



PEŁNE SPRAWOZDANIE Z OBRAD 29 STYCZNIA 2020 R.

(C/2024/4412)

PARLAMENT EUROPEJSKI

SESJA 2019-2020

Posiedzenia z 29 i 30 stycznia 2020 r.

BRUKSELA

Spis treści	Strona
1. Wznowienie posiedzenia	3
2. Otwarcie posiedzenia	3
3. Uroczyste posiedzenie – Międzynarodowy Dzień Pamięci o Ofiarach Holokaustu – 75. rocznica wyzwolenia obozu w Auschwitz	3
4. Wznowienie posiedzenia	10
5. Przyjęcie protokołu poprzedniego posiedzenia: Patrz protokół	10
6. Skład Parlamentu: Patrz protokół	10
7. Skład grup politycznych: Patrz protokół	10
8. Skład komisji i delegacji: Patrz protokół	10
9. Negocjacje przed pierwszym czytaniem w Radzie (art. 72 Regulaminu): Patrz protokół	10
10. Podpisanie aktów przyjętych zgodnie ze zwykłą procedurą ustawodawczą (art. 79 Regulaminu): patrz protokół	10
11. Działania podjęte w związku z rezolucjami Parlamentu: patrz protokół	10
12. Akty delegowane (art. 111 ust. 2 Regulaminu): patrz protokół	10

Spis treści	Strona
13. Środki wykonawcze (art. 112 Regulaminu): patrz protokół	10
14. Składanie dokumentów: patrz protokół	10
15. Porządek prac	10
16. Umowa o wystąpieniu Zjednoczonego Królestwa Wielkiej Brytanii i Irlandii Północnej z Unii Europejskiej i Europejskiej Wspólnoty Energii Atomowej (debata)	14
17. Głosowanie	37
17.1. Umowa o wystąpieniu Zjednoczonego Królestwa Wielkiej Brytanii i Irlandii Północnej z Unii Europejskiej i Europejskiej Wspólnoty Energii Atomowej (A9-0004/2020 - Guy Verhofstadt) (głosowanie)	37
18. Wyjaśnienia dotyczące sposobu głosowania: Patrz protokół	37
19. Korekty do głosowania i zamiar głosowania: Patrz protokół	38
20. Wznowienie posiedzenia	38
21. Ognisko epidemiczne koronawirusa (debata)	38
22. Prawa ludów tubylczych (debata)	49
23. Nowelizacja indyjskiej ustawy o obywatelstwie w 2019 r. (debata)	55
24. Nagląca sytuacja humanitarna na wyspach greckich, zwłaszcza sytuacja dzieci – działania na rzecz ochrony, relokacji i łączenia rodzin (debata)	61
25. Strategia UE na rzecz mobilności i transportu: środki niezbędne do 2030 r. i w późniejszym okresie (debata)	74
26. Jednominutowe wystąpienia w znaczących kwestiach politycznych	89
27. Decyzje w sprawie sporządzenia sprawozdań z własnej inicjatywy (art. 54 Regulaminu): Patrz protokół	95
28. Decyzje o zastosowaniu procedury obejmującej wspólne posiedzenia komisji (art. 58 Regulaminu): Patrz protokół	95
29. Porządek obrad następnego posiedzenia: patrz protokół	95
30. Zamknięcie posiedzenia	95

PEŁNE SPRAWOZDANIE Z OBRAD 29 STYCZNIA 2020 R.

PRESIDENZA DELL'ON. DAVID MARIA SASSOLI

Presidente

1. Wznowienie posiedzenia

Presidente. – Dichiaro ripresa la sessione del Parlamento europeo interrotta giovedì 16 gennaio 2020.

2. Apertura del meeting

(La seduta è aperta alle 15.08)

3. Uroczyste posiedzenie – Międzynarodowy Dzień Pamięci o Ofiarach Holokaustu – 75. rocznica wyzwolenia obozu w Auschwitz

Presidente. – Prima di iniziare questa seduta con la commemorazione della Giornata internazionale dedicata alla memoria delle vittime dell'Olocausto e del 75° anniversario della liberazione di Auschwitz, vi invito a guardare un breve video di testimonianze.

(Proiezione di un video)

Ho il piacere di dare il benvenuto in quest'Aula al violoncellista Mischa Maysky, che suonerà un brano d'apertura accompagnato dal figlio Max al pianoforte. Il brano è «From Jewish Life: Prayer» di Ernest Bloch.

(Intermezzo musicale)

Colleghe e colleghi, signora Liliana Segre, signora Presidente della Commissione, Commissari, gentili ospiti, rappresentanze diplomatiche, rappresentanti dei parlamenti nazionali, sindaci delle città martiri, siamo qui oggi a ricordare che 75 anni fa si aprirono i cancelli di uno dei luoghi che la memoria degli europei non potrà mai dimenticare. L'esercito sovietico era arrivato ad Auschwitz-Birkenau e i cancelli si spalancarono su una fabbrica della morte che, con maniacale puntualità e sistematico sterminio, provocò in quel campo oltre un milione e mezzo di morti, causando sofferenze e dolori indicibili.

Aprire quei cancelli, come tutti gli altri cancelli che si aprirono via via in tutti i campi di sterminio nazisti, è significato per le generazioni future, per noi, scoprire dove può arrivare l'uomo che perde la propria umanità.

Ma non solo: ha mostrato cosa significhi costruire un nemico per dimostrare di poterlo annientare; cosa può produrre l'odio al servizio di una volontà di potenza incontrollata; fin dove il sadismo possa inquinare le nostre società; dove può portare l'istinto, liberato dalla coscienza, nell'esaltare la soddisfazione di sentirsi proprietari della vita.

Ad Auschwitz, terra europea, quel giorno del 1945 vennero aperti i cancelli dell'abisso. Perché in quel luogo non bastava distruggere i corpi delle persone, riducendoli in fumo e in cenere per cancellare ogni loro traccia passata, presente e futura, ma bisognava in primo luogo annientare le loro anime, privarli della propria identità, trasformarli in un numero da marciare sul corpo, usarli, come ricordava la Presidente Simone Veil, come «Stück», ovvero dei «pezzi» di materia prima.

Ad Auschwitz è l'essenza stessa dell'umanità ad essere stata messa in dubbio dalla volontà di sterminare il popolo ebraico, e con esso il popolo rom e i sinti, gli oppositori, e rendere schiavi i popoli slavi, gli omosessuali.

Auschwitz è indicibile. Vasilij Grossman, raccontando l'esperienza del campo di concentramento di Treblinka ha scritto: «Nel suo inferno Dante non le vide, scene come queste».

Ma se l'inferno è riservato ai peccatori, quale peccato si poteva imputare ai bambini, alle donne, a tutti coloro che passarono per il camino o furono torturati, offesi, umiliati, ridotti a pezzi di ricambio?

Ad Auschwitz si è incarnata la negazione stessa della nostra civiltà. La civiltà che ha origini ebraiche e cristiane, che ha incontrato il mondo islamico, che ha conquistato l'Illuminismo e costruito la propria convivenza sul diritto, che si è battuta contro la barbarie e per la difesa della dignità umana, che ha cercato di offrire un'idea della bellezza della persona e delle persone che vivono insieme nelle nostre città e nei nostri paesi. Una civiltà che ha fermato la propria corsa verso il desiderio di libertà sulla soglia del cancello di Auschwitz.

Dinanzi a ciò, quest'oggi, pieni di emozione e riuniti nel raccoglimento, ci inchiniamo davanti a tutte le vittime della Shoah e vogliamo assumerci il nostro dovere di ricordare. Ci assumiamo questo dovere perché sappiamo che Auschwitz è stata costruita da europei e noi siamo chiamati ad assumerci questa paternità perché quello che è successo incombe su di noi e ci chiama alla responsabilità.

Quello che è successo è figlio della nostra storia. Perché i nazisti sono usciti dal grembo di mamme buone, da famiglie cosmopolite, da famiglie che cantavano il Te Deum, da padri che educavano allo spirito libero. Figli che non sono stati in grado di reagire e di opporsi e definire la propria responsabilità.

La soluzione finale ha fatto sì che l'inimmaginabile entrasse nell'immaginario e dimostra che ciò che può essere immaginato, coadiuvato dalle circostanze, può essere portato a incarnarsi.

Auschwitz, con tutte le fabbriche della morte disseminate nello spazio europeo, a nord e a sud, a est, rappresenta una questione fondamentale della nostra società, della nostra civiltà, della nostra cultura e ci impone degli obblighi.

Ci impone innanzitutto l'obbligo di agire ogniqualvolta vi è un atto di violenza e discriminazione, tutte le volte che un'azione antisemita e razzista si presenta nelle nostre società. Dobbiamo sempre considerare tutto ciò un attacco alla dignità delle persone e un attacco alla nostra idea di Europa.

E allora ripetiamolo insieme oggi, perché altrimenti non avrebbe senso ricordare la liberazione del campo di Auschwitz-Birkenau: il nazismo e il razzismo non sono opinioni, ma sono crimini!

(Ovazione)

Ogni volta che leggiamo sul giornale notizie di violenze, sacrilegi, insulti, noi dobbiamo considerare quelle violenze, quei sacrilegi e quegli insulti rivolti a ciascuno di noi. Sono attacchi all'Europa e ai valori che essa rappresenta e che incarnano le due malattie della nazione moderna, che si propagano nel nostro continente: da una parte la sacralizzazione delle frontiere e, dall'altra, la ricerca di un'identità pura e univoca – religiosa, etnica e culturale – che conduce inevitabilmente a costruire nemici.

L'Europa al contrario si è formata e vogliamo continui a formarsi con le nostre diversità, con le nostre pluralità, con il pluralismo politico, religioso, culturale. Ed è proprio per questo che dobbiamo essere riconoscenti all'ebraismo che ci ha consentito di formare quello spirito universalista che è parte integrante della nostra visione del mondo.

Nell'Europa che ha conosciuto il male assoluto siamo riusciti a costruire uno spazio di fratellanza, amicizia e democrazia che non vogliamo venga violato. Ecco perché ci rivolgiamo ai governi perché usino vigilanza e severità nei confronti di ogni forma di intolleranza. Non sono ragazzate i vandalismi compiuti nei cimiteri ebraici, gli assalti alle sinagoghe e ai luoghi di culto, le minacce a cui vengono sottoposte famiglie europee di religione ebraica o le forme di intolleranza che colpiscono le minoranze presenti nei nostri Stati membri. Non sono ragazzate!

Nei nostri trattati tutto questo è scritto molto chiaramente e chiediamo alla Commissione e al Consiglio di adoperarsi perché ciò venga fatto rispettare. Noi abbiamo la responsabilità di fronte a questi pericoli. È accaduto una volta e può accadere ancora. Dobbiamo sentire l'impegno per una lucida coscienza storica e rendere sempre testimonianza veritiera agli eventi che sono accaduti per impedire negazioni e amnesie, magari dettate da volgari opportunismi. Ma la nostra coscienza deve essere anche vigile, e cioè capace di capire, per prevenire e intervenire ogni qualvolta si diffondono i semi del male assoluto.

La Shoah, infatti, non sarebbe stata possibile senza la complicità e la viltà che esistevano allora in Europa. Di fronte a ciò è necessario «pensare sé stesso come un altro», come diceva il filosofo Paul Ricoeur. L'altro è l'uomo scheletrico di Auschwitz, l'uomo che cammina di Alberto Giacometti, un uomo che si dirige verso un futuro che spera migliore. Ma l'altro è anche lo straniero che desidera scrivere insieme a noi la storia dell'Europa.

I Giusti, come Jan Karski e molti altri, che rischiando la propria vita hanno salvato degli innocenti dall'abisso, devono essere ogni giorno fonte di ispirazione per le nostre azioni, poiché abbiamo sempre la possibilità di scegliere e il dovere assoluto di non accettare l'indifferenza di fronte ai pericoli dell'antisemitismo, del razzismo e del rifiuto dell'altro.

In definitiva, dobbiamo accogliere l'ingiunzione della Bibbia che troviamo, espressa in modo esplicito ma molto semplice, nel Libro del Levitico, e di cui riconosciamo la portata etica fondamentale, indipendentemente dall'essere credenti o meno: «Non [...] coopererai alla morte del tuo prossimo».

Questo presupposto deve guidare le nostre azioni e ci invita a conservare la memoria di quanto è accaduto ad Auschwitz e a caricarci della responsabilità di trasmettere la memoria. Questo compito, man mano che il volgere inesorabile del tempo farà mancare i testimoni, è affidato alla nostra e alle future generazioni.

Paul Celan in una delle sue poesie scriveva: «Nessuno / testimonia per il / testimone» riferendosi al carattere quasi sacro di quello che un testimone rappresenta.

Noi tutti siamo qui oggi ad esprimere la nostra riconoscenza alla senatrice Liliana Segre che è qui con noi oggi per consegnarci la sua testimonianza.

Quando Gilles Deleuze affermava di scrivere «per gli analfabeti», non intendeva dire che scriveva «perché gli analfabeti leggessero», ma che scriveva «al posto degli analfabeti», di cui si faceva portavoce e testimone. Allo stesso modo, ad Auschwitz e oggi in quest'Aula dove si esprime la democrazia europea, noi testimoniamo per quei morti, assumendo il dovere di trasmissione che il loro sacrificio ci ha implicitamente assegnato.

Auschwitz è indicibile. Voglio però credere che la testimonianza di coloro i quali hanno visto l'indicibile riesca a muovere i nostri cuori e a ispirare l'etica delle nostre azioni, affinché ciò non avvenga mai più.

Ascoltiamo dunque la voce della signora Segre, a cui cedo la parola. Con lei saremo più forti nel sostenere la nostra testimonianza contro l'indifferenza. È un grande onore, signora, che oggi sia qui con noi ed è un grande dono che lei sia riuscita a sopravvivere ad Auschwitz e a consentirci di conoscere per non dimenticare.

(Applausi)

Liliana Segre, *Senatrice a vita del Senato della Repubblica italiana, sopravvissuta di Auschwitz*. – Devo per forza cominciare con i ringraziamenti al mio amico Sassoli che mi ha invitata e a tutto il Parlamento. Vorrei anche salutare i parlamentari inglesi che ci stanno lasciando, con grande dispiacere di tutti.

Non nascondo l'emozione profonda ad entrare in questo Parlamento europeo dopo aver visto all'ingresso le bandiere, le bandiere colorate di tanti Stati affratellati nel Parlamento europeo, dove si parla, si discute, ci si guarda negli occhi.

Non è stato sempre così. La giornata del 27 gennaio è una giornata che a volte è ripetuta troppo, dando al 27 gennaio molta importanza. In fondo non è che Auschwitz sia stato liberato quel giorno. L'Armata Rossa è entrata, ed è molto bella la descrizione che fa Primo Levi nel libro «La tregua» di questi quattro soldati russi che aprono e si trovano davanti – senza liberare niente perché i nazisti erano già scappati da tanti giorni – questo spettacolo incredibile, al momento ai loro occhi, ma che poi più tardi, molto più tardi, diventò uno spettacolo incredibile per chi lo volle guardare. Qualcuno non lo vuole guardare neanche adesso, dice che non è vero.

Queste parole straordinarie di Primo Levi esprimono lo stupore per il male altrui, perché questo stupore per il male altrui nessuno che è stato prigioniero ad Auschwitz l'ha potuto mai dimenticare un secondo della sua vita. Lo stupore perché altre persone che non sono pazze, che non vengono da un mondo lontano ma sono tuoi fratelli europei, hanno pensato per te.

Il 27 gennaio io avevo tredici anni ed ero operaia schiava nella fabbrica di munizioni Union, fabbrica che c'è tuttora, dove facevamo bossoli per mitragliatrici. Di colpo, in fabbrica, dopo che avevamo sentito scoppi lontani – lavoravamo nella città di Auschwitz e sapevamo le cose che stavano succedendo a Birkenau dove ero stata fino a pochissimo prima – venne il comando immediato dalla fabbrica stessa di cominciare quella che fu chiamata la «marcia della morte».

Io non fui liberata il 27 gennaio dall'Armata Rossa. Io facevo parte di quel gruppo di più di 50 000 prigionieri ancora in vita e che eravamo stati obbligati in quelle condizioni fisiche, senza parlare di che cosa erano quelle psichiche, a cominciare quella marcia, che durò mesi e di cui si parla pochissimo, la «marcia della morte». Quando parlo nelle scuole da nonna, come parlo da nonna da trent'anni a questa parte, dico che ognuno deve, una gamba davanti all'altra, nella vita, non appoggiarsi mai a nessuno, perché nella marcia della morte non potevamo appoggiarci al compagno vicino che si trascinava sulla neve coi piedi piagati come noi e che veniva finito dalle guardie della scorta se fosse caduto, veniva ucciso, nessuno poteva rimanere lì su quelle strade. Traversammo.

Come si fa? Come si fa in quelle condizioni? Perché la forza della vita è straordinaria: è questo che bisogna trasmettere ai giovani di oggi che sono mortificati dalla mancanza di lavoro, mortificati dai vizi che ricevono dai loro genitori molli, per cui tutto è concesso, mentre la vita non è così, la vita poi ti prepara a questa marcia che deve diventare «marcia per la vita».

Noi non volevamo morire. Noi eravamo pazzamente attaccate alla vita, qualunque fosse, per cui, una gamba davanti all'altra, buttarci sui letamai, mangiare qualunque schifezza, qualunque cosa, mangiare la neve dove non era sporcata dal sangue e non domandarci più nient'altro che andare avanti, camminare, camminare.

Era il male altrui. Le finestre erano chiuse. Attraversammo, all'inizio fu la Polonia e l'Alta Slesia, poi fu la Germania. E mesi e mesi dopo, dopo aver passato altri Lager, altri orrori, altri mali, arrivammo a Ravensbruck, un *Jugendlager* che si chiamava *Jugendlager* perché in effetti eravamo giovani, ma sembravamo vecchie, senza sesso, senza età, senza seno, senza mestruazioni, senza mutande. Non si deve aver paura di queste parole, perché è così che si toglie la dignità a una donna. È così.

(Applausi vivi)

Abituate ormai a sopravvivere perché c'era qualche cosa dentro di noi che ci diceva: avanti, avanti, avanti, avanti, avanti. Giorno dopo giorno, campo dopo campo, io mi ritrovai alla fine del mese di aprile del 1945 – pensate in quella situazione quanto era lontano il 27 di gennaio — in quello stato fisico, con compagne perdute in quella marcia, rimaste lì senza potersi alzare, non soccorse mai da nessuno, perché nessuno aprì una finestra, buttò un pezzo di pane.

C'era la paura. Era la paura che faceva sì che la scelta fosse di pochissimi. Perché non si parla quasi mai di questi straordinari che hanno fatto la scelta, si dà per scontato che popoli interi siano stati colpevoli perché non fu solo il popolo tedesco, fu tutta l'Europa occupata dai nazisti. Parliamo della Francia, parliamo dell'Italia, non so molto di altri Stati, in cui i nostri vicini di casa furono degli aiuti straordinari per i nazisti. Io parlo dell'Italia, dove abbiamo visto purtroppo i nostri vicini di casa che ci denunciavano, che prendevano possesso del nostro appartamento, del nostro ufficio e anche del cane qualche volta perché era un cane di razza. Il cane era di razza. Questa parola «razza», che ancora sentiamo dire, e per questo dobbiamo combattere questo razzismo, questo razzismo strutturale che c'è ancora.

La gente mi chiede: ma come mai ancora si parla di antisemitismo? Va bene che sono vecchissima nel mio novantesimo anno di età, ma non sono quella che sa perché c'è ancora l'antisemitismo, perché ancora c'è il razzismo. Io rispondo che c'è sempre stato ma che non c'era il momento politico per poter tirar fuori l'antisemitismo e il razzismo che sono insiti nell'animo dei poveri di spirito. Sì, è così. E poi arrivano i momenti, i corsi e ricorsi storici. Arrivano i momenti più adatti, arrivano i momenti in cui ci si volta dall'altra parte, in cui è più facile di nuovo far finta di niente, è più facile guardare il proprio cortile, dire che è una cosa che non mi interessa, perché mi deve interessare, non mi riguarda. E allora tutti quelli che approfittano di questa situazione trovano il terreno adatto per farsi avanti.

Ora, la guerra non si fermò, come sappiamo, e prima di essere stata liberata dagli Alleati nel nord della Germania, arrivò il 1° maggio del 1945. La condizione degli ebrei fu analoga nei paesi occupati, alleati dei nazisti, fu analoga di fatto se non di diritto. Gli ebrei di allora erano stati e si erano profondamente sentiti cittadini e patrioti tedeschi, italiani, francesi, ungheresi, si erano battuti nelle guerre. Io mi ricordo mio padre e mio zio che erano stati ufficiali nella prima guerra mondiale e quanti ebrei tedeschi piangevano e si suicidarono perché si sentivano tedeschi più di ogni altra cosa. Questa espulsione dalle comunità nazionali fu dolorosissima, fu qualche cosa che andava molto al di là delle leggi, perché era appunto il tuo vicino di casa.

Io ero una bambina diventata invisibile e questo mi è successo anche subito dopo la guerra, quando io per caso rimasi viva e tornai nella mia Milano con le macerie ancora fumanti e incontrai delle mie compagne di scuola che non mi avevano visto più, perché nel 1938 io avrei dovuto fare la terza elementare ed ero evidentemente un pericolo molto grave sia per i fascisti che per i nazisti per cui decisero che i bambini ebrei di quella piccola comunità degli ebrei italiani – trentottomila o quarantamila persone, quindi una piccola comunità, che fu vittima per un terzo almeno della Shoah – fossero allontanati dalle scuole. Ero una bambina che era assolutamente introdotta nella società e non si sentiva assolutamente diversa e queste compagne, rinate dopo tre o quattro anni, mi dissero: «Ma tu Segre dove sei andata finire che non ti ho più vista a scuola?»

Io ero una ragazza ferita, ero una ragazza selvaggia, una ragazza che non sapeva più mangiare con la forchetta e il coltello perché ancora ero abituata a «*fressen nicht essen*» che voleva dire come le bestie che mangiano – «*fressen*» non «*essen*» – e come tale ero bulimica, e come tale ero anche disgustosa, e come tale ero criticata anche da quelli che mi volevano bene e volevano di nuovo la ragazza borghese con la buona educazione familiare.

È difficile ricordare queste cose. Devo dire che da trent'anni io parlo nelle scuole e sento ormai come una difficoltà psichica molto forte continuare, anche se il mio dovere è questo e sarebbe questo fino alla morte, visto che io ho visto quei colori, ho sentito quegli odori, ho sentito quelle urla, ho incontrato delle persone in quella babele di lingue, che oggi non posso che ricordare qui dove tante lingue si incontrano in pace, perché era possibile comunicare con le compagne che venivano da tutta l'Europa occupata dai nazisti solo trovando delle parole comuni, perché se non la solitudine assoluta del silenzio, di non poter scambiare una parola con l'altro derivava da qualche isolamento ancestrale delle comunità che non si erano riunite in parlamenti, visto che l'Europa da secoli litigava in modo spaventoso. Chiunque abbia studiato la storia sa che è adesso, da 75 anni, un periodo assolutamente incredibile, mentre tutto il passato ha fatto sì che i popoli a volte non si conoscessero.

Le bandiere fuori, che ricordavo all'inizio, mi hanno fatto proprio ricordare quel desiderio di trovare con le olandesi, con le francesi, con le polacche, con le tedesche, con le ungheresi, una parola comune. Per esempio io dell'ungherese ho imparato una sola parola che era «pane», che in ungherese si dice *kenyér*. Ed è la parola principale, che vuol dire fame, ma che vuol dire anche sacralità di una cosa che viene sprecata oggi senza neanche guardare che cosa si butta via.

Allora io da tre anni almeno sento che i ricordi di quella ragazzina che sono stata, mentre oggi sono una vecchia di novant'anni, non mi danno pace. Non mi danno pace perché da che sono diventata nonna io, trentadue anni fa, di uno dei miei tre nipoti – per fortuna ne ho tre, oltre che tre meravigliosi figli, e il Parlamento europeo e la non mia estinzione mi sembrano in questo momento lo stesso miracolo, non so se sbaglio, immodestamente, immodestamente – quella ragazzina lì che ha fatto la marcia della morte, quella lì che ha brucato nei letamai, quella lì che non piangeva più, quella lì che cercava la parola comune, quella lì è un'altra da me e io sono la nonna di me stessa.

Sono una nonna e quando mi rivolgo ai miei nipoti che hanno un dispiacere d'amore o di studio o di mancato raggiungimento di qualche cosa che loro vorrebbero raggiungere sono una nonna amorosa, sono una nonna molto presente, sono una nonna grata del fatto di essere anche nonna, un miracolo eccezionale per una che doveva morire. Io sono nonna anche di me stessa.

Ed è una sensazione che a volte non mi abbandona quando io ho finito di parlare nelle scuole. A volte io parlo a migliaia di ragazzi, tutti insieme due o tremila, e quindi è il mio dovere i testimone parlare e non posso che parlare di me e delle mie compagne, ma sono io che salto fuori, quella ragazzina magra, scheletrita, disperata, sola. E non la posso più sopportare, perché sono la nonna di me stessa e sento che se non smetto di parlare e se non mi ritiro, quel tempo che mi resta a ricordare da sola o a godere delle grandi gioie della mia famiglia ritrovata, non lo potrò più fare comunque perché non ce la farò più.

Quindi anche oggi fatico a ricordare, ma mi è sembrato un grande dovere accettare questo invito e avere questa occasione per ricordare il male altrui, ma anche per ricordare che si può, una gamba davanti all'altra, essere come quella bambina di Terezín – chi andrà a Praga o c'è già stato può visitare il museo dei bambini che a Terezín potevano fare le recite o colorare coi pastelli e che poi un giorno furono tutti deportati e uccisi ad Auschwitz per la colpa di esser nati, perché erano bambini e quindi non potevano aver fatto del male a nessuno – quella bambina, di cui non ricordo il nome, che ha disegnato una farfalla gialla che vola sopra i fili spinati.

Io non avevo le matite colorate e forse non avevo e non ho mai avuto la fantasia meravigliosa della bambina di Terezín. Che la farfalla gialla voli sempre sopra i fili spinati. Questo è un semplicissimo messaggio da nonna che io vorrei lasciare ai miei futuri nipoti ideali: che siano in grado di fare la scelta e con la loro responsabilità e la loro coscienza essere sempre quella farfalla gialla che vola sopra i fili spinati.

(Applausi vivi e prolungati)

Presidente. – Grazie. Invito l'orchestra a entrare in Aula per la conclusione. Prima però voglio invitare tutti a osservare un minuto di silenzio. Mi sembra che, dopo le parole che abbiamo ascoltato, sia giusto.

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

Ursula von der Leyen, President of the Commission. – Mr President, Madam Senator Ms Liliana Segre, Honourable Members, dear Anita Lasker-Wallfisch, dear European friends. Of course, it is very difficult to take the floor after you, Liliana Segre. The power and the humanity of your speech, dear Liliana, was profoundly moving, and your memories. And I deeply admire, like all of us here in the room, your endless fight for remembrance. It is an important reminder for all of us of life and, as you've said, of its dignity. You often say that, and I quote: 'understanding is impossible but knowledge is necessary'. And how could we ever understand this completely dehumanised world, this world beyond time, life and reality?

These words come from another Auschwitz survivor, Ms Simone Veil – we've seen her in the video. The first President of the first directly-elected European Parliament, Simone Veil was a woman who, with heart and conviction, lived through Europe's worst days and also its greatest moments of hope and of unity. Looking at Auschwitz Birkenau and what happened there, she coined the term of 'the absolute evil'.

Die systematische Ausrottung von sechs Millionen Juden ist das absolut Böse – das absolut Böse, das sich nicht in Worte fassen lässt, die schlimmste Barbarei, die der Mensch dem Menschen zufügen kann, das Verbrechen von Nazideutschland gegen die Menschheit. Und als Deutsche fühle ich schwere Schuld. Und doch spreche ich hier. Die Opfer, vor denen wir uns verneigen, wurden im Namen meiner Nation umgebracht. Die Stätten dieses Mordes wurden über ganz Europa verteilt: Auschwitz, Buchenwald, Babij Jar, Mauthausen, Bergen-Belsen, Treblinka – Namen unvorstellbarer Menschlichkeitsverbrechen und des Verlustes aller Humanität. Wir gedenken heute der Gequälten und Entrechteten der nationalsozialistischen Gewaltherrschaft. Wir gedenken Millionen ermordeter europäischer Juden, der Roma, der Sinti, der Zwangsarbeiterinnen und Zwangsarbeiter, der Zeugen Jehovas, der Homosexuellen, der Kranken und Behinderten, der politischen Gefangenen und der Kriegsgefangenen und vieler vieler anderer mehr. Wir verneigen uns vor den Toten. Ja, als Deutsche fühle ich die besondere Schuld, aber ich fühle auch die besondere Verantwortung. Denn als Deutsche in Europa weiß ich auch, dass es unsere Nachbarn waren, die uns die Hand gereicht haben und uns wieder aufgenommen haben in den Kreis der demokratischen Völker.

Je sais, en tant qu'Européenne, que notre Union s'est bâtie en s'appuyant sur la volonté absolue de protéger la dignité de chaque être humain, car elle est inviolable; que nous avons la responsabilité permanente de combattre avec détermination toute forme d'antisémitisme et de discrimination, et de ne jamais, jamais oublier.

Le souvenir est douloureux et effrayant, mais il ne nous paralyse pas. Au contraire, il aiguise notre boussole morale et nous met en garde, parce que la Shoah n'a pas commencé à Auschwitz, mais bien plus tôt, dans les esprits des gens. Elle a commencé avec l'affaiblissement de la capacité de s'indigner face au dénigrement dont d'autres étaient victimes. Elle a commencé avec la brutalité et les discours de haine à l'égard des Juifs.

Aux paroles ont succédé les actes, dont les crimes contre l'humanité constituent la concrétisation indicible. On a d'abord vu mourir l'empathie et déferler les invectives, sans que personne n'y mette fin.

The former United Nations Secretary, General Kofi Annan, once said: 'all that evil needs to triumph is the silence of the majority'. This fight for remembrance, which you are leading with so much courage and determination, dear Liliana Segre, must be our common fight. It is a duty to remember for all of us and must be passed down from generation to generation. For when the memory fades, where today there are attempts to deny the Holocaust, where people are vilified and treated with contempt because they are Jews or because they are not like the majority, this is where Europe is called into question. For Europe rose with a firm will never again to give any quarter to absolute evil. Europe knows, like no other continent, that this mission means: do not let it take root – never, ever again.

I thank you from the bottom of my heart, dear Liliana, for your tireless dedication to stop us forgetting, and I thank you for the courage with which you counter the hatred which has been rekindled in Europe and which you experienced first-hand. Your courage gives us strength. And we wish to say to you that Europe will not remain silent when Jews in Europe are again subjected to hatred and harassment. We will fight anti-Semitism at all levels. We will never allow the Holocaust to be denied. We will fight with all our strength against discrimination, racism and exclusion, and we want to see – and we will fight for – a normal life for Jews in Europe. You can rely on us.

(Applause from the House)

Der fünfundsiebzigste Jahrestag der Befreiung des Lagers Auschwitz ist Gedenken. Wir gedenken all derer, deren Zukunft ausgelöscht wurde. Wir gedenken all derer, die nie aus den Lagern zurückgekehrt sind. Anderthalb Millionen jüdische Kinder wurden ermordet. Ich weine um jedes Kind, und es hat seinen Namen in Yad Vashem. Wir gedenken aber auch derer, die überlebt haben und, liebe Liliana Segre, denen die schrecklichen Erinnerungen an diese Hölle auf ewig ins Gedächtnis eingebrannt sind.

Aber dieses Gedenken ist auch ein Aufruf zur Wachsamkeit. Heinz Galinski, der langjährige Vorsitzende des Zentralrats der Juden in Deutschland, hat zu Recht gesagt: 'Demokratie kann man keiner Gesellschaft aufzwingen, sie ist auch kein Geschenk, das man ein für allemal in Besitz nehmen kann. Sie muss täglich erkämpft und verteidigt werden.' Genau darum geht es: Wehret den Anfängen! Seid wachsam! Seien wir aufrichtig gegenüber unserer Geschichte! Verteidigen wir die Unantastbarkeit der Würde eines jeden einzelnen Menschen! Verteidigen wir das Innerste und die Werte unserer Demokratie! Das sind wir den Opfern des Holocaust schuldig, das sind wir der Würde des Menschen schuldig wie genauso auch unserer Demokratie.

(Beifall)

Presidente. – Invito i nostri musicisti a prendere posto. Ascolteremo il brano «Kaddish» di Maurice Ravel, interpretato da Naomi Couquet e dal Karski Quartet.

(La seduta è sospesa alle 16.10)

4. Wznowienie posiedzenia

(La seduta è ripresa alle 16.16)

5. Przyjęcie protokołu poprzedniego posiedzenia: Patrz protokół

6. Skład Parlamentu: Patrz protokół

7. Skład grup politycznych: Patrz protokół

8. Skład komisji i delegacji: Patrz protokół

9. Negocjacje przed pierwszym czytaniem w Radzie (art. 72 Regulaminu): Patrz protokół

10. Podpisanie aktów przyjętych zgodnie ze zwykłą procedurą ustawodawczą (art. 79 Regulaminu): patrz protokół

11. Działania podjęte w związku z rezolucjami Parlamentu: patrz protokół

12. Akty delegowane (art. 111 ust. 2 Regulaminu): patrz protokół

13. Środki wykonawcze (art. 112 Regulaminu): patrz protokół

14. Składanie dokumentów: patrz protokół

15. Porządek prac

Presidente. – Il progetto definitivo di ordine del giorno, fissato dalla Conferenza dei presidenti, ai sensi dell'articolo 157 del regolamento, nella riunione di giovedì 16 gennaio 2020 è stato distribuito. Vi sono richieste di modifica. A seguito di consultazioni con i gruppi politici, desidero sottoporre all'Aula le seguenti proposte di modifica del progetto definitivo di ordine del giorno:

Mercoledì

Sono aggiunte le dichiarazioni del Consiglio e della Commissione sull'epidemia di coronavirus come primo punto all'ordine del giorno della sera. Di conseguenza, la seduta è prolungata fino alle ore 24.00.

Giovedì

Sono aggiunti i seguenti sei punti: obiezione a norma dell'articolo 111 del regolamento: classificazione, etichettatura e imballaggio delle sostanze e delle miscele – biossido di titanio; due relazioni dell'on. Tinagli sulla nomina di un membro del Comitato di risoluzione unico; la relazione dell'on. Tinagli sulla nomina del vicepresidente del Comitato di risoluzione unico; la relazione dell'on. Tinagli sulla nomina del direttore esecutivo dell'Autorità bancaria europea; la relazione dell'onorevole Nethsingha sulla verifica dei poteri.

Tutto questo è aggiunto direttamente alle votazioni.

Per la relazione dell'on. Nethsingha sulla verifica dei poteri le scadenze sono aperte come segue: emendamenti: mercoledì 29 gennaio alle ore 18.00; votazioni per parti separate e votazioni distinte: mercoledì 29 gennaio alle ore 21.00.

(Il Parlamento approva le modifiche)

Mercoledì

Il gruppo GUE/NGL ha chiesto che il titolo della dichiarazione della Commissione sulla «Strategia dell'UE per la mobilità e i trasporti: misure necessarie per il 2030 e oltre» venga cambiato in «Strategia dell'Unione europea per la mobilità e i trasporti sostenibili: misure necessarie per entro il 2030 e oltre». Do la parola all'on. Kontoura per presentare la richiesta del gruppo GUE/NGL.

Elena Kountoura, *on behalf of the GUE/NGL Group*. – Mr President, we would like to change the title of today's debate from 'EU strategy for mobility and transport' to 'EU strategy for sustainable mobility and transport', and the reason is obvious. Only days after the European Green Deal has been proposed by the European Commission, we must send the right signal that sustainability is our first priority – and not only in terms of climate or the environment, but also in social terms, so that the transition is fair for all. So I would like to ask you to support this request and correct the title for this debate.

Barbara Thaler (PPE). – Herr Präsident! Vielen Dank für den Änderungsvorschlag. Die Themen, die Sie angesprochen haben, sind definitiv alle wichtig, wenn es um eine Strategie für Mobilität und Verkehr in der Zukunft geht, vor allem für das Ziel 2030 und auch darüber hinaus. Aber ich glaube, dass es bei dieser großen Strategie um mehr geht als nur um Nachhaltigkeit. Es geht um Technik, es geht um Leistungsfähigkeit, und der Titel wurde so gewählt, dass alle unsere Fraktionen ihre verschiedensten Standpunkte zu allen verschiedenen Transportarten auch einbringen können. In diesem Sinne glaube ich, wir sollten den Titel so belassen, wie er ist, und ganzheitlich diskutieren. Ich möchte vorschlagen, dass wir dem Antrag nicht zustimmen.

(Il Parlamento approva la richiesta)

Presidente. – Per quanto riguarda la giornata di mercoledì, il gruppo ID ha chiesto che la discussione sulla modifica della legge sulla cittadinanza indiana del 2019 sia ritirata dall'ordine del giorno. Do la parola all'on. Mariani per presentare la richiesta del gruppo ID.

Thierry Mariani, *au nom du groupe ID*. – Monsieur le Président, nous vous demandons effectivement le retrait de l'ordre du jour de la résolution sur la réforme de la loi indienne sur la citoyenneté, de 2019.

Nous pensons que cette résolution est particulièrement malvenue dans le contexte actuel, puisque la Cour suprême indienne doit se prononcer prochainement sur la validité de cette loi. Imaginons une seconde que la Cour suprême rejette cette loi: elle sera accusée d'avoir cédé à la pression internationale. Imaginons que, par ailleurs, elle accepte cette loi: elle sera, là aussi, accusée d'avoir provoqué une décision de l'Union européenne.

Je pense sincèrement que, respectant la souveraineté de l'Inde, il est urgent d'attendre la décision de la Cour suprême. C'est pourquoi nous vous demandons le retrait pur et simple de cette résolution.

Michael Gahler, on behalf of the PPE Group. – Mr President, the EPP Group agrees to have the debate today, but we ask colleagues to support the postponement of the vote to March II in Strasbourg. The issue is ongoing, as the Indian Supreme Court has asked the government to clarify numerous issues, and we should await the answers and then assess how to fairly evaluate this law. We will also have time in February to get hold of Indian government ministers visiting Brussels. Let's give the government a chance to explain directly, and today they can already listen to our questions and concerns and give us answers next month. Please support the request for postponement of the vote.

Presidente. – Onorevole Gahler, lei ha anticipato la prossima votazione.

Adesso dobbiamo votare sulla richiesta del gruppo ID. Do la parola all'onorevole Mohammed che è contrario alla richiesta.

Shaffaq Mohammed (Renew). – Mr President, I was the one who asked for this to be an urgency in Strasbourg. I was then told: please could we delay it until Mr Borrell went to India and came back. This is my last chance to speak on this issue. I am proposing this. We have just heard the President of the Commission say that, in order for bad things to happen, all it takes is for good people to be silenced. Of all the weeks this Parliament is going to silence people – we just heard the presentation on the Holocaust. Look at the paragraphs here: in Assam the NRC has already made 1.9 million people stateless. So I say: have the debate, have the vote, because states in India are currently debating this and voting on this.

(Applause)

(Il Parlamento respinge la richiesta)

Presidente. – Per quanto riguarda la giornata di mercoledì, il gruppo PPE ha chiesto che la votazione sulla risoluzione relativa alla modifica della legge sulla cittadinanza indiana del 2019, attualmente prevista per giovedì, sia rinviata alla tornata di marzo II. Avete già ascoltato l'on. Gahler. Do la parola all'on. Ainslie che vuole intervenire in senso contrario.

Scott Ainslie (Verts/ALE). – Mr President, as has already been said, this has been kicked down the road once. Are we going to just keep kicking this down the road? We cannot keep delaying. We have all been bombarded from the Indian lobby; we have been bombarded from various parts of the Parliament here. As my colleague just said, we cannot stand here and commemorate 75 years of the Holocaust. This started with hate speech, this started with the death of empathy, this started with incitement – and all that it takes for evil to triumph is that good people do nothing. We cannot keep postponing. So I vote very strongly against and I hope that everyone will be vigilant and not hypocritical, that they deliver on this today. No more delays.

(Il Parlamento approva la richiesta)

Presidente. – Per quanto riguarda la seduta di mercoledì, il gruppo GUE/NGL ha chiesto di aggiungere come quarto punto all'ordine del giorno della serata una dichiarazione del Vicepresidente della Commissione/Alto rappresentante dell'Unione per gli affari esteri e la politica di sicurezza sulla situazione in Brasile per quanto riguarda il procedimento giudiziario a carico del giornalista statunitense-brasiliano Glenn Greenwald prima della discussione sulle dichiarazioni del Consiglio e della Commissione sulla situazione umanitaria urgente nelle isole greche, in particolare per i minori – garantire la protezione, il ricollocamento e il ricongiungimento familiare. Do la parola all'on. Daly per presentare la richiesta del gruppo GUE/NGL.

Clare Daly, on behalf of the GUE/NGL Group. – Mr President, I am moving a request for a debate with the High Representative for Foreign Affairs on the situation in Brazil regarding the prosecution of US-Brazilian journalist Glenn Greenwald. The debate would be without resolution as a third item this evening, and I propose to put it to a roll call vote.

Colleagues, Glenn Greenwald's work as a journalist is of no small significance to this European Parliament. His reporting on the Snowden disclosures in 2013 formed an important basis for the necessary work carried out by this Parliament in scrutinising unrestrained mass surveillance. That journalism contributed to landmark cases in the European Court of Justice, and a huge body of European Union legislation is today on the books because of the journalism of Glenn Greenwald. Last year he published a story on the high-level corruption in Brazil, including judicial corruption that led to the wrongful conviction of former President Lula da Silva. Lula was released as a result; Greenwald is now under attack for that same story.

Colleagues, this is a transparent retaliation for holding power to account. If it's attack on freedom of the press which Bolsonaro has spoken out about: an attack on the democratic opposition. It cannot go without comment from this body, and I urge you to speak out.

Kati Piri (S&D). – Mr President, on the case itself, I think we heard a presentation by our colleague from the GUE/NGL Group. My group will vote against this proposal not because of the case, but I don't think we should start adding individual cases to plenary debates – we have the urgencies for that – and my group will be happy to support to add it as an urgency in the next plenary, but vote against this for a debate here this week.

(Il Parlamento respinge la richiesta)

Presidente. – Per quanto riguarda la giornata di giovedì, il gruppo S&D ha chiesto che venga aggiunta una dichiarazione della Commissione sulle proposte di modifica alla legge elettorale della Romania come secondo punto all'ordine del giorno del mattino. Di conseguenza, le votazioni inizieranno alle ore 12.00. Do la parola all'on. Simona Bonafè per presentare la richiesta del gruppo S&D.

Simona Bonafè, a nome del gruppo S&D. – Signor Presidente, onorevoli colleghi, il governo rumeno ha presentato una proposta di legge per modificare la legge elettorale per le elezioni locali, che verrebbe adottata tre mesi prima delle elezioni stesse violando palesemente le raccomandazioni della commissione di Venezia.

Inoltre, si vogliono adottare questi cambiamenti in via straordinaria, senza emendamenti e senza dibattito nel Parlamento rumeno. A nome del gruppo dei socialisti e democratici, vorrei chiedere di aggiungere all'ordine del giorno di domani una dichiarazione della Commissione, come guardiana dei trattati e dei principi fondamentali dello Stato di diritto, su queste modifiche della legge elettorale e chiedo che questa richiesta sia votata per appello nominale.

Esteban González Pons (PPE). – Señor presidente, en Rumanía no se establece un nuevo sistema electoral; se introduce una figura que existía ya en 2012, que es la segunda vuelta para la elección de alcaldes, de manera que los alcaldes tengan como mínimo el 51 % de los votos. Eso sucede en la mayoría de nuestros países, y en aquellos países en los que no sucede, como el mío, estamos deseando que llegue a suceder algún día.

¿Qué tipo de mensaje estamos enviando si condenamos o censuramos a Rumanía por hacer lo que están haciendo la mayoría de los países de la Unión Europea? Este no es un Parlamento antirrumano.

(Il Parlamento respinge la richiesta)

Presidente. – Sempre per la giornata di giovedì, il gruppo dei Verdi ha chiesto di aggiungere come secondo punto dell'ordine del giorno della mattina una dichiarazione della Commissione sulla risposta dell'Unione europea alle devastazioni causate dalle inondazioni in Spagna. Do la parola all'onorevole Riba i Giner per presentare la richiesta del gruppo dei Verdi.

Diana Riba i Giner, en nombre del Grupo Verts/ALE. – Señor presidente, la semana pasada la tormenta Gloria tuvo efectos devastadores en el Estado español, donde perdieron la vida hasta trece personas. Gloria ha tenido un impacto ecológico y agrícola sin precedentes, y evidentemente es una clara consecuencia de los efectos del cambio climático. La costa ha sufrido especialmente las consecuencias. Un gran número de playas ha desaparecido. Las infraestructuras situadas junto al mar están muy dañadas. La tormenta ha causado daños especialmente en el delta del Ebro, una de las reservas naturales más valiosas del Mediterráneo, donde el agua del mar ha entrado hasta tres kilómetros en la tierra, inundando miles de hectáreas de arrozales, playas y parajes naturales.

Ante estos hechos y ante la necesidad de activar mecanismos europeos financieros de cofinanciación para paliar los efectos del temporal y proteger la costa, en nombre del Grupo Verts/ALE, proponemos un debate sin resolución para poder debatir ante la Comisión sobre la respuesta de la Unión Europea.

(Il Parlamento approva la richiesta)

(L'ordine dei lavori è così fissato)

Sergey Lagodinsky (Verts/ALE). – Mr President, on behalf of the Greens, I wanted to make a point of order that regards the report on credentials. We have applied for amendments for this particular report in order to clarify the democratic situation here. The Parliament has not done its duty regarding the Young Carers Rights and it is not part of the report, and therefore we insist on our right to discuss this and to make it part of the report. This is our parliamentary colleague, and the European Court of Justice has confirmed that, and we think that the honourable President did not follow his rights to consult the Parliament regarding this. So let's make this a discussion in this House, because it is our duty to follow up on the colleague and the solidarity with our colleagues, regardless of his political agenda.

Presidente. – Forse era distratto ma io ho fatto una comunicazione a questo riguardo. La relazione dell'on. Nethsingha sulla verifica dei poteri è aggiunta direttamente alle votazioni. Per la relazione dell'on. Nethsingha sulla verifica dei poteri ho anche indicato le scadenze per presentare emendamenti. Forse era distratto, ma non c'è stata nessuna omissione.

16. Umowa o wystąpieniu Zjednoczonego Królestwa Wielkiej Brytanii i Irlandii Północnej z Unii Europejskiej i Europejskiej Wspólnoty Energii Atomowej (debata)

Presidente. – L'ordine del giorno reca la raccomandazione di Guy Verhofstadt, a nome della commissione per gli affari costituzionali, sul progetto di decisione del Consiglio relativa alla conclusione dell'accordo sul recesso del Regno Unito di Gran Bretagna e Irlanda del Nord dall'Unione europea e dalla Comunità europea dell'energia atomica (21105/3/2018 - C9-0148/2019 - 2018/0427(NLE)) (A9-0004/2020).

Do la parola al relatore, on. Verhofstadt, e ringrazio per la loro presenza in Aula la Presidente von der Leyen e Michel Barnier e naturalmente la Presidenza croata.

Guy Verhofstadt, Rapporteur. – Mr President, colleagues, the first thing that I want to do in this debate is to thank one man – a man here in this room – because in this fight he has played a crucial role. He has kept the unity of the 27, he has kept the unity between the three institutions, and everybody who works in Europe knows that this is not a small achievement. And for that reason, I want – especially for his friendship, for his cooperation – to thank Michel Barnier, our chief negotiator.

(Applause)

At the beginning of this debate, Mr President, I want also to pay tribute to our British colleagues – well, at least the overwhelming majority of them. I have to say to them that they have always brought wit, charm, intelligence (some of them). And, let's recognise, sometimes also stubbornness in this House. I think that I can say, in the name of all of us, from all Groups, I can only say we will miss you in the coming time and in the coming years.

(Applause)

Mr President, let me be clear from the start of this debate. Today's vote is not a vote in favour of or against Brexit; it's a vote for an orderly Brexit against a wild, a hard Brexit. I will be very honest with you: if we could stop Brexit by voting 'no' today, I would be the first to recommend it. But that's not on our plate today. That's not on our table and not the issue today. It is indeed a sad issue: sad to see a nation leaving, a great nation that has given all of us so much. I mean culturally, I mean economically, I mean politically, even its own blood in two world wars. It's in fact sad to see a country leaving that twice liberated us, has twice given its blood to liberate Europe. And I think, Mr President, in these debates we cannot escape a key question: how could this happen? How is it possible that, more than 40 years after, I think, an enormous overwhelming majority of nearly 70% voted to enter into the European family, how 40 years later they decided, based on their sovereign rights, to leave this European project? I have to tell you that, since the outcome of the referendum (and that is now more than 3 years ago), I have heard many opinions about it. Everybody has an opinion about it. Some people are saying: well look, they are simply afraid, the Brits, of losing their sovereignty.

That's the issue. But colleagues, what does 'sovereignty' in fact mean today, in a world that is completely dominated by powerhouses like China, like India, like the US; in a world where we have to challenge transnational problems like climate change and the digital supremacy – tomorrow, of China, today of the US?

Let me say it maybe a little more punchily: what is in fact threatening Britain's sovereignty most – the rules of our single market or the fact that tomorrow there will be, maybe, the planting of Chinese 5G masts in the British Isles? The cruel reality that we have to consider today in this debate is that European countries lost their sovereignty already a long time ago, and that Europe is just the way to regain that sovereignty in the coming years.

There have been other people who told me and Michel Barnier: look, you don't understand it. It's all about migration that Brexit is happening: migrants working in British hospitals, migrants working in British universities, migrants working on construction sites in London. While in fact, dear colleagues, these migrants are European citizens exactly like British citizens are: paying taxes to Britain and, in fact, contributing to the future of British society.

Then, finally, there are other opinions, but I will be short today (for once). There are others who are saying, and pointing the finger at us, and saying: yes, the reason for Brexit is simple. You didn't give enough to Mr Cameron when he came to Brussels and when he requested new exceptions for Britain: exceptions on free movement, exceptions on the question of the political union. Well I have to tell you, Mr President and colleagues today, that, as rapporteur, it's my personal opinion and my firm conviction that the opposite is true. Brexit started not three and a half years ago. Brexit started long ago, and I think, personally, that Brexit started exactly the day we started giving exceptions: with opt-ins, with opt-outs, with rebates. That's, in my opinion, the moment the Union ceased to be in union. And it's also the moment, colleagues, that the discontent about Europe started. All these exceptions, all these vetoes make a union, in my opinion, not capable to act effectively: always acting too little, too late. And it is, in my opinion, this lack of effectiveness that leads to even more discontent. It's like a self-fulfilling prophecy, with members – one leg in the Union and another leg outside the Union – only looking for the advantages, not for the obligations.

So in my opinion: yes, Brexit is also a failure of the Union. It's also our failure: we have to recognise that in this debate. And yes, there is a lesson to learn from it, and this lesson, dear colleagues, is not to undo the union, as some are arguing here; no, this lesson is – and we have to learn this from Brexit – to deeply reform the union, to make it a real union in the coming years. That means a union without opt-ins, opt-outs, rebates, exceptions and, above all, without unanimity rules and veto rights. Only then can we act, and only then will we defend our interests, and only then will we defend our values. It is this lack of effectiveness that is the problem that we have seen in Brexit.

I have to tell you – and that will be my conclusion, Mr President – in the last couple of days, I received – maybe as you – hundreds of mails from British citizens saying they desperately want either to stay or to return. And I have to tell you, for once – normally it's easy for me – but this time I don't know what to respond, because it's not in our capacity to decide that. But that doesn't mean that we don't have a responsibility to make sure that the Union to which they will return will be another Union, effective and more democratic. So – and that's my last sentence as rapporteur, Mr President (thank you for the support): this vote is not an *adieu*; this vote is, in my opinion, only an *au revoir*.

Nikolina Brnjac, *President-in-Office of the Council*. – Mr President, when the honourable Members next meet in this Chamber after this weekend, this will be a different plenary. This will be a different union, with one member less. This is not the choice of the Council, nor the Parliament, but we have to respect it.

The withdrawal of the United Kingdom will open a period of transition: a rather short one, if the United Kingdom's intention remains not to seek its extension before 1 July. Our priority should, therefore, be to rapidly adopt a comprehensive negotiation mandate and start negotiations in order to build a new relationship with the United Kingdom that is as close as possible but balanced in terms of rights and obligations. The short duration of the transition period will, unfortunately, make it more difficult to achieve the widest-ranging outcome by the end of the year. We, therefore, have to remain prepared for all possible scenarios.

It also seems that the current orientations of the United Kingdom Government are adding to this complexity, be it as regards the end of free movement, non-participation in the Single Market or the Customs Union, or the intention to diverge from a regulatory perspective. We have to invest all efforts to avoid the risk of a cliff edge, and to ensure a meaningful outcome of the negotiation this autumn.

Fortunately, and regardless of the outcome, the Withdrawal Agreement will continue to apply, especially its Part 2 on citizens' rights and the various remedies foreseen should the UK not deliver adequately in implementing these provisions. As we debated two weeks ago, having the Withdrawal Agreement in force does not mean that we should rest on our laurels. As noted in your resolution adopted on the occasion, a number of concerns regarding the preservation of citizens' rights have to be addressed. This will call for careful monitoring by the UK side as well as by the Commission of the implementing of the relevant provisions.

Today, your vote will hopefully pave the way for the next stage: negotiating the terms of the future relationship with the UK. A relationship for which the European Council called for a comprehensive mandate, covering trade and economic relations, as well as external and internal security. Likewise, this relationship should be underpinned by strong governance and robust level playing field provisions, given the close economic proximity of the United Kingdom.

Even if the core elements of the future relationship – notably the horizontal provisions on governance and the level playing field – can be agreed by the end of the year, the negotiations are expected to take longer: until all the matters covered by the Political Declaration have been addressed. I therefore welcome the step taken by the Parliament to prepare itself within the adaptation of the Brexit Steering Group in a manner that will allow a closer follow-up of the negotiation process. Parliament's resolution as well as its engagement, notably on citizens' rights, have proved extremely useful during the negotiation process. We count on this engagement to continue during the transition period and later on – and indeed, a large degree of convergence was revealed during the Brexit process between the position of Parliament as developed in your various resolutions and the priorities of the Council.

Whatever happens, good cooperation between all EU institutions must continue. The European Parliament will remain fully informed and involved in accordance with the EU treaties. I do hope that, during the negotiations to come, our common efforts and commonality of purpose will provide the support required by our negotiator and help to achieve an outcome to the benefit of the Union and its citizens.

To conclude, as I said at the beginning of my intervention, this is a special moment. A number of your colleagues, Members of this House, will be leaving. I know it is an emotional occasion for many of you and I would like to associate myself by addressing my gratitude to the UK Members of the European Parliament for their significant contribution to the work of your institution and of the European Union over the years and wish them well for the future. Thank you for your attention.

Ursula von der Leyen, *President of the Commission*. – Mr President, honourable Members, as President of the European Commission, first of all I want to pay tribute to all those British people who contributed so much to almost half a century of British EU membership. I think of all those who helped to build our institutions: people like Commissioner Arthur Cockfield, who was known as the father of our single market, or Roy Jenkins, President of the European Commission, who did so much to pave the way for our single currency. I think of these thousands of European civil servants of British nationality who devoted their lives and their careers to Europe and have done so much to build our Union. They will always stay part of our family. And I think of all those years so many British MEPs have contributed to making this Parliament and the Union strong. You have our gratitude and our respect, even more so for your resilience in the last 3.5 years. We will miss you, but we will always keep up our friendship with you, and you can count on us, as we know that we can count on you.

Honourable Members, in the last plenary session we discussed the issues of citizens' rights. We will also be vigilant on the implementation of the agreement in Northern Ireland. The power-sharing agreement in Northern Ireland gives us hope that the spirit of cooperation will continue to mark relations across the border. Yet the Withdrawal Agreement is only a first step. From now on it's about our new partnership with the United Kingdom. The negotiations are about to start. And just to be very clear: I want the European Union and the United Kingdom to stay good friends and good partners. The story is about old friends and new beginnings, and we have a lot in common. We both believe that climate change needs to be fought as a matter of urgency. There's still scope to address these risks, but the window of opportunity is closing. So let's join forces in protecting our planet.

We both understand that it takes very little power to break a fragile balance and turn it into a full-blown conflict but that the true power lies in putting the pieces back together. And therefore we both believe in the power of development cooperation, and we know that our security is interlinked. And here too we should join forces. For all these and many other reasons, we want to forge a close partnership, but we also know that we have to sort out how to deal with the United Kingdom as a third country. When it comes to trade, we are considering a free trade agreement with zero tariffs and zero quotas. This would be unique; no other free trade agreement offers such an access to our single market. But the precondition is that European and British businesses continue to compete on a level playing field. We will certainly not expose our companies to unfair competition. And it's very clear: the trade-off is simple. The more united the United Kingdom does commit to uphold our standards for social protection and workers' rights, our guarantees for the environment and other standards and rules ensuring fair competition, the closer and better the access to the single market. And let me say that, just days ago, some of the largest business associations in Britain – particularly in the car and aerospace industry – asked their government to retain EU standards and rules. And I think this is in our mutual interest. This is about jobs, it's about common solutions for the world market. And I believe that the United Kingdom and the European Union have a mutual interest in the closest possible partnership.

Honourable Members, no new partnership will bring back the benefits of being part of the same Union, but we have a duty to seek the best for the British and for the European people in a post-Brexit world. On our side, we'll seek the best for industries and farmers across our continent who ask for predictability. We will seek our best for young British and young European students who want to study and who want to live across the Channel. And we'll seek the best for all the researchers and scientists who want to explore the unknown and work for common solutions together in the European Union as well as in the United Kingdom. We will devote all our energy, 24/7, to come to results. And to our British friends, and many – perhaps not all, but many – of our British MEPs here in the room, I want to use the words of the famous British poet George Eliot. She said: only in the agony of parting do we look into the depth of love. We will always love you, and we will never be far. Long live Europe.

Manfred Weber, *on behalf of the PPE Group*. – Mr President, dear colleagues, everybody in this room who feels to be a European knows the story how to achieve this feeling, how to get this feeling: which event, which book, which talk, which person gave us this idea of being a European.

For me it was a trip to Great Britain. I was in England as an 18-year-old boy with Interrail. I stood in a bar. I spoke with an old man, a Guinness in my hand, and we talked about history. He spoke about our fears towards the future, our values. And I understood that we as Europeans have similar fears, hopes; face the same global challenges and stand on the same ground: our European way of life.

Great Britain is now leaving. This week is a sad day for the European Union. Great Britain did so much for prosperity, for peace and democracy in Europe. They will leave us. We cannot change it, but – I have to be clear again – it is a huge mistake. I want to thank also, like my previous speakers, our British colleagues and all the staff members who served in this European Parliament. On Friday you will leave a unique institution and one of the greatest projects in European history: the place of European democracy. And I'll tell you again: we will miss you. Now we have the Leave Treaty on the table: a good agreement which creates certainty. I also want to thank Jean-Claude Juncker, Donald Tusk, Guy Verhofstadt and especially Michel Barnier for their work. Especially our Irish friends got a good understanding of what it means to be part of a big family. The British-Irish history is not an easy one, but it was clear during the last three years: Dublin and Leo Varadkar were strong due to the membership in the European Union. Togetherness makes you stronger: that is the lesson which our Irish friends learned.

And we must keep known the unity. We will focus now on the partnership and friendship with the UK. But one thing is clear: the UK will be a third country. And that means the rules will change. I want to identify two main points on behalf of the EPP. It was the decision of the UK to limit the transition period. We have always shown understanding and flexibility, but we will not allow the EU to be put under pressure and reach a rushed final agreement. We are ready for intensive talks, but in the end, we want to have the best agreement, not the quickest one. And the second thing I want to remind us is: once you're part of a union, you can enjoy the advantages; once you're not part of a union, you're losing the advantages. That has nothing to do with punishment; that is simply the outcome of the decision of the British voters. And let me say it in other words: there will be no cherry picking, No European Singapore next to our markets. We only will grant them access to our market if they respect the European rules. And I also want to add: we defend not only the rules on market base. We tell, for example, Norway and Switzerland that they can only have access to the single market if they respect also the freedom of movement. That's the same for great Britain: we do not allow trucks to cross our borders without control and people to be stopped. That is not the idea of our European Union; there is not a dream you're dreaming.

And dear colleagues, a final word on what also Guy Verhofstadt underlined about the lesson we have to learn out of the Brexit developments. To avoid another Brexit debate in one of our Member States, we need a European Union that is ready to act: results, outcomes, positive contributions to the daily life of our citizens is in the centre of our work, and that's why, again, to the colleagues who will leave us – in my Group it was Julie Girling, it was Richard Ashworth, Richard Corbett, other friends here in the plenary – I tell you, I hope our work in the next years will make Europe so strong, so attractive, that your children and grandchildren will want to be part of the European Union once again. I hope one day they will vote again for this unique institution and will send European members from Britain to the European Parliament. Thank you so much. We will work hard on this.

IN THE CHAIR: MAIREAD McGUINNESS

Vice-President

Philippe Lamberts (Verts/ALE). – Madam President, I know that you manage the time in order to serve us all. I recognise that and you do it very well. It is not every day that a Member State is leaving the European Union; do not tell me that we have to vote at 6.00 p.m. sharp because TVs are waiting for us. This is a historic day, please.

President. – Indeed, I agree absolutely with you. This is an historic day. I am not free here, I am under some direction. I agree with you that we should speak all night if possible, but I will try and manage the debate within our time and I would ask you to respect it.

Iratxe García Pérez, on behalf of the S&D Group. – Madam President, today is a very sad day for Europe. At the end of this week, after 47 years, the United Kingdom will end its historic relationship with the European Union. We are devastated to see the UK go.

Respetamos la decisión del pueblo británico, pero su soberana decisión no es óbice para que denunciemos a los responsables políticos que influyeron en la opinión pública británica a través de una campaña populista y desinformada; la derecha británica acabó devorada en su particular guerra civil por la extrema derecha inglesa y el referéndum del Brexit inauguró la era de las noticias falsas en un contexto de desencanto general de la población después de años de austeridad.

La Unión Europea es mucho más que un mercado y necesitamos seguir adelante. Estamos construyendo un espacio de derechos, de seguridad y de progreso social por el que muchos británicos y británicas —sobre todo los laboristas— se han batido durante décadas, incluso sacrificando su vida, tal y como ocurrió con la diputada laborista asesinada Jo Cox. Por ello, no hay mejor manera de honrar su memoria que trabajar día a día por una Europa que murió defendiendo.

El populismo ha obtenido una victoria con su mejor arma: la mentira. Pero que nadie dude de que se trata de una victoria pírrica y la mejor prueba de ello es el Acuerdo de retirada entre el Reino Unido y la Unión Europea que esta Cámara se dispone a adoptar. Este Acuerdo demuestra que nuestros lazos históricos prevalecerán sobre quienes aspiran a destruirlos.

Por un lado, el Acuerdo de retirada garantiza los derechos de los ciudadanos europeos en el Reino Unido y los derechos de los ciudadanos británicos en la Unión Europea, y por otro, evita el levantamiento de la frontera entre la República de Irlanda e Irlanda del Norte, porque la pertenencia de los dos países a la Unión Europea ha tenido un efecto crucial: convertir la frontera que separa Irlanda del Norte de Irlanda en irrelevante y rebajar la tensión del conflicto.

Otro ejemplo que demuestra la victoria desfavorable obtenida por el populismo británico es la negociación sobre nuestra nueva futura relación. El 1 de febrero, el Reino Unido pasará formalmente a ser un país tercero y perderá todos sus derechos políticos. Pero en todo lo demás nada cambiará hasta que termine el periodo transitorio.

The history of the United Kingdom and that of the European Union is one. We also share our laws and values. If the British people ever decide to come back, our arms will be open. You can always count on the support of the Social Democrats because our common values will always remain.

Nathalie Loiseau, on behalf of the Renew Group. – Madam President, for once, I will make an exception. Today is an exceptional moment and I will speak in English because I want to speak to our British friends. To all of you, I will say that we will miss you. The EU will not be the same without you. My deep feeling is that there is no good Brexit. Although I support the Withdrawal Agreement, I'm still convinced that we are better off together than we will be apart from one another.

To all our Lib Dem colleagues, I want to express my deep friendship, emotion and admiration. They fought for Europe against all odds. They were a tremendous added value to the work of this Parliament and they remain part of the Renew Europe family.

To the British citizens living in the EU, to the European citizens living in the UK, I want to assure you: we won't let you down. This Parliament is the voice of the citizens, and we will make sure that citizens' rights are fully respected.

To the Brexiteers, I could say 'no hard feelings'. You have achieved your objective. You enter a new phase – the most difficult one – and you will have no one to blame for the future of your country, especially not Brussels. You are in charge. But trust me, if some of you think that the next phase is the weakening of the EU, we will prove you dead wrong. We will renew Europe, make it better, make it stronger, learn the lessons from Brexit. Brexit is a sad and exceptional moment and will remain both.

Philippe Lamberts, *on behalf of the Verts/ALE Group*. – Madam President, for some, 31 January will be a happy day. For us Greens and European Free Alliance members, it will be a sad day. It's no secret that each and every one of us fought relentlessly to keep the United Kingdom as part of the European Union: not because we think that whatever the European Union does is the right thing, but because we firmly believe that the only way for Europeans to regain sovereignty – that is, the ability to shape our future – is by sharing it.

As Jean-Claude Juncker once said, there are two sorts of European States: the small ones and those who don't yet realise they are small. But more importantly, we see the European Union as an unprecedented, if fragile, attempt at building a transnational democracy. Such an experiment may come in handy at a time when not just Europe but the entire world is facing challenges beyond the might of any single nation.

Citizens, we fought the battle and we lost. Last December's election provided a result, but not the one we wished. In two days from now, Brexit will happen and, in order for it to be orderly, we will vote for the Withdrawal Agreement. The United Kingdom and the EU remain bound by geography. It is in no-one's interest to have bad relations as neighbours. But more fundamentally, we European decision-makers must realise that, if an increasing number of our fellow citizens have turned their backs against the European project, it's for a reason. It's because many believe that too often, policies adopted at European level have served the interests of the few rather than of the many. And we need to fix this. We need to fix this if we really want to avoid the repetition of Brexit happening. Let us make it our utmost priority that, from now on, our aim will be that all our policies will strive to serve the interests of everyone, starting with the most vulnerable, and do this while respecting the limits that nature imposes on us. The European Green Deal announced by the European Commission is an opportunity to take the right course. Let us seize it. This is the best – and the only – way to win or regain the hearts and minds of the European citizens. Long live the European Union.

Gerolf Annemans, *namens de ID-Fractie*. – Collega's, vandaag nemen wij afscheid van onze vrienden uit het Verenigd Koninkrijk en ik zou erop aan willen dringen om dat afscheid waardig te laten verlopen en vriendschappelijk. Hou dus op, goede collega's, deze dag te betreuren of, zoals sommigen deden, te spreken over een donkere dag in de geschiedenis van Europa. Dat is deze dag dus niet. Het Verenigd Koninkrijk heeft na een grondig en zelfs jarenlang debat over de Europese Unie besloten om gebruik te maken van de Verdragsbepalingen die voorzien dat een lidstaat deze "much too close Union" mag verlaten.

Als hier dan toch iets zou moeten worden betreurd, dan is het enkel het feit dat mensen als ik, critici van de steeds hechtere Unie, die steeds meer federaal gecentraliseerd is, nu zonder de Britse steun achterblijven en dat de EU-fanaten nu ongehinderd tegen de tijdsgeest in, vol gas naar een versnelde integratie kunnen doorstomen. Het is in dat verband dat ik zou willen aanbevelen om het politieke getouwtrek te stoppen en op het niveau van de Commissie en de Britse regering snel en flexibel tot een relatie te komen, niet naar het model van een associatieverdrag, het gaat tenslotte niet om Turkije of Moldavië, maar op basis van een sui-generis model van bevoorrechte vriendschap en volledige vrijheid.

Dat een volk opnieuw terugkeert naar zijn volle autonomie, soevereiniteit, onafhankelijkheid en vrijheid, inspireert mij hier vandaag te zeggen: "Oh what a wonderful afternoon, what a happy day."

Daniel Hannan, *on behalf of the ECR Group*. – Madam President, 'how did we get here?' asked Mr Verhofstadt, opening the debate. There was a referendum in 1975, which went in favour of continued membership. There was no continuity leave campaign after that; people accepted the result with good grace. They did not seek to overturn it. Indeed, Euroscepticism was confined to the fringes of the Bennite left.

What changed, frankly, was the Maastricht Treaty. Up until that moment, it was still possible to see the EU as a club of nations, as an association of states primarily concerned with trade and economics. But after Maastricht it became clear that EU jurisdiction was being extended into a whole series of completely uneconomic fields: foreign policy, culture, migration, citizens' rights etc., etc., and that the aspiration was to have the EU as a quasi-state with a flag and a parliament and a currency and a president and external embassies and all the other accoutrements.

If, at any stage, Britain had been able to have a trade-only association, of course that would have been enough. In fact, even as recently as February 2016, if David Cameron had come back with any repatriation of power, can we doubt that he would have won the ensuing referendum? But, faced with the departure of its second financial contributor, the EU was still not prepared to allow any devolution of power and that, ultimately, is what made a parting of ways inevitable.

So I wish you all the best. I want to return to the kind of vision that Churchill set out when he said, let's have a united Europe with Britain looking on as a friend and sponsor. You are losing a bad tenant but gaining a good neighbour.

Vous allez perdre un mauvais locataire, mais vous allez gagner un bon voisin.

Martin Schirdewan, *on behalf of the GUE/NGL Group*. – Madam President, first of all, I would like to thank the British for their contribution to the European Union over forty years, for good and for ill. But in particular, I want to thank our Irish friend, Martina Anderson, who has fought so hard for the people of the North of Ireland. She has made a lasting difference to this Parliament, to the Brexit agreement. GUE/NGL will miss her voice.

Although Brexit is partly the result of a huge disinformation campaign, I somehow feel that Britain might not be the last Member State to leave the European Union, but the first. If the EU doesn't change its political course, more Member States might follow. By persisting with austerity and by putting corporate interests ahead of our citizens, governments allow big companies to dominate our lives and our politics. That dominance destroys not only our environment but our economy, our jobs, our public services, our streets, our local libraries, our railways, our post offices, our schools, our entire social fabric. So don't be surprised the next time we sit here to lament the departure of another Member State. Britain may be the first, but it may not be the last. Brexit should be the wake-up call that we must finally put people and planet before profit in Europe.

Nigel Farage (NI). – Madam President, so this is it, the final chapter, the end of the road: a 47-year political experiment that the British, frankly, have never been very happy with. My mother and father signed up to a common market, not to a political union, not to flags, anthems, presidents – and now you even want your own army.

For me, it's been 27 years of campaigning and over 20 years here in this Parliament. I'm not particularly happy with the agreement we're being asked to vote on tonight, but Boris has been remarkably bold in the last few months and, Ms von der Leyen, he's made it clear: he's promised us there'll be no level playing field. And, on that basis, I wish him every success in the next round of negotiations, I really do.

But the most significant point is this: what happens at 11p.m. this Friday, 31 January 2020 marks the point of no return. Once we've left we are never coming back, and the rest, frankly, is detail. We're going, we will be gone – and that should be the summit of my own political ambitions. I walked in here – as I've said before, you all thought it was terribly funny, you stopped laughing in 2016 — but my view has changed of Europe since I joined.

In 2005, I saw the Constitution that had been drafted by Giscard and others. I saw it rejected by the French in a referendum. I saw it rejected by the Dutch in a referendum. And I saw you, in these institutions, ignore them, bring it back as the Lisbon Treaty and boast you could ram it through without there being referendums. Well, the Irish did have a vote and did say no and were forced to vote again. You're very good at making people vote again. But what we proved is, the British are too big to bully, thank goodness.

So I became an outright opponent of the entire European project. I want Brexit to start a debate across the rest of Europe. What do we want from Europe? If we want trade, friendship, cooperation, reciprocity, we don't need a European Commission. We don't need a European Court. We don't need these institutions and all of this power. And I can promise you, both in UKIP and indeed in the Brexit party, we love Europe; we just hate the European Union. It's a simple as that.

So I'm hoping this begins the end of this project. It's a bad project. It isn't just undemocratic, it's anti-democratic, and it puts in that front row, it gives people power without accountability – people who cannot be held to account by the electorate. And that is an unacceptable structure.

Indeed, there's an historic battle going on now across the West: in Europe, America and elsewhere. It is globalism against populism. And you may loathe populism, but I'll tell you a funny thing, it's becoming very popular, and it has great benefits: no more financial contributions, no more European Court of Justice, no more common fisheries policy, no more being talked down to, no more being bullied, no more Guy Verhofstadt. I mean, what's not to like?

I know you're going to miss us, I know you want to ban our national flags, but we're going to wave you goodbye and we'll look forward, in the future, to working with you as sovereign...

(The President cut off the speaker)

President. – If you disobey the rules, you get cut off. Could we please remove the flags. Mr Farage, could you remove the flags, please. Could I please ask for quiet. Please sit down. Resume your seats. Put your flags away and take them with you, if you are leaving now. Goodbye.

Can I just say that the word 'hate' was used in the last contribution. I really think, given what we heard before this, that we should not 'hate' anyone, or any people or any nation.

(Applause)

Danuta Maria Hübner (PPE). – Madam President, I must say that the only thing I am absolutely sure I will not miss is listening to Mr Farage. I speak here as EPP representative in the Brexit steering group but also as the former Chair of the Constitutional Affairs Committee who had all those Brexiteers and nearly 500 meetings with all those potentially affected by Brexit.

From the very beginning of the negotiations, the EU side has aimed for an orderly withdrawal based on an agreement. This is the only thing we could do to give legal certainty to the process, and we have achieved this goal. I hope most of us will endorse the consent to the Council Decision on the conclusion of this agreement to avoid a hard Brexit. From the very beginning of this process, we have been also clear that UK withdrawal is not a final destination. Now we should aim at a close comprehensive agreement on the future relationship, preferably in the form of an association agreement embracing both close economic partnership and security cooperation. We know that the UK political choice has been taking back control. So yes, we are aware that, if the UK aims at divergence from European norms and standards, it can put at risk even a bare-bone FTA. That is why a well-tailored agreement on a level playing field will be crucial, Mr Farage. But there is ahead of us, as the European Parliament, also the task to have a watchful eye on the implementation and enforcement of the withdrawal agreement. Of particular importance for us will be the oversight of the implementation of citizens' rights and of the Irish protocol.

To conclude, let me call on the Commission to respect the commitment of its former President to involve the European Parliament in the work of the Joint Committee, and let me reach out to Robert Burns and say: *For auld lang syne*.

Richard Corbett (S&D). – *(inaudible)* ... against this Withdrawal Agreement because it's bad for Britain, it's bad for Europe, and we think it was wrong for Boris Johnson to proceed without putting it back to the British people to a confirmatory referendum. That was like saying to the British public: you had your say three years ago (four years ago now); now you have to shut up and accept whatever I come up with, no matter how bad it is and no matter how different it is from what he promised.

Four years ago, Johnson and his Leave campaign said this would all be easy; it's turned out to be rather difficult. They said it would save lots of money that would all go to the NHS; it's turning out to cost a fortune. They said it would be good for Britain and the economy; the opposite is true. That's why the British public voted 53% in our elections for parties demanding another referendum. Brexit does not have the wholehearted consent of the British people, and that's for very good reasons: it bears no resemblance to what they were promised.

Nor will his promise to 'get Brexit done' on 31 January turn out to be anything like true. That's the beginning of the next phase: negotiations to settle issues which will prove very difficult. Britain has to make difficult choices. Will it want to stay close to the European Union, aligned with the rules, or distance itself? If it distances itself, it has huge economic costs. If it aligns itself, it has to follow the rules without having a say on them anymore. Neither is actually good for Britain.

And that's why public opinion will continue to move against Brexit. That's why I predict that the catchphrase next year in our media and social media will be 'Brexit isn't working'. That's what people will say, and that's why – that, and the fact that it is especially our young people who are strongly against Brexit – this may indeed not be an *adieu*, it may just be an *au revoir*.

President. – Just to say that I did ask colleagues to remove the flags from their desks. Our British colleagues have obliged; they've left the Chamber with their flags. I would ask that other colleagues please do the same. I am bound to apply the rules that the President has set.

(Interruption from the floor)

With due respect, Mr Annemans, it is not an abuse. Could I just say that this is an emotional debate. I'm trying to keep the House in order.

(Further interruption from the floor)

Please don't shout back. You don't have the microphone. I'm not going to give points of order. I am going to say that this is the rule; I've done my best to try and apply it. I am not going to physically remove the flags myself, but I would ask you to respect the speaker. I am doing my job on behalf of this House.

(Applause)

Thank you for your support.

Caroline Voaden (Renew). – Madam President, last July when I came to this Parliament with 15 colleagues we were full of optimism and hope; today our mood is very sombre. In a world that is ever more interconnected, with problems that don't respect national borders, Brexit is a backward step.

Here we have seen democratically elected politicians work together with each other, across party, across groups, across national divides. It is truly inspirational.

Brexit is the result of an ideological divide in an old political party that should have split decades ago, but it won't because of a voting system that is not fit for purpose. The only silver lining in this very dark cloud is that the division caused by Brexit could now be the catalyst for something even bigger: a wholesale reform of our democracy in the UK which will mean that our country can never again be hijacked by a vanity project that has no basis in reality.

We will hold our government to account every step of the way. They have promised us the earth; let's see if they can deliver. We are still Europeans. For now we say, *merci, au revoir*. This is not goodbye.

(Applause)

Jill Evans (Verts/ALE). – Madam President, I took my seat in this House, representing Wales, over twenty years ago. Wales has benefited hugely from EU membership. We also had a lot to contribute. Now, despite my best efforts, Welsh is still not a fully official language. But I will use it now in my final speech in this Parliament.

(A few words in Welsh)

Wales is a European nation. I believe our future is within the EU. We are leaving now, but know this: in our hearts we are still here: *(a few words in Welsh)*. And we will be back *(a few words in Welsh)*.

(Applause)

Jörg Meuthen (ID). – Frau Präsidentin, meine Damen und Herren! Mit dem Vereinigten Königreich verlässt nun eine der wichtigsten Nationen die EU. Endlich haben diese unwürdigen Austrittsverhandlungen ein Ende. Sie, die Repräsentanten dieser nun deutlich verkleinerten EU, haben sich damit selbst ein Armutszertifikat ausgestellt. Es wird sich nun bald zeigen, wie Sie sich mit Ihren düster drohenden Prophezeiungen einer tiefschwarzen Zukunft Großbritanniens geirrt haben. Während Großbritannien jetzt auch wirtschaftlich im wahrsten Sinne des Wortes zu neuen Ufern aufbrechen wird, bedeutet der Brexit für die verbleibenden EU-Staaten tatsächlich sowohl eine ökonomische wie eine politische Verzweigung. Die Briten haben sich demokratisch gegen den EU-Zentralismus entschieden. Verstehen Sie doch endlich: Das ist ein Weckruf, eine Warnung an alle! Will diese EU eine Zukunft haben, muss sie sich dringend grundlegend reformieren. Hören Sie auf, die Freiheit der Bürger und die Souveränität der Nationen weiter mit Füßen zu treten! Schluss mit immer mehr Machtakkumulation hier in Brüssel! An unsere britischen Freunde gerichtet:

We stay friends in freedom, and from now on you will have more freedom than we Remainers have. Brexit will make Britain great again. Good luck, guys.

Geoffrey Van Orden (ECR). – Madam President, may I first of all say a big thank you to colleagues from other nations who've made such generous remarks this afternoon. But I have to say, Britain always sat somewhat uneasily in the European Union. A common market is indeed what many thought they'd joined, rather than a project for political integration.

The advance of the EU juggernaut through Monnet's small steps was sometimes hardly noticed. As national borders were eroded and more policy areas became EU competences, so British disenchantment intensified: not surprisingly, as we hear the answer to every problem is more Europe – and we even hear this from colleagues from the left in the British political setup.

Friday will mark the beginning of a new relationship between Britain and the European Union. The negotiation this year of a free trade agreement and other arrangements should be seen as an opportunity, not a confrontation. It's in the interests of both the EU and the UK for a good agreement, negotiated with goodwill and flexibility, based on precedent, to be concluded in friendship and before the end of the year.

Britain will still be a European power – the leading European power in NATO, committed to the security of the democracies of the European continent, sharing many of the standpoints and aspirations of the nations of Europe, an independent sovereign country with friendly relations with the EU: that's our aim.

Madam President, may I just say, on a personal note: I spent 30 years as a British Army officer and now 20 years representing Britain in this European Parliament. I've enjoyed my work, and I want to say a big thank you to all colleagues here and to the officials and personal staff that I've worked with over the years. Thank you and farewell.

Martina Anderson (GUE/NGL). – A *chairde*, on Friday at 11.00 p.m. this Irish MEP will be kicked out of this Parliament against the democratic wishes of the people of Ireland who voted to remain, and who want to stay in the EU.

After forty-seven years of membership, and after fifty years of fighting against gerrymandering in places like Derry, the British Government is once again kicking our voting rights away – taking them away from us and, once again, is changing the constitutional position of the people of Ireland without our consent. Today I am voting in favour of this Irish protocol because Sinn Féin will not consent to the hardening of the British border partition in Ireland. We will not consent to custom posts. We will not consent to barbed wire. There is no doubt that the Irish protocol in the withdrawal agreement is an ugly compromise, but it's better than a crash-out Brexit.

However, partition and Brexit are ugly impositions that have burdened Ireland for years. Because of partition, Brexit is stripping away our democratic and social rights. But because of Brexit, a dynamic conversation about Irish unity has been invigorated. The EU Council made its contribution to Irish unity when, on the 29th of April 2017, 27 Member States agreed that, if Ireland is reunified, the whole of Ireland is in the EU.

The partition of Ireland is not only a problem for us in Ireland. The 300 mile border, with 320 border crossings, is now your problem too. When Britain gets its empire back, showing it cares nothing about your level playing field, and when shady low-standard products with minimum protection make their way into your market, you will not be long in joining the sensible people in supporting Irish unity. There is no doubt that the day will come when Irish MEPs from the north will be back in the European Parliament. Mark my words: *tíocfaidh an lá sin*.

Mislav Kolakušić (NI). – Poštovana predsjednice, Europska unija je prvenstveno zajednica građana Europske unije. Većina država je ušla u Europsku uniju putem direktnog odlučivanja na referendumima. Građani su se direktno izjašnjivali da žele biti članovi Europske unije. Odgovarali su na vrlo jednostavno pitanje „da” ili „ne”. Sada su građani Ujedinjenog Kraljevstva ponovno odgovorili na vrlo jednostavno pitanje „da” ili „ne”. Kako građani odlučuju? Prvenstveno žele da bi bili članovi neke zajednice da imaju više koristi nego štete, žele da imaju jednakost i poštovanje, žele da imaju ekonomsku korist. Ukoliko građani određenih država vide da drugi građani drugih država imaju veću ekonomsku korist, doći će do ponovnog udaljenja iz Europske unije i mislim da ovo nije posljednje.

Esteban González Pons (PPE). – Madam President, I would like to say to our British colleagues: we have had disagreements, but you have been loyal in the debates. Europe is today a better place because of you. We will never forget that your parents fought on oceans and seas, on the beach and landing grounds, in the fields, in the streets, in the hills, and that they did never surrender. Our freedom lies in their generosity. Our peace lies in their sacrifice. We are blood brothers and sisters, a community of hope. We shall never forget it; you should never forget it. So in this crucial moment of history, let me tell you that it's been the greatest honour to share the last 46 years with you, and that the day will come that we will be reunited again. I don't know when, I don't know how, but, as we learned from your parents, surrender is never an option. Dear colleagues, God bless the United Kingdom. God bless all of us.

Pedro Silva Pereira (S&D). – Madam President, sadly we will have to vote today on the agreement on the withdrawal of the United Kingdom from the European Union, and we will do it for one reason and one reason only: this agreement is needed for damage control. Brexit, even many of those who voted to leave know it by now, will always be damaging: damaging for the European Union, even more damaging for the UK, and most of all, damaging for our capacity to tackle together the common challenges we face. But if Brexit is to happen, it is better to have it in an orderly way, providing for a transition period, avoiding by now a catastrophic no-deal scenario, safeguarding citizens' rights and ensuring an open border between Ireland and Northern Ireland.

But we are not here today only to vote on an agreement; we are here to write history. Unfortunately, the page that is going to be written today is regrettable. I wish to thank our British colleagues with great emotion for their valuable contribution to the European project. Looking ahead, I want to assure them that we will do our best to negotiate a fruitful future relationship with the UK for the benefit of both parties while safeguarding the integrity of the single market, our high environmental and social standards, and citizens' rights.

Finally, let me say that, despite Brexit and this rising movement of nationalism and populism, the European project will prevail, will prevail ensuring peace, will prevail delivering prosperity and defending our common values.

Bill Newton Dunn (Renew). – Madam President, I want to make two points. First of all, the root cause why the UK is leaving is because the leaders of the parties at Westminster, the two big parties, live in a fantasy world. They work in ancient buildings. The buildings were built for an empire, and they still think they're running an empire and are a superpower. Consequently, they have never told the British people the reality that we are a European country and not a superpower, and even our children in the schools are not taught in the curriculum about Europe. So there has been an abject failure by Westminster.

Sadly, in this debate, Farage, who's gone, and Hannan, who I think is still in there, told a complete untruth. This project was never about free trade. It was always about more than free trade and ever-closer Union. Even Mrs Thatcher, in the referendum campaign in 1975, said this is about more than just free trade. So when they talk about free trade only, it's been misleading the British people all the way along. And that's a disgrace.

The last thing I want to say is, I've been privileged enough to have been elected here for the first time in 1979 — a very long time ago — and I still want to see next (it isn't finished) the construction of a European FBI to fight cross-border crime, because our police forces — we have 500 in Europe — none of them can cross borders and pursue the criminals. So colleagues, keep building, keep going on, as Liliana Segre said to us, one foot in front of another.

Gwendoline Delbos-Corfield (Verts/ALE). — Madam President, it is important to remember that the majority of women and young people of the UK voted to stay in the European Union. 75% of 18-24-year-olds voted to keep the United Kingdom in the European Union. More specifically, 80% of women between the ages of 18 and 24 were against Brexit, and there is a reason for that.

The European Union protects women's rights to a great extent. Will the UK, out of Europe, give the same guarantees? The Scots, the northern Irish, the Welsh, by their citizens' votes and also, these last two years, by their national parliaments have continued to express their attachment to the European Union. They now find themselves on the sidelines. The choices of these regional assemblies are not heard, and this is one of the major problems of Brexit. But there is another concern, a very strong one. Great Britain today is a country with a very deregulated economy and a very unequal society. European directives on workers' rights were the last bulwark for the most vulnerable part: women, minorities and young people.

We Greens, regionalists and pirates will pay close attention to the situation of citizens' rights in the aftermath. We are committed to protecting the rights of all Europeans living in Britain and British people living in the rest of Europe.

Antonio Maria Rinaldi (ID). — Signora Presidente, onorevoli colleghi, oggi siamo chiamati a votare non per l'uscita del Regno Unito dall'Europa ma dall'Unione europea e per quel che mi riguarda il Regno Unito fa parte dell'Europa dalla notte dei tempi e ci rimarrà finché la terra girerà intorno al sole.

Il problema è che hanno esercitato un sacrosanto diritto, perché la più grande conquista del genere umano è aver attribuito la sovranità al popolo e il popolo del Regno Unito lo ha perfettamente incarnato questo principio.

Piuttosto, credo che la storia sarà estremamente severa nei confronti di Barnier, che è stato il peggiore, il peggiore, dei negoziatori possibili. Nel 2016 disse: «sarei riuscito nel mio compito se alla fine l'accordo fosse così duro con gli inglesi che preferiranno rimanere nella Unione europea». Spero che un giorno si vergogni e chieda scusa per queste affermazioni. *God save the Queen!*

Geert Bourgeois (ECR). — Voorzitter, mijn gevoelens vandaag zijn gevoelens van tevredenheid dat wij een ordelijke brexit hebben dankzij Michel Barnier. Ten tweede, droefheid omdat onze Britse partners, onze Britse geallieerden, onze Britse vrienden ons verlaten. Ten derde, respect voor de beslissing van het Britse volk.

Maar wie brexit zegt, zegt nadenken over de toekomst van de Europese Unie. In de eerste plaats een goed, diepgaand partnerschap met onze Britse vrienden. We hebben in feite maar acht maanden de tijd en we moeten een andere beweging maken dan bij vorige onderhandelingen. Toen ging het over meer liberalisering. Nu moeten we een vrije markt behouden, moeten we zien dat we zoveel mogelijk interne markt en vrijhandel behouden. Ten tweede moeten we nadenken over de toekomst van de Europese Unie en daar wil ik veel over zeggen, maar wat voor mij voorop staat: na de brexit moet de Europese Unie meer dan ooit een geopolitieke rol op zich nemen.

Matt Carthy (GUE/NGL). — *A Uachtarán*, this Friday, part of our country will be taken out of the European Union against the wishes of the vast majority of people who live there. I'm proud of Sinn Féin's record in this Parliament and elsewhere in working to ensure that the repercussions of Brexit for the north of Ireland, for the border regions and for our entire island have been minimised in this Withdrawal Agreement, but the fact remains that, from this weekend, one part of Ireland will be in the EU while the other part will operate outside. The complications that come with that are yet to be told.

The future trade relationship between Britain and the EU could yet create unprecedented difficulties for the Irish economy and vulnerable sectors, particularly agriculture. So, much work remains to be done and Sinn Féin will be a leading voice in protecting Ireland's interests in the trade negotiations, in calling for mitigation measures from any economic Brexit fallout and for presenting the case for Irish unity as a crucial mechanism to withstand the worst excesses of British Tory policies, which once again have no mandate in any part of Ireland. *Go raibh maith agat, a Uachtarán.*

Seán Kelly (PPE). – Madam President, when somebody leaves after fifty years it is bound to be emotional and sad, and that is the way many of us feel here today. I can understand, like Guy Verhofstadt, that so many British citizens would ask me to vote against the Withdrawal Agreement. My heart says ‘yes’, but my head says ‘no’, because we have to respect the decision of the British people and let them leave with good grace and pay tribute to them, their Prime ministers, their ambassadors and above all their MEPs who played a mammoth role in building up the European Union. Especially for their friendship and support to us Irish MEPs and Ireland generally. They will continue to be our close allies for many years to come.

I am conscious that the young people of the United Kingdom did not want to leave and, for that reason, when their day comes, it is very likely they will decide to come back into the European Union. So instead of saying *slán* or goodbye, I say: *à bientôt, beidh fáilte romhaibh ar ais. Go raibh maith agat, a Uachtarán.*

Domènec Ruiz Devesa (S&D). – Madam President, it is, as has been said, a very sad day for the pro-Europeans, most of the Members of this House. We will be voting in favour of this agreement because there is no choice in order to avoid the worst, which is a no-deal Brexit.

I think it is important also to reply to some of the things that have been said by Mr Hannan and Mr Farage and Mr Van Orden. They said it is the fault of the Maastricht Treaty, that this was never meant to be a political union. I would ask you, have you ever read the Schuman Declaration of 1950, which says that the Coal and Steel Community was the first step forward to a European Federation? Why is it that Clement Attlee and Anthony Eden didn't want to sign up to the Coal and Steel Community or to the Common Market? It was because of the pooling of sovereignty. So you decided to leave, but don't give the wrong answers to the matter at hand. Good luck and see you soon.

Naomi Long (Renew). – Madam President, for me, today is a historic day but one of profound regret at the departure of the United Kingdom from its place of influence within the European Union. I will vote against the Withdrawal Agreement today to record the continued opposition of those whom I represent to this insular, isolationist and reckless course of action. But I want to place on record my thanks to Michel Barnier and his team for all they have done to mitigate that recklessness. The people of Northern Ireland rejected Brexit in 2016, and we are certainly not accepting it now.

(President: Could I just ask: we need to listen to the speakers, and there's a lot of people to my right here who are having a great old chat. There's a restaurant outside: go for a coffee. This is Ms Long's last speech here in the Parliament. Please listen with respect.)

Whilst the UK may withdraw from these institutions, the people of Northern Ireland will never withdraw the hand of friendship, the spirit of cooperation, or the shared determination to secure peace and prosperity for all of our people. As a child of the Northern Ireland conflict, I'm grateful to the European Union, which helped shape our peace and which provides a model for pragmatic win-win politics based not on division but upon diversity. The decisions you make in this place will continue to shape the lives of the people I represent, and I look forward to forging new ways of ensuring that those close and enduring partnerships built between Northern Ireland and this place flourish. Finally, whilst we will no longer be colleagues in these institutions, I remain your steadfast colleague outside of them, as together we continue to champion the values of cooperation, interdependence and mutual respect which the European Union represents, until one day we rejoin you here. *Au revoir, auf Wiedersehen, slán go fóill, good-bye for now.*

Molly Scott Cato (Verts/ALE). – Madam President, in spite of the powerful campaign we've waged for 4 years, with grief and regret I accept that we will leave the European Union on Friday. Oh no, here come the tears. Our future as a country has no clear shape beyond a few slogans, and this means that we have some very important political tasks ahead. As the Brexit losses mount, we must counter the betrayal narrative, where those who promoted the doomed strategy tried to shift the blame for the damage onto the EU and onto those of us who argued against it. We must demonstrate compassion and solidarity with EU citizens living in the UK who feel vulnerable and fearful, and we must revitalise the friendship groups and twinning associations that thrived in the decades before we joined the EU. Now is not the time to campaign to rejoin, but we must keep the dream alive – especially for young people, who are overwhelmingly pro-European. I hold in my heart the knowledge that one day, I will be back in this Chamber celebrating our return to the heart of Europe.

Jaak Madison (ID). – Madam President, what a show tonight, again – for the last time finally. First of all, I will not cry. I will congratulate the British guys. The one thing I would like to mention is that last week the IMF was forecasting that the UK's economy will grow in the next two years after Brexit faster than the eurozone economy. So it means that all those Remainers were lying before Brexit. They were lying that the UK will have a crash in the economy. So they were lying.

The second thing, if they are growing faster than the EU is doing, it means that the EU is doing something very wrong. If we are so successful, why are we so slow and they are so fast?

For the final statement, I really wish great parties and celebrations for Friday night. We will celebrate with you. Have nice drinks.

Anthea McIntyre (ECR). – Madam President, I want to really thank friends and colleagues from across all the political groups for great cooperation over many years. We have certainly not always agreed, but we have all worked for what we believe is in the best interests of the people we represent.

My overwhelming feeling is of a job well done, though not always understood back home. I am proud of all that my colleagues have achieved in here over many years and I want to pay tribute to the British Conservative MEPs who have gone before and contributed enormously to this Parliament and the legacy we leave behind. I want to thank previous speakers for their very generous remarks towards the UK. It is important that we leave on good terms with a climate of friendly cooperation for productive talks on a trade deal ahead. I am not saying it will be easy, but I do think that it is in the best interests of all of us.

Finally, I speak as a very proud daughter of a Scottish soldier who landed on D-Day on the beaches of Normandy. We are all Europeans. We are certainly leaving the European Institutions, but we are not leaving Europe.

David McAllister (PPE). – Madam President, for me, Brexit is and will remain a historic mistake. However, this Withdrawal Agreement provides now for an orderly exit of the UK from our EU by addressing all issues that have been of key importance for us in the European Parliament from the onset of the negotiations. We must now focus on our common future relations. I believe the EU should enter these negotiations from a position of certainty, good will, respect and mutual interest. At the same time, we need to acknowledge that our partnership will remain close, but will no longer be the same. We need to negotiate a truly ambitious and comprehensive new partnership with the UK, but because of the limited timeframe for negotiations, we cannot expect to agree on every single aspect of our new partnership. We will have to prioritise, as Commission President, Ursula von der Leyen, has pointed out.

I would like to thank all members of the Brexit Steering Group for the very good work they have done, and I hope to continue their good work in the UK Coordination Group, which I'm honoured to chair. More than 100 meetings of the Brexit Steering Group is an impressive track record. Let me thank our colleagues, staff and especially Mr Guy Verhofstadt for his excellent work.

Katarina Barley (S&D). – Madam President, on this Holocaust remembrance day I would like to quote a great European, former German Chancellor Helmut Schmidt, who said ‘rather debate a hundred hours in vain than shoot for one minute’. Why do I say that here and now? Because, yes, the European Union is complicated, slow, sometimes non-transparent, but it is the closest we have come to what Schmidt meant.

For me, the European Union is not only about trade and about finances – it is about values and it is about peace. My father is English. He was born in 1935, not far from a Royal Air Force Base and he loved, as a kid, to see the bombers rise into the sky. My mother is German, she was born in 1940 and she fled through the city of Dresden, the day after it was bombed. So the image that the bombers my father cherished almost killed my mother is something that brought me into politics in the first place. It will always be this image that keeps me going and that will keep me being a bridge between these two countries, a ‘*bridge over troubled water*’ at the moment, as Art Garfunkel would say. It is so sad to see you leaving, but you still have friends in this House.

(Applause)

Luisa Porritt (Renew). – Madam President, I will today vote against this deal. I do so on behalf of the millions of British people who voted to remain, including my constituents in London. Brexit is a regressive, reckless, right-wing project. The only people celebrating it outside the UK are those who wish to weaken us all. This decision is harmful for young people, our fellow Europeans living in the UK, and the most vulnerable. Over the last few days we have welcomed young Brits to this Parliament. They don’t want Brexit. They value common endeavours over isolationism. Brexit is now inevitable, but I don’t believe it will be permanent. Young Brits will one day lead the campaign for us to rejoin as committed members, invested in our shared European future. *À bientôt, chers amis.*

(Applause)

Aileen McLeod (Verts/ALE). – Madam President, as a Scottish MEP, I will be voting against the Withdrawal Agreement, as the majority of my country has mandated me to do. The people of Scotland have consistently voted against Brexit, and Scotland’s Parliament has refused to give its consent to this Brexit deal. The tragedy for Scotland is that, on Friday, Scotland will be dragged out of the EU against the democratic wishes of our people. Scotland is a European nation, and I look forward to an independent Scotland re-joining the EU – and we will soon – playing a positive role and promoting Europe’s values, international solidarity and cooperation as an equal partner.

I am proud to have been a Member of this Parliament of Europe’s citizens and I give you my word that Scotland’s Government will continue to protect the interests of all EU citizens who have chosen to make Scotland their home and have contributed to our society in so many important ways. When the moment comes for Scotland to re-join the EU, I hope this Parliament will welcome us in that same spirit of European solidarity. In the meantime, I hope very much that you will leave a light on for Scotland.

(Applause)

Laura Huhtasaari (ID). – Madam President, it’s the final countdown. Next Friday will be a glorious day for the United Kingdom. Brexit is the victory of the common British people against multinational corporations, special interests and other elites. The 2020s is the decade when the nation state makes the ultimate comeback in Europe. The supranational, unaccountable bureaucracy will be rolled back in favour of real democracy at national level. Britain will triumph outside of the EU. The island nation began a shining movement that cannot be stopped. Farewell to the Brexit Party, I love you guys.

Nosheena Mobarik (ECR). – Madam President, respected colleagues, Friday will see the UK leave the EU.

The result of the democratic referendum of 2016 will be honoured. That is as it should be. But I also know that it is the end of an era for myself, for my UK colleagues and for my country. Even those supportive of Brexit know that much has been accomplished through our membership of the EU, and as we look forward to the new opportunities of the future, we should, at the same time, always remember the achievements of the past. As I said recently in my last meeting of the Committee on International Trade, we require much good will and good faith in our negotiations for our future trading relationship, aiming for a successful outcome which will benefit both the UK and the EU, and I have every confidence that good faith exists and that a successful outcome will, indeed, be achieved.

My own view is that this is not the end of the UK's relationship with Europe, but rather the start of a new and enhanced one. The bonds of friendship that bind our countries, all 28 of them, will endure, and, I hope, deepen still further as we work together in future productive partnership.

Esther de Lange (PPE). – Madam President, ‘how did we get here?’ Daniel Hannan asked at the beginning of this debate. I’m afraid, dear colleagues, that he didn’t give you a full answer. So let me try. We got here because so-called leaders who acted out of self-interest rather than out of the common good – Brexit or Remain, Boris didn’t really care, did he? He made up his mind at the last minute and saw a ticket into Downing Street’s No. 10.

This is, secondly, what happens when part of the media gets away with misinformation and blatant lies, when journalism, when the tabloids, become entertainment instead of information, democracy ultimately suffers and this is, thirdly, what happens when people no longer speak up for European cooperation.

We might – 75 years after the end of the Second World War in the West, I need to say – take peace, stability and democracy for granted. But let me tell you one thing: our Union is unique and our cooperation is very, very vulnerable. We need to cherish it, yes, we need to improve it, but we also need to speak out and defend it. Let that be the lesson that we take out of Brexit.

Theresa Griffin (S&D). – Madam President, every day in this House, a member of another delegation says ‘please stay, we want you to remain’. Britain’s withdrawal from the European Union is a political tragedy that will damage the economic well-being and social fabric of the UK and diminish our country’s standing in the world. We are British and European and part of the most successful social peace project in history. For the clean air we want for our children to eradicating energy poverty, to workers’ rights – that’s got to be worth fighting for.

I continue to believe that Britain has been and would be best served by being a member of the European Union. For our young people and future generations, keep the faith that one day we can come back. Thank you. *Merci. Köszönöm. À bientôt.* And to you, Mairead, *go raibh maith agat!*

Sheila Ritchie (Renew). – Madam President, thank you, Mr Barnier, thank you, Guy, thank you to the European Parliament for the way that you have treated us through the negotiation on this Withdrawal Agreement. I’m shocked but, frankly, not surprised that it took your intervention to protect the rights of the EU 27 citizens in Britain and the British citizens in the EU 27 countries. You people here have an opportunity next month to be generous to us again when you consider our status as citizens in your Europe going forward. Please be kind to us again. This shameful document, which I will vote against, is our reality today. I’m going home to fight for a better reality tomorrow.

Jordan Bardella (ID). – Madame la Présidente, nous y voilà donc enfin! Il aura donc fallu quatre ans.

Quatre ans de fausses promesses, de reports, de multiples tentatives de sabotage. Quatre ans pour que l’expression d’un peuple souverain par référendum soit enfin entendue. Les dirigeants de l’Union européenne veulent nous faire croire que la Grande-Bretagne est la grande perdante du Brexit et qu’elle s’apprête à sortir de l’Histoire, elle est au contraire en train d’y entrer en renouant avec les instruments qui fondent la liberté d’une nation. Les théories des peurs ne fonctionneront jamais contre le réel: le FMI l’admet désormais lui-même, l’économie britannique va bien et ses perspectives de croissance sont prometteuses.

Avec le Brexit, c’est un chapitre de l’histoire européenne qui se tourne, celui où l’on a cru, à tort, qu’affaiblir les souverainetés de chacun ferait la puissance de tous. Le vote de ce jour est un message d’espérance que le peuple britannique nous envoie. Il nous invite à refonder une construction européenne à la dérive afin de relever les défis de demain.

Amis britanniques, cette Europe des coopérations, nous allons la construire pour vous donner envie d’en être. Vous quittez l’Union européenne mais vous demeurez d’Europe, bon vent vers la liberté.

Βαγγέλης Μείμαράκης (PPE). – Κυρία Πρόεδρε, είναι αδιαμφισβήτητο ότι η σημερινή ψηφοφορία είναι ιστορικής σημασίας. Κατ' αρχήν, θα ήθελα να δηλώσω απερίφραστα ότι το Ηνωμένο Βασίλειο πρέπει να αποτελεί στενό σύμμαχο της Ευρωπαϊκής Ένωσης και ότι είναι ιδιαίτερα σημαντικό να υπάρξει αμοιβαία επωφελής εμπορική συμφωνία, ιδιαίτερα την ώρα που οι διεθνείς εμπορικοί κανόνες καταπατούνται και ο εμπορικός προστατευτισμός ξανακάνει την εμφάνισή του.

Δυστυχώς, αγαπητοί συνάδελφοι, το Brexit είναι σήμερα γεγονός. Είναι μια μέρα στενόχωρη και ιδιαίτερα φορτισμένη συναισθηματικά. Το κατά πόσο αυτό το γεγονός θα είναι ένα ιστορικό λάθος για το Ηνωμένο Βασίλειο θα κριθεί από τους ιστορικούς του μέλλοντος. Αυτό το οποίο εμείς, ως Ευρωπαϊκή Ένωση, δεν πρέπει να επιτρέψουμε είναι να αποτελέσει ένα ιστορικό λάθος για την Ένωση. Πρέπει να διδαχθούμε από αυτά τα οποία οδήγησαν στο Brexit, να πράξουμε, να ηγηθούμε και να δείξουμε ότι οι αξίες της Ευρώπης είναι αδιαπραγμάτευτες, διαχρονικές και απόλυτα αναγκαίες. Γιατί, όπως είπε σοφά ο Jean Monet, «η Ευρώπη θα σφυρηλατηθεί από κρίσεις και θα είναι το αποτέλεσμα των λύσεων που υιοθετήθηκαν από αυτές τις κρίσεις». Και αυτή η κρίση πρέπει να μετρήσει και να μετρήσει θετικά για την Ευρωπαϊκή Ένωση.

Brando Benifei (S&D). – Signora Presidente, onorevoli colleghi, oggi è un giorno triste per chi come me crede nell'Unione sempre più stretta e nell'Europa federale. Rimane un dato storico e politico che nessun nazionalismo potrà cancellare. La Brexit non potrà cancellare le profonde connessioni tra la società europea e quella britannica, le appartenenze comuni, i valori che condividiamo, i nostri rapporti umani e culturali, prima che economici.

Come socialisti e democratici da domani lavoreremo affinché Unione europea e Regno Unito continuino ad affrontare insieme le grandi questioni del nostro tempo, dalla lotta alle disuguaglianze al cambiamento climatico.

Ai colleghi che oggi ci lasciano voglio dire grazie a tutti voi per lo straordinario lavoro fatto insieme e ai compagni del Partito laburista dico grazie, grazie per aver lavorato insieme a noi per il pane e per le rose (*for bread and roses*). So che è solo un arrivederci. È il nostro destino continuare a camminare insieme.

Judith Bunting (Renew). – Madam President, I can't quite believe this is happening. However, I love the UK, and I will do everything I can to make sure that our future, whatever it is, is bright and successful. However, this is a bad deal for Britain and the fault for that lies at the feet of the British Government. The deal takes Britain outside of the customs union and the single market, something certain leading leavers said need never happen. In it, Boris Johnson has weakened support for workers' rights, and he did that after he put the deal to the British people. It has more red tape, more delays, more barriers to Brits who want to work and do business with the EU, which is our largest trading partner, and it removes opportunities for young people in Britain. I thank all of my colleagues here for your lovely, kind words today. We will miss you. I thank Guy Verhofstadt and Michel Barnier and this Brexit Steering Group for the huge amount of work that they all put into this deal, but I will not be blackmailed by Boris Johnson into supporting a deal that is fundamentally bad for Britain.

Siegfried Mureșan (PPE). – Madam President, today marks the end of populism in the debate regarding Brexit. Starting tomorrow, we need to start to work on our future relationship and that needs to be based on reasoning and on facts. We have to recognise reality: European students want to continue to study in UK universities and British students want to continue to study in European universities. European and British researchers want to continue to work together and businesses on both sides of the Channel want to continue to invest on the other side.

We also have to recognise that the number of British citizens demanding EU citizenship has increased every year after the referendum. So we need to work on a good future relationship and we need to recognise that a close relationship is a good relationship.

Nevertheless, of course, we also know that the European Union and the United Kingdom will not be married any more, starting on 1 February, but we want to be friends. The people of the United Kingdom should know that, here in the European Parliament, there is a majority of Members who want to be friends of the British people.

Martin Horwood (Renew). – Madam President, I'm voting against this agreement because it's a bad deal for Britain and I, for one, will 'not go gently into that good night'. But before that vote I'd like to say thank you to all parliamentary colleagues, to Dacian Cioloș and friends in the Renew Europe Group whom I have been proud to serve as a vice-president, and thank you to the EU for all the support given to my region and my country over decades, in education, science and medicine, in shared prosperity, opportunity and support for business, in protection of the environment and workers' rights and by preserving Europe's peace – and let me tell you that my parents survived the war we remembered earlier and they knew exactly what they were voting for in 1975.

One special thank you to our translators, who have had to help the Brits rather more than most, and I apologise to them that I am now going to try and speak in more than one language to deliver one last message, as much on behalf of my children as myself: *Wir werden wieder kommen. Ne vom intoarce. We komen terug. Nous reviendrons. Volveremos. Beimid ar ais. Vi kommer tillbaka. Retornaremos. We will be back.*

François-Xavier Bellamy (PPE). – Madame la présidente, chers collègues, avant tout, nous voudrions dire nos remerciements à tous nos collègues britanniques pour leur contribution au travail effectué ici, notre respect pour le grand peuple qu'ils représentent et notre gratitude à l'égard de ce peuple auquel nous devons, au regard de notre histoire, notre liberté, celle qu'ils nous ont acquise au prix de leur sang.

Nous devons évidemment poursuivre maintenant cette histoire et nous faisons confiance à Michel Barnier pour préparer notre relation future. Nous devons construire ensemble le partenariat sur les questions de sécurité, d'économie, d'écologie – et je voudrais mentionner en particulier la question de la pêche, qui nous tient tellement à cœur. Nous avons tant à partager, il faut que cette amitié se poursuive maintenant.

Mes chers collègues, ne nous voilons pas la face. Le Brexit est aussi un message d'alerte. La défiance qui s'est exprimée à l'occasion de ce référendum doit être pour nous un avertissement. Nous ne résoudrons pas les problèmes de l'Europe en méprisant cette défiance ou en la condamnant. Nous ne résoudrons ce problème qu'en reconstruisant une Europe qui puisse susciter la confiance des citoyens de nos pays, en faisant la preuve de son efficacité et en montrant qu'elle peut renforcer nos démocraties et servir nos libertés.

PRESIDENZA DELL'ON. DAVID MARIA SASSOLI

Presidente

Michel Barnier, *chef de la task-force pour les relations avec le Royaume-Uni* – Monsieur le Président, je suis très touché, pour vous dire la vérité, au terme de ce débat qui a été très émouvant à quelques moments particuliers, grave, qui est important, aux côtés de la présidente Ursula von der Leyen, de vous dire quelques mots pour conclure.

Le Royaume-Uni, à la suite d'un référendum où s'est exprimée démocratiquement une majorité de citoyens, a choisi de quitter l'Union. Nous avons, pour beaucoup d'entre nous, regretté et nous continuerons de regretter ce vote, mais nous l'avons respecté et donc la tâche qui nous a été confiée à la Commission par les gouvernements, par vous, a été de travailler pour organiser ce retrait. Si le traité qui vous est soumis a une qualité, mesdames et messieurs – je reprendrai le mot de Guy Verhofstadt –, c'est d'organiser le retrait du Royaume-Uni de manière ordonnée. Le Brexit, bien plus et bien davantage que tous ceux qui l'ont voulu nous l'ont expliqué ou compris, a des conséquences innombrables – je n'ai cessé de vous le dire – sur le plan humain et social, sur le plan technique et juridique, sur le plan financier et économique, et ce n'est pas fini. Ce que nous avons essayé de faire dans ce traité, objectivement, avec patience et avec respect, a été d'apporter des réponses ou des assurances juridiques pour toutes celles et tous ceux et pour tous les secteurs où le Brexit, comme un divorce, crée des incertitudes innombrables. D'abord, les citoyens et leurs droits ont été depuis le début de cette négociation votre priorité. Nous avons travaillé pour ce traité dans cet esprit: un retrait ordonné. Et nous avons beaucoup travaillé: une centaine de réunions du *Brexit steering group* (groupe de pilotage sur le Brexit), 17 séances plénières et puis j'ai eu l'honneur de rendre compte devant la plupart de vos groupes à plusieurs reprises. En ce moment, je voudrais dire un mot particulier à Guy Verhofstadt pour l'intelligence et l'objectivité avec lesquelles il a dirigé pendant trois ans les travaux du *Brexit steering group*, à chacune et chacun des membres de ce groupe et à tous ceux qui ont travaillé pour ce groupe, notamment le secrétariat général du Parlement et vos collaborateurs. Vous me permettrez de vous dire que nous allons continuer, dans l'année qui vient, dans le même esprit, avec le même respect, avec la même objectivité, sans aucune agressivité, mais en défendant fermement les intérêts de l'Union et de ses États membres, sur la ligne et selon les principes rappelés tout à l'heure par notre présidente Ursula von der Leyen pour la future relation. En ayant toujours la perspective – j'ai toujours travaillé avec cette perspective – qu'au-delà du Brexit, le Royaume-Uni reste là. Partenaire proche sur le plan de l'économie, allié comme il l'a toujours été et ami. Nous allons donc travailler pour recréer un nouveau cadre juridique pour cette alliance entre l'Union européenne et le Royaume-Uni, pour consolider cette amitié et faire fonctionner ce partenariat.

Nous aurons une deuxième tâche, mesdames et messieurs les députés, Monsieur le Président, qui n'est pas négligeable et qu'il ne faut pas oublier: c'est de mettre en œuvre cet accord dans toutes ses dimensions et ce sera notre travail cette année pour qu'il soit opérationnel à la fin de l'année. Je pense aux droits des citoyens et je pense aussi précisément à l'Irlande et à l'Irlande du Nord, où la paix reste très fragile.

Vous me permettez à mon tour, comme l'a fait notre présidente, de saluer l'ensemble des députés britanniques et toutes celles et tous ceux qui, d'une manière ou d'une autre ont travaillé depuis 47 ans à la construction de ce projet européen. Personnellement, j'ai le souvenir de plusieurs d'entre vous et de plusieurs élus. Je pense à Andrew Duff et Richard Corbett durant les travaux de la convention. Je pense aussi, aux deux moments où j'ai eu l'honneur d'être commissaire européen au marché intérieur et avant à la politique régionale, à Malcom Harbour, à Vicky Ford, à Sharon Bowles et à tant et tant d'entre vous dans la diversité des groupes que vous représentez, avec lesquels j'ai eu toujours des discussions fructueuses, importantes et utiles. Je voulais vous remercier, à titre personnel.

Vous me permettez juste de conclure par trois brefs messages. Le premier est que tout au long de cette négociation et dans l'année qui vient, notre tâche a été et va être de traiter les conséquences du Brexit, mais je recommande, comme plusieurs d'entre vous l'ont dit avec beaucoup de force, que dans notre responsabilité politique – et je reste un homme politique – nous prenions du temps pour écouter le sentiment populaire qui s'est exprimé à l'occasion du Brexit, qui s'exprime aussi dans beaucoup de nos régions: que nous prenions du temps pour tirer les leçons du Brexit.

Le deuxième point s'appuie sur une conférence qu'a donnée un jour un homme que j'aime bien, que je respecte, qui était mon collègue à la Commission européenne, conservateur et britannique, Chris Patten. Un jour, à Dublin, il a fait une conférence qu'il a conclue par cette question: la défense de l'intérêt national peut-elle être uniquement nationale? La défense de l'intérêt national peut-elle être seulement, uniquement, nationale. On pourrait poser la question d'une autre manière: ne faut-il pas être européen en plus d'être patriote? Je dis bien: en plus, pas à la place d'être patriote. Moi, j'ai la conviction que l'on peut, que l'on doit être patriote – je le suis passionnément – et en même temps européen, et que cette dimension européenne donne davantage de force à notre patriotisme national.

(Applaudissements)

Mr President, let me finish with a short message I passed on in Belfast on Monday at Queen's University: in this new beginning, I would really and sincerely like to wish the UK well.

(Applause)

Nikolina Brnjac, *President-in-Office of the Council*. – Mr President, with your vote tonight and adoption by the Council tomorrow of its decision to conclude the Withdrawal Agreement we will soon be able to move to another, more positive step in the Brexit process. The scope of the Withdrawal Agreement as well as the ambitions on the future relations with the UK imply that we will have to remain vigilant as regards, first and foremost, the preservation of citizens' rights, be it during the transition period or under whatever future relationship with the United Kingdom. But our vigilance will have to be no less thorough when considering the intended economic partnership where strong safeguards and robust governance will be called for to protect the integrity of the EU's single market and the competitive position of EU firms. We will therefore count on your cooperation in this respect as well.

Although we are sincerely sad to see a Member State leaving, the European Union and the United Kingdom share a long history together, and this should truly be a new starting point for the building of a closer relationship in the future, based on mutual respect and equality.

Presidente. – La discussione è chiusa.

Procediamo ora alla votazione su questo punto. Vi informo che le dichiarazioni di voto saranno prese in considerazione domani dopo le votazioni.

Dichiarazioni scritte (articolo 171)

Andrus Ansip (Renew), *kirjalikult.* – Ühendkuningriigi lahkumine EList ei ole kindlasti rõõmus sündmus, kuid ma austan nende rahva tahtet. Pean oluliseks Ühendkuningriigi korra kohast lahkumist ega pea õigeks leppeta lahkumist, mis tooks kaasa suurema segaduse. On Euroopa Liidu 27 liikmesriigi ja Ühendkuningriigi elanike huvides, et suhted ELi ja Ühendkuningriigi vahel oleksid head ka pärast lahkumist.

Carmen Avram (S&D), *în scris.* – Ieșirea Marii Britanii din Uniunea Europeană va aduce schimbări radicale, multe la care, probabil, nici măcar nu ne așteptăm. Singurele pe care nu ni le putem permite sub nicio formă sunt cele referitoare la respectarea drepturilor celor trei milioane de cetățeni europeni care se află acum pe teritoriul Regatului Unit.

Comunitatea cu cea mai mare migrație din ultimii doi ani a fost cea românească, ajunsă astăzi la peste 400 000 de cetățeni, prima ca pondere în Londra, și a doua la nivel național, după polonezi. Comisia trebuie să se asigure că acești oameni nu vor suferi discriminări în procesul de selectare a angajaților, că nu vor fi refuzate împrumuturile guvernamentale acordate azi studenților, că nu le vor fi majorate taxele în universități și că nu li se va îngrădi dreptul de a lucra în Marea Britanie după absolvire.

În ultimele decenii, comunitatea provenită din restul Uniunii a contribuit masiv la dezvoltarea Marii Britanii, inclusiv la bugetul țării. Pentru toți acești oameni, anularea acestor drepturi ar fi o nedreptate, iar pentru Marea Britanie, o pierdere atât umană, cât și economică.

Cristian-Silviu Bușoi (PPE), *in writing.* – I would first express my regret for the departure of our British colleagues, with whom we achieved important results for both European and British citizens, reflected in more than 47 years of common economic development. In my capacity as Chair of the Committee on Industry, Research and Energy of the European Parliament, I stress the importance to foster dialogue and establish new comprehensive agreements regarding UK's participation in Union programmes in areas of common interest, such as research, defence and space. Future collaboration in energy sector will be key for the United Kingdom to ensure that exit from the EU doesn't disrupt its electricity market and does not slow down its de-carbonisation commitment by 2050. Future relations should include as well a wide-ranging nuclear cooperation agreement on the use of nuclear energy, underpinned by commitments to existing high standards of nuclear safety. I am looking forward to establishing a strong post-Brexit collaboration by the end of 2020, as I consider that both the European Union and the United Kingdom can achieve more together than apart.

João Ferreira (GUE/NGL), *por escrito.* – A saída do Reino Unido da União Europeia concretiza a vontade expressa pelo povo britânico, através de um referendo, e representa uma derrota de todos aqueles que, nos últimos anos, por meios diversos, tentaram contrariar esta decisão. Esta saída corresponde a um acontecimento histórico, de um enorme significado político.

O processo de integração – que não é uma integração qualquer, não é uma integração neutra, é uma integração capitalista – não é irreversível, não é inevitável e não conhece apenas um sentido. Muito se disse já sobre as motivações que ditaram este desfecho. Certamente que para ele terão contribuído motivações e sentimentos diversos, até contraditórios. Mas será seguro afirmar que, mesmo com motivações contraditórias, esta saída resulta de um inequívoco desejo de rutura, que sucede a uma profunda insatisfação. Insatisfação que é inseparável das consequências sociais e económicas das políticas da União Europeia. Insatisfação que é inseparável do sentimento de que os povos foram espoliados de instrumentos essenciais para determinar os seus destinos. Ora, a este sentimento, sobreveio a vontade de recuperar o controlo sobre decisões fundamentais que afetam esses destinos. A soberania não se perde, não se ganha. A soberania exerce-se. Esta é outra das lições que podemos retirar deste processo – algo que alguns tudo fazem para esconder.

Εμμανουήλ Φράγκος (ECR), *γραπτώς*. – Οι πολίτες του Ηνωμένου Βασιλείου προτίμησαν και ψήφισαν το Brexit, διότι η Ευρωπαϊκή Ένωση φάνηκε αδύναμη μπροστά στις σύγχρονες προκλήσεις. Συγκεκριμένα, έχει χαθεί πλήρως ο έλεγχος των μεταναστευτικών ροών προς την ΕΕ και η κοινότητα αδυνατεί έως και σήμερα να λάβει μέτρα για την προστασία των συνόρων και της ομοιογένειας της. Πιστεύουμε ότι η γερμανική ηγεμονία της Ένωσης και η βλαπτική πολιτική που ακολούθησε εις βάρος των πιο αδύναμων κρατών μελών (με χαρακτηριστική περίπτωση αυτήν την Ελλάδα) και προς όφελος της οικονομίας των πιο ισχυρών ήταν ένας ακόμη βασικός λόγος του Brexit. Είναι σημαντικό να ληφθεί μέριμνα στο μέλλον για την εξάλειψη αυτών των εγγενών αδυναμιών της Ένωσης, πριν οδηγηθούν και άλλα κράτη μέλη σε απόφαση εξόδου. Είναι σημαντικό, επίσης, να οικοδομηθεί μια στενή οικονομική, πολιτική και εμπορική συνεργασία της ΕΕ με το Ηνωμένο Βασίλειο προς όφελος των πολιτών του Ηνωμένου Βασιλείου και προς όφελος όλων των Ευρωπαίων πολιτών.

Agnes Jongerius (S&D), *in writing*. – The fact that the UK is no longer member of the EU does not mean that all of a sudden it does not need better protection for its platform workers anymore or an increase of the minimum wage. Quite the opposite! As a social democrat I realise that unity makes strength. Only together we can take on big platforms and asocial multinationals. By exchanging information, ideas, know-how and eventually proper regulation, we will still be able to help each other, with the EU connecting us. We have a common interest that the UK will not turn into a second Singapore on Thames. I am sure that the relationships that were built in the European Parliament will remain close, long after the Brexit. Our shared values will continue to bring us together.

Ondřej Kovařík (Renew), *in writing*. – Friday, 31 January 2020 is not a happy date in the history of European integration, but it is good that we can put the difficult negotiations on the withdrawal agreement behind us and start focusing on the most important task: negotiating our future relationship with United Kingdom. The countdown starts Friday midnight. Time is tight and the number of issues and challenges to deal with are enormous. Let's keep in mind that the UK is leaving the European Union, but not Europe. We will still remain partners, allies and most of all, friends, although the institutional set-up will change. We will still share the same values, the same economic interests such as free trade, the same security concerns and the same responsibilities to be strong global actors promoting peace and stability in our neighbourhood and in the world. In the negotiations, let's be ambitious and pragmatic, let's talk frankly and openly, but let's always remain constructive and flexible. This is the only way to build a solid foundation for our future relationship which should be nothing less than a true strategic partnership.

Eva Maydell (PPE), *in writing*. – The UK is leaving the EU today but we should aim to start real partnership with our former allies. For the next 11 months we need put our efforts to achieve single comprehensive partnership agreement with the UK. It should be based on mutual trust, respecting of interest and a general level playing field. In the process of negotiations the EU should insist on real safeguards for the rights of its citizens after the end of the transition period. Secondly, the EU should not compromise with its standards if the UK does not wish to alight to but insists on access to the European market. Thirdly, the EU should not tolerate any attempts for separate bilateral negotiations between the UK and the Member States, as this will ruin our unity.

The EU on the other hand should seek deeper partnership with the EU in specific sectors like defence, protection and exchange of data, external security. This should ensure that the UK remains a valuable partner in support of the global security.

Peter Pollák (PPE), *písomne*. – Nie som nadšencom odchodu Británie z Európskej únie. To, že dnes musíme hlasovať o dohode o odchode Británie z EÚ, je pre mňa sklamaním. Verím však, že to nie je koniec vzájomných vzťahov. Stále máme veľa toho, čo nás spája. Dnes je dôležité zintenzívniť prácu na oboch stranách, aby sa dohoda presadzovala a reálne uplatňovala. Som presvedčený, že ľudia vo Veľkej Británii nemali objektívne informácie pri referende, kde sa rozhodli odísť. Hlasovanie v Europarlamente však nebolo o odchode, nebolo to o tom, či ja chcem, aby Británia odišla. Bolo o dohode, či odíde Británia k 31. januáru riadnym a náležitým spôsobom.

Bronis Ropé (Verts/ALE), raštu. – Jungtinė Karalystė nuo sausio 31-osios nakties oficialiai nebebus Europos Sąjungos narė. Bet tai tik proceso pradžia, pereinamasis išstojimo laikotarpis truks apie metus. Šiandien turime eiti pirmyn. Nors ir netikiu, kad būdami atskirai esame stipresni, turime vykdyti žmonių valią. Sutarties nebuvimas sukeltų dar didesnę chaosą. Šis „išsiskyrimas“ yra liūdnas abiem pusėms. Daug daugiau temų mus jungia nei skiria. Jungtinė Karalystė niekur nedingsta, turėsime sukurti naujus tarpusavio santykius, naujus būdus bendradarbiauti. Pirmiausia užduotis – užtikrinti ES piliečių, gyvenančių ir dirbančių D. Britanijoje, teises. Taip pat – britų teises Europos Sąjungoje. O šiandien tariau savo kolegoms iki greito pasimatymo, tikėdamas, kad vieną dieną jie vėl dirbs Europos Parlamente drauge.

Michaela Šojdrová (PPE), in writing. – This is the last time I can speak to my UK colleagues who will no longer be EU citizens this Saturday. According to my opinion and that of my voters, the United Kingdom has always been for us a great symbol of freedom and parliamentary democracy, a symbol of excellent business, education, culture and science. I would like to assure you, my dear British and Northern Irish friends, that in the EU, you'll always find plenty of helping hands. Brexit will not change it. I hope you manage to transform your 'new independence from the EU' into something new positive. Because independence of country is not possible without cooperation with others, especially in today's highly interconnected, globalised world. When you will wake up on 1 February, the world will be equally unsafe and dangerous as it is today. That's why I believe that we will have to negotiate a good agreement for the benefit of both UK and EU citizens. And what is most important, that we will always jointly protect the security and peace in Europe, both insular and continental.

Romana Tomc (PPE), pismo. – Velika Britanija zapušča EU. Posledice izstopa bomo čutili na obeh straneh, zmagovalca ni.

Na obeh straneh se bomo morali prilagodili spremenjenim razmeram, sklenili bomo nove sporazume in se naučili živeti skupaj v novih razmerah in z novimi pravili. Zaprli smo eno poglavje, uredili pogoje za urejen izstop, v nadaljevanju pa nas čaka naporna naloga. Naše sodelovanje na gospodarskem in drugih področjih je močno prepleteno. Veliko ljudi iz držav članic EU je zaposlenih v Veliki Britaniji in veliko Britancev dela v EU. To bomo morali rešiti na čim bolj pravičen način. Nič več ne bo tako kot je bilo, ne pravice ne obveznosti.

Vendar se lahko dogovorimo za pravila sodelovanja, ki bodo v korist obeh strani, predvsem pa ljudi in podjetij, ki jih bo Brexit najbolj prizadel.

Henna Virkkunen (PPE), kirjallinen. – Arvoisa puhemies, Iso-Britannia jättää pian Euroopan unionin. Olen iloinen, että sopimukseton ero vältetään, mutta surullinen siitä, että britit päättivät lähteä.

Kun jälkikäteen katsoo historiaan, voi helposti sanoa brexitin olleen tekeillä jo pitkään. Viimeinen pisara oli brittikonservatiivien antautuminen EU-vastaisten paineelle ja lupaus kansanäänestyksestä. Se oli historiallinen virhe. Mielestäni on rehellistä sanoa suoraan, että kansanäänestyksen tulos perustui pitkälti puutteelliselle tiedolle sekä täysin katteettomille lupauksille, joita niiden antajien on äärimmäisen vaikea toteuttaa. Brexit on surullinen esimerkki siitä, mihin populismi voi johtaa.

EU:n ja Britannian katseet on nyt välittömästi suunnattava uusiin neuvotteluihin, joissa määritetään unionin ja Britannian tuleva suhde. Neuvottelujen aikataulu on äärettömän tiukka. On kuitenkin haettava sopimusta, joka takaa EU:n ja Britannian välille tiiviin suhteen ja tuo mahdollisimman vähän esteitä. Ihmisten mahdollisuus hakeutua jatkossakin työhön ja opintoihin, samoin kuin yritysten sujuva kaupankäynti, eli tavaroiden ja palveluiden liikkuminen yli rajojen, ovat aivan keskeisimmät kysymykset. Suuri merkitys on myös sillä, minkälaiseksi EU:n ja Britannian suhde muodostuu ulko- ja turvallisuuspoliittisesta näkökulmasta. Britannia on Euroopan suurin sotilasmahti.

Britannian EU-ero on monelle – myös itselleni – tunteellinen hetki. Myöhemmin tunteilulle jää melko vähän tilaa. Ratkaistavia kysymyksiä on monia ja työtä edessä paljon.

17. Głosowanie

Presidente. – L'ordine del giorno reca il turno di votazioni.

(Per i risultati delle votazioni e altri dettagli che le riguardano: vedasi processo verbale)

17.1. Umowa o wystąpieniu Zjednoczonego Królestwa Wielkiej Brytanii i Irlandii Północnej z Unii Europejskiej i Europejskiej Wspólnoty Energii Atomowej (A9-0004/2020 - Guy Verhofstadt) (głosowanie)

Presidente. – Onorevoli colleghe e colleghi, il Parlamento ha ormai votato e ha dato la propria approvazione a larga maggioranza al recesso del Regno Unito dall'Unione europea. Ora spetta al Consiglio, nella giornata di domani, concedere la sua approvazione finale, in modo da concludere le formalità necessarie affinché il Regno Unito possa lasciare l'Unione europea alla mezzanotte, ora di Bruxelles, del 31 gennaio.

Desidero cogliere questa opportunità, prima di firmare l'atto ufficiale, per condividere con voi alcune osservazioni.

Naturalmente siamo tutti rattristati profondamente dal pensare di essere arrivati a questo punto e che un membro partner e amico di lunga data dell'Unione europea abbia deciso di lasciare la famiglia dell'Unione. Ricordo ancora la sensazione di sconcerto che tutti abbiamo avuto quando, nel giugno del 2016, si diffuse la notizia della decisione del Regno Unito di lasciare l'Unione europea. Ovviamente abbiamo sempre rispettato pienamente la decisione del popolo del Regno Unito e la sua volontà di costruire un futuro diverso al di fuori dell'Unione europea.

A nome del Parlamento desidero esprimere ai colleghi che oggi ci lasceranno – sarà l'ultima plenaria – la nostra gratitudine e i più profondi sentimenti di gratitudine per il contributo che hanno offerto nel corso degli anni. La vostra presenza, amici britannici, ha arricchito la nostra Istituzione ed è certo che sentiremo la vostra mancanza. Perdiamo tutti colleghi e alleati con i quali intratteniamo strette relazioni e con i quali abbiamo lavorato fianco a fianco in questi anni qui al Parlamento europeo.

Cinquant'anni di integrazione non possono dissolversi facilmente. Dovremo impegnarci ora tutti per costruire nuove relazioni, mettendo sempre al centro gli interessi e la protezione dei diritti dei cittadini e sappiamo che ci saranno anche momenti difficili. Sono sicuro però che sapremo superare qualsiasi divergenza e trovare sempre un punto d'incontro. Lasciate l'Unione europea, ma continuerete naturalmente a far parte dell'Europa per i valori che ci tengono insieme e che ci uniscono profondamente.

Cari amici britannici, naturalmente dirsi addio è troppo impegnativo e definitivo. È per questo che insieme a tutti i colleghi dico soltanto arrivederci. E voglio salutarvi con le parole che diceva Jo Cox, la deputata britannica uccisa durante una campagna elettorale: «abbiamo molto di più in comune di quanto ci divide». Grazie.

Adesso firmerò la lettera che trasmette al Consiglio l'approvazione del Parlamento della conclusione dell'accordo sul recesso del Regno Unito di Gran Bretagna e Irlanda del Nord dall'Unione europea.

Grazie per la vostra collaborazione.

(I deputati, in piedi, cantano «Auld Lang Syne»)

18. Wyjaśnienia dotyczące sposobu głosowania: Patrz protokół

19. Korekty do głosowania i zamiar głosowania: Patrz protokół

(La seduta è sospesa alle 18.43)

VORSITZ: RAINER WIELAND

Vizepräsident

20. Wznowienie posiedzenia

(Die Sitzung wird um 18.45 Uhr wieder aufgenommen.)

21. Ognisko epidemiczne koronawirusa (debata)

Der Präsident. – Als nächster Punkt der Tagesordnung folgt die Aussprache über die Erklärungen des Rates und der Kommission zum Ausbruch des Coronavirus (2020/2511(RSP)).

Ich möchte Sie daran erinnern, dass Sie spontane Wortmeldungen und Wortmeldungen nach dem Verfahren der blauen Karte sowohl auf die herkömmliche Weise als auch elektronisch beantragen können. Die Anleitung finden Sie am Eingang zum Plenarsaal.

Nikolina Brnjac, *President-in-Office of the Council.* – Mr President, honourable Members, I wish to start by thanking you for inviting me to update you on the potentially very serious threat to public health that could result from the ongoing outbreak of acute respiratory syndrome in the Chinese city of Wuhan. It is caused by a novel coronavirus and there are already thousands of cases and more than 100 people have died. This is a place where hundreds of EU citizens live and work and I will come back to that later but let me first give a few details about the outbreak of this disease.

The Presidency takes this issue very seriously. We monitor the situation in close cooperation with Member States, authorities, EU institutions, bodies and agencies and with international organisations such as the World Health Organisation. The first cases were reported on 31 December 2019. Already on 9 January, the Chinese authorities reported that the outbreak was caused by the novel coronavirus. It is genetically closely related to the virus that caused more than 8 000 cases of severe acute respiratory syndrome, better known as SARS.

First, I'd like to state that available data about the virus transmissibility and fatality rates should be treated with caution as the situation is still evolving. What we know is that the virus causes a potentially very dangerous illness, as the mortality rate of the 2019 virus seems to be lower than the SARS, but it is still very high: about 3 percentage of the cases, varying with age, and the incubation period during which any infected persons can infect others seems to be longer. It is, therefore, potentially a serious threat.

As I speak, over 6 000 cases of coronavirus infections have been confirmed in China and Southeast Asia and regrettably 132 persons have died. So far, to the best of our knowledge, No EU citizen currently in China has been infected but some isolated cases have been reported in Europe.

In the beginning, victims seemed to have been infected by animals, but in recent days first the Chinese and then the German authorities have confirmed human-to-human transmission of the virus. This increases the potential of the virus to infect a large number of people. As you know, the Commission has the possibility and duty to assist Member States, in particular, in cases of cross-border health threats and Member States' competent authorities follow the developments very closely.

The Health Security Committee, which deals with serious cross-border threats to health and which involves all Member States and the Commission, has already met three times to exchange information about the outbreak and will of course be involved in the further coordination of the response to this health threat.

As you know, we also have a specialised European Agency active in this field: the European Centre for Disease Prevention and Control. It now provides, on an almost daily basis, updates about the situation. I dare, therefore, say that, as regards the threat to public health in Europe we have sufficient expertise available to handle the situation. Furthermore, Member States' authorities are very vigilant to further developments and, as long as there is adherence to appropriate prevention and control practices, there is a low likelihood that secondary cases will occur in the European Union. If, however, a person infected outside Europe would be discovered late, the risk of secondary transmission would be high, so we need to remain vigilant.

Let me now further outline what we have undertaken so far. On Monday, we very swiftly activated the EU's Integrated Political Crisis Response mechanism for enhanced information sharing among Member States, the Commission and the European External Action Service. This mechanism brings together, under the steer of the Council Presidency, all relevant experts from the Member States and the European Union institutions, such as in fields of health, consular affairs and civil protection. It is an effective tool to support a collective horizontal response covering both the European Union internal and external dimension of the situation. The objective at this stage is to facilitate information sharing across relevant sectors based on expert input from all EU services so as to gain a common understanding of the situation and the latest developments.

As regards the need for repatriation of EU citizens, it should be noted that consular affairs fall under Member States' competence, but, of course, also here we have means for cooperation. We also called on Monday a telephone conference among the Member States. Through these coordination and facilitation efforts we are giving Member States the opportunity to update and support each other on their repatriation plans. Close cooperation between the Council structures and preparatory bodies will enable us to reach, effectively and in an appropriate manner, whatever way the situation develops. We have taken this step proactively to ensure we are prepared.

We are looking forward to hearing from the Commission about their work, which is closely linked to our efforts. For example, as regards the activation of the Union Civil Protection Mechanism, which has been requested by several Member States.

Stella Kyriakides, *Member of the Commission*. – Honourable Members, I'm very grateful to have this opportunity to inform you about the EU's preparedness and response to the developing situation of the coronavirus, which was first reported in China one month ago. Latest reports from this morning indicate just over 6 000 laboratory-confirmed cases and 132 deaths. All the deaths have occurred in China. The situation is evolving very rapidly and has potentially serious public health implications. We have seen that the World Health Organization is again convening the International Health Regulations Emergency Committee on the situation tomorrow to advise on whether the current outbreak constitutes a public health emergency of international concern. We will follow these discussions very closely.

My priority as Commissioner in charge of health is to make sure that we as the Commission provide all the support to Member States. This means that the Commission is monitoring the situation very closely and has taken action to support national measures and coordinate the response of Member States. This takes place via the EU's early warning and response system, where information is exchanged in real time, as well as discussions with Member States in the Health Security Committee, which has met three times. I'm also in regular contact with the Director-General of the World Health Organization and its regional director in Europe to coordinate next steps at a global level. This ensures essential and immediate information exchange and a coordinated Europe-wide response, which is, of course, the Commission's primary responsibility.

Ladies and gentlemen, the vast majority of cases have been identified in China, but last week, cases have also been confirmed in other parts of the world, including Europe. At the moment we have four confirmed cases in France, four confirmed cases in Germany, and we also have information that a case has just been confirmed in Finland. I am in continuous contact with the French, Italian, German and Croatian health ministers, and I am assured that the necessary steps to contain the virus have been taken. On Monday the EU's Health Security Committee met to discuss preparedness and needs of Member States and response options on the basis of the updated risk assessment from the European Centre for Disease Prevention and Control. I have been reassured that the vast majority of European countries reported a high level of preparedness to face the coronavirus in Europe, including access to laboratory diagnosis networks; readiness for clinical diagnosis and management of cases; guidance for travellers; capacities and guidance for manage-

ment of points of entry; and guidance for healthcare professionals and the public on how to deal with suspected cases.

An important topic is the repatriation of EU citizens from China: the Hubei region, more precisely, where the epidemic is concentrated. On Tuesday, France activated the EU Civil Protection Mechanism. We hope that as soon as possible, EU citizens will be able to come back to Europe. The details are being coordinated as we speak and the EU emergency response centre is supporting the efforts of Member States.

There remain at the moment important uncertainties surrounding the coronavirus such as its origins, its transmission mode and its pathogenicity. So we need to continue to monitor this situation very closely. It's clear that rapid communication, sharing of information and close cooperation are paramount to tackle this outbreak effectively. If the situation deteriorates, we will consider all other tools to strengthen our support to Member States, and this would include emergency funding to support outbreak response and, of course, research, where our supercomputer centres stand ready to sequence and simulate the evolution of the virus, which can help researchers develop a vaccine. For the time being, we will continue to offer all our support. Should the EU Council Presidency decide, we would support a decision to organise an extraordinary Health Council, but I understand this is not imminent. We will update you, of course, as the situation evolves.

Peter Liese, *im Namen der PPE-Fraktion*. – Herr Präsident, liebe Kolleginnen und Kollegen! Wir müssen die Sache sehr ernst nehmen, und ich verstehe, dass viele Menschen sich jetzt Sorgen machen. Insbesondere ist es so, dass der Fall, der vorgestern in Deutschland identifiziert wurde, auf eine Ansteckung innerhalb Deutschlands, das heißt, innerhalb der Europäischen Union, beruht. Wir haben also nicht nur importierte Fälle von Menschen, die sich in China infiziert haben, sondern auch Ansteckungen innerhalb der Europäischen Union. Das ändert natürlich schon die Lage. Wir sollten es wirklich sehr ernst nehmen und sehr wachsam sein!

Auf der anderen Seite bin ich auch bei denen, die sagen: jetzt keine Panik verbreiten! Wir haben andere Gesundheitsrisiken, zum Beispiel die ganz normale Influenza, die aktuell in Europa sehr viel mehr Menschen tötet als das neuartige Corona-Virus.

Eines ist aber klar: Bei solchen Gefahren, wie sie jetzt durch das neuartige Corona-Virus entstehen, brauchen wir europäische Zusammenarbeit. Es ist gut, dass die Mitgliedstaaten sich sehr schnell gegenseitig informieren und dass keiner irgendwelche Informationen für sich behält. Ich fände es gut, wenn auch die Empfehlungen einheitlich sind, dass man nicht, wenn man in einem Grenzgebiet lebt – zum Beispiel zwischen Deutschland, Belgien und den Niederlanden – an den Flughäfen jeweils andere Empfehlungen und andere Verfahren hat. Das sollten wir gemeinsam hinkriegen, denn die Viren kennen keine Grenzen.

Ganz wichtig ist für mich, dass wir einen Appell an China richten. Es gibt ein großes Misstrauen in Europa, aber offensichtlich auch in der chinesischen Bevölkerung, ob uns die chinesischen Behörden wirklich die ganze Wahrheit erzählt haben und ob sie schnell genug die notwendigen Informationen weitergegeben haben. Ich kann das nicht beurteilen. Ich glaube aber, dass es eben einfach leider die Doktrin in China gibt, dass Transparenz nicht die oberste Pflicht ist. Das muss sich ändern! Wir müssen an China appellieren, der eigenen Bevölkerung und uns die ganze Wahrheit zu sagen, damit wir wirklich gut reagieren können. Vertuschen ist keine Lösung. Dankeschön.

Jytte Guteland, *för S&D-gruppen*. – Herr talman, fru hälsokommissionär, ordförandeskapet!

Först och främst vill jag säga att jag känner med alla som drabbats av detta virus och med de familjer som svävar i oro över anhöriga. Det är naturligtvis av stor vikt att vi tar coronaviruset på allvar. Tack vare de tidiga reaktionerna och informationen från Kina så har vi givits förutsättningar att förbereda oss på vad vi behöver göra i EU.

Jag är också glad över att vi har denna debatt här i dag och över mycket av det som har sagts från ordförandeskapet och från hälsokommissionären. Jag vill dock ändå uppmana medlemsländernas hälsoministrar att verkligen bidra av bästa förmåga så att EU är ordentligt förberett och så att vi ser till också att ha det bästa samarbetet på global nivå för att få ett stopp på spridningen av viruset.

Det finns fortfarande oklarheter, vilket har nämnts i diskussionen om hur spridningen går till. Det är viktigt med löpande uppdateringar och öppenhet kring all den information som kan hjälpa oss.

Vi ska vara vaksamma och redo. Samtidigt ska vi också känna att vi har erfarenheter i EU och lärdomar från tidigare spridningar och utbrott, som till exempel utbrottet av sars i början av 2000-talet, samt även en god infrastruktur från sjukvårdens sida som också kan hjälpa oss med detta.

Nu krävs det extra vaksamhet. Genom att förbereda oss på bästa sätt, vara uppmärksamma, se till att samarbeta och vara beredda kan vi förhindra att denna spridning drabbar stort i Europa.

Véronique Trillet-Lenoir, *au nom du groupe Renew*. – Monsieur le Président, Madame la commissaire à la santé, cette nouvelle forme de virus ne doit certainement pas nous inciter à la panique, mais à la prudence, étant donné les incertitudes qui persistent. Elle nous montre que les menaces sanitaires sont désormais globales et réclament une réponse unitaire et solidaire.

Non, les virus ne connaissent pas les frontières. Les solutions sont à trouver à l'échelle européenne. Je salue à ce titre l'action de l'Union européenne et l'activation du mécanisme de protection civile pour le rapatriement des citoyens de mon pays, la France. Je salue également le suivi et la coordination de la situation par le Centre européen de prévention et de contrôle des maladies.

En tant que médecin, je voudrais terminer par une remarque: la grippe a fait 13 000 morts en France l'année dernière. L'inquiétude actuelle ne doit donc pas faire oublier que des problèmes sanitaires graves sont accessibles actuellement à la prévention par la vaccination, vis-à-vis de laquelle nous devons encore lutter contre les réticences.

Michèle Rivasi, *au nom du groupe Verts/ALE*. – Monsieur le Président, Madame la Commissaire, comme vous l'avez indiqué, il existe encore beaucoup d'incertitudes sur ce coronavirus.

D'abord, sur le nombre de personnes contaminées. Quand on voit les chiffres, les Chinois nous parlent de 6 000 personnes contaminées, l'université de Hong Kong nous parle de 40 000.

Ensuite, sur sa contagion. Est-il vraiment plus contagieux que d'autres virus? On s'aperçoit que ce n'est pas vraiment le cas. Est-il plus mortel que d'autres virus? On voit que par rapport à la grippe, il ne l'est pas. Est-ce qu'il va muter plus que d'autres? À l'heure actuelle, ce n'est pas vraiment le cas non plus.

Donc, je suis d'accord avec ma collègue, arrêtons de nous faire peur et je voudrais surtout transmettre un message: arrêtons de stigmatiser la communauté chinoise et asiatique. Comme vous l'avez indiqué, il faut vraiment se concentrer sur une politique de recherche, sur une politique de coopération entre les États et surtout sur une bonne information de la population, car il ne faut pas tomber dans une panique irrationnelle.

Il faut enfin rappeler qu'en France, on a entre 600 et 700 personnes qui meurent chaque année des suites de formes de coronavirus.

Silvia Sardone, *a nome del gruppo ID*. – Signor Presidente, onorevoli colleghi, il coronavirus è una cosa seria: stiamo parlando di 6 000 contagi, è stata superata la SARS, 132 morti e il virus è entrato anche in Europa.

Allora, vede, in questa sede dove noi sovranisti siamo stati definiti un virus, avete detto di fare nei nostri confronti un cordone sanitario, ecco, ora che invece un virus vero c'è, l'Europa si mostra disunita e in ritardo. Disunita perché alcuni paesi richiamano i connazionali, altri no. Alcune compagnie, come British Airways e Lufthansa, bloccano i voli, altre no. Altri paesi hanno addirittura bloccato gli ingressi, altri no.

In ritardo perché è chiaro che bisogna lavorare insieme all'Organizzazione mondiale della sanità, che tra l'altro solo adesso ha alzato il livello di valutazione del rischio ad elevato, bisogna lavorare con loro per trovare il più velocemente possibile il vaccino.

E poi è infine chiara la necessità di sollecitare il governo cinese a intervenire anche sulle condizioni igienico-sanitarie dei mercati, anche perché è molto probabile che questo virus, come la SARS, si sia sviluppato in zone e in mercati dove si vendono e si mangiano animali selvatici, tra cui anche pipistrelli e serpenti.

Joanna Kopcińska, w imieniu grupy ECR. – Panie Przewodniczący! W oparciu o ostatnie doświadczenia z SARS i MERS (obydwoma koronawirusami) Unia Europejska jest zaznajomiona z tego rodzaju infekcjami. Mamy wystarczająco silną infrastrukturę medyczną, aby móc zwalczyć eskalację tych zakażeń. Z zadowoleniem przyjmuję pracę przeprowadzoną przez ECDC i PREPARE oraz wymianę danych z monitorowania i ocen ryzyka z państwami członkowskimi. Niemniej jednak musimy zachować czujność. Koronawirus może przenosić się z człowieka na człowieka, a długość okresu inkubacji wirusa może być różna.

Czy Komisja może dostarczyć informacji na temat tego, kiedy zostaną opublikowane zaktualizowane oceny ryzyka, które uwzględniałyby wspomniane fakty? Wczoraj na wniosek Francji uruchomiono Unijny Mechanizm Ochrony Ludności. Uwzględniając dynamiczną sytuację, czy Rada i Komisja mogą przekazać Parlamentowi aktualne informacje na temat Centrum Koordynacji Reagowania Kryzysowego i jego współpracy z rządami państw członkowskich w zakresie koordynacji repatriacji obywateli Unii Europejskiej i ewentualnych późniejszych okresów ich kwarantanny?

Kateřina Konečná, za skupinu GUE/NGL. – Pane předsedající, paní komisařko, členové Rady, určitě se shodneme na tom, že se nejedná o první ani bohužel o poslední epidemii, kterou tady řešíme. Ale souhlasím s kolegy, že bychom neměli panikařit, přestože infekční nemoci jistě není radno podceňovat. Každopádně doufám, že to tak i zůstane a že informace od lékařů o tom, že nakažených je méně a nákaza v porovnání se SARS se jeví jako slabší, tak to i zůstanou.

Co si myslím, že bychom neměli také podceňovat, a jsem ráda, že zafungovaly mechanismy na téměř všech evropských letištích, je screening na letištích samotných. Měli bychom mít přístup k rychlé akci, kdy budeme moci tyto pacienty v podstatě zadržet a ihned začít léčit tak, aby nám virus dále nepřenášeli. Stejně tak rychlá diagnostika nám může velmi pomoci. Ale nicméně chci říct na závěr toto – věrme námi nastavenému systému. Naše ECDC a WHO monitorují situaci a jsou připraveni jednat. Zdá se, že doporučení vlády respektují, a pevně věřím, že to bude i tak nadále, a děkuji paní komisařce za její aktivní pomoc.

Esther de Lange (PPE). – Voorzitter, allereerst wil ik, ondanks het feit dat we, zoals collega's al gezegd hebben, veel nog niet weten of niet zeker weten, toch alvast de Europese Commissie complimenteren. Want ik heb een Commissie gezien die snel reageert, die ook heeft aangeboden om bijvoorbeeld de repatriëring van mensen gezamenlijk uit te voeren en te coördineren. Zeker voor kleine landen is dat heel erg belangrijk. Zo'n snelle reactie hebben we in vorige gevallen niet gezien, dus dat is goed.

Dan heb ik een aantal vragen aan de Commissie over de ontwikkeling van een vaccin. Dat wordt ontwikkeld, maar gebeurt het ook in Europa op een gecoördineerde manier? En als dat vaccin er eenmaal is, is de Commissie dan ook voornemens en bereid om bijvoorbeeld verkorte vergunnings- en toelatingsprocedures te gebruiken? Als dat vaccin er eenmaal is, is het heel belangrijk om het ook snel op de markt te krijgen. En raadt de Commissie bijvoorbeeld ook aan om op dit moment virusremmers in te slaan?

and maybe then one request to the Commissioner from a personal experience: Commissioner, if you could please coordinate the advice that Member States give to people who have questions. When the Mexican flu came to Europe and people were concerned, I was at the time pregnant in Belgium, and in the Netherlands obviously, and in Belgium I got the advice to get vaccinated and in the Netherlands I got the advice to absolutely don't get a vaccination. So that makes people very insecure and if you could help take these concerns away among Europeans that would be highly appreciated.

Heléne Fritzon (S&D). – Herr talman, kommissionär! I början på året bekräftades ett nytt coronavirus, nu i Kina. Det allvarliga är att det kan smitta människor. Ett nytt virus leder alltid till oro och i vissa fall också till panik. Jag välkomnar därför det tydliga ledarskap som WHO har tagit också tillsammans med Kina – detta för att stoppa spridningen av viruset. Det är bra. Det är viktigt att världssamfundet och berörda länder är snabba och transparenta med information och fakta om smittspridningen.

Det är nu väldigt viktigt att vi och våra medlemsstater, våra olika regeringar och ministrar på alla sätt bidrar till att förhindra ett utbrott i Europa. Det går aldrig att underskatta vikten av korrekt och relevant information till alla våra medborgare. Kunskap ger trygghet, och kunskap leder till rätt åtgärder och rätt insatser. Vi har medicinska experter som gör bedömningen att Europas sjukvård god, men vi får inte luta oss tillbaka. Vi ska göra allt vi kan. Våra medborgares folkhälsa är viktig, och där har vi ett ansvar.

Nicolae Ștefănuță (Renew). – Domnule președinte, doamnă comisar, câteodată simt că istoria se repetă, atunci când văd cetățenii care se reped la farmacia pentru a cumpăra măști de protecție, care cumpără gel dezinfectant și îl folosesc la fiecare cinci minute și care, parcă, se așteaptă, mereu, la o nouă epidemie. Sindromul SARS, în 2003; Ebola, în 2014; Zika, în 2015, iar acum, în 2020, coronavirus.

În epoca schimbărilor climatice, singura constantă este schimbarea și virulența tot mai mare a pandemiilor. Rolul nostru este să arătăm *leadership* și metodă, un plan concret pentru ceea ce știm deja că se întâmplă.

Dragi colegi, avem oportunitatea să întărim RescEU pentru o întreagă generație. Haideți să dotăm programul cu o rezervă serioasă de medicamente și cu o procedură rapidă de achiziții publice comune. Trebuie să fim pregătiți mâine așa cum am fi vrut să fim azi. Cetățenii europeni așteaptă de la Europa un scut pentru viață și pentru sănătate.

(Vorbitorul a acceptat să răspundă unei întrebări adresate în conformitate cu procedura „cartonașului albastru” (articolul 171 alineatul (8) din Regulamentul de procedură)

Tomislav Sokol (PPE), blue-card question. – Dear colleague, I think that this debate has shown us that, in cases like this, we need a strong common European response, a common European Union healthcare policy. Unfortunately, we know that – according to Article 168 – possibilities to have a common EU policy in this area are very limited. So my question to you is this: does this outbreak show us that the European Union needs more powers in the area of healthcare to combat these kinds of threats?

Nicolae Ștefănuță (Renew), blue-card answer. – Mr Sokol, you're preaching to the converted: you know we want this; you know we need this; you know that Europe needs to 'send a man to the moon' in the form of fighting cancer. So yes, I do think that we need not only more competence, but also to use what we already have: to use Article 168, to use the common market, to use every exception we can get to bring health policy forward for one simple reason: because European citizens accept and want this very much. So, definitely, yes.

Francisco Guerreiro (Verts/ALE). – Senhor Presidente, Senhora Comissária, desde dezembro de 2019 até aos dias de hoje mais de seis mil pessoas foram contaminadas com o vírus corona e mais de cem morreram devido aos seus efeitos. Mesmo sabendo que o surto é mais intenso na China, o vírus já chegou aos Estados Unidos da América, ao Canadá, à Austrália e mesmo aqui, à Europa.

Nesta questão não podemos esquecer que a China é a principal fonte de importações da União Europeia, e nós na UE seguimos as recomendações da Organização Mundial de Saúde, alcançando assim padrões de segurança e qualidade alimentar elevados.

A China, ao invés, não se rege pelos mesmos padrões. No entanto, continua a beneficiar de uma abertura comercial privilegiada por parte desta União Europeia. Em troca desta nossa abertura parece que recebemos agora um vírus mortífero, que está não só a afetar os chineses como grande parte do mundo.

A irresponsabilidade da China em termos de segurança e higiene alimentar tem que ser fortemente questionada por esta União Europeia.

Simona Baldassarre (ID). – Signor Presidente, onorevoli colleghi, le notizie che ci giungono in questi giorni sull'epidemia di coronavirus sono sempre più preoccupanti e spesso contraddittorie. Siamo a 132 morti, più di 6 000 casi accertati e quasi 10 000 sospetti.

Il ministro della Salute della Costa d'Avorio ha riferito che una trentaquattrenne arrivata da Pechino è stata ricoverata con sintomi simili a quelli del coronavirus e molti Stati africani hanno quindi emesso restrizioni ai viaggiatori.

Ma c'è il controllo di chi entra in Europa da paesi terzi? E inoltre, chi controlla i flussi di immigrazione irregolari che giungono sulle sponde europee? Chi impone le quarantene necessarie?

Peraltro, voglio far notare che l'attuale protocollo di verifica della temperatura spot dei turisti in ingresso è insufficiente e pericoloso, sia per l'imprecisione della misurazione cutanea, sia perché non tiene conto del periodo di incubazione. La Commissione dovrebbe imporre a tutti gli Stati di controllare che i viaggiatori non abbiano risieduto in aree infette, almeno nelle due settimane precedenti o imporre un equivalente periodo di quarantena.

Dolors Montserrat (PPE). – Señor presidente, las epidemias y los virus no entienden de fronteras y, por tanto, la epidemia de coronavirus sigue extendiéndose en China.

Europa se ha distinguido siempre por hacer frente a emergencias sanitarias en todo el mundo, en la detección precoz y en la prevención. Diecisiete años después de la epidemia de síndrome de respiración agudo, las lecciones aprendidas tenemos que ponerlas en marcha para contrarrestar esta epidemia. La Unión Europea es ejemplo en el mundo de solidaridad, de cooperación, de eficacia, pero también a la vez somos líderes en el mundo en prevención y en atención sanitaria. Por tanto, tenemos la obligación de apoyar a cualquier país en dificultad, en el respeto de esos principios de solidaridad y cooperación en los que se ha construido la Unión Europea, y, por ello, también debemos exigirle a China transparencia e información. Porque pensamos que la Unión Europea debe activar el Centro Europeo de Coordinación de la Respuesta a Emergencias para facilitar estas acciones de asistencia y de asesoramiento a China, así como a otros países afectados, y también para poder coordinar la respuesta temprana en los Estados miembros y la prevención en los Estados miembros. Y nos tenemos que poner a trabajar, coordinados por la Comisión Europea y, por supuesto, con la colaboración de la OMS.

Europa tiene que garantizar la defensa de la salud pública de sus ciudadanos, como también de los ciudadanos del resto del mundo. Y por ello tenemos que ponernos en primera línea en la organización de una respuesta coordinada a la emergencia sanitaria, que puede llegar a ser global.

Miriam Dalli (S&D). – Iċ-ċittadini taghna mhassba u ghandhom id-dritt li jkunu jafu li qieghed isir minn kollox biex l-interessi taghhom ikunu mharsa.

Inti semmejt 132 persuna li tilfu hajjithom, aktar minn 6000 persuna infettati. Veru ma rridux noholqu paniku imma rridu nibqghu vigjilanti ghaliex in-numri qeghdin jinbidlu b'ritmu mgħaġġel. Issem mew erba' kazi kkonfermati fi Franza, erba' kazi kkonfermati fil-Ġermanja u issa anke każ fil-Finlandja. U dan huwa virus li qieghed ihasseb lid-dinja kollha u allura iva hemm bżonn miżuri Ewropej komuni għall-pajjiżi kollha fl-Unjoni Ewropea biex nillimitaw il-firxa ta' dan il-virus.

Ghaliex iċ-ċittadini taghna huma fliema pajjiż huma tal-Unjoni Ewropea għandhom ikunu protetti u jhossuhom siguri, partikolarment jekk qeghdin isiefru. U qeghdin nitolbuk Kummissarju, għal miżuri urgenti biex ikunu identifikati u iżolati pazjenti infettati u għal kull persuna li qieghda tivvjagġa minn pajjiż infettat biex ikunu segwiti għall-perjodu mehtieġ anke ma jidhirx li jkollhom sintomu mal-wasla taghhom fil-pajjiż taghna.

U nappella wkoll lill-Istati Membri, ghaliex l-Istati Membri għandhom ikollhom kampanji ta' informazzjoni għaċ-ċittadini taghhom.

Katalin Cseh (Renew). – Well, if we as MEPs ever needed a reminder that we are dealing with matters of life and death, this is it. I'm a physician by training and there are three aspects I want to stress. Europe needs to be calm, united and prepared, because in a crisis situation trust in our institutions is paramount, and I'm very worried to see the legitimate fears of the public being manipulated and geared towards hate-mongering. Descending to xenophobia against Chinese, Europeans, visitors and immigrants leads absolutely nowhere. If there is an irresponsible way of dealing with a crisis, well, this is it.

And this challenge highlights also how interdependent we are in Europe, because pandemics know no borders and, unfortunately, there are great inequalities between the healthcare systems of our Member States. We have to help each other. Less developed regions need European help to take the necessary precautionary measures. If one Member State is overburdened, that has an impact on every single Member State. So a crisis like this makes it crystal clear that solidarity is in the interest of all of us.

Luisa Regimenti (ID). – Signor Presidente, onorevoli colleghi, in primis, in quanto medico, sono fortemente preoccupata per il diffondersi a macchia d'olio del coronavirus, il cui rischio globale, per stessa ammissione dell'Organizzazione mondiale della sanità, è considerato elevato.

Siamo di fronte a una minaccia mondiale di vasta proporzione e di estrema gravità. Il virus si sta rafforzando ed è diffondibile anche tramite soggetti asintomatici. Sono ad oggi stati riscontrati numerosi casi di contagio anche in Europa.

Le azioni finora intraprese dalla Commissione europea, seppure opportune, non bastano a proteggere i nostri cittadini da un virus potente di cui non possediamo informazioni chiare su sintomi e percorsi epidemiologici. Ritengo di estrema urgenza e importanza che l'Unione europea insista presso l'Organizzazione mondiale della sanità perché sia dichiarata l'emergenza sanitaria internazionale e, conseguentemente, si prendano immediatamente misure sanitarie che la situazione richiede, non da ultimo, se necessario, la chiusura temporanea delle frontiere della Cina, con la sospensione delle importazioni di tutti i potenziali veicoli di infezione.

Ewa Kopacz (PPE). – Panie Przewodniczący! Sytuacja, z którą mamy dzisiaj do czynienia, jest z pewnością poważna. Nie możemy jej lekceważyć, nie możemy zastanawiać się, kiedy to w naszym państwie, w naszym mieście pojawi się pierwszy czy kolejny przypadek zakażenia. Dzisiejszy świat bez granic wyjątkowo sprzyja takim obawom.

Apeluję do Komisji Europejskiej, by zjednoczyć siły. Wspólnie musimy znaleźć odpowiedzi na trudne pytania. Czy europejskie laboratoria są przygotowane na szybką identyfikację wirusa? Czy europejskie szpitale są gotowe na odpowiednie i skuteczne leczenie zakażonych pacjentów? Czy obowiązują i są przestrzegane procedury zabezpieczające personel medyczny? Czy nie należałoby się zastanowić nad powołaniem stałego europejskiego zespołu szybkiego reagowania?

Nicolás González Casares (S&D). – Señor presidente, le diría a la Comisión y al Consejo que, sobre todo, seriedad, sin alarmismos, pero seriedad en la comunicación. Tenemos muchos ciudadanos y ciudadanas de la Unión Europea que viven en Asia y, además, tenemos un gran comercio internacional; por lo tanto, tenemos que ser serios en la comunicación.

Creo que hemos aprendido de crisis anteriores y tenemos un conocimiento previo. Pongámoslo en marcha y utilicémoslo. Desde luego, la coordinación entre los Estados miembros y dentro de la Unión Europea es fundamental. Tenemos fronteras comunes y debemos controlarlas, pero, como digo, sin caer en el alarmismo.

El personal sanitario de la Unión Europea y nuestros servicios de emergencias han aprendido de crisis previas; por lo tanto, tenemos ese conocimiento que nos va a permitir no caer en alarmismos. Y también hablo de las repatriaciones. No es lo mismo repatriar a personas que están viviendo fuera y que están en situación de alerta que a personas que tengan y presenten síntomas: debemos saber diferenciar y fundamentar; pongamos en marcha protocolos y comuniquémoslos bien.

Andreas Glück (Renew). – Herr Präsident, werte Kolleginnen und Kollegen! Ich halte es für richtig, dass ein Großteil des Gesundheitsbereichs durch die Nationalstaaten geregelt ist. Aber es gibt manche Bereiche, da muss Europa stärker werden, gerade im Bereich der Arzneimittelzulassung und auch bei dem Thema Hygiene. Gerade vorher habe ich mit Herrn Professor Kreamer von der Universität Tübingen gesprochen – dort habe ich Medizin studiert –, und er hat mir bestätigt, dass auf europäischer Ebene tatsächlich sehr vieles gut läuft, aber eben nicht alles perfekt.

Frau Kommissarin Kyriakides hat zwei Punkte genannt, die ich unterstreichen möchte. Zum einen müssen wir das ECDC stärken – finanziell aber auch mit seinen Kompetenzen. Im Vergleich zum amerikanischen CDC führt das ECDC ein Armutsdasein. Und das Zweite ist: In Notfällen muss eben auch die Arzneimittelzulassung wenig bürokratisch laufen können. Hierzu möchten wir, dass nicht nur Phase-3-Studien durch die Europäische Arzneimittelagentur erfolgen, sondern eben auch Phase-1- und -2-Studien, um hier Zeit zu sparen.

In times of nova corona, we say it clearly: Europe is quite well when it comes to public health, but we can get a lot better, so let's make it so.

Edina Tóth (PPE). – Tisztelt Elnök úr! Tisztelt Biztos Asszony! Az utóbbi hetekben rendkívül aggasztó hírek érkeztek a Kínában nemrégiben azonosított súlyos tüdőgyulladással járó koronavírus terjedéséről. Kiemelten fontosnak tartom, hogy a tagállamok naprakész és valós információkkal rendelkezzenek, és folyamatosan figyeljék az Egészségügyi Világszervezet és az uniós szakügynökségek ajánlásait, az óvintézkedésekkel kapcsolatos döntéseket pedig ennek megfelelően hozzák meg. Mivel légikikötőink a kínai beutazók esetén Európa kapuját jelentik, esetleges hatósági intézkedés elrendelése esetén repülőtereinknek rendelkeznie kell minden olyan szükséges eszközzel és felszereléssel, amellyel képesek ellátni a rájuk vonatkozó előírásokat, és támogatni tudják a hatóságok munkáját. Úgy gondolom, hogy polgáraink védelme az első. A koordináció most nagyon fontos, ezért is kérem az Európai Bizottságot, hogy folyamatosan elemezze a helyzetet, és tegye meg a szükséges javaslatait a tagállamok számára.

Tudor Ciuhodaru (S&D). – Domnule președinte, este oficial. Chiar dacă nu ne place, este oficial. Noul coronavirus amenință acum și Europa. Sunt decelate patru cazuri în Franța și patru în Germania, iar măsurile de prevenție sunt extrem de importante.

Eu sunt medic, medic de urgență în Iași, România, la Spitalul Clinic de Urgență „Nicolae Oblu” și consider că, în acest moment, onorată Comisie și onorat Consiliu, este extrem de important să punem în practică un plan unitar de intervenție pentru a realiza trei lucruri care pot să prevină răspândirea acestui tip de virus.

În primul rând, măsuri unitare de prevenție la nivel european. În al doilea rând, măsuri unitare de monitorizare activă și da, sistemul de alertă rapidă poate fi o soluție. În al treilea rând, pregătirea pentru o eventuală intervenție, iar RescEU și Mecanismul european de protecție civilă sunt doar câteva elemente din acest ansamblu și cred că dotarea cu medicamente și o echipă medicală mobilă la nivel european pot fi soluții oricând într-o astfel de situație de criză.

În plus, vă reamintesc că virusul a depășit trei bariere majore. În primul rând, s-a spus inițial că este o zoonoză, că nu se poate transmite de la animale la om și uite că se transmite, iar în acest moment vedem că sunt foarte multe cazuri la nivel european, așa cum spunem noi... (*Președintele a retras cuvântul vorbitorului*).

Maria da Graça Carvalho (PPE). – Senhor Presidente, o novo surto de coronavírus demonstra, mais uma vez, a importância do financiamento adequado da ciência, bem como da cooperação internacional.

Em diferentes partes do mundo várias equipas já estão a trabalhar numa vacina para este vírus e temos razões para acreditar que a solução poderá surgir mais rapidamente que em 2003, quando enfrentámos o coronavírus SARS.

Vale a pena estar preparado, vale a pena investir em ciência. Foi graças aos fundos fornecidos pelo Horizonte 2020 que se conseguiui chegar a uma vacina contra o ébola na sequência do surto dessa doença ocorrido em 2014. Esse desenvolvimento permitiu-nos salvar muitas vidas em todo o mundo. O valor acrescentado do investimento em ciência torna-se muito evidente quando surgem os resultados, mas estes só aparecem quando há uma aposta sólida, continuada e sustentável.

Milan Brglez (S&D). – Gospod predsedujoči, gospa komisarka, predstavniki Sveta.

Poročila o tem, kako se širi koronavirus, so vsekakor zaskrbljujoča. Tisto, kar bi sam hotel poudariti, je predvsem to, da to še enkrat več kaže, kako moramo premišljeno in usklajeno delovati. Torej, da je dodana vrednost Evropske unije v usklajevanju in sodelovanju članic.

Glede na to sem dal tudi urgentno vprašanje Svetu, vendar to ni namenjeno temu, da bi ustvarjali izredne razmere, paniko ali širili nestrpnost, ampak predvsem poziv k temu, da usklajeno delujemo.

Veseli me proaktivna vloga Evropske komisije, tudi na operativni ravni, tako na področju zdravja kot kriznega upravljanja, prav tako dejstvo, da imamo mehanizme, na katere se lahko zanesemo, torej civilne zaščite, ki so razviti, treba jih je še ustrezno materialno podpreti, da bodo razmeram ustrezno reagirali, še preden bo volja držav, da bodo ...

(predsedujoči je izklopil mikrofona.)

Spontane Wortmeldungen

Eugen Tomac (PPE). – Domnule președinte, doamnă comisară, intervenția mea este foarte scurtă. Într-adevăr, ne îngrijorează pe toți, Europa este preocupată de acest virus și pericolul vine tocmai de la faptul că este un virus care se răspândește foarte rapid.

Felicit Comisia și Consiliul pentru că acționează ferm, rapid, comunică, însă simt că trebuie să faceți mai mult tocmai pentru a informa cetățenii, în mod special cetățenii din zonele vulnerabile. Cred că este bine să treceți la următorul nivel, prin care să pregătiți, prin mijloacele de informare în masă, campanii prin care să încurajați cetățenii să se protejeze. Igiena, prevenția sunt lucruri esențiale în momente de asemenea criză.

Manuel Pizarro (S&D). – Senhor Presidente, Senhora Comissária, a epidemia do coronavírus não justifica o pânico, mas justifica uma preocupação e uma atitude concertada. Mais de cem pessoas já morreram, há casos diagnosticados em dezoito países diferentes. Todos sabemos que a epidemia começou na China, que é onde está o seu ponto mais preocupante, e todos sabemos também que Taiwan é um *hub* importantíssimo naquela zona geográfica do leste da Ásia.

São por isso, do meu ponto de vista, muito preocupantes as notícias que chegam de que os especialistas de Taiwan não estão incluídos na reunião de especialistas de alto nível convocada pela Organização Mundial de Saúde.

As considerações de geopolítica não podem ser mais relevantes do que a proteção da saúde pública e da saúde de todos os cidadãos do mundo, e eu gostava de saber o que pensam as instituições europeias, e nomeadamente a Comissão Europeia, fazer para garantir que Taiwan é ativamente envolvida no combate a esta epidemia, o que é também essencial para nós, europeus.

Liudas Mažylis (PPE). – Gerbiamas Pirmininke, koronavirusas, nepaisant prielaidų, vis dėlto ateina. Epidemiologiškai nėra tame nieko nuostabaus. Yra paskaičiuota, kad vienas apkrėstasis paskleidžia infekciją vidutiniškai dviem su puse aplinkinių, tad norint nukirsti plitimo grandinę, būtina izoliuoti 60 proc. tų, kurie patyrė kontaktą. Ir, kaip buvo galima tikėtis, Kinijoje šis virusas nebuvo izoliuotas.

Istoriškai tokių pavyzdžių buvo. Prieš 100 metų buvo ispaniškasis virusas, kurio patirtis mums gal ir ne tiek svarbi, bet XXI a. susidūreme su SARS virusu, ir ta patirtis yra sukaupta. Aš manau, kad profesionalams priemonių planas yra iš esmės aiškus. Pritarčiau, kad trumpuoju laikotarpiu yra labai svarbu informacinės kampanijos, o kalbant apie ilgąjį laikotarpį, pritariu tiems, kurie kalba apie didesnes investicijas į mokslinius tyrimus.

(Ende der spontanen Wortmeldungen)

Stella Kyriakides, Member of the Commission. – It's an interesting debate. I will try to touch on as many questions as possible.

I hope, in the way that I spoke at the beginning, I did not appear to stir up panic. This was not the intention, and as Veronique Trillet-Lenoir has said, we should not create panic. But we need to balance that with being vigilant and carefully monitoring a changing situation, which is what we have at the moment.

There are many uncertainties – many of you have mentioned this. The WHO has issued guidelines, together with ECDC, for travel, and I would also like to add here that we really don't have any indications, as has been said by some colleagues and by Madam Montserrat, that China is not giving all the necessary information. In fact, the WHO General Director was there two days ago and has already briefed us on what the situation is.

It's obvious that we need to have global cooperation and we need to have constant updates. We do need to be very careful that we are speaking with one clear voice, and this is exactly what we are trying to do in our coordinating role as a Commission, to ensure that ECDC info and WHO information reaches the Member States.

In terms of vaccinations, the Commission is launching a call to develop a vaccine as we speak, and the European Medicines Authority can authorise a fast-track procedure if this is found.

There is concern among European citizens, and WHO and ECDC have given clear guidelines on travel precautions and laboratory testing and isolation, and our information from Member States is that, once EU citizens are repatriated, quarantine measures will be taken.

We have joined forces with as many other entities and bodies as possible, and Member States have assured us through the CDC that their laboratories are ready.

Finally, I wanted to say that, under the Union Civil Protection Mechanism, further emergency assistance can be provided if requested, including emergency medical corps, which can be deployed both inside and outside the European Union.

So I will stop here. I just want to be absolutely emphatic that we are going to continue to monitor this very closely. We are monitoring it on a daily basis – responsibly, without creating panic, but also being aware that we have a complex evolving situation that we need to be aware of, and I will be available to inform the Parliament at any point in time of any developments.

Nikolina Brnjac, *President-in-Office of the Council*. – Mr President, I would like to thank you for today's exchange of views on this topic, which is of crucial importance for the health of EU citizens at home and abroad. The Croatian Presidency will do its part, in close cooperation with the EU bodies responsible for health and other Member States, to ensure continued monitoring of the development of the situation in China, but also in other south-eastern Asian countries and indeed in the European Union, so that necessary measures can be taken if the situation gets worse.

At this stage, we do not consider that the situation in Europe constitutes a crisis. However, to make sure, we are ready for any developments, and we believe it is prudent to enable maximum information sharing among the European partners as well as to our citizens. The activation of the Integrated Political Crisis Response mechanism offers a practical tool to do that. Furthermore, we underline the important work done by the Health Security Committee and the European Centre for Disease Prevention and Control.

I assure you that we very closely follow the development of this potentially very serious disease outbreak. There are established EU structures for handling serious health threats – I think in particular of the Health Security Committee and the European Centre for Disease Prevention and Control, which both do an excellent job. For the time being, there is, in our view, no reason to assume that those structures, in combination with increased vigilance from national authorities, would not suffice for protecting public health in the European Union. The Presidency will keep the situation under close review and will keep you actively informed.

Der Präsident. – Die Aussprache ist geschlossen.

Schriftliche Erklärungen (Artikel 171)

Robert Hajšel (S&D), *písomne*. – Aktivovanie Európskeho mechanizmu civilnej ochrany bolo prvou reakciou inštitúcií EÚ v snahe pomôcť členským štátom v boji proti šíreniu nového koronavírusu z Číny. Prostredníctvom tohto mechanizmu môže EÚ poskytovať pomoc občanom EÚ v núdzi kdekoľvek vo svete. Podarilo sa už napríklad poskytnúť dve lietadlá na repatriáciu občanov EÚ z regiónu Wu-chan. To je iba začiatok, vzhľadom na epidemické šírenie nebezpečného koronavírusu budú žiadosti členských štátov o pomoc nepochybne pribúdať. Koordinácia, materiálna pomoc a najmä vhodná komunikácia a výmena informácií musí pokračovať v čo najvyššej kvalite, keďže práve tieto postupy sú pridanou hodnotou EÚ. Situáciu nemožno podceňovať, ale zároveň musíme urobiť všetko pre to, aby sa po rozšírení koronavírusu do Európy zabránilo panike, ktorá by mohla poškodiť naše hospodárstvo a spoločnosť možno viac ako samotný vírus. Ochrana zdravia ľudí musí byť na prvom mieste a tomu treba podriadiť celé úsilie inštitúcií EÚ. Naše kompetentné úrady musia spolupracovať so Svetovou zdravotníckou organizáciou, ako aj s Čínou, USA, Izraelom,

Ruskom a ďalšími na urýchlenom vyvíjaní vakcíny, ale spoluprácu treba podporiť aj pri výrobe a distribúcii vhodných antivirotik a pri repatriácii občanov. Pri fungujúcej spolupráci a dodržiavaní určených postupov by sa mohlo podariť ochrániť naše obyvateľstvo pred oveľa horšími zdravotnými a sociálnymi dôsledkami.

22. Prawa ludów tubylczych (debata)

Der Präsident. – Als nächster Punkt der Tagesordnung folgt die Aussprache über die Erklärung des Vizepräsidenten der Kommission und Hohen Vertreters der Union für Außen- und Sicherheitspolitik zu den Rechten indigener Völker (2019/3015(RSP)).

Auch hier möchte ich Sie daran erinnern, dass Sie spontane Wortmeldungen und Wortmeldungen nach dem Verfahren der blauen Karte sowohl auf die herkömmliche Weise als auch elektronisch beantragen können. Die Anleitungen finden Sie am Eingang zum Plenarsaal.

Helena Dalli, Member of the Commission, on behalf of the Vice-President of the Commission / High Representative of the Union for Foreign Affairs and Security Policy – Mr President, honourable members, the EU policies on support to indigenous peoples goes back three decades and were last reconfirmed in the May 2017 Council Conclusions on Indigenous Peoples, reaffirming our support for the UN Declaration on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples.

Despite some important gains in the recognition of the rights of indigenous peoples in many countries of the world, in recent years we have also seen a number of setbacks. Most troubling are the high numbers of indigenous leaders and activists killed every year in the defence of their ancestral lands and the environment – at least 40 persons every year. Such tragic crimes underline the high relevance of our policies on support to indigenous peoples and human rights defenders working on land, environment, biodiversity and climate.

Specifically on human rights defenders, the European Instrument for Democracy and Human Rights funds the EU Human Rights Defenders Mechanism, which provided support to more than 30 000 HRDs from 2015 to 2019 and their families through a combination of short-, medium- and long-term initiatives.

The EU's support to land governance and secure access and tenure of land is equally important. While we continue to foster dialogue and promote respect for responsible land governance, the EU is supporting land governance in about 40 countries, with a total budget of 240 million euros. As an example, I mention the EU support to land governance in Colombia, which enabled the collective titling of 280 000 hectares, benefiting some 8 000 indigenous and Afro-Colombian families. Indigenous peoples also feature highly in our enhanced attention to the human rights and environment and climate nexus.

During the European Development Days held in June of 2019, the EEAS organised an event dedicated to the strengthening of international solidarity and support to indigenous peoples and environmental human rights defenders. Another event at the EDDS on non-discrimination and the human rights to safe drinking water and sanitation brought testimonies from indigenous experts, along with other experts on other frequently-discriminated groups. Furthermore, the 21st Annual EU NGO Human Rights Forum meeting in December 2019 under the theme of building a fair environmental future had a specific session dedicated to indigenous peoples. Indigenous experts, including the UN Special Rapporteur on the rights of indigenous peoples, along with indigenous youth, had prominent speaking roles, allowing them – together with the invited indigenous participants – to bring forward concerns as possible contributions of indigenous peoples in building a fair environmental future.

The afore-mentioned Council Conclusions underscore the crucial importance of further enhancing opportunities for dialogue and consultation with indigenous peoples at all levels of EU cooperation. This includes EU-funded programmes and projects under all aid modalities to secure the full participation of indigenous people; their free, prior, and informed consent in a meaningful and systematic way; and also to inform and underpin EU External Action policy and its implementation worldwide.

In follow-up to the Council Conclusions, on 24 and 25 February in Brussels we will host a round table with indigenous peoples' representatives as well as experts from the four indigenous socio-cultural regions of the world. The specific objectives of the round table will be the identification of the most prevalent and emerging threats to indigenous people's rights, and to generate recommendations on how to best address indigenous people's rights through EU policy and action.

Mr President, please allow me now to mention briefly some examples of support that we provide in the context of indigenous peoples' languages. In Namibia, the European Instrument for Democracy and Human Rights contributed to the revitalisation of endangered indigenous languages. In the Chittagong Hill Tracts of Bangladesh, we have also helped develop a multilingual mother-tongue education programme in seven different tribal languages as part of the 500 million the EU invests annually in education programmes in around 60 countries across the world. Such programmes and projects can be seen as the EU's contribution to the success of the International Decade of Indigenous Languages 2020-2029, which was proclaimed by the United Nations General Assembly in December of last year.

Let me assure you and the honourable Members of the EU's strong commitment to the rights of indigenous peoples as part of our human rights policies. As such, we remain firmly committed to their promotion and respect through all aspects of EU external policies, cooperation and trade, as well as through political dialogues with third countries in regional and multilateral lateral fora and by giving financial support.

Honourable Members, Mr President, thank you for your attention, and I look forward to our discussion tonight.

Isabel Santos, *em nome do Grupo S&D*. – Senhor Presidente, as comunidades indígenas estão presentes em cerca de noventa países nos cinco continentes e mantêm vivas mais de cinco mil culturas e uma grande parte das sete mil línguas existentes. Mais de 80% da biodiversidade mundial está ao seu cuidado, bem como a larga maioria das florestas. Apesar de existirem apenas 370 milhões de pessoas que se identificam como membros de povos indígenas, são responsáveis por quase um quarto do planeta, e são, por isso, as primeiras a sofrer os efeitos das alterações climáticas extremas e da luta pelos recursos. Da Ásia à Amazónia, do Ártico à Oceânia, as comunidades indígenas lutam pela defesa da sua herança e da sua história, e quando o fazem são constantemente vítimas de ataques, ocupação, militarização dos territórios, intimidação, violência e tortura que levam tantas vezes à morte – ações ditadas pela voragem das indústrias extrativas, pela desflorestação, pela mineração, pelo agronegócio, com total impunidade e tantas vezes por ação dos próprios Estados.

Numa reunião recente dos povos indígenas da Amazónia, o Chefe Raoni Metuktire, finalista do Prémio Sakharov, declarou que, no Brasil, as ameaças sobre estas comunidades e os ambientalistas têm sofrido uma escalada dramática. As políticas defendidas pelo governo Bolsonaro para os territórios indígenas representam um genocídio, um etnocídio e um ecocídio, e eu sublinho estas palavras. Os indígenas são dos povos mais desprotegidos do mundo. Constituem apenas 5% da população, mas representam 15% das pessoas que vivem em situação de pobreza.

Temos ouvido muitos discursos, temos assistido a muitas conversas, mas é preciso passar do reconhecimento político à ação. E por isso pergunto-lhe, Senhora Comissária, sabendo que muitos destes problemas advêm da luta pela exploração da terra e recursos: como encara a responsabilização das empresas europeias predadoras e como encara a implementação do mecanismo europeu de interdição à importação de produtos e matérias-primas retiradas dos territórios indígenas sem autorização e violando o direito à consulta?

Stéphane Bijoux, *au nom du groupe Renew*. – Monsieur le Président, ici, dans notre Parlement européen, nous travaillons pour 500 millions de personnes. Mais partout sur la planète, il y a aussi 500 millions de femmes et d'hommes qui sont les derniers ambassadeurs de la force ancestrale des populations autochtones; et parmi eux, il y a des Européens: les Kanaks de Nouvelle-Calédonie, les Maohi de Polynésie; les Bushinings et tous les autres sur les fleuves de Guyane et les Inuits du Groenland.

Alors, vous savez quand ils voient fondre leurs icebergs au Pôle Nord, comment ne pas comprendre qu'il y a une urgence absolue? Quand, dans leur forêt amazonienne, leurs rivières sont empoisonnées au mercure par des orpailleurs clandestins: il faut les protéger. Quand sur leurs îles dans le Pacifique, ils voient monter le niveau des océans, le Pacte vert européen doit intervenir.

Face au dérèglement climatique, nous cherchons des solutions. Eh bien, les populations autochtones ont des solutions, ce sont des savoir-faire ancestraux. Les protéger là-bas, c'est aussi sauver des vies ici.

Anna Cavazzini, *on behalf of the Verts/ALE Group*. – Mr President, Paulo Paulino, Firmino and Raimundo Guajajara, Chief Emrya Wajãpi, Chief Francisco de Souza Pereira: all of them, murdered. They had one thing in common: they were Brazilian indigenous leaders and defended their land, their people and the forest.

Invasions of indigenous lands in Brazil have increased 150% since Bolsonaro's election in October 2018. The number of murders of indigenous leaders in the Brazilian Amazon has hit its highest level in two decades. And this is, since his first day in office Bolsonaro has pushed to roll back protections for indigenous lands and pave the way for logging, mining and agricultural interests. The situation in Brazil is really an emergency.

I call on the Brazilian Government to stop the attacks on indigenous people and their land. I call on European companies to make sure that their business in Brazil is not driving these crimes and I call on the Commission not to conclude this Mercosur agreement, which will increase the pressure on indigenous land.

Nicolaus Fest, *im Namen der ID-Fraktion*. – Herr Präsident! Die indigenen Völker sind ohne Zweifel Opfer. Ihnen wurde großes Leid zugefügt. Ihr Land wurde ihnen geraubt, ihre Traditionen wurden missachtet, ihre Kultur wurde zerstört. Die indigenen Völker selbst wurden misshandelt und getötet.

Das allerdings könnte auch die Zukunft Europas sein. Wenn es nicht rassistisch ist, Menschen, Kulturen und Traditionen in anderen Teilen der Welt zu verteidigen, dann kann es auch nicht rassistisch sein, wenn man die Einwohner, die Kultur und die Traditionen Europas verteidigt.

Qualifizierte Zuwanderer zu integrieren ist nicht dasselbe, wie unterschiedslos und naiv alle Kulturen und Millionen Einwanderer willkommen zu heißen. Und wir Europäer sollten auch nicht durch die selbtherrliche und demokratisch nicht legitimierte Resettlement-Politik der EU gezwungen werden, unsere Kultur und unsere Werte irgendwelchen Fremden anzupassen.

Die EU muss aufhören, illegale Migration gleichsam als unvermeidlich hinzunehmen und aufhören, Länder zu kritisieren, die ihre Grenzen schützen. Das ist *rule of law*, das ist nicht *hate speech*. Europas Menschen, Kulturen und Traditionen verdienen nämlich genauso viel Schutz und Respekt wie die der indigenen Völker.

Miguel Urbán Crespo, *en nombre del Grupo GUE/NGL*. – Señor presidente, desde América hasta Asia, los pueblos indígenas y originarios se enfrentan a las mismas amenazas.

Hace un año, en un debate similar, exigimos que no se firmaran acuerdos comerciales que permitieran o fomentaran el expolio de tierras indígenas y la vulneración de sus derechos. ¿Y qué ha hecho la Unión Europea en todo este tiempo? Pues, por ejemplo, acelerar las negociaciones comerciales con Mercosur, que incluyen a un país como Brasil, con un Gobierno de extrema derecha, que acosa a los pueblos indígenas para expoliar sus tierras.

El 80 % de la biodiversidad del planeta, crucial para cualquier estrategia de lucha contra el cambio climático, está en territorios indígenas. Dejémoslos de hipocresías, señorías. Los derechos de los pueblos indígenas tienen que estar por encima del poder corporativo, del poder de las multinacionales europeas.

Antoni Comín i Oliveres (NI). – Señor presidente, a pesar de ser sistemáticamente discriminados u oprimidos por los Estados coloniales, los pueblos indígenas son vitales para la conservación de nuestro equilibrio ecológico, porque para ellos sus ecosistemas son parte intrínseca de su identidad. En los últimos treinta años, su reconocimiento internacional ha mejorado, particularmente con la Declaración de las Naciones Unidas de 2017, pero cada año miles de ellos siguen siendo criminalizados por defender su derecho al autogobierno y a la tierra.

Solo ellos pueden proteger la naturaleza de la mentalidad neocolonial de algunos gobernantes y de la mentalidad neoliberal de algunas multinacionales. Los tenemos que apoyar también desde Europa, pero no solo con buenas palabras. La Unión Europea tiene la obligación de revisar todos sus tratados de libre comercio para asegurar que no se usen ni el territorio ni los recursos de los pueblos indígenas sin su consentimiento. Como dice la Resolución, los pueblos indígenas tienen derecho a la autodeterminación. Es nuestro deber respetarlo y protegerlo.

Nacho Sánchez Amor (S&D). – Señor presidente, este es uno de esos debates que vamos posponiendo porque nunca hay en la agenda de la semana un asunto candente, como fueron los incendios de Brasil el verano pasado. Yo creo que, precisamente, como decía la diputada Santos, el haber tenido en el Premio Sájarov algunos candidatos de pueblos indígenas al menos ha hecho aflorar el asunto.

Los pueblos indígenas tienen que ser tratados con justicia -lo han dicho todos los colegas-, pero también tienen que ser tratados con inteligencia estratégica. Hay que abandonar el tradicional eurocentrismo paternalista e incorporar los pueblos indígenas a los debates contemporáneos y a la toma de decisiones global, por ejemplo, en materia de cambio climático. Combinar las sabidurías ancestrales de las culturas indígenas con el desarrollo tecnológico de los países desarrollados es una ventaja, es una baza que tenemos que explorar. Y tenemos que comenzar a hablar mucho más allá de la cooperación Norte-Sur -también más allá de la cooperación Sur-Sur- y comenzar a hablar de la cooperación Sur-Norte. Y hay algunos ejemplos radiantes de cómo, desde países como Kenia, un premio Nobel fue capaz de, con sistemas tradicionales y utilizando la fuerza de trabajo de las mujeres, plantar cincuenta millones de árboles.

Lo han dicho los compañeros: hay que proteger a los pueblos indígenas. Pero hay que defenderlos también por su valor añadido, por la plusvalía que representan en el orden económico y social mundial.

María Soraya Rodríguez Ramos (Renew). – Señor presidente, hablamos de pueblos indígenas y hablamos de más de 5 000 pueblos indígenas que se encuentran en 90 países diferentes. De toda esa población, 185 millones son mujeres.

Se ha dicho que los pueblos indígenas han defendido a lo largo de los siglos su casa, su entorno; y defendiendo su casa han defendido la casa de todos. Hoy sabemos que muchísimas especies en extinción se conservan porque ellos han defendido la biodiversidad, su entorno, a veces con su vida. Debemos protegerlos, debemos respetarles y debemos hacer una defensa especial, señora comisaria, de las mujeres.

Hace veinte años Vandana Shiva ya nos lo decía: en la mayoría de las culturas, las mujeres han sido las guardianas de la biodiversidad. Ellas producen, reproducen, consumen y conservan la biodiversidad en la práctica de la agricultura. Protejámoslos, protejámoslas especialmente, porque respetando su vida garantizamos la vida de todos nosotros.

Marie Toussaint (Verts/ALE). – Monsieur le Président, les écocides gagnent du terrain. En Australie, les aborigènes ont vu leurs terres ravagées par des méga-feux dont l'ampleur est étroitement liée au réchauffement climatique. Leurs alertes n'ont pas été entendues et on a ignoré et nié leurs connaissances, notamment celles qu'ils détiennent sur la nature. Depuis trop longtemps, nous avons méprisé le savoir autochtone des femmes et des hommes qui savent respecter et protéger le vivant. Il est temps de respecter leurs droits. Les peuples autochtones ont des savoirs et des savoir-faire venus de loin. Ces peuples n'ont pas oublié que nous faisons toutes et tous partie du vivant. La relation qu'ils entretiennent avec la nature devrait davantage nous inspirer. Ayons la sagesse de redevenir modestes, de reconnaître enfin les droits de la nature, d'en finir avec les modes de production et de consommation inconsidérés qui détruisent la planète. Le temps de l'écologie est venu: protégeons l'avenir en réconciliant les humains et la nature, la justice sociale et la justice environnementale, les droits des peuples autochtones et l'universalisme.

PRZEWODNICTWO: EWA KOPACZ*Wiceprzewodnicząca*

Neena Gill (S&D). – Madam President, systematic and institutional discrimination against indigenous people is alive and well, and it's not confined to one continent or one field, it's across the board: health, employment, social protection, on top of historic injustices that they have faced from dispossession of their lands, territories and resources. So when we look at the challenges, whether it's the Amazon rainforest lost to flames or the catastrophe of the fires in Australia, indigenous people offer the world innovative solutions, solving some of the biggest challenges.

According to the United Nations, the world has an estimated 370 million indigenous people. They make up about one third of the world's 900 million people in rural areas who are classified as extremely poor. Yet indigenous voices continue to be marginalised. In the mainstream media and in politics, their struggle for equal rights remains unheard. Indigenous women, in particular, suffer from multiple discrimination, both as women and based on their indigenous status. The Commission really needs to ensure that these rights are upheld and that they have a seat at the decision-making table.

Zgłoszenia z sali

Robert Hajšel (S&D). – Vážená pani predsedajúca, áno, toto je veľmi závažná téma. Ide naozaj o ohrozovanie a pretrvávajúce ohrozovanie práv stoviek miliónov ľudí na tejto planéte. Ľudí, domorodcov, ktorí vlastne vlastnia vlastnú pôdu, majú vlastnú zem a často sú oklamávaní rôznymi veľkými firmami, ktoré sa snažia profitovať na ich pôde, ťažiť rôzne nerastné suroviny, a tým pádom aj toxikovať túto pôdu. Čiže tu, naozaj, nielen klimatické zmeny a nielen chudoba, ale aj takéto závažné veci ako ohrozovanie ich zdravia cez toxikáciu pôdy. Ale aj samozrejme ohrozovanie práv žien. Ale aj prenasledovanie samotné a zabíjanie aktivistov, ktorí bojujú za ich práva. Preto my ako Európska únia sa musíme postaviť a urobiť všetko preto, aby sme práva týchto domorodých obyvateľstiev na celom svete zaradili aj do našich zmlúv o medzinárodnej spolupráci s ďalšími tretími krajinami. Musíme sa snažiť, aby to bol štandard. Veď nám ide o zákon práva, o vládu práva, o ľudské práva. Tak to musíme preukázať aj v tejto oblasti.

Sandra Pereira (GUE/NGL). – Senhora Presidente, frases como «cada vez mais o índio é um ser humano igual a nós», ou «sonho com uma Bolívia livre de rituais satânicos indígenas», de Jair Bolsonaro, do Brasil, e de Jeanine Áñez, na Bolívia, são representativas da forma como o capitalismo encara os povos indígenas, as populações nativas de territórios invadidos, ocupados e explorados de norte a sul na América, e das ilhas do Pacífico à Austrália.

O rasto de séculos de ocupação é a morte e a expropriação. Estes povos continuam, de um modo geral, a ser encarados como sub-humanos, um empecilho à colonização territorial e cultural capitalista, na sua senda de se apropriar de e rentabilizar os recursos naturais, mesmo que para isso tenha que atropelar continuamente legislação nacional, resoluções da ONU e milhares de vidas humanas.

A União Europeia, com o seu apoio a golpes de Estado ou com acordos de livre comércio, é cúmplice dos assassinatos, da ocupação de reservas territoriais, da perda de património cultural e da violação diária dos direitos dos povos indígenas.

Fabio Massimo Castaldo (NI). – Signora Presidente, onorevoli colleghi, oggi non sono solo ecosistemi, animali e piante a rischio di estinzione, ma anche popoli, culture, civiltà. Le popolazioni indigene o tribali costituiscono solo poco più del 4 % della popolazione mondiale, ma rappresentano oltre il 90 % della diversità culturale del nostro pianeta.

Vittime della storia, dell'espansione coloniale europea, della supremazia tecnica, economica e militare della civiltà occidentale, i nativi sono rimasti in condizione di subordinazione, hanno perso quasi tutti i loro territori e sono ridotti a vivere al margine di una società a loro estranea, privati del diritto di autodeterminazione, della propria terra e delle proprie risorse. Queste popolazioni sono oggi succubi di rinnovati interessi economici e commerciali, sfruttate come manodopera a basso costo, obbligate ad abbandonare la propria terra quando risorse o ricchezza vengono scoperte e, ancora, vittime principali degli effetti della deforestazione e dei cambiamenti climatici, dallo scioglimento dei ghiacciai al riscaldamento climatico stesso.

Cari colleghi, bisogna fare di più e meglio per tutelare i custodi della terra dalle antiche minacce e dalle nuove, ma soprattutto, bisogna intensificare il dialogo con queste popolazioni, che con la loro profonda conoscenza dell'ambiente in cui vivono possono e devono giocare un ruolo chiave nello sforzo contro i cambiamenti climatici.

(Koniec zgłoszeń z sali)

Helena Dalli, *Member of the Commission, on behalf of the Vice-President of the Commission / High Representative of the Union for Foreign Affairs and Security Policy.* – Madam President, I would like to thank the honourable Members for their interventions and their suggestions. Of course, we can always do more and we can always do better. And let me reiterate the high importance that the EU attaches to reversing the negative trends that we are currently seeing as regards the enjoyment of human rights by indigenous people. So support for indigenous people's rights will remain high on our agenda.

With regard to the issue raised by Ms Santos, business, yes, may indeed have impacts on the rights of indigenous people, and the Commission is ready to consider the issue in the ongoing reflections on the policy related to responsible business conduct. So thank you for your comments.

I will make some remarks now on the EU approach on human rights in Brazil within the future EU-Mercosur Agreement. The EU follows closely the situation of human rights in Brazil, particularly human rights defenders, indigenous peoples and all those working to protect land, environment, biodiversity and climate. Indigenous peoples feature prominently also in our comprehensive and sustained contact and cooperation with Brazil, for instance by regular visits by the EU delegation in Brasília, to different regions and indigenous communities, regular visits by the EU Special Representative for Human Rights as well.

The last edition of the EU-Brazil dialogue on human rights was on 9 October 2019, and it included a focus on indigenous peoples, human rights defenders, labour standards, businesses and human rights, and children's and women's rights, which already also were mentioned here tonight. And in particular we voiced our concern on the situation of indigenous peoples and human rights defenders. Our offer of cooperation was positively appreciated by the Brazilians, and as a positive follow-up to this dialogue, Brazil invited the EU Special Representative for Human Rights, Mr Gilmore, to visit the country during 2020 as a mid-term review of the joint work carried out in these areas between annual dialogues.

The EU-Mercosur Association Agreement would serve as a valuable tool to further promote the protection of human rights and to address environmental issues in Brazil and the region. It includes provisions on human rights, indigenous peoples and cooperation on sustainable development. It will provide for upgraded mechanisms for enhanced political dialogue and cooperation between the two sides of these issues. These include specific mechanisms for EU-Mercosur dialogue and exchanges between parties, including at the level of parliaments and civil societies of both regions. In the trade part, a trade and sustainable development chapter provides for binding commitment to the effective implementation of the multilateral environmental agreements – including the Paris Agreement – ratified by each of the parties. These will bring reinforced commitments and tools for regular dialogue with our partners.

Przewodnicząca. – Zamykam debatę.

Oświadczenia pisemne (art. 171 Regulaminu)

Kinga Gál (PPE), írásban. – Az ENSZ Közgyűlése a 2019-es esztendőt az őslakos nyelvek nemzetközi évének nyilvánította. Az EP Kisebbségi Munkacsoportjának társelnökeként személyesen részt vettem ezen tematikus év előkészítésében, melynek célja az volt, hogy elősegítse és védje az őslakos nyelveket és javítsa az őslakos nyelveket beszélő közösségek életét. Az őslakos nyelvek folyamatos eltűnése aggodalomra okot adó jelenség a világban. Egy 2016-os ENSZ-jelentés szerint a világban jelenleg beszélt közel 6700 nyelv – amelyek nagy többsége őshonos nyelv – 95%-át fenyegeti annak veszélye, hogy az évszázad végére kihal.

Pedig a nyelvek az emberi jogok és alapvető szabadságjogok meghatározó alkotóelemei, és fontosak a fenntartható fejlődés megvalósítása szempontjából is, hiszen az őslakos közösségek helyismerete, kollektív tudása és tapasztalata ezekbe a nyelvekbe van kódolva. Így ezen tudás, amely hozzájárul a globális környezetvédelmi kihívások leküzdéséhez is, csak ezen közvetítő nyelvek által adható át a jövő nemzedékeknek. Éppen ezért kiemelten fontos ezen nyelvek védelme és használatának előmozdítása. Az őslakos nyelvek fennmaradásához elengedhetetlen a megfelelő oktatás biztosítása. Támogatni kell az interkulturális közpolitikák, az őshonos nyelvek és a történelemismeret integrálását iskolai programokba, mert ez hozzájárul az őslakos népek kultúrájának nemzeti és nemzetközi szinten történő megőrzéséhez, megújításához és népszerűsítéséhez.

Bettina Vollath (S&D), schriftlich. – Ja, Die Rechte der indigenen Bevölkerung müssen uns, dem Europäischen Parlament, ein großes Anliegen sein. Wenn Landraub passiert, dürfen wir nicht wegsehen! In Zeiten der Klimakrise darf die Profitgier einiger weniger nicht die Lebensgrundlage von Jahrtausende alten Kulturen zerstören. Letztendlich können wir mit unserem umweltschädlichen Konsumverhalten einiges von indigenen Lebensweisen lernen. Nun dürfen wir nicht nur vom Schützen dieser Menschen sprechen, sondern müssen auch handeln! Fangen wir an, Unternehmen und Regierungen verantwortlich zu halten. Schaffen wir Transparenz in globalen Lieferketten und verpflichten diese auch zur Einhaltung der Menschenrechte. Von der Herstellung bis zum Konsumenten und zur Konsumentin sollten weder der Mensch noch die Natur leiden müssen.

23. Nowelizacja indyjskiej ustawy o obywatelstwie w 2019 r. (debata)

Przewodnicząca. – Kolejnym punktem porządku dziennego jest oświadczenie wiceprzewodniczącego Komisji / wysokiego przedstawiciela Unii do spraw zagranicznych i polityki bezpieczeństwa w sprawie nowelizacji indyjskiej ustawy o obywatelstwie w 2019 r. (2020/2519(RSP)).

Helena Dalli, Member of the Commission, on behalf of the Vice-President of the Commission/High Representative of the Union for Foreign Affairs and Security Policy. – Madam President and honourable Members of this Parliament, the European Union and India enjoy a strong bond rooted in the 2004 strategic partnership. It is based on shared values of democracy, rule of law, respect for human rights, commitment to the rules-based global order, effective multilateralism and sustainable development.

The President of the European Council and the President of the European Commission will host the Prime Minister of India for the 15th EU-India summit on 13 March here in Brussels. We have a rich, frank and open dialogue with India on all issues of common interest, as well as on issues where we might have different perspectives.

The High Representative/Vice-President of the Commission was in India on 16 and 17 January, where he discussed the preparation for the summit. On this occasion, the Minister for External Affairs and Prime Minister Modi reaffirmed their strong interest for a deepened strategic partnership with the European Union.

The issue that you are debating today was also part of the discussions, and the HR/VP enquired about the risk of discrimination among refugees and migrants on religious grounds under the revised legislation. He also drew the attention of his interlocutors to the need to ensure compliance of national legislation with international law. Beyond this point, we believe that it is the role of the Supreme Court of India to assess compliance of the law with the Constitution and we are confident that the ongoing judicial process will contribute to appeasing the tensions and violence witnessed over the past weeks in the country.

Thank you for your attention and I look forward to your remarks.

Michael Gahler, *im Namen der PPE-Fraktion*. – Liebe Kolleginnen und Kollegen! Indien ist, wie die Kommissarin zu Recht gesagt hat, ein wichtiger Partner für uns, sowohl politisch als auch wirtschaftlich, und wir wollen die Beziehungen verbessern. Deswegen ist es für uns wichtig, zu schauen, was in dem Land vor sich geht. Wenn uns zur Kenntnis kommt, dass es dort aufgrund eines geänderten Gesetzes oder auch anderer geplanter gesetzlicher Änderungen – wie beim Registrierungsgesetz – Schwierigkeiten, und sogar Gewalt und Tote gibt, dann ist das ein Punkt, wo wir genauer hinschauen. Das tun wir in dem Zusammenhang, und es ist wichtig, dass wir uns hier schlau machen, wie die Situation einzuschätzen ist. Das Gesetz als solches nimmt ja nicht etwas von einem bestehenden Recht weg. Es gibt zwölf Jahre als Frist für alle, die legal in Indien gelebt haben, egal ob sie Muslime oder Christen sind oder anderen Glaubensrichtungen oder Ethnien angehören. Es ist in dem Falle eher eine selektive Privilegierung, also eine positive Diskriminierung. Dann stellt sich die Frage, ob in dem Zusammenhang tatsächlich etwas zu kritisieren ist. Die Kritik, die man sicherlich aus meiner Sicht üben kann, ist, dass im Zusammenhang mit der Debatte über dieses Gesetz auch das Gesetz über die Registrierung von Bürgern überarbeitet wird. Dort besteht die Befürchtung, dass viele Bürger den Nachweis nicht erbringen können, dass sie tatsächlich ein Recht haben, in Indien zu sein. Ich glaube, da muss Klarheit geschaffen werden. Ich bin froh, dass wir jetzt auch abwarten, bis wir die Möglichkeit haben, in zwei Wochen oder bei nächster Gelegenheit hier vielleicht auch mit Regierungsvertretern zu sprechen. Dann sollten wir – auch im Lichte dessen, was das oberste Gericht sagt – unser Urteil fällen. Schnellschüsse sind bei so wichtigen Partnern verkehrt, aber ich bin bereit, die Kritik da zu üben, wo sie auch angemessen ist.

John Howarth, *on behalf of the S&D Group*. – Madam President, I find and many of the people I represent find the Indian Citizenship Act amendments alarming. This cannot be dressed up. This is a highly discriminatory piece of legislation which targets a specific religion. Muslims are singled out and the threat that this legislation represents to the secular nature of India should be clear, and it's all very well asking the Indian Government what's actually going on, what they think, but I don't believe this is necessarily a government they can trust. I mean, they're going to say that it's okay, but the reality appears to me to be somewhat different, and the reports of violence that we hear from India are on the increase. I think a message needs to be sent to the Indian Government from the European Union – because this is a government of Hindu nationalism, a populist government out of the same mold that we have seen elsewhere in the world. The message needs to be very clear: whether it's Kashmir or the rights of citizens, respect for human rights is an essential element of the arrangements that this Union makes with other partners, and without that respect for human rights, our relationship as the European Union with India will come under serious threat.

Dinesh Dhamija, *on behalf of the Renew Group*. – Madam President, India takes in persecuted refugees from Afghanistan, Pakistan and Bangladesh – and they're the bad guys? No, they're the good guys. They've taken in the refugees.

This motion does not censure any of those three Muslim countries for having created this refugee crisis. The UN Minorities Declaration of 1992 states that minorities can be classified as national, ethnic, religious, linguistic or cultural. This act, the CAA, is just focused on persecuted religious minorities seeking refuge in India. Thus, Muslims coming from those three Muslim countries cannot be considered minorities. Muslims do have a right to become Indian citizens by the 1955 act, of course. The CAA allows Christians, Hindus, Buddhists, Jains and Parsis and Sikhs to become citizens after six years of living in India. These are persecuted religious minorities.

There are many things wrong with our motion today, but I'll just give you four: Rohingyas, Tamils, police violence and the National Register of Citizens. Rohingyas are a religious Muslim minority leaving Myanmar for Bangladesh. When they come from Bangladesh to India they become economic migrants because they're coming from a majority Muslim state. Violence and brutality of the police: let me inform you that 57 policemen had bullet wounds in a demonstration in Lucknow. Tamils are an ethnic minority, not a religious minority. The National Register of Citizens is not even mentioned in the CAA. Are we saying that India, or any other country for that matter, is not allowed to document the people living inside its boundaries?

The CAA is in front of the Supreme Court and thus should be considered *sub judice*. The real reason for this motion has come before us: the India-EU summit. Should we not be talking to the Indians rather than criticising them and playing neo-colonial politics. We must have a debate but we must also have a summit.

Scott Ainslie, *on behalf of the Verts/ALE Group*. – Madam President, I say to my colleagues that I am utterly heartbroken by the appalling decision that we have taken today to postpone the cross-party resolution on India's Islamophobic Citizenship Act – a resolution to which all the main groups had committed and the EPP has co-signed, but today they have chosen to postpone the vote yet again. Faced with the pressure of India's diplomatic lobby, the EU have crumbled, capitulated, prioritising yet another trade summit with India over our commitment to protecting human rights. We have refused to take a stand on this Islamophobic policy which could drive 200 million Muslims – nearly half the EU's population – toward statelessness, incarceration or deportation. In the state of Assam, 1.9 million citizens have already felt the curse of this nationalistic move by Modi. It's shameful. Now, many words were said in this Chamber today and from your seat to say that the only thing necessary for the triumph of evil is for good people to do nothing. Today, colleagues, we are doing nothing – to protect the rights of Muslims. Today's persecuted peoples. This will be the very last time I address Parliament, but I want to leave you with this simple plea: do not allow the Indian Government to use its diplomatic and political might to buy itself impunity. Stay strong and principled and fight against human rights violations and injustices, speak truth to power and hold the authoritarians to account, but you must act. Words are not enough.

Thierry Mariani, *au nom du groupe ID*. – Madame la Présidente, l'Inde est une démocratie, la plus grande démocratie du monde si l'on tient compte de sa population. Son gouvernement et son premier ministre ont été élus et réélus.

Madame la Commissaire, vous avez tenu des propos apaisants: oui, nous devons avoir un partenariat avec l'Inde; et oui, surtout, cette loi est en ce moment en plein processus démocratique. L'Inde dispose d'une Cour suprême qui va juger de la validité de cette loi, et je me félicite que le vote de notre résolution a été repoussé. En effet, comment ce vote aurait-il été interprété en Inde? Imaginons que nous ayons voté contre cette loi: on aurait dit que la Cour suprême a été influencée par l'Union européenne. Non, je pense que ce vote devait être reporté et je pense surtout que nous n'avons pas à nous prononcer sur cette loi: c'est de la souveraineté des États de choisir leurs nationaux. Comme cela a été dit par l'orateur du PPE, il n'y a en réalité aucun changement pour une partie de la population. Il y a, si vous me permettez cette expression britannique, un *fast track* qui est créé pour certains. En France, il y a un *fast track* sur la nationalité qui est créé pour certains ressortissants qui viennent de pays qui ont partagé notre histoire à un moment ou bien qui parlent français. Je ne pense pas qu'il y ait une persécution de qui que ce soit dans ce pays et dans cette loi.

Enfin, comment ne pas voir la main du Pakistan derrière cette campagne médiatique contre l'Inde? Le Pakistan qui, je le répète, ne respecte aucun accord international et que nous continuons à gratifier du statut de GSP+. Le Pakistan, où la minorité chrétienne est menacée.

Alors, laissons à chaque État le droit de choisir qui peut avoir sa nationalité. L'Inde accueille des milliers, voire des millions de réfugiés. À mon avis, ce sont les pays d'où viennent ces réfugiés qui sont à blâmer et non pas l'Inde qui les accueille.

Ryszard Czarnecki, *w imieniu grupy ECR*. – Pani Przewodnicząca! Pani Komisarz! Przed chwilą padły tutaj słowa o lobby, silnym lobby, a ja myślę, że dzisiaj w Parlamencie Europejskim zwyciężyło lobby zdrowego rozsądku i szacunku. Szacunku dla największej demokracji świata (w sensie demograficznym), szacunku dla naszego bardzo ważnego partnera w Azji – partnera ekonomicznego, a także politycznego, szacunku dla bardzo starej cywilizacji, szacunku dla państwa, które nigdy nie wtrącało się w nasze wewnętrzne sprawy Unii Europejskiej. Kiedy debatowaliśmy nad traktatami, żadnych uwag ze strony New Delhi nie było. Mam wrażenie, że sytuacja, w której my będziemy występować jako nauczyciele, sędziowie czy prokuratorzy, nie jest dobrą metodą. Tutaj chodzi o partnerstwo i o wzajemny szacunek. O to apeluję.

Idoia Villanueva Ruiz, *en nombre del Grupo GUE/NGL*. – Señora presidenta, cierres de Internet, represión policial, 170 muertos en las protestas contra la Ley de nacionalidad en la India. Una Ley que no solo viola el carácter laico de la propia Constitución india, al introducir la religión como criterio para obtener la nacionalidad, sino que también rompe los compromisos internacionales basados en los derechos humanos, como denunció la Oficina del Alto Comisionado de las Naciones Unidas.

Esta Ley no es solo en sí misma discriminatoria, es un peligroso resurgir para los derechos de todas, desde la «internacional reaccionaria». El primer ministro Modi, en conexión con Trump, con Bolsonaro, comenzó su segundo mandato con peligrosas decisiones en el conflicto de Cachemira atacando a ONG y cercenando libertades públicas.

Europa debe ponerse al lado de los millones de trabajadores indios e indias que están haciendo huelgas por sus derechos laborales; de los grupos de mujeres que denuncian las violaciones en grupo. Esto significa condicionar el acuerdo estratégico a un cambio sustancial en los derechos humanos. O apostamos decididamente por ser un actor político independiente que pueda dialogar en pie de igualdad o la propia Europa está en riesgo.

Fabio Massimo Castaldo (NI). – Signora Presidente, onorevoli colleghi, nonostante l'emendamento alla legge sulla cittadinanza del governo Modi sia formulato in termini apparentemente di accoglienza e protezione, in realtà questa norma è discriminatoria e divisiva, escludendo molte religioni dalle stesse facilitazioni attribuite ad altre e, unitamente all'istituzione del registro nazionale dei cittadini dell'India, il CAA potrebbe infatti portare a una crisi di apolidia su larga scala, senza contare le inutili tensioni e risentimento creato nella comunità musulmana.

Colleghi, mi chiedo: se lo scopo della legge fosse stato effettivamente finalizzato alla tutela delle minoranze perseguitate, perché non sono state incluse altre minoranze perseguitate di paesi limitrofi? Penso, ad esempio, alle popolazioni musulmane dei Rohingya in Myanmar, dei Bihari in Bangladesh o ancora degli Ahmadi in Pakistan, e potrei continuare con una lunga lista.

L'azione esterna dell'Unione si basa su principi che ne hanno informato la creazione, tra cui il principio di non discriminazione. Sono profondamente rammaricato per la decisione di rinviare il voto di oggi. È un nostro dovere, colleghi, come rappresentanti eletti, condannare le azioni del governo indiano e fare quanto in nostro potere affinché riconsideri il CAA e magari lo abroghi. La tradizione, la storia e la grande ricchezza culturale dell'India non meritano tutto questo.

Neena Gill (S&D). – Madam President, there's been much disinformation in the run-up to this debate, and even misleading statements in this House by some who have spoken before me, mixing up all sorts of issues. Let's just stick to the Citizenship Amendment Act (CAA). This is an action of positive discrimination aimed at fast-tracking the integration process of refugees from Pakistan, Afghanistan and Bangladesh, who have already been in India for many years, recognising the high level of discrimination faced by non-Muslims in those countries. It is not seeking to exclude any of the other groups who do not fall within this category. They can still apply for citizenship and be processed. What really pains me is that I have repeatedly raised the concerns around the persecution of minorities in Pakistan, Afghanistan and Bangladesh only for them to fall on deaf ears. Had this house paid a little bit more attention to those gross violations, as we do today to the CAA, India may not have had to take these actions. So I really welcome that the vote has been postponed on the resolution. First, it's full of factual inaccuracies. Secondly, it is right that we take time to have a proper debate and this House waits until the Supreme Court has deliberated on this. One thing we have to recognise is that India has a very strong civil society and Indians are far more than capable of holding their executive to account without interference from those who know very little about it.

Shaffaq Mohammed (Renew). – Madam President, earlier, at the start of this session, we had a very powerful lesson in history, a lesson that's painful for this Chamber because that's one of the reasons this House came into being: where one group of people decided another group of people were going to become stateless. I thought this Chamber had learned that lesson and I thought that we were going to be moving on, but what we see now – yes, you can have your meetings and resolutions, but I say to you: I have tried so hard to get this resolution on the table. I postponed the last one. I sat down with all the groups and I thought we had an agreement, but we haven't. I'm going to be away from here now, I'll be gone. God forbid, god forbid, if something terrible happens to that new group of people that are going to be made stateless, I can go away with a hand on my heart and say, 'I did everything possible', but individuals in here from the top table downwards thought that business and trade interests were more important than human rights. That's what you've done today. Well done.

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

Eugen Tomac (PPE), *Întrebare adresată conform procedurii „cartonașului albastru”*. – Ați vorbit despre faptul că un grup important de cetățeni vor deveni apatrizi în urma acestei legi. Puteți să ne spuneți cifra exactă a cetățenilor care rămân fără identitate cetățenească?

Shaffaq Mohammed (Renew), *blue-card answer*. – Apologies for taking my headphones off. If you looked at the motion in ‘H’, this NRC has been enacted in just one state. One state, and 1.9 million people cannot prove that they are Indian citizens. What on earth are you going to do with those people? Because there are already detention camps set up. That’s why I say to you, remember your history: in Nuremberg, that law was also passed, and that was ‘legal’. Just because a law is passed in a Parliament doesn’t mean it is legal. Learn from our history. I am taking his home with me. I am going to hold this in my drawer. God forbid if anything happens, those people that stop this vote today, I’ll be publicly naming them and saying ‘these are the people that have led to this tragedy’.

Anna Bonfrisco (ID). – Signora Presidente, onorevoli colleghi, egregio Alto rappresentante, l’Unione europea ha da sempre intensi rapporti commerciali con l’India, ma deve anche riconoscere il suo tentativo di costruire e difendere uno Stato di diritto, pur tra le molte, molte contraddizioni.

Noi dobbiamo rispetto all’India. L’India non ha nulla a che fare con i paesi che la circondano, a partire dal Pakistan, ideologicamente e religiosamente contrario al progresso, alla Cina, che impone il suo autoritarismo su più di un miliardo di persone, o al Myanmar, con la sua pulizia etnica contro i Rohingya.

Al netto di eventuali profili di costituzionalità, che non spetta a noi valutare, l’interesse dell’Unione europea deve essere quello di evitare ogni conflitto con un paese come l’India, proiettato nel futuro e all’avanguardia nel mondo per un sistema di educazione, quello dello STEM, fonte di benessere per i suoi cittadini. L’India è un paese ben cosciente delle minacce interne ed esterne alla sua sicurezza e cerca solo di attuare le misure che ritiene necessarie.

Phil Bennion (Renew). – Madam President, I certainly welcome the idea of a Citizenship Amendment Act in offering protection for persecuted groups. Unfortunately, the Act as it stands is seriously flawed. The law does not extend to the protection of Muslims. Now, there are Muslim sects in neighbouring countries that do face discrimination and one of them, the Ahmadiyyas, has already been mentioned. Ultimately, this law discriminates on religious grounds, and is therefore contrary to the whole principle in India of secularism and also its obligations and international human rights law. The danger, if this act is applied alongside the requirements of the National Register of Citizens, is that many Muslims could be deemed stateless if they cannot produce the correct documentation. This is already proving to be an issue in Assam, where – it’s already been stated by Mr Mohammed – 1.9 million people have been excluded from the register on the basis of not having the documents. So, India’s refugee policy needs to be applied to all of those in need, including Muslims, and the Government should ensure that security forces show sufficient restraint towards protesters and are held to account for their excessive use of force.

France Jamet (ID). – Madame la Présidente, mes chers collègues, aucun pays au monde n’admettrait de ne pas contrôler ses frontières. L’Inde est un pays souverain qui a prérogative pour décider qui est éligible à déposer une demande de nationalité, à plus forte raison lorsque la cohésion nationale et la sécurité autant intérieure qu’extérieure du pays sont menacées: l’Inde est une démocratie – nous l’avons tous répété ici – la plus grande du monde; et une fédération dans laquelle les États ont une importance cruciale dans un nombre important de domaines.

L’afflux de millions de réfugiés en provenance du Bangladesh, du Pakistan et surtout d’Afghanistan n’est pas, pour l’Inde, qu’un fait humanitaire; c’est un défi national posé à l’unité du pays déjà fragile. L’Inde doit gouverner une population de plus d’un milliard 300 millions d’habitants et n’entend pas succomber – comme cela a été souvent le cas dans son histoire – à des divergences internes, mais bien prendre sa place dans le monde en tant que nation unie. C’est son droit le plus strict.

Silvia Sardone (ID). – Signora Presidente, onorevoli colleghi, trovo francamente sconcertante che per l'ennesima volta qui in Parlamento europeo ci troviamo a parlare di altri Stati, mettendo in dubbio la sovranità che gli altri Stati hanno, tra l'altro mettendola in dubbio in uno Stato come l'India, che è riconosciuta come grande democrazia, soprattutto in Asia. Tra l'altro, su un tema che tra febbraio e marzo vedrà coinvolti esponenti del Parlamento europeo ed esponenti indiani che si incontreranno per discuterne. Un tema e un provvedimento che è *sub judice* e che sarà valutato dalla Suprema Corte indiana.

Però io mi chiedo: ma ha veramente senso mettere in discussione i rapporti tra Europa e India su un tema che è chiaramente di politica interna indiana? E soprattutto io penso che i cittadini europei ci avevano votato per discutere dei temi e dei grandi problemi degli europei non degli indiani o di altri Stati.

Chiudo con una cosa: il testo include attacchi al governo, parla di chiusura di accesso Internet e tante altre cose, quindi è chiaro che noi come gruppo saremo contrari.

(Koniec zgłoszeń z sali)

Helena Dalli, on behalf of the Vice-President of the Commission/High Representative of the Union for Foreign Affairs and Security Policy. – Madam President, I have taken due note of the various opinions expressed by the honourable Members today. The EU values its partnership with India – may I reiterate this. It's a respected democracy, the largest in the world and the oldest in Asia, and we look forward to pursuing and intensifying our dialogue with India at the forthcoming summit on the whole range of issues of common interest, including our mutual commitment to democracy, the rule of law and human rights. I thank you and good night.

Przewodnicząca. – Otrzymałam sześć projektów rezolucji złożonych zgodnie z art. 132 ust. 2 Regulaminu.

Zamykam debatę.

Głosowanie odbędzie się podczas drugiej marcowej sesji miesięcznej.

Oświadczenia pisemne (art. 171 Regulaminu)

Łukasz Kohut (S&D), na piśmie. – W grudniu 2019 roku przyjęto w Indiach prawo przyznające obywatelstwo migrantom, którzy przed 2015 rokiem przybyli do tego kraju z Pakistanu, Bangladeszu i Afganistanu, pod warunkiem, że nie są muzułmanami. Takiego prawa nie sposób nazwać inaczej niż dyskryminacją. Nie ma wytłumaczenia, które mogłoby uzasadnić dyskryminowanie i wykluczanie ludzi ze względu na wyznawaną religię czy też jej brak. Nie ma wytłumaczenia dla dyskryminacji z powodu jakiegokolwiek cechy – płci, wieku, stopnia sprawności, pochodzenia etnicznego, orientacji seksualnej, czy jakiegokolwiek innego powodu.

Przed dwoma dniami ocalały z Holocaustu Marian Turski, przemawiając w 75-tą rocznicę wyzwolenia Auschwitz, powiedział: „Nie bądźcie obojętni, gdy jakakolwiek mniejszość jest dyskryminowana, ponieważ istotą demokracji jest to, że większość rządzi, ale demokracja na tym polega, że prawa mniejszości muszą być chronione jednocześnie”. Ludzi, którzy przeżyli piekło będące wynikiem wykluczenia i nienawiści, trzeba słuchać.

Unia Europejska i Indie mają dobre stosunki i regularnie prowadzą dialog. Ważne jest, byśmy w ramach tego dialogu zwracali mocno uwagę na to, że prawo, które wyklucza, że prawo, które dyskryminuje, zawsze źle się kończy. Ważne jest również, byśmy zwracali uwagę na wartość, jaką jest świeckie państwo – państwo, w którym kościoły i związki wyznaniowe oddzielone są od władzy publicznej.

Antonio López-Istúriz White (PPE), por escrito. – La ley de nacionalidad aprobada por el Parlamento indio en diciembre de 2019 ha llevado a la violencia en las calles. Tenemos que analizar con detenimiento lo que está ocurriendo, pedir aclaraciones a las autoridades y esperar la decisión del Tribunal Supremo de la India. En 15 días, representantes gubernamentales y el primer ministro de la India vendrán a Bruselas y esa será una oportunidad de pedir aclaraciones. Desde su independencia en 1947, la India ha emprendido un admirable desarrollo, consolidándose como un referente democrático en la región e incluso como un paladín de la tolerancia y de la diversidad. Una normativa que discrimine abiertamente a los musulmanes y desafíe a sus países vecinos, sería crear un problema con su minoría musulmana. Este tipo de políticas tiene el riesgo de ampliar la brecha entre musulmanes e hindúes y dificultar la entrada de musulmanes en el país sería darles un sentimiento de ciudadanos de segunda categoría. De confirmarse, se crearía un motivo para la radicalización, en un país en el que hasta ahora no ha habido grandes problemas con el terrorismo yihadista. Confío en que el Gobierno aclarará la situación y rectificará lo que tenga que rectificar antes de que la violencia en las calles empeore.

24. Nagląca sytuacja humanitarna na wyspach greckich, zwłaszcza sytuacja dzieci – działania na rzecz ochrony, relokacji i łączenia rodzin (debata)

Przewodnicząca. – Kolejnym punktem porządku dziennego jest oświadczenie Rady i Komisji w sprawie naglącej sytuacji humanitarnej na wyspach greckich, zwłaszcza sytuacji dzieci – działania na rzecz ochrony, relokacji i łączenia rodzin (2020/2520(RSP)).

Nikolina Brnjac, President-in-Office of the Council. – Madam President, I would like first of all to thank you for this timely debate. As you know, the Croatian Presidency is particularly sensitive to the situation in the eastern Mediterranean, which has a direct impact on the flow of migrants in the whole of south-eastern Europe and even further. We are closely monitoring the events on the migration routes and we will continue to do so throughout our Presidency.

The situation on the Greek islands is currently very difficult. In 2019, more than 60 000 migrants arrived in Greece by sea, compared to 32 000 recorded in 2018. This represents an increase of 87% – far greater than the 9% percent increase recorded in 2017 and 2018. The number of people present on the Aegean islands increased significantly, reaching a peak of over 40 000 migrants. It is the first time since the implementation of the EU-Turkey statement that we have reached such a high number. Among them, there are several thousand children and unaccompanied minors who were accommodated in facilities which are not adapted to their needs. According to the UNHCR, around 40% of the 20 000 migrants in and around the Moria Camp are under 18 and nearly half of those are under 12 years old.

Due to the high number of arrivals, the situation on the islands continues to deteriorate. The humanitarian situation requires our close follow-up, and we will continue supporting the efforts of Greece to relieve the situation. The Greek government is undertaking concrete actions to improve the situation, inter alia by increasing the number of transfers to the mainland. In 2019, more than 35 000 migrants have been transferred but, unfortunately, this has not decreased the pressure on the islands. Further actions are needed.

The Greek Government has also announced a new scheme to protect unaccompanied minors reaching the country. I understand that the No Child Alone plan was designed to protect unaccompanied children from exploitation and criminality and includes commitments to swiftly create new structures to provide long-term accommodation for thousands of children. These new structures will provide housing, education, food and medical support. The plan also foresees the necessary legal services to allow accompanied minors to reunite with relatives in other Member States.

We also take note of government measures to speed up and streamline asylum procedures and manage flows to Greece by improving border surveillance. Some of these measures are part of the new asylum legislation which recently entered into force in Greece. It will be important to implement the new provisions as fast as possible, including regarding the return procedures.

The return rate so far has been a very low, for far too long. Returns are instrumental in keeping the numbers down on the islands and managing the flows. The plan of the Greek Government includes a target of returning 10 000 migrants by the end of 2020. This is ambitious, but it can be done, with the appropriate procedures in place and assistance from IOM, Frontex and EU Member States and through cooperation with third countries. Effective returns also require the cooperation of Turkey. In this respect, it is vital that both parties apply in good-faith all the provisions and operating procedures agreed as a result of the EU-Turkey statement.

On a broader note, I would like to use the opportunity of this debate to reiterate that the Croatian Presidency intends to continue its focus on implementation with regard to the comprehensive approach to migration. We will do our part to ensure coherent action at EU level in terms of more effective control of the EU external borders, increased external actions and address internal aspects.

I would like to stress that the humanitarian situation on the Greek islands is a cause of great concern. We have to work together to relieve the humanitarian situation. And let me also express here our appreciation for the work of all humanitarian partners. I will let the Commission further elaborate on the assistance and advice the EU provides to the Greek Government on this issue.

Ylva Johansson, *Member of the Commission*. – Madam President, honourable Members, as we are standing here, sitting here, speaking, waiting for our turn, more than 40 000 migrants are stuck in so-called hot spots on the Greek islands.

Most of them are living under conditions that are totally unacceptable. Many of them are children. I can only imagine being a mother in these hot spots, with children, being responsible for children, and living in a tent when it's cold, there's not enough food, with terrible conditions in many aspects, and being responsible for your own children and not being able to actually take responsibility as a mother. Or being a mother in a totally other country knowing that your teenager, your teenage boy, is alone there as unaccompanied minor.

These conditions are not acceptable, this we can't stand having in the European Union in 2020. I am probably not the only one who keeps awake at night thinking about these people and the conditions they are living under. But, of course, nobody will be helped by me being awake at night. I'm the Commissioner and I am of course responsible for doing things, and you who are here tonight will probably ask me, quite rightly, what is the Commission doing and what more can we do?

The Commission is supporting the Greek authorities with finding shelter for unaccompanied minors on the mainland. We will continue to support Greece and relocate people from the islands to new centres – new centres that will meet the minimum European standards for humanitarian intervention. We support the Greek authorities with our European funds. To mention just a few: EUR 50 million from the asylum migration and integration fund that supports up to 2 000 places in shelter for unaccompanied minors on the mainland; EUR 4.2 million for the IOM to create additional safe zones for unaccompanied minors on all the Greek islands; funds for a specific facility for vulnerable applicants called Kara Tepe on Lesbos; specific facilities also exist on Kos and Leros. We will continue to support Greece with our funds.

I welcome the appointment that the Greek Government has done to appoint a national coordinator for unaccompanied minors. I think that the Greek Government shows the right emphasis on this very difficult situation, and I welcome that the Greek Government are committed to improve the living conditions for migrants, bringing them to new centres, reforming the asylum system and also starting returning those that are not eligible for international protection.

We also think that additional incentives for the employment of doctors in the reception centres and identification centres is important. It is of great urgency to release unaccompanied minors from protective custody and transfer them to safe zones – zones that are suitable for long-term accommodation.

Is this enough? Apparently not. We need to do more. Yesterday I met with the newly-appointed Greek Migration Minister, Notis Mitarakis. We discussed measures as to how we can help Greece more and what also the Greek Government and the Greek authorities are planning.

Yesterday also, the European Asylum Support Office signed an agreement with Greece to double the staff in Greece from EASO.

The Commission will continue to show solidarity with Greece. This includes financial support of over EUR 2.2 billion. But the Commission alone cannot do everything. We also need the support from the Member States. We are lacking a common European asylum and migration system. In lack of that, we need voluntary support from other Member States. Greece has asked for the relocation of unaccompanied minors and I strongly support this. I support all solidarity efforts between Member States, especially when it comes to children. I call on Member States to continue to help Greece, to continue voluntary relocations and we, the Commission, will do the financial support. We will continue to work closely with the Greek authorities to help facilitate all voluntary solidarity efforts by other Member States.

I call on Member States to speed up the necessary procedures to reunify children with their families as soon as possible.

Honourable Members, we talk about migration policy and the migration situation in Europe. It's clear that even though we can see an increase of migrants arriving in Greece and especially at the Greek islands the overall situation is not a crisis. We have seen fewer irregular arrivals in the European Union than for many years. We are not in crisis; we do not have a migration crisis in Europe. But there are at least 40 000 individuals on the Greek islands and they are in crisis.

We need to support them and the most effective thing that we must do is to find a common solution that can unite Member States and Parliament in a new pact for migration and asylum. Every week, every month that we are not able to find this new common policy means these people paying too high a price.

Ελισάβετ Βόζεμπεργκ-Βρουονίδη, *εξ ονόματος της ομάδας PPE*. – Κυρία Επίτροπε, ακόμη μια φορά διαπιστώνουμε την αποτυχία στην αποτελεσματική διαχείριση του μεταναστευτικού. Απελπισμένοι άνθρωποι φτάνουν καθημερινά στην Ελλάδα από την Τουρκία, μέσω διακινητών, και η κατάσταση είναι πλέον δραματική. Τα νησιά καταστρέφονται και η ενδοχώρα αδυνατεί να χωρέσει τόσο μεγάλο πλήθος. Οι ασυνόδετοι ανήλικοι ξεπέρασαν τους 5.000, ενώ οι δυνατότητες της χώρας δεν επαρκούν σήμερα να καλύψουν ούτε τους μισούς.

Η ελληνική κυβέρνηση ζήτησε συνδρομή από τα κράτη μέλη, και ανταποκρίθηκαν θετικά μόνο η Γαλλία, η Πορτογαλία, η Βουλγαρία και η Τσεχία. Για τις επανενώσεις οικογενειών υπάρχει μεγάλο πρόβλημα λόγω υπερβολικών απαιτήσεων αλλά και αντιφατικών νομοθεσιών που επικαλούνται τα κράτη μέλη. Στην Ελλάδα βιώνουμε σκληρή ανθρωπιστική κρίση και αισθανόμαστε ότι είμαστε μόνοι. Μόνο πέντε χώρες έχει η ευρωπαϊκή οικογένεια; Πώς αποδεικνύουμε έμπρακτη αλληλεγγύη, όταν, ακόμη και στο δράμα ανήλικων παιδιών, γυρίζουν ανάληψη την πλάτη; Η ελληνική κυβέρνηση εφαρμόζει νέα μεταναστευτική πολιτική και, ειδικά για τα παιδιά, ο Πρωθυπουργός ανακοίνωσε πρωτοβουλία «κανένα παιδί μόνο», με στόχο την αυστηρή τιμωρία των διακινητών και την ολοκλήρωση 4.000 δομών φιλοξενίας για ασυνόδευτους ανήλικους. Όμως δεν είναι δυνατόν να το διαχειριστούμε χωρίς βοήθεια. Η δυσπιστία των Ελλήνων στις αξίες της Ευρώπης αυξάνεται, και όχι άδικα.

Η Τουρκία συνεχίζει αδιάκοπα την παράνομη πολιτική της σε βάρος μας εκμεταλλευόμενη ανθρώπινες ψυχές, και η συντριπτική πλειονότητα των κρατών μελών αδιαφορεί. Δεν μπορεί να συνεχιστεί έτσι η κατάσταση. Κρούουμε κώδωνα κινδύνου. Το μεταναστευτικό ήδη κλονίζει σοβαρά τα θεμέλια της Ευρωπαϊκής Ένωσης. Γνωρίζετε ότι οι καθυστερήσεις για νέες δράσεις επιτείνουν την ένταση. Δεν θα κουραστώ να το λέω: Οφείλουμε όλοι, χωρίς εξαιρέσεις, να αναλάβουμε ευθύνες τώρα. Η Ελλάδα δεν ζητάει προνόμια. Τα δικαιώματά της ασκεί. Συνάδελφοι, σήμερα αποχαιρέτησαμε με λύπη το Ηνωμένο Βασίλειο και ευχόμαστε να μην ακολουθήσει άλλος. Όμως, χωρίς δικαιοσύνη, τα επόμενα χρόνια κινδυνεύουμε να θρηνώμε συνέπειες από λάθη και παραλείψεις. Έχουμε πετύχει πάρα πολλά. Η αποτυχία δεν μας αξίζει.

Claude Moraes, *on behalf of the S&D Group*. – Madam President, the Commissioner was very robust in stating how unacceptable these conditions are, because they exist within the European Union. We have many refugee hotspots around the world, but this is the problem: they exist within the European Union, and they are afflicting – as we heard from the last speaker – Greece in particular. She and the Commissioner explained what the elephant in the room was: Member State coordination is lacking.

We are asking today for the Commission to act: this, for my group, is really the most important thing. I've been to the islands many times – other speakers will speak of this – and we need action, and the Commissioner prefaced this in the details that she gave. So, for my group, that is not to talk again about all the chronic and severe problems of understaffing in the hotspots – the risks for children under Dublin, and so on – but to say that we need to act on long-term reception capacities on the mainland in the overcrowded hotspots, to deploy additional expert staff, and to provide crucial legal information to end the regime of geographical restrictions. So we ask the Commission to do everything it can, but of course the Member States must do more: this is really the elephant in the room. If we don't have this combined comprehensive approach, we will continue to have these – as the Commissioner said – unacceptable conditions within the European Union.

Commissioner, this is my last speech after 20 years and six months (remember the six months!), and for much of that time I have spoken about these issues: humanitarian issues and issues of asylum. I've been to the Greek islands many times, and I know that these issues affect the European Union disproportionately for what they are, because they define the values of the European Union. So I really urge colleagues to do everything they can to ensure that we solve this problem, because it affects the very values of the European Union: we send a message to the world about what kind of European Union we are. I wish you all the best of luck to deal with this issue as comprehensively as possible in the coming months.

Maite Pagazaurtundúa, *en nombre del Grupo Renew*. – Señora presidenta, señora comisaria, muchas gracias por estar aquí. Usted lleva poco tiempo en el cargo, y, por lo que nos ha dicho, conoce los elementos fundamentales de esos centros que se han convertido en infiernos. Pero no es en 2020 cuando Moria, o lo que pueda haber en Samos o Quiós, es un infierno. Es así desde 2015, desde 2016, y seguimos igual o peor.

Moria es una fábrica de estrés traumático, de estrés postraumático, de sufrimiento moral. Y nosotros no podemos permitirlo. Usted habla de que vamos a ayudar para tener nuevos centros, ¿cuándo van a estar? Usted habla de que se va a doblar el personal de la EASO. Yo he ido dos veces a la isla de Lesbos. No he podido ver nunca a nadie de la EASO. No sabemos cuánto es el doble de cero.

Entiéndame, nuestro Grupo es un grupo responsable. Queremos ayudar a que haya un nuevo pacto de migración y asilo. Estamos dispuestos a los compromisos. Pero si no se saca a esa pobre gente de las islas griegas, si no se ayuda a Grecia, no va a salir adelante. Porque nadie va a confiar en que vamos en serio. Y esos niños y esas mujeres y esos ancianos no pueden esperar, no pueden esperar más. Por tanto, ¿cuándo vamos a tener esos nuevos centros de recepción, comisaria?

Erik Marquardt, *im Namen der Verts/ALE-Fraktion*. – Frau Präsidentin! Vielen Dank, Frau Johansson, für Ihre Worte, für Ihre wirklich starken Worte und Anstrengungen. Ich war selbst oft auf Lesbos, und inzwischen schicken mir jeden Tag Menschen Bilder und Nachrichten. Wenn ich die Bilder sehe, dann sehe ich eigentlich hauptsächlich Leid, ich sehe Kälte, ich sehe Perspektivlosigkeit und zunehmend auch Gewalt. Und es macht mich schon traurig, dass das jetzt nicht der erste Winter ist, sondern der vierte Winter, in dem Menschen in unbeheizten Zelten dort überwintern müssen. Ich muss schon auch sagen: Wenn Menschen leiden, dann muss Politik handeln. Es ist gut, dass wir hier reden, aber um endlich zu handeln, brauchen wir vielleicht auch nicht mal einen neuen Asylopakt der Kommission, sondern eigentlich nur den Willen der Mitgliedstaaten, die Menschenwürde und die Rechtsstaatlichkeit zu achten, sich dafür einzusetzen. Ohne diesen Willen, wenn er jetzt nicht sichtbar wird, ist auch der neue Asylopakt der Kommission zum Scheitern verurteilt.

Wir können und werden uns hier auch über Asylpolitik streiten, wir werden unterschiedliche Meinungen haben und sie diskutieren. Aber wenn unsere Mitgliedstaaten nicht einmal Kinder retten, die im Schlamm überwintern, wie sollen wir dann eigentlich die europäische Asylpolitik retten? Ich finde, dass es angesichts der Zustände auf den griechischen Inseln richtig wäre, wenn wenigstens einzelne Mitgliedstaaten vorangehen und ein Zeichen setzen und zuerst die Kinder von den griechischen Inseln evakuieren. Denn ich finde, dass wir seit Jahren einfach zu lange an unseren eigenen Ansprüchen scheitern. Wir schotten uns ab und glauben, dass es uns dann besser geht. Aber Europa geht es nicht besser, wenn wir die Augen davor verschließen, dass es Menschen schlecht geht. Diese Politik entwürdigt eben nicht nur die Menschen an den europäischen Außengrenzen, sondern diese Politik entwürdigt Europa. Und ich denke, wir können eigentlich erfolgreicher sein als das.

Annalisa Tardino, *a nome del gruppo ID*. – Signora Presidente, onorevoli colleghi, lo scorso novembre abbiamo affrontato a Strasburgo il tema degli *hot spot* in Grecia e oggi ci ritroviamo ancora qui con le medesime parole ma nessun fatto.

La Grecia ha visto l'arrivo di oltre 70 000 migranti nel 2019 e, secondo le ultime statistiche, circa 30 000 migranti o rifugiati si trovano attualmente in Grecia. Siamo di fronte a una vera e propria crisi umanitaria che richiede azioni concrete e immediate. E quali sono le azioni concrete e immediate che l'UE sta portando avanti, oltre a farsi ricattare da Erdogan? Miliardi di euro dei nostri contribuenti che avremmo potuto utilizzare in maniera più proficua.

E non mi sembra che l'approccio della nuova Commissione sia tanto diverso. Si parla di un nuovo, risolutivo, piano per la migrazione e l'asilo, ma, da quanto ascoltato, la situazione in Grecia rimarrà tale. Peraltro mi chiedo anche come questo piano contribuirà a migliorare la situazione dell'Italia che per anni ha affrontato da sola l'emergenza, bloccata con coraggio solo dal nostro governo, anche a costo di un processo. Purtroppo in nessun modo, finché non si andrà alla radice del problema, se mai lo farete.

Εμμανουήλ Φράγκος, εξ ονόματος της ομάδας ECR. – Κυρία Πρόεδρε, ακούγοντας τις τοποθετήσεις ορισμένων ευρωβουλευτών, ακόμη και Ελλήνων, νομίζει κανείς ότι βρίσκονται εδώ εκπροσωπώντας τους πολίτες του Πακιστάν, της Συρίας, του Αφγανιστάν και άλλων τρίτων χωρών, οι οποίοι βρίσκονται παράνομα στην Ελλάδα. Επειδή όμως η Ελληνική Λύση και ο Κυριάκος Βελόπουλος μαχόμαστε καθημερινά ενάντια σε αυτόν τον εποικισμό που γίνεται στην Ελλάδα, θέλω να μιλήσω για την κατάσταση που βιώνουν οι Έλληνες στα ελληνικά νησιά, για την οποία κανείς δεν μιλά. Η Ευρωπαϊκή Ένωση αγνοεί ότι οι Έλληνες κοντεύουμε να γίνουμε μειονότητα στην Ελλάδα, και ότι οι ντόπιοι, όχι μόνο στα νησιά αλλά και σε όλη την επικράτεια, στέκονται αβοήθητοι και κοιτούν τις περιουσίες τους, τις οικογένειές τους και τα μέρη στα οποία μεγάλωσαν να καταστρέφονται και να απειλούνται από τη λαθρομετανάστευση. Για αυτή την κρίση θα κάνει κάτι η Ευρωπαϊκή Ένωση ή θα ευχαριστεί μονίμως την Ελλάδα που στέκεται αλληλέγγυα απέναντι στους ίδιους της τους εισβολείς; Μίας και έχουμε φτάσει στο σημείο να συζητάμε για την επανένωση των οικογενειών των λαθρομεταναστών, θέλω να πω και κάτι ακόμη: Τα τελευταία χρόνια, λόγω της οικονομικής κρίσης, σχεδόν μισό εκατομμύριο νέοι Έλληνες της γενιάς μου, οι οποίοι είχαν τελειώσει κάποιο Πανεπιστήμιο, όπως και εγώ, αλλά δεν μπορούσαν να βρουν δουλειά στην Ελλάδα, εγκατέλειψαν τη χώρα μου και τις οικογένειές τους. Τα άτομα αυτά συναντούν πλέον τους γονείς και τους συγγενείς τους για λίγες μόνο ημέρες τον χρόνο. Με αυτήν την οικογενειακή επανένωση, λοιπόν, πρέπει να ασχοληθεί η Ευρωπαϊκή Ένωση, γιατί οτιδήποτε άλλο ξεπερνά την ανοχή των Ελλήνων.

(Ο ομιλητής δέχεται να απαντήσει σε ερώτηση με γαλάζια κάρτα (άρθρο 171 παράγραφος 8 του Κανονισμού).)

Damian Boeselager (Verts/ALE), blue-card question. – I have a very simple question for you, and that is this: are you willing to uphold the right to asylum and the right to have an interview to determine the asylum status?

Εμμανουήλ Φράγκος (ECR), απάντηση σε ερώτηση με γαλάζια κάρτα. – Κατ' αρχάς εγώ μιλώ εκ μέρους της πολιτικής μου Ομάδας. Τυχαίνει να κατάνομαι από ένα από αυτά τα νησιά για τα οποία συζητάμε σήμερα. Μεγάλωσα στη Χίο και έχω δει όλη την εξέλιξη του νησιού αυτά τα χρόνια και για αυτό μιλάω λίγο πιο έντονα. Η κατάσταση είναι τραγική και πρέπει να αλλάξει τώρα. Πρέπει να γίνει άμεσα επαναπροώθηση όλων αυτών των παράνομων μεταναστών.

Κωνσταντίνος Αρβανίτης, εξ ονόματος της ομάδας GUE/NGL. – Κυρία Πρόεδρε, αυτό που ακούσατε πριν δεν είναι η Ελλάδα. Είναι μια ακροδεξιά αντίληψη. Εμείς ξέρουμε ότι μία εικόνα είναι χίλιες λέξεις. Κυρία Επίτροπε, αυτή είναι η κατάσταση στη Μόρια σήμερα. Πριν από δύο μέρες πήγε εκεί κλιμάκιο μας, και πρέπει να σας πω ότι, στη Μόρια, βρίσκονται άνθρωποι και σκουπίδια και παιδιά όλοι μαζί ανακατεμένοι. Είχαμε πάει στη Μόρια πριν από τρεις μήνες. Από τις 5.000, βρήκαμε 17.000 χιλιάδες ανθρώπους. Χθες βρήκαμε 20.000 ανθρώπους. Θα σας δώσω στοιχεία για να βοηθήσω: το 37% είναι άνδρες, το 23% είναι γυναίκες και το 34% είναι παιδιά. Μιλάμε για παιδιά. Από αυτά, τα 1.700 είναι ασυνόδευτα. Πρέπει να σας πω ότι το 63% στο ΚΥΤ είναι οικογένειες.

Βάζω ένα ερώτημα προοδευτικά: Μιλάμε για πρόσφυγες και μετανάστες. Το 70% στη Μόρια είναι Αφγανοί. Το 2019 έπεσαν στο Αφγανιστάν 7.500 βόμβες. Αυτοί τι είναι, λοιπόν, πρόσφυγες ή μετανάστες; Αυτά τα παιδιά, τι θα τα κάνουμε; Θα τα «χρησιμοποιήσουμε» ως πρόσφυγες ή ως μετανάστες; Είναι πρόσφυγες πολέμου. Και ένα τελευταίο: Διαβάσαμε σήμερα στον διεθνή Τύπο ότι η ελληνική κυβέρνηση παραγγέλνει πλωτά φράγματα. Ποιος πληρώνει αυτά τα πλωτά φράγματα; Πρώτη φορά χρησιμοποιούνται κατά ανθρώπων και, βεβαίως, κατά πολιτών. Είναι για πολεμικές επιχειρήσεις.

(Ο ομιλητής δέχεται να απαντήσει σε ερώτηση με γαλάζια κάρτα (άρθρο 171 παράγραφος 8 του Κανονισμού).)

Michaela Šojdrová (PPE), otázka položená zvednutím modré karty. – Já také znám situaci v hotspotu Moria. Souhlasím s Vámi, že ta situace je tam velmi špatná, už v roce 2018 byl dvojnásobně překročen počet uprchlíků, kteří tam mohou být. A já se Vás ptám, co dělala vláda Syrizey v té době? Kolik nových center otevřela? Jakým způsobem navracela nelegální uprchlíky? Jak zrychlila azylový proces? Když kritizujete vládu dnes, která je u vlády ani ne půl roku a snaží se dělat konkrétní kroky.

Κωνσταντίνος Αρβανίτης (GUE/NGL), απάντηση σε ερώτηση με γαλάζια κάρτα. – Η κυβέρνηση αυτή κατήργησε το Υπουργείο Μεταναστευτικής Πολιτικής και το επανίδρυσε μετά από έξι μήνες. Αυτό το είχαμε καταγγείλει εδώ. Σας δίνω, λοιπόν, στοιχεία: Το 2016 η κυβέρνηση του ΣΥΡΙΖΑ διαχειρίστηκε 176.906 ανθρώπους. Η σημερινή κυβέρνηση, το 2019, διαχειρίστηκε μόλις 60.000 ανθρώπους. Νομίζω ότι υπάρχει θέμα και για την ελληνική κυβέρνηση αλλά και για την Ευρωπαϊκή Ένωση στη διαχείριση του προβλήματος. Να επισημάνουμε επίσης ότι διαφωνούμε με τα κλειστά κέντρα τύπου «φυλακές».

Ιωάννης Λαγός (NI). – Κυρία Πρόεδρε, είναι θρασύτατο να έρχονται σε αντίθεση με την πλειοψηφία του ελληνικού λαού βουλευτές μέσα στην αίθουσα που προέρχονται από την Ελλάδα. Πάνω από το 65% των Ελλήνων είναι αντίθετο με το λαθρομεταναστευτικό. Εγώ είμαι έξι μήνες εδώ και δεν σας έχω ακούσει ποτέ να μιλάτε υπέρ των δικαιωμάτων των Ελλήνων. Ακούω να μιλάτε συνεχώς για τους λαθρομετανάστες και τα δικαιώματά τους. Οι Έλληνες δεν έχουν δικαιώματα; Ξέρετε ότι δεν μπορούν να κινηθούν στην πατρίδα τους, στα σπίτια τους, στις περιουσίες τους; Ξέρετε ότι τους κυνηγάνε οι λαθρομετανάστες και τους έχουν τρομοκρατήσει; Γνωρίζετε ότι τον έλεγχο για το λαθρομεταναστευτικό στην Ελλάδα δεν το έχει η κυβέρνηση της Ελλάδος αλλά το έχουν οι ΜΚΟ; Μάλιστα, πριν από δύο μήνες, φτάσαμε στο σημείο να απαγορεύουν κατά παράνομο τρόπο στον υπουργό Εθνικής Άμυνας να μπει σε στρατόπεδο της Ελλάδας, που χρησιμοποιείται σαν hotspot, για να ελέγξει την κατάσταση. Εμείς, λοιπόν, για τι μιλάμε; Για τα δικαιώματα των λαθρομεταναστών; Η κατάσταση είναι τραγική. Κλέβουν, βιάζουν, σκοτώνουν. Και εσείς εδώ οι ανθρωπιστές μιλάτε μόνο για τους Πακιστανούς, μόνο για τους Αφγανούς και για τον οποιονδήποτε άλλο. Μιλήστε λοιπόν για τους Έλληνες και δώστε στους Έλληνες, που ζουν στην πατρίδα των προγόνων τους, τα δικαιώματά τους, που τα έχουν χάσει. Απεναντίας, «χαϊδεύετε» την Τουρκία. Η Τουρκία είναι το αγαπημένο παιδί. Τους αφήνετε να κάνουν πραγματικά ό,τι θέλουν. Γεμίζουν με ασταμάτητες ροές λαθρομεταναστών την πατρίδα μου και όλη την Ευρώπη. Αυτή εδώ η σημαία, η τουρκική σημαία, που δεν επιτρέπεται να κάνει αυτά που κάνει, μια αιματοβαμμένη σημαία-το μοναδικό που της αξίζει είναι αυτό εδώ: τίποτε άλλο. Έξω οι Τούρκοι, και να τελειώνει η διαδικασία μαζί τους. Για να τελειώνουμε με όλους αυτούς.

Przewodniczająca. – Przywołuję Pana do porządku, Panie Pośle, i proszę o zaznajomienie się z Regulaminem.

Lena Düpont (PPE). – Frau Präsidentin, sehr geehrte Frau Kommissarin! Die humanitäre Situation auf den griechischen Inseln ist zweifelsohne dramatisch. Wir sehen steigende Ankunfts zahlen jeden Tag, und die unsichere Lage im Umfeld lässt wenig Hoffnung auf Entspannung. Wenn wir aber Griechenland alleine für die Zustände verantwortlich machen, ist das aus zweierlei Gründen zu kurz gesprungen. Erstens sind viele Engpässe vor allem die Folge jahrelanger Versäumnisse. Die neue griechische Regierung ist hier jetzt vorangegangen und hat Evakuierungen aufs Festland vorgenommen unter anderem mit der Initiative „No child alone“, die heute auch schon mehrfach angesprochen wurde. Gleichzeitig geht Griechenland auch das Problem der langen Verfahrensdauer an – ein Grund, warum immer mehr Menschen auf den Inseln festsaßen und festsitzen. An der Stelle vielleicht eine kurze Bemerkung: Es ist nicht hilfreich, wenn wir Griechenland einerseits für zu lange Verfahren kritisieren und andererseits jegliche neuen Vorschläge zur Beschleunigung auch gleichzeitig angreifen. Das ist nicht im Interesse der Menschen auf den Inseln.

Klar ist: Griechenlands Regierung ist weiterhin in der Pflicht. Klar ist aber auch: Zweitens sind auch alle anderen Mitgliedstaaten in der Pflicht. Asyl- und Migrationspolitik funktioniert nur über das „und“. Wir brauchen für die Menschen auf den Inseln schnelle Abhilfe und einen funktionierenden Schutz der Außengrenzen. Wir brauchen schnellere Verfahren und konsequente Rückführung. Was wir aber vor allem brauchen, ist ein Rat, der sich bewegt, in dem wieder mehr um Lösungen gerungen wird von den unmittelbar und den mittelbar betroffenen Staaten. Wir – das Parlament, die EVP – stehen bereit. Nutzen wir das Zeitfenster für eine echte Reform des Asyl- und Migrationspakets!

Pietro Bartolo (S&D). – Signora Presidente, onorevoli colleghi, sono anni che parliamo della situazione delle isole greche senza che nulla cambi. Più di 42 000 persone intrappolate, 8 800 minori, di cui più di 1 800 non accompagnati, molti abbandonati e senza protezione.

Ma come può l'Europa dei diritti accettare che delle persone vivano in condizioni disumane? Come possiamo permettere che il governo greco con la nuova legge indebolisca le tutele e l'accesso all'asilo ed estenda l'uso della detenzione? La Commissione deve fare pressione sul governo per rafforzare le tutele legali e l'accesso ai servizi sanitari e ai tutori per i minori.

Si parla di chiudere i campi e creare dei centri chiusi nelle isole dove trasferire i richiedenti. Ma perché trasferirli nuovamente in centri inadeguati? Dovremmo invece trasferirli con urgenza sulla terraferma e promuovere i ricollocamenti, specialmente per i minori. Nel lungo periodo, poi, non abbiamo bisogno di soluzioni di fantasia, l'unica risposta è un sistema di ricollocamento automatico obbligatorio. Svegliamoci! Stiamo parlando di persone, di esseri umani e non di merce da stoccare.

Jan-Christoph Oetjen (Renew). – Frau Präsidentin, verehrte Kolleginnen und Kollegen! Die Zustände auf Morea sind inakzeptabel. Ich finde es gut, dass auch Sie das so festgestellt haben, Frau Kommissarin. Sie haben ja dargestellt, was für Hilfen die Kommission gibt. Und auch da sind wir uns einig, dass das viel ist, aber wahrscheinlich nicht genug, um die Situation zu lösen. Das Signal, das Sie jetzt setzen, dass Sie die Zahl der Mitarbeiter des EASO verdoppeln, ist ein gutes Signal, aber am Ende brauchen wir die Mitgliedstaaten. Wir brauchen die Mitgliedstaaten dafür, die Kinder und die Jugendlichen aus Morea herauszuholen. Und ich glaube, dass es dafür eine gemeinsame Anstrengung der Mitgliedstaaten braucht, damit wir das schaffen. Wir können es nicht zulassen, dass die Situation dort so weiter besteht, denn das ist der Europäischen Union unwürdig.

Wir haben – das haben Sie zu Recht gesagt – gerade eine Situation, in der wir keine Krise haben. Dieses Zeitfenster müssen wir aus meiner Sicht nutzen, damit wir einen neuen Pakt für Migration und Asyl auf den Weg bringen können. Renew hat dazu seine eigenen Vorschläge gebracht. Aber das hilft den Menschen in Morea nicht kurzfristig, sondern kurzfristig müssen die Mitgliedstaaten tätig werden. Und wenn wir die nicht dazu bekommen, den Menschen dort zu helfen und Menschen aufzunehmen, dann wird auch die Verdopplung der Mitarbeiter des EASO nicht ausreichen.

Tineke Strik (Verts/ALE). – Voorzitter, de vluchtelingen op de Griekse eilanden raken getraumatiseerd. De inhumane opvang, het jarenlange wachten en het gebrek aan medische voorzieningen maken hen voor tweede keer slachtoffer. Onbegeleide kinderen worden aan hun lot overgelaten en lopen er grote risico's. Let wel, ik schets een Europa waarin we gezamenlijk de verantwoordelijkheid dragen voor het asielbeleid. Het erge is dat deze situatie op de Griekse eilanden al vier jaar duurt en dat die alleen maar slechter in plaats van beter is geworden. Ik ben blij met de oproep van de Commissie aan de lidstaten. Ik ben ook blij dat er meer ondersteuning komt en ik verzoek de Commissie ook om niet alleen EASO, maar ook artsen en andere hulpverleners te sturen. Ik roep vooral ook de lidstaten op om de mensen die daar nu zijn, te evacueren en te verdelen over de lidstaten, te beginnen met de kinderen. Pas dan kunnen we weer echt over Europese waarden praten.

Gilles Lebreton (ID). – Madame la Présidente, la submersion migratoire est une réalité: elle a notamment frappé les îles grecques de la mer Égée, dont la population nous appelle au secours. Le 22 janvier, une grève générale a été observée en signe de protestation par les habitants de Lesbos, Samos et Chios.

La situation y est intenable: le camp de Moria, sur l'île de Lesbos, accueille par exemple plus de 19 000 migrants alors qu'il était conçu pour en recevoir à peine 3 000. L'Union européenne est responsable de ce désastre. Elle doit impérativement aider la Grèce à agrandir et rénover ces camps afin de traiter dignement ces personnes, en attendant d'organiser l'expulsion hors d'Europe de toutes celles qui sont des migrants économiques illégaux.

Il faut, d'autre part, adopter une politique de fermeté et refouler vers leur port de départ les bateaux qui nous amènent de nouveaux contingents: 60 000 migrants arrivés en Grèce par mer en 2019, c'est beaucoup trop.

Patryk Jaki (ECR). – Pani Przewodnicząca! Pozostaje mi tylko zgodzić się z wieloma głosami, które tutaj dzisiaj padły, że potrzebny jest nowy pakt migracyjny, potrzebna jest szersza refleksja nad całą sprawą, bo przecież na początku ważni politycy z Unii Europejskiej zaprosili migrantów, a jednocześnie nie przygotowali narzędzi i całych rozwiązań systemowych, które byłyby w stanie sobie z tą sytuacją poradzić. Dzisiaj rzeczywiście dochodzimy do takiej sytuacji, że mamy problemy z dziećmi, z osobami, które potrzebują pomocy, a nie mamy skutecznych rozwiązań systemowych. To wszystko pokazuje, jak nieskuteczne były działania Unii Europejskiej w tym zakresie.

Przez lata rośnie ilość migrantów, mamy problemy w rozpoznawaniu tych ludzi i brak rozwiązań systemowych, dlatego natychmiast potrzebne są umowy bilateralne, ale z tymi państwami, z których uchodźcy przyjeżdżają, a dodatkowo musimy pomagać na miejscu, tak jak robiła to Polska czy pani minister Kempa: Polska przez lata przeznaczyła prawie dwa miliardy złotych, aby pomagać tamtym ludziom na miejscu i rozwiązać problem systemowo.

Anne-Sophie Pelletier (GUE/NGL). – Madame la Présidente, Madame la Commissaire, si cette situation vous empêche de dormir, alors je vous demande de trouver la conviction et l'énergie pour réunir vos amis de la Commission ainsi que vos amis du Conseil afin de trouver des solutions immédiates.

Andrei Makine disait: «les images d'enfance ne se décolorent ni ne s'effacent». 18 000 personnes sur le seul camp de Moria pour 2 840 en capacité d'accueil. 5 000 personnes en attente dans la vulnérabilité, mais comment s'en étonner puisqu'il n'y a que trois médecins et huit psychologues? Le décalage entre le nombre de femmes, d'hommes et d'enfants accueillis et les moyens mis en place créent cette violence, car en les privant de tout vous les avez montés les uns contre les autres. Pour autant, ces chiffres ne peuvent décrire le désespoir des personnes présentes dans ces îles. Voici les mots d'un enfant: «Je suis si stressé que j'en perds la mémoire, chaque fois que je ferme les yeux je fais des cauchemars. Tout ce que je veux, c'est revoir ma famille». Madame, la Grèce fait face seule à l'afflux des personnes en quête d'une vie meilleure et d'un peu de répit.

L'Union européenne doit prendre ses responsabilités et, en tant que soignante, quand j'entends ces récits, quand je vois l'isolement de ces personnes, cette Union européenne-là me révolte. Et ce soir, Madame, je ne suis pas fière d'être une députée européenne de cette Union européenne déshumanisante.

Κωνσταντίνος Παπαδάκης (NI). – Κυρία Πρόεδρε, είναι υποκριτική η ανησυχία σας για την προστασία ανήλικων μεταναστών, ασυνόδευτων και όσων αναμένουν οικογενειακή επανένωση, από τη στιγμή που εσείς και οι σύμμαχοί σας προωθείτε όλες τις ιμπεριαλιστικές επεμβάσεις. Η πολιτική καταστολής είναι αυτή που οδηγεί σήμερα, σύμφωνα με δημοσιεύματα, την κυβέρνηση της Νέας Δημοκρατίας να σχεδιάζει ως και πλωτά φράγματα-παγίδες στο Αιγαίο για τους μετανάστες και τους πρόσφυγες, βάζοντας σε κίνδυνο τη ζωή τους και ανοίγοντας τον δρόμο για νέες πολύνεκρες τραγωδίες στο Αιγαίο. Σας λέμε: Ούτε να το σκέφτεστε! Πάρτε τώρα πίσω αυτά τα απάνθρωπα σχέδια.

Τοποθετείτε και εσείς, κυρία Επίτροπε. Η Ευρωπαϊκή Ένωση είναι συνυπεύθυνη. Με τη συμφωνία ΕΕ-Τουρκίας και με το Δουβλίνο, εγκλωβίζετε τόσα χρόνια στην Ελλάδα δεκάδες χιλιάδες αιτούντες άσυλο σε άθλιες συνθήκες. Το ψευτοδίλημμα ανάμεσα σε κλειστά κολαστήρια τύπου Αμυγδαλέζας, της Νέας Δημοκρατίας, και ανοικτά τύπου Μόριας, του ΣΥΡΙΖΑ, έχουν τη σφραγίδα της Ευρωπαϊκής Ένωσης και είναι απαράδεκτα και έχουν ως κοινή κατάληξη τον πολλαπλασιασμό των απελάσεων και την περιστολή των εναπομεινάντων δικαιωμάτων των αιτούντων άσυλο.

Ενάντια στην επικίνδυνη ευρωενωσιακή πολιτική και τον εθνικισμό, απαιτούμε μετάβαση των αιτούντων άσυλο στις χώρες προορισμού τους, ανθρώπινα κέντρα φιλοξενίας στην ηπειρωτική χώρα, με γρήγορες διαδικασίες. Κανένας ανήλικος άστεγος, φυλακισμένος, απροστάτευτος, χωρίς εκπαίδευση, μακριά από την οικογένειά του.

Michaela Šojdrotová (PPE). – Paní předsedající, paní komisařko, já děkuji za Vaše prohlášení, ve kterém jste uvedla, že Evropská komise chce podpořit řeckou vládu v jejím úsilí o ochranu hranic před nelegální migrací. Chcete podpořit řeckou vládu při budování nových center, kde budou důstojnější podmínky pro uprchlíky, a také v lepší návratové politice a v dalších opatřeních.

Souhlasím s Vámi ale, že to nestačí, pokud se týká dětí. Děti, které jsou nezletilé a bez doprovodu. Od roku 2018 jich bohužel neubýlo, tehdy jsem navštívila ostrov Lesbos, Atény, Soluň, navštívila jsem sheltery i uprchlická zařízení. Těch dětí přibýlo, dokonce jich je dnes přes 5 tisíc, které jsou nezletilé a bez doprovodu. Já oceňuji práci humanitárních pracovníků, ale viděla jsem také velmi pomalé jednání bývalé řecké vlády. O to více si vážím dnešních ministrů, jak ministra pro migraci, vnitra a také celé vlády, která usiluje o zlepšení podmínek. Přivítala jsem požadavek ministra vnitra řecké vlády, který se obrátil na ministry členských států, aby pomohli. Byla tady zmíněná Česká republika. Ano, po velkém tlaku občanské společnosti se i český ministr vnitra dotázal a nabídl jistou pomoc. A my máme naději, že i Česká republika pomůže a přijme nedoprovázené děti, které potřebují pomoc.

Juan Fernando López Aguilar (S&D). – Madam President, I would like to say to Commissioner Johansson that we welcome your strong words as we welcome you to your portfolio. You said it right: the situation is totally unacceptable. But we have been saying this for the last five years in all of the languages of the European Union.

According to the UNHCR, 75 000 people arrived on the Greek islands just last year: 40 000 are in camps meant for barely 5000; 8000 are minors and 2000 are unaccompanied minors. So the situation is not only unacceptable; it is also against the law. It is against the Charter of Fundamental Rights, which is binding law for all the Member States. It's also against the Reception Directive, which is in effect. That is why we say that the Member States and the Union must help Greece: it's not the fault of Greece; it is our responsibility. That is why we adopted the Asylum and Migration Integration Fund, which provides for relocation, provides for reunification of families, and provides for protecting children. But more than that, in the mid-term we need to adopt the European Common Asylum System, work on the same, and Dublin, with binding solidarity among Member States and relocation programmes funded by the European Union.

Damian Boeselager (Verts/ALE). – Madam President, I would like to say to Commissioner Johansson that as we speak, argue, and also scream here, these children that we talked about are still stuck on the islands and there are no transfers. There are also, at the moment, no more guardians taking charge of their legal cases and they are already traumatised and sick when they arrive. So I'm very happy, Commissioner, that you take first measures and want to improve the situation.

And I would like to point out to the State Secretary that the Member States are blocking any additional, even voluntary, support at this very moment and so I would ask, State Secretary, that you please press for additional steps here. But I also want to bring your attention to a fact that is overlooked, which is that the Member States are even opting out of the current responsibilities that they have under this law that we already have in place. So, my Member State, Germany, is currently declining 70% of the family reunification cases for these children. Which means that we are basically telling them: even though you have family, you are not welcome here, and this is not okay.

Raffaele Stancanelli (ECR). – Signora Presidente, onorevoli colleghi, il rispetto per l'interesse superiore del minore dovrebbe essere sempre garantito in tutte le azioni intraprese sia dall'Unione europea che dai suoi Stati membri.

La situazione particolarmente disagiata in cui versano tanti migranti minori è moralmente inaccettabile e, nonostante i continui sforzi sostenuti dal governo greco e dal popolo greco, sono nuovamente necessarie misure di emergenza. Mi permetto sottolineare che situazioni che si ripetono con la stessa intensità per un tempo duraturo non possono più essere definite urgenti o emergenziali, esse sono diventate purtroppo strutturali.

Bisogna smetterla con l'ipocrisia di chi non si rende conto, anche qui in Europa, che è necessario adottare iniziative comuni, volte al blocco delle partenze dei migranti irregolari, e concentrare i nostri sforzi anche e soprattutto finanziari per creare le condizioni economiche e sociali affinché chiunque possa rimanere nel proprio paese, invece di cercare fortuna altrove. Solo così l'Unione europea potrà dimostrare di essere concretamente solidale nei confronti di chi ha per davvero bisogno.

Nikolaj Villumsen (GUE/NGL). – Fru formand! Situationen for flygtninge på de græske øer er fuldstændig katastrofal. Overfyldte lejre, åbne kloakker, oversvømmede telte. Det er situationen for titusinder af flygtninge. Værst af alt er at tænke på de tusindvis af uledsagede børn, som sidder der midt i mudderet. Sidder alene i mørket. Sidder fuldstændig uden beskyttelse mod overgreb. Det er ikke bare en græsk katastrofe, det er en europæisk katastrofe. Og det er en katastrofe, som er menneskeskabt. Elendigheden på de græske øer er et direkte resultat af EU/Tyrkiet-aftalen og en fuldstændig forfæjlet EU-politik. Kære kolleger, det er tid til handling. Det er tid til at løfte i flok. Lad os hjælpe de nødstedte børn. Lad os få en solidarisk fordeling af flygtningene, og lad os stoppe den humanitære katastrofe.

Karlo Ressler (PPE). – Poštovana potpredsjednice, prošlo je sada već više od četiri godine od početka izbjegličke krize. Međutim, teška humanitarna situacija na grčkim otocima s nekoliko desetaka tisuća migranata, uključujući i djecu, u iznimno teškim životnim uvjetima još jednom pokazuje koliko smo, zapravo, još uvijek nespremni za suočavanje s migracijskim pritiskom.

Grčka poduzima konkretne aktivnosti kako bi se poboljšala situacija te upravljanje migracijom, ali ovo sasvim sigurno nije pitanje samo jedne države članice, jednako kao što niti pojačani, nezakoniti migracijski pritisci na jedinoj kopnenoj ruti prema Europskoj uniji nisu pitanje samo jedne države članice. Niti jedna europska država ne može se samostalno suočiti s izazovom migracija. Zbog toga što se migracije tiču cijele Europske unije i stoga nam je potreban novi zajednički, učinkovit, održiv i humani sustav migracija i azila.

Životni uvjeti migranata na grčkim otocima su potpuno neprihvatljivi. Potrebno je, stoga, još odlučnije suprotstaviti se i lancima krijumčara i trgovaca ljudima koji sve češće dovode migrante u po život opasne situacije, ali isto tako potrebno je poštivati prava i dostojanstvo svih migranata, kao i što imamo dužnost osigurati normalan život stanovnicima grčkih otoka, a svim europskim građanima sigurnost.

(Zastupnik je pristao odgovoriti na pitanje postavljeno podizanjem plave kartice (članak 171. stavak 8. Poslovnika))

Maria Grapini (S&D), *Întrebare adresată conform procedurii „cartonașului albastru”*. – Doamnă președintă, stimate coleg, sigur, subiectul pe care îl discutăm este foarte grav, este tragic, avem copii, adulți, dar ați atins un punct foarte important. Ați spus că niciun stat singur nu poate să rezolve problema migrației și ați mai spus un lucru: că avem, ne confruntăm cu migrația ilegală.

Ce credeți că ar trebui să facem să punem stop migrației ilegale, căci, de fapt, acest lucru complică lucrurile și acest lucru face ca cei care ar fi legal să nu poată să aibă condițiile corespunzătoare?

Karlo Ressler (PPE), *odgovor na pitanje postavljeno podizanjem plave kartice*. – Hvala puno na pitanju. Mislim da nema nikakve dvojbe, da ako želimo postići novi dogovor o pravednom, humanom, učinkovitom sustavu migracije i azila, moramo početi od onih ključnih preduvjeta, a prije svega to je učinkovita zaštita vanjske granice Europske unije, budući da bez toga niti bilo kakav dogovor između država članica, jasno utemeljen i na solidarnosti, ali isto tako i na odgovornosti neće biti moguć.

Νίκος Ανδρουλάκης (S&D). – Κυρία Επίτροπε, η κατάσταση στις νησιωτικές δομές είναι απάνθρωπη. Το 2019 ήρθαν στην Ελλάδα 73.000 πρόσφυγες και μετανάστες — αύξηση κατά 100% σε σχέση με το 2018. Πάνω από 40.000 είναι εγκλωβισμένοι στα νησιά, ενώ σε πολλές περιπτώσεις αποτελούν πάνω από το ένα τέταρτο του τοπικού πληθυσμού, με αποτέλεσμα να προκαλούνται κοινωνικές αντιδράσεις.

Ας είμαστε ειλικρινείς. Η κοινή δήλωση ΕΕ-Τουρκίας έχει αποτύχει. Μετά από τρία χρόνια εφαρμογής, μόλις 2.000 Σύριοι έχουν επιστρέψει από την Ελλάδα στην Τουρκία, ενώ από την Τουρκία προς την Ευρώπη έχουν φύγει πάνω από 20.000. Άρα το «ένα προς ένα» που προέβλεπε η συμφωνία δεν λειτούργησε ποτέ. Για κάποιους, η ευρωπαϊκή αλληλεγγύη είναι μόνο παροχή χρημάτων. Ωστόσο αυτό δεν αρκεί. Μετά το τέλος του προγράμματος μεταγκατάστασης, τον Μάρτιο του 2018, μόνο δύο χώρες —η Πορτογαλία και η Γαλλία— συμφώνησαν σε εθελοντικό πρόγραμμα.

Αγαπητή Επίτροπε, η αναθεώρηση του Δουβλίνου III έπρεπε ήδη να έχει ολοκληρωθεί στη βάση των αποφάσεων του Ευρωπαϊκού Κοινοβουλίου. Συμβιβασμοί για ένα τόσο ευαίσθητο θέμα με χώρες που υπονομεύουν την αλληλεγγύη θα οδηγήσουν σε μια κάλπικη αναθεώρηση και δεν πρέπει να γίνουν αποδεκτοί, γιατί θα έχουμε τον παραλογισμό να καταγγέλλουν οι Έλληνες ακροδεξιοί εσάς για έλλειψη αλληλεγγύης αντί να κατηγορούν τους ακροδεξιούς Πολωνούς, που είναι στην ίδια πολιτική ομάδα, οι οποίοι δεν θέλουν την πραγματική αναθεώρηση του Δουβλίνου.

Traian Băsescu (PPE). – Doamnă președintă, în fapt, reluăm subiectul care s-a discutat acum o lună la Strasbourg, exact în aceiași parametri. Nimic nu se întâmplă. În realitate, situația din insulele grecești este extrem de dificilă, și pentru localnici, și pentru refugiați.

Mă voi referi, însă, la cei circa 7 600 de copii care se află în insule și care trăiesc în condiții absolut inumane. Trăiesc în corturi, hrăniți insuficient, în condiții de igienă precare, se îmbolnăvesc și doamnă președintă, doamnă comisară, mor copii în Europa din cauza mizeriei.

Iar noi, aici, spunem că am dat Greciei 2,1 miliarde. Da, s-au dat de patru ani încoace, iar sprijinul este insuficient. Este un moment al solidarității. Avem obligația să preluăm copii din insulele grecești în toate statele.

Isabel Wiseler-Lima (PPE). – Nous sommes en Europe, au XXI^{ème} siècle, nous sommes dans l'Union européenne. J'ai l'honneur d'être la rapporteure, dans cette enceinte, du rapport sur la situation des droits de l'homme dans le monde. Nous sommes une Union qui défend les valeurs de dignité humaine, également au-delà de ses frontières, et qui exige beaucoup de ses partenaires internationaux, ce dont je suis fière.

Or, comment pouvons-nous nous arroger le droit de critiquer la façon dont d'autres pays, sur d'autres continents, traitent leurs migrants quand dans l'Union européenne, il y a des îles où la situation des enfants migrants nous oblige à parler de crise humanitaire.

Je le répète, nous sommes en Europe, au XXI^{ème} siècle, et il est intolérable que la solidarité de tous, dans l'Union, ne soit pas une évidence quand des enfants pataugent dans la boue et le froid. Ce n'est pas un problème uniquement grec, ce n'est pas un problème uniquement des pays du pourtour méditerranéen, il est de notre responsabilité à tous de garantir une situation décente à ces enfants. Nous devons nous donner les moyens de garantir, au sein de l'Union, cette solidarité puisque manifestement, elle ne se fait pas de manière naturelle et libre. La solidarité au sein de l'Union se fait dans les deux sens: on ne peut y prétendre que si on est soi-même prêt à la donner: tu ne donnes pas, alors tu ne reçois pas non plus.

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

Erik Marquardt (Verts/ALE), Frage nach dem Verfahren der „blauen Karte“. – Meine Frage ist eigentlich recht einfach, weil ich Ihrem Redebeitrag und auch dem Redebeitrag davor zustimmen kann. Aber ich glaube, dass wir diese Nachricht als Parlament viel stärker senden könnten, wenn wir beim nächsten Mal, wenn wir diese Situation diskutieren, das auch mit einer Entschließung machen, wo wir nicht nur 60 oder 90 Sekunden haben, sondern wo wir uns auf einen Text verständigen können und mit diesem Text dann vielleicht auch eine starke Botschaft senden können, was wir genau fordern. Deswegen wollte ich fragen: Werden Sie sich in Ihrer Fraktion dafür einsetzen, dass wir beim nächsten Mal eine Entschließung beschließen können?

Isabel Wiseler-Lima (PPE), Antwort auf eine Frage nach dem Verfahren der „blauen Karte“. — Ich sehe absolut kein Problem darin, ganz im Gegenteil. Vielen Dank.

Anna-Michelle Asimakopoulou (PPE). – Madam President, 'united we stand, divided we fall' – a famous phrase, and today in this Chamber we stood united in the face of a threat to our unity: Brexit. And today in this Chamber we stood united in commemorating the International Day for the victims of the Holocaust, and in a united voice, we said: We remember. But when it comes to the migration issue, we are clearly not united. When it comes to dealing with President Erdoğan's blackmail, using the migration issue, we are not united.

At this moment, there are 5 301 unaccompanied minors in Greece, and the Greek Government has asked for European Member States to accommodate 2 500 of them, and only three states have replied. I ask you, dear colleagues, from all Member States and all political parties: have we become so entrenched in our national interest and so thick-skinned that we do not care about children? Frankly, I'm no longer worried about Europe's unity if we can't find a solution for 5 000 children; I'm worried about our dignity.

Jiří Pospíšil (PPE). – Paní předsedající, já jsem se zájmem vyslechl vystoupení paní komisařky. Je dobře, že chce svoji pozornost zaměřit na téma nezletilých dětí uprchlíků, ta tragédie je obrovská, kolegové to popisovali. Určitě zde nová Komise může udělat kus práce, ale velmi bych vyzýval k tomu, paní komisařko, abyste i v rámci debaty na Radě debatovali o tom, jak funguje bilaterální pomoc. Já jsem z České republiky, už to zmiňovala paní kolegyně Šojdřová. V České republice na nátlak občanské společnosti, ale také za obrovského přispění paní poslankyně Šojdřové, které chci tímto poděkovat, se nakonec vláda odhodlala převzít děti uprchlíků z Řecka, ale celý proces trval mnoho týdnů a nakonec vyšuměl, skončil ostudou, skončil trapnou situací, kdy nyní není jasné, jestli česká vláda nakonec odmítla děti převzít nebo byla chyba na administrativní zátěži řeckých úřadů. Takže i tady je role Komise a Rady, aby bilaterálně fungovaly lépe, aby se nehledaly překážky proč ne, ale proč naopak pomoci.

Sandra Pereira (GUE/NGL). – Senhora Presidente, é revoltante a situação, descrita pelos Médicos Sem Fronteiras, de vários milhares de crianças nos campos de refugiados nas ilhas gregas. São crianças que lutam por comida em campos sobrelotados, dormem na lama, sofrem de graves problemas psicológicos, deixam de comer, beber e dormir. Muitas automutilam-se, tentam o suicídio e algumas acabam mesmo por conseguir pôr fim à vida.

Estas crianças e adolescentes fugiram da fome e da guerra, sobretudo do Afeganistão, Síria, Iraque e Somália, países destruídos por agressões militares nas quais a União Europeia e as suas potências têm grandes responsabilidades. A mesma União Europeia que se quer arvorar em paladina dos direitos humanos convive hipocritamente com uma situação que criou.

A sobrelotação destes campos não se desliga das políticas migratórias cada vez mais seletivas, restritivas e desumanas que a União Europeia promove. A União Europeia tem, por isso, uma dupla responsabilidade: o que se exige é o fim da desestabilização, da ingerência e agressão sobre países terceiros e o escrupuloso cumprimento do direito internacional em matéria de migrações.

Ljudmila Novak (PPE). – Gospa predsedujoča! Pred leti sem bila z delegacijo Evropskega parlamenta na Lezbosu. Takrat tam še ni bilo beguncev, bil je turizem, dobro smo se počutili, ljudje so bili prijazni. Zato imam sedaj seveda razumevanje do teh ljudi in tudi do vseh grških kolegov, ki najbolj vedo, v kakšnih razmerah živijo sedaj njihovi rojaki na grških otokih.

In če pomislim na otroke, tudi sama imam več vnukov, se mi pa zagotovo zasmilijo v dno srca, ko gledam te slike bosih otrok, lačnih in tako naprej. Največ, seveda rešitev ni enostavna, moramo ravnati, iskati različne rešitve na več področjih, vsekakor pa bi morali poskrbeti za otroke, da ne bodo lačni, da jim bomo ponudili tudi izobrazbo, da bodo morda nekoč imeli spet perspektivo v svoji državi.

(Konec zglaszeń z sali)

Ylva Johansson, Member of the Commission. – Madam President, I've been listening very carefully, and I understand from your genuine and committed interventions with a lot of feelings that I'm not the only one that sleeps badly at nights while we have a situation with over 40 000 people living under these unacceptable conditions, many of them children and many of them unaccompanied minors, mostly teenagers. We can't continue like this, and I understand that we all agree on this.

But as I said earlier, lying awake at night will not help anything. We are politicians, we need to act, and I, as the new Commissioner, have a special responsibility to act, of course. So the Commission will, of course, continue to help and support Greece. We have in the last one and a half years spent EUR 35 million to help unaccompanied minors with hotels, with guardians, and we are doing a lot of things, as I also said in my first intervention.

But, as many of you have mentioned, we have been in this situation for many years. And at the same time we have, for many years, been in a politically-stuck situation, unable to take the necessary political decisions for a decent way to manage European migration in an orderly way and to have a decent way for solidarity that shows that we all know that we have different geographical realities. Those Member States that are under pressure – for example, these people living on the islands – we need to show solidarity towards the migrants but also, of course, to the Greek people, who are now paying also a very high price.

Therefore, of course, first continue to support the migrants and especially the Greek Government and the Greek authorities to change these conditions. But I also think it's very urgent to find a political solution so that we can actually come together and find this necessary common migration and asylum policy for the European Union. We can't continue being in a stuck situation. Those who pay the price for this are the people that live under these terrible circumstances on the islands. So there is high pressure on me personally but also on Member States, and I count on your support from Parliament to find these political solutions.

Thank you very much for this good debate tonight, and hopefully we can come back to another debate, having more solutions on a decent European way of meeting people that is true to our values, both between Member States and also towards those that are searching for shelter in the European Union.

Nikolina Brnjac, *President-in-Office of the Council*. – Madam President, let me first of all thank you for this debate. Your input is very important to help to find workable answers to the current challenges.

There is no doubt that the situation on the Greek islands must be addressed in an effective and timely manner. As I have mentioned, I am convinced that the Greek government is committed to improving migrants' conditions, especially those of children and unaccompanied minors. The new Greek Government announced a new plan designed to protect minors who have arrived in Greece, and we expect the situation to improve soon. I know the Member States and agencies are already extensively supporting all the Greek authorities, and I urge the Greek authorities and the Commission to speed up all the important work they do so that the people most affected can see an improvement in the difficult situation in which they are living.

The Presidency will continue working towards a balanced approach between responsibility and solidarity in a comprehensive manner, in view of the upcoming Commission proposals.

Przewodnicząca. – Zamykam debatę.

Oświadczenia pisemne (art. 171 Regulaminu)

Dominique Bilde (ID), *par écrit*. – Je ne sais pas ce qui est le plus indécent: l'opprobre unanimement jeté à la Grèce pour son prétendu manque de générosité envers les migrants, ou bien la violation permanente par la Turquie de son engagement en matière de contrôle des flux migratoires, payé pourtant à prix d'or par l'Union européenne. Aux 6 milliards d'euros de la facilité pour les réfugiés s'ajoutent en effet les 3,2 milliards des fonds de préadhésion. Le tout pour un résultat indigent: en 2019, seuls 189 migrants ayant traversé la mer Égée ont effectivement été renvoyés vers Ankara. Comment s'étonner dans ces conditions que le gouvernement de Mitsotakis prenne enfin un tour de vis salutaire? Le camp de Lesbos, avec ses 17 000 migrants pour une capacité de 3 000, est certes un cas limite en Europe — les émeutes de septembre dernier l'ont amplement démontré. Mais de la Bosnie-Herzégovine à l'Italie, le seuil de tolérance est largement dépassé et les mêmes causes continueront de produire les mêmes effets, tant que l'Europe ne prendra pas les seules décisions qui s'imposent: le contrôle des frontières et le renvoi vers les pays d'origine.

Caterina Chinnici (S&D), *per iscritto*. – Nelle isole greche si sta consumando una grave crisi umanitaria che colpisce drammaticamente in primo luogo i bambini. Le cifre UNICEF non hanno bisogno di commenti: al 31 dicembre 2019 la popolazione di rifugiati migranti in Grecia è cresciuta di oltre 100.000 persone di cui 40.000 bambini, e tra questi più di 5.000 non accompagnati. Solo nel 2019 sono stati 21.800 i bambini arrivati via mare (con un aumento dell'80% rispetto al 2018), dei quali 3.500 non accompagnati. Tende e container allestiti nei centri di accoglienza e identificazione per i richiedenti asilo sono sovraffollati, le condizioni igieniche e le violenze che ivi si registrano sono insostenibili, tanto più per i più piccoli che già prima di arrivare alla terraferma hanno subito esperienze traumatiche. È necessario sostenere lo stato greco per migliorare la sua capacità di risposta rapida, ma anche quelle associazioni che possono offrire un sostegno mirato alle specifiche esigenze dei bambini, in particolare se non accompagnati. Tuttavia non possiamo ritrovarci ancora a gestire l'emergenza: occorre una strategia a lungo termine, un Sistema europeo comune di asilo che tenga conto dell'interesse superiore del bambino, in ottemperanza alla normativa internazionale e al dovere morale di proteggere i più piccoli.

Laura Ferrara (NI), *per iscritto*. – Le isole greche di fronte alla Turchia sono diventate le prigioni europee per chi fugge. La situazione peggiore riguarda i minori, i quali subiscono conseguenze fisiche e psicologiche devastanti. Lunghe permanenze in condizioni di sovraffollamento, separazioni da fratelli o altri parenti, privazione di cure mediche e servizi essenziali espongono i soggetti più vulnerabili a violenze, al rischio di sfruttamento, abusi e danni irreparabili. A Samos, un mese fa, la Corte europea per i diritti dell'uomo è intervenuta per salvaguardare l'integrità fisica e psicologica di alcuni minori profughi non accompagnati. Ha stabilito il tempestivo trasferimento in un luogo sicuro, nel rispetto della Convenzione europea dei diritti dell'uomo, che sancisce il divieto di trattamenti inumani e degradanti. Tre sono stati trasferiti solo ieri, uno è rimasto sull'isola. Non è più il momento di parlare ma di agire. Prima di altre misure della Corte, l'UE contribuisca a ristabilire i diritti fondamentali dei profughi più vulnerabili e a ridare normalità agli abitanti delle isole, con un sistema di trasferimenti regolare, dando priorità ai minori.

Billy Kelleher (Renew), in writing. – I used my maiden speech to the Parliament in July of last year to express my grave concerns about the humanitarian crisis unfolding in the Mediterranean. It pains me that six months later I am still having to make the same points, and in the meantime there has been great suffering and grave breaches of fundamental rights in registration camps for asylum seekers. The Moira camp, for example, hosts 19 000 people whilst its maximum capacity is 3 100. The Commission has committed to delivering a new Pact on Migration and Asylum, which of course we welcome. However, the resulting agreement does not absolve the Commission and the Member States from their responsibility to address these deplorable conditions urgently.

Janina Ochojska (PPE), na piśmie. – Grecja zмага się z największym napływem migrantów od 2015 r., kiedy to do Europy przybyło ponad milion uchodźców. W 2019 r. napłynęło ponad 60 tysięcy migrantów starających się o status uchodźcy. Obozy na wyspach greckich są przeludnione, a nieletni koczują na ulicach bez dostępu do jedzenia, obiektów sanitarnych i elektryczności. Musimy pamiętać, że za powstałą sytuację humanitarną na wyspach greckich odpowiadamy my wszyscy, bo jest ona wynikiem braku solidarności. Tyle mówimy w Parlamencie o europejskich wartościach, takich jak równość, jedność, prawa człowieka, a jednocześnie jesteśmy obojętni na los potrzebujących. Dużo też dzisiaj mówimy na temat reformy polityki azylowej. Zgadzam się, że musi być zreformowana, aby weryfikacja migrantów była usprawniona. Potrzebne są przede wszystkim nowe procedury, które będą chroniły, w szczególności dzieci, przed przestępczością, zapewnią dostęp do edukacji oraz umożliwią sprawne łączenie małoletnich bez opieki z członkami rodzin w innych krajach członkowskich.

Polityka to wypracowywanie skutecznych rozwiązań, a do takich nie należy zamykanie granic i skazywanie ludzi na śmierć w morzu. Rozwiązaniem jest pomoc ludziom na miejscu w ich krajach pochodzenia, bo jeśli będą mogli zapewnić swoim bliskim podstawowe potrzeby, nie będą migrować!

25. Strategia UE na rzecz mobilności i transportu: środki niezbędne do 2030 r. i w późniejszym okresie (debata)

Przewodnicząca. – Kolejnym punktem porządku dziennego jest oświadczenie Komisji w sprawie strategii UE na rzecz zrównoważonej mobilności i zrównoważonego transportu: środki niezbędne do 2030 r. i w późniejszym okresie (2020/2518(RSP)).

Adina-Ioana Vălean, Member of the Commission. – Madam President, I am very happy to be back with you again today and to give you a first insight into our reflections on the future of transport and mobility. I would also like to welcome your choice to put sustainability at the centre of this debate, as it perfectly mirrors our common ambitions. As we look to the future, and in line with President von der Leyen's political guidelines, our policy actions will, on the one hand, be guided by the ambition of the European Green Deal to ensure that transport makes its important contribution to climate neutrality by 2050 and, on the other, by a Europe that is fit for the digital age when it comes to harnessing digital technologies to make mobility smart as well as sustainable.

The strategy on sustainable and smart mobility will have these two objectives at its heart and will guide us towards a transport sector that is fit for a clean, digital and modern economy. The Commission will adopt the strategy later this year, once we have completed our preparatory work, including the public consultation, and received feedback from the stakeholders. What is certain is that the strategy must include ambitious measures aimed at significantly reducing CO₂ and pollutant emissions across all modes. It will exploit digitalisation and automation, enhancing connectivity to the next level, and – last but not least – it will ensure safety and accessibility.

Our comprehensive strategy for sustainable and smart mobility will have to be unprecedented in ambition to achieve a 90% reduction in emissions by 2050. I want to share what I see as the four principles that will guide transport's contribution to the European Green Deal. First: making the transport system as a whole more sustainable, making sustainable alternative solutions available to all citizens and businesses, respecting the polluters-pay principle in all transport mode and, not in the last, fostering connectivity and access to transport for all.

Therefore, in the upcoming transport strategy, I am planning to put forward measures in the following four areas of action. First, to boost the uptake of clean vehicles and alternative fuels for road, maritime and aviation. In this regard, we are already looking into specific initiatives to ensure the availability of marine alternative fuels and sustainable aviation fuels, Second, increase the share of more sustainable transport modes, such as rail and inland waterways, and improving efficiency across the whole transport system. Thirdly, incentivising the right consumer choices and low-emissions practices. Fourth, investing in low-and zero-emissions solutions, including infrastructure.

On the road to a climate-neutral Europe by 2050, it is essential that sustainable and smart go hand-in-hand. Digitalisation is not simply a means to an end. We must take full advantage of the opportunities presented to us by digitalisation and automation, for instance, by increasing traffic efficiency through artificial intelligence or reducing traffic hazards to a minimum, to name only a few. They are the key to cleaner, simpler, smart and safe mobility across all transport modes. Digitalisation also opens the door to mobility as a service and the seamless combination of transport modes for a single journey, encouraging more people out of private cars and onto shared and more efficient forms of transport. We will, of course, be vigilant and watch out for any impact on jobs and skills.

To make this happen, we need accessibility, affordability, connectivity. I am 100% committed to leaving nobody behind as we embark on this green and digital transformation. The Just Transition Mechanism will be key here: it will mobilise EUR 100 billion to address the social and economic effects of the green transition, focusing on the region's industries and workers who will face the greatest challenges. The connectivity provided by transport is fundamental to freedom of movement in the European Union.

Safety and security: it should go without saying that, while we must embark on a significant reduction of emissions from transport and harness digital opportunities for the sector, safety and security will continue to come first. Our strategy will incorporate measures for maintaining the highest safety and security standards in the world of transport.

When you talk about global leadership, a real market for the green digital solution is emerging, and I want the EU to be a global leader in these areas: from block chain and digital mapping and tracking, to connected and automated vehicles, trains, planes and vessels. To secure our position at global level, we need to take investment in research and innovation very seriously, and we need to work closely with the industry. This are some of my initial remarks on your questions, and of course I am looking forward to your questions and comments.

Puhetta johti HEIDI HAUTALA

varapuhemies

Marian-Jean Marinescu, în numele grupului PPE. – Doamnă președintă, doamnă comisară, mulțumesc foarte mult pentru intervenția dumneavoastră. Vă mulțumesc și pentru ceea ce ați spus că veți face anul acesta și vă mulțumesc, în același timp, și pentru introducerea, în programul Comisiei, a multor dosare importante pentru politica de transport în viitor. Pentru mine a fost o surpriză foarte plăcută.

Politica de transport viitoare trebuie să asigure, în primul rând, mobilitatea și conectivitatea, atât de necesare, amândouă, dezvoltării economiei. Toate măsurile pe care trebuie să le luăm în viitor trebuie, în primul rând, să asigure mobilitatea și apoi trebuie să respecte și, bineînțeles, cerințele Pactului ecologic.

Sunt lucruri pe care le puteți face fără a avea foarte multe costuri, nu neapărat niște măsuri de piață, și vă pot da niște exemple. De exemplu, pentru transportul pe cale ferată, aveți coridoarele de marfă, care nu sunt dezvoltate la nivelul la care ar trebui. Trebuie să aplicați regulamentul existent și, în același timp, să asigurați armonizarea tuturor regulamentelor și standardizarea în acest mod de transport foarte important, pentru că se cere transferul de pe drum, pe cale ferată.

Pentru transportul rutier, trebuie să existe o foaie de parcurs. Predictibilitatea este necesară atât industriei, cât și consumatorilor. Trebuie să completăm coridoarele rutiere. Pentru aviație, Cerul unic european, plus o nouă reglementare a ajutorului de stat pentru aeroporturi va aduce foarte multe îmbunătățiri. Nu uitați de transportul pe căile fluviale, căile navigabile interne, care poate să aducă, în același timp, dezvoltare economică, dar poate să aducă și micșorare de emisii.

Johan Danielsson, *för S&D-gruppen*. – Fru talman, kommissionär Vålean! Att ställa om till en grönare och mer hållbar transportsektor kommer att vara avgörande för att vi ska nå våra klimatmål. Fram till 2050 förväntas godstransporterna öka med 80 procent och persontransporterna med 50 procent. Samtidigt ska EU nå nettonollutsläpp.

Då kommer det inte att räcka med skatter och avgifter på fossila bränslen och på olika typer av utsläpp, utan då måste vi också presentera en positiv vision av den gröna omställningen genom investeringar. Vi måste investera i infrastruktur. Vi måste investera i alternativa bränslen och säkerställa att en hållbar omställning är möjlig i alla transportslag, må det vara väg, flyg, järnväg eller till sjöss.

Jag ser fram emot att arbeta med kommissionen i linje med det som ni föreslog i ert arbetsprogram för att bygga ut järnvägen, öka andelen gods som går på järnväg, bygga ut laddinfrastrukturen för att säkerställa en elektrifiering av våra vägtransporter och för att se till att EU också leder omställningen av flyget genom alternativa bränslen men också en elektrifiering av det kortare flyget. Transporterna är blodomloppet på vår inre marknad. Nu måste det också bli grönt.

José Ramón Bauzá Díaz, *en nombre del Grupo Renew*. – Señora presidenta, quiero agradecer la intervención de la comisaria, que ha marcado muy claramente las líneas a seguir, muchas de las cuales obviamente compartimos. Señorías, permítanme que les cite la siguiente frase, que cito textualmente: «Quien más viaja en avión probablemente es quien tiene más recursos o quien ve sus billetes sufragados por la empresa». Estas son las irresponsables declaraciones que la vicepresidenta del Gobierno de España hizo ayer en una entrevista. Una desafortunada retórica antiaviones que lo que hace es pretender cuestionar a los ciudadanos que hacen uso del avión para desplazarse simple y llanamente, y se les cuestiona simplemente por ser libres.

Discursos como este, que no compartimos en absoluto, lo que hacen es buscar, culpabilizar y criminalizar no solo a la industria, sino también a todas aquellas personas que usan determinados bienes o servicios simplemente porque son libres y tienen la capacidad de elegir.

La criminalización del transporte no solo arruina a camioneros o a pilotos, sino que también genera la quiebra directa del comercio exterior, de nuestras exportaciones, del comercio interior y, por supuesto, de las regiones isleñas. Yo procedo de unas islas, de las islas Baleares, y nosotros necesitamos un transporte seguro, fiable, rápido, en este caso, como es el de los aviones. Y lo hacemos o por necesidad o porque queremos. Simplemente porque somos ciudadanos libres.

Hoy más que nunca, desde las instituciones europeas necesitamos alejarnos de los populismos, y que no se vea al transporte como una amenaza sino como una oportunidad; ya no voy a decir como una necesidad.

Necesitamos pensar de forma constructiva. Necesitamos apoyarnos en las nuevas tecnologías, en las nuevas oportunidades que se nos brindan, también con biocombustibles o con combustibles alternativos. Prohibir, señalar, criminalizar, nunca es la solución. Y precisamente los que estamos aquí tenemos esa responsabilidad.

Karima Delli, *au nom du groupe Verts/ALE*. – Madame la Présidente, Madame la Commissaire, mes chers collègues, le transport, c'est 30 % des gaz à effet de serre. C'est le seul secteur qui ne réduit pas ses gaz à effet de serre depuis 1990 et, en parallèle, aucun État membre ne respecte les accords de Paris. Ce phénomène a aussi enclenché une deuxième dynamique, qui est terrible puisque nous avons la maladie du XXI e siècle sous nos yeux, notamment cette pollution de l'air: 800 000 morts prématurés chaque année.

Et donc, Madame la Commissaire, vous nous parlez du Green Deal (Pacte vert pour l'Europe). Je suis d'accord, mais il ne faut pas du tout en faire un Green Washing! L'écologie de l'illusion mérite l'écologie des solutions. Dans cette feuille de route du Pacte vert pour l'Europe, il faut de l'audace, il faut être ambitieux, attaquer là où ça fait mal. Alors oui, on va s'attaquer à des sujets qui font mal, mais nous devons obtenir des réponses.

Premièrement, le secteur de l'aviation: il est grand temps qu'il entre dans le système de l'ETS (SEQE). Et allons plus loin pour mettre en œuvre une véritable taxe kérosène. Ce sont vos services qui ont montré qu'une taxe kérosène pouvait apporter au budget de l'État 27 milliards d'euros par an. N'est-ce pas formidable en matière de levée de fonds pour relancer ce dont nous avons besoin? Relancer le fret, relancer notamment la mobilité urbaine dure avec plus de transports en commun, plus de pistes cyclables ?

Madame la Présidente, je termine très rapidement: je n'accepte pas ou je n'accepterai pas que la Commission prenne son courage pour nous remettre un texte sur l'Eurovignette, texte qui a été torpillé par le Conseil, voté par le Parlement. Je vous remercie.

Roman Haider, *im Namen der ID-Fraktion*. – Frau Präsidentin! Das Papier, das die Kommission hier vorgelegt hat, ist leider weder besonders grün noch ist es ein guter Deal. Ganz im Gegenteil: Eine Umsetzung dieses Entwurfs gefährdet Millionen von Arbeitsplätzen, und zwar ohne auch nur in entscheidender oder in irgendeiner Weise zur Umwelt oder zum Klimaschutz beizutragen. Im Klartext heißt das: Die Kommission stellt die wirtschaftlichen Grundlagen von fast 500 Millionen Bürgern in Frage – für nichts.

Ganz besonders sauer stößt mir auf, dass die Bürger und ihre Bedürfnisse bei diesen hochfliegenden Plänen der Kommission überhaupt keine Rolle spielen. Die Menschen brauchen ihr Fahrzeug, um zur Arbeit zu kommen – jeden Tag. Sie brauchen ihre Fahrzeuge, um ihren Lebensunterhalt zu verdienen. Und genau diese Millionen von Pendlern nehmen Sie mit diesem Vorhaben aus wie die sprichwörtliche Weihnachtsgans. Diese Pläne sind nicht nur wirtschaftsfeindlich, sie sind auch unsozial. Sie machen Mobilität zum Luxusgut.

Kosma Złotowski, *w imieniu grupy ECR*. – Pani Przewodnicząca! Szanowana Pani Komisarz! Kluczowym elementem unijnej strategii w zakresie mobilności powinny być nakłady na środki komunikacji przyjazne środowisku, szczególnie jeśli chodzi o transport publiczny. Mamy nowoczesne europejskie know-how, zwłaszcza jeśli chodzi o pojazdy szynowe, czego przykładem jest choćby bydgoska Pesa. Warto w rozwój tego rodzaju przedsiębiorstw zainwestować.

Przyszłość transportu to także inteligentne pojazdy i infrastruktura gwarantujące jak najwyższe bezpieczeństwo pieszym i kierowcom, to także większa efektywność transportu towarowego, której nie da się osiągnąć, ograniczając konkurencję przy pomocy pakietu mobilności.

Rok 2030 to bardzo ambitna cezura przy tak złożonej i kosztownej agendzie. W wielu regionach podstawowe potrzeby komunikacyjne wciąż nie zostały zaspokojone, brakuje bezpiecznych dróg, a średni wiek samochodów w Unii Europejskiej to 11 lat.

Mam nadzieję, że Pani Komisarz będzie o tym wszystkim pamiętała. Strategia patrzenia w przeszłość nie może być strategią ucieczki do przodu od bieżących problemów, które zastaliśmy.

Έλενα Κουντουρά, *εξ ονόματος της ομάδας GUE/NGL*. – Κυρία Vălean, σας ευχαριστώ πολύ για την παρουσίαση. Εύχομαι να έχουμε πολύ καλή συνεργασία τα επόμενα χρόνια. Στη συζήτηση για το μέλλον των μεταφορών, πρέπει να θέσουμε τρεις προτεραιότητες οι οποίες είναι άρρηκτα συνδεδεμένες μεταξύ τους: Πρώτον, οι καθαρές μεταφορές για το κλίμα αλλά και για την ανθρώπινη υγεία. Ξέρουμε ότι οι μεταφορές ευθύνονται για το 27% των αερίων του θερμοκηπίου, τη στιγμή που η ατμοσφαιρική ρύπανση, ιδιαίτερα στα αστικά κέντρα, προκαλεί εκατομμύρια πρόωρους θανάτους. Δεύτερον, δεν νοείται ευρωπαϊκή στρατηγική που να μην έχει ως στόχο τη συνδεσιμότητα όλων των κρατών μελών αλλά κυρίως των νησιωτικών και απομακρυσμένων περιοχών. Η κατάσταση είναι δραματική. Ήδη σήμερα το κόστος που επιβιβάζονται οι πληθυσμοί αυτοί είναι τεράστιο. Το μόνο που ζητούν είναι ίσες συνθήκες και ευκαιρίες με τους άλλους Ευρωπαίους. Τρίτον, κοινωνικά δίκαιη μετάβαση. Αν δεν δημιουργήσουμε αντίμετρα και πρόνοια για τους πιο αδύναμους, θα χάσουμε την αποδοχή της κοινωνίας. Δεν πρέπει οι μεταφορές να γίνουν μια πολυτέλεια για τους προνομιούχους. Το κλειδί της επιτυχίας είναι οι επενδύσεις σε νέες τεχνολογίες, στην καινοτομία και την έρευνα. Δεν πρέπει να χάσουμε άλλο χρόνο. Πρέπει να περάσουμε από τα λόγια στην πράξη.

Ivan Vilibor Sinčić (NI). –Poštovana potpredsjednice, željeznica je slika države, odnosno ako želimo vidjeti u kakvom stanju je neka država, pogledajmo njezinu željeznicu. Kad govorimo o državnom prometu, bojim se da je Hrvatska daleko od spremnosti za budućnost održivoga prometa, o tome nažalost i svjedoče činjenice iz hrvatske strategije prometnog razvoja iz 2017. godine, a tamo recimo stoji: „Vozni park željeznica u prosjeku je stariji od 30 godina, 70 % lokomotiva u idućih će deset godina doći do kraja svog radnog vijeka. Vozni park zbog svoje starosti uništava željezničku infrastrukturu. Samo je na 18 % ukupne duljine pruga dozvoljena najviša brzina koja je projektirana. Dalje, brzina vlakova do 160 km/h dopuštena je samo na 7 %, a do 100 km/h na samo 12 % pruga. Obnova sustava koja je propisana svakih osam do deset godina nije se provodila proteklih 35 godina. Postojeće poslovanje željeznice nije održivo bez državne potpore. Nažalost, kolegice i kolege, ovako izgleda kronična desetljetna korupcija u praksi. Ona se vidi na željeznici.”

Barbara Thaler (PPE). – Madam President, dear colleagues, mobility is an indicator of wealth, opportunities and prosperity. Mobility brings individuals and consequently Europe closer together. Mobility itself is not a problem – it's quite the opposite.

Dear Commissioner, our European transport system has to stay affordable, reliable and sustainable. And let me share three ideas on this:

Firstly, I think we all agree that our railway system can contribute to our shared goals. However, we need to cut red tape, to an enormous extent, we need to unleash competition and we need to tear down national borders. I know the Commission is well aware and I know you are committed to solve this problem. But how exactly are you planning to proceed?

Secondly, for 20 years the average European household has been spending 13% of their monthly available income on mobility, while at the same time better technology reduced our CO₂ emissions by 25%. How are you going to ensure that the expenses for our citizens will stay the same in the future?

And lastly, now I switch back to mother tongue.

Wir wurden nicht gewählt, um Mobilität zum Problem zu machen. Wir wurden gewählt, um die Probleme der Mobilität zu lösen. Seien Sie sich sicher, Frau Kommissarin, in uns haben Sie einen starken Partner darin.

Ismail Ertug (S&D). – Madam President, the future of mobility has to be CO₂ neutral. We can reach that only through new technologies and alternative fuels, and electrification will not be possible without the corresponding infrastructure. Therefore, Madam Commissioner, I urge you as soon as possible to come forward with the Alternative Fuels Infrastructure Directive, which we had seven years ago but which failed due to the destructive approach of the Council. Furthermore, I want to raise one more issue, which is the importance of the Trans-European Networks Directive or Regulation. This is also in preparation – we know that. I was the rapporteur eight years ago, and at that time we had different goals. Now we have different goals as well. Therefore we have to support, with the Trans-European Networks guidelines, also these targets and these goals that I mentioned before. We have to fund the smart and clean infrastructure also within the Transport and TEN-T guidelines as well, and the funding has to be there.

Caroline Nagtegaal (Renew). – Voorzitter, geef ons duidelijkheid. Dat is wat ik heel vaak hoor van de binnenvaartschippers in Moerdijk en in Delfzijl. Maar ook in mijn eigen stad Rotterdam. “Wij willen wel”, vertellen ze me, “en eigenlijk liever nog vandaag dan morgen.” De binnenvaart in Nederland, maar zeker ook in Europa, wil heel graag die stap naar duurzame brandstoffen maken. Op dit moment is het eigenlijk alleen het gebrek aan duidelijkheid vanuit Europa dat ze daarvan weerhoudt. Of het nu gaat om waterstof, LNG of elektrische aandrijving. Of misschien wel die meest briljante vondst die we nog niet kennen. Het maakt eigenlijk niets uit, als de Europese regelgeving het maar toestaat en de infrastructuur er maar komt te liggen.

Daarom sta ik hier nu ook. Ik wil dat in Europa echt wordt gestopt met beschuldigend te wijzen naar de binnenvaart. Ik weet eigenlijk wel zeker dat met de herziening van de TEN-T-richtlijn en de richtlijn alternatieve brandstoffen al die hardwerkende en voor ons onmisbare binnenvaartschippers wordt toegestaan om te doen wat ze zo graag willen, namelijk een duurzaam Europa nalaten aan de volgende generatie.

En mijn vraag aan u, mevrouw de commissaris, is dan ook: “Bent u het met mij eens dat waterstof, LNG of die andere mogelijke, toekomstige alternatieve brandstoffen juist kansen bieden voor onze binnenvaartsector om te verduurzamen en op die manier ruim baan te krijgen? Zo ja, hoe ziet u dat in het licht van de aankomende TEN-T-richtlijn en de richtlijn alternatieve brandstoffen?”

Ciarán Cuffe (Verts/ALE). – Thank you, Madam President. The future of transport must be affordable, accessible, healthy and clean: not my words, but the words of our President, Commissioner Ursula von der Leyen, and I agree with that sentiment. I want to see it delivered. So let's start with walking, move on to cycling and then invest in quality public transport. It's not rocket science. If our transport systems work for children, if they work for older people, then we're on the right road to sustainability. But we do have to move away from a car-centric vision of transport and mobility, and I want you, Commissioner, to place a clear focus on active travel and safer, low-carbon mobility solutions. We have to move away from our obsession with mega projects and focus more on the small things that make a difference in different regions around Europe. An EU strategy must not repeat the mistakes of the past – endless motorway and airport expansions and subsidies for pollution industries – so let's offer a positive vision for how people can move around.

Philippe Olivier (ID). – Madame la Présidente, laissez-moi vous rappeler une vérité simple: l'énergie la plus propre et celle qu'on ne consomme pas. Vous nous proposez de réduire la pollution des transports, vous avez raison. Mais comment ne pas penser que vous êtes atteinte d'une certaine schizophrénie, parce qu'ayant fait le constat que la planète s'asphyxie avec le développement des transports, vous vous acharnez à mettre en œuvre un modèle fondé sur le libre-échange, le nomadisme, c'est-à-dire en pratique le développement infini des transports, et l'on voit dans le monde, le ballet des super-cargos baladant des marchandises et même des déchets.

Vous ne parlez pas de citoyens, mais seulement de consommateurs, réduisant l'homme à cette fonction consumériste. C'est cette conception mercantiliste de l'homme qui vous place en pleine contradiction écologique. Au globalisme, nous opposons le localisme qui nous convie à produire, consommer, retraiter sur place. Au nomadisme, nous opposons le bonheur de vivre sur sa terre avec ses affections et ses traditions, à votre hyper-consumérisme nous opposons une sobriété qui, comme nous le rappelle Pierre Rabhi peut être source de bonheur. Je vous remercie.

Ангел Джамбазки (ECR). – Г-жо Председател, г-жо Комисар, колеги, този дебат сякаш го е писал г-н Франц Кафка. Вярвам, че ви е известен този чешки писател. Чувам и виждам едни и същи хора, които гласуваха и прокараха силно срещу интересите на Централна и Източна Европа, на Румъния, на Унгария, на България, на Полша, на прибалтийските републики, на Испания, на Португалия пакета „Мобилност“. Тези същите хора говорят за зелена сделка и се оплакват от замърсяващия транспорт. И се оплакват, че се повишавали емисиите. Ами как няма да се повишават, като гласувахте да разхождате хиляди празни камиони на хиляди километри из цяла Европа? Как няма да се повишават тези емисии? Едното от двете не е вярно.

Не може да разкарвате празни камиони и да искате зелена сделка. Това как се нарича: лицемерие, двуличие, дебелоочие? Не зная, кажете ни! Това, което се случва пред очите ни, е истински фалш и Вие, г-жо Комисар, имате голям проблем. Вие трябва да се преборите с пакета „Мобилност“, който беше направен в интерес на превозвачи от държави извън Европейския съюз като Русия, като Турция, които вземат бизнеса. Не слушате превозвачи – превозвачите от България, от Румъния, от Полша и от прибалтийските държави, защото има лобизъм и той е грозен и не трябва да се случва.

João Ferreira (GUE/NGL). – Senhora Presidente, as políticas de mobilidade são cruciais para a qualidade de vida das populações, para o funcionamento da economia e para a redução dos impactos antrópicos no ambiente. Na perspetiva da coesão económica, social e territorial devem necessariamente ser tidas em conta as necessidades de mobilidade nos planos local, regional e nacional.

A União Europeia tem vindo a colocar um foco crescente nas chamadas redes transeuropeias por pressão das principais economias que dominam o mercado único, ao mesmo tempo que reduz os recursos necessários para o que falta fazer, e é muito, ao nível da mobilidade local, regional e nacional, em especial em domínios como a ferrovia ou o metropolitano nas cidades. O chamado Pacto Ecológico Europeu, apesar da muita propaganda, falha clamorosamente na questão da mobilidade. Não há mobilidade sustentável sem uma aposta forte nos transportes públicos, sem a transição massiva de utilizadores do transporte individual para o transporte público coletivo.

Pois bem, nem por uma vez o chamado Pacto Ecológico Europeu fala em transportes públicos. Esperamos que a estratégia para a mobilidade que aí vem corrija estas distorções.

Antoni Comín i Oliveres (NI). – Señora presidenta, estimados colegas, comisaria Válean, Europa, sin duda, tiene que estar en la vanguardia de un paradigma de transporte capaz de reconciliar la eficiencia y la sostenibilidad medioambiental. Pero en Cataluña, cuando pensamos en el futuro del transporte, lo primero que nos viene a la cabeza es el Corredor Mediterráneo. Los actores sociales y económicos, tanto de Cataluña como de Valencia, nunca han dejado de insistir y de trabajar en la necesidad de esta conexión, que es altamente estratégica para Europa. Está incluida en la RTE-T, desde hace diez años, pero todavía no ha sido terminada.

Hace tiempo que vemos cómo desde el Estado español se frena la inversión; falta un plan director integral para la década 2020-2030, desde Francia hasta Algeciras; falta saber la fecha de la nueva conexión del puerto de Barcelona, que está proyectada desde hace más de doce años, la nueva terminal del antiguo cauce del Llobregat, etcétera.

Los discursos de la Comisión siempre son bienvenidos y son importantes, pero las reglamentaciones no sirven de nada si no se hacen cumplir. No tienen verdadero efecto, si no van seguidas de una buena implementación por parte de los Estados miembros. Esperamos que la Comisión Europea sea realmente firme en este sentido.

Sven Schulze (PPE). – Frau Präsidentin! Vielen Dank, Frau Kommissarin, dass Sie heute bei uns sind. Wir reden über die Zukunft der Mobilität. Ich möchte heute aber mal ein Thema ansprechen, das die Bürger Europas ganz aktuell interessiert und zu dem ich in den letzten Monaten unzählige Fragen von meinen Wählern bekommen habe. Das ist das Thema der Umweltplaketten. Wir erleben, dass viele Städte in Europa, in der Europäischen Union eigene Systeme einführen. In Straßburg haben wir das beispielsweise. Wer, so wie ich, jedesmal zur Straßburgwoche mit dem Auto fährt, musste dort eine Plakette beantragen. Wer, so wie ich, mit dem Auto hierher nach Brüssel fährt, musste sich hier registrieren lassen, und das haben wir in unzähligen Städten innerhalb der Europäischen Union. Wir, die Europäische Volkspartei, haben in den vergangenen Jahren schon mehrfach bei der Kommission angefragt – das waren Ihre Vorgänger, die wir da gefragt haben –, ob das a) mit europäischen Regeln übereinstimmt und b), ob dieser Flickenteppich im Sinne unserer Europäischen Union ist. Viele Bürger haben die Befürchtung, dass, wenn sie in Städte hineinfahren, sie dann empfindliche Strafen bekommen, wenn sie sich nicht registriert haben. Auch die Registrierung ist nicht immer ganz einfach. Und da meine Bitte: Bei aller Weitsicht, die wir zu den verschiedenen Themen heute hier hören und die auch alle wichtig sind, dass wir auch diese aktuellen Themen beachten und Sie als neue Kommissarin – ich habe Sie so kennengelernt, dass Sie sich wirklich auch um das Wohl der Bürger bemühen wollen – dieses Thema mal aufgreifen und uns eine Rückmeldung geben und das mal überprüfen.

Giuseppe Ferrandino (S&D). – Signora Presidente, onorevoli colleghi, il *Green Deal* non può e non deve essere un mero spot politico. Abbiamo piena coscienza delle sfide climatiche da fronteggiare e urge correggere il tiro delle politiche comunitarie presto e in modo efficace.

Chiedo alla Commissione un atteggiamento più ambizioso e determinato, a cominciare da Eurovignette bloccato da logiche nazionali che cozzano con la visione a lungo termine del *Green Deal*. Tutti sappiamo che i trasporti sono responsabili di un quarto delle emissioni dell'Unione. Occorrono specifici investimenti in trasporti ferroviari, aerei e marittimi.

Inoltre, l'attuale posizione della Commissione sul trasporto intermodale non è ancora sufficiente. Il Parlamento ha già ribadito che serve uno sforzo economico maggiore per raggiungere gli obiettivi previsti per il 2030.

Sono inoltre molto preoccupato che punire chi inquina di più possa trasformarsi in una iniqua tassazione che ricade esclusivamente sul consumatore finale, invece di rappresentare un incentivo affinché si sviluppino tecnologie meno impattanti.

Ancora una volta gli investimenti richiesti per collegare le zone periferiche dell'Europa, come ad esempio il sud dell'Italia, sembrano essere insufficienti. Pertanto chiediamo che, come già proposto dal Parlamento, vi sia un aumento di 6 miliardi del meccanismo CEF.

Izaskun Bilbao Barandica (Renew). – Señora presidenta, bienvenida comisaria, la movilidad eficiente, sostenible y limpia de personas y mercancías es una de las claves para la competitividad de nuestra economía. Es una herramienta imprescindible para luchar contra el cambio climático y garantiza la libertad de movimientos. Somos líderes en muchas tecnologías de transporte, y mantener esa posición nos obliga a innovar, a crear el primer sistema integrado de movilidad del mundo.

Ello requiere apostar por la digitalización intensiva, la innovación industrial para descarbonizar vehículos y conectarlos entre sí, con las infraestructuras y los usuarios, y la formación de nuevos profesionales. Hay que evolucionar en la gestión por modos de transporte para empezar a hablar de movilidad. Van a aparecer nuevos modelos de negocio que permitirán a los usuarios, en una sola operación, resolver sus necesidades del primer al último kilómetro.

Una transformación que requiere, además, un cambio del que todos somos protagonistas y que comienza a ras de suelo. Por eso insisto en que sume voluntades de abajo a arriba y que se apoye en las instituciones más próximas a la ciudadanía para avanzar. Y, por supuesto, han de cumplirse compromisos y acuerdos que son claves para este desarrollo: las redes transeuropeas de transporte, el Cielo Único, la red Galileo, el paquete ferroviario; apostamos por el Pacto Verde, pero se quedará solo en palabras bonitas si los Estados miembros siguen bloqueando los cimientos de esta transformación. Usted debe ser la protagonista para exigirles que lo cumplan.

Tilly Metz (Verts/ALE). – Madame la Présidente, le Luxembourg est le premier pays européen où le transport public sera gratuit à partir du 1^{er} mars. L'accès à des solutions de substitution pratiques et efficaces de déplacement est essentiel pour donner envie aux citoyens et aux citoyennes de changer de mode de transport.

L'accès pour tous et le coût abordable des transports sont des éléments indispensables, mais il faut aussi faire d'autres investissements. Il faut faire en sorte que les infrastructures soient là pour passer facilement du train au vélo, du train à la voiture électrique ou encore du train au tram. Tout aussi nécessaires, la mise en place de tarifs réduits dans toute l'Europe pour les transports faibles en carbone, tels que le train, notamment pour les étudiants, et la juste taxation des moyens de transport polluants. Enfin, il faut aussi un renforcement des lignes de train intraeuropéennes et des trains de nuit.

Cette stratégie doit faire partie intégrante du pacte vert. C'est un domaine concret dans lequel l'Europe doit améliorer la qualité de vie des citoyens et des citoyennes.

Beata Mazurek (ECR). – Pani Przewodnicząca! Wysłuchaliśmy interesującej prezentacji Komisji Europejskiej na temat jej strategii dla transportu i mobilności. Życzyłabym sobie, aby nam wszystkim udało się wypracować spójne podejście w tym obszarze. Dotychczasowe doświadczenia pokazują, że aby projekty infrastrukturalne miały gwarancję sukcesu, muszą przede wszystkim uzyskać zgodę państw członkowskich i mieć zapewnione źródła finansowania. Stąd w kontekście trwających obecnie rozmów nad nową perspektywą finansową szczególne znaczenie ma Fundusz Spójności i instrument C. Takie projekty jak Via Carpatia czy Bursztynowy Korytarz Kolejowy powinny mieć to samo znaczenie polityczne dla Komisji Europejskiej jak pozostałe korytarze transeuropejskiej sieci transportowej.

W pierwszym wystąpieniu przewodniczącej Komisji Europejskiej niewiele było odniesień do transportu kolejowego. Czy zatem Komisja Europejska przewiduje podjęcie działań np. na rzecz wspierania inwestycji w koleje dużych prędkości i stworzenia europejskiego centralnego planu dla sieci kolei dużych prędkości w Unii Europejskiej? Jeśli przewidują państwo działania, to jakie i kiedy?

Benoît Lutgen (PPE). – Madame la Présidente, Madame la Commissaire, merci pour la présentation. Permettez -moi de vous dire que la durabilité repose sur trois piliers.

Tout d'abord, bien sûr, l'enjeu écologique, qui a été largement diffusé dans votre intervention. Nous devons tous souscrire au pacte vert pour l'Europe et faire en sorte que, demain, les marchandises –notamment– soient transportées davantage par le rail que par la route, mais aussi qu'il y ait une taxation sur le kérosène – personnellement, je suis tout à fait pour – afin qu'il y ait une fiscalité juste et que nous puissions favoriser certains modes de transport.

Ensuite, la durabilité, c'est aussi l'économie, l'emploi, les familles et les entreprises qui dépendent directement du secteur du transport. Oui, nous devons veiller à avoir cette attention particulière pour les entreprises et pour l'emploi dans la stratégie qui sera menée avec l'aide du numérique.

Enfin, il y a l'aspect social ou démocratique. Oui, le transport est un enjeu démocratique pour bon nombre de nos régions: celles qui sont enclavées, celles qui sont délaissées, celles où des citoyens ne peuvent pas se déplacer parce qu'il y a un manque de moyens de transport, qu'ils soient publics ou privés. C'est un enjeu démocratique pour l'Europe: Madame la Commissaire, vous avez un rôle très important à jouer en la matière, pour faire en sorte que chaque citoyen, demain, ait des solutions de mobilité près de chez lui, près de son domicile, près de son travail. À ce moment-là, oui, la foi en l'Europe grandira grâce à ces solutions qui seront apportées par vous, par la Commission et par l'ensemble des acteurs de la mobilité.

C'est donc aussi un enjeu démocratique au-delà de l'enjeu écologique et économique.

(Applaudissements)

Isabel García Muñoz (S&D). – Señora presidenta, señora comisaria, la revisión del Reglamento sobre la RTE-T será uno de los pilares fundamentales de la próxima estrategia para la movilidad y el transporte sostenibles y deberá alinearse con los nuevos objetivos del Pacto Verde.

Para esto son necesarias propuestas legislativas concretas que potencien el ferrocarril, en favor de un transporte de mercancías y pasajeros más eficaz y sostenible, para lo cual es esencial el impulso de la multimodalidad, y que mejore la interconexión con puertos, aeropuertos, con plataformas logísticas, nodos urbanos, con las regiones insulares y también con las áreas rurales. Se necesitan directrices específicas para asegurar que todos los usuarios tienen acceso a puntos de recarga de vehículos eléctricos, incluso en las zonas despobladas. Es necesaria la simplificación de los procesos administrativos para trabajar de manera más eficaz en los proyectos transfronterizos. Y es necesario también disponer de instrumentos de financiación fuertes, como el próximo MCE, donde ya el 60 % de su dotación se destina acciones que promuevan la movilidad sostenible e inteligente.

Por ello, recalco la importancia de mantener la posición del Parlamento durante las negociaciones del MCE.

Clotilde Armand (Renew). – Doamnă președintă, orice strategie europeană în materie de transport trebuie să țină seama de obiectivele noastre ecologice, dar și de realitățile economice. Sunt țări din Europa, cum este țara pe care o reprezintă, România, care nu dispun de o conectare la rețeaua de autostrăzi europene. Nu există nicio autostradă în România care să traverseze frontiera spre restul spațiului european. Nu există nicio autostradă care să traverseze Munții Carpați, pentru a conecta regiunile țării.

Nu este vorba de proiecte de densificare rutieră, este vorba de un minim de care are nevoie o economie ca să prospere. Chiar dacă mutăm investițiile spre transportul feroviar și fluvial – investiții, de altfel, foarte mari și de lungă durată – nu vom putea eluda această necesitate, completarea rețelei rutiere europene la un minim. Este dreptul tuturor cetățenilor europeni de a beneficia de accesibilitate în transport. Strategia europeană trebuie să permită o tranziție ecologică justă.

Anna Deparnay-Grunenberg (Verts/ALE). – Frau Präsidentin! Den Verkehrssektor umzugestalten, um überhaupt eine Chance zu haben, die Pariser Klimaziele zu erreichen, ist ohne Frage eine Mammutaufgabe. Wir müssen jetzt damit beginnen. Lasst uns heute damit anfangen, das Offensichtlichste zu machen: Ohne eine massive Stärkung der Bahn in Europa werden wir den Verkehrssektor nicht nachhaltig transformieren können. Sei es der nötige Ausbau der Bahninfrastruktur, und da insbesondere die Lückenschlüsse im grenzüberschreitenden Bahnverkehr, oder die Herstellung eines fairen Wettbewerbs zwischen den Verkehrsträgern. Ich sage nur: Externalitäten bepreisen, um die altbekannte und heute anachronistische Benachteiligung der Bahn zu beenden. Heute möchte ich die Wichtigkeit von Nachtzügen betonen. Sie sind oft die einzige konkrete klimafreundliche Alternative zum innereuropäischen Fliegen. Oft als romantisch abgetan, zeigt sich, dass ein realer Markt da ist, mit hoher Nachfrage. Sie haben heute zu Recht eine Renaissance in Europa. Wo bleibt nur die Kommission mit Ideen, um diesen Trend ganz konkret zu beflügeln? Ich hätte einiges in petto: Anschlag von Fahrzeugfinanzierung, gemeinwohlorientierte Trassenpreise, durchgehendes Ticketing. Lasst uns gerne gemeinsam daran arbeiten!

Raffaele Stancanelli (ECR). – Signora Presidente, onorevoli colleghi, i trasporti e la mobilità costituiscono la linfa vitale della nostra economia. Il diritto a un trasporto sicuro, efficiente e sostenibile è fondamentale e l'Unione europea deve fare di tutto per garantirlo a prezzi accessibili che consentano la libera circolazione delle persone e delle merci.

Vorrei approfittare di questo dibattito sulla strategia dell'Unione europea per la mobilità e i trasporti per il 2030, per ricordare alla Commissione europea che vi sono alcune regioni europee nelle quali è necessario realizzare i collegamenti mancanti ed eliminare le strozzature esistenti che ancora ostacolano il buon funzionamento del mercato interno.

La Sicilia risulta caratterizzata da una condizione di insularità e dall'oggettivo svantaggio di natura economica per le sue imprese e per i suoi cittadini. Per questo motivo, l'Unione europea deve sostenere un effettivo riconoscimento della continuità territoriale per quanto concerne il trasporto aereo e finanziare l'investimento per la realizzazione del ponte sullo Stretto di Messina quale infrastruttura necessaria e indispensabile per il collegamento ferroviario all'interno del corridoio europeo TEN-T.

Henna Virkkunen (PPE). – Madam President, when we are speaking about the Green Deal, I think that the decarbonisation of transport will be one of the biggest challenges. We know that, all the time, emissions from the transport sector have been increasing, and we also know that the need for mobility is increasing all the time. But I very much agree with the Commissioner that we already have solutions available: we have alternative sustainable fuels, and here I think it is very important that we have a very technology-neutral approach, because we have very different regions in Europe and also different modes of transport with different needs. We have digital innovations, as the Commissioner said, and we can make mobility more smart and effective because of these new innovations. We also have the possibility to invest more: very modern, smart, fast connections in the transport sector, and here I'm also asking for your support, Madame Commissioner. As you know, Parliament is very willing to invest in more cross-border transport connections in Europe, and now we are negotiating on the next MFF, it is very important that we are really investing in transport connections also.

Петър Витанов (S&D). – Г-жо Председател, европейските граждани искат да живеят в един мирен свят, в екологична среда, в един социално отговорен и мислещ за хората Съюз. Качеството на живот, по-чистият въздух, водата са свързани със съществена трансформация в сферата на транспорта чрез постигане на ефективна и взаимосвързана мобилност, но също чиста и нисковъглеродна мобилност. Необходимо е да положим максимални усилия, за да осъществим прехода от високоемисионен транспорт към такъв с нулеви емисии, какъвто е железопътният транспорт. Чрез екшън план за съживяването му трябва да гарантираме регулации за разгръщане на потенциала на пътническото и товарното направление, които да подобрят координацията и да намалят бюрократичните спънки.

Ето защо са необходими целенасочени инвестиции, които да бъдат вложени в инфраструктура и цифровизация за осъществяване на прехода от шосеен към железопътен план. Трябва да подобрим свързаността на европейската железопътна мрежа, така че тя да стане по-привлекателен начин за пътуване на средни и далечни разстояния на достъпна цена. И последно, неприемливо е европейски граждани да бъдат заложници на некомпетентността на собствените си правителства, защото е абсолютно недопустимо в 21-ви век разстоянието между две европейски столици като Берлин и София да се взима за 3-4 дни.

Pablo Arias Echeverría (PPE). – Señora presidenta, señora comisaria, el transporte es un sector básico para el funcionamiento de nuestra economía, el mercado interior y el comercio, y su competitividad, fundamental para las industrias manufactureras y la exportación de mercancías. Sin el transporte, el mercado interior no existe, pero, además y según recoge el Tratado, es un elemento fundamental de cohesión territorial y social. Por eso, la nueva estrategia sobre movilidad y transporte, además de tener como objetivo principal la protección del medio ambiente, debe tener en cuenta estos elementos.

Si queremos alcanzar el ambicioso objetivo de conseguir la descarbonización total de nuestra economía en 2050, hemos de reducir la contaminación y mejorar la calidad del aire de las ciudades. Necesitamos una movilidad más segura, más sostenible y más eficiente, pero también reformas; no podemos crearles a los ciudadanos más problemas, debemos darles, sin duda, soluciones.

Nuestras ciudades tendrán que cambiar para fomentar modos de transporte más limpios y eficientes, incorporar combustibles alternativos, electrificar el transporte e integrar nuevas formas de movilidad. Y en ese sentido, es necesario —y lo quiero hacer hoy aquí— destacar el plan del Ayuntamiento de Madrid —MADRID 360—: un plan integral para conseguir una movilidad segura, sostenible y eficiente e incluyente. Un ejemplo de cómo hacer bien las cosas, del que deberán tomar nota muchas ciudades de la Unión.

Vera Tax (S&D). – Voorzitter, in mijn regio is sinds een jaar sprake van een groot verlies aan banen in de auto-industrie, 1700 banen zijn daar verloren gegaan. Die mensen zitten nu thuis. De reden hiervoor is de onzekerheid over mobiliteit in Europa. In China is die twijfel er niet. Daar worden juist op dit moment veel banen gecreëerd door investeringen in duurzaamheid. Dat is wat ons nu te doen staat. De EU-strategie van mobiliteit en vervoer moet over werkgelegenheid gaan. De productie van duurzame voertuigen maakt duizenden nieuwe banen mogelijk. Dit moet een belangrijk deel zijn van onze strategie. Dus daarom roep ik u op om niet alleen te investeren in duurzame mobiliteit, maar ook in de werkgelegenheid van de toekomst.

Andrey Novakov (PPE). – Madam President, first of all, I would like to congratulate you Commissioner for your hard work from day one and bringing back to normal the work of the Directorate-General for DG MOVE, including the legislative work, including the mobility package procedure, which in the past crossed some boundaries that shouldn't be crossed.

I know the future belongs to green policies. I know the future belongs to green transport but someone proposed, just a minute ago, that we should decrease airline routes, we should tax kerosene and, instead, we should be building bicycle lanes. I would like to see a bicycle lane between Amsterdam and Sofia instead of the plane.

But now back to the topic. A lot has been said about CO₂ ceilings, about strategies, about priorities, I would like to say something about road safety. Road safety and the roads are responsible for more casualties than any other disease which is attacking humankind now. So, we need safer roads and better education for drivers. This can happen only with EU funds with significant amounts in them, so we should provide safer roads in a better condition and a EU-wide strategy on how to educate young drivers.

Μαρία Σπυράκη (PPE). – Κυρία Vălean, επιτρέψτε μου να εκφράσω τη χαρά μου που είστε σήμερα εδώ μαζί μας. Είμαι σίγουρη ότι εσείς, περισσότερο από όλους μας σε αυτήν εδώ την αίθουσα, κατανοείτε ότι η βιώσιμη κινητικότητα απαιτεί επενδύσεις σε πράσινες δημόσιες μεταφορές, και μάλιστα με επιταχυνόμενους ρυθμούς. Σήμερα, μόλις το 9% του στόλου των αστικών μεταφορών στην Ευρώπη είναι ηλεκτροκίνητο. Το 2035 θα έχουμε ξεπεράσει το 50%. Μέχρι τότε, όμως, μεσολαβούν 15 χρόνια. Γι' αυτά τα 15 χρόνια, λοιπόν, πόλεις όπως η Θεσσαλονίκη —η πόλη μου—, χρειάζονται αξιόπιστες αστικές μεταφορές. Χρειάζονται αστικές μεταφορές που θα προσφέρουν συστηματικές και ακριβείς υπηρεσίες στους πολίτες. Η έλλειψη αυτών των μεταφορών, σε συνδυασμό με τη μεγάλη ηλικία του στόλου των αυτοκινήτων, η οποία αποτυπώνεται σε χώρες όπως η Ελλάδα, που είχαν επιπτώσεις από την κρίση, δείχνει πως υπάρχει ένα σοβαρό επενδυτικό κενό. Αυτό μπορεί να γεφυρωθεί με τη συμμετοχή του νέου προϋπολογισμού 2021-2027, με την κινητοποίηση του ιδιωτικού τομέα και με όλα τα εργαλεία που μας δίνει η Πράσινη Συμφωνία. Χρειαζόμαστε στόχους που αυτή τη φορά θα επιτευχθούν. Χρειαζόμαστε δημόσιες μεταφορές με χαμηλό κόστος, προσβάσιμες σε όλους.

Pyynnöstä myönnettävät puheenvuorot

Traian Băsescu (PPE). – Doamnă președintă, permiteți-mi să o felicit pe doamna comisară Vălean că are ca prioritate transportul durabil, transportul pe căile navigabile. În acest sens, îi adresez următoarea rugămintă.

Germania a construit un canal care se numește Canalul Rin-Main-Dunăre. România a construit un alt canal care a legat Dunărea de Marea Neagră, de Portul Constanța. Prin cele două canale avem 2 900 de km de cale navigabilă care nu este utilizată.

De ce? Pentru că nu s-a negociat unificarea regulamentelor Comisiei Dunării și al Comisiei Rinului. Rog Comisia Europeană să încerce armonizarea celor două comisii și unificarea regulamentelor de circulație.

Maria Grapini (S&D). – Doamnă președintă, doamnă comisară, stimați colegi, sigur că și acum cinci ani, și acum patru ani, am auzit discursuri cam în același gen: ce trebuie să facem pentru a avea un transport sustenabil, durabil, ecologic. Și în seara aceasta am auzit foarte multe. Problema este că am auzit mai puțin cum să facem acest lucru și cred că pe acest lucru trebuie să punem accent.

Dumneavoastră ați spus, doamnă comisară, că trebuie să consolidăm conectivitatea, dar trebuie, întâi, să o creăm, pentru că avem zone deconectate. Trebuie să vedem cum conectăm toată Europa. S-a spus aici: sunt țări care nu au autostrăzi, sunt țări care au jumătate sau trei sferturi din rețeaua de cale ferată defăectată. Ce program avem noi? Cât primește finanțare sectorul transporturilor în noul cadru financiar, pentru că nu o să putem altfel, împreună cu statele membre?

Și mai este un lucru. Foarte multe lucruri se blochează la Consiliu. Șefii de stat și de guvern trebuie să înțeleagă că degeaba muncim noi aici, în Parlament, venim cu proiecte, venim cu propuneri, veniți dumneavoastră, Comisia, cu propuneri, și totul se blochează. Doar într-un parteneriat între statele membre și Comisie putem să facem, într-adevăr, un transport durabil și sustenabil.

Valter Flego (Renew). – Poștovana potpredsjednice, povjerenice, znamo da strategija Europske unije nula stopa poginulih u prometu do 2020. imala je za cilj upola smanjiti broj poginulih u odnosu na 2010. Nažalost, to se neće ostvariti jer, evo, samo 2018. čak je 25 000 ljudi poginulo u prometu, odnosno oko 500 ljudi tjedno.

Među zemljama gdje najviše ljudi pogiba, nažalost, uz Rumunjsku je i Hrvatska. Prosjek Eurpske unije je 49 smrtno stradalih na milijun stanovnika, a u Hrvatskoj 89. A važno je naglasiti kako čak 94 % svih slučajeva jesu uzrokovani ljudskom greškom. Zato mislim da je ključno, s jedne strane, ulagati u cestovnu infrastrukturu, ali s druge, u napredne tehnologije u vozilima, u digitalnu tehnologiju, odnosno u nove prilike kako bi mogli smanjiti ovu strašno veliku brojku smrtnosti.

Bogdan Rzońca (ECR). – Pani Przewodnicząca! Pani Komisarz! Chciałem bardzo serdecznie podziękować za to, że w swoim wystąpieniu wspomniała Pani o wypadkach drogowych. Jestem kolejnym posłem, który o tym tutaj mówi. Rozumiejąc potrzebę budowania niskoemisyjnego, nieszkodliwego dla środowiska systemu transportowego, nie możemy zapomnieć, że w 2017 roku na drogach w Unii Europejskiej zginęło 25 tysięcy osób, z tego niestety najwięcej w Rumunii, w Bułgarii i także w moim kraju, w Polsce.

Szansą dla Pani Komisarz, szansą dla nas wszystkich jest zbudowanie korytarza Via Carpathia – bardzo potrzebnego korytarza północ-południe, który pozwoli szybciej i lepiej przemieszczać się ludziom i towarom między północą a południem. Ma Pani tutaj ogromne pole do popisu. Zachęcam do poparcia tego projektu i proszę wziąć pod uwagę wszystkie kwestie związane ze śmiertelnością dnia codziennego. 25 tysięcy pogrzebów w roku to wstyd dla Unii Europejskiej.

Eugen Tomac (PPE). – Doamnă președintă, doresc și eu să îi urez mult succes doamnei comisare. Astăzi a fost o zi tristă pentru noi, în Parlament. Ne-am despărțit, după 47 de ani împreună, de Marea Britanie. Însă cred că Comisia, prin obiectivele pe care și le-a propus, trebuie să atingă ținte extrem de importante și să contribuie mult mai mult la întărirea Uniunii, să avem o Uniune puternică prin care să putem circula cât mai în siguranță și mai rapid de la est la vest, de la nord la sud.

Vin cu o propunere practică, care vine în acord cu aspirațiile Comisiei prin Pactul ecologic european: dacă este posibil, să implementăm o serie de recomandări prin care cel puțin instituțiile naționale și europene să instaleze stații pentru încărcat autovehicule electrice. Este un prim pas pentru a veni în sprijinul acestei industrii.

(Pyynnöstä myönnettävät puheenvuorot päättyvät)

Adina-Ioana Vălean, Member of the Commission. – Madam President, I say to the House: thank you for this interesting debate and the pertinent comments. I have carefully noted them and am very much encouraged by your interest in the subject.

I do recognise what you are saying on all the ideas. We are working on them in the Commission in order to put forward this strategy by the end of the year. All the points are valid. And, as I said at the beginning, for this strategy to be successful we need to have everyone on board. So it needs to be just, and it needs to be how create new jobs, it has to be accepted. And this will be part of our thinking.

Listening to you all, it also becomes very clear that there are baskets of measures for each mode. There is not merely one solution for everything, and we have to carefully blend and balance several measures in order to achieve smoothly the best possible outcome in the short term. Because people are expecting to see results rather quickly from our work on the sustainability of transport.

Many of you stressed the importance of the TEN-T infrastructure. And I can only say that I share this view, where it is needed, because it is incomplete, be it for various modes of cross-border interconnection. We know that we need to do more there in order to help create the missing links, which are not necessarily economically sustainable. And this would be the role of the European Union to add and support the missing links. And why not eliminate the barriers, which are cross-border, in order to make flows easier? The Commission announced – or at least I'm telling you – that we're are going to revise the TEN-T infrastructure in 2021.

Many Members mentioned alternative fuels infrastructure and alternative fuels as such. I think this is also very much in connection with aviation, which was intensely mentioned. We have to keep in mind that both aviation and maritime transport are global businesses. Once more, we need to understand there are baskets of measures, there are technological advances and there are alternative fuels. We need to very carefully look into them and into the market and the volume of this kind of fuels on the market, so that they could have an important uptake.

But these are all things we are looking at. A lot of you talked about implementation. Of course it is all for nothing if we adopt legislation which is not implemented in the end. So many countries are very late in implementing important things in regulation. We could mention railway signalling as just one example.

Many Members mentioned the fact that there are files which are blocked by the Council. I hope I can assure you that, for example, the single European sky is something I'm trying to lobby for and promote in each meeting I have with any representative of the Member States. We have it on the table and we'd like very much to see it moved forward by the Croatian presidency. This is something I'm insisting on, and I really hope we will have movement here.

The same is true with the Eurovignette, we haven't withdrawn the Eurovignette, we are trying to lobby for it in order to benefit from all the good work done. We have to push forward so that the Council will have a general approach – hopefully – by June. Because the Eurovignette or the single European sky are the kind of things which will make a difference in road transport or improving the efficiency of air traffic. And this will have a concrete impact on sustainability and on the reduction of emissions or on internalising the externalities in road transport.

Road safety was mentioned. Of course, road safety has to be at the core of our activity. And what we are going to propose, or work on, is a safe system, which is an integrated approach towards safety in transport. Because, as was mentioned by several people here, there are so many elements which together constitute the environment for safety in transport. All this needs to be taken into account.

All the ideas I heard are very good. And the last word would be on the fact that all the industries in connection with transport as such are the backbone of our economy. We need to make it more sustainable and smart, but keep in mind that it is competitive and it has to remain as such. And for this industry – as it was mentioned – we need measures which are predictable so people will know, investors will know, what is coming so they can plan in advance for 10 or 20 years.

I also had some particular questions from Mr Schulze on low-emission zones or the harmonising of vignette systems. This is something we are working on. Because the idea of having low-emission zones is good. Yes it is, but it is true that for people moving around not knowing the system is a deterrent or an obstacle. So what we are looking at is to propose a harmonisation of these systems for urban areas. For the Eurovignette, we have already said that we would like to support the Eurovignette.

The question on inland waterways raised by Mr Bănescu: inland waterways need to become the new big thing because I think they are underused. You are absolutely right, because inland waterways together with transport with rail are the most sustainable modes we have. And new progress on inland waterways is needed in terms of sustainability of the ports and the vessels and new intelligent traffic systems. All these are there, we are looking into them.

And you are right that the Danube Commission, which is 70 years old – or something similar, you know would know better – has a different regulation. But I promise you, we are going to look into harmonisation. I think because they are non-EU members it is not easy but it is absolutely needed. So thank you very much for the suggestion.

So this would be, honourable Members, in a nutshell, my reaction to your comments. I trust that you will get involved in the work on such a sustainable transport system for the future. And, Madam President, consider this my invitation to you to contribute to this work. So thank you very much and I hope will have new occasions to go more in depth on each of the subjects touched upon this evening.

Puhemies. – Keskustelu on päättynyt.

Kirjalliset lausumat (171 artikla)

Milan Brglez (S&D), pisno. – Prometna povezanost in mobilnost v EU sta brez dvoma temeljni vzvod za gospodarski razvoj držav članic.

Vendar ob zavedanju, da je prometni sektor odgovoren za skoraj 30 % vseh emisij CO₂ v EU, pri čemer cestni promet predstavlja 72 % delež, in upoštevajoč ambicije, ki si jih je zadala EU pri doseganju brezogljične prihodnosti, bodo prihodnji ukrepi EU na področju prometa in mobilnosti bistvenega pomena. V tem okviru bi posebej poudaril nujnost prizadevanj EU za krepitev razvoja kakovostnega javnega prevoza (mestnega, medkrajevnega in mednarodnega), ki naj bo predvsem cenovno in fizično dostopen slehernemu prebivalcu v EU, še zlasti invalidom in tistim, ki živijo na bolj perifernih območjih. Rešitev pa ni zgolj strukturna, saj je dejstvo, da če mislimo resno z uresničitvijo podnebnih ciljev, bomo primorani tudi korenito prilagoditi vedenjske vzorce in navade glede pogostosti uporabe osebnih avtomobilov. Zato še posebej pozdravljam predlog, da se v samem naslovu strategije upošteva koncept trajnosti, kar ne nazadnje določa tudi resolucija Evropskega parlamenta o Zelenem dogovoru.

Na tej osnovi pričakujem, da bo nova strategija umestila socialno in okoljsko dimenzijo razvoja mobilnosti in prometa na način, da se slednji ne bosta primarno podrejali gospodarskim ambicijam, ampak se bodo slednje prilagajale ljudem in okolju.

Andor Deli (PPE), írásban. – Nem vitatható el a megállapítás, hogy a közlekedés okozta légszennyezés egyik kiváltó oka a klímaváltozásnak, ezért ennek az ágazatnak is részt kell vállalnia a megoldás keresésében. A számunkra ma ismeretes közlekedési módok nagy változás előtt állnak, az uniós intézményeknek pedig jelentős szerep jut e változások irányvonalainak kialakításában. Fontos viszont azt is kihangsúlyozni, hogy a közlekedésnek meghatározó szerepe van a mindennapi életünkben és az európai gazdaság gerincét képezi. Ezért az uniós közlekedési stratégiának kiemelt figyelmet kell szentelnünk.

A kidolgozás alatt álló stratégiai dokumentumoknak figyelembe kell venni az tagállamok közötti különbségeket, hogy olyan megoldásokat kínáljunk, amelyek nem a leszakadást erősítik, vagy új különbségeket eredményeznek az uniós fejlett és kevésbé fejlett régiói között. Úgy gondolom, hogy nincs egy mindenkire alkalmazható megoldás, hanem különböző megoldások vannak a különböző helyzetek kezelésére, viszont amelyek végső célja közös. Másodsorban pedig, és talán ez a legfontosabb, szeretném elmondani, hogy a zöld átállás teherviselésének arányosnak és igazságosnak kell lennie, nem a polgárokra kell újabb és újabb anyagi terhet kiróni. Mindenkinek olyan mértékben kell hozzájárulni a megoldáshoz, amekkora mértékű a hozzájárulása a probléma kialakulásában is.

Tomasz Frankowski (PPE), na piśmie. – Swobodny przepływ osób, towarów oraz usług stanowi jedną z podstaw obywatelstwa unijnego. Wykorzystanie potencjału swobodnego przepływu możliwe jest dzięki sprawnie działającym usługom sektora mobilności i transportu. Według najnowszych danych Komisji Europejskiej przemysł transportowy stanowi ponad 6% PKB Unii Europejskiej, zapewniając przy tym zatrudnienie prawie 13 milionom ludzi.

W kraju, z którego pochodzę – w Polsce – transport stanowi około 9% krajowego PKB, generując około 30 miliardów euro (125 mld złotych) wartości dodanej brutto. Jest to niewątpliwie jedna z najważniejszych gałęzi gospodarki unijnej. W świetle ambitnych wyzwań stających przed pełnym zrealizowaniem założeń Zielonego Ładu Unia Europejska powinna przyjąć za priorytet przygotowanie krótkoterminowych oraz długoterminowych strategii dotyczących transportu i mobilności. Nie ulega wątpliwości, że redukcja emisji CO₂ oraz innych gazów cieplarnianych wymaga zaangażowania wszystkich: nas legislatorów, przedsiębiorców oraz obywateli. Biorąc pod uwagę wyzwania stojące przed europejskimi przedsiębiorcami, Unia Europejska powinna również jasno określić fundusze przeznaczone na transformację sektorowe, sprzyjające ochronie rynku oraz innowacjom. Tylko wtedy uda nam się osiągnąć wyniki w obszarze klimatu w połączeniu z dobrobytem i ochroną europejskich firm.

András Gyürk (PPE), *írásban*. – Az Európai Zöld Megállapodás sikere mindannyiunk közös érdeke. Ennek elengedhetetlen összetevője egy igazságos és fenntartható mobilitási stratégia kidolgozása. A sikernek véleményem szerint három feltétele van. Az első a fenntarthatóság fogalmának megfelelő értelmezése. A fenntartható fejlődés az ökológiai összetevő mellett ugyanis gazdasági és szociális dimenzióval is bír. Ezért a stratégia megalkotásánál a klímavédelmi ambíciók mellett kiemelt figyelmet kell fordítani az intézkedések munkahelyekre és versenyképességre gyakorolt hatásaira. A második a technológiasemlegesség elvének tiszteletben tartása.

Az Unió tagállamai eltérő adottságokkal és közlekedési infrastruktúrával rendelkeznek. Ahhoz, hogy ezeket sikerrel tegyék fenntarthatóvá minden környezetbarát technológiára szükségünk van. Végül, felelős, a kihívás összetettségét szem előtt tartó cselekvésre van szükség. Ennek során a már meglévő technológiai megoldásokra és kialakult iparágakra is érdemes támaszkodnunk. Egy ilyen jó példa a bioetanol, amely az üvegházhatású gáz kibocsátásának csökkentése mellett fontos szerepet játszik a vidékfejlesztésben és a gazdasági versenyképesség javításában.

Julie Lechanteux (ID), *par écrit*. – Les propositions de la Commission concernant la mobilité et les transports en vue d'une réduction d'émissions de CO₂ pour 2030 sont très ambitieuses, mais nous devons regarder la réalité en face. C'est ce que j'ai fait au mois de novembre dernier, quand j'ai visité à Lyon le plus important salon international des solutions de transports routiers et urbains, Solutrans, où j'ai pu échanger avec les professionnels de la filière du transport routier de marchandises, l'épine dorsale de notre économie. Aujourd'hui, 98 % des véhicules industriels vendus en France roulent au diesel. Pour un changement de modèle, il faudra procéder à l'adoption de mesures phares. Nous devons soutenir les entreprises dans la conversion de leur flotte, que ce soit à l'électrique, au gaz ou à l'hydrogène. Il faut investir dans le développement des infrastructures de recharge, aider financièrement les collectivités et les entrepreneurs individuels, adapter la réglementation relative au poids total autorisé en circulation pour les véhicules écologiques, favoriser la circulation des véhicules propres en zone urbaine, favoriser le système des recharges dynamiques, encourager le projet de recharge longue distance et enfin, développer la formation des nouvelles professions dans ce domaine. Voilà des solutions concrètes!

Rovana Plumb (S&D), *in writing*. – Transport and mobility services employ around 11 million people, and the demand for mobility today is higher than ever. However, transport today generates air pollution, noise, congestion and road accidents. The sector already represents almost a quarter of Europe's greenhouse gas emissions and its emission footprint is rising. We need to prioritise clean and affordable alternatives, with an objective to have only zero emission vehicles on EU roads and make the best use of digital technologies to help reduce fuel consumption. Likewise, the EU's satellite navigation systems contribute to reducing emissions, for instance in aviation and road transport. As part of this new strategy, the cities and citizens have an important role to play, through sustainable urban planning and addressing mobility demands and infrastructure. Urban areas should also be assisted in digitisation, automation and other innovative solutions and should pursue active and shared transport, from more walking and cycling to car-sharing services and car-pooling. More can and should be done from using recycled content in vehicles and transport infrastructure to reaching more circularity. For example, increasing the collection and recycling rates of electric car batteries in the EU could reduce dependence on imported raw-materials and help to retain the value of recovered materials in the EU economy.

Sylwia Spurek (S&D), *in writing*. – The overall challenge of the European Mobility and Transport agenda was always to enhance the system's sustainability and competitiveness while satisfying the evolving mobility needs of society. It is thus essential to take a common approach on standards, rules and practices. Unfortunately, so far, little has been done to harmonise the rules concerning the least protected and vulnerable group of road users – pedestrians, including people with disabilities or elderly people, who are one of the main victims of road accidents. In light of some Member States' legislations, for instance the Polish one, the pedestrian has the priority when he or she is already on the road while in Scandinavia and in the majority of Western European countries pedestrians are protected and have priority even before entering the lanes. Experts and representatives of Polish NGOs like The City is Ours (Miasto jest Nasze) or Critical Walking Mass (Piesza Masa Krytyczna) agree that harmonising laws among the EU by introducing a general provision that would give priority to pedestrians as soon as they intend to enter lanes would increase safety on roads and – consequently – would reduce the number of potential road accidents involving pedestrians.

26. Jednominutowe wystąpienia w znaczących kwestiach politycznych

Puhemies. – Esityslistalla on seuraavana minuutin puheenvuorot poliittisesti tärkeistä asioista työjärjestyksen 172 artiklan mukaisesti.

Jiří Pospíšil (PPE). – Paní předsedající, jako zastupitel hlavního města Prahy, hlavního města České republiky, chci konstatovat, že Česká republika, respektive Praha, přistoupila k výzvě evropských měst, aby Evropská komise připravila evropskou regulaci krátkodobých nájmu, tzv. Airbnb, a chtěl jsem na tomto místě vyzvat Evropskou komisi, aby začala tento problém řešit na evropské úrovni.

Většina evropských velkoměst má dnes velký problém s krátkodobými komerčními nájmy, které vedou k tomu, že naše evropská velkoměsta se v centrech vyliďňují a vzniká nám tak neoprávněná forma podnikání, která poškozují majitele hotelů a klasických formálně registrovaných ubytovacích kapacit. Vyzývám Komisi, aby toto téma začala řešit, protože bude lepší mít jednu evropskou centrální právní úpravu a ne partikulární právní úpravy, které nebudou tak efektivní.

Tamás Deutsch (PPE). – Hogyha megnézzük azt, hogy mi marad, ha lehántod ezeket a gyűlölet-velamiket, ugye felsoroltuk: a nem magyarok, a mások, a migránsok, a romák, a nem tudom én mik, akkor ott marad egy rémisztő képződmény középen. Ezek a fehér, keresztény, heteroszexuális férfiak, meg azért nők is vannak közöttük. Ezt az előbb szó szerint idézett, gyalázatos, rasszista kijelentést, hogy a fehér, keresztény, heteroszexuális emberek rémisztő képződménynek az európai szocialistákhoz tartozó DK párt alelnöke, az S&D frakció volt európai parlamenti képviselője tette a napokban.

A DK vezetőjének kijelentése durván rasszista. Elfogadhatatlan, hogy bárkit is bőrszíne, vallása vagy szexuális irányultsága miatt megbélyegezzenek. Határozottan visszautasítjuk, hogy az európai emberek többségét rasszista és uszító módon rémisztő képződménynek minősítsék. Az Európai Parlament egyik alelnöke, Dobrev Klára is a DK politikusa. Ezért egyértelmű választ várunk Dobrev Klárától, mikor lesz hajlandó a Demokratikus Koalícióval és az európai szocialisták frakciójával egyetemben nyilvánosan elhatárolódni párttársa rasszista nyilatkozatától.

Rory Palmer (S&D). – Madam President, this will probably be my final speech in this Parliament, so can I begin by – through you, President – thanking the Parliament staff and their services and indeed my own staff as well, who've been truly brilliant through a difficult period of uncertainty. One of my biggest regrets is that as a student, as a young person, I didn't do an Erasmus exchange and I really wish that I had. In many ways, I feel my time in this Parliament has been like my Erasmus exchange, which sadly now comes to an end, and I want to use this, probably my final words in this Parliament, to encourage young people to take those opportunities that the Erasmus programme offers. I intend to continue to campaign to ensure those opportunities are still there for all young people in the UK, and that means continued and full participation in Erasmus programmes in the future. Brexit, in my view, is a historic mistake. It will come with costs and consequences. Those consequences must not damage the chances and opportunities of the next generation. But I fear they will. We must now do all we can to make sure they don't. So, thank you, and for now, from me, farewell and good luck.

Maria Grapini (S&D). – Doamnă președintă, independența justiției și respectarea drepturilor omului sunt elemente fundamentale pentru viitorul Europei. Încrederea cetățenilor în Uniunea Europeană sigur că ne asigură și viitorul Europei. Dar ce facem când avem state în care justiția nu este independentă, în care deciziile justiției încalcă drepturile omului?

Am să dau un exemplu foarte concret, revin cu acest exemplu: cazul familiei Simicală. Româncă noastră, medic în Finlanda, care de trei ani a fost despărțită într-un mod odios de copii. Copiii au fost maltratați. Puteți vedea filmul pe YouTube și veți vedea cum mascații ridică copiii, care țipă din brațele mamei. Copiii aceștia sunt traumatizați: doi frați, care au fost separați și de mamă, și între ei. Acum, recent, în noiembrie, au fugit. De ce au fugit din instituția statului?

Ce face Europa? Cum lasă copiii și drepturile copilului să nu fie respectate, pentru că iată, au împlinit 12 ani, și Maria, și Mihai, și nu au dreptul să se prezinte în instanță pentru a-și spune punctul de vedere. În numele Cameliei Simicală, în numele celor doi copii, vă rog și pe dumneavoastră, doamnă comisară, pentru că este o româncă de-a noastră, faceți să vină copiii acasă, lângă mama lor.

Valter Flego (Renew). – Poštovana potpredsjednice, proračun 2021. do 2027. mora biti vizionarski, mora biti hrabar proračun koji potiče inovacije i istraživanje, koji potiče ekologiju i zelene politike i koji apsolutno potiče digitalizaciju. Dok u SAD-u s jedne strane već voze taksiji bez vozača, mi kaskamo. Mi odugovlačimo s pokretanjima programa koji su ključni za konkurentnu, za uspješnu Europu i sve države članice.

Kao izvjestitelj Digital Europe programa kažem vam da je utrka već započela, a upravo je digitalna Europa jedan od ključnih naših konkurenata ili favorita u globalnoj utrci. Zato i tražim od Vijeća da nam čim prije donese proračun, da nam predstavi proračun koji će imati odlučnosti i mudrosti da kaže ne rezanju, financijskom rezanju takvih programa poput digitalne Europe koji mogu doprinijeti većoj konkurentnosti europskog gospodarstva, ali i boljem životnom standardu svih naših građana.

Francisco Guerreiro (Verts/ALE). – Senhora Presidente, há quatro anos, na COP 22, o Primeiro-Ministro português, Dr. António Costa, comprometeu-se a atingir a neutralidade carbónica em 2050. Venceu mesmo que uma das suas prioridades era diminuir drasticamente a emissão de gases com efeito de estufa no setor dos transportes.

Mas, contrariamente ao anunciado, o governo português avança hoje para a construção de um aeroporto comercial no Montijo. Avança, assim, sem o apoio da sociedade civil, sem uma avaliação de impacto ambiental, sem considerar os impactos nas reservas do estuário do Tejo, sem estudos de capacidade turística e sem estudar a opção complementar do aeroporto de Beja. Aliás, a melhor justificação dada pelo governo para rejeitar o já construído e pago aeroporto de Beja é que fica – e cito – muito longe. Assumimos que seja muito longe da capital mas, caros e caras amigas, nem isto é verdade nem Portugal se resume a Lisboa.

Maria Walsh (PPE). – Madam President, under the European VAT Directive, sun cream is not listed as a product eligible for a reduced VAT rate. This desperately needs to change.

Irish Senator Tim Lombard has proposed that, in an effort to tackle skin cancer and make sun cream more available, we need to remove VAT on it. Sun cream is classed as a luxury product in this day and age. My group, the European People's Party, recently launched our new campaign to ensure the fight against cancer is a top priority in the European Union over the next five years.

Disease prevention must be high on the European agenda. I intend to raise this issue with our Health Commissioner and ask for the utmost support in categorising sun cream as a pharmaceutical product for use for health care, and not a luxury product.

I believe we need to take a holistic approach to well-being to ensure our Europeans, our citizens have optimum physical and mental health. Prevention for any illness, be it cancer or mental health – which is a priority for my mandate – is a tool that must be used to help everyone's health and well-being.

Traian Băsescu (PPE). – Doamnă președintă, astăzi, ca și acum o lună, am discutat de situația din Grecia, dar trebuie să dăm și soluții. Iar soluțiile trebuie date pe termen lung pentru că migrația este un fenomen care va dura mulți ani de acum înainte. Sunt trei lucruri care trebuie făcute.

În primul rând, domnul Borrell trebuie să negocieze acorduri de readmisie cu toate țările care sunt sursă de migrație ilegală. În al doilea rând, domnul Borrell trebuie să negocieze cooperarea cu țările de tranzit, în așa fel încât să fie neutralizate grupurile de crimă organizată care mișcă acești oameni către ambarcațiunile de la malul Mediteranei. Și, în sfârșit, al treilea punct care trebuie rezolvat: navele flotelor militare să întoarcă ambarcațiunile care au la bord migranți ilegali în portul de unde au plecat.

Julie Lechanteux (ID). – Madame la Présidente, le 23 novembre et le 1^{er} décembre 2019, dans mon département, le Var, des inondations d'une ampleur inattendue ont fait plusieurs morts et des blessés graves, avec des séquelles physiques et psychologiques importantes. Ces intempéries ont causé des dégâts matériels pour des centaines de millions d'euros, le tout à la veille de la commémoration du 60^e anniversaire de la catastrophe du barrage de Malpasset, qui avait fait 423 morts. Nous savons que le Var est une zone à risque. Malheureusement, il faut constater que le programme d'action de prévention des inondations, le fameux PAPI, est toujours resté au stade de paroles et d'études et ne s'est jamais traduit par des actes concrets. Devant cette scandaleuse inertie du gouvernement français, j'estime donc l'heure venue de mobiliser immédiatement le fonds de solidarité de l'Union européenne afin de faire les travaux nécessaires pour la mise en sécurité du territoire, afin de protéger la population de ces catastrophes naturelles.

Sandra Pereira (GUE/NGL). – Senhora Presidente, há neste momento em Portugal uma estratégia de ataque ao Serviço Nacional de Saúde pela ofensiva contra os profissionais de saúde e um sistémico défice de investimento em meios e infraestruturas. Escancaram-se as portas para a privatização da saúde, tornando-a num negócio altamente lucrativo para os grupos económicos. Esta ofensiva alinha-se com as imposições e constrangimentos da União Europeia, que não servem o país. As recomendações por país, no âmbito do Semestre Europeu, insistem em cortes de despesa na saúde quando o que é urgente é mais investimento para dar resposta às necessidades das populações de norte a sul nas diversas unidades de saúde e valências, na sua resposta central ou de proximidade.

Um Serviço Nacional de Saúde público, gratuito e de qualidade, tal como consagrado na Constituição da República Portuguesa, é o que serve o país. Para isso é preciso pôr os interesses do país à frente dos interesses da União Europeia.

Belinda De Lucy (NI). – Madam President, I may be happy today that democracy is finally being implemented in the UK, but I am also very sad. I'm sad at the UK taking a path that is incompatible with democracy.

I loved how the nations united around trade after the Second World War. For us it was good, it was hopeful, it was positive, but it has morphed into something very different that labels criticism as populism, that needs to steal democratic agency from people in order to run smoothly.

This is not a recipe for peace that I recognise, and I just pray that you self-reflect after we leave. Please do not treat democracy like an obstacle that you need to navigate around for efficiency. The smooth running of the EU should not come at the cost of democratic agency for your people.

Please, please take heed. We do not leave in a way that is unfriendly, and it's not as if we want bad relations. We love Europe; Brexit was never a rejection of Europe. We are your friends and we wish to remain your friends.

Радан Кънев (PPE). – Днес в градовете на България хиляди представители на малкия и средния бизнес протестираха. Протестираха срещу бюрократичен произвол, срещу непрекъснато увеличаващата се административна и данъчна тежест, срещу несправедливи и дискриминационни форми на данъчно облагане, срещу ежедневието партийно-политически натиск и правна несигурност, напомнящи отдавна отминалите времена на комунистическия режим. Протестираха въпреки опитите на правителството за пореден път да отложи справедливото им недоволство с празни обещания.

Европейските институции са в дълг към малкия бизнес, който осигурява работните места и икономическия растеж на Европа, който ни измъкна от икономическата криза. Нашите стратегии и програми за подкрепа на малкия бизнес трябва да излязат от сферата на пожеланията и да се превърнат в реални, действащи гаранции, в реална защита от произвола на бюрократи и самозабравили се властници.

Lina Gálvez Muñoz (S&D). – Señora presidenta, quiero intervenir hoy en este Pleno para hablar de Andalucía, del Pacto Verde Europeo y también de movilidad. Quiero hablar del Parque Nacional de Doñana, reserva de la biosfera y el espacio con mayor biodiversidad de Europa y también patrimonio de la humanidad.

El Gobierno andaluz ha anunciado que va a licitar la construcción de un tercer carril, al parecer reversible, en la carretera entre Matalascañas y Almonte, en el Parque Natural de Doñana. Si bien es cierto que este proyecto es muy demandado y que puede mejorar la seguridad vial, hay que ver muy bien cómo se ejecuta y se materializa. Hablamos de una zona extremadamente sensible desde el punto de vista medioambiental.

Hace unos meses, el Gobierno de Andalucía anunció un plan que preveía construir una autovía en Doñana. Entonces dirigí una pregunta a la Comisión Europea, que respondió claramente diciendo que estaría vigilante para que esa autovía no se construyera. En este sentido creo que este nuevo proyecto también debe vigilarse muy de cerca.

Igualmente quiero aprovechar esta oportunidad para poner sobre la mesa la necesidad de seguir ahondando en el debate sobre movilidad y sobre el modelo turístico en un parque nacional.

Radka Maxová (Renew). – Paní předsedající, v neděli 16. ledna došlo v Česku k obrovské tragédii. V domově pro osoby se zdravotním postižením ve Vejpřtech během požáru zemřelo osm lidí, dalších třicet muselo být hospitalizováno. Chci vyjádřit hlubokou soustrast pozůstalým a poděkovat všem, kteří s nasazením vlastního života zabránili dalším úmrtím a zraněním. Je důležité se zamyslet nad příčinou požáru.

V Česku se téměř zastavila transformace sociálních služeb. Přestala být společenským i politickým tématem. Lidé se zdravotním postižením často žijí ve stavebně nevyhovujících velkokapacitních ústavech, nedostává se jim dostatečné individuální podpory a mnohdy se tak prohlubuje jejich závislost na péči. Často to souvisí s nedostatkem personálu a nedostatečným a nepředvídatelným financováním sociálních služeb. Podobná situace je i v dalších členských zemích. Není to směr, kterým by se Evropská unie měla vydávat. Právě v těchto dnech Evropský parlament chystá usnesení o strategii pro osoby se zdravotním postižením po roce 2020. Apeluji, abychom k tomuto dokumentu přistupovali se vší vážností a odpovědností.

Eugen Tomac (PPE). – Doamnă președintă, din nou mă voi referi la un subiect pe care l-am discutat astăzi, Brexitul. Cred că, în această zi, pe lângă efectele imediate pe care le va produce plecarea Marii Britanii din Uniunea Europeană, trebuie să ne gândim la cei 3,5 milioane de cetățeni europeni care se află pe piața forței de muncă din Marea Britanie.

Printre cei 3,5 milioane de europeni, se află peste 450 000 de cetățeni români. Cred că viitoarele relații dintre Bruxelles și Londra trebuie să se axeze, să aibă drept prioritate ca cetățenii noștri să fie respectați, să nu existe niciun fel de discriminare. Îmi pun mari speranțe în capacitatea Comisiei de a ne apăra libertățile și principiile care stau la baza Uniunii noastre, precum libertatea de mișcare, libertatea de muncă, să fie respectate și puse în centrul atenției în cadrul negocierilor care urmează în următorul an.

Domènec Ruiz Devesa (S&D). – Señora presidenta, en primer lugar, un saludo especial en un día como hoy a mis colegas Richard Corbett, Julie Ward, Jude Kirton-Darling y Claude Moraes.

En segundo lugar, quiero utilizar esta intervención para denunciar ante esta Cámara y la opinión pública europea —e informar a la Comisión de ello— una grave iniciativa que ha tomado el partido de la ultraderecha española Vox en la región de Murcia con el llamado «veto parental», que pretende restringir la participación de los niños y niñas en actividades complementarias que ellos consideran que no deben recibir. Me refiero a igualdad de género, orientación sexual o educación para la ciudadanía.

Esto es algo gravísimo que tenemos que combatir también desde la esfera pública europea y espero que la Comisión y la mayoría de los grupos políticos de la Cámara nos ayuden.

Irena Joveva (Renew). – Gospa predsedujoča! Najlepša hvala. Zelo čustveno je bilo danes v tej stavbi, govorili smo o preteklosti, o tem, kaj je šlo narobe pred nekaj desetletji – govorim o Auschwitzu – in o tem, kaj je šlo narobe pred nekaj leti – govorim o Združenem kraljestvu, ki nas s petkom res zapušča.

Marsikaj je šlo narobe in od te preteklosti se imamo še ogromno za naučiti. Zakaj? Zaradi prihodnosti, ker je marsikaj še vedno narobe in ne upam napovedovati, kaj bo s to tako opevano Konferenco o prihodnosti Evrope.

Ampak vsem nam je najbrž, upam, jasno, da so ljudje upravičeno razočarani in moramo jim dati možnost sodelovanja, ravno to je tu najpomembnejše: sodelovanje državljanek in državljanov. Tudi če bo narejeno manj, naj bo narejeno tako, kot gre, ne pa, da nekaj delamo napol ali pa da sploh nič ne naredimo na koncu.

Kolegice in kolegi, Abraham Lincoln je nekoč dejal in s tem bom zaključila. V originalu bom povedala: „The best way to predict our future is to create it.“ Hvala.

Fernando Barrena Arza (GUE/NGL). – Señora presidenta, señorías, mañana en Euskal Herria —en la Comunidad Autónoma del País Vasco y la Comunidad Foral de Navarra— tendrá lugar una convocatoria de huelga general en defensa de las pensiones y unas condiciones laborales y de vida digna para los trabajadores en general. Esta huelga viene inspirada por las grandes movilizaciones de pensionistas y la iniciativa de la Carta comunitaria de los derechos sociales, que aboga por construir un modelo socioproductivo diferente, que ponga en el centro la vida, dando prioridad al cuidado de las personas y a la sostenibilidad del planeta.

Queremos mostrar nuestro apoyo a dicha convocatoria e instar a la Comisión a que persiga medidas que hagan que los Estados implementen pensiones y salarios mínimos dignos, garanticen el derecho a volver vivos del trabajo y la eliminación de la brecha salarial, implanten la jornada laboral de 35 horas, eliminen los recortes sociales, apuesten por los servicios públicos y establezcan cláusulas sociales en todas las contrataciones administrativas.

Los derechos que hoy disfrutamos no nos los ha regalado nadie. Se consiguieron mediante la lucha y la movilización, y mañana, sin duda, habrá una nueva oportunidad para defenderlos y mejorarlos.

Peter Pollák (PPE). – Vážená pani predsedajúca, v týchto dňoch si pripomíname obeť, ktoré počas druhej svetovej vojny stratili život a ich život sa zmenil na popol. Miliómy ľudí zaplatili životom kvôli nacistickej ideológii, ktorá rozdeľovala ľudí na nadľudí a podľudí. V pečiach koncentračných táborov sa zmiešal popol Židov, Rómov, Slovanov a iných Európanov. Všetci rovným dielom zaplatili svojím životom za mier v Európe. Je neakceptujúce, že sa v súčasnosti ticho pozeráme na to, ako si fašisti vyzliekli uniformy, obliekli saká, pripevnili na svoje saká kríž a dnes sedia v demokratických inštitúciách, dokonca aj v tomto Parlamente. Nacizmus a fašizmus nemá nič spoločné so slobodou a demokraciou. Je to zločin. Je to semeno absolútneho pekla, nemá nič spoločné s Bohom, je to dielo diabla. Boj proti neznášanlivosti, boj proti nacizmu a fašizmu musíme zviest aj kvôli tomu, lebo je to dlh voči tým, ktorí zomreli počas druhej svetovej vojny. Žiadam Európsku komisiu, Európsku radu, Európsky parlament a všetky demokratické inštitúcie aj v členských krajinách Európskej únie, aby urýchlene zastavili všetkých tých, ktorí šíria nenávisť a presadzujú nacizmus a fašizmus.

Isabel García Muñoz (S&D). – Señora presidenta, ante los negacionistas del cambio climático pasó por España la borrasca Gloria, con fuertes lluvias, viento, olas y brutales nevadas que dejaron aisladas a miles de personas en mi región, Aragón, y cuyo deshielo amenaza ahora a muchas poblaciones por el desbordamiento de los ríos.

Se han visto afectados cerca de 4 000 kilómetros de carreteras y 142 municipios en las provincias de Zaragoza y Teruel, con miles de personas incomunicadas, sin luz ni agua, sin conexión a Internet ni cobertura; ha habido daños también en edificios y naves y graves pérdidas en el campo y la ganadería. La cooperación entre el Gobierno central y el regional ha sido fundamental y, junto con las fuerzas de seguridad, la UME y los servicios de emergencias regionales, ayuntamientos y vecinos están trabajando para dar respuesta a la excepcionalidad vivida.

Una excepcionalidad que pone de manifiesto aún más la necesidad de trabajar desde las instituciones europeas, junto con las autoridades nacionales, regionales y locales, por la cohesión territorial y socioeconómica y de buscar soluciones a los retos de estas zonas rurales y montañosas, que sufren también la despoblación y la urgente necesidad de mejorar sus infraestructuras de transporte y telecomunicaciones.

Andrea Caroppo (ID). – Signora Presidente, onorevoli colleghi, il 22 gennaio in Italia migliaia di partite IVA hanno lasciato chiuse le aziende e sono andate in piazza a Roma per protestare e per dire basta, soprattutto nei confronti di un fisco iniquo e di un fisco vessatorio. Una tassazione complessiva che supera il 60 % e che sta costringendo alla chiusura numerose attività. Basti pensare che, nell'arco degli ultimi anni, il numero di piccole e medie imprese e di professionisti si è ridotto di quasi il 40 %.

Nel 2018 gli italiani hanno pagato di tasse 33 miliardi in più rispetto alla media europea ed è un differenziale che pesa quasi il 2 % sul PIL. È evidente che questo che sta accadendo in Italia mette a repentaglio l'equità dei sistemi fiscali negli Stati membri e la politica di crescita dell'intera Unione europea. Per questo è fondamentale che la Commissione intervenga e conceda una maggiore flessibilità all'Italia per evitare quindi la fine e soprattutto la morte delle partite IVA di questo mondo che è il tessuto produttivo dell'Italia.

Hermann Tertsch (ECR). – Señora presidenta, el lunes pasado, un ministro del Gobierno socialcomunista español fue a medianoche al aeropuerto de Barajas de forma clandestina a entrevistarse —y evitar su detención— con Delcy Rodríguez, vicepresidenta de la dictadura de Maduro en Venezuela, una criminal sometida a sanciones de la Unión Europea, que prohíbe su entrada en Europa.

Sabemos que la dictadura ha financiado a comunistas españoles, sabemos que el expresidente socialista Zapatero es el principal defensor de la narcodictadura criminal. Los comunistas financiados por esa narcodictadura están hoy en el Gobierno español.

La Unión Europea debe investigar el trasfondo de esta gravísima violación de las sanciones de la propia Unión Europea contra criminales de Caracas por parte de este Gobierno español socialcomunista.

John David Edward Tennant (NI). – Madam President, as Britain prepares for life outside our membership of this Union, I thought I would reflect on just how damaging this Union has been for my country. You say that the Union has been good for democracy. I fail to see how democratic this place is, while governed by unelected, largely unaccountable bureaucrats no one has ever heard of. You say this Union has been good for jobs and industry. Well, that's a laugh and a half: in my region, the steel industry has collapsed, leading to huge job losses due to state-aid legislation that this place has imposed. You say that the Union is value-for-money, yet Britain has been contributing the second-highest amount to the EU, and you continue the traveling circus to Strasbourg every month at a cost of roughly EUR 114 million a year. But listen carefully: Brexit is a warning shot to many of you, who blindly ignore the public who view you as wasteful, ignorant and distant. If you do not learn the lessons of Britain's departure from this House of largesse, you will consign yourselves to the dustbin of history.

Цветелина Пенкова (S&D). – Уважаема г-жо Председател, уважаеми колеги, Европейската комисия неколкократно заяви, че правителствата на държавите членки трябва да изготвят подробна стратегия за прилагането на Европейския зелен пакт. Факт е, че някои страни и региони в Европа ще бъдат по-силно засегнати от прилагането на тези политики и считам, че е изключително важно да знаем какви ще са социалните измерения на бъдещия преход към нисковъглеродна икономика. Трябва да имаме ясна представа как може да трансформираме икономиката си, така че всички да спечелят от тази промяна, а за това ни трябва ясна и дългосрочна стратегия, подготвена от правителствата на държавите членки.

Екологичният преход е икономическа и социална възможност за всеки един регион в Европа. Зеленият пакт е цялостно трансформиране на европейската икономика и не бива да се възприема като поредното решение, налагано от Брюксел. Ние всички заедно трябва да сме двигателят на този план за бъдещето, а не просто пасивни наблюдатели.

Marc Botenga (GUE/NGL). – Madame la Présidente, j'ai rencontré David à une mobilisation, ici juste dehors, sur la sécurité sociale et il m'a parlé du fait que, dans son secteur, avec le fait que certaines entreprises, disons une entreprise roumaine qui envoie temporairement un travailleur en Belgique; alors, les cotisations sociales sont payées au taux du pays d'envoi, donc celui de la Roumanie. Et, cela lui pose problème parce que dans une logique de concurrence, cette entreprise a un avantage compétitif par rapport à des entreprises belges, notamment, et cela devient une excuse pour des gouvernements, comme le gouvernement belge, d'imposer des baisses de cotisations sociales aux entreprises belges au nom de la compétitivité.

Les travailleurs du coup sont les dindons de la farce, parce qu'ils perdent en salaire brut et ils perdent en sécurité sociale donc une question très claire pour la Commission européenne: peut-on s'il vous plaît, imposer le taux de cotisation sociale le plus élevé, le plus favorable aux travailleurs et à la sécurité sociale; et quand? Parce que les travailleurs en ont besoin, je vous remercie.

Robert Rowland (NI). – Mr President, the Brussels hierarchy wants the EU to be a superpower. Well it has achieved that in one sense: it is a regulatory superpower. On that score, it has got no global peer. The whole *raison d'être* of the EU is regulation. It is a form of directive economics but has the advantage of not being paid for by taxation, as the costs are borne by businesses and passed on to consumers. Regulation is really a subspecies of central planning.

What shocks me is how Europe has developed economically: it is truly status, where only large multinationals thrive due to crony capitalism. Its attitude to business in general, start-ups, innovation in the sciences and technology and the sheer scale of regulation have been anti-competitive, anti-growth and job-destroying. So, as we leave the EU, I believe the economic consequences will be hugely positive for the UK – not least through regaining our regulatory autonomy and the ability to do our own free-trade deals. We should strive to become Singapore on terms the EU fears so much.

So I warn you: as I look forward to the EU's prospects for 2020, I see negative interest rates, the start of QE once again and a (*microphone clicks*) state of the economy. So please watch and be careful, because your economy is in tatters.

Puhemies – Kohdan käsittely on päättynyt.

27. Decyzje w sprawie sporządzenia sprawozdań z własnej inicjatywy (art. 54 Regulaminu): Patrz protokół

28. Decyzje o zastosowaniu procedury obejmującej wspólne posiedzenia komisji (art. 58 Regulaminu): Patrz protokół

29. Porządek obrad następnego posiedzenia: patrz protokół

30. Zamknięcie posiedzenia

(*Istunto päättyi klo 23.51.*)

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