that the part of the proposal provoking this controversy among Member States also affects the rest of the suggestions, which are otherwise valuable and forward-looking in themselves.

(The speaker agreed to take a blue-card question under Rule 171(8))

Richard Corbett (S&D), *blue-card question*. – Mr Szájer, do you not agree that if Member States, and indeed the Parliament, have conferred the power on the Commission to take a decision when the Member States cannot agree – remember to implement legislation that we have adopted but Council is unable to agree one way or another – that it is not unreasonable that the Commission should take its responsibilities and take a decision. And after all, the Commission is an executive that is responsible to this Parliament. It's accountable to us. So it should take the decision and not actually try to divest itself of political responsibility through this proposal.

József Szájer (PPE), *blue-card answer*. – Mr Corbett, I'm not against that solution. I could very well back that. We understand at the moment that it has not moved in Council for several years. This is the situation. We can push it forward, we can be enthusiastic supporters of this idea, but I would like to go with the line that Vice-President Šeďčovič has proposed: to be creative and find some way, especially in the area where we can enhance transparency and accountability. On this point, basically all the committees who gave their opinions agree.

Bettina Vollath, *im Namen der S&D-Fraktion*. – Herr Präsident, Herr Kommissar! Bei dieser Debatte müssen zwei wesentliche Begriffe im Vordergrund stehen: Rechenschaftspflicht der Mitgliedstaaten und Transparenz für die Bevölkerung. Wie vom Kommissar schon geschildert, ist es auch in politisch sehr sensiblen Bereichen, die unmittelbare Auswirkungen auf die Gesundheit und Sicherheit der Bürgerinnen und Bürger haben, wie zum Beispiel im Bereich Zulassungen, bei der Gentechnik oder Genehmigung von Wirkstoffen mit Pestiziden, möglich, dass Mitgliedstaaten ihre Meinung eben nicht kundtun und die Entscheidung auf die Kommission überwälzen. Das ist nicht befriedigend. Das ist wirklich nicht befriedigend, weil in der Folge durch die mangelnde Transparenz ein anderes Abstimmungsverhalten in den jeweiligen Mitgliedstaaten nach außen kommuniziert werden kann, als es tatsächlich der Fall gewesen ist, so nach dem Motto: Wasch mir den Pelz, aber mach mich bitte nicht nass.

Aus diesen Gründen stehe ich den Vorschlägen der Kommission zur Verbesserung des Verfahrens sehr positiv gegenüber: der Änderung der Berechnungsmethode, der verpflichtenden Anrufung des Berufungsausschusses und auch einer Veröffentlichung des Wahlverhaltens im Berufungsausschuss. Ich lehne den Vorschlag mancher Kollegen, den wir auch gerade in diesem Haus gehört haben, ab, dass die Kommission den Vorschlag zurückzieht und einen neuen Vorschlag machen soll, der dem Rat besser gefällt. Denn es muss uns klar sein: Jeder neue Vorschlag wird eine abgeschwächte Version des jetzigen Vorschlags sein.

Was mir abschließend sehr wichtig ist klarzustellen, auch Ihnen gegenüber, Herr Kommissar: Das Europäische Parlament will an diesem Dossier weiterarbeiten. Es ist der Rat, der in diesem Fall leider blockiert und offenbar nicht in der Lage ist, in dieser wesentlichen Frage eine Entscheidung zu treffen. Daher geht mein Appell heute Abend an den Rat, endlich eine Position festzulegen und am besten dem Vorschlag der Kommission zuzustimmen.

Pascal Durand, *au nom du groupe Renew*. – Monsieur le Président, Monsieur Šeďčovič, on est entre nous, donc on peut peut-être se parler franchement, on va donc le faire. Vous savez très bien que si la Commission a donné ce texte, c'est parce qu'elle se retrouve entre le marteau du Conseil et l'enclume des grandes sociétés qui disent: si vous ne prenez pas de décision, nous poursuivrons la Commission et l'Union européenne. Vous êtes donc obligé de trancher là où le Conseil fait preuve d'une lâcheté effrayante. Nous sommes quand même en train de parler – et vous l'avez dit et nous le savons tous ici – de la santé de 500 millions de consommatrices et de consommateurs européens. Nous sommes en train de parler de produits chimiques, d'OGM, et je le dis devant le Parlement, dont je suis membre, nous sommes obligés maintenant de prendre des objections. Vous l'avez dit, elles ne sont pas encore très nombreuses mais elles sont de plus en plus nombreuses, parce que nous sommes dans une société de plus en plus complexe. On nous demande, en fait, de statuer en urgence dans du binaire: oui ou non. Ce n'est plus acceptable, ce n'est plus possible. Monsieur Šeďčovič, je venais vous entendre d'abord et avant tout pour savoir si la Commission allait continuer à faire de cette question une priorité, car c'en est une pour la démocratie et pour les citoyens. On ne va pas entrer aujourd'hui dans le détail de savoir comment on peut faire, mais je pense que donner une prime à ceux qui ne votent pas, c'est peut-être augmenter la

lâcheté, mais c'est un autre débat. En tout cas, je suis heureux de vous avoir entendu dire que c'était une question qui restait à l'agenda de la Commission pour l'année qui vient. J'espère que le Parlement pourra vous aider à avancer.

Permettez-moi de terminer en rendant hommage au travail de mon collègue Richard Corbett, avec lequel nous avons élaboré un avis en commission des affaires constitutionnelles dans la dernière mandature, à tout ce travail que Richard a pu faire dans ce Parlement, et de dire, à mon tour, à quel point je regrette de voir des députés comme lui nous quitter à cause des mensonges de ceux qui sont là-bas.

Bronis Ropė, Verts/ALE frakcijos vardu. – Gerbiamas Pirmininke, gerbiamas Komisijos nary, kolegos. Šiandien ryte šiuose rūmuose diskutavome apie konferenciją dėl Europos ateities ir sutarėme, kad ateities Europa turi būti demokratiškesnė, labiau girdėti savo piliečių balsą. Komitologijos procedūra yra bene labiausiai dėl demokratijos ir skaidrumo trūkumo kritikuojama europinė teisėkūros tvarka. Deja, tačiau jos spragos bei valstybių narių piktnaudžiavimas šiuo mechanizmu ypatingai akivaizdus priimant sprendimus, ypač jautriais klausimais, turinčiais tiesioginės įtakos mūsų maisto, aplinkos kokybei, žmonių ir gyvūnų sveikatai bei gerovei. Kaip atsakingas Žaliųjų grupės Žemės ūkio ir kaimo plėtros komiteto nuomonės pareiškėjas noriu paraginti naują Komisiją ir toliau tęsti jūsų pirmtakų užsibrėžtą tikslą, kuo greičiau reformuoti komiteto procedūrą, užtikrinant sprendimų priėmimo skaidrumą, ribojant valstybių narių galimybes išvengti atsakomybės susilaikant nuo sprendimų priėmimo.

Jiří Pospíšil (PPE). – Pane předsedající, pane komisaři, já stejně jako moji kolegové podporuji reformu komitologie. Jsem přesvědčen, že v případě pravomoci Komise přijímat prováděcí akty je velmi nešťastné, pokud nemalá část těchto aktů zůstala bez stanoviska jednotlivých členských států. Už zde bylo popsáno, že se rozhoduje v těchto prováděcích aktech o celé řadě důležitých věcí – modifikované potraviny, pesticidy atd.

Na druhou stranu jsme ve stavu takové plíživé debaty, která trvá několik let. Několikrát jsme k tomuto tématu debatovali v minulém volebním období a asi by stálo za to, aby nyní Komise toto téma, které působí více technicky a ne tak významně, protože není doceněn jeho význam, vzala za své a pokusila se nyní v Radě s novým elánem tento návrh prosadit nebo získat jasné stanovisko, zda určitý upravený materiál je pro Radu přijatelný. Shodně se na tom, že současná situace není vyhovující, ale cítíme, že zkrátka není vůle nějakým způsobem dokončit celý proces. Tedy prosím, je to na vás, udělejte pro to maximum.

Martin Hojsík (Renew). – Mr President, I think comitology is one of the amazing things about the European Union that no one understands, and we all talk about...

(Interjection from the floor: 'I do!')

— he does, but the public doesn't! —

(Laughter)

and we talk about an EU close to the people, and that's where we are missing out a lot. We also talk about transparency and accountability and this is something that this procedure is utterly lacking. Pesticides have been one of the hallmarks of the problems related to comitology. People don't know how the governments voted, and what it ends up with is the general blame – Brussels decided, it's a Brussels diktat – but at the end of the day, it's the civil servants of the very Member States, of the very governments, who are there, taking the decisions, without public scrutiny.

I think this is something where we really need to change. I'm very happy to see that the Commission proposal is still on the table, but what we need now is really to start to get some movement in this House, but also with a renewed initiative from the Commission, so I hope that it's going to end up on the work plan, but above all, from the Council, and maybe citizens need to step up their pressure.

Karen Melchior (Renew). – Hr. formand! Jeg følger op på, hvad min kollega Martin Hojsík sagde, nemlig at EU er europæernes union, og at vi står her i dag, fordi europæerne valgte os til og stå her. Men jeg ved også godt, at der er mange europæere, som føler, at EU er langt væk. De forstår ikke, hvad der foregår, og føler, at det er bureaukrati og teknokratvælde. Hvor mange af os forstår egentlig komitologi? Det er få mennesker i Europa, og det er selv få mennesker i dette lokale. Og hvis ikke vi selv kan forstå og forklare komitologien, hvordan skal vi så kunne forvente, at vores vælgere – vores europæere – forstår det og accepterer den måde, beslutningerne bliver truffet på? Hvis ikke vi kan forklare vores lovgivningsprocesser, så svigter vi de grundlæggende demokratiske principper, som vores union er grund-

lagt på. Det er en forpligtelse, at vi kan forklare vores demokrati og vores lovgivning over for vores vælgere. Derfor støtter jeg Renew Europe-Gruppens ønske om at reformere komitologiprincipperne og er glad for at høre, at kommissær Šefčovič også støtter dette.

Spontane Wortmeldungen

Richard Corbett (S&D). – Mr President, the points made by Ms Melchior and others were absolutely right. The comitology system is opaque and nobody in the wider public understands it.

But of course we do have another system for delegating powers to the Commission, which is delegated acts, where it is clear and simple. We delegate powers to the Commission, but we can block their decision if we don't like it, and we can even retrieve the powers that we have delegated if we wish to do so. This can be done unilaterally as Parliament, even though it was a joint decision with the Council to delegate the powers.

Is that not an argument to make much greater use of delegated powers rather than implementing acts? Mr Szájer and I were the co-rapporteurs on the delimitation between implementing acts and delegated acts, but, frankly, we should make much more use of delegated acts. They are transparent and democratic.

(Ende der spontanen Wortmeldungen)

Maroš Šefčovič, Vice-President of the Commission. – Mr President, I would also like to thank honourable Members for the family atmosphere in this discussion on a highly legalistic and challenging topic. I agree with Mr Hojsík and also with Karen Melchior that it's not easy to explain to our citizens how the implementing acts are being implemented and adopted. I would really like to reassure all of you that I took very good note of all your thoughts and suggestions, and I also want to make it clear that President von der Leyen and I are fully committed to deploy also this process and our special partnership to advance on the reforms in all aspects, including on promoting more transparency and accountability in this particular area.

I took very good note of Mr Szájer, Mr Ropè and also Mr Durand, with clear advice and points made in that direction. I would like to thank Mr Corbett also for explaining the difficult situation in which we are because when we are implementing and adopting, we are actually fulfilling the will of this House which was expressed as a co-legislator when adopting the legislative act. Therefore, our space for legislative manoeuvre is very often very limited and therefore what we would do is we will again try to advance this file and work with the Council and with you to really make sure that the procedures have more transparency and clarity in the future.

I very much appreciate the fact that most of your suggestions and interventions went in the same direction as the Commission proposal, and I will do my best to actually get a better understanding of the position of the Council. I will work with the Croatian and, if necessary, the German Presidency to make sure that we get some traction on this file.

What would also help us would be a clear position from the European Parliament. I appreciate that several committees have already adopted their positions, but what we need is your clear position, a clear European Parliament stand on this issue. This gives my discussions with the Council more authority because we know that it is not only the Commission but also the European Parliament seeing things in the same way which can help us to advance the discussion further. So thank you very much for the support, for the ideas on this very important issue, and we will definitely work with you very closely on this.

Der Präsident. – Herr Kommissar Šefčovič, ich möchte die familiäre Atmosphäre nicht übertreiben, aber Sie haben gesagt, mit den „implementing acts“ erfüllen sie den Willen des Parlaments. Ich will durchaus bekennen, dass mir manchmal nicht ganz klar ist, ob sie mit diesem Handeln einen „implementing act“ oder einen „interpreting act“ vornehmen. Darüber sollten wir uns vielleicht gelegentlich mal unterhalten.

Die Aussprache ist geschlossen.

22. Zatwierdzenie protokołu niniejszego posiedzenia: patrz protokół

23. Porządek obrad następnego posiedzenia: patrz protokół

24. Zamknięcie posiedzenia

(Die Sitzung wird um 22.22 Uhr geschlossen.)

—

Skróty i symbole

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

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

Rozwinięcia skrótów nazw komisji parlamentarnych

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

Rozwinięcia skrótów nazw grup politycznych

PPE	Grupa Europejskiej Partii Ludowej (Chrześcijańscy Demokraci)
S&D	Grupa Postępowego Sojuszu Socjalistów i Demokratów w Parlamencie Europejskim
Renew	Grupa Renew Europe
Verts/ALE	Grupa Zielonych/Wolne Przymierze Europejskie
ID	Grupa Tożsamość i Demokracja
ECR	Grupa Europejscy Konserwatyści i Reformatorzy
GUE/NGL	Grupa Zjednoczonej Lewicy Europejskiej/Nordycka Zielona Lewica
NI	Niezrzeszeni