



Европейски парламент Parlamento Europeo Evropský parlament Europa-Parlamentet Europäisches Parlament
Euroopa Parlament Ευρωπαϊκό Κοινοβούλιο European Parliament Parlement européen Parlaimint na hEorpa
Europski parlament Parlamento europeo Eiropas Parlaments Europos Parlamentas Európai Parlament
Parlament Ewropew Europees Parlement Parlament Europejski Parlamento Europeu Parlamentul European
Európsky parlament Evropski parlament Euroopan parlamentti Europaparlamentet

2014 - 2019

ПЪЛЕН ПРОТОКОЛ НА РАЗИСКВАНИЯТА	DEBAŠU STENOGRAMMA
ACTA LITERAL DE LOS DEBATES	POSĚDŽIO STENOGRAMA
DOSLOVNÝ ZÁZNAM ZE ZASEDÁNÍ	AZ ÜLÉSEK SZÓ SZERINTI JEGYZŐKÖNYVE
FULDSTÆNDIGT FORHANDLINGSREFERAT	RAPPORTI VERBATIM TAD-DIBATTITI
AUSFÜHRLICHE SITZUNGSBERICHTE	VOLLEDIG VERSLAG VAN DE VERGADERINGEN
ISTUNGI STENOGRAMM	PEŁNE SPRAWOZDANIE Z OBRAD
ΠΛΗΡΗ ΠΡΑΚΤΙΚΑ ΤΩΝ ΣΥΖΗΤΗΣΕΩΝ	RELATO INTEGRAL DOS DEBATES
VERBATIM REPORT OF PROCEEDINGS	STENOGRAMA DEZBATERILOR
COMPTE RENDU IN EXTENSO DES DÉBATS	DOSLOVNÝ ZÁPIS Z ROZPRÁV
TUARASCÁIL FOCAL AR FHOCAL NA N-IMEACHTAÍ	DOBESEDNI ZAPISI RAZPRAV
DOSLOVNO IZVJEŠĆE	SANATARKAT ISTUNTOSELOSTUKSET
RESOCONTO INTEGRALE DELLE DISCUSSIONI	FULLSTÄNDIGT FÖRHANDLINGSREFERAT

Сряда - Miércoles - Středa - Onsdag - Mittwoch - Kolmapäev - Τετάρτη - Wednesday
Mercredi - Dé Céadaoin - Srijeda - Mercoledì - Trešdiena - Trečiadienis - Szerda
L-Erbgha - Woensdag - Środa - Quarta-feira - Miercuri - Streda - Sreda - Keskiviikko - Onsdag

28.11.2018



Единство в многообразието - Unida en la diversidad - Jednotná v rozmanitosti - Forenet i mangfoldighed - In Vielfalt geeint - Ühinenud mitmekesisuses
Ενωμένη στην πολυμορφία - United in diversity - Unie dans la diversité - Aontaithe san éagsúlacht - Ujedinjena u raznolikosti - Unita nella diversità
Vienoti daudzveidībā - Susivieniję įvairovėje - Egyesülve a sokféleségben - Maġġquda fid-diversità - In verscheidenheid verenigd - Zjednoczona w różnorodności
Unida na diversidade - Unită în diversitate - Zjednotení v rozmanitosti - Združena v raznolikosti - Moninaisuudessaan yhtenäinen - Förenade i mångfalden

ВГ СЪДЪРЖАНИЕ

1 - Възобновяване на сесията	27
2 - Откриване на заседанието	27
3 - Декларация на председателството	27
4 - Одобряване на протокола от предишното заседание: вж протоколите	29
5 - Състав на Парламента: вж. протоколи	29
6 - Проверка на пълномощията: вж. протоколи	29
7 - Искане за снемане на парламентарен имунитет: вж. протокола	29
8 - Състав на комисиите и делегациите: вж. протоколи	29
9 - Преговори преди провеждане на първото четене в Парламента (член 69в от Правилника за дейността): вж. протокола	29
10 - Делегирани актове (член 105, параграф 6 от Правилника за дейността): вж. протокола	29
11 - Мерки по прилагане (член 106 от Правилника за дейността): вж. протокола	29
12 - Внасяне на документи: вж. протокола.....	29
13 - Въпроси с искане за устен отговор (внасяне): вж. протокола	29
14 - Действия, предприети вследствие позиции и резолюции на Парламента: вж. протокола	29
15 - Подписване на актове, приети съгласно обикновената законодателна процедура (член 78 от Правилника за дейността)	29
16 - Ред на работа	32
17 - Разискване с участието на министър - председателя на Дания, Ларс Льоке Расмусен, относно бъдещето на Европа (разискване).....	34
18 - Стратегия за дългосрочно намаляване на емисиите на парникови газове на ЕС в съответствие с Парижкото споразумение (разискване)	62
19 - Пакет за единния пазар (разискване)	79
20 - СТО: бъдещи перспективи (разискване)	88
21 - Състав на комисиите и делегациите: вж. протокола	100
22 - Доклад от 2018 г. относно Сърбия (разискване).....	100
23 - Доклад от 2018 г. относно Косово (разискване)	111
24 - Приветствие с добре дошли	120
25 - Доклад от 2018 г. относно бивша югославска република Македония (разискване).....	120
26 - Доклад от 2018 г. относно Албания (разискване)	132
27 - Доклад от 2018 г. относно Черна гора (разискване).....	139
28 - Защита на академичната свобода в рамките на външната дейност на ЕС (разискване)	146
29 - Едноминутни изказвания по въпроси с политическа значимост	150
30 - Дневен ред на следващото заседание: вж. протокола.....	154
31 - Закриване на заседанието.....	154

ES ÍNDICE

1 - Reanudación del período de sesiones.....	27
2 - Apertura de la sesión.....	27
3 - Declaración de la Presidencia.....	27
4 - Aprobación del Acta de la sesión anterior: véase el Acta	29
5 - Composición del Parlamento: véase el Acta.....	29
6 - Comprobación de credenciales: véase el Acta.....	29
7 - Supplicatorio de suspensión de la inmunidad parlamentaria : véase el Acta	29
8 - Composición de las comisiones y delegaciones : véase el Acta.....	29
9 - Negociaciones antes de la primera lectura del Parlamento (artículo 69 quater del Reglamento interno): véase el Acta.....	29
10 - Actos delegados (artículo 105, apartado 6, del Reglamento interno): véase el Acta.....	29
11 - Medidas de ejecución (artículo 106 del Reglamento): véase el Acta	29
12 - Presentación de documentos: véase el Acta.....	29
13 - Preguntas con solicitud de respuesta oral (presentación): véase el Acta.....	29
14 - Curso dado a las posiciones y resoluciones del Parlamento: véase el Acta	29
15 - Firma de actos adoptados de conformidad con el procedimiento legislativo ordinario (artículo 78 del Reglamento)	29
16 - Orden de los trabajos.....	32
17 - Debate con el primer ministro de Dinamarca, Lars Løkke Rasmussen, sobre el futuro de Europa (debate).....	34
18 - Estrategia para la reducción a largo plazo de las emisiones de gases de efecto invernadero de la Unión de conformidad con el Acuerdo de París (debate).....	62
19 - Paquete sobre el mercado único (debate)	79
20 - OMC: el camino a seguir (debate)	88
21 - Composición de las comisiones y delegaciones: véase el Acta.....	100
22 - Informe de 2018 sobre Serbia (debate).....	100
23 - Informe de 2018 sobre Kosovo (debate)	111
24 - Bienvenida	120
25 - Informe de 2018 sobre la Antigua República Yugoslava de Macedonia (debate)	120
26 - Informe de 2018 sobre Albania (debate).....	132
27 - Informe de 2018 sobre Montenegro (debate).....	139
28 - Defensa de la libertad académica en la acción exterior de la Unión (debate)	146
29 - Intervenciones de un minuto sobre asuntos de importancia política	150
30 - Orden del día de la próxima sesión : véase el Acta	154
31 - Cierre de la sesión	154

CS OBSAH

1 - Pokračování zasedání.....	27
2 - Zahájení zasedání	27
3 - Prohlášení předsednictví	27
4 - Schválení zápisu z předchozího denního zasedání: viz zápis	29
5 - Složení Parlamentu: viz zápis	29
6 - Ověřování pověřovacích listin: viz zápis	29
7 - Žádost o zbavení parlamentní imunity: viz zápis	29
8 - Členství ve výborech a delegacích: viz zápis	29
9 - Jednání předcházející prvnímu čtení v Parlamentu (článek 69c jednacího řádu): viz zápis	29
10 - Akty v přenesené pravomoci (čl. 105 odst. 6 jednacího řádu): viz zápis	29
11 - Prováděcí opatření (článek 106 jednacího řádu): viz zápis	29
12 - Předložení dokumentů: viz zápis	29
13 - Otázky k ústnímu zodpovězení s rozpravou (předložení): viz zápis	29
14 - Další kroky na základě postojů a usnesení Parlamentu: viz zápis	29
15 - Podepisování aktů přijatých řádným legislativním postupem (článek 78 jednacího řádu)	29
16 - Plán práce	32
17 - Rozprava s dánským předsedou vlády Larsem Løkke Rasmussenem o budoucnosti Evropy (rozprava)	34
18 - Strategie pro dlouhodobé snížení emisí skleníkových plynů EU v souladu s Pařížskou dohodou (rozprava)	62
19 - Balíček opatření pro jednotný trh (rozprava)	79
20 - WTO: cesta kupředu (rozprava)	88
21 - Členství ve výborech a delegacích: viz zápis	100
22 - Zpráva o Srbsku za rok 2018 (rozprava).....	100
23 - Zpráva o Kosovu za rok 2018 (rozprava)	111
24 - Přivítání	120
25 - Zpráva o Bývalé jugoslávské republice Makedonii za rok 2018 (rozprava)	120
26 - Zpráva o Albánii za rok 2018 (rozprava).....	132
27 - Zpráva o Černé Hoře za rok 2018 (rozprava).....	139
28 - Obrana akademických svobod v rámci vnější činnosti EU (rozprava).....	146
29 - Jednominutové projevy k důležitým politickým otázkám	150
30 - Pořad jednání příštího zasedání: viz zápis	154
31 - Ukončení zasedání	154

DA INDHOLD

1 - Genoptagelse af sessionen.....	27
2 - Åbning af mødet.....	27
3 - Erklæring fra formanden.....	27
4 - Godkendelse af protokollen fra det foregående møde: se protokollen.....	29
5 - Parlamentets sammensætning: se protokollen.....	29
6 - Valgs prøvelse: se protokollen.....	29
7 - Anmodning om ophævelse af parlamentarisk immunitet: se protokollen.....	29
8 - Udvalgenes og delegationernes sammensætning: se protokollen.....	29
9 - Forhandlinger forud for Parlamentets førstebehandling (forretningsordenens artikel 69c): se protokollen.....	29
10 - Delegerede retsakter (forretningsordenens artikel 105, stk. 6): se protokollen.....	29
11 - Gennemførelsesforanstaltninger (forretningsordenens artikel 106): se protokollen.....	29
12 - Modtagne dokumenter: se protokollen.....	29
13 - Forespørgsler til mundtlig besvarelse (modtagne dokumenter): se protokollen.....	29
14 - Meddelelse om Kommissionens reaktion på Parlamentets udtalelser og beslutninger: se protokollen.....	29
15 - Undertegnelse af retsakter vedtaget efter den almindelige lovgivningsprocedure (forretningsordenens artikel 78).....	29
16 - Arbejdsplan.....	32
17 - Drøftelse med Danmarks statsminister, Lars Løkke Rasmussen, om Europas fremtid (forhandling).....	34
18 - Strategi for langsigtet reduktion af drivhusgasemissioner i EU i overensstemmelse med Parisaftalen (forhandling).....	62
19 - Pakke for det indre marked (forhandling).....	79
20 - WTO: vejen frem (forhandling).....	88
21 - Udvalgenes og delegationernes sammensætning: se protokollen.....	100
22 - Kommissionens 2018-rapport om Serbien (forhandling).....	100
23 - Kommissionens 2018-rapport om Kosovo (forhandling).....	111
24 - Velkomstord.....	120
25 - Kommissionens 2018-rapport om Den Tidligere Jugoslaviske Republik Makedonien, (forhandling).....	120
26 - Kommissionens 2018-rapport om Albanien (forhandling).....	132
27 - Kommissionens 2018-rapport om Montenegro (forhandling).....	139
28 - Forsvar af den akademiske frihed i EU's optræden udadtil (forhandling).....	146
29 - Indlæg af et minuts varighed om politisk vigtige sager.....	150
30 - Dagsorden for næste møde: se protokollen.....	154
31 - Hævelse af mødet.....	154

DE INHALT

1 - Wiederaufnahme der Sitzungsperiode.....	27
2 - Eröffnung der Sitzung.....	27
3 - Erklärung des Präsidenten.....	27
4 - Genehmigung des Protokolls der vorangegangenen Sitzung: siehe Protokoll.....	29
5 - Zusammensetzung des Parlaments: siehe Protokoll.....	29
6 - Prüfung der Mandate: siehe Protokoll.....	29
7 - Antrag auf Aufhebung der parlamentarischen Immunität: siehe Protokoll.....	29
8 - Zusammensetzung der Ausschüsse und der Delegationen: siehe Protokoll.....	29
9 - Verhandlungen vor der ersten Lesung des Parlaments (Artikel 69c GO): siehe Protokoll.....	29
10 - Delegierte Rechtsakte (Artikel 105 Absatz 6 GO): siehe Protokoll.....	29
11 - Durchführungsmaßnahmen (Artikel 106 GO): siehe Protokoll.....	29
12 - Vorlage von Dokumenten: siehe Protokoll.....	29
13 - Anfragen zur mündlichen Beantwortung (Einreichung): siehe Protokoll.....	29
14 - Weiterbehandlung der Standpunkte und Entschlüsse des Parlaments: siehe Protokoll.....	29
15 - Unterzeichnung von nach dem ordentlichen Gesetzgebungsverfahren angenommenen Rechtsakten (Artikel 78 GO).....	29
16 - Arbeitsplan.....	32
17 - Aussprache mit dem dänischen Ministerpräsidenten Lars Løkke Rasmussen über die Zukunft Europas (Aussprache).....	34
18 - Strategie für die langfristige Verringerung der Treibhausgasemissionen der EU nach Maßgabe des Übereinkommens von Paris (Aussprache).....	62
19 - Binnenmarktpaket (Aussprache).....	79
20 - WTO: Wie geht es weiter? (Aussprache).....	88
21 - Zusammensetzung der Ausschüsse und Delegationen: siehe Protokoll.....	100
22 - Bericht 2018 über Serbien (Aussprache).....	100
23 - Bericht 2018 über das Kosovo (Aussprache).....	111
24 - Begrüßung.....	120
25 - Bericht 2018 über die ehemalige jugoslawische Republik Mazedonien (Aussprache).....	120
26 - Bericht 2018 über Albanien (Aussprache).....	132
27 - Bericht 2018 über Montenegro (Aussprache).....	139
28 - Schutz der akademischen Freiheit im auswärtigen Handeln der EU (Aussprache).....	146
29 - Ausführungen von einer Minute zu Fragen von politischer Bedeutung.....	150
30 - Tagesordnung der nächsten Sitzung: siehe Protokoll.....	154
31 - Schluss der Sitzung.....	154

ET SISUKORD

1 - Istungjärgu jätkamine	27
2 - Osaistungjärgu avamine	27
3 - Presidentuuri avaldus	27
4 - Eelmise istungi protokollki kinnitamine (vt protokoll)	29
5 - Parlamendi koosseis (vt protokoll)	29
6 - Volituste kontrollimine (vt protokoll)	29
7 - Parlamendiliikme puutumatus e äravõtmise taotlus (vt protokoll)	29
8 - Parlamendi komisjonide ja delegatsioonide koosseis (vt protokoll)	29
9 - Parlamendi esimesele lugemisele eelnevad läbirääkimised (kodukorra artikkel 69c) (vt protokoll)	29
10 - Delegeeritud õigusaktid (kodukorra artikli 105 lõige 6) (vt protokoll)	29
11 - Rakendusmeetmed (kodukorra artikkel 106) (vt protokoll)	29
12 - Esitatud dokumendid (vt protokoll)	29
13 - Suuliselt vastatavad küsimused (esitamine) (vt protokoll)	29
14 - Parlamendi seisukohtade ja resolutsioonide vastuvõtmisele järgnev tegevus (vt protokoll)	29
15 - Seadusandliku tavamenetluse kohaselt vastu võetud õigusaktide allakirjutamine (kodukorra artikkel 78)	29
16 - Tööplaan	32
17 - Euroopa tulevikku käsitlev arutelu Taani peaministri Lars Løkke Rasmusseniga (arutelu)	34
18 - ELi pikaajaline kasvuhoonegaaside heitkoguste vähendamise strateegia kooskõlas Pariisi kokkuleppega (arutelu)	62
19 - Ühtse turu pakett (arutelu)	79
20 - WTO edasine tegevus (arutelu)	88
21 - Parlamendi komisjonide ja delegatsioonide koosseis (vt protokoll)	100
22 - 2018. aasta Serbia aruanne (arutelu)	100
23 - 2018. aasta Kosovo aruanne (arutelu)	111
24 - Tervitus	120
25 - 2018. aasta aruanne endise Jugoslaavia Makedoonia vabariigi kohta (arutelu)	120
26 - 2018. aasta Albaania aruanne (arutelu)	132
27 - 2018. aasta Montenegro aruanne (arutelu)	139
28 - Akadeemilise vabaduse kaitsmine ELi välistegevuses (arutelu)	146
29 - Üheminutilised sõnavõttud poliitiliselt olulistel teemadel	150
30 - Järgmise istungi päevakord (vt protokoll)	154
31 - Istungi lõpp	154

ΕΛ ΠΕΡΙΕΧΟΜΕΝΑ

1 - Επανάληψη της συνόδου	27
2 - Έναρξη της συνεδρίασης.....	27
3 - Δήλωση της Προεδρίας.....	27
4 - Έγκριση των συνοπτικών πρακτικών της προηγούμενης συνεδρίασης: βλ. Συνοπτικά Πρακτικά	29
5 - Σύνθεση του Κοινοβουλίου: βλ. Συνοπτικά Πρακτικά	29
6 - Έλεγχος της εντολής: βλ. Συνοπτικά Πρακτικά	29
7 - Αίτηση άρσης βουλευτικής ασυλίας: βλ. Συνοπτικά Πρακτικά.....	29
8 - Σύνθεση των επιτροπών και των αντιπροσωπειών: βλ. Συνοπτικά Πρακτικά.....	29
9 - Διαπραγματεύσεις πριν από την πρώτη ανάγνωση του Κοινοβουλίου (άρθρο 69γ του Κανονισμού): βλ. Συνοπτικά Πρακτικά.....	29
10 - Κατ' εξουσιοδότηση πράξεις (άρθρο 105 παράγραφος 6 του Κανονισμού): βλ. Συνοπτικά Πρακτικά	29
11 - Εκτελεστικά μέτρα (άρθρο 106 του Κανονισμού): βλ. Συνοπτικά Πρακτικά.....	29
12 - Κατάθεση εγγράφων: βλ. Συνοπτικά Πρακτικά.....	29
13 - Ερωτήσεις με αίτημα προφορικής απάντησης (κατάθεση): βλ. Συνοπτικά Πρακτικά.....	29
14 - Συνέχεια που δόθηκε στις θέσεις και τα ψηφίσματα του Κοινοβουλίου: βλ. Συνοπτικά πρακτικά ..	29
15 - Υπογραφή πράξεων που έχουν εγκριθεί σύμφωνα με τη συνήθη νομοθετική διαδικασία (άρθρο 78 του Κανονισμού)	29
16 - Διάταξη των εργασιών.....	32
17 - Συζήτηση με τον Πρωθυπουργό της Δανίας, Lars Løkke Rasmussen, σχετικά με το μέλλον της Ευρώπης (συζήτηση)	34
18 - Στρατηγική για μακροπρόθεσμη μείωση των εκπομπών αερίων του θερμοκηπίου στην ΕΕ, σύμφωνα με τη συμφωνία του Παρισιού (συζήτηση)	62
19 - Δέσμη Μέτρων για την Ενιαία Αγορά (συζήτηση).....	79
20 - ΠΟΕ: Πορεία προς το μέλλον (συζήτηση).....	88
21 - Σύνθεση των επιτροπών και αντιπροσωπειών: βλ. Συνοπτικά Πρακτικά.....	100
22 - Έκθεση του 2018 για τη Σερβία (συζήτηση).....	100
23 - Έκθεση του 2018 για το Κοσσυφοπέδιο (συζήτηση)	111
24 - Υποδοχή	120
25 - Έκθεση του 2018 για την πρώην Γιουγκοσλαβική Δημοκρατία της Μακεδονίας (συζήτηση).....	120
26 - Έκθεση του 2018 για την Αλβανία (συζήτηση)	132
27 - Έκθεση του 2018 για το Μαυροβούνιο (συζήτηση).....	139
28 - Προάσπιση της ακαδημαϊκής ελευθερίας στην εξωτερική δράση της ΕΕ (συζήτηση)	146
29 - Παρεμβάσεις ενός λεπτού επί σημαντικών πολιτικών θεμάτων	150
30 - Ημερήσια διάταξη της επόμενης συνεδρίασης: βλ. Συνοπτικά Πρακτικά.....	154
31 - Λήξη της συνεδρίασης.....	154

EN CONTENTS

1 - Resumption of the session	27
2 - Opening of the sitting	27
3 - Statement by the President.....	27
4 - Approval of the minutes of the previous sitting: see Minutes	29
5 - Composition of Parliament: see Minutes.....	29
6 - Verification of credentials: see Minutes.....	29
7 - Request for the waiver of parliamentary immunity : see Minutes	29
8 - Composition of committees and delegations: see Minutes.....	29
9 - Negotiations ahead of Parliament's first reading (Rule 69c): see Minutes	29
10 - Delegated acts (Rule 105(6)): see Minutes.....	29
11 - Implementing measures (Rule 106): see Minutes	29
12 - Documents received: see Minutes	29
13 - Questions for oral answer (submission): see Minutes	29
14 - Action taken on Parliament's positions and resolutions: see Minutes.....	29
15 - Signature of acts adopted under the ordinary legislative procedure (Rule 78)	29
16 - Order of business	32
17 - Debate with the Prime Minister of Denmark, Lars Løkke Rasmussen, on the Future of Europe (debate).....	34
18 - Strategy for long-term EU greenhouse gas emissions reduction in accordance with the Paris agreement (debate).....	62
19 - Single Market package (debate).....	79
20 - WTO: the way forward (debate)	88
21 - Composition of committees and delegations : see Minutes.....	100
22 - 2018 Report on Serbia (debate)	100
23 - 2018 Report on Kosovo (debate).....	111
24 - Welcome	120
25 - 2018 Report on the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia (debate)	120
26 - 2018 Report on Albania (debate)	132
27 - 2018 Report on Montenegro (debate)	139
28 - Defence of academic freedom in the EU's external action (debate)	146
29 - One-minute speeches on matters of political importance.....	150
30 - Agenda of the next sitting : see Minutes.....	154
31 - Closure of the sitting	154

FR SOMMAIRE

1 - Reprise de la session	27
2 - Ouverture de la séance	27
3 - Déclaration de la Présidence	27
4 - Approbation du procès-verbal de la séance précédente: voir procès-verbal.....	29
5 - Composition du Parlement: voir procès-verbal.....	29
6 - Vérification des pouvoirs: voir procès-verbal	29
7 - Demande de levée de l'immunité parlementaire : voir procès-verbal	29
8 - Composition des commissions et des délégations: voir procès-verbal.....	29
9 - Négociations avant la première lecture du Parlement (article 69 quater du règlement): voir procès-verbal.....	29
10 - Actes délégués (article 105, paragraphe 6, du règlement): voir procès-verbal.....	29
11 - Mesures d'exécution (article 106 du règlement): voir procès-verbal	29
12 - Dépôt de documents: voir procès-verbal	29
13 - Questions avec demande de réponse orale (dépôt): voir procès-verbal	29
14 - Suites données aux positions et résolutions du Parlement: voir procès-verbal.....	29
15 - Signature d'actes adoptés conformément à la procédure législative ordinaire (article 78 du règlement).....	29
16 - Ordre des travaux.....	32
17 - Débat avec le Premier ministre danois, Lars Løkke Rasmussen, sur l'avenir de l'Europe (débat)	34
18 - Stratégie en vue de la réduction des émissions de gaz à effet de serre de l'UE à long terme ainsi que le prévoit l'accord de Paris (débat)	62
19 - Paquet «Marché unique» (débat)	79
20 - OMC: la voie à suivre (débat).....	88
21 - Composition des commissions et des délégations : voir procès-verbal	100
22 - Rapport 2018 concernant la Serbie (débat)	100
23 - Rapport 2018 concernant le Kosovo (débat).....	111
24 - Souhaits de bienvenue	120
25 - Rapport 2018 concernant l'ancienne République yougoslave de Macédoine (débat).....	120
26 - Rapport 2018 concernant l'Albanie (débat).....	132
27 - Rapport 2018 concernant le Monténégro (débat)	139
28 - Défense de la liberté académique dans l'action extérieure de l'Union (débat)	146
29 - Interventions d'une minute sur des questions politiques importantes	150
30 - Ordre du jour de la prochaine séance : voir procès-verbal.....	154
31 - Levée de la séance	154

IT INDICE

1 - Ripresa della sessione.....	27
2 - Apertura della seduta	27
3 - Dichiarazione della Presidenza.....	27
4 - Approvazione del processo verbale della seduta precedente: vedasi processo verbale.....	29
5 - Composizione del Parlamento: vedasi processo verbale.....	29
6 - Verifica dei poteri: vedasi processo verbale	29
7 - Richiesta di revoca dell'immunità parlamentare: vedasi processo verbale.....	29
8 - Composizione delle commissioni e delle delegazioni: vedasi processo verbale.....	29
9 - Negoziati precedenti alla prima lettura del Parlamento (articolo 69 quater del regolamento): vedasi processo verbale	29
10 - Atti delegati (articolo 105, paragrafo 6, del regolamento): vedasi processo verbale.....	29
11 - Misure di esecuzione (articolo 106 del regolamento): vedasi processo verbale.....	29
12 - Presentazione di documenti: vedasi processo verbale.....	29
13 - Interrogazioni con richiesta di risposta orale (presentazione): vedasi processo verbale	29
14 - Seguito dato alle posizioni e risoluzioni del Parlamento: vedasi processo verbale	29
15 - Firma di atti adottati in conformità della procedura legislativa ordinaria (articolo 78 del regolamento).....	29
16 - Ordine dei lavori.....	32
17 - Discussione con il Primo ministro danese Lars Lokke Rasmussen sul futuro dell'Europa (discussione).....	34
18 - Strategia a lungo termine dell'UE per la riduzione delle emissioni di gas a effetto serra conformemente all'accordo di Parigi (discussione).....	62
19 - Pacchetto sul mercato unico (discussione).....	79
20 - OMC: la via da seguire (discussione)	88
21 - Composizione delle commissioni e delle delegazioni : vedasi processo verbale.....	100
22 - Relazione 2018 sulla Serbia (discussione).....	100
23 - Relazione 2018 sul Kosovo (discussione)	111
24 - Benvenuto.....	120
25 - Relazione 2018 sull'ex Repubblica iugoslava di Macedonia (discussione)	120
26 - Relazione 2018 sull'Albania (discussione).....	132
27 - Relazione 2018 sul Montenegro (discussione).....	139
28 - Difesa della libertà accademica nell'azione esterna dell'UE (discussione)	146
29 - Interventi di un minuto su questioni di rilevanza politica	150
30 - Ordine del giorno della prossima seduta: vedasi processo verbale.....	154
31 - Chiusura della seduta	154

LV SATURS

1 - Sesijas atsākšana	27
2 - Sēdes atklāšana.....	27
3 - Priekšsēdētāja paziņojums	27
4 - Iepriekšējās sēdes protokola apstiprināšana (sk. protokolu)	29
5 - Parlamenta sastāvs (sk. protokolu)	29
6 - Pilnvaru pārbaude (sk. protokolu)	29
7 - Pieprasījums atcelt deputāta imunitāti (sk. protokolu).....	29
8 - Komiteju un delegāciju sastāvs (sk. protokolu).....	29
9 - Sarunas pirms Parlamenta pirmā lasījuma (Reglamenta 69.c pants) (sk. protokolu).....	29
10 - Deleģētie akti (Reglamenta 105. panta 6. punkts) (sk. protokolu).....	29
11 - Īstenošanas pasākumi (Reglamenta 106. pants) (sk. protokolu)	29
12 - Dokumentu iesniegšana (sk. protokolu)	29
13 - Jautājumi, uz kuriem jāatbild mutiski (iesniegšana) (sk. protokolu).....	29
14 - Saistībā ar Parlamenta nostājām un rezolūcijām veiktie pasākumi (sk. protokolu)	29
15 - Saskaņā ar parasto likumdošanas procedūru pieņemto tiesību aktu parakstīšana (Reglamenta 78. pants).....	29
16 - Darba kārtība	32
17 - Debates ar Dānijas premjerministru Lars Løkke Rasmussen par Eiropas nākotni (debates)....	34
18 - Stratēģija ES siltumnīcefekta gāzu emisiju ilgtermiņa samazināšanai saskaņā ar Parīzes nolīgumu (debates)	62
19 - Vienotā tirgus pasākumu kopums (debates).....	79
20 - Turpmāka PTO darbība (debates).....	88
21 - Komiteju un delegāciju sastāvs (sk. protokolu).....	100
22 - 2018. gada ziņojums par Serbiju (debates)	100
23 - 2018. gada ziņojums par Kosovu (debates)	111
24 - Oficiāla sveikšana	120
25 - 2018. gada ziņojums par bijušo Dienvidslāvijas Maķedonijas Republiku (debates)	120
26 - 2018. gada ziņojums par Albāniju (debates)	132
27 - 2018. gada ziņojums par Melnkalni (debates).....	139
28 - Akadēmiskās brīvības aizsardzība ES ārējā darbībā (debates)	146
29 - Vienu minūti ilgas uzstāšanās par politiski svarīgiem jautājumiem.....	150
30 - Nākamās sēdes darba kārtība (sk. protokolu).....	154
31 - Sēdes slēgšana	154

LT TURINYS

1 - Sesijos atnaujinimas	27
2 - Posėdžio pradžia	27
3 - Pirmininko pareiškimas.....	27
4 - Ankstesnio posėdžio protokolų tvirtinimas (žr. protokolą).....	29
5 - Parlamento sudėtis (žr. protokolą).....	29
6 - Igaliojimų tikrinimas (žr. protokolą)	29
7 - Prašymas atšaukti Parlamento nario imunitetą (žr. protokola).....	29
8 - Komitetų ir delegacijų sudėtis (žr. protokolą)	29
9 - Derybos prieš pirmąjį svarstymą Parlamente (Darbo tvarkos taisyklių 69c straipsnis) (žr. protokola).....	29
10 - Deleguotieji aktai (Darbo tvarkos taisyklių 105 straipsnio 6 dalis) (žr. protokola).....	29
11 - Įgyvendinimo priemonės (Darbo tvarkos taisyklių 106 straipsnis) (žr. protokola)	29
12 - Pateikti dokumentai (žr. protokola)	29
13 - Klausimai, į kuriuos atsakoma žodžiu (gauti klausimai) (žr. protokola).....	29
14 - Veiksmai įgyvendinant Parlamento pozicijas ir rezoliucijas: žr. protokolą.....	29
15 - Pagal įprastą teisėkūros procedūrą priimtų teisės aktų pasirašymas (Darbo tvarkos taisyklių 78 straipsnis).....	29
16 - Darbų programa.....	32
17 - Diskusijos su Danijos Ministru Pirmininku Larsu Løkke Rasmussenu Europos ateities tema (diskusijos).....	34
18 - Ilgalaikio ES išmetamo šiltnamio efektą sukeliančių dujų kiekio mažinimo strategija pagal Paryžiaus susitarimą (diskusijos)	62
19 - Bendrosios rinkos teisės aktų rinkinys (diskusijos).....	79
20 - PPO. Tolesnė veikla (diskusijos).....	88
21 - Komitetų ir delegacijų sudėtis (žr. protokola)	100
22 - 2018 m. ataskaita dėl Serbijos (diskusijos).....	100
23 - 2018 m. ataskaita dėl Kosovo (diskusijos).....	111
24 - Oficialus pasveikinimas	120
25 - 2018 m. ataskaita dėl buvusiosios Jugoslavijos Respublikos Makedonijos (diskusijos)	120
26 - 2018 m. ataskaita dėl Albanijos (diskusijos)	132
27 - 2018 m. ataskaita dėl Juodkalnijos (diskusijos).....	139
28 - Akademinės laisvės gynyba ES išorės veiksnių srityje (diskusijos)	146
29 - Vienos minutės kalbos svarbiais politiniais klausimais	150
30 - Kito posėdžio darbotvarkė (žr. protokola)	154
31 - Posėdžio pabaiga	154

HU TARTALOM

1 - Az ülészak folytatása.....	27
2 - Az ülés megnyitása.....	27
3 - Az elnök nyilatkozata.....	27
4 - Az előző ülés jegyzőkönyvének elfogadása: lásd a jegyzőkönyvet	29
5 - A Parlament tagjai: lásd a jegyzőkönyvet	29
6 - Mandátumvizsgálat: lásd a jegyzőkönyvet.....	29
7 - Kérelem a parlamenti mentelmi jog felfüggesztésére: lásd a jegyzőkönyvet	29
8 - A bizottságok és a küldöttségek tagjai: lásd a jegyzőkönyvet	29
9 - A Parlament első olvasatát megelőző tárgyalások (az eljárási szabályzat 69c. cikke): lásd a jegyzőkönyvet.....	29
10 - Felhatalmazáson alapuló jogi aktusok (az eljárási szabályzat 105. cikkének (6) bekezdése): lásd a jegyzőkönyvet.....	29
11 - Végrehajtási intézkedések (az eljárási szabályzat 106. cikke): lásd a jegyzőkönyvet	29
12 - Dokumentumok benyújtása: lásd a jegyzőkönyvet.....	29
13 - Szóbeli választ igénylő kérdések (benyújtás): lásd a jegyzőkönyvet	29
14 - A Parlament álláspontjaival és állásfoglalásaival kapcsolatos további intézkedések: lásd a jegyzőkönyvet.....	29
15 - A rendes jogalkotási eljárás szerint elfogadott jogszabályok aláírása (az eljárási szabályzat 78. cikke)	29
16 - Ügyrend	32
17 - Vita Lars Løkke Rasmussen dán miniszterelnökkel Európa jövőjéről (vita).....	34
18 - A Párizsi Megállapodással összhangban az üvegházhatásúgáz-kibocsátás csökkentésére irányuló, hosszú távú uniós stratégiatervezet (vita).....	62
19 - Egységes piaci intézkedéscsomag (vita).....	79
20 - WTO: a következő lépések (vita)	88
21 - A bizottságok és a küldöttségek tagjai: lásd a jegyzőkönyvet.....	100
22 - A Szerbiáról szóló, 2018. évi jelentés (vita)	100
23 - A Koszovóról szóló, 2018. évi jelentés (vita)	111
24 - Köszöntés.....	120
25 - A Macedónia Volt Jugoszláv Köztársaságról szóló, 2018. évi jelentés (vita)	120
26 - Az Albániáról szóló, 2018. évi jelentés (vita).....	132
27 - A Montenegróról szóló, 2018. évi jelentés (vita).....	139
28 - A tudományos élet szabadságának védelméről az EU külső fellépéseiben (vita)	146
29 - Egyperces felszólalások fontos politikai kérdésekben	150
30 - A következő ülésnap napirendje: lásd a jegyzőkönyvet.....	154
31 - Az ülés berekesztése.....	154

MT WERREJ

1 - Tkomplija tas-sessjoni	27
2 - Ftuh tas-seduta	27
3 - Dikjarazzjoni tal-President.....	27
4 - Approvazzjoni tal-Minuti tas-seduta ta' qabel: ara l-Minuti	29
5 - Kompożizzjoni tal-Parlament: ara l-Minuti	29
6 - Verifikazzjoni tas-setgħat: ara l-Minuti	29
7 - Talba għat-tneħħija ta' l-Immunità Parlamentari: ara l-Minuti.....	29
8 - Kompożizzjoni tal-kumitati u tad-delegazzjonijiet: ara l-Minuti	29
9 - Negożjati qabel l-ewwel qari tal-Parlament (Artikolu 69c tar-Regoli ta' Proċedura): ara l-Minuti	29
10 - Atti delegati (Artikolu 105(6) tar-Regoli ta' Proċedura): ara l-Minuti.....	29
11 - Mizuri ta' implimentazzjoni (Artikolu 106 tar-Regoli ta' Proċedura): ara l-Minuti.....	29
12 - Dokumenti mressqa: ara l-Minuti.....	29
13 - Mistoqsijiet orali għal twegħiba orali (tressiq): ara l-Minuti.....	29
14 - Azzjonijiet meħuda skond il-petizzjonijiet u r-riżoluzzjonijiet tal-Parlament: Ara l-Minuti ...	29
15 - Iffirmar tal-atti adottati skont il-proċedura legiżlattiva ordinarja (Artikolu 78 tar-Regoli ta' Proċedura)	29
16 - Ordni tas-seduta	32
17 - Dibattitu mal-Prim Ministru tad-Danimarka, Lars Løkke Rasmussen, dwar il-Futur tal-Ewropa (dibattitu)	34
18 - Strategija għal tnaqqis fit-tul tal-emissjonijiet tal-gassijiet b'effett ta' serra tal-UE b'konformità mal-Ftehim ta' Pariġi (dibattitu)	62
19 - Pakkett dwar is-Suq Uniku (dibattitu)	79
20 - WTO: it-triq 'il quddiem (dibattitu)	88
21 - Kompożizzjoni tal-kumitati u tad-delegazzjonijiet : ara l-Minuti	100
22 - Rapport tal-2018 dwar is-Serbja (dibattitu)	100
23 - Rapport tal-2018 dwar il-Kosovo (dibattitu)	111
24 - Merħba	120
25 - Rapport tal-2018 dwar l-Eks-Repubblika Jugoslava tal-Macedonja (dibattitu).....	120
26 - Rapport tal-2018 dwar l-Albanija (dibattitu).....	132
27 - Rapport tal-2018 dwar il-Montenegro (dibattitu).....	139
28 - Difiza tal-libertà akkademika fl-azzjoni esterna tal-UE (dibattitu).....	146
29 - Interventi ta' minuta dwar kwistjonijiet ta' importanza politika	150
30 - L-aġenda tas-seduta li jmiss: ara l-Minuti	154
31 - Ghelug tas-seduta	154

NL INHOUD

1 - Hervatting van de zitting	27
2 - Opening van de vergadering.....	27
3 - Verklaring van de Voorzitter	27
4 - Goedkeuring van de notulen van de vorige vergadering: zie notulen.....	29
5 - Samenstelling Parlement: zie notulen	29
6 - Onderzoek geloofsbrieven: zie notulen	29
7 - Verzoek om opheffing van de immuniteit: zie notulen.....	29
8 - Samenstelling commissies en delegaties: zie notulen	29
9 - Onderhandelingen voorafgaand aan de eerste lezing door het Parlement (artikel 69 quater van het Reglement): zie notulen	29
10 - Gedelegeerde handelingen (artikel 105, lid 6, van het Reglement): zie notulen	29
11 - Uitvoeringsmaatregelen (artikel 106 van het Reglement): zie notulen	29
12 - Ingekomen stukken: zie notulen	29
13 - Vragen met verzoek om mondeling antwoord (indiening): zie notulen.....	29
14 - Aan de standpunten en resoluties van het Parlement gegeven gevolg: zie notulen.....	29
15 - Ondertekening van volgens de gewone wetgevingsprocedure vastgestelde handelingen (artikel 78 van het Reglement)	29
16 - Regeling van de werkzaamheden	32
17 - Debat met de premier van Denemarken, Lars Løkke Rasmussen, over de toekomst van Europa (debat).....	34
18 - Langetermijnstrategie van de EU voor broeikasgasemissiereductie in overeenstemming met de Overeenkomst van Parijs (debat)	62
19 - Pakket eengemaakte markt (debat).....	79
20 - WTO: de weg vooruit (debat).....	88
21 - Samenstelling commissies en delegaties: zie notulen	100
22 - Verslag 2018 over Servië (debat)	100
23 - Verslag 2018 over Kosovo (debat).....	111
24 - Welkomstwoord.....	120
25 - Verslag 2018 over de voormalige Joegoslavische Republiek Macedonië (debat).....	120
26 - Verslag 2018 over Albanië (debat)	132
27 - Verslag 2018 over Montenegro (debat)	139
28 - Verdediging van de academische vrijheid bij het externe optreden van de EU (debat).....	146
29 - Spreektijd van één minuut over kwesties van politiek belang.....	150
30 - Agenda van de volgende vergadering: zie notulen.....	154
31 - Sluiting van de vergadering.....	154

PL SPIS TREŚCI

1 - Wznowienie sesji.....	27
2 - Otwarcie posiedzenia	27
3 - Oświadczenia Przewodniczącego / Przewodniczącej.....	27
4 - Zatwierdzenie protokołu z poprzedniego posiedzenia: patrz protokół	29
5 - Skład Parlamentu: patrz protokół.....	29
6 - Weryfikacja mandatów pełnomocnictw: patrz protokół	29
7 - Wniosek o uchylenie immunitetu parlamentarnego: Patrz protokół	29
8 - Skład komisji i delegacji: patrz protokół	29
9 - Negocjacje przed pierwszym czytaniem w Parlamencie (art. 69c Regulaminu): Patrz protokół	29
10 - Akty delegowane (art. 105 ust. 6 Regulaminu): Patrz protokół	29
11 - Środki wykonawcze (art. 106 Regulaminu): Patrz protokół.....	29
12 - Składanie dokumentów: patrz protokół	29
13 - Pytania wymagające odpowiedzi ustnej (składanie dokumentów): patrz protokół.....	29
14 - Działania podjęte w związku ze stanowiskami i rezolucjami Parlamentu: patrz protokół	29
15 - Podpisanie aktów prawnych przyjętych zgodnie ze zwykłą procedurą ustawodawczą (art. 78 Regulaminu).....	29
16 - Porządek obrad.....	32
17 - Debata z premierem Danii Larsem Løkke Rasmussenem na temat przyszłości Europy (debata)	34
18 - Strategia w zakresie długoterminowej unijnej redukcji emisji gazów cieplarnianych zgodnie z porozumieniem paryskim (debata)	62
19 - Pakiet dotyczący jednolitego rynku (debata)	79
20 - WTO: Przyszłe działania (debata).....	88
21 - Skład komisji i delegacji: Patrz protokół.....	100
22 - Sprawozdanie za rok 2018 dotyczące Serbii (debata).....	100
23 - Sprawozdanie za rok 2018 dotyczące Kosowa (debata).....	111
24 - Powitanie	120
25 - Sprawozdanie za rok 2018 dotyczące byłej jugosłowiańskiej republiki Macedonii (debata)	120
26 - Sprawozdanie za rok 2018 dotyczące Albanii (debata).....	132
27 - Sprawozdanie za rok 2018 dotyczące Czarnogóry (debata).....	139
28 - Obrona wolności akademickiej w działaniach zewnętrznych UE (debata).....	146
29 - Jednominutowe wystąpienia w ważnych kwestiach politycznych	150
30 - Porządek obrad następnego posiedzenia: Patrz protokół.....	154
31 - Zamknięcie posiedzenia	154

PT INDICE

1 - Reinício da sessão	27
2 - Abertura do período de sessões.....	27
3 - Declaração da Presidência	27
4 - Aprovação da ata da sessão anterior: Ver Ata	29
5 - Composição do Parlamento: ver Acta	29
6 - Verificação de poderes: ver Ata	29
7 - Pedido de levantamento da imunidade parlamentar: Ver Acta	29
8 - Composição das comissões e das delegações: ver Ata	29
9 - Negociações antes da primeira leitura do Parlamento (artigo 69.º-C do Regimento): Ver Acta	29
10 - Atos delegados (artigo 105.º, n.º 6, do Regimento): Ver Acta	29
11 - Medidas de execução (artigo 106.º do Regimento): Ver Acta	29
12 - Entrega de documentos: ver Ata	29
13 - Perguntas com pedido de resposta oral (entrega): Ver Acta	29
14 - Seguimento dado às posições e resoluções do Parlamento: ver Ata	29
15 - natura dos atos aprovados em conformidade com o processo legislativo ordinário (artigo 78.º do Regimento)	29
16 - Ordem dos trabalhos	32
17 - Debate com o Primeiro-Ministro da Dinamarca, Lars Løkke Rasmussen, sobre o Futuro da Europa (debate).....	34
18 - Estratégia a longo prazo relativa à redução das emissões de gases com efeito de estufa da UE em conformidade com o Acordo de Paris (debate).....	62
19 - Pacote relativo ao Mercado Único (debate).....	79
20 - OMC: rumo a seguir (debate)	88
21 - Composição das comissões e delegações : Ver Acta	100
22 - Relatório de 2018 sobre a Sérvia (debate)	100
23 - Relatório de 2018 sobre o Kosovo (debate)	111
24 - Boas-vindas.....	120
25 - Relatório de 2018 sobre a antiga República jugoslava da Macedónia (debate)	120
26 - Relatório de 2018 sobre a Albânia (debate)	132
27 - Relatório de 2018 da Comissão sobre o Montenegro (debate)	139
28 - Defesa da liberdade académica na ação externa da UE (debate)	146
29 - Intervenções de um minuto sobre questões políticas importantes	150
30 - Ordem do dia da próxima sessão: Ver Acta.....	154
31 - Encerramento da sessão.....	154

RO CUPRINS

1 - Reluarea sesiunii	27
2 - Deschiderea ședinței.....	27
3 - Declarația Președinției.....	27
4 - Aprobarea procesului-verbal al ședinței precedente: a se vedea procesul-verbal.....	29
5 - Componența Parlamentului: a se vedea procesul-verbal	29
6 - Verificarea prerogativelor: a se vedea procesul-verbal.....	29
7 - Cerere de ridicare a imunității parlamentare: consultați procesul-verbal.....	29
8 - Componența comisiilor și a delegațiilor: a se vedea procesul-verbal	29
9 - Negocieri înaintea primei lecturi a Parlamentului (articolul 69c din Regulamentul de procedură): consultați procesul-verbal	29
10 - Acte delegate [articolul 105 alineatul (6) din Regulamentul de procedură]: consultați procesul-verbal	29
11 - Măsurile de executare (articolul 106 din Regulamentul de procedură): consultați procesul-verbal.....	29
12 - Depunerea documentelor: a se vedea procesul-verbal	29
13 - Întrebări cu solicitare de răspuns oral (depunere): consultați procesul-verbal.....	29
14 - Continuări ale avizelor și rezoluțiilor Parlamentului: a se vedea procesul-verbal	29
15 - Semnarea actelor adoptate în conformitate cu procedura legislativă ordinară (articolul 78 din Regulamentul de procedură)	29
16 - Ordinea lucrărilor	32
17 - Dezbateri cu prim-ministrul Danemarcei, Lars Løkke Rasmussen, privind viitorul Europei (dezbateri)	34
18 - Strategia pentru reducerea pe termen lung a emisiilor de gaze cu efect de seră din UE, în conformitate cu Acordul de la Paris (dezbateri).....	62
19 - Pachetul privind piața unică (dezbateri)	79
20 - OMC: calea de urmat (dezbateri).....	88
21 - Componența comisiilor și delegațiilor: consultați procesul-verbal.....	100
22 - Raportul pe 2018 privind Serbia (dezbateri).....	100
23 - Raportul pe 2018 privind Kosovo (dezbateri)	111
24 - Urări de bun venit	120
25 - Raportul pe 2018 privind Fosta Republică Iugoslavă a Macedoniei (dezbateri)	120
26 - Raportul pe 2018 privind Albania (dezbateri).....	132
27 - Raportul pe 2018 privind Muntenegru (dezbateri).....	139
28 - Apărarea libertății academice în acțiunile externe ale UE (dezbateri).....	146
29 - Intervenții de un minut privind chestiuni politice importante.....	150
30 - Ordinea de zi a următoarei ședințe: consultați procesul-verbal	154
31 - Ridicarea ședinței.....	154

SK OBSAH

1 - Pokračovanie prerušeného zasadania	27
2 - Otvorenie rokovania	27
3 - Vyhlásenie predsedníctva	27
4 - Schválenie zápisnice z predchádzajúceho rokovania: pozri zápisnicu	29
5 - Zloženie Parlamentu: pozri zápisnicu.....	29
6 - Preskúmanie osvedčení o zvolení za poslanca	29
7 - Žiadosť o zbavenie poslaneckej imunity: pozri zápisnicu	29
8 - Zloženie výborov a delegácií: pozri zápisnicu.....	29
9 - Rokovania pred prvým čítaním v Parlamente (článok 69c rokovacieho poriadku): pozri zápisnicu.....	29
10 - Delegované akty (článok 105 ods. 6 rokovacieho poriadku): pozri zápisnicu	29
11 - Vykonávacie opatrenia (článok 106 rokovacieho poriadku): pozri zápisnicu	29
12 - Predložené dokumenty: pozri zápisnicu.....	29
13 - Otázky na ústne zodpovedanie (predložené dokumenty): pozri zápisnicu	29
14 - Kroky podniknuté na základe pozícií a uznesení Parlamentu: pozri zápisnicu.....	29
15 - Podpis aktov prijatých v súlade s riadnym legislatívnym postupom (článok 78 rokovacieho poriadku)	29
16 - Program práce	32
17 - Diskusia s dánskym premiérom Larsom Løkkem Rasmussenom o budúcnosti Európy (rozprava)	34
18 - Stratégia dlhodobého znižovania emisií skleníkových plynov v EÚ v súlade s Parížskou dohodou (rozprava)	62
19 - Balík opatrení pre jednotný trh (rozprava)	79
20 - WTO: cesta vpred (rozprava)	88
21 - Zloženie výborov a delegácií: pozri zápisnicu.....	100
22 - Správa o Srbsku za rok 2018 (rozprava)	100
23 - Správa o Kosove za rok 2018 (rozprava)	111
24 - Oficiálne privítanie.....	120
25 - Správa o bývalej Juhoslovenskej republike Macedónsko za rok 2018 (rozprava).....	120
26 - Správa o Albánsku za rok 2018 (rozprava)	132
27 - Správa o Čiernej Hore za rok 2018 (rozprava).....	139
28 - Obrana akademickej slobody vo vonkajšej činnosti EÚ (rozprava)	146
29 - Jednominútové vystúpenia k otázkam politického významu.....	150
30 - Program rokovania na nasledujúci deň: pozri zápisnicu	154
31 - Skončenie rokovania.....	154

SL VSEBINA

1 - Nadaljevanje zasedanja	27
2 - Otvoritev seje	27
3 - Izjava predsedujočega	27
4 - Sprejetje zapisnika predhodne seje: glej zapisnik	29
5 - Sestava Parlamenta: glej zapisnik	29
6 - Preverjanje veljavnosti mandatov poslancev: glej zapisnik	29
7 - Zahteva za odvzem poslanske imunitete: gl. zapisnik	29
8 - Sestava odborov in delegacij: gl. zapisnik	29
9 - Pogajanja pred prvo obravnavo v Parlamentu (člen 69c Poslovnika): gl. zapisnik	29
10 - Delegirani akti (člen 105(6) Poslovnika): gl. zapisnik	29
11 - Izvedbeni ukrepi (člen 106 Poslovnika): gl. zapisnik: gl. zapisnik	29
12 - Predložitev dokumentov: glej zapisnik	29
13 - Vprašanja za ustni odgovor (predložitev): gl. zapisnik	29
14 - Nadaljnje obravnavanje stališč in resolucij Parlamenta: glej zapisnik	29
15 - Podpis aktov, sprejetih v skladu z rednim zakonodajnim postopkom (člen 78 Poslovnika) ..	29
16 - Razpored dela	32
17 - Razprava s predsednikom danske vlade Larsom Løkkejem Rasmussenom o prihodnosti Evrope (razprava)	34
18 - Strategija za dolgoročno zmanjševanje emisij toplogrednih plinov v EU v skladu s Pariškim sporazumom (razprava)	62
19 - Sveženj za enotni trg (razprava)	79
20 - STO: pot naprej (razprava)	88
21 - Sestava odborov in delegacij: gl. zapisnik	100
22 - Poročilo o Srbiji za leto 2018 (razprava)	100
23 - Poročilo o Kosovu za leto 2018 (razprava)	111
24 - Dobrodošlica	120
25 - Poročilo o Nekdanji jugoslovanski republiki Makedoniji za leto 2018 (razprava)	120
26 - Poročilo o Albaniji za leto 2018 (razprava)	132
27 - Poročilo o Črni gori za leto 2018 (razprava)	139
28 - Varstvo akademske svobode v zunanjem delovanju EU (razprava)	146
29 - Enominutni govori o zadevah političnega pomena	150
30 - Dnevni red naslednje seje: gl. zapisnik	154
31 - Zaključek seje	154

FI SISÄLTÖ

1 - Istuntokauden uudelleen avaaminen	27
2 - Istunnon avaaminen	27
3 - Puhemiehen julkilausuma.....	27
4 - Edellisen istunnon pöytäkirjan hyväksyminen: ks. pöytäkirja.....	29
5 - Parlamentin kokoonpano: ks. pöytäkirja	29
6 - Valtakirjojen tarkastus: ks. pöytäkirja	29
7 - Parlamentaarisen koskemattomuuden pidättämisestä koskeva pyyntö: ks. pöytäkirja	29
8 - Valiokuntien ja valtuuskuntien kokoonpanot: ks. pöytäkirja	29
9 - Neuvottelut ennen parlamentin ensimmäistä käsittelyä (työjärjestyksen 69 c artikla): ks. pöytäkirja.....	29
10 - Säädösvallan siirron nojalla annetut delegoidut säädökset (työjärjestyksen 105 artiklan 6 kohta): ks. pöytäkirja	29
11 - Täytäntöönpanotoimenpiteet (työjärjestyksen 106 artikla): ks. pöytäkirja: ks. pöytäkirja	29
12 - Vastaanotetut asiakirjat: ks. pöytäkirja.....	29
13 - Suullisesti vastattavat kysymykset (vastaanotetut asiakirjat): ks. pöytäkirja	29
14 - Parlamentin kantojen ja päätöslauselmien johdosta toteutetut toimet: ks. pöytäkirja.....	29
15 - Tavallista lainsäätämisyjärjestystä noudattaen annettujen säädösten allekirjoittaminen (työjärjestyksen 78 artikla)	29
16 - Käsittelyjärjestys.....	32
17 - Keskustelu Tanskan pääministerin Lars Løkke Rasmussenin kanssa Euroopan tulevaisuudesta (keskustelu).....	34
18 - Strategia EU:n kasvihuonekaasupäästöjen vähentämiseksi pitkällä aikavälillä Pariisin sopimuksen mukaisesti (keskustelu)	62
19 - Sisämarkkinapaketti (keskustelu)	79
20 - WTO: tie eteenpäin (keskustelu).....	88
21 - Valiokuntien ja valtuuskuntien kokoonpano: ks. pöytäkirja	100
22 - Serbiaa koskeva vuoden 2018 kertomus (keskustelu).....	100
23 - Kosovoa koskeva vuoden 2018 kertomus (keskustelu).....	111
24 - Tervetuloitotukset.....	120
25 - Entistä Jugoslavian tasavaltaa Makedoniaa koskeva vuoden 2018 kertomus (keskustelu) ..	120
26 - Albaniaa koskeva vuoden 2018 kertomus (keskustelu).....	132
27 - Montenegroa koskeva vuoden 2018 kertomus (keskustelu).....	139
28 - Akateemisen vapauden puolustaminen EU:n ulkoisessa toiminnassa (keskustelu)	146
29 - Minuutin puheenvuorot poliittisesti tärkeistä asioista	150
30 - Seuraavan istunnon esityslista: ks. pöytäkirja.....	154
31 - Istunnon päättäminen	154

SV INNEHÅLL

1 - Återupptagande av sessionen	27
2 - Öppnande av sammanträdet	27
3 - Uttalande av talmannen.....	27
4 - Justering av protokollet från föregående sammanträde: se protokollet	29
5 - Parlamentets sammansättning: se protokollet.....	29
6 - Valprovning: se protokollet	29
7 - Begäran om upphävande av parlamentarisk immunitet: se protokollet	29
8 - Utskottens och delegationernas sammansättning: se protokollet.....	29
9 - Förhandlingar inför parlamentets första behandling (artikel 69c i arbetsordningen): se protokollet.....	29
10 - Delegerade akter (artikel 105.6 i arbetsordningen): se protokollet.....	29
11 - Genomförandeåtgärder (artikel 106 i arbetsordningen): se protokollet: se protokollet	29
12 - Inkomna dokument: se protokollet	29
13 - Frågor för muntligt besvarande (inkomna dokument): se protokollet.....	29
14 - Kommissionens åtgärder till följd av parlamentets åtgärder och resolutioner: se protokollet	29
15 - Undertecknande av rättsakter som antagits i enlighet med det ordinarie lagstiftningsförfarandet (artikel 78 i arbetsordningen)	29
16 - Arbetsplan.....	32
17 - Diskussion med Danmarks statsminister Lars Løkke Rasmussen om EU:s framtid (debatt) ...	34
18 - Strategi för långsiktiga minskningar av växthusgasutsläppen i EU i enlighet med Parisavtalet (debatt)	62
19 - Inre marknads paketet (debatt)	79
20 - WTO: vägen framåt (debatt).....	88
21 - Utskottens och delegationernas sammansättning: se protokollet.....	100
22 - Rapport för 2018 om Serbien (debatt).....	100
23 - Rapport för 2018 om Kosovo (debatt)	111
24 - Välkomsthälsning.....	120
25 - Rapport för 2018 om f.d. jugoslaviska republiken Makedonien (debatt)	120
26 - Rapport för 2018 om Albanien (debatt).....	132
27 - Rapport för 2018 om Montenegro (debatt).....	139
28 - Försvar av akademisk frihet inom EU:s yttre åtgärder (debatt).....	146
29 - Anföranden på en minut om frågor av politisk vikt	150
30 - Föredragningslista för nästa sammanträde: se protokollet	154
31 - Avslutande av sammanträdet	154

HR Sadržaj

1 - Nastavak zasjedanja	27
2 - Sastav odbora	27
3 - Izjava Predsjedništva	27
4 - Usvajanje zapisnika s prethodne dnevne sjednice: vidi zapisnik	29
5 - Sastav Parlamenta: vidi zapisnik	29
6 - Provjera valjanosti mandata: vidi zapisnik	29
7 - Zahtjev za ukidanje zastupničkog imuniteta: vidi zapisnik.....	29
8 - Sastav odbora i izaslanstava : vidi zapisnik	29
9 - Pregovori prije prvog čitanja u Parlamentu (članak 69.c Poslovnika): vidi zapisnik	29
10 - Delegirani akti (članak 105. stavak 6. Poslovnika): vidi zapisnik.....	29
11 - Provedbene mjere (članak 106. Poslovnika): vidi zapisnik: vidi zapisnik.....	29
12 - Podnošenje dokumenata: vidjeti zapisnik.....	29
13 - Pitanja za usmeni odgovor (podnošenje): vidi zapisnik.....	29
14 - Daljnje radnje poduzete na temelju stajališta i rezolucija Europskog parlamenta: vidjeti zapisnik.....	29
15 - Potpisivanje akata donesenih u skladu s redovnim zakonodavnim postupkom (članak 78. Poslovnika)	29
16 - Plan rada	32
17 - Rasprava s danskim premijerom Larsom Løkkeom Rasmussenom o budućnosti Europe (rasprava)	34
18 - Strategija za dugoročno smanjivanje emisija stakleničkih plinova u EU-u u skladu s Pariškim sporazumom (rasprava)	62
19 - Paket mjera za jedinstveno tržište (rasprava).....	79
20 - WTO: smjernice za budućnost (rasprava)	88
21 - Sastav odbora i izaslanstava : vidi zapisnik	100
22 - Izvješće o Srbiji za 2018. (rasprava)	100
23 - Izvješće o Kosovu za 2018. (rasprava)	111
24 - Dobrodošlica.....	120
25 - Izvješće o bivšoj jugoslavenskoj republici Makedoniji za 2018. (rasprava).....	120
26 - Izvješće o Albaniji za 2018. (rasprava).....	132
27 - Izvješće o Crnoj Gori za 2018. (rasprava).....	139
28 - Obrana akademske slobode u vanjskom djelovanju EU-a (rasprava).....	146
29 - Jednominutni govori o pitanjima od političke važnosti	150
30 - Dnevni red sljedeće dnevne sjednice: vidi zapisnik.....	154
31 - Zatvaranje dnevne sjednice.....	154

1-001-0000

СРЯДА 28 НОЕМВРИ 2018 Г.
MIÉRCOLES 28 DE NOVIEMBRE DE 2018
STŘEDA 28. LISTOPADU 2018
ONSDAG DEN 28. NOVEMBER 2018
MITTWOCH, 28. NOVEMBER 2018
KOLMAPÄEV, 28. NOVEMBER 2018
ΤΕΤΑΡΤΗ 28 ΝΟΕΜΒΡΙΟΥ 2018
WEDNESDAY, 28 NOVEMBER 2018
MERCREDI 28 NOVEMBRE 2018
MERCOLEDI' 28 NOVEMBRE 2018
TREŠDIENA, 2018. GADA 28. NOVEMBRIS
2018 M. LAPKRIČIO 28 D., TREČIADIENIS
2018. NOVEMBER 28., SZERDA
L-ERBGĦA 28 TA' NOVEMBRU 2018
WOENSDAG 28 NOVEMBER 2018
ŚRODA, 28 LISTOPADA 2018
QUARTA-FEIRA, 28 DE NOVEMBRO DE 2018
MIERCURI 28 NOIEMBRIE 2018
STREDA 28. NOVEMBRA 2018
SREDA, 28. NOVEMBER 2018
KESKIVIIKKO 28. MARRASKUUTA 2018
ONSDAGEN DEN 28 NOVEMBER 2018
SRIJEDA 28 STUDENOG 2018

1-002-0000

PRESIDENZA DELL'ON. ANTONIO TAJANI
Presidente

1. Ripresa della sessione

1-004-0000

Presidente. – Dichiaro ripresa la sessione del Parlamento europeo interrotta il 15 novembre 2018.

2. Apertura della seduta

1-006-0000

(La seduta è aperta alle 15.02)

3. Dichiarazione della Presidenza

1-008-0000

Presidente. – Onorevoli colleghi, il 25 novembre 3 navi ucraine – un rimorchiatore e due navi da guerra – hanno tentato di passare lo stretto di Kerč' sulla rotta da Odessa a Mariupol; le autorità russe hanno impedito loro il passaggio. Il rimorchiatore è stato successivamente speronato da una nave militare di Mosca e la marina russa ha sparato contro le navi ucraine e le ha sequestrate;

almeno 6 militari ucraini sono stati feriti e 23 sono stati arrestati. A seguito di questi eventi, l'Ucraina ha dichiarato la legge marziale in 10 regioni per un periodo di 30 giorni.

Di fronte a quest'ulteriore grave escalation delle tensioni nella regione, voglio esprimere tutta la nostra preoccupazione e ricordare che per noi l'integrità territoriale dell'Ucraina è fondamentale: la Russia non ha il diritto di impedire il passaggio delle imbarcazioni ucraine o di altri paesi verso il Mare di Azov e ha l'obbligo di rispettare la concezione delle Nazioni Unite sul diritto marittimo e l'accordo di cooperazione concluso con l'Ucraina nel 2003. Chiediamo quindi che le autorità russe si impegnino a garantire il rispetto dei loro obblighi e rilascino i militari ucraini che sono stati arrestati.

Nel mio incontro di ieri con il Presidente del parlamento ucraino, Andrij Parubij, ho tenuto ad assicurare che questo Parlamento segue con grande attenzione la vicenda e che farà tutto il possibile per facilitare una soluzione positiva. L'ho messo altresì al corrente della risoluzione che abbiamo adottato il 30 ottobre, nella quale si deplorano le azioni sproporzionate delle autorità russe nel Mare di Azov.

- 4. Approvazione del processo verbale della seduta precedente: vedasi processo verbale**
- 5. Composizione del Parlamento: vedasi processo verbale**
- 6. Verifica dei poteri: vedasi processo verbale**
- 7. Richiesta di revoca dell'immunità parlamentare: vedasi processo verbale**
- 8. Composizione delle commissioni e delle delegazioni: vedasi processo verbale**
- 9. Negoziati precedenti alla prima lettura del Parlamento (articolo 69 quater del regolamento): vedasi processo verbale**
- 10. Atti delegati (articolo 105, paragrafo 6, del regolamento): vedasi processo verbale**
- 11. Misure di esecuzione (articolo 106 del regolamento): vedasi processo verbale**
- 12. Presentazione di documenti: vedasi processo verbale**
- 13. Interrogazioni con richiesta di risposta orale (presentazione): vedasi processo verbale**
- 14. Seguito dato alle posizioni e risoluzioni del Parlamento: vedasi processo verbale**
- 15. Firma di atti adottati in conformità della procedura legislativa ordinaria (articolo 78 del regolamento)**

1-021-0000

Presidente. – Comunico di aver proceduto, congiuntamente al Presidente del Consiglio, alla firma dei seguenti atti approvati secondo la procedura legislativa ordinaria:

– regolamento del Parlamento europeo e del Consiglio relativo all'uso del sistema d'informazione Schengen per il rimpatrio di cittadini di paesi terzi il cui soggiorno è irregolare (00034/2018/LEX - C8-0485/2018 - 2016/0407(COD));

– regolamento del Parlamento europeo e del Consiglio sull'istituzione, l'esercizio e l'uso del sistema d'informazione Schengen (SIS) nel settore delle verifiche di frontiera, che modifica la

convenzione di applicazione dell'accordo di Schengen e abroga il regolamento (CE) n. 1987/2006 (00035/2018/LEX - C8-0486/2018 - 2016/0408(COD));

– regolamento del Parlamento europeo e del Consiglio sull'istituzione, l'esercizio e l'uso del sistema d'informazione Schengen (SIS) nel settore della cooperazione di polizia e della cooperazione giudiziaria in materia penale, che modifica e abroga la decisione 2007/533/GAI del Consiglio e che abroga il regolamento (CE) n. 1986/2006 del Parlamento europeo e del Consiglio e la decisione 2010/261/UE della Commissione (00036/2018/LEX - C8-0487/2018 - 2016/0409(COD)).

1-022-0000

Philippe Lamberts (Verts/ALE). – Mr President, two days ago, in Estonia, a demonstration was organised by the parliamentary party, the Conservative People's Party of Estonia, in front of the Estonian Parliament. It was a protest against the United Nations migration compact, and our colleague, Indrek Tarand, wanted to address the floor with a different point of view from those of the organisers. He was violently taken off stage by the organisers, including members of the National Parliament of Estonia.

Democracy supposes that we can peacefully exchange different opinions, different points of view and different perspectives on society. What we try to strive for in Europe is for all this to be organised within the framework of democratic institutions and in a peaceful way. That was blatantly not the case on this occasion.

Therefore, I would like to request, Mr President, that you react to this. When, for any reason, a Member of Parliament is deprived of his right of free expression, especially by violent means, I think that you, as the President of our Parliament, have to react and to condemn these cases, especially when members of national parliaments are actively condoning that kind of violence.

(Applause)

1-023-0000

Presidente. – Com'è avvenuto in passato, non mancherà la mia condanna e quella del Parlamento per gli atti di violenza nei confronti di parlamentari che siedono in questa Assemblea.

Prima di qualsiasi dichiarazione ufficiale – se fosse vero sarebbe un fatto molto grave – voglio avere una conferma ufficiale. Chiamerò l'ambasciata di questo Paese per chiedere conto di ciò che è accaduto e se mi verranno confermati i fatti – io credo alle sue parole ovviamente – protesterò formalmente con l'ambasciatore del Paese in questione. La informerò sull'esito di questi colloqui.

1-024-0000

Jörg Meuthen (EFDD). – Herr Präsident! Es läge mir fern, Ihnen das Wort abschneiden zu wollen. Ich bitte um Entschuldigung.

Ich stütze mich auf Artikel 46 und 52 der Geschäftsordnung hinsichtlich der Entscheidung der Konferenz der Fraktionsvorsitzenden, ein zweites Verfahren über die humanitären Visa durchzuführen. Ich erinnere daran, dass der Initiativbericht über humanitäre Visa am Mittwoch, dem 14. November, mit demokratischer Mehrheit vom Plenum abgelehnt wurde.

Das war eine einwandfreie Prozedur und Abstimmung. Doch Demokratie gefällt einigen im Hause offenbar nur, wenn das gewünschte Ergebnis herauskommt. Die hausinterne grün-linke Lobby hat deswegen bewirkt, dass derselbe Vorschlag noch einmal in den Innenausschuss eingebracht werden darf. Ich frage Sie, Herr Präsident, zu welchem Ergebnis Sie hinsichtlich der Prüfung der Rechtsgrundlage des Vorschlages gelangt sind, zu der Sie nach Artikel 46 Absatz 2 verpflichtet sind? Können Sie zudem garantieren, dass das Verfahren im Ausschuss den Regeln der

Geschäftsordnung entspricht, wenn das Verfahren schon im Dezember in Straßburg abgeschlossen werden soll?

Auf welcher Rechtsgrundlage geht es überhaupt, dass die Konferenz der Fraktionsvorsitzenden entscheidet, sich über ein Votum des Plenums hinwegzusetzen, um eine zweite Abstimmung zu einem bereits verworfenen Text anzuberaumen?

Ich frage: Welche Fraktionen haben dem zugestimmt und wie haben die PPE und die ECR in der Konferenz der Fraktionsvorsitzenden abgestimmt?

(Beifall)

1-025-0000

Presidente. – Onorevole, non ha bisogno di informazioni da parte mia perché il presidente del suo gruppo ha partecipato come tutti i presidenti dei gruppi, quindi era perfettamente informato. Il suo gruppo sa come si è svolta la vicenda....

Non c'è nessuna violazione del regolamento. Io sono stato molto chiaro: il voto non si poteva ripetere. Se si vuole riiniziare l'iter legislativo nulla vieta che si riinizi l'iter legislativo. E tutto deve essere fatto nel rispetto del regolamento. Questo è quello che ho detto alla Conferenza dei presidenti e questo è quello che hanno accettato tutti i rappresentanti che partecipavano alla Conferenza dei presidenti.

Quindi nessuna violazione del regolamento e nessun favoritismo né per una parte né per l'altra. Il voto era assolutamente valido. La proposta è stata respinta. Se poi si volesse adottare un'altra iniziativa, nessuno può impedire a parlamentari che vogliono un'iniziativa analoga di ripresentarla. Non è vietato da nessun articolo del regolamento.

1-026-0000

Izaskun Bilbao Barandica (ALDE). – Señor presidente, este Parlamento apuesta por trabajar por la igualdad en la escuela y desde la educación, y por eso quiero pedir solidaridad para personas como la consejera de Educación del Gobierno de Navarra, María Solana. ¿Cuál ha sido su delito? Introducir en la escuela un programa pionero para educar en valores de igualdad, «Skolae»; un programa que ha sido aplaudido por técnicos de toda Europa. La consecuencia: lleva escolta desde el mes de junio para protegerse de las amenazas. Acosan a los técnicos que gestionan este proyecto; su departamento acaba de ser asaltado y allanado. Por eso hago esta denuncia. Porque es urgente, pido que se interese por el caso y, sobre todo, pido solidaridad hoy de esta Cámara hacia este Gobierno, esta consejera y todos sus técnicos.

1-027-0000

Pavel Svoboda (PPE). – Mr President, I wanted just to inform the plenary that today it is Red Wednesday, which is the day of commemoration of those who are suffering persecution linked to liberty of belief – those who are persecuted for their belief, for their faith. Public buildings are being lit in red, people are wearing red ties and other such things. There are hundreds of millions of people suffering only because of their faith. I wanted the plenary to commemorate this.

(Applause)

1-028-0000

Presidente. – Ci associamo tutti a questa battaglia di libertà in difesa della libertà di espressione religiosa, non soltanto all'interno dell'Unione europea ma in tutto il mondo.

1-029-0000

Bruno Gollnisch (NI). – Monsieur le Président, je ne souhaitais pas du tout vous interrompre mais j'ignorais à quel moment vous auriez fini de parler au sujet de l'interpellation de notre

collègue, M. Lamberts. Je suis heureux d'avoir entendu la seconde partie de votre réponse, à savoir que vous commenceriez par enquêter sur les faits.

J'ai bien écouté ce qu'a dit M. Lamberts et je suis partisan de la liberté d'expression, mais j'ai cru comprendre qu'il s'agissait d'une manifestation privée organisée par des personnes qui sont hostiles à la politique migratoire. En ce qui me concerne, je peux dire que si, en France, par exemple, il me prenait la fantaisie de venir parler à une manifestation organisée par des personnes qui sont favorables à l'invasion migratoire, je doute très fort qu'elles me donnent la parole.

Mais je dis que, s'il doit y avoir une intervention en faveur de notre collègue, que mentionnait M. Lamberts, je suis sûr que la réciprocité prévaudra et qu'à toutes les manifestations autorisées, on entendra des points de vue contradictoires.

1-030-0000

Elżbieta Katarzyna Łukacijewska (PPE). – Panie Przewodniczący! Dokładnie 100 lat temu, 28 listopada 1918 r., Polki uzyskały prawa wyborcze, wcześniej niż Francuzki czy Amerykanki. Więc myślę, że tutaj, wprost z Parlamentu Europejskiego, należą się wielkie brawa dla wszystkich Polek, a zwłaszcza dla tych, które cały czas walczą o demokrację, o wolność, równość i starają się o tyle dobrych rzeczy dla Polski i Polaków. Ślijmy im pozdrowienia i gratulacje.

1-031-0000

Presidente. – È un impegno comune di tutto questo Parlamento battersi per la parità di genere. Io ho cercato di dimostrarlo anche domenica scorsa, in occasione della Giornata contro la violenza di nei confronti delle donne.

16. Ordine dei lavori

1-033-0000

Presidente. – Il progetto definitivo di ordine del giorno, fissato dalla Conferenza dei presidenti, ai sensi dell'articolo 149 del regolamento, nella riunione del 15 novembre 2018, è stato distribuito. Sono state presentate le seguenti proposte di modifica:

Mercoledì

Dopo la discussione sul futuro dell'Europa, l'ordine dei primi due punti è così modificato: inizieremo alle 17.30 con la dichiarazione della Commissione sulla strategia a lungo termine dell'UE per la riduzione delle emissioni di gas a effetto serra conformemente all'accordo di Parigi, seguita dalla dichiarazione della Commissione sul pacchetto sul mercato unico.

La dichiarazione sulla relazione dell'onorevole Khan relativa alla difesa della libertà accademica nell'azione esterna dell'Unione è aggiunta come ultimo punto prima degli interventi di un minuto. Di conseguenza, la seduta si protrarrà fino alle 24.

Giovedì

A seguito del mancato accordo al termine del periodo di conciliazione di bilancio, la discussione sulla procedura di bilancio per il 2019 è rinviata. È aggiunta come primo punto all'ordine del giorno una discussione sulle dichiarazioni del Consiglio e della Commissione relative al recesso del Regno Unito dall'Unione europea. Saranno rinviate le votazioni sulle seguenti relazioni, tutte legate alla procedura di bilancio:

– relazione dell'onorevole Viotti, sulla mobilitazione di uno strumento di flessibilità per finanziare misure di bilancio immediate per affrontare le sfide attuali della migrazione, del flusso di rifugiati e delle minacce alla sicurezza;

- relazione dell'onorevole Christoforou, relativa alla mobilitazione del Fondo di solidarietà dell'Unione europea per il versamento degli anticipi a titolo del bilancio generale dell'Unione per il 2019;
- relazione dell'onorevole Mureşan, sul progetto di bilancio rettificativo n. 6/2018: riduzione degli stanziamenti di pagamento e di impegno: le risorse proprie.

Inoltre, i seguenti punti sono aggiunti direttamente alle votazioni:

- relazione dell'onorevole Dalli, sul reimpegno degli importi rimanenti impegnati a sostegno dell'attuazione delle decisioni del Consiglio nn. 2015/1523 e 2015/1601 o della loro assegnazione ad altre azioni nell'ambito dei programmi nazionali, e obiezione a norma dell'articolo 106 sull'autorizzazione per taluni usi del bicromato di sodio.

1-034-0000

Tanja Fajon (S&D). – Mr President, on behalf of the S&D Group, I request the Council and Commission statement on the preparation of the Marrakesh Intergovernmental Conference of 10 and 11 December on the UN Global Compact for Migration to be the second item on Thursday morning. Why now, and why again, after it was on the agenda of the plenary in Strasbourg? We see growing insecurity in Member States and a debate which has become so critical that in Parliament, we should use this last occasion before Marrakesh to stress the importance of global cooperation to tackle global challenges. In Parliament, back in April, we supported the Global Compact for Migration with a big majority and if all over Europe, the UN Compact is being debated, Parliament should use this last opportunity to strengthen its voice.

1-035-0000

Presidente. – C'è qualcuno che vuole intervenire contro la proposta del gruppo S&D?

1-036-0000

Marek Jurek (ECR). – Panie Przewodniczący! Parlament Europejski jest jednym z organów Unii Europejskiej, który działa w ramach traktatów zawartych przez nasze państwa. Kwestia globalnego porozumienia w sprawie migracji jest w bardzo wielu krajach kwestią sporną. Musimy sobie odpowiedzieć na elementarne pytanie: czy tak naprawdę chcemy Europę łączyć czy dzielić. Debata i stanowisko Parlamentu Europejskiego przeciwko polityce wielu krajów Unii będzie działaniem w sposób otwarty Europę dzielącym i dlatego z szacunku do krajów, które nie chcą zawierać tego porozumienia, wnioskuję o nieprzeprowadzenie debaty.

1-037-0000

Presidente. – Pongo in votazione per appello nominale la proposta del gruppo socialista di aggiungere un punto.... Non è un dibattito, è già intervenuto qualcuno a favore della proposta e adesso uno contro.

Il gruppo socialista chiede di aggiungere all'ordine del giorno di giovedì mattina la preparazione della Conferenza intergovernativa di Marrakech del 10 e 11 dicembre 2018.

(Il Parlamento accoglie la richiesta)

1-038-0000

Rosa Estaràs Ferragut (PPE). – Señor presidente, era para solicitarle una aclaración. En el orden del día de mañana estaba el debate sobre la situación de las mujeres con discapacidad, muy oportuno porque el día 3 de diciembre celebramos el Día Internacional de las Personas con Discapacidad y acabamos de celebrar el Día Internacional contra la Violencia de Género. Es para certificar que este debate no se ha quitado y se celebra mañana, porque lo está esperando el sector para hacerlas visibles y oír su voz.

1-039-0000

Presidente. – Si aggiunge il punto in questione ma nulla viene sacrificato. La discussione avrà luogo.

1-040-0000

Claudia Țapardel (S&D). – Domnule președinte, aș fi vrut să vorbesc înainte de începerea ordinii de zi, dar este un subiect foarte important pentru România.

La 1 decembrie, sâmbătă, România sărbătorește Centenarul Marii Uniri, adică o sută de ani de la formarea României Mari. Este un eveniment important pentru România, în care sărbătorim rolul important pe care România îl are în Europa, ca o țară puternică și lider regional.

Regret că v-am întrerupt dezbateră pe ordinea de zi, dar cred că este un eveniment important, pentru o țară importantă a Uniunii Europene.

1-041-0000

Presidente. – Buon compleanno. Prima di invitare a entrare in Aula il Primo ministro danese, onde evitare fraintendimenti vi ricordo che i presidenti dei gruppi devono attenersi al tempo di parola loro assegnato perché più parlano loro meno parleranno i rappresentanti dei gruppi. Il tempo di parola a disposizione dei gruppi è assegnato in base al sistema d'Hondt. Non è il Presidente che decide quando parla questo o quel gruppo. Più non si rispettano i tempi, più si crea confusione. Quindi invito sia i presidenti dei gruppi che i parlamentari durante la procedura catch-the-eye a rispettare i tempi assegnati perché più si parla, meno deputati parlano.

(L'ordine dei lavori è così fissato)¹.

17. Discussione con il Primo ministro danese Lars Lokke Rasmussen sul futuro dell'Europa (discussione)

1-043-0000

Presidente. – L'ordine del giorno reca la discussione con il Primo ministro danese Lars Løkke Rasmussen sul futuro dell'Europa (2018/2734(RSP)).

1-044-0000

Thank you for coming, Prime Minister. It is a pleasure for us to have this debate with you. It is important for us to know the position of your country on the future of the European Union.

The European Parliament wants to be the heart of European democracy. We want to pave the way for a better Europe. We need to change this Europe, but to destroy this Europe would be a big mistake.

We are working hard. As you know, the European Parliament wants more power. We are the only democratic institution. For us it is important to vote on our budget for 2021-2027 before the European elections. For us it is important to achieve an agreement on the Dublin reform. For us it is also important to work on immigration through a strong action plan in Africa. On Brexit, we will vote on a report – we will be ready by January, but this will probably be held in February or March – on the agreement between the United Kingdom and the European Union.

Thank you very much for coming. You have the floor.

1-045-0000

Ricordo che aprirò il sistema per il catch-the-eye da allora sino dopo l'intervento del Primo Ministro Rasmussen, quindi per registrarvi bisogna premere sul pulsante.

1-046-0000

Lars Løkke Rasmussen, Prime Minister of Denmark. – Mr President, let me begin by quoting from the Danish debate on the European Union: 'The European Union has too much power!', 'The

¹ Per le altre modifiche all'ordine dei lavori: vedasi processo verbale

European Union is not for the people!' These are statements – made by Danish citizens – during our citizens' consultations on the future of the EU. I bring up these statements today not because they are shared by me or because they are shared by the majority – far from it, but because these are views that are not uncommon in Denmark or the rest of Europe. I bring up these statements because I care. I care about my country, about Europe, about our Union: a Union born from the ashes of war and division turned into the greatest and most successful peace project in the history of the world.

My grandfather witnessed the First World War from a distance. My mother witnessed the Second World War up close. To her, the golden stars were not only symbols of peace; they were also a reminder of the opposite: fear, destruction, war. She was born on the island of Bornholm and she witnessed the Russian bombardment after Denmark had regained freedom in May 1945, so she witnessed the burning fire when bombs fell from the sky. To people like my mother, the Anthem of Europe was the anthem of peace, but to my daughter and my sons, war in Europe is a long time ago. It's a story, not a memory. To them and to younger generations, bringing peace in the past will not be enough to justify our Union in the future. This puts new pressure on the European Union. How should we respond? We must keep reminding people of what we have achieved together in the past, but we must also listen – listen to what the people of Europe want the EU to be in the future. If we don't, we risk jeopardising European solidarity.

Brexit is a case in point. We must respect the choice of the British people, but we also need to learn from this choice. For forty years, the people of Britain were told how European cooperation was holding them back, but in fact, Brexit has revealed how European cooperation was solving problems that the Brits now have to deal with on their own: securing open borders, frictionless trade, peace and security. In Britain, the Government perhaps forgot to tell people about the results in Europe, forgot to tell people about what we have achieved together, and perhaps, along the way, they forgot to listen to the voices of concern, too – before it was all too late.

Many of you would maybe claim that the Danes, too, are reluctant Europeans. You saw how the Danes rejected the Maastricht Treaty in 1992, rejected the Euro in the year 2000, and, in 2015, rejected the ability to fully participate in cooperation on Justice and Home Affairs, but you would be greatly mistaken to cast the Danes as being in opposition to the European Union. In fact, the share of people supporting the EU is larger in Denmark than in most other European countries and the share of Danes who believe their voice is heard at European level ranks 2nd among all 28 Member States.

How can that be? Part of the reason is that in Denmark, we have a long tradition of discussing the European Union. Not as much as I would like, but politicians from left to right have, in fact, promoted this debate for the last 30 years. This has given everyone, including myself, a much more pragmatic view on our Union. Perhaps this is also why Danes are not swayed by distant dreams of a future that might be. Grand ideas of the 'United States of Europe' fall on deaf ears. We are concerned about finding down-to-earth solutions to present-day problems, to making the EU work better. As a people with a thousand-year long tradition for trading, Danes recognise a good deal when they see it, and the EU is a good deal. The Single Market is a tremendous benefit to our economy which cannot be understated. The EU is also a close-knit political community of nations that share and seek to protect the same fundamental values, a Union of nations that solve their problems through peaceful means. That is a good deal.

Denmark belongs in the European Union, but, at the same time, Danes are proud of their unique model of society. Over the course of this past century, Denmark has developed one of the best welfare states known in history. People pay a large share of their income to ensure that every

citizen, regardless of gender, race or origin, has a fair chance to succeed. For the most part, our model of society is well protected under the EU Treaties and in EU regulations.

In fact, the EU has helped to strengthen our economy: estimates say that real wages in Denmark are 10 percent higher than they would have been had we been outside the EU. The freedom of movement ensures that our businesses have direct access to half a billion consumers and that Danes can work and deliver services all over Europe.

However, in certain key areas, I have a hard time defending and explaining the EU rules. For instance, our high levels of child benefit payments – financed by Danish tax payers – are made available to all workers in Denmark, regardless of whether their children actually live in Denmark or not. This is, from a Danish perspective, not fair, and it is a challenge to the Danish model of society, which is based on a shared sense of solidarity and on our ability to ensure a sustainable balance of rights and responsibilities. The EU must guarantee the freedom to move, but freedom of movement must also be fair and freedom of movement must not be abused.

During this very fall, a number of third-country truck drivers – technically employed in another EU country – were found to be working permanently in Denmark under horrible conditions, apparently under the pretext of the freedom of movement. Stories like this hurt the image of the EU and we need to work together to ensure that they are not repeated and that rules are strongly enforced for the benefit of the people.

In some cases, the solution is for the EU to step down, to interfere less; yet, in other areas, the EU needs to step up. In four existential areas, I hear our citizens calling for more cooperation. Our time will be defined by our ability to solve these issues – together in this room and in the Council.

The first issue is migration. This is a challenge that will not disappear anytime soon, but even if the challenge is still here, we could all do a better job of explaining to citizens that the EU and the Member States have already achieved quite a lot: for instance, a 95% drop in arrivals since the crisis of 2015. However, more needs to be done. We have to break the cynical business model of human traffickers. We must develop European policies which remove the incentive for those with no real need for protection to embark on a dangerous journey towards Europe. Common solutions are necessary, but not all European solutions are equally good. I continue to believe that redistribution of asylum seekers is not the right way to solve the problem, but make no mistake: Denmark is willing to take responsibility and support those frontline Member States in need. We support a more flexible – yet mandatory – mechanism of solidarity and we are ready to put actions behind our words. In 2019, we will significantly enhance our contribution to Frontex. We already rank among the top four when it comes to financing the EU Trust Fund for Africa. We are among only three or four European Member States who actually have managed to allocate 0.7% of GDP to aid, and we are actively exploring further contributions.

Speaking of Africa, I believe it is time for Europe to start rebuilding our partnership with the nations of Africa. Our two continents are bound to each other: what is good for Africa will also be good for Europe. Europe has flourished because of decades of international trade liberalisation by the EU. There is no reason why the same benefits cannot be applied to Africa. That is why I believe we must help Africa in building a true African free trade area which can serve as the bedrock for future African jobs and prosperity. While pushing for further progress on return and readmission, our aim should be to create a full and equal partnership.

The second issue where increased EU action is essential is the fight against climate change. Almost three years ago, Paris, the City of Lights, turned into the shining city on the hill as the world agreed

to save the planet from climate breakdown. Two months earlier, at the UN Assembly in New York, I had the privilege to co-chair the very UN meeting where we adopted the Sustainable Development Goals. These are two historic agreements offering new hope for future generations. Denmark is determined to act in support of both agreements. During the last 17 years, we have tripled our consumption of green electricity. On windy days, all of our electricity is produced by windmills, and we are well on the way to reaching our goal of net zero emissions by 2050. I was happy to learn earlier today that the Commission has adopted the same vision of carbon neutrality for all of Europe. Decades ago, a political decision on renewable energy was taken in Denmark and it has proven to be a good deal for Danish companies. They were forced to innovate and now we all profit: businesses as well as the environment. Recently, my government has launched a new vision. In 17 years – in 2035 – every single new car bought in Denmark must be an electric car or another type of zero-emission car. It is a big ambition that will not be easy to reach, but it is precisely this kind of decision that I believe will foster innovation, and I will push hard to make this a European policy. Make no mistake about it: if we set ambitious goals for the green transition at European level, we will motivate our own industry to be frontrunners – to the benefit of all of us in Europe, and not least to the benefit of our children and grandchildren. Today, the EU has become the global voice of the climate and green transition. We need to live up to that responsibility and I urge everyone in this room to work to that end. Now is not the time to slow down.

The third issue where more EU action is needed is on expanding and modernising and implementing the Single Market. That is, after all, the backbone of our European cooperation. Our internal market needs to be brought up to speed. I can be blunt: the internal market is no longer only about physical goods at physical borders; the modern economy is much more than that. Today, services, and in particular digital services, constitute an increasingly important part of our economy; goods and services are intertwined in global value chains. The Single Market must match this development: it must be digitally competitive, data must flow freely, every corner of the Internal Market must be digitally fit – from production to consumer protection. As legislators, we have to stimulate innovation, not kill it in regulation. The digital transformation of the Internal Market is a huge challenge, but the US and China will not wait for Europe.

Finally, the fourth issue where the EU needs to do more is on free trade. Europe itself is a testament to how trade liberalisation brings both prosperity and peace among free people. It is our duty to safeguard free trade, even when we find ourselves under historic pressure. In the US, the land of dreams, they are now dreaming of less free trade, of fewer international obligations, of barriers to trade and perhaps even of breaking up the international rules-based trading system. We must not allow that to happen and it has become increasingly clear that only Europe will be able to prevent it.

My fellow Europeans, I started my speech by saying that the European Union must be justified by more than the memory of division and war, but that doesn't mean that we should forget about the past. In contrast to my parents, I didn't witness the two world wars; I witnessed the Cold War, but I also witnessed the end of it 28 years ago. On 2 October 1990, my wife and I fastened the seatbelts in our wrecked Volvo and headed for Berlin. We took the ferry to Rostock and we reached the Brandenburger Tor at midnight, just in time to witness the official reunification of Germany. In my old passport, there are two stamps from that trip: one from 2 October saying 'Rostock, DDR', the other from 3 October saying 'Rostock, Bundesrepublik Deutschland'. To me, these stamps prove that even the deepest wounds can be healed and that Europe must always strive to fulfil its potential – together and in peace.

1-047-0000

Valdis Dombrovskis, *Vice-President of the Commission*. – Mr President, honourable Prime Minister Rasmussen, honourable Members, good after midday.

Before moving today's discussion on the future of Europe, let me come back to the point which President Tajani raised at the beginning of this plenary, namely concerning the situation in Ukraine.

Escalating tensions in the Azov Sea over the past days have led to the seizure of Ukrainian vessels and shots being fired at them by Russia, as well as injuries to a number of Ukrainian servicemen. These developments are unacceptable and we expect Russia to immediately release the vessels and the crew and to ensure the medical assistance needed is given to the Ukrainian servicemen. International law obliges the Russian Federation to ensure unhindered and free passage of all vessels through the Kerch Strait. Therefore we expect Russia to restore freedom of passage at the Kerch Strait.

As you know, the EU does not and will not recognise the illegal annexation of the Crimean peninsula by Russia and condemns its aggression towards Ukraine.

High Representative Federica Mogherini has been in touch with several partners since this escalation started, and will continue to engage on this issue with a view to a broader international response. The EU's Political and Security Committee also met earlier this week to discuss the situation and the next steps.

(Applause)

Mr President, now let me move to today's discussion on the future of Europe. Speaking on behalf of President Juncker, who is on his way to Buenos Aires for the G20 meeting, allow me to start by thanking Prime Minister Rasmussen for taking part in today's debate on the future of the Union.

At the start of this year we celebrated 45 years since Denmark joined the European Union. In that time Denmark has given the Union so much, from its effective social model, its growth-friendly business environment and its well-functioning social dialogue to the richness of its culture.

It was Denmark that pioneered a successful model for labour markets, combining flexibility with a high degree of social protection. In a political sphere Danish leadership was also as visible. As a Latvian I well remember that Denmark was among the first countries to recognise Latvia's restoration of independence in 1991; it was a concrete expression of European solidarity.

This support continued and together with other Nordic countries, Denmark provided important political backing for the accession of the Baltic states in 2004.

This leadership role has continued since the crisis. For instance, in the post-crisis period Denmark was quick to implement difficult but effective public spending controls. Crucially this was achieved by still maintaining the second highest level of social protection spending in the EU. This serves as a good example of how prudent fiscal policy is compatible with the delivery of high-quality public services.

More recently, Denmark has been working hard to further improve competitiveness and increase productivity. Ultimately it is productivity gains that will allow for continued improvements in living standards. That too is a lesson for all countries to draw on.

These are good economic times. Europe's economy is now entering its sixth year of uninterrupted growth. Employment has risen to a record level of 239 million people and unemployment has fallen back to pre-crisis levels, helping more than 10 million people out of poverty or social exclusion.

But we cannot become complacent. External risks are there and mounting while at the same time important reforms remain incomplete. The current economic sunshine is an opportunity for us to finish what we have started before the next storm arrives.

Completing reforms is not just a matter of individual countries. Building a stronger, more democratic and more united Union will require us to stay close and build trust with one another. As President Juncker said in his State of the Union address, Europe succeeds when it speaks with one voice.

Now more than ever, global events highlight the importance of this message. The reality is that European nations have neither the size nor the means to shape global affairs on their own and the strength is only going in one direction. By 2060, no single European nation will have more than 1% of the world's population.

This is why European countries, big or small, pool and share their sovereignty to build a stronger form of common sovereignty. As part of the world's largest single market, and a bloc which accounts for a fifth of the global economy, each country is better placed to defend its national interests and to ensure fairness and prosperity for its people.

This pooling of sovereignty begins with a single market, a concept that Denmark has embraced and made the most of since 1973. Last week we presented the communication to highlight the achievements of the single market over the past 25 years, but we also stressed the need to improve and deepen it for our future prosperity.

This is why we have set out our road map for deepening economic and monetary union. A strong economic and monetary union is vital to the stability and prospects of the euro area, but as the Prime Minister has often said, it is equally important for the European Union as a whole.

In that spirit, Denmark has played an active and positive role in the debate on strengthening our economic and monetary union, but now it is time to move from debate to decision in order to strengthen the resilience of the euro area. This means completing the banking union, which Denmark might decide to join soon, and completing the capital markets' union on which the Commission adopted a report today.

Strengthening the single market and economic and monetary union also means strengthening the role the euro plays in the global currency system. Even if Denmark remains outside the currency area, its peg to the euro has given it a solid anchor for low and stable inflation and to reduce uncertainty in trade.

This is true for Denmark, as it is true for many other countries. Countries across the globe rely on the euro as a safe store of value. Around 20% of international reserves of foreign central banks are denominated in euros. Yet there is scope for the further development of the euro's global political role.

Recent political events should serve as a wake-up call in this area. Now it's time for us to take the initiative. The Commission will put out a communication and an accompanying act on this important issue next week.

Last but not least, if we want to be truly ready for the future, we need to invest in it now. We need to plan together with a common purpose. This is why we have focused our proposals for the new multiannual financial framework on areas where we can achieve more together and which are crucial to Denmark's and Europe's future.

Our proposal is balanced. As Denmark and others have called for, we have put forward programmes that are modern, more efficient and more focused on urgent priorities. For instance, there has been almost a three-fold increase in funding for migration and security to make sure that Europe can protect its citizens.

Funding for research and innovation, of which Denmark is one of the highest recipients, will be increased by 50% to reach EUR 100 billion. We have proposed a new digital Europe programme worth EUR 9 billion to support Europe's digital transformation, and we will also ensure that 25% of the budget will support our climate and sustainable development targets.

But, just as we cannot delay or postpone our future, we should not lose time in agreeing on the resources needed to bring that future alive. As President Juncker said, there would be no better message, no greater symbol to Europeans that their Union will invest in the future and take its destiny in its own hands.

To conclude, when we think about the future of Europe, we should perhaps recall an old and wise Danish saying, 'making predictions is hazardous, especially about the future'.

But there are two things I feel confident in predicting. Firstly if we are going to protect our citizens, harness the benefits of a rapidly changing world and create more opportunities for more prosperity, we will have to remain strong and united. And my second prediction is that Denmark will continue to play a positive role for shaping a better, stronger, European future.

1-048-0000

Manfred Weber, *on behalf of the PPE Group*. – Mr President, I would like to welcome the Prime Minister to the European Parliament. Denmark has been a member of the European Union for 45 years – Valdis Dombrovskis was referring to this – so that gives you a lot of knowledge and a lot of experience about the future of Europe and what the experience of the Danish people and Danish society on Europe has been in the last decades.

As you said, it was not always easy with Europe in Denmark and the Maastricht Treaty, but finally there was always a clear 'yes' to membership and to readiness to contribute to positive development. I was surprised when I saw the Eurobarometer data, which said that Denmark is a country where the people say that their voice counts the most in Europe.

So Denmark is in first place and public involvement in the European decision-making process is obviously working very well in Denmark. Congratulations on this because I think that the most important thing for the future of Europe is the bridge between the European decision-making process and the people of Europe. You said it: some call us bureaucrats and some call us elites. People have the feeling that, after the votes in the elections next year, nothing will have changed. Some people will have been removed, but nothing will have changed in the political direction. I think that is the key question.

When we talk about Brexit and the lesson we have to learn from Brexit, it is about getting sovereignty back. People want to have a say. People must know that their voice counts at a European level.

That's why I welcome the ideas in this regard to make it clearer to people what we are doing here. I want to strongly underline that the most important issue for the future of Europe is – and I think all of us here in this plenary agree – the field of foreign affairs and defence.

Russia is giving us a concrete case at the moment where we have to give a proper answer as Europeans together. For us it is clear that the Ukrainians must decide about their way towards the future, whether they want to go in the direction of the European Union or whether they see their future more in the east. It is up to Kiev to decide. It is not for Russia, not for Moscow and not for Brussels, but for Kiev to decide.

I also want to underline that we urgently need a common voice in these fields of external affairs. We understand that unanimous voting is an old concept. We have to come to the majority decision-making process in this field to be stronger and more active.

Finally, on the Russian thing, I want to underline that, when Russia is still provoking Europe and European partners and friends, I think we also have to rethink the investments on Nord Stream 2. I do not think we should be more dependent on Russian gas than we already are now, and it should be a European decision-making process when we talk about Nord Stream 2.

We have a lot of these points on the table. I only want to mention the key issues. When we want to discuss a Europe for the future, we have to defend Europe. That's why the Schengen question, the border protection issue – in my home region between Germany and Austria, but also in the Danish-German border region – is not something which is good for the future. That's why we should invest in Frontex. Let's protect the Bulgarian and the Greek border with Turkey. That would be much more efficient and would also bring the same effect.

Another element is to continue to convince – you had all of the decisions about Europol in your country where people didn't trust cooperation on data exchange – and to strengthen the data exchange for more security and for the fight against organised crime at a European level.

Prime Minister, I thank you for your engagement in this regard to try still to convince the Danish people that it is in all of our interests to have this data exchange and, finally, to strengthen Europe. Yes, the single market is the future. In this period, frankly speaking, we did not do much to strengthen the single market, or only the digital single market but not the rest.

We have to be more engaged in this. You have the full support of the EPP. We have to create prosperity and that's why free and fair trade agreements are the future of this continent. We have to do so. You have the full support of the EPP. Finally, let me switch to German.

Ich möchte nämlich am Schluss einen grundsätzlichen Gedanken anbringen: Die Sorge der Menschen, wie es weitergeht auf dem Kontinent, wird zum einen durch Populisten mit einfachen Antworten bedient, aber wir haben leider auch die Situation, dass einfach Schuldige gesucht werden. Der Antisemitismus auf diesem Kontinent nimmt zu, sowohl in meinem Land, in Deutschland, als auch in Frankreich, in Großbritannien, in vielen Staaten sind die Entwicklungen beunruhigend. Ich habe letzte Woche Auschwitz besucht. Man wird dort an diesem Ort still, es ist kalt dort, die Tötungsmaschine der Nazideutschen hat dort ihr unsägliches Werk vollbracht. Ich spreche das deswegen an, weil es auch der Gründungsimpuls für Europa war. Simone Veil war die

erste Präsidentin dieser Institution und Auschwitz-Überlebende. Sie hat beim vierzigsten Jahrestag der Befreiung von Auschwitz in einer Rede gesagt, dass der Gründungsimpuls für Europa das „Nie wieder!“ war. „Nie wieder Krieg!“, so wie Sie es angesprochen haben. Aber auch nie wieder Rassismus, Antisemitismus, Ausgrenzung, kein Respekt vor den Menschenrechten. Auch das war das Gründungsmoment für die Europäische Union. Warum spreche ich das heute an? Weil ich in den Unterlagen gesehen habe, dass in Dänemark 99 % aller Juden den Holocaust überlebt haben. Dänemark hat gehandelt. In Dänemark sind die Menschen aufgestanden und haben den Juden einen Weg aus dem Land heraus ermöglicht und haben sie gerettet, die Bürgergesellschaft hat sie gerettet, die Werte hochgehalten, die Europa ausmachen. Ich finde das, gerade wenn wir über die Zukunft Europas reden, einen wichtigen Gedanken, dass Menschen, dass wir zu unseren Werten stehen, dass wir sie verteidigen, auch in dunklen Zeiten, und da ist Dänemark ein Vorbild.

1-050-0000

Jeppe Kofod, for S&D-Gruppen. – Hr. formand! Kære statsminister, kære Lars Løkke Rasmussen, velkommen til Europa-Parlamentet. Tillad mig og tale på mit modersmål i dagens anledning. Fredens projekt, migration, klimaforandringer, det at få et velfungerende indre marked, fri og fair handel, alt sammen vigtige ting, som vi kan blive enige om skal styrkes i det samarbejde, vi står i.

Men det er også vigtigt at sige, at når der er utilfredshed blandt borgerne i Europa, skyldes det jo også, at der også er forfejlede politikker. Vi har set en globalisering igennem de sidste årtier, som har bragt mange positive ting, men også negative ting med sig. Vi har mistet kontrollen over områder, hvor borgerne med rette efterspørger, at vi tager kontrollen tilbage på demokratisk vis. Så nogle – liberale og konservative især – har jo hyldet globaliseringens vindere og lukket øjnene for dem, der betaler prisen i form af løntrykkeri og social dumping. Lad mig tage et eksempel: De sidste 20 år er selskabsskatten i EU-landene faldet fra 35 % til 22 %. Udviklingen fortsætter. Der er et skatteræs mod bunden. Apple, Facebook og Google har betalt under 1 procent af deres fortjenester i Europa i skat. Europas statskasser er blevet frastjålet over 400 milliarder kroner i skandalen Cum-Ex, Cum-Cum-skandalen, som vi har set i mange europæiske lande. Danmark alene har mistet over 12 milliarder kroner på de svindlere. De stjal af vores statskasse, banditter i habitter. Skat på digitale giganter, fælles bund under selskabsskatten i Europa, afgift på finansielle transaktioner, åbne regnskaber for multinationale selskabers datterselskaber, en konsolideret selskabsskattebase i EU, en EU-alarmcentral mod skattesvig og hvidvask, økonomisk kriminalitet. Alle disse konkrete løsninger på internationalt skattefusk, kæmper din regering – din regering! – aktivt imod på EU-niveau. Statsministerens egen skatteminister nægtede sågar og mødes med det særlige skattesnydsudvalg her i parlamentet, da vi inviterede ham. Så statsminister, i kampen mod international skattefusk er din regering alt for ofte, desværre ikke – og jeg begræder det – en del af løsningen, men en del af problemet.

Og kære statsminister, EU-samarbejdet handler jo netop om og samarbejde – det er vi enige om – og at finde nogle gode pragmatiske fælles løsninger. Og beslutninger træffes af dem, der er til stede ved bordet, det ved vi allesammen i dette rum. Derfor undrer det mig også, at den danske regering er så lidt aktiv i EU, som den er. Selv på egne helt erklærede mærkesager – og det blev også nævnt her i talen af statsministeren – er regeringen fraværende. Syv dage før valget i 2015 udsendte du, Venstre, Dansk Folkeparti, de Konservative og Liberal Alliance i en fælles erklæring under overskriften, jeg citerer; ”borgerlige partier vil sikre dansk velfærd i EU”. I gik til valg på – og jeg citerer; ”sikre dagpengeregler så EU borgere ikke fremover kan opnå fuld ret til danske dagpenge efter bare få ugers medlemskab af en a-kasse og fuldtidsarbejde i Danmark”. Nu må vi så konstatere, at regeringen ikke kan leve op til det valgløfte, man lovede før sidste valg, at man ikke har gjort de nødvendige anstrengelser i Ministerrådet, og at vi nu har den samme situation her i Parlamentet. Hvorfor skulle der gå hele 1266 dage fra Venstre, Dansk Folkeparti, Liberal Alliance og de Konservative lovede danskerne at begrænse mulighederne for eksport af velfærdsydelse, til de nu tager sagen op i Europa-Parlamentet, som vi hørte i dag. Det forstår jeg ikke.

Det der er vigtigt, hr. statsminister, det er, at vi har et stærkt Europa omkring de værdier, som kendetegner os velfungerende velfærdsstater, velfungerende demokratier og beskyttelse af borgernes rettigheder. Så det er mennesker før markedet. Det er, arbejder før aktiekurs, og det er, også klima før konkurrencehensyn. På den måde kan vi bygge et fremtidigt Europa, der respekterer borgernes bekymringer, og beskytte vores særlige sociale model i Europa. Det skal vi stå sammen om. Vi har brug for en ny kurs, og den ville jeg gerne have hørt noget mere om i dag.

1-051-0000

Anders Primdahl Vistisen, for ECR-Gruppen. – Hr. formand! Velkommen til Europa-Parlamentet på vegne af ECR-Gruppen og Dansk Folkeparti, hr. statsminister. Vi har set meget frem til at høre din vision for fremtidens EU. Jeg kan forstå, at det drejer sig meget om EU som fredens projekt, og man kunne måske på den baggrund foranlediges til at spørge statsministeren, hvilke konflikter Danmark kunne have rodet sig ud i, hvis vi ikke var blevet medlem af EU i 1973. Men i dag er det mere nærliggende for mig at spørge statsministeren om forsvarsforbeholdet, som statsministeren og hans forsvarsminister jo fornyligt har sagt, vi skal afskaffe. Det kan jo undre, at man nu for ikke første, men anden – og heller ikke anden, men tredje gang kræver af danskerne, at de skal forholde sig til forbeholdene ved en folkeafstemning, selv om man hver gang har bekræftet dem. Men det, der mere undrer mig omkring forsvarsforbeholdet, hr. statsminister, det er, hvad Venstres logik er? Venstre vil – som jeg har hørt det – af med forsvarsforbeholdet, for at vi ikke kan deltage i en europæisk hær. Det er jo internt modstridende, og jeg kan forstå, at logikken er, at statsministeren finder, at hvis han bare sidder med ved bordet, så kan han forhindre etablering af en europæisk hær på trods af, at dette Parlament, Kommissionen, Tysklands Angela Merkel og præsident Macron alle er varme fortalere for projektet. Ja, sidstnævnte Macron har endda sagt, at initiativet delvist er rettet mod vores nære ven og allierede USA. Men, hr. statsminister, undskyld, jeg tror desværre, at din selvtillid er lidt rigelig stor på det område. Jeg tror ikke, at du kan vende tidevandet her i Europa, når det kommer til føderaliseringen, og grunden til, at jeg mener det, er netop det, du selv har bragt op i dag med velfærdsydelse.

Det er jo sådan, at din en regering er løbet ind i det ene nederlag efter det andet, når det kommer til at bekæmpe velfærdsturisme, som ellers var en fælles ambition fra vore partier før sidste valg. Du har undladt at indeksere børnepengene, selv om den østrigske regering er gået ned ad den vej. Desværre vil du jo ikke løbe den samme procesrisiko over for EU-Domstolen. Og i forhold til kampen om dagpenge – danske dagpenge – hvor det før valget var en katastrofe, at der kunne gives fuld dagpengeter efter en lille måned, så tegner flertallet sig nu til, at det skal ske efter én dags arbejde i Danmark, og man i øvrigt må tage den her dagpengeter med sig til et andet EU-land i op til seks måneder. Så kære statsminister, jeg respekterer, at du gerne vil sidde med ved bordet, men det ser ikke ud til, at det nytter særlig meget for danske interesser, om du er der eller ej.

Man kunne så foranlediges til at tro, at den stribe af nederlag, som regeringen er løbet ind i dens EU-politiske mærkesager, der blev fremlagt før valget, havde fået statsministeren og hans parti til at reflektere over alle de positive følelser, man generelt har for EU-projektet. Det lader ingenlunde til at være tilfældet. Statsministeren har jo netop haft landsmøde i Venstre, og jeg kan forstå, at mantraet, der kom ud derfra frem mod EU-valget, var, at Venstre er Danmarks mest EU-positive parti, og ret skal være ret, sådan føler jeg egentlig også sagen her fra Europa-Parlamentets side. I sidder jo i den føderalistiske ALDE-Gruppe, I har støttet hr. Verhofstadt som gruppeformand for gruppen, I har støttet ham som Spitzenkandidat i den sidste EU-parlamentsvalgkamp, og I har endda støttet ham til formandsposten her i Europa-Parlamentet. Det var en varm støtteerklæring hr. Verhofstadt fik, forfatteren til bogen om Europas Forenede Stater. Det er godt med kærligheden i ALDE, og støtteerklæringen var, at hr. Verhofstadt havde de klareste visioner for Europa. Og hr. Verhofstadts visioner er klare! Der er tale om en ny EU-forfatning, der indeholder

alt fra en fælles præsident, udenrigsminister, finansminister, direkte skatter, EU-hær, afskaffelse af alle nationale forbehold og tvangsfordeling af migranter.

Og hr. Verhofstadts visioner går endnu videre: Han har også sagt, at den yderste konsekvens af at tænke i national identitet er gaskamrene i Auschwitz, og endelig, at vort fædreland nu er Europa, vor nationalsang nu er glædeshymnen, vort flag er de 12 gule stjerner på den azurblå baggrund. Det må siges at være klare liberale visioner for Europa, hr. statsminister. Og jeg glæder mig til, at du og Danmarks mest EU-glade parti, Venstre, vil anfægte de synspunkter i valgkampen frem mod valget til Europa-Parlamentet i 2019.

1-052-0000

Guy Verhofstadt, *on behalf of the ALDE Group*. – Mr President, I should like to say to Prime Minister Rasmussen, Mr Vistisen tried to tell you what a devil I am and that you are in fact working with the devil at the European level. But let me explain what I think about Europe – it's not necessary to believe what Mr Vistisen is telling you this morning.

In fact I was very pleased that you were talking about your red Volvo. I don't know, was it a 122 or a 140 or a 240? If it is a 140 or a 240 then it could have been made in Ghent, in Belgium, and that says everything about Europe today. The single market is what you are talking about. It's a Swedish car, used by a Danish Prime Minister, built in Belgium to go to the Berlin Wall. And that is in fact why I'm so pleased about the way you talked about the future of the European Union. The future of the European Union is not the centralistic nightmare that Mr Vistisen is telling us it is. I am very much pleased by what you have told us today, namely that also Denmark is of the opinion that the worst thing to do today is to throw away the European Union, and that is exactly what didn't happen in recent years, Mr Vistisen.

It's a pity that Mr Farage is not here, because the first thing Mr Farage told us after Brexit was that the next domino stone to fall would be Denmark. After Brexit we should have seen immediately a Dexit! That is what he was telling us here two years ago, but we have seen exactly the opposite. There was no Dexit, and in today's Eurobarometer the Danish people are in favour of the European Union; they like the European project. They are still critical towards the European project. I don't think that every Danish citizen finds that everything is going well – certainly not Mr Vistisen! But anyway they are saying that they are not so stupid as to leave the European Union. Let's reform the European Union: that is the message of the Danish people as I see it in the Eurobarometer. And I hear this not only in Denmark but in many countries of the European Union when we are talking about the future.

What we have to do now, Prime Minister – and this is in opposition to Mr Vistisen who wants everything as a conservative, so nothing will change for him, otherwise he is not a conservative – what we have to do now is to take the lesson of Brexit seriously. Not say 'oh Brexit, it's only the UK going out and let's just go on the same way'. No, take the lessons from Brexit, because the UK leaving the European Union is not an enormous success, it's a failure of the European Union. So we have to reform the European Union.

I want to mention two things. First, the so-called European army, as Angela Merkel called it. I think that Mr Weber has given all the arguments about why we need a foreign policy, why we need a European army – and Mr Vistisen, it has nothing to do with killing NATO – for me a European army is the European pillar of the North Atlantic Treaty Organisation, and it is absolutely not in opposition to that. But we have to stop the waste of money on defence in Europe: we are spending 40% of what the Americans spend on their army but we are incapable of doing 10% what the American army does. We are spending three times more than the Russians on

military defence in Europe – three times more! But I'm not sure, Prime Minister, that if the Russians come over our borders we will be capable of stopping them without American help.

My second point concerns the single market. We need the single market to complete it. You are totally right. We have a single market for Belgian chocolates. Very good. We have a single market for French champagne. Good also. We have a single market for German cars. Fine. We have a German market for Danish design. I'm not talking about IKEA now, I am talking about real design, especially in Denmark.

But we do not have a single market for the services of the future. We don't have one for telecom, or for digital, or for the capital markets. That can only be realised when we have a single regulator in Europe. At one time we had one standard for mobile, you might remember, the GSM standard, a European standard. We had champions in Europe, Nokia, Eriksson... And now we don't have European standards, and among the 200 biggest high-tech companies there are only eight Europeans. None of the 20 biggest high-tech companies in the world are European. So I want to support you in your endeavour to create this digital single market as quickly as possible and to do it with one regulator.

And finally, on the values, also there Denmark has to play a role, Manfred – we cannot go forward with illiberal tendencies in the European Union, and there also Denmark will play a key role.

1-053-0000

Philippe Lamberts, *on behalf of the Verts/ALE Group*. – Mr President, I would like to welcome the Prime Minister to the European Parliament. When Denmark comes into the conversation, many good things spring to mind: the global champion of renewable energy, a world leader in development aid, a country that has the guts to confront Russia's power plays by saying 'no' to Nord Stream 2 (and for that thank you), and a country where the social partners are strong and which invented flexicurity as a way to give security to workers and flexibility to employers, and not the other way round. Your country also gave us Margrethe Vestager, the most impressive Competition Commissioner for a very long time, a real liberal fighting rent-extraction, even when it gets in the way of sweetheart deals given by governments to multinationals.

Denmark, as a small country like my own, has a lot to offer to the European Union. You had four points. I have only three, but at least we have two in common. Let me start with the ecological and just transition. We share your view that it's vital for Europe to be a world leader in that transition. We need to ensure that all societies operate within the boundaries that our planet has set for them. We also need to do it in a way that is good for everyone and not just for the happy few like we can see in France. It is an environmental imperative, a social necessity, a geopolitical aspiration, but also – and you mentioned this – an economic opportunity not to be missed.

One could expect Denmark to share in that aspiration towards leadership – and listening to you, I tend to believe this – and we praise you for pushing Europe to the most ambitious standards for instance on CO₂ emissions for cars. Thank you for that as well. But your country – and this is a bit surprising – ranks fifth in Europe in terms of carbon footprint by household. If you don't change political course, the non-renewable part of your energy mix is actually expected to increase, and thus your CO₂ emissions would rise and not fall.

On the second point, migration, we believe that the European Union should assume its part of the responsibility in facing the asylum and migration challenge. We agree with you when you say that this is a place where more European action is needed. But, under your party's leadership, Denmark is now joining hands with those who want to make Europe a fortress, slamming its door shut to those in need.

When you speak about tackling the root causes of migration, you are only focusing on the smugglers. Not only is your country reducing its development budget, because you claim – and rightly so – that it is 0.7% of GDP, but it used to be 1% of GDP. But it is now increasingly using this development budget to force beneficiary countries to lock their borders and take back migrants who might have escaped.

Prime Minister, when people forcibly leave their country, it is because they are fleeing wars, persecution, climate change, natural resource exhaustion or their social and economic conditions. If they turn to smugglers, it is for a lack of safe and legal ways to access safe countries such as ours.

Nowadays, the key words of EU asylum and migration policy are pushback and containment. We believe that we should welcome our fair share, while working on the real root causes. Of course Europe cannot solve all the world's problems. But we can do much more to fight climate change, to have a fairer global economic system, and to promote democracy and the rule of law instead of supporting tyrannies, notably by selling them weapons and buying natural resources extracted with little respect for the local communities.

Let me conclude with a point that you didn't tackle: the euro. Denmark is in the unenviable position of actually not being part of the euro, but having its currency pegged to it. We are disappointed that your country is now joining the camp of the naysayers who deny reality by claiming that the euro is safe and viable just by applying the current rules.

On the contrary, we are convinced that no monetary union is viable without strong financial solidarity, both in the private and public sectors. That means a fiscal union where common taxes fund a common budget and, possibly, basic elements of a common social safety net. It also means a full banking union that eliminates the doom loop between states and their banking systems. And of course financial solidarity comes with responsibility enshrined in rules.

But these rules need to be based on sound economic science, which is not always the case – far from it – and protect the general, rather than particular, interests. Indeed, mutual trust is badly affected when these rules are breached. Speaking of which, Mr Prime Minister, such breaches sometimes come from unexpected quarters, like when Danske Bank is exposed as one of the worst money launderers in Europe.

Mr Prime Minister, we share your European ambition. I'm not sure that we agree on everything, but I'm glad to see Denmark engaging. I'm sure that we are going to have lively debates because in this – we could hear this, for instance, from Mr Vistisen – we have strikingly different visions about the future of Europe. But you know what? I am confident that next year, during the European elections, those who are committed to discourse in our continent, to keep it as a beacon of peace, human rights, liberty and freedoms will prevail.

1-054-0000

Dennis de Jong, *on behalf of the GUE/NGL Group*. – Mr President, a big welcome to the Danish Prime Minister. I must confess that I have a bit of a weak spot for Denmark, coming from the Netherlands myself. I am thinking not only of the landscape and the windmills – the old ones but especially also the new ones are a good example – but also the people's character. Danes are pretty stubborn, you can't tell the Danes what to do and in that they are very much like the Dutch. I mean, they have the same sort of character.

I must say that, when you started, Mr Prime Minister, the reactions like 'the EU has too much power' or also 'it is not good for the ordinary citizen' sound like what I am hearing in my country.

At the same time we have the, now famous, 84% of the Danes saying that the EU has brought Denmark advantages. I really am a bit puzzled how you could bring these together. Is the Eurobarometer representative or is your public consultation representative? What is the real opinion in Denmark at the moment?

Now, the other particular aspect of Denmark is all its opt-outs. To go through them one-by-one, you have opted out of EU citizenship. I have asked my Danish colleagues what that means – nobody knew – but perhaps it is relevant in the context of Brexit. It would be nice to know if there is a difference between how the rest of Europe will deal with British citizens after Brexit and how Denmark will deal with them, or is this just not a problem?

Then, on justice and home affairs you have an opt-out. In 2015, the Danes confirmed that they didn't want an opt-in, instead of an opt-out. Again, the question of organised crime doesn't stop at the Danish border. Do you think you will have another referendum shortly on this issue, and what is the general opinion these days on that?

Then on the opt-out on defence. It has been mentioned by others, we had a meeting in Copenhagen, hosted by you, of the Liberal prime ministers in Europe. Apparently, the European army was discussed there because at least the Dutch Minister of the Interior said, 'yes, in the long term we are in favour of a European army'. Is that true? Do you share that opinion or what was the outcome of that meeting, because there's a lot of confusion about it.

You have no euro but are pegged to the euro. I can see that Denmark is not doing so badly at the moment. My question there, again, is there still discussion on the euro? Do you think this is a better solution than being part of the euro yourself and having the euro instead of the Danish crown?

Just one or two minutes on the single market. I think that we can safely say that the single market, as such, brings economic benefits, but the point is always: to whom? And if we look at the general situation, then I think workers, employees, are generally of the opinion that the single market works better for employers, for the factor of capital, than for the factor of labour and work.

I'm just curious how you see this. If you see the new single market programme of the Commission, the word 'employee' doesn't occur anywhere. So no money for the workers, whereas we also see Commission proposals for mobility of companies. But where is the voice of the workers? If your company, where you have worked for many decades, suddenly goes to another Member State, does the worker have to right to say 'no, we don't want that'? Do we give a golden share to the workers for these type of decisions are so important for their daily lives?

Also, this morning we had the transport trade unions at our group and I saw a documentary on 200 Filipinos being exploited in Denmark because of the freedom of movement of services. It was completely legal, this works via subsidiaries in Poland which hired Filipinos who are now being used all over Europe, and especially in Denmark.

How can we counter that, and make these practices illegal? And how can we counter the fact that, for example, Ukrainians are now working in the Polish construction sector, while Poles are working in the construction sector elsewhere in Europe? That's not right. So I call for there to be a single market for workers too, what are your views about that?

1-055-0000

Laura Agea, a nome del gruppo EFDD. – Signor Presidente, onorevoli colleghi, Primo ministro Rasmussen, Commissario Dombrovskis, questo è un'altra delle tante discussioni che facciamo sul

futuro dell'Europa. Noi questo confronto ovviamente lo apprezziamo, lo apprezziamo davvero. Ma dovremmo essere altrettanto sinceri e dovremmo dirci e ammettere che l'Unione europea sta attraversando un momento di estrema difficoltà, una difficoltà che riguarda i cittadini; immagino riguardi in parte anche i suoi cittadini, ministro. Riguarda soprattutto le istituzioni che non godono né di ottima salute, né tantomeno di una buona reputazione e noi dobbiamo chiederci quali sono realmente le cause di questa situazione infelice.

I cittadini sono in grandi difficoltà. Ovviamente, le scelte che quest'Europa ha fatto negli ultimi anni – e soprattutto le scelte delle istituzioni europee – hanno veramente fatto danni irreparabili ai cittadini e al tessuto sociale di quest'Europa. Sono anni di politiche austere e anni di austerità che hanno causato disastri nel tessuto sociale; le politiche economiche e fiscali hanno messo in ginocchio non solo i cittadini ma anche le imprese e le politiche economiche sbagliate portano danni e ingiustizie.

Ogni tanto io seguo le domande che ci poniamo, i colleghi, i professori che si interrogano sul perché c'è tanta disaffezione da parte dei cittadini nei confronti delle istituzioni; ci facciamo delle domande, ci poniamo degli interrogativi, addirittura commissioniamo studi per capire che cosa in quest'Europa non ci piace. In realtà, la verità è sotto i nostri occhi: peccato che noi abbiamo dimenticato di confrontarci e di parlare costantemente con i cittadini.

Noi ci siamo e voi, soprattutto, vi siete rinchiusi in queste gabbie dorate, in questi palazzi dorati e non vi confrontate con la realtà; non parlate con i cittadini, perché i cittadini sarebbero in grado di dirvi quali sono le difficoltà che affrontano, quali sono i problemi e le sofferenze che oggi si trovano a vivere. È come se vi foste rinchiusi in una campana di vetro, nella quale non arrivano le parole dei cittadini che però negli Stati e nella nostra società vivono situazioni di grande difficoltà e noi dovremmo tornare a parlare costantemente con loro.

I cittadini vogliono un cambiamento sostanziale, immediato e radicale e io porto l'esempio del mio paese, dell'Italia. Noi stiamo cercando di cambiare radicalmente quella che è la realtà del nostro paese con delle riforme che siano veramente fatte per i cittadini, perché l'agenda dei governi non deve essere dettata né dall'austerità né dalle regole di bilancio, né dalle imposizioni, né dai trattati. L'agenda dei governi deve essere dettata dalle esigenze, dai bisogni e dalle sofferenze dei cittadini e noi stiamo cercando di realizzare il reddito di cittadinanza.

Credo che in tutti i paesi voi conosciate bene questa misura, una misura che voi avete già tranne l'Italia, che ancora non ce l'ha perché non c'è stato modo di realizzarla. Una misura di dignità che possa permettere ai cittadini di vivere in condizioni dignitose e rientrare nel circuito del lavoro, così come i giovani – e questa è una misura fondamentale. Noi stiamo cercando di riformare le pensioni: l'Europa ci ha imposto veramente la riforma delle pensioni che è stata realizzata dal precedente governo in maniera sostanziale e pedissequa con risultati devastanti per tutti i cittadini e nel tessuto sociale italiano. Abbiamo creato gli "esodati", abbiamo creato veramente una voragine e un disastro sociale.

Oggi stiamo cercando di mettere mano a questa riforma, imposta dall'Europa e realizzata in maniera prona dal precedente governo, che però è stato, tra l'altro, mandato a casa proprio sulla base delle riforme scellerate che ha fatto in questi ultimi anni e stiamo cercando di dare dignità con la riforma delle pensioni. Abbiamo creato un fondo per i truffati delle banche, perché i precedenti governi, con i soldi dei cittadini, salvano le banche private e ci sono cittadini che sono rimasti sul lastrico: hanno visto i propri conti correnti azzerati; oggi noi dobbiamo adoperarci per poter dare sostegno ai cittadini che sono stati truffati. Noi siamo sicuri che questi sono cambiamenti che

verranno accettati perché solo attraverso questi cambiamenti sostanziali l'Europa potrà ripartire e ricostruire le proprie basi.

Noi ci crediamo profondamente nell'Europa e vogliamo restare in Europa, ma a condizioni sostenibili e sostanziali, cambiate per i nostri cittadini. Noi vogliamo un'Unione che sia un'Unione non solo di nome ma anche di fatto: un'Unione che fondi le sue radici sui bisogni e sulle necessità dei cittadini. Noi abbiamo apprezzato, per esempio, il voto di ieri sul no all'inserimento del *fiscal compact* nei trattati: è fondamentale. Questo è un accordo scellerato e il fatto che la commissione per gli affari economici e monetari ha detto un no così intransigente – e siamo assolutamente favorevoli a questo passaggio – è la dimostrazione di come le politiche dell'austerità stanno fallendo e si deve invertire la rotta.

Io credo che sia questo il cambiamento che i cittadini ci stanno chiedendo: lo stanno chiedendo in Italia, lo stanno chiedendo qui in Europa e, sicuramente, lo chiederanno fra pochi mesi con il voto delle europee. Sicuramente un vento di cambiamento, che sta soffiando non solo in Italia ma anche in Europa, porterà cambiamenti sostanziali il prossimo anno e forse, allora, il prossimo anno sarà anche molto più interessante sedersi qui e parlare del futuro dell'Europa, quando ci saranno condizioni diverse, una base diversa, fatta di bisogni reali e di un'agenda politica e veramente di riforme dettate sulla base dei bisogni e delle necessità dei cittadini.

1-056-0000

Nicolas Bay, *au nom du groupe ENF*. – Monsieur le Premier ministre, votre pays a adhéré à la Communauté européenne en 1973, c'est-à-dire en même temps que le Royaume-Uni. À l'instar des Britanniques, les Danois ont su faire valoir leur singularité dès le départ. En effet, votre pays a négocié un certain nombre d'*opt out*, c'est-à-dire des exceptions au droit européen. Quand d'autres dirigeants livraient leur pays pieds et poings liés à la Commission européenne, vos prédécesseurs ont su préserver des pans entiers de votre souveraineté, c'est-à-dire de votre liberté en fonction de vos intérêts.

Ainsi n'avez-vous pas adhéré à l'espace de liberté, de sécurité et de justice, la flatteuse et pompeuse appellation du système d'asile européen. Vous n'avez pas non plus adhéré, et vous êtes le seul État membre dans ce cas, à la PSDC, la politique de sécurité et de défense commune. Vous avez également obtenu une option de retrait lors des négociations sur le traité de Maastricht, qui a transformé la Communauté européenne en Union européenne. Vous n'avez donc pas adhéré à l'Union économique et monétaire et vous utilisez toujours la couronne danoise et non l'euro.

Proche de la Suède, culturellement mais aussi et d'abord géographiquement, vous n'avez pas commis les mêmes erreurs que votre voisin en matière de politique migratoire. En vous reliant à la Suède, le pont construit entre Copenhague et Malmö a sans doute contribué à vous éloigner de votre voisin, du moins de son prétendu modèle d'intégration des communautés immigrées. Malmö, le Molenbeek de Scandinavie, où près de la moitié de la population est d'origine immigrée; Malmö, où la criminalité a explosé, de la petite délinquance au grand banditisme; Malmö, qui subit régulièrement des émeutes du type de celles que la France a connues en 2005. Votre gouvernement a su prendre des mesures drastiques pour éviter une pareille désintégration de la société danoise.

Vous avez vous-même dénoncé l'émergence de zones de non-droit et, je cite, «de sociétés parallèles musulmanes». En septembre, vous avez encore plaidé pour le renforcement des frontières extérieures, alors que vous avez déjà rétabli le contrôle effectif de frontières intérieures. En octobre, votre ministre de l'immigration et de l'intégration a annoncé que le Danemark n'accepterait plus aucun réfugié jusqu'à nouvel ordre.

Cependant, après ce portrait flatteur, permettez-moi de vous dire qu'il y a tout de même quelque chose de pourri au royaume du Danemark. Loin de moi, bien sûr, l'idée d'offenser votre pays, dont je viens de faire un large éloge. Mais par cette phrase de Shakespeare, devenue proverbiale dans la langue de Molière, je voudrais pointer une forme de schizophrénie. Malgré toutes ces mesures qui vous placent, à bien des égards, presque à la droite de Viktor Orbán, vous appartenez toujours au groupe libéral fédéraliste de M. Verhofstadt et vous ne tarissez pas d'éloges pour M^{me} Merkel et pour M. Macron.

M. Macron est un ultralibéral et, en même temps, pour reprendre sa formule fétiche, un adepte du racket fiscal. Oui, il accable les Français de nouvelles taxes, alors même que la France est déjà l'un des pays les plus taxés – ou surtaxés – d'Europe. C'est ce même M. Macron qui dépense des milliards pour une politique migratoire qui est d'ailleurs diamétralement opposée à la vôtre.

Alors que votre pays ne fait pas partie de la PSDC, vous avez étonnamment soutenu l'idée macronienne d'une armée européenne. Seriez-vous prêt, Monsieur le Premier ministre, à placer des soldats danois sous les ordres directs de M. Juncker ou de celui qui lui succédera? Personnellement, je ne veux pas que des soldats français aillent verser leur sang sur ordre des bureaucrates non élus et sans légitimité de la Commission européenne.

Enfin, pas plus tard qu'hier, au Parlement danois, vous avez déclaré que le Danemark bénéficierait du pacte mondial des Nations unies pour les migrations. Pourtant, ce pacte est immigrationniste, il est rejeté par les États-Unis, l'Australie, Israël, l'Autriche, la Hongrie, la Pologne, la Bulgarie, la Suisse, la Croatie et sans doute beaucoup d'autres encore.

Aujourd'hui, l'avenir de l'Europe, c'est l'objet de notre débat, se joue à Budapest, à Rome et à Varsovie. Le tandem entre M. Macron et M^{me} Merkel, qui représente le fédéralisme et l'immigrationnisme, appartient déjà bel et bien au passé.

1-057-0000

Λάμπρος Φουντούλης (ΝΙ). – Κύριε Πρόεδρε, κύριε Πρωθυπουργέ, η συζήτησή μας σήμερα αφορά το μέλλον της Ευρώπης. Δυστυχώς όμως, αδυνατώ να συμμεριστώ την αισιοδοξία που διακατέχει πολλούς από τους παρόντες. Η Ευρωπαϊκή Ένωση, αυτήν τη στιγμή, θεωρεί ότι έχει ξεπεράσει την οικονομική κρίση και περιμένει να έρθουν οι ημέρες της ανάπτυξης. Ή έτσι θέλει να παρουσιάζει την κατάσταση. Στην πραγματικότητα όμως, η Ένωση βρίσκεται στην αρχή μιας πολύ μεγαλύτερης κρίσης, και αυτό συμβαίνει διότι οι ηγεμονικές ελίτ της Ένωσης αδυνατούν -ή δεν θέλουν- να καταλάβουν την τεράστια απόσταση που χωρίζει τις δικές τους προτεραιότητες από εκείνες των ευρωπαϊκών λαών. Η νέα αυτή κρίση θα είναι κρίση πολιτική, η οποία όμως ευελπιστώ ότι θα φέρει στην εξουσία δυνάμεις που θα εκφράζουν τη θέληση των λαών και όχι των πολυεθνικών εταιρειών.

Τέλος, θα ήθελα να αναφερθώ και στο σημαντικό ζήτημα της λαθρομετανάστευσης. Η χώρα σας ακολουθεί μία πολιτική που κινείται στη σωστή κατεύθυνση και έχει καταφέρει σε μεγάλο βαθμό να σταματήσει τις επιπλέον ροές. Δυστυχώς, δεν νομίζω ότι αυτό από μόνο του αρκεί. Επιπλέον, πολλές άλλες κυβερνήσεις χωρών, συμπεριλαμβανομένης και της ελληνικής, αρνούνται να υιοθετήσουν παρόμοιες πολιτικές παρά το γεγονός ότι οι χώρες αυτές είναι σημεία εισόδου στην Ένωση. Εάν δεν αντιμετωπιστούν τα φλέγοντα προβλήματα της καθημερινότητας των πολιτών από εθνικά σκεπτόμενες κυβερνήσεις, προβλέπω δυστυχώς πολύ ασταθείς ημέρες για την Ένωση.

1-058-0000

Lars Løkke Rasmussen, Prime Minister of Denmark. – Mr President, I would like to thank everyone for sharing their views with me. It is not easy to respond because you brought many issues to the table.

First of all, I would like to thank the Vice-President of the Commission for your very kind comments about the Danish society model, flexicurity, etc. I think that is in response to some remarks given by good colleagues here, that is one of the reasons – because you asked me, which is right, the Eurobarometer or the people's consultations – I think that's probably the secret why the Danes are still so open-minded towards this idea of European cooperation and the single market, it is due to our social model. The fact that we, perhaps better than many other countries, have managed to redistribute what we have achieved from being a part of this more and more global economy.

I think that should be a lesson learned, but not necessarily something we should then reinvent in a European context because countries are different. But it should be something that should inspire each of the 28 – unfortunately soon 27 – member countries to look inwards. How can we secure sound fiscal policy? How can we introduce flexicurity? How can we strike a balance between high taxation and at the same time citizens' freedom to choose within services provided to the public, etc.

I think that's exactly why both figures are right. The Danes are reluctant in certain aspects and are pragmatic and not as warm-blooded as perhaps you will find in other countries, and that is why political leaders will not make speeches like my good friend Guy, but at the same time, they share these values. That is, I think, an important point to make.

Now, if you will excuse me, I will turn to my mother tongue in order to respond to some of the Danes present here today.

Og det står lidt i kontrast, hr. Vistisen og hr. Kofoed, når man ligesom portrætterer det billede af den danske regering. Der blev sagt, at der skulle gå 1200-et-eller-andet dage, før jeg bragte temaerne omkring mere fairness i den frie bevægelighed op i Europa Parlamentet, og det er jo rigtigt i den forstand, at det er første gang, jeg optræder i Europa Parlamentet. Jeg har jo heller ikke været inviteret før, jeg er ikke medlem, så jeg har jo ikke rigtig haft mulighed for at komme lige her før. Men det er jo ikke et rigtigt billede at tegne, at der ikke har været arbejdet med den sag, og hele denne sag handler jo altså om, hvordan vi – inden for visionen om den frie bevægelighed – sikrer, at befolkningen føler rimelighed, og at vi undgår løntrykkeri, social dumping, noget af det vi har set på den dansk-tyske grænse. Det har der været arbejdet med, og det er jo rigtigt, hr. Vistisen, at vi jo ikke har haft den store succes. Jeg var selv glad ved, at vi op til den britiske folkeafstemning jo rent faktisk begyndte at nå nogle resultater. For under indtryk af en britisk folkeafstemning om brexit eller remain lykkedes det jo faktisk i Rådet at lave et kompromis, som betød – under den forudsætning, at briterne stemte remain – at nogle af de danske prioriteter, f. eks omkring indekseringen af børnechecken, kunne sættes igennem. Det er jo sådan set bare en ekstra grund til at beklage udkommet af den britiske folkeafstemning, og jeg bliver nødt til at sige, også i dette rum, at vi kommer til at genbesøge nogle af disse spørgsmål. Og det bør vi jo gøre allerede i forbindelse med forordning 883, hvor jeg har noteret mig, at der nu er opbakning her i Parlamentet til, at der kommer en generaldebat i Parlamentet om den forordning. For vi skal finde de balancer, der gør, at vores befolkninger stadigvæk omfavner den frie bevægelighed. Og det gør de ikke, hvis man optjener retten til dagpenge allerede efter én dag. Det gør de ikke, hvis man kan hjemsende en børnecheck, der modsvarer mere end en månedsløn, til børn, der bor i et andet land, hvor leveomkostningerne er langt lavere end i f.eks Danmark. Og her er der en kæmpe opgave for Parlamentet, som jeg håber, man vil gribe ud efter. Jeg har jo lyttet nok til debatten allerede nu til at kunne konstatere, at der jo ikke i Parlamentet er konsensus om alting, men der ligger en vigtig opgave for Parlamentet her.

Så kunne jeg godt have lyst til at sige en bemærkning omkring de spørgsmål og kommentarer, der har været rejst fra forskellige sider, om en europæisk hær, den nye sikkerhedspolitisk situation, etc.

We are living in a different security situation, that goes without saying: a more aggressive Putin to the East – and I totally share what the Vice-President said about Russia's aggression in Ukraine – but it's not only about Russia, it's also about what we experience in the Middle East, in Turkey, a US President who is not as engaged in world policy as one perhaps could wish, and we have to respond to this. But we have to respond to this in a clever way, and introducing this vision of a European army as something very operational, something that is kind of in competition with NATO, that's not, at least in my opinion, the right way to respond.

We need to uphold this strong transatlantic defence cooperation. With the UK leaving the European Union, I think the rest of us together will represent less than 20% of NATO's total capacity. So the idea that we should, among ourselves, be able to do something which can compete with the NATO alliance, that's not a good idea, but that's not what is proposed either. So I think we should be careful in the way we use words.

My perspective is that it is absolutely necessary that Europe steps up – it's about spending but it's also about closer cooperation. But by doing so we have to be sure that we do not duplicate capacity that already exists in the NATO framework. So we should stick to the idea of added value, and that's not a European army in the sense that I think people will interpret the idea if you just say 'a European army'. It's all about closer cooperation in the defence industry, it's about closer cooperation when we, for instance, go in and stabilise things after wars in neighbouring countries.

And the reason why I have called for a debate in Denmark about this defence opt-out is exactly this. We are known as a country who always participates and steps up. This is the case for aid: we haven't reduced our aid actually, due to the growth in our economy our aid budget is increasing year on year. We are always ready to contribute soldiers to the NATO framework, and if we develop in the future a different division of labour between NATO and Europe, then it will be from my perspective a disaster if Danish soldiers wearing a NATO cap can do the tough missions but then if we turn the tough missions into soft missions and stabilise nations – talking about nation-building within the European framework – then Danish soldiers have to return home.

That's exactly why I raised this debate about a possible referendum sometime in the future about this defence opt-out. Not joining a European army under the leadership of Juncker, as was said, but a stronger cooperation between national defence capacities within the European Union.

Given the time, I think I should bring this to a conclusion and just respond perhaps to one very concrete question about the Nord Stream, which is in my eyes, or in my opinion, linked to this discussion about the new security situation in Europe. And that's why I have been asking again and again and again – and I really hope that the Parliament will give a big push towards this – for us to discuss this infrastructure project at a European level, because it is definitely a project which comes with some geopolitical implications as well. And honestly speaking, I must say that I think it shouldn't be up to Denmark, squeezed in between countries who have already given a clear 'yes' to this line, to take the final decision. So what we need is a European answer to that challenge.

I think I will limit myself to these short comments and I'm looking forward to this catch-the-eye element.

(Applause)

1-061-0000

Procedura "catch the eye"

1-062-0000

Bendt Bendtsen (PPE). – Hr. Formand! Først vil jeg sige tak til statsministeren for en flot tale, tak for det udsyn, der ligger specielt på klima, bæredygtighed, energi. At så statsministeren sådan blev overfaldet lidt indenrigspolitisk, det må vi jo så tage, som det kommer. Nu er der jo tradition for, her i salen, at når vi har statsministre fra Danmark, så bliver de overfaldet af Dansk Folkeparti. Nå, men til det jeg vil sige omkring klima, bæredygtighed og lignende: Jeg er glad for de momenter, der kom i talen i dag. Der er et sted, hvor jeg gerne vil høre, om statsministeren er enig. Det drejer sig om Europas bygningsmasse. Vi bruger 40 % af vores energi i vores huse, 75 % af Europas bygninger er energiineffektive, derfor er der behov for, at vi får gjort noget ved den eksisterende bygningsmasse for at nå klimamålene. Derfor ligger der nu nogle langsigtede planer om, at EU medlemslande får øget renoveringsraten af vores bygninger i Europa, så vi også kan nå klimamålene, samtidig med at det jo faktisk er den billigste måde, man overhovedet kan skære CO² af. Og endnu engang velkommen!

1-063-0000

Maria Grapini (S&D). – Domnule președinte, domnule prim-ministru - aștept să vă puneți căștile, o să vorbesc în limba mea, măcar pentru fapitul că sărbătorim o sută de ani.

Domnule prim-ministru, am încercat să fiu prezentă la toate prezentările făcute de toți șefii de stat și de guverne, pentru că vreau să înțeleg ce viziune și ce viitor al Europei dorește Consiliul, doresc șefii de stat și de guverne. Trebuie să recunosc că din discursul dumneavoastră eu am înțeles că subliniați foarte clar că Danemarca are drumul ei, că vreți mai departe cele opt excepții, că, în același timp, doriți mobilitatea forței de muncă, dar vorbiți de *dumping* social. Singura țară care poate să facă *dumping* este Danemarca, dacă primiți un lucrător din țara mea și nu îl plătiți la salariul din Danemarca. De asemenea, tot contradictoriu, spuneți de fapitul că doriți să ascultăm cetățenii și să fie solidaritate, dar vorbiți de alocațiile pentru copii, care ar trebui scăzute pentru că sunt cetățeni din alte țări care vin la dumneavoastră.

Sincer, eu vreau vă întreb foarte concret, nu ne-ați spus nimic: care este viziunea dumneavoastră legată de noul cadru financiar multianual? Nu ne-ați spus nimic: care este viziunea dumneavoastră referitoare la pachetul de mobilitate, lucruri foarte importante care ne preocupă pe noi. Nu ne-ați spus nimic: cum vedeți dumneavoastră viitorul Europei, dacă să punem condiționalitatea de stat de drept? Sigur, dumneavoastră nu aveți teamă de o rezoluție: țara mea a avut o rezoluție. Nedreaptă, de fapt.

1-064-0000

Hans-Olaf Henkel (ECR). – Mr President, I would like to say to the Prime Minister: you mentioned Brexit and I would like to take you up on the subject.

Today the UK's economic institutions have projected the impact of Brexit on the British economy, and it is a disaster. Less known is the fact that there will also be a significant impact on the European economy.

You mentioned that there were numerous referenda in Denmark, that there were special deals for Denmark, there were opt-outs for Denmark. On 8 December the British Parliament will decide on the new deal. It is possible that the new deal will be rejected. Mr Prime Minister, this would be your hour because you could lean on Brussels and make sure that Brussels offers Britain a new deal. A new deal, possibly, on freedom of movement, which will enable the remainers to get some more dynamic support in Britain, and it will offer the Brexiteers a face-saving way out. So it increases the chances of a second referendum.

I think one thing we can learn from Denmark: a democracy which ceases to learn, ceases to be a democracy.

1-065-0000

Morten Helveg Petersen (ALDE). – Hr. Formand! Tak til statsministeren og velkommen her til Europa-Parlamentet. Jeg er – ikke overraskende – helt enig i, at EU selvfølgelig er vejen frem for Danmark, at EU er utrolig vigtig for Danmarks fremtid. Men en offensiv dansk EU-politik kræver, at EU prioriteres i Danmark. Det gør det ikke tilstrækkeligt i øjeblikket efter min bedste mening. Lad mig nævne et par eksempler: Danske ministre er blandt de mindst flittige, når det gælder om at møde op i EU's Ministerråd, viser en undersøgelse for tænketanken EUROPA. Danmark har ingen stærke partnere i EU, viser en undersøgelse for European Council on Foreign Relations. De manglende venner betyder, at Danmark kæmper under sin vægtklasse på EU-scenen, hedder det i undersøgelsen. Og Danmark kunne være en grøn stormagt, der trak EU i en endnu grønnere retning, hvis vi ville. Derfor er min opfordring til statsministeren her i dag, at Danmark søger de reelle fælles løsninger på de reelle problemer. Min opfordring til statsministeren vil være, at Danmark afstår fra de bilaterale initiativer med Østrig på flygtningeområdet og søger de reelle fælles løsninger på de fælles problemer, vi står overfor, i fællesskab.

1-066-0000

Margrete Auken (Verts/ALE). – Hr. Formand! Velkommen her, kære statsminister, og tak for talen – hvis det holdt alt sammen, så tror jeg, at jeg kunne være enig i det meste af det. Jeg har et enkelt punkt, der ligger mig voldsomt på sinde. En meget stærk værdi i det europæiske fællesskab er humanismen. Og det er dejligt at høre, at du står fast på, at Danmark også skal underskrive traktaten i Marrakesh, at du ikke lader dig presse. Men jeg må sige, at jeg er meget foruroliget over at høre, at du måske ikke modstår presset for at introducere et nyt princip i vores asylpolitik, nemlig et skrub af-princip. I stedet for at fortælle mennesker, at når de er kommet her og har været her en tid, og børnene er her og så videre, så kan de få et liv. Børn kan få et liv. Så er der jo nu en tendens, desværre, i Danmark til og sige, at dem, der er her på en eller anden form for flygtningestatus, de skal vende hjem. Jeg håber ikke, det bliver en dansk position, og jeg håber i særdeleshed ikke, det bliver en europæisk position, og at du vil gå videre med den, men det er meget skræmmende, hvis vi kommer til og samle os først og fremmest om at bygge store mure, grænsekontrol og så sige skrub af til de mennesker, der kommer her, og som jo også har – ja undskyld mig – ret til et liv.

1-067-0000

Rina Ronja Kari (GUE/NGL). – Hr. Formand! Og velkommen til Europa-Parlamentet, hr. statsminister. Jeg har lyttet med særlig stor interesse til dine ord om at lytte til borgerne. For der er i sandhed brug for at lytte til borgerne og tage dem med på råd og sørge for, det bliver dem, der er i fokus. Derfor undrer det mig også, at du så kategorisk afviser folkeafstemninger. Det er jo netop her, vi kan få afklaret, hvad borgernes holdning er. Nu kan det godt være, at du har en eller anden form for særlig evne, sådan at du kan forudse, hvad borgerne mener, men helt ærligt, den eneste måde vi kan sikre os, er jo faktisk ved en folkeafstemning. Derfor bekymrer det mig, når du snakker om, at Danmark skal med i en bankunion, men fuldstændig afviser at spørge borgerne om, hvad de mener om bankunionen. Eller som når du i dag taler om, at vi skal have flere handelsaftaler, på trods af at de møder stor modstand, netop fordi de begrænser vores demokrati, og fordi de udsætter keredele af vores velfærd, for at blive ødelagt. Derfor, hr. statsminister: Gør nu alvor af dine egne ord, spørg nu borgerne, hvad deres egen holdning er, hold en folkeafstemning. Tak!

1-068-0000

David Coburn (EFDD). – Mr President, George Orwell said if you want a picture of the future, imagine a boot stamping on a human face forever. The EU has tried to stamp the jackboot down on Britain with this recent so-called Brexit deal for democratically daring to leave. An attempted enslavement of the very nation that fought the Nazis and liberated Europe.

The EU is supposed to be about government by consent, not force. I asked the Parliament when we voted on an arrangement for Lake Lugano's Italian-Swiss border why the same arrangement could not be made for Northern Ireland. No answer. Well it is because the EU are using the tragedy of Ulster as a bargaining chip. Well that's not government by consent with friends.

In reality, I tried in vain to explain to Mr Barnier that the UK constitution explicitly forbids one Parliament binding another. The deal must be fair to stick. Well, he obviously hasn't got that message through – obviously I got it wrong.

When the Brexit deal fails in the UK Parliament and we have a World Trade Organisation deal, a totally liberated UK economy will take on a command economy – Europe – and we will win. We will see that happen. A potentially despotic EU army controlled by unelected bureaucrats, more EU isolationism and regulation. Crazy immigration, a false currency, mass unemployment as you isolate your greatest trading partner, London, the financial centre of the world with which you can never compete.

The future of Europe is one of a division like the Berlin Wall. On one side we will have those countries outside the EU, particularly in the Anglosphere and its free enterprise, which will prosper and grow as it always has.

On the other side will be a command economy – the EU. Once again plunged into poverty, darkness and held back from real progress like the Soviet Union. It is the EU folly, along with the absence of a proper relationship which will cause Europe to collapse.

We should try to part amicably as friends. Orwell's picture of the future is probably accurate. The EU, however, should not think too soon, that theirs is the boot rather than the face.

1-069-0000

Presidente. – Ognuno è libero in quest'Aula di dire ciò che pensa. Io spero che le sue profezie non si avverino perché altrimenti sprofonderemmo tutti. Ma non credo che sprofonderemo e, anzi, spero che tutti quanti noi potremo vivere a lungo.

1-070-0000

Γεώργιος Επιτήδειος (NI). – Κύριε Πρόεδρε, κύριε Πρωθυπουργέ, καλώς ήρθατε. Ο τρόπος με τον οποίον αντιμετωπίζουμε τα σημερινά προβλήματα προδικάζει και τις μελλοντικές εξελίξεις. Με βάση αυτήν την πραγματικότητα, θα σας θέσω δύο ερωτήματα. Πρώτον, ποια είναι η θέση σας σχετικά με την αντιμετώπιση του σοβαρού προβλήματος της λαθρομετανάστευσης; Αναφέρατε προηγουμένως ότι η αναδιανομή όσων ζητούν πολιτικό άσυλο δεν είναι η λύση. Είστε δηλαδή υπέρ της άποψης ότι οι παράνομοι μετανάστες πρέπει να παραμένουν στις χώρες εισόδου; Με άλλα λόγια, η Ιταλία και -κυρίως- η πατρίδα μου, η Ελλάδα, θα πρέπει να σηκώσουν το βάρος των εσφαλμένων και τραγικών λαθών της Ευρωπαϊκής Ένωσης, που διόγκωσε το πρόβλημα αυτό, και να γίνουν μόνιμοι καταυλισμοί δυστυχισμένων και εξαθλιωμένων ανθρώπων;

Το δεύτερο ερώτημα αφορά την αρχή της ομοφωνίας. Θεωρείτε ότι η κατάργηση της αρχής αυτής και -ουσιαστικά- η απαξίωση της ισχύος της ψήφου των μικρών χωρών, όπως είναι και η δική σας, που θα δημιουργήσει την Ευρώπη των δύο και τριών ταχυτήτων, είναι το ιδανικό πρότυπο και μέσο για τη δημιουργία της Ευρώπης του μέλλοντος έτσι όπως την οραματίζονται όσοι αγαπούν την πατρίδα και το έθνος τους;

1-071-0000

Christel Schaldemose (S&D). – Hr. Formand! Kære statsminister, kære Lars, velkommen her til Europa Parlamentet. Selv om vi ikke er enige om alt i politik, så synes jeg det er dejligt og se sit lands statsminister her. Jeg er også rigtig glad for, at du lagde vægt på det her med den frie

bevægelighed og den fair bevægelighed, da du fortalte om situationen med chaufførerne nede i Padborg. Men jeg kunne godt tænke mig at få dig til at prøve og folde det lidt mere ud – hvad er det, du forestiller dig, vi rent faktisk kan gøre for at løse det her? Vi taler om EU i fremtiden: Hvad kan vi gøre på det sociale område? Er du tilhænger for eksempel af en social protokol, som kan ligestille arbejdstagerrettigheder og fri bevægelighed? Det er jo en måde og gøre det på, selv om det ikke ligger lige for. Det er en hamrende vigtig sag for os. Jeg tror, det er ret afgørende for, at vi får løst de forhold, for at få befolkningens opbakning til, at vi fortsat skal være stærkt engageret i vores europæiske samarbejde, så jeg er meget spændt på at høre din holdning til det.

1-072-0000

Bogdan Andrzej Zdrojewski (PPE). – Panie Premierze! Panie Przewodniczący! Chcę postawić, ze względu na ograniczony czas wypowiedzi, trzy krótkie tezy. Mam nadzieję, że pan Premier się do nich odniesie.

Po pierwsze, odczuwam, że najwięksi przeciwnicy Unii Europejskiej są jednak wśród euroentuzjastów. Ci którzy nie widzą wad, ci którzy nie widzą mankamentów, ci którzy nie widzą przeszkód, koniec końców muszą doprowadzić do kolizji. Przeciwników po skrajnej lewej, czy skrajnej prawej stronie doskonale rozpoznajemy, wiemy czego chcą i potrafimy się z nimi uporać.

Druga kwestia to widzenie wad. Dobra inwentaryzacja to jedynie szansa na sukces. Natomiast brakuje nam narzędzi do tego, aby z tego kryzysu, krótko mówiąc, wyjść. I trzecia, ostatnia teza. Dziś nie stoimy w miejscu, jak twierdzą niektórzy teoretycy. My albo maszerujemy, albo wręcz biegniemy, ale niestety w miejscu. I to jest gorsze od stania, bo stojąc, nie marnujemy energii. My niestety marnujemy energię, nie poprawiając swojej kondycji.

1-073-0000

Ramón Jáuregui Atondo (S&D). – Señor primer ministro, por este salón de plenos han pasado ya veinte primeros ministros de la Unión Europea. Todos han dicho cosas muy importantes sobre el futuro de Europa, pero si hubiera que establecer un común denominador, un valor común de lo que han dicho es que afrontamos retos tan grandes que solo podemos afrontarlos juntos.

Si hubiera una frase que pudiera resumirlo bien, sería algo así como «debemos hacer mejor lo que solo podemos hacer juntos». Bajo esta idea, el Parlamento Europeo viene expresando la reclamación de que se superen dos problemas fundamentales para el futuro de Europa.

El primero es que haya que hacer más aportaciones al marco financiero de los próximos siete años. ¿Está su país dispuesto a hacer más aportaciones económicas para una Europa que tiene que afrontar todos estos retos de los que le hablaba?

Y, segundo problema: la unanimidad. ¿Está su país dispuesto y a favor de superar la unanimidad para establecer mayorías absolutas que permitan ser más ágiles, más flexibles, más eficaces a la hora de afrontar los retos del futuro de la Unión?

1-074-0000

Morten Løkkegaard (ALDE). – Hr. Formand! Velkommen hr. statsminister, velkommen Lars. Også fra Venstres side. Og tak til alle mine udemærkede danske kolleger for at have startet valgkampen her i rummet, jeg synes, det er rart at blive mindet om, at vi nu er i gang.

Jeg vil egentlig pege på, at det, der optager mig en hel del – jeg skal ikke gentage nogle af de mange spørgsmål og kommentarer og emner, der er blevet bragt op, som jo også er valgkampsemner – men bare pege på, at meget af en debat, der foregår, som bekymrer lidt, er en debat, som jo – og det kan man jo også høre illustreret her – er en debat om mere eller mindre. Der er også et par af mine kolleger, der ligesom har fået gjort det til et spørgsmål om mere eller mindre EU, hvilket jo er en forfejlet – helt igennem forfejlet præmis for en samtale, så jeg kunne godt tænke mig, at du, hr.

statsminister, måske ville sige et par ord om, at det jo måske i virkeligheden handler om et bedre EU, og ikke mere eller mindre EU. Hvis du kunne elaborere lidt på det, for det synes jeg, debatten fortjener, inden alle går i det sædvanlige selvsving med at gøre det til et spørgsmål om mere eller mindre EU.

Og så en enkelt bemærkning til hele den diskussion, der i øjeblikket kører om forordning 883: Jeg synes, det er helt rigtigt at understrege, at vi har en særlig forpligtelse her i huset, fordi vi jo netop er i en situation i Rådet, hvor det ikke nødvendigvis er særlig hjælpsomt, det der foregår. Så hvis du måske kunne uddybe den situation, der er, for at kunne gøre det klart, også for andre medlemmer i huset her, at vi har en særlig forpligtelse til at sørge for, at den debat ikke skrider fuldstændig af sporet.

1-075-0000

Zigmantas Balčytis (S&D). – Premjere, labai dėkingas už labai nuosekliai išsakytą savo poziciją dėl Danijos šalies, mes Jums tikrai pavydim ir pavydim tam tikrų dalykų – kad dar šiandieną kai kuriuose klausimuose esat nepriklausomi.

Tačiau pirmiausia aš norėčiau Jūsų paklausti. Aš esu iš Lietuvos, iš vienos Baltijos šalies. Mes, kaip Baltijos šalys, Europos Sąjungoje esame gana ne tiktai aktyvūs ir ištikimi tiems bendriems principams, už ką esam pasirašę.

Pirmiausia, ką darytumėt mūsų vietoje, kada mūsų pragyvenimo lygis – ir Jūs žinote dėl ko, todėl, kad mes turėjome kitus kaimynus ir kitokią savo praeitį šešiasdešimties metų – kada mūsų valstybės pragyvenimo lygis yra mažas ir kada mūsų įmonės negali mokėti tiems vairuotojam tokio atlyginimo, kaip Jūs kad mėginate mums pasakyti? Antra, ką darytumėte, kada didžiosios šalys Europos Sąjungoje apeina susitarimus bendrus ir apsirūpina dujom per Nord Stream I, Nord Stream II? Ką darytumėte, kada mūsų kaimynas pastoviai, kiekvieną kartą, grasina, ir mes esame kiekvieną vakarą išsigandę, kad nebūtų tam tikros invazijos, kas buvo, kas taip atsitiko keturiasdešimt pirmais metais? Aš labai sveikinu Jus, kad keturiasdešimt penktais įgijot nepriklausomybę, tačiau mes ją gavome tiktai devyniasdešimt pirmais metais.

Tai, Premjere, jeigu Jūs atsakysite, kad „nežinau“, aš būsiu labai patenkintas.

1-076-0000

Jens Rohde (ALDE). – Hr. Formand! Jamen også jeg vil gerne sige velkommen, hr. statsminister. Når man hører Anders Vistisens tale til dig, så vil det jo nok undre en del her i huset, at det jo er dem, du deler politisk dyne med i det daglige. Man kan jo blive helt bekymret for, om du egentlig lider af Stockholmsyndromet, men ellers vil jeg sige, at vi, Radikale Venstre, jo er et åbensindet parti, og vi er jo også asylvenlige, så hvis statsministeren skulle få brug for hjælp en dag, så diskuterer vi gerne det.

Jeg vil gerne som en af dem, der normalt plejer at kritisere dig, have lov til at kvittere for både, at du står her i dag, og også regeringens holdning til Marrakeshtraktaten, trods interne skærmydsler og pres fra Dansk Folkeparti om ikke at underskrive den, og for støtte til, at vi begynder at diskutere forsvarspolitik i EU. Selv din tale i dag handlede om, hvad vi skal i EU, i stedet for at vi hele tiden i Danmark taler om, hvad vi ikke skal. Men det er altså ikke løst med fire fikspunkter, hvis vi vil skabe opbakning til det europæiske samarbejde. Det kræver sammenhæng i forsvars- og sikkerhedspolitik, fælles skattebase, så vi kan gøre op med alt det snyderi, der foregår i den finansielle sektor, fælles migrationsregler – hvad gør regeringen for at afblokere den situation, der er i Rådet i øjeblikket, hvor tingene er låst fast på asylpakken? Det kræver også social lighed, en vis social lighed, hvis vi skal have opbakning til den frie bevægelighed. Så kræver det forsvar for demokrati og retsstat, og så kræver det, at vi får nogle børnerettigheder i EU. Og der er det, jeg gerne vil spørge statsministeren: Hvad gør den danske regering i Rådet for at fremme disse sager?

Statsministeren siger, at man skal lægge hovedet til jorden og lytte til folket, Ja, men det er også fint nok, Churchill svarede bare, da han fik at vide, at han skulle lægge øret mere til jorden, at "så er det vanskeligere for folk at se op til mig". Jeg kunne godt tænke mig, om den danske statsminister stod lidt mere op i den danske EU-debat i stedet for altid og ligge og rode nede på gulvet sammen med Dansk Folkeparti. Men tak for fremmødet her i dag.

1-077-0000

Liisa Jaakonsaari (S&D). – Arvoisa puhemies, te, herra pääministeri sanoitte, että meidän pitää kuunnella kansalaisia. Me varmasti teemme sitä joka päivä, me Euroopan parlamentin jäsenet. Te sanoitte myös, että meidän pitää kertoa saavutuksista. Sitäkin me teemme.

Mutta en kuitenkaan usko, että menneillä saavutuksilla voitetaan koskaan lisää kannatusta, vaan meidän täytyy pystyä löytämään tämän päivän kuumiin kysymyksiin ratkaisut ja meillä täytyy olla jonkinlainen käsitys tulevaisuudesta.

Yksi näistä asioista on maahanmuutto. Täällä on tänään keskusteltu tästä, mutta valitettavasti minun täytyy sanoa, että Tanska ei tässä kelpaa kyllä esimerkiksi siitä, koska teiltä puuttuu humanismia. Teillä on pragmatismia mutta humanismia ei kyllä juuri ole. Mutta uskon siihen, että se, mitä sanoitte nostamalla Afrikan puheenvuoronne keskiöön, niin se on se ydinkysymys. Kyllä Afrikka on Euroopan unionin kohtalonkysymys. Meidän täytyy yhdessä pohtia todellakin kaikkia niitä asioita, joilla voidaan auttaa Afrikkaa, ja nähdä se kumppanina eikä pelkästään minään kehitysavun kohteena. Sitäkin tarvitaan.

1-078-0000

(Fine della procedura "catch the eye")

1-079-0000

Lars Løkke Rasmussen, Danmarks statsminister. – Hr. formand! Tusind tak for de mange kommentarer, de mange spørgsmål, mange af dem jo fra danske engagerede medlemmer af Europa Parlamentet. Jeg skal prøve at nå at svare på så meget som overhovedet muligt.

I forhold til den grønne omstilling, er Bendt Bendtsen jo inde på – og det synes jeg er klogt – at man også skal række ud efter de lavt hængende frugter, og de er jo til og få fat på. Og der er jo ingen tvivl om, at en større indsats mod energieffektivisering og energirenovering er en del af det. Der er sådan set meget, der kan gøres, hvis alle europæere vaskede med 10 grader lavere temperatur, end det, vi almindeligvis gør, så svarer det til den samlede kapacitet fra alle tyske akraftværker – altså hvis vi vaskede ved 30 grader i stedet for 40 grader – og tilsvarende kan man omkring energirenovering lave tilsvarende regnestykker. Det viser vel sådan set bare, at vi i den grønne omstilling skal tage alle instrumenter i brug, og det, du peger på, Bendt, er jo et af dem.

Så vil jeg gerne sige til Grapini, som skaber et billede af, at jeg skulle være imod, at folk, der for eksempel arbejder i Danmark, ikke har de samme rettigheder som danskere, der arbejder i Danmark. Det er ikke, hvad jeg siger! Det er klart, at hvis man kommer til Danmark, og man har sine børn med sig, så skal man jo kunne arbejde og leve under de samme vilkår som alle mulige andre. Jeg taler om det forhold, hvor man ikke har sine børn med, og hvor den danske børnecheck, der sådan set er tilsigtet at skulle dække de omkostninger, der knytter sig til at have børn i det danske samfund, sendes til andre lande, hvor leveomkostningsniveauet er langt lavere, og pengene derfor rækker længere. Det er den situation, jeg taler om.

Så spurgte Grapini også til mine synspunkter omkring MFF, og det kunne blive et meget langt foredrag. Jeg vil bare sige ganske kort, at under en rimelig ramme, 1 % af BNI, som vil være et stigende budget, givet at der er vækst i Europa, vil vores prioriteter jo være, at vi investerer i nye områder. Det er blandt andet udvikling, forskning, innovation, men det er også – for at give en

bemærkning til det allersidste spørgsmål fra det finske parlamentsmedlem – en mere holistisk indsats i forhold til hele den udfordring, der knytter sig til migration i alle former, og flere har været inde på det: Margrethe Auken har været inde på det, Jens Rohde antyder det, flere andre er inde på det, og jeg tror altså, at tiden er kommet, hvor vi har brug for at tale om disse ting i en sammenhæng og være lidt klare, når vi taler om disse ting. For der er en ekstrem forskel på en ung afrikaner, der sådan set, helt naturligt, kan man sige, søger lykken i et velstående Europa for at forbedre sin livssituation, og så den individuelle forfulgte, der er reelt på flugt, kontra den interne bevægelse i Europa på et arbejdsmarked. Og der er en tendens til i debatten – muligvis ikke her, men så andre steder, hvor jeg deltager i debatten – til at blande det hele sammen i en stor pærevælling.

Jeg er varm tilhænger af den frie bevægelighed i Europa. Danmark vil ikke kunne fungere, medmindre vi havde det privilegium, at man ville kunne trække på arbejdskraft, der kommer andre steder fra. Engang imellem viser der sig også nogle problemer. Jeg er varm tilhænger af, at vi skal gøre en indsats i forhold til og bekæmpe, i forhold til og sikre folk, der på flugt. Det er jo derfor jeg er stolt af at komme fra et land, hvor vi, som kun en håndfuld lande i hele verden, øger FN's målsætning 0,7 i udviklingshjælp. Derfor er der jo brug for – og hr. Jens Rohde spørger til, hvad vi så gør i Rådet – der er jo brug for, at vi udvikler en samlet strategi, som ikke kun handler om at beskytte de ydre grænser, som ikke kun handler om at lave udviklingshjælp i Afrika, som ikke kun handler om at understøtte en egentlig fri markedsøkonomi i Afrika, der har potentiale til, i spejlbillede af Europa, at udvikle et Afrikansk indre marked. Men det kan ikke kun handle om det. Det er nødt til at handle om det hele på én gang, og det er den eneste måde, hvorpå vi får alle ombord. Det er også derfor, at jeg har det synspunkt i forhold til hr. Morten Helveg og andre, der har været inde på spørgsmålet omkring reallokering og solidaritet, at vi jo er nødt til og arbejde med et afsæt i virkeligheden, og virkeligheden er den, at det ikke lader sig gøre at lave en reform af Dublinsystemet, der hviler på en obligatorisk reallokering. Det lader sige ikke gøre, det kommer til og splitte Europa. Og så må man jo med det afsæt pragmatisk diskutere, hvad man så sætter i stedet. Det, man kan sætte i stedet, er jo en anden form for forpligtet solidaritet, som ikke kun handler om at tage imod folk på flugt, men som handler om og yde et andet bidrag på en anden måde et andet sted. For hvis ikke vi får skred i udviklingen af dette koncept, som både handler om at beskytte Europa og række hånden ud til Afrika, og som også handler om at sikre midlertidighed til de mennesker, der midlertidigt flygter fra noget, en mulighed for og vende tilbage, så får vi ikke håndteret den samlede udfordring, som er kæmpe, kæmpe stor, og måske i virkeligheden den største, vi står med.

Jeg må så sige til Ronja omkring folkeafstemning og demokrati: Den danske deltagelse i Den Europæiske Union hviler jo på ikke bare en, men flere folkeafstemninger. Efter den danske befolknings nej til Maastricht, blev der så indgået i Danmark et nationalt kompromis, som også blev sendt til folkeafstemning, og det er derpå, vores forbehold hviler. Og det siger sig selv, at hvis der skal ændres på de forudsætninger, som danskerne har sagt ja til i Maastrichttraktaten på, så skal der selvfølgelig en folkeafstemning til. Men det kan man jo ikke trække til et synspunkt om, at en hvilken som helst justering af samarbejdet, som ikke er dækket af de danske forbehold, så kræver en folkeafstemning. Jeg abonnerer ikke på det synspunkt, at vi skal have årets folkeafstemning for at tage stilling til, om vi så stadigvæk ønsker, at vi skal være med. Jeg siger også dette som en bemærkning til Hekel og overvejelserne om en new deal, hvis og såfremt man i det britiske underhus ikke når frem til en beslutning om at støtte den aftale, der er indgået, og Danmark her qua vores historik skulle byde ind og sige, at så finder vi bare en anden løsning. I min læsning af det, så er den aftale, Theresa May har indgået, jo at sammenligne med det, vi gjorde i Danmark, da danskerne tilbage omkring Maastricht sagde nej til Maastricht, nemlig at vi definerede vores nationale bud på, under hvilke omstændigheder, vi så kan have en relation. Det gik vi til en folkeafstemning om, og det vandt vi, og det vil ikke være en farbar vej, hvis det skal

genforhandles successivt. Så jeg tror, at jeg må sige, at jeg er på linje med Juncker og alle kolleger i Rådet, der har sagt, at nu har der været et langt kompliceret forløb, hvor hvert et komma i en meget, meget kompliceret aftale har været vendt. Det er ligesom den konstruktion, der ligger på bordet, og det er så den, man må tage stilling til.

Så vil jeg godt måske afslutningsvis sige, når det Litauiske parlamentsmedlem spørger mig, hvordan jeg ville se på tingene, fra f.eks. et Litauisk perspektiv i lyset af, at der er forskelle i levestandarder. Og det er også et svar til Christel Schaldemose og andre, der har berørt spørgsmålet om den frie bevægelighed og rimeligheden i tingene – Jens Rohde også, hr. Morten Lykkegaard såmænd også. Grundlæggende handler det jo om, som en forudsætning for den frie bevægelighed, at sikre sig, at når man ligesom bevæger sig et andet sted hen, så optræder man på de samme vilkår, under de samme betingelser som dem, der var der i forvejen – altså når vi snakker løn og ansættelsesforhold. Hvis man ser på Danmark som en showcase her, så må man sige, at der, hvor vi er udfordret, er jo ikke der, hvor folk flytter ind i Danmark for kortere eller længere tid, og siger: ”Jeg tager et job her”. Hvis vi kigger på deres dækningsgrad overenskomstmæssigt, så er det næsten på niveau med danskerne i al almindelighed, det er ikke der, problemerne opstår. Problemerne opstår i relation til service, problemerne opstår i relation til transport. Og de problemer, vi har set på det seneste, er netop linket til det. Det bliver vi jo nødt til og gøre noget ved, og det bliver vi nødt til at angribe helt konkret, og her har Parlamentet jo også et arbejde, der skal gøres. For det handler jo om at sikre sig mod, at man kan bruge postkassefirmaer til i virkeligheden proforma at vinde nogle rettigheder til at krydse grænser. Det handler om at stille nogle krav til, på hvilke lønvilkår man kan køre rundt. Det handler om og sikre sig, at man ikke i forhold til transportsektoren får en masse undtagelser fra det almindelige servicedirektiv. Det er jo et helt praktisk stykke arbejde, der skal gøres, og som vi må arbejde sammen om, hvis vi skal sikre os befolkningernes opbakning. For min egen læsning af den danske befolkning er, at den er ikke imod den frie bevægelighed, den er imod de situationer, hvor man oplever, at man under dække af den frie bevægelighed i virkeligheden tilbyder mennesker løn og vilkår, som vi ikke ville acceptere at tage på vores egen krop. Det er jo det, det handler om, og det er et stykke praktisk arbejde, der skal laves.

Så tror jeg bare, at jeg vil slutte af med at sige tak til Jens Rohde for de pæne ord. Og så lige måske en enkelt ting om FN-papiret, den globale migrationspakt, som jo ikke er en traktat, og som ikke er nogen Marrakeshtraktat, men som er et FN-papir, som så skal diskuteres i Marrakesh. Og jeg vil bare prøve og sætte det ind i en sammenhæng at slutte af på. Det kan jo ikke nytte noget, at vi introducerer et internationalt samarbejde, hvor standarden bliver den, at man kun deltager, hvis alle mener det samme som en selv. Og det er jo lidt den skygge, jeg synes, man ser kaste sig ud i det europæiske landskab, i hvert fald i en tendens, og som man også fornemmer på et par af indlæggene her i dag. Vi vil have det, ligesom vi vil have det, ellers vil vi ikke være med. Det er jo imod hele konceptet, og jeg taler selvfølgelig ind i en aktuel dansk debat, men jeg taler også ind i en europæisk debat. EU er jo en drøm, men det er jo også en realitet, noget vi skal forholde os praktisk til. Og det kan ikke nytte noget, hvis vi deler os i de lejre, hvor man enten ligesom skal anprise hele projektet med alle sine herligheder, for ellers er man nok ikke en sand europæer, og eller også skal man kritisere alting. Vi er nødt til og have den balancerede tilgang til det, at når vi taler om grænseoverskridende problemer og om at løfte europæisk velstand, også i en global konkurrence, der bliver skarpere og skarpere med et mere og mere selvbevidst Kina, med et USA der i nogen grad vender ryggen til sig selv, så skal der et samarbejde til! Og der har vi allesammen en forpligtelse til, at få den dialog i gang med vores borgere, hvor vi får sagt – for jeg tror sådan set godt, vi alle sammen forstår det – at hvis alting skal være vores egen løsning, så bliver der ikke noget at samarbejde om.

Det er den tunge opgave, og det er også der hvor jeg synes – og derfor vil jeg gerne takke for, at jeg måtte komme her i dag – at hele idéen om at prøve at iværksætte en europæisk debat med europæerne på nationalt niveau og forankret her i parlamentet har noget for sig. Det er ikke gjort med det, vi skal også levere på det konkrete indhold, men vi er nødt til at starte der, hvor vi får sagt, at der er intet alternativ til et samarbejde, andet end at vi vender ind i os selv og glider baglæns velstandsmæssigt etc. Og med de ord vil jeg sige tusind tak, hr. formand, fordi jeg måtte være her i dag.

1-080-0000

President. – Thank you very much, Prime Minister Rasmussen. Thank you for your participation in this very important debate on the future of the European Union.

1-081-0000

Presidente. – La discussione è chiusa.

Dichiarazioni scritte (articolo 162)

1-081-5000

Eva Maydell (PPE), in writing. – If we are to reflect on the Future of Europe, we must take stock of what we have achieved. European citizens enjoy freedom of movement in the biggest single market in the world, education opportunities under the Erasmus programme; and solidarity in times of crisis.

Nevertheless, the unity of our union is put into question. I believe we need to learn to live in this new environment, where the European idea will be under attack and it will need to compete with other less liberal and less globalist ideas for the future of the European continent. What is more important, we need to learn to defend the European idea, by providing real solutions to the public's fears like migration, security and climate change while upholding the values our Union is based on.

In the physical world, strengthening the Schengen area, the eurozone and the accession of the Western Balkans will ensure security and stability for our continent. In the digital world, in spite of setting the highest existing standard for data protection with GDPR, Europe should also be a digital frontrunner with investments in new technologies and innovations, and ethical AI.

1-081-7500

Pirkko Ruohonen-Lerner (ECR), kirjallinen. – Viimeisten vuosien aikana Euroopan parlamentissa on käyty useita keskusteluja miljardiluokan veronkierto- ja rahanpesutapauksista. Tänä syksynä käsittelyssä on ollut tanskalaisen Danske Bankin rahanpesuskandaali. Tanskalaispankin Viron-yksikössä pestiin rahaa jopa 200 miljardin euron arvosta. Ensimmäinen vinkki rikollisesta toiminnasta tuli Venäjän keskuspankilta jo vuonna 2007, mutta toiminta sai jatkaa vielä vuosikausia. Kukaan ei ollut halukas puuttumaan rikolliseen toimintaan ja rahanpesun valvonnassa epäonnistuttiin totaalisesti.

Tapauksen ilmiantaja britti Howard Wilkinson oli kuultavana marraskuun lopulla parlamentin talousrikoksia, veropetoksia ja veronkiertoa käsittelevässä TAX3-erityisvaliokunnassa. Wilkinsonin esittämien todisteiden mukaan Tanskan rahoitusvalvontaviranomainen on tietoisesti sulkenut silmänsä ongelmilta ja jopa kokenut velvollisuudekseen auttaa kotimaansa pankkia sen vaikeassa tilanteessa. Valvontaviranomaisen tehtävä ei varmasti ole auttaa kotimaansa pankkia vaan valvoa sitä. Mikäli Wilkinsonin antamat tiedot pitävät paikkansa, vaikuttaa rahoitusvalvontaviranomaisen toiminta ammattitaidottomalta ellei jopa korruptoituneelta.

Rahanpesun torjuntaa, viranomaistoimintaa ja tietojenvaihtoa eri maiden välillä tulee tehostaa. Toivottavasti pääministeri Rasmussen ja kollegansa tekevät kaikkensa, jotta vastaavanlaista ei

enää tapahdu yhdessäkään EU-maassa. Kun pankkimaailmassa havaitaan rikoksia, on erityisesti toimintaa valvovien viranomaisten velvollisuus puuttua niihin välittömästi.

1-082-0000

IN THE CHAIR: MAIREAD McGUINNESS

Vice-President

18. Strategy for long-term EU greenhouse gas emissions reduction in accordance with the Paris agreement (debate)

1-084-0000

President. – The next item is the debate on the Commission statement on the strategy for long-term EU greenhouse gas emissions reduction in accordance with the Paris agreement (2018/2941(RSP)).

We have two Commissioners with us this evening. You are both very welcome. I will now give the floor to Vice-President Šefčovič, who is also responsible for the energy union.

1-085-0000

Maroš Šefčovič, Vice-President of the Commission. – Madam President, under this mandate we focused primarily on what needs to be done for the clean energy transition between now and 2030, and by the end of it, also thanks to the great cooperation we had with this House, we will have delivered on all our commitments. The policies put in place will go a long way even after 2030, but they will only bring us to emission reductions of around 60% by 2050, and this is not sufficient for the EU to contribute to the Paris Agreement temperature goals.

Climate change is already impacting on the European Union. We had extreme heat waves in four of the last five years and this summer temperatures in the Arctic Circle were five degrees higher than normal. Central Europe was so dry that the Rhine was in places too shallow for inland navigation. And this is just the beginning: a planet with a climate that's out of control would not be a safe and prosperous home, and we have to act.

Today we are therefore looking further ahead towards 2050 and towards a climate-neutral Europe, not only to contribute but to lead on the Paris goals. The Commission is responding to a call by this Parliament from last October which was renewed last month. In March the European Council also called on the Commission to present a long-term strategy by the first quarter of 2019, taking into account national plans.

Parliament called for an ambitious mid-century zero emission strategy for the EU, providing a cost-efficient pathway towards a net zero carbon economy in the Union by 2050 at the latest.

The Commission has taken up this challenge and we are starting from a good basis: we have reduced emissions by 22% while our economy grew by 58% since 1990 and this was accomplished by investing in clean energies, energy efficiency, innovation and cleaner transport.

We have seen that this not only produces benefits for the environment and therefore for the citizens, but that it also creates growth and jobs. Four million green jobs already exist in the European Union.

Under this Commission we have learned how to better integrate climate, energy, transport and other policies into the energy union and we are the world leader in designing coherent policies that drive investment, and investment that delivers results.

The strategy we are presenting today builds on this comprehensive approach. The strategy looks at all the key economic sectors, at innovation, finance, agriculture, the circular economy, trade... in short, how to make climate neutrality a cornerstone of a modern European economy fit for the 21st Century that will leave the planet clean.

Climate neutrality in 2050 will require additional investment – EUR 175 to 290 billion a year – but it will drastically reduce our bill for fossil fuel imports, which today is EUR 266 billion a year. The mathematics are clear, instead of paying to burn fuels that pollute our climate and our air, we can invest in cleaner and modern European industries that provide good local jobs.

I'm particularly proud of one aspect. It's a strategy that makes sure that we do not leave any Europeans or any regions behind. It analyses which sectors will benefit, which will transform and which will lose out, and it looks into how to mitigate these losses, especially through upskilling for higher quality jobs, and it has European solidarity at its core.

Honourable Members, there are many strong reasons to put forward the long-term strategy now: global commitments, economic rationale, but also a key political reason. More and more people are asking in the run-up to the European elections about the future of Europe. There is widespread public support for climate action and actually widespread optimism: 85% of Europeans agree that fighting climate change and using energy more efficiently can create economic growth and jobs in Europe, and I am one of them.

1-086-0000

Miguel Arias Cañete, *Member of the Commission*. – Madam President, the long-term strategy adopted by the Commission today spells out a clear vision for the European Union climate and energy policy, one that can lead to net-zero greenhouse gas emissions by 2050, through a socially fair transition in a cost-efficient manner.

The strategy is meant to set the direction of travel for European Union climate efforts and to frame the European Union contribution to achieving the Paris Agreement goals. In Paris, the world committed to keeping the global temperature rise to well below 2°C and to pursue efforts to limit it to 1.5°C, and thanks to the support of the European Parliament, the European Union has adopted all the legislation needed to meet our Paris commitment, and in fact in doing so we have de facto increased the level of ambition to some -45%, and the role of the Parliament was instrumental in this process.

We should now follow through and start preparing the next step, looking at the 2050 perspective. The difference between 1.5°C and 2°C is considerable, and the IPCC Special Report presented this year provides a clear signal. If we are to avoid the more disastrous impact of climate change we should seek to limit it to 1.5°C.

The IPCC report also told us what we have to do collectively to limit climate change. The world will have to go to net zero greenhouse emissions in the second half of the century, but if the aim is to pursue 1.5° this goal needs to be reached at global level by 2070.

The European Union should lead in this transformation, demonstrating to others that the transition to net zero greenhouse gas emissions is possible and opens up many opportunities, and this is what the Commission is doing today. With this strategy, the European Union would become the first major economy to be climate neutral. If we succeed, others will follow. If we do not lead, nobody else will, and if nobody else acts unrestrained climate change will severely impact Europe and rest of the world.

The Commission proposal is based on a detailed assessment looking at the possibilities for economic and social transformation that deliver such decarbonisation pathways. Some pathways are looking at reductions going to 80% by 2050, while others look into pathways leading to net zero greenhouse gas emissions by 2050.

The results clearly point to a comprehensive vision with seven key strategic building blocks that will be required to achieve a net zero greenhouse gas economy by 2050.

First, energy efficiency plays a central role. In the future our economy will grow but we need to prepare for reducing energy consumption by as much as a half compared to 2005. Energy efficiency is central to continue reducing emissions from industry but equally in the housing sectors.

Second, we need to advance the deployment of renewables. By 2050 more than 80% of electricity will be coming from renewable energy sources and these will have beneficial effects on our security of energy supply and deliver cumulative savings on our import bill of between EUR 2 and 3 trillion over the period 2031-2050.

There will also be additional benefits due to the reduced fugitive emissions of fossil fuels used in the energy sector and in this context, the Commission is looking into policy options for addressing methane emissions. A central tenet here is the electrification of our energy system, at least doubling its share in final energy demand by 2050 and with electricity generated by renewable sources, spreading to more uses such as heating and transport.

Thirdly, we have to embrace a clean mobility system. The automotive industry already invested in this new future and electrification is a promising option but some transport modes will not be able to electrify. For them alternatives in the form of advanced biofuels and e-fuels would need to be applied. And it's not only the vehicle or the fuel that can change. With 75% of our population living in urban areas, cities are breeding grounds for new solutions and we already see movement towards smart urban planning and traffic management. These, together with clean public transport, have the potential to reduce emissions and improve the quality of life.

Our industry is already one of the most efficient globally, but the transformation will converge with the need for modernising industrial assets. Steel, cement and chemicals dominate industrial emissions and in the next 10 to 15 years technologies already known in these sectors will need to be demonstrated at a scale to facilitate investment in clean and competitive industrial installations. Electrification, hydrogen, biomass and synthetic fuels are part of the solution.

The transformation will require an adequate smart network infrastructure and interconnections and we need also to harmonise the potential of the bio-economy while preserving our carbon sinks.

European Union agriculture and forestry will continue to provide food, feed and fibres as well reduce emissions. Continued efficiency improvements, better fertiliser application and nutrient management, and healthy animal stocks will benefit both farmers and the climate.

Agriculture and forestry will contribute also to decarbonising other sectors and EU forests will play a central role in providing biomass.

The transition of our economy will always have to be careful of how to make best use of scarce land and other natural resources.

And finally, we need to look into how to tackle with carbon capture and storage those CO₂ emissions which we cannot otherwise reduce. Thanks to the rapid deployment of renewable energy this is no longer the silver bullet to decarbonising. Still, CCS has a crucial role to close the circle for a net-zero economy, notably for energy intensive industries. If combined with sustainable biomass it could create negative emissions, helping to compensate for remaining emissions in our economy.

While by no means easy, these options, if deployed together, can make our path towards net-zero greenhouse gas emissions a reality. But to achieve this vision we will need additional investment of around 0.8% of our GDP. But this can also benefit our GDP by up to 2% by 2050.

This transformation will also save on health costs, with estimated reductions in premature death of more than 40% and health damage reduced by around EUR 200 billion per year.

The European Union climate policy relies on global cooperation and next week's Conference of the Parties – COP 24 – is decisive for the future of the Paris Agreement.

In Katowice the European Union has a good story to tell. We have adopted all the legislation needed for implementing our Paris contribution and our 2030 targets are projected to reduce greenhouse emissions by around 45% by 2030, which is the starting point for long-term planning. With the strategic vision that we adopted today we can also show our partners that we have started preparing for a climate-neutral economy fully in line with the Paris Agreement. It demonstrates our determination to shape together the best future for our planet, and this should inspire others to follow.

In the months ahead our proposals and different pathways should be studied in detail to understand how the European Union can best achieve a net-zero greenhouse gas emission economy in 2050 in a cost-effective way. We look forward to engaging with you, the European Parliament, Member States, national parliaments, business, NGOs, cities, communities and our citizens on the EU's long-term ambition and its contribution to the Paris Agreement.

Whatever the outcome of this debate, the European Union objective needs broad and deep endorsement, not only by our decision-makers, by our legislators, but also by all stakeholders and citizens. These debates and discussions should allow the European Union to adopt and submit an ambitious and broadly supported long-term strategy by 2020 to the UNFCCC. I look forward to continuing this essential work with you in the months to come.

1-087-0000

Ivo Belet, *namens de PPE-Fractie*. – Voorzitter, collega's, commissarissen, goedenavond. Dit plan komt inderdaad op het juiste moment, aan de vooravond van de klimaatconferentie in Katowice. We kunnen de wereld nu een duidelijk signaal geven dat we in Europa onze verantwoordelijkheid nemen om de Overeenkomst van Parijs in de praktijk om te zetten.

Onze fractie steunt dit plan voluit. Wij steunen alle investeringen die u in het vooruitzicht stelt op het vlak van onderzoek en ontwikkeling. Die zijn uiteraard cruciaal. Wij steunen uw voorstellen, mijnheer Šefčovič, om in Europa een batterijenalliantie tot stand te brengen om in Europa zelf batterijen te realiseren en te produceren. Wij steunen ook uw voorstellen om CO₂-opslag te realiseren. U hebt verwezen naar de chemiesector, de staalsector en de cementsector, waar dat uiteraard essentieel is.

Op een aantal punten kunnen we nog ambitieuzer zijn. Ik verwijs naar het transport. Ik verwijs naar de luchtvaart en de scheepvaart. De luchtvaart wordt een van de grote bedreigingen voor ons klimaat de komende jaren. Deze sector dreigt alweer te ontsnappen en zijn verantwoordelijkheid te ontlopen. De Corsia-onderhandelingen (over de koolstofcompensatie- en -verminderingregeling voor de internationale luchtvaart) dreigen geboycot en uitgehold te worden. Wij rekenen op u, mijnheer Šefčovič en mijnheer Cañete, om dat tegen te houden.

Tot slot nog een opmerking over de flankerende sociale maatregelen. Die zijn alleen realistisch als we het sociale draagvlak behouden. Werknemers wier baan bedreigd wordt in de automobielnijverheid of in steenkoolgebieden, moeten zeker zijn dat we hen zullen begeleiden bij de overgang naar een koolstofarme economie. Dat dubbele aspect van deze transitie moeten we goed in het oog blijven houden.

Ik wens u veel succes, volgende week in Katowice.

1-088-0000

Kathleen Van Brempt, *on behalf of the S&D Group*. – Madam President, we can say ‘yes we can’. Yes, we can take the right decision to go to a fully climate-neutral economy. This is one of the real ‘TINAs’ – there is no alternative to taking this decision.

But let me also be very clear. There are different pathways to get there and we need to change that as well. It is not just about greening the economy. It is about making a just transition to do so.

We’ve witnessed the *gilets jaunes* in Belgium, and more in France. We should not say these are climate sceptics. We should not say that. We need to make sure that moving in that direction – and we really need to do that – is done in such a way that takes everybody on board. I’m looking to my good colleague, Ivo Belet. I liked your speech and I hope that next time, if we vote on CO₂ car emissions or energy efficiency that we have your support to do so.

That is really very clear because it is not good enough just to give speeches. We need to get results, and one of the results that we have to work on – and we need your support, Commissioners – is: we need to change the governance in Europe. We need to change the European Semester, take ecological and social indicators into account and change the way we govern the European Union. I sincerely hope that we will have the support of the EPP on that as well.

1-089-0000

Jadwiga Wiśniewska, *w imieniu grupy ECR*. – Pani Przewodnicząca! Panowie Komisarze! Polityka klimatyczno-energetyczna jest szczególnie trudnym wyzwaniem dla Polski, w której węgiel jest podstawowym surowcem w procesie wytwarzania energii elektrycznej i ciepła. Doceniam fakt, że w strategii dostrzeżono rolę lasów w pochłanianiu CO₂, które jest efektywną metodą zmniejszania koncentracji dwutlenku węgla w powietrzu.

Polska jest otwarta na uczciwą, rzetelną i konstruktywną dyskusję o tym, jak wspólnie osiągnąć cele klimatyczne w sposób efektywny kosztowo, akceptowalny społecznie i bez wpływu na bezpieczeństwo energetyczne kraju. Obawiam się jednak, że restrykcyjne scenariusze będą miały nikłe znaczenie w skali globalnej, za to wywołają ogromne problemy w Unii Europejskiej, szczególnie w mojej ojczyźnie, Polsce.

1-090-0000

Gerben-Jan Gerbrandy, *on behalf of the ALDE Group*. – Madam President, I would like to thank both Commissioner Šefčovič and Commissioner Arias Cañete very much. I would like to congratulate them on this visionary document. It’s a really fundamental document. I would argue that it’s the most radical transition of our economy and society in 150 years, and that is quite something. It means that climate change is not business as usual. We have to do things differently,

not in an incremental way, but in a quite radical way. In that sense, it's essential that we build the trust of citizens, as my colleague, Ms Van Brempt emphasised, but also the private sector.

One other thing is very obvious to me. We have to be focused, we have to be united and our policies have to be coherent. That means not just mainstreaming a part of our budget like we're doing now. It means climate-proofing the entire budget. My plea is that the Commission should launch a climate-proofing exercise of the next 2021-2027 budget proposal. I do not think we can leave it like this after you have published this fundamental document. The Commission should also look again at its plans for sustainable finance because just sustaining a very small part of the financial sector will not be sufficient for this fundamental change of our economy and society.

1-091-0000

Bas Eickhout, *on behalf of the Verts/ALE Group*. – Madam President, I would like to thank the Commission for this strategy. I quote Mr Šeřčovič, 'our strategy now shows that by 2050 it's realistic to make Europe both climate neutral and prosperous, while leaving no European and no region behind' – it's beautiful – and Mr Arias Cañete, 'going climate neutral is necessary, possible and in Europe's interest'. It's a beautiful press release, so I was eager to read it. I'm a bit confused now because, at the end of the document, you conclude, 'well, you know, the EU should adopt and submit an ambitious strategy by early 2020 to the United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change (UNFCCC), as requested under the Paris agreement', so our mid-century strategy for this beautiful scenario will be published sometime in early 2020. Now I'm really confused. I thought we were doing that here. This is just eight scenarios on the table and, more importantly, it's avoiding one of the key questions: what are we going to do by 2030? If you are sketching a beautiful scenario out there that we should do it for everything – for people, for the economy, for the environment – so we are creating a heaven on earth, but we wait until 2030 before we take additional action, it doesn't make sense economically. Environmentally it doesn't make sense because the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change (IPCC) was very clear: we need early action to meet the 1.5 degrees goal. 2030 is not early action and for Katowice, it doesn't make sense because everyone will watch Europe. Are you going to raise ambition before 2030? There is a gap in reaching the Paris commitments. This document is beautiful, but this document is avoiding the question 'what is Europe going to do by 2030?' That's the question in Katowice. That's our economic and our environmental challenge, and the Commission is just postponing, as always. Unfortunately, I can only conclude that, despite the nice words, climate change policy is not a priority for this Commission.

1-092-0000

Lynn Boylan, *on behalf of the GUE/NGL Group*. – Madam President, this is an ambitious strategy. On paper it's aiming to keep all Member States on board and reacting to the alarm bells from the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change (IPCC) UN Special Report. If it's lived up to, it would be a step in the right direction, but is the strategy really safeguarded, given that it is so dependent on the strong political will that we need across the board in every single Member State.

If we want to be serious about curbing global warming at 1.5° Celsius rather than 2°, we have to make sure we are providing a realistic chance to achieve this. We firstly need to avoid factoring in reliance on technologies that are not even proven yet. We cannot cross our fingers with techno-fixes when it comes to the climate.

Secondly, to ensure that this target is actually achieved and that we don't miss it, has the Commission considered any pathways looking at reaching carbon neutrality already by 2040? Taking account of the EU's huge responsibility for historical emissions, logically we should be aiming for zero net emissions before 2050. We are talking about human existence on this planet, so we cannot risk missing this contribution to curbing global warming at 1.5°.

1-093-0000

Mireille D'Ornano, *au nom du groupe EFDD*. – Madame la Présidente, tandis que le Parlement débat d'environnement, de pollution atmosphérique et automobile, un mouvement citoyen inédit est né en France: les gilets jaunes, soutenus par 80 % des Français.

Écrasés de taxes, certains compatriotes ne pourront bientôt plus se rendre à leur travail en voiture tellement le carburant est cher. Au même moment, les Nations unies alertent sur l'écart croissant entre l'action des États et les engagements de la COP21. Or, c'est la mondialisation qui a favorisé la pollution, et ce, via l'importation massive de produits conçus à l'autre bout du monde. Alors, qu'attendons-nous pour sanctionner non pas les citoyens, mais les vrais pollueurs? Le transport maritime utilisant du fioul de très mauvaise qualité avec des rejets d'oxyde de soufre, d'oxyde d'azote et de particules fines est bien pire que le diesel. Qu'attendons-nous pour favoriser les circuits courts?

Soyons lucides, ce n'est pas en favorisant le libre-échange avec le monde entier que l'Union européenne remplira les objectifs annoncés.

1-094-0000

Barbara Kappel, *im Namen der ENF-Fraktion*. – Frau Präsidentin, Herr Kommissar Cañete, Herr Kommissar Šeřčovič! Sie haben heute ihre Netto-Null-Emissionsstrategie für das Jahr 2050 vorgestellt.

Die vollständige Dekarbonisierung soll jährlich 290 Mrd. Euro kosten und es sind bis 2050 positive Effekte von 2 % der Wirtschaftsleistung zu erwarten. Einige Branchen – also speziell die, die an fossilen Energieträgern hängen – können in diesem Szenario komplett vom Markt verschwinden, aber das wird in Kauf genommen. Auch für die Mitgliedstaaten bedeutet es enorme Anstrengungen, die Klimaneutralität zu erreichen, bisher wurde der CO₂-Ausstoß lediglich um ein Fünftel reduziert. Selbst wenn die kürzlich auf EU-Ebene beschlossenen Maßnahmen, wie der Ausbau der erneuerbaren Energie, die Steigerung der Energieeffizienz und die Reform des Emissionshandels umgesetzt würden, würde der Ausstoß bis 2050 um 60 % reduziert. Das ist ja noch weit entfernt von der Hundert-Prozent-Grenze des Null-Prozent-Szenarios.

Der Weg dorthin führt über einen höheren CO₂-Preis, bis zu 68 Euro/Tonne, sagt der *Emissions Gap Report*. Derzeit liegen wir bei 19,77 Euro/Tonnen, eine Erhöhung also um das Dreifache – der Tod für manche Industrien. Deshalb bitte ich Sie: Lassen Sie uns weltweit hier im Einklang mit anderen Regionen handeln, lassen Sie uns die Energiewende nicht allein vollziehen. Lassen Sie Europa Vorreiter sein für eine klimaneutrale Wirtschaft – aber im Einklang mit den anderen.

1-095-0000

Jerzy Buzek (PPE). – Pani Przewodnicząca! Panowie Komisarze! Ta strategia jest najbardziej ambitną próbą realizacji Porozumienia paryskiego, które mówi o neutralności klimatycznej dopiero w drugiej połowie XXI wieku. O sukcesie strategii zdecydują dwa czynniki: wewnętrzny i zewnętrzny.

Wewnętrzny – na ile nasz przemysł, małe i średnie firmy, ośrodki naukowo-badawcze będą w stanie tę strategię zrealizować. Mówię o technologiach, ich dostępności i koszcie. Ważne jest też poparcie obywateli, dobrze więc, że strategia pojawia się przed wyborami europejskimi. Pojawia się również przed COP24.

I tu przejdę do czynnika zewnętrznego – tytuł strategii to „Czysta Planeta dla wszystkich”. Unia Europejska jest istotną, ale małą częścią tej planety i odpowiada za 10% emisji CO₂. Już w Katowicach dowiemy się, na ile poważnie reszta świata traktuje porozumienie z Paryża i czy jest

gotowa w swych ambicjach do roku 2050 isć nawet dalej. To kluczowe dla uratowania całej planety i przed nami wielkie zadanie na spotkaniu w Katowicach. Jak przekonać wszystkich największych emitentów do tego, żeby poszli w nasze ślady, bo przecież naszym planem jest ograniczenie temperatury do 2 stopni. A według najnowszych badań, według tego do czego się zobowiązaliśmy w Paryżu, to może być nawet około 3 stopni, a może więcej. A więc jest to groźne.

1-096-0000

Miriam Dalli (S&D). – Sinjura President, Kummissarji, Jekk hemm messaġġ li dan id-dokument iwassal b'mod b'saħħtu, huwa l-fatt li ma nistgħux nibqgħu nipposponu d-deċiżjonijiet li rridu nieħdu. Jekk verament irridu li sas-sena 2050, tletin sena biss 'il bogħod mil-lum, ikollna ekonomija dekarbonizzata, irridu naħsbu għaliha mil-lum.

Il-liġijiet li qegħdin niddiskutu llum se jwittu t-triq għat-tnax-il sena li ġejjin. Eżempju tipiku hija l-liġi dwar it-tnaqqis fit-tniġġis mill-karozzi. Huwa llum li nistgħu, jew nieħdu d-deċiżjonijiet li verament jagħmlu d-differenza, jew inkella noqogħdu sottomessi għall-interessi ta' min ma jaqbillux li din it-tranzizzjoni sseħħ.

Dan id-dokument jidher pożittiv, imma ma nistgħux nibqgħu biss kliem fuq karta. Dan id-dokument wassal messaġġ ċar li fl-Unjoni Ewropea, l-aġar li se jkunu milquta, huma dawk il-pajjiżi li qegħdin fil-Mediterran, dawk il-pajjiżi li jmissu mal-kosta, jew il-pajjiżi li qegħdin taħt il-livell tal-baħar. B'indikazzjonijiet li l-baħar jista' anki jogħla b'seba' metri jekk it-temperaturi globali jtilgħu b'1.5 gradi Celsius jew 2 gradi Celsius, inħallikom taħsbu x'jistgħu jkunu l-konsegwenzi għal min, bħali u bħan-nies li jiena nirrappreżenta, jgħix qrib il-baħar.

Għalina u għal hafna ċittadini madwar l-Ewropa, il-prezz tan-nuqqas ta' azzjoni huwa għoli żżejjed, ifisser l-eżistenza ta' pajjiżna u tal-ħajja tagħna. Sakemm se nibqgħu naħsbu li l-ekonomija u l-ambjent huma separati minn xulxin m'inx konvinta li se jinbidlu l-affarijiet. Irridu, illum, naqblu biex ninvestu fl-innovazzjoni u fir-riċerka biex ikollna soluzzjonijiet li jagħmlu sens ekonomiku u li jpoġġu lill-Unjoni Ewropea fit-triq tad-dekarbonizzazzjoni.

1-097-0000

Evžen Tošenovský (ECR). – Paní předsedající, určitě souhlasím, že musíme zvyšovat ochranu životního prostředí a chránit je před narůstajícími vlivy civilizace – růst dopravy, výrobní aktivity a obecného vlivu na přírodní bohatství je v současné době enormní.

Na druhé straně ale získáváme nové technologie a věda a výzkum přináší neuvěřitelný pokrok, poznání a pomoc s technologiemi vstřícnými vůči životnímu prostředí. Na druhé straně při definování cílů a strategií pro nejbližší desetiletí v oblasti klimatu musíme být velmi obezřetní. Při přehnaném nastavení limitů, které dnes vypadají velmi hezky a ambiciózně, bychom mohli dosáhnout velmi negativního vývoje v mnoha oblastech.

Taktéž jsem přesvědčen, že naším zájmem musí být komplexní přístup, tak jak se to nakonec povedlo v programu platformy pro postuhelné regiony. Za tuto aktivitu panu komisaři velmi děkuji. Jsem pro výraznou podporu vědy, výzkumu a inovací, které jediné umožní vstřícné a rozumné chování lidí vůči životnímu prostředí.

1-098-0000

Michèle Rivasi (Verts/ALE). – Madame la Présidente, je remercie les commissaires de présenter enfin une stratégie sur le long terme, mais vous nous proposez huit scénarios, dont seulement les deux derniers visent à atteindre zéro émission en 2050. Ceux-ci reposent sur des techniques d'apprentis sorciers pour capturer d'énormes et irréalistes quantités de carbone, voire à les éliminer de l'atmosphère.

Si nous voulons montrer au reste du monde que l'Union européenne reste le champion du climat et faire en sorte de rester sous la barre de 1,5 degré, la priorité est d'abord la réduction de nos émissions. La barre doit être mise plus haut pour arriver, au sein de l'Union européenne, à une économie à zéro émission d'ici 2040. C'est cela être leader au niveau du changement climatique.

D'autre part, le dernier rapport du Groupe d'experts intergouvernemental sur l'évolution du climat (GIEC) appelle à des transitions rapides et de grande envergure pour limiter le réchauffement planétaire à 1,5 degré. Que nous dit la Commission européenne pour 2030? Rien. Elle commence les scénarios en 2030, comme si l'Union européenne était en bonne voie.

Le dérèglement climatique est là. Il faut agir dès maintenant. Soyons ambitieux: il faut réduire les émissions de 65 % par rapport à 2010 si on veut vraiment atteindre la neutralité en gaz à effet de serre.

1-099-0000

Robert Jarosław Iwaszkiewicz (EFDD). – Pani Przewodnicząca! Poziom ograniczenia emisji gazów cieplarnianych, jaki został narzucony przemysłowi, osiągnął już granice absurdu. Nie ma technologii, które zadowolilyby Wasze wybujałe ambicje, i żadne zakłęcia tego nie zmieniają. Porozumienie paryskie było błędem, z którego już wycofują się najważniejsi partnerzy. Emisja CO₂ w Chinach jest prawie trzy razy większa niż we wszystkich krajach Unii Europejskiej i nie da się tego zmienić.

Podkreślacie zyski z rozwoju zielonej energii i ograniczenia emisji, ale dlaczego milczycie o kosztach? Dlaczego nie mówicie o ucieczce przemysłu do krajów wschodnich graniczących z Unią Europejską? Tymczasem koszty unijnej polityki energetycznej dla mojego kraju, Polski wynoszą około 5 mld złotych rocznie i ciągle rosną. Polska już wkrótce będzie miała najwyższe ceny energii w całej Europie. To realny efekt Waszej polityki. Należy natychmiast zawiesić ramy czasowe polityki klimatycznej i zlikwidować tzw. uprawnienia do emisji.

1-100-0000

Seán Kelly (PPE). – A Uachtaráin, déanaim comhghairdeas leis an mbeirt Choimisinéirí Cañete agus Šefčovič as ucht na lainseála inniu. Is dúshlán mór é chun ár n-astaíochtaí carbóin a laghdú go náid faoi 2050 ach, tá sé indéanta.

So as one who represented Parliament at COP 21 and 22 and will be at COP 24 in Poland, and as the rapporteur for the renewable energy file here for the EPP Group, I welcome these announcements today. Also, I think that we are being ambitious, regardless of what people say, and as the Commissioner said: 'if we don't lead, nobody will follow'. Europe is doing that and I think that's what we need to do.

I am going to mention something I haven't mentioned before, and that is those who might be left behind. I welcome the emphasis on the socio-economic impact. Citizens and workers were made redundant in my own constituency. Bord Na Móna has announced 430 job losses because of the closure of peat factories or power stations. I would be the last person to say these should be left open – obviously they should not, but we do need to show empathy with these people and I think there are opportunities for us to have a just transition fund at national level to use the MFF. I'm the rapporteur for my Group on InvestEU. All these possibilities need to be explored so that nobody is left behind. This is a very important point. I think if we do that, we can make progress, but it has to be inclusive and fair, and I think we can bring citizens with us in that way.

1-102-0000

Sylvie Goddyn (EFDD). – Suite aux conclusions alarmistes du Groupe d'experts intergouvernemental sur l'évolution du climat (GIEC), la Commission européenne a décidé

d'accelerare la realizzazione degli obiettivi degli accordi di Parigi per il 2050. I popoli europei vorranno espriamere il loro dolore per ciò che ha strutturato il loro modo di vivere da un secolo e fare penitenza.

La penitenza sarà dolorosa, e la Commissione lo sa poiché essa prevede un trattamento differenziato per gli Stati membri.

Il mio paese, la Francia, è classificato tra i paesi ricchi. La realtà è tuttavia diversa: 10 milioni di francesi vivono al di sotto della soglia di povertà, l'economia francese è stagnante e la disoccupazione non scende al di sotto del 10%. Su questo argomento, il presidente della Repubblica, M. Macron, si è scontrato con la realtà sociale, il che ha scatenato la collera dei gilet gialli aumentando le tasse sulle benzine.

Questo deve servire da avvertimento: l'ecologia punitiva, che preme sui più poveri, è senza uscita.

Io vi propongo quindi alcune proposte: innanzitutto, per ridurre i gas a effetto serra e per finanziare la transizione ecologica, bisogna tassare i flussi mondiali prima di tassare i popoli. Possiamo anche utilizzare la Banca centrale europea, come avete fatto per salvare il sistema bancario. Infine, bisogna mettere in place un protezionismo intelligente, fondato su norme ambientali virtuose e che daranno un vantaggio competitivo alle nostre imprese rispetto alle loro concorrenti straniere.

1-103-0000

Giovanni La Via (PPE). – Signora Presidente, onorevoli colleghi, ringrazio il Commissario Šefčovič e il Commissario Cañete per la proposta oggi pubblicata, che delinea la strategia per un'Europa a emissioni zero al 2050. Così, come avete sentito, in quest'Aula, c'è chi ritiene la vostra proposta, da un lato dell'Aula, poco ambiziosa, e chi invece, ritiene che sia una proposta che vada molto in avanti. Quindi, è chiaro che avete centrato l'obiettivo: avete dato un percorso a quest'Europa perché continui ad essere leader sul piano internazionale e a guidare la lotta al cambiamento climatico; così come abbiamo fatto dopo Parigi e così come stiamo continuando a fare.

Come tutti voi sapete, quest'anno abbiamo avuto diversi eventi avversi sul continente europeo – eventi scatenati sicuramente dal cambiamento climatico – che hanno comportato anche la morte di centinaia di persone. È chiaro che questo ci deve spingere ad agire, a fare di più, soprattutto per salvare le zone che sono più sensibili. Dobbiamo tutelare, da un lato, il nostro ambiente, ridurre ovviamente l'incremento della temperatura; però, dall'altro lato, dobbiamo sempre essere attenti a quello che è il sistema economico, perché non dobbiamo andare troppo in là dove non possiamo spingerci.

Credo che la strategia che avete delineato è una strategia equilibrata che potrà raggiungere gli obiettivi al 2050 ma che potrà senz'altro aiutare la crescita di un'economia verde e sostenibile.

1-104-0000

Dario Tamburrano (EFDD). – Signora Presidente, onorevoli colleghi, sono molto orgoglioso come cittadino europeo di ricevere questa comunicazione. È un segnale importante – e lo è – se è il primo firmatario di Parigi a darsi un obiettivo preciso per un'economia a zero emissioni nette al 2050. Infatti, gli effetti dell'instabilità climatica, previsti già da tempo dalla scienza, sono oggi fatti di cronaca quotidiana, delineando quella che è la nostra nuova quotidianità. Inoltre, noto con piacere un cambio di passo anche terminologico, dal momento che già nel titolo della comunicazione è citata non la parola "crescita" ma la parola "prosperità": le parole sono importanti, oltre ai contenuti.

Tuttavia, per evitare effetti più disastrosi, sappiamo che è necessario un più profondo cambio di paradigma. Siamo entrati in un'era di sfide enormi, dove l'economia neoliberista basata sul

mercato non sempre è in grado di gestire più il nostro futuro. Per superare queste sfide, sono necessarie politiche economiche fortemente espansive e il superamento dell'*austerità*, dando finalmente attenzione al bilancio del capitale naturale e non solamente ai bilanci finanziari che hanno perso di vista quello che è l'equilibrio termodinamico, che regola l'economia e la nostra esistenza sulla Terra, prestando quindi attenzione a quello che è il cosiddetto *spread* ecologico.

Contemporaneamente, è inefficace pensare alla leadership nella lotta al cambiamento climatico senza considerare l'effetto degli scambi commerciali; i prodotti non sono sottoposti a un'analisi del carbonio emesso con la delocalizzazione delle produzioni che noi importiamo: è quindi urgente l'istituzione di una tassa sul carbonio alla frontiera europea e, eventualmente, una riforma dell'OMC in questo senso.

Per essere leader responsabili e consapevoli, inoltre, non possiamo nemmeno trascurare le necessità dei paesi in via di sviluppo: viviamo sullo stesso pianeta! Dobbiamo evitare che prendano le scelte sbagliate da noi imboccate nel secolo scorso e quindi dobbiamo permettere che non solo le persone, ma soprattutto la conoscenza possa fluire liberamente. Noi abbiamo un debito nei confronti di alcuni paesi ai quali abbiamo levato risorse ed è un debito che possiamo ripagare fornendo loro le conoscenze e le tecnologie necessarie alla lotta al cambiamento climatico.

1-105-0000

Francesc Gambús (PPE). – Señora presidenta, señores comisarios, quisiera empezar agradeciendo a los comisarios Arias Cañete y Šefčovič la rápida respuesta de la Comisión en la lucha contra el cambio climático tras la publicación del alarmante informe de las Naciones Unidas.

Hoy, a las puertas de la Cumbre del Clima de Katowice, la Unión Europea debe renovar su liderazgo y compromiso en la lucha contra el cambio climático y les deseo, en ese sentido, acierto y suerte a partes iguales.

Debemos avanzar más y más rápido. Para ello, conjuntamente con las inversiones necesarias, debemos dotarnos de los instrumentos para apoyar un proceso de descarbonización y desfosilización que permita conjugar nuestros compromisos a nivel internacional con el mantenimiento de una industria europea competitiva, capaz de crear nuevos puestos de trabajo que permitan la transición social, que permitan también recuperar a aquellos que se van quedando atrás.

Para 2020, los Estados miembros y los principales emisores de CO₂ deben participar y facilitar a la Comisión toda la información disponible para que, conjuntamente con este Parlamento, puedan decidir la mejor estrategia para alcanzar tan alto objetivo que, a mi entender, pasa por una apuesta decidida por las energías renovables; la neutralidad tecnológica; la colaboración estrecha, en consecuencia, con los principales actores de la industria, de la innovación, de la investigación; la mejora en eficiencia energética; y una mayor implantación de la economía circular en todas las etapas del proceso productivo.

Y, para ello, la Comisión también debe entender que es urgente actualizar la Directiva de ecodiseño.

1-106-0000

Catch-the-eye procedure

1-107-0000

Bogdan Andrzej Zdrojewski (PPE). – Jestem zwolennikiem rozwiązań proekologicznych, ale oczywiście realnych. A także zwolennikiem liczenia kosztów brutto a nie tylko i wyłącznie netto. Jeżeli ktoś mówi, iż energia ekologiczna jest droższa, to zapomina o tym, że życie w smogu jest

kosztowne dla państw. Kosztowne, jeżeli chodzi o leczenie, utratę zdrowia, a w niektórych wypadkach życia.

Opowiadam się za realnymi programami i za realnym monitorowaniem. W ramach tego monitorowania trzeba szukać także dodatkowych zachęt dla tych państw, które muszą ponosić koszty zmieniania swojego systemu energetycznego, bo rzeczywiście to w niektórych wypadkach buduje negatywne skutki dla kosztów życia, te bezpośrednio, płacone przez konsumentów. Ale podkreślam jeszcze raz, że dla nas dzisiaj, po to żeby osiągnąć realne cele, potrzebny jest dobry monitoring, skuteczne narzędzia i dobra motywacja.

1-108-0000

Maria Grapini (S&D). – Doamnă președintă, stimați domni comisari, dragi colegi, evident că subiectul este interesant și important pentru toată lumea, evident că noi, ca parlamentari, suntem de acord, ca Parlament European, cu reducerea emisiilor, însă, așa cum s-a mai spus aici, există nivele diferite de posibilități ale statelor membre și domnii comisari au subliniat aici: avem nevoie de investiții în tehnologie, de investiții în infrastructură.

Întrebarea mea către Comisie este: dacă vrem să atingem aceste ținte și să nu rămână niște vise puse pe hârtie, cum gândiți în noul cadru financiar multianual să existe alocate resurse pentru a veni cu o tehnologie modernă, pentru a putea îmbunătăți infrastructura și pentru a putea să ajungem la aceste ținte care sunt, evident, benefice pentru umanitate?

Aș mai avea o întrebare legat de faptul că Uniunea Europeană este lider în scăderea emisiilor noi, noi nu suntem singuri aici pe glob: ce părere aveți, ce se poate face ca și celelalte continente și celelalte instituții să lupte pentru scăderea emisiilor lor, global?

1-109-0000

Jakop Dalunde (Verts/ALE). – Fru talman, kommissionen och kära kolleger! I sin nya klimatstrategi bekräftar kommissionen äntligen det som Parisavtalet redan förpliktar – EU måste bli koldioxidneutralt. Det är en såväl välkommen som senkommen insikt.

Kommissionen har också insett värdet i den gröna omställningen. Strategin beskriver väl hur klimatsatsningar kan gå hand i hand med ekonomisk utveckling, stärkt konkurrenskraft och nya arbetstillfällen. Mot bakgrund av just detta ställer jag mig emellertid mycket kritisk till varför man väntar till 2030 med att börja arbeta från den nya strategin. Om man beskriver att det är bråttom, varför inte agera redan nu?

Det är avgörande att denna strategi översätts till nya initiativ nu – skarp lagstiftning, högre pris på klimatpåverkan och offensiva gröna investeringar. Annars är målet om nollutsläpp omöjligt att nå. Det är dags att agera nu – klimatet kan nämligen inte vänta.

1-110-0000

Xabier Benito Ziluaga (GUE/NGL). – Señora presidenta, señores comisarios, la Comisión ha dado un buen paso proponiendo la neutralidad climática para 2050. Sin embargo, veo en esta propuesta el mismo baile de fechas y cifras que cuando usted, señor comisario Arias Cañete, tiene que responder sobre cuándo se cerraron las cuentas *offshore* de su familia.

Y, sin embargo, yo me pregunto también: ¿es creíble este objetivo viniendo de ustedes y de lo que han estado haciendo hasta ahora? ¿Cómo les vamos a creer cuando están proponiendo retrasar la mayoría de los esfuerzos para después de 2030, cuando la clave es lo que hagamos en esta década? A eso, en fútbol —usted, señor comisario, lo sabe— se le llama el «patapúm palante»: el retrasar lo urgente.

¿Cómo creerles cuando acabamos de aprobar unos objetivos de renovables y eficiencia energética totalmente insuficientes que, o bien son papel mojado, o bien hay que revisarlos al alza, como ya reclamábamos desde nuestro Grupo?

¿Cómo creerle si pretenden seguir manteniendo y dando prioridad al gas fósil en la estrategia de la Unión Europea? El cambio climático, señores comisarios, afecta ya a millones de personas, entre ellos muchos europeos, así que, por favor, sean coherentes.

1-111-0000

John Stuart Agnew (EFDD). – Madam President, agriculture will be expected to reduce its greenhouse gas emissions. Farmers can reduce CO2 emissions by reducing tractor use. This is possible without reducing productivity if GM seeds and glyphosate are regularly used to establish crops. The green lobby hate GM and glyphosate even more than they hate CO2, so the alternative is to abandon some land and reduce food production.

Farmers can reduce methane emissions by feeding their ruminants expensive cereals and soya instead of grazing grass. This significantly raises the costs of producing meat, milk leather and wool. The green lobby insist that ruminants should be able to graze naturally so the only alternative is for the farmer to reduce ruminant numbers.

Farmers can reduce nitrous oxide emissions by growing fewer leguminous crops, but the green lobby want more protein crops grown in Europe. These are leguminous. The green lobby cannot have it both ways.

Farmers can reduce water vapour emissions by maintaining large areas of bare soil, preventing transpiration. The green lobby do not like bare soil because of erosion risk. Perversely, but fortunately, the green lobby do like the greenhouse gas water vapour.

1-112-0000

Dobromir Sośnierz (NI). – Pani Przewodnicząca! Ja może nie wiem, jak obniżyć temperaturę na Ziemi o dwa stopnie, ale wiem, jak tego nie należy robić. Nie należy tego robić tak, że państwa odpowiedzialne za 10 % światowych emisji będą się wykrwawiały, próbując obniżyć swoje emisje o 40 %, co da w skali świata mniejszy efekt, niż gdybyśmy namówili wszystkich, żeby obniżyli emisje o 5 %. Taka postawa to frajerstwo, bo emisje, które wykluczymy na swoim terenie, przeniosą się w inne miejsce, inni na tym zarobią, my stracimy i nic z tego wszystkiego nie będzie. Dodatkowo podbijając stawkę i podnosząc cele coraz wyżej, do 30, 40, 50 %, zniechęcamy innych do tego, żeby poszli naszą drogą, bo pokazujemy tylko negatywne skutki i wysokie koszty, które nie przynoszą w skali świata żadnych efektów. Dlatego nie idźmy tą drogą.

1-113-0000

Florent Marcellesi (Verts/ALE). – Señora presidenta, señores comisarios, gracias por sus propuestas, pero me temo que ninguno de los escenarios propuestos por la Comisión es realmente compatible con limitar a tiempo el calentamiento global a un grado y medio, y eso no puede ser, porque, con esos escenarios, el sur de España podría convertirse en un desierto y los próximos refugiados climáticos podrían ser las y los andaluces. No lo digo yo: lo dicen los expertos climáticos de las Naciones Unidas.

Y digo yo, ya que vamos a descarbonizar la economía, por qué no hacerlo bien ahora; es decir, más rápido y con más ambición, para cumplir el Acuerdo de París tal y como pedimos en el Parlamento Europeo. Esto significaría miles de empleos y una economía mucho más próspera, además de grandes beneficios para la salud.

A pocos días de la COP24, estamos perdiendo la oportunidad de liderar la ambición climática mundial. Si Donald Trump no se cree el cambio climático, y la UE no da ejemplo, díganme quién más lo va a hacer.

1-114-0000

(End of catch-the-eye procedure)

1-115-0000

Maroš Šefčovič, *Vice-President of the Commission*. – Madam President, if you'll allow me to elaborate on three points on the deepest transformation. We started with our European economy, on the importance of social inclusion and the need for more advanced technology to use to power this transformation. Before I start, I really would like to thank the honourable Members for what I feel was broad support for our approach and for seeing this importance in the same way as we do. I absolutely agree with honourable Member Gerbrandy that what we started under the Energy Union is the deepest transformation of our energy systems since they were built in Europe one hundred years ago. I would like to assure Ms Rivasi and Mr Eickhout that climate change is a top priority for this Commission and I am ready to say that no other Commission in the history of the European Union did more to tackle climate change than this one, and it was in close cooperation with this House, the European Parliament.

Looking at the parameters, at the pace and milestones – and here I am sure that my colleague, Commissioner Miguel Arias Cañete, will explain the calendar and the timelines of our efforts – it is very important to have public support and to have people on board. Therefore, the issues like energy poverty and the need for upskilling for those who might lose their job because of this energy transformation are so important. Therefore, we started close cooperation with the co-regions in the transition, where we already have seven countries working with us and we will have our first annual assessment already this Friday and, yes, already in Katowice, just to show that we care, we have the solution and we have to offer these people a new, brighter, cleaner economic future.

When it comes to technologies, as you will see from our strategy, we've been looking at all aspects of the technologies and some of them would need help through our research and innovation programmes, would need help through our eligible Important Projects of Common European Interest (IPCEI) state aid programmes, like we do for batteries. Of course, we need to de-risk some of the financing for these cutting-edge new technologies, but it is very important, because what I see in the world of batteries is that if we hadn't started at European level a year ago, we would really have risked being behind our competitors in Asia for many, many years. We need cleaner mobility, we need electric cars, we need less air pollution in our cities. Therefore, we are aiming to have 35 million electric cars in Europe by 2030, and I want to make sure that they will be powered by high-quality green energy batteries in Europe because the market for that would be enormous: EUR 250 billion a year. That is the challenge. That's a market we have to capture.

What we are announcing today is the opening of the debate. We need to have the people with us. We need to analyse all the aspects of it and I'm sure that we will present an excellent story and clear European leadership, not only in Katowice, but also later when we present the document to the UN.

1-116-0000

PRZEWODNICTWO: ZDZISŁAW KRASNODEŃSKI

Wiceprzewodniczący

1-117-0000

Miguel Arias Cañete, *Member of the Commission*. – Mr President, I would like to thank all the honourable Members who have participated in this debate.

Some of you have complained that this strategy is not ambitious. Others considered the importance and dimension of this strategy. I would just say that the strategy proposed by the Commission is fully in line with the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change (IPCC) Special Report. The Special Report talks of global greenhouse gas neutrality by 2070 and carbon neutrality, which is not as ambitious as greenhouse gas neutrality, in 2050. The Commission strategy is far more ambitious because it nails down climate neutrality and greenhouse gas neutrality already in 2050, 20 years before what the IPCC, with the better science available, recommends at global level, so we have ambitious objectives. It is very clear, if you read the communication, that the Commission considers that the European Union should, by 2050, be among the first to achieve net-zero greenhouse gas emissions and lead the way worldwide. To do so, the European Union needs to step up its efforts. That means that we have to go through scenario 7 and 8, which are the most ambitious scenarios and those which lead to climate neutrality. The ambition is here and it touches all sectors of the economy.

Some of you say, 'well, but there is no action'. We have started taking action. We have delivered, as Vice-President Šefčovič said, all the legislation needed on the climate, the Emissions Trading System that performs as foreseen, regulations on, land use, land use change and forestry, the whole energy union package. With the cooperation of Parliament, which has been more ambitious than the Commission – for sure, I have to recognise it – we could have a very good dialogue and we convinced also the Council to go along and now we have legislation that permits us to reach a reduction in emissions in 2030 of at least 45% – it might be bigger if other legislation comes – and this simple legislation, as the Vice-President said, will lead us in 2050 to emission reduction of greenhouse gas emission levels of 60%. So we are already working, but also because of you, we have excellent review clauses in 2023 and 2024 in all the legislation. That means that there will be more ambitious targets in 2030 because there are review clauses there that you have introduced and you have agreed, Mr Eickhout. So we have the tools, we have the elements to start being ambitious, but for sure we have to step up efforts in the future. This is a revolutionary change, a societal change. It's a radical change. That's why I don't understand very well why Mr Eickhout considers that we can lead this exercise in 20 minutes. No, because now we, the Commission, are inviting the European Parliament, the European Council, the Committee of the Regions, the Economic and Social Committee and the European Investment Bank to consider this mission for a climate neutral Europe in 2050. We have to prepare the special summit of the Heads of State and of Government for shaping the future of Europe at the European Council on 9 May 2019 in Sibiu. In order to prepare for that Council, we want to have a real Council – all the relevant Council formations should have extensive political debates on the contribution of the respective policy areas to the world vision because this touches every area: industry, transport, mobility – all of them – energy, buildings, heating. This is a very complex debate at Council and at Parliament level. It touches all the committees of the House.

All the Commissioners have worked together in project teams in order to deliver this communication. It has been a complicated exercise, but we have the product here. Also, in parallel to this political exercise, during the first half of 2019, the European Commission will take the debate on the necessary deep economic transformation and the profound societal change in an open and inclusive manner to all Member States, to national parliaments, to business, NGOs, cities, communities, citizens and youth. They should participate in a dialogue in the European Union and give their contributions on what is the level of ambition we really want and what is the speed of travel we really want with this informed debate in the whole of Europe.

I expect in the European elections we will talk about the climate and that could be one of the most important topics. Nine out of ten Europeans think that the climate is an important problem and

more than 74% that it is a very important problem. I think these topics will be at the election. If the different political parties show their positions and we have a world debate, then we are ready to go to the United Nations in 2020 with the final strategy.

This is the first Commission communication to launch the debate. We have preferred scenarios, for sure. We have four ambitions and we also want an informed debate and that, finally, we follow an ambitious path and we are the first major economy to reach climate neutrality in 2050. It's hard. We will require huge investments but with huge benefits also: for health, the economy and also for the responsibility we have with the rest of the world.

Some of you said it, if we don't lead, nobody will lead us. The United States are on climate holidays, as the Governor of California, Jerry Brown, said, and it is up to us to lead the way. But if we show that it is feasible and all our impact assessments – and I recommend that you have a look at the in-depth analysis that supports the Commission communication, which is a communication with 20-something pages, the documents here show the difficulties and the challenges, but the possibility to achieve our targets. This is a complex exercise. It touches all society and is something we have to discuss in depth. This is the first moment we sit together. There will be much conversation on it and I expect that we will reach agreement on a very ambitious pathway to deliver what is expected of the European Union: the leading climate change policy in the world.

(Applause)

1-118-0000

Przewodniczący. – Zamykam debatę.

Oświadczenia pisemne (art. 162)

1-118-2500

Clara Eugenia Aguilera García (S&D), *por escrito.* – El Grupo S&D apoya una economía neta con cero emisiones de carbono para 2050, pero demanda acciones para una transición justa. En este sentido, los socialdemócratas españoles en el Parlamento Europeo celebramos la propuesta de la Comisión Europea de poner fin a las emisiones de gases de efecto invernadero para el año 2050, pero teniendo en cuenta que hay que asegurar que la transición a una economía neta cero en carbono beneficie a todos los ciudadanos y no cree nuevas desigualdades. La estrategia debería contribuir a cerrar la brecha creciente entre ricos y pobres y reforzar la cohesión social entre los ciudadanos y entre las regiones. Los eurodiputados socialdemócratas han liderado el trabajo legislativo en el Parlamento Europeo para conseguir una legislación ambiciosa sobre energía renovable y eficiencia energética. Sin embargo, se necesita una visión global para garantizar una sociedad sostenible y liderar una transformación ecológica que vaya de la mano con una reforma de la gobernanza económica y de políticas sociales para garantizar que esta sea una transición justa para todos. Por último, somos conscientes de que, para alcanzar los objetivos a largo plazo, se deben mejorar las ambiciones de objetivos intermedios de cara a 2030.

1-081-2500

José Blanco López (S&D), *por escrito.* – El Grupo S&D apoya una economía neta con cero emisiones de carbono para 2050, pero demanda acciones para una transición justa. En este sentido, los socialdemócratas españoles en el Parlamento Europeo celebramos la propuesta de la Comisión Europea de poner fin a las emisiones de gases de efecto invernadero para el año 2050, pero teniendo en cuenta que hay que asegurar que la transición a una economía neta cero en carbono beneficie a todos los ciudadanos y no cree nuevas desigualdades. La estrategia debería contribuir a cerrar la brecha creciente entre ricos y pobres y reforzar la cohesión social entre los ciudadanos y entre las regiones. Los eurodiputados socialdemócratas han liderado el trabajo

legislativo en el Parlamento Europeo para conseguir una legislación ambiciosa sobre energía renovable y eficiencia energética. Sin embargo, se necesita una visión global para garantizar una sociedad sostenible y liderar una transformación ecológica que vaya de la mano con una reforma de la gobernanza económica y de políticas sociales para garantizar que esta sea una transición justa para todos. Por último, somos conscientes de que, para alcanzar los objetivos a largo plazo, se deben mejorar las ambiciones de objetivos intermedios de cara a 2030.

1-081-6250

Soledad Cabezón Ruiz (S&D), *por escrito*. – El Grupo S&D apoya una economía neta con cero emisiones de carbono para 2050, pero demanda acciones para una transición justa. En este sentido, los socialdemócratas españoles en el Parlamento Europeo celebramos la propuesta de la Comisión Europea de poner fin a las emisiones de gases de efecto invernadero para el año 2050, pero teniendo en cuenta que hay que asegurar que la transición a una economía neta cero en carbono beneficie a todos los ciudadanos y no cree nuevas desigualdades. La estrategia debería contribuir a cerrar la brecha creciente entre ricos y pobres y reforzar la cohesión social entre los ciudadanos y entre las regiones. Los eurodiputados socialdemócratas han liderado el trabajo legislativo en el Parlamento Europeo para conseguir una legislación ambiciosa sobre energía renovable y eficiencia energética. Sin embargo, se necesita una visión global para garantizar una sociedad sostenible y liderar una transformación ecológica que vaya de la mano con una reforma de la gobernanza económica y de políticas sociales para garantizar que esta sea una transición justa para todos. Por último, somos conscientes de que, para alcanzar los objetivos a largo plazo, se deben mejorar las ambiciones de objetivos intermedios de cara a 2030.

1-081-8125

Iratxe García Pérez (S&D), *por escrito*. – Los socialdemócratas apoyamos una economía neta con cero emisiones de carbono para 2050 y reclamamos acciones para una transición justa. En este sentido, los socialdemócratas españoles en el Parlamento Europeo celebramos la propuesta de la Comisión Europea de poner fin a las emisiones de gases de efecto invernadero para el año 2050, pero teniendo en cuenta que hay que asegurar que la transición a una economía neta cero en carbono beneficie a todos los ciudadanos y no cree nuevas desigualdades. La estrategia debería contribuir a cerrar la brecha creciente entre ricos y pobres y reforzar la cohesión social entre los ciudadanos y entre las regiones. Los eurodiputados socialdemócratas han liderado el trabajo legislativo en el Parlamento Europeo para conseguir una legislación ambiciosa sobre energías renovables y eficiencia energética. Sin embargo, se necesita una visión global para garantizar una sociedad sostenible y liderar una transformación ecológica que vaya de la mano con una reforma de la gobernanza económica y de políticas sociales para garantizar una transición justa para todos. Por último, somos conscientes de que, para alcanzar los objetivos a largo plazo, se deben mejorar las ambiciones de objetivos intermedios de cara a 2030.

1-118-5000

João Ferreira (GUE/NGL), *por escrito*. – Há um problema de partida na abordagem da União Europeia ao objetivo de redução das emissões de gases de efeito de estufa: a opção e a insistência por uma abordagem de mercado que revelou sobejamente não apenas a sua ineficácia, mas também a sua perversidade. O resto é muita propaganda e algumas medidas de discutível acerto. A criação de um comércio de licenças para poluir nada fez nem faz pela desejada redução da emissão de gases de efeito de estufa, sobretudo se a quisermos concretizada num quadro de justiça e de sustentabilidade. Deixar nas mãos do mercado objetivos ambientais – que bem podiam e deviam ser logrados por outras vias – será útil para alguns, sem dúvida, mas prejudicial para o ambiente e para as populações. Ademais, esta abordagem da UE tem associadas as limitações, as insuficiências e as contradições do próprio Acordo de Paris. A propaganda não chega. Sobretudo, quando as ações concretas ou não a acompanham ou laboram em sentido contrário. Continuamos, no fundamental, perante um quadro de incoerência entre os objetivos proclamados no domínio do ambiente e o conteúdo das políticas sectoriais relevantes – da política agrícola à política comercial,

entre outras. Se são necessários meios para alcançar determinados objetivos, a proposta de Quadro Financeiro Plurianual pós-2020 não autoriza triunfalismos.

1-119-5000

Miguel Viegas (GUE/NGL), *por escrito*. – A criação de um comércio de licenças para poluir nada fez nem faz pela desejada redução da emissão de gases de efeito de estufa, sobretudo se a quisermos concretizada num quadro de justiça e de sustentabilidade. Deixar nas mãos do mercado objetivos ambientais – que bem podiam e deviam ser logrados por outras vias – será útil para alguns, sem dúvida, mas prejudicial para o ambiente e para as populações. Ademais, esta abordagem da UE tem associadas as limitações, as insuficiências e as contradições do próprio Acordo de Paris. A propaganda não chega. Sobretudo, quando as ações concretas ou não a acompanham ou laboram em sentido contrário. Continuamos, no fundamental, perante um quadro de incoerência entre os objetivos proclamados no domínio do ambiente e o conteúdo das políticas sectoriais relevantes – da política agrícola à política comercial, entre outras.

1-119-0000

Carlos Zorrinho (S&D), *por escrito*. – A comunicação da Comissão Europeia intitulada “um planeta limpo para todos”, hoje debatida, é extremamente oportuna, e segue-se à apresentação pela Agência Internacional da Energia de previsões muito pessimistas sobre o grau de cumprimento global do Acordo de Paris, que considerou que mesmo os melhores esforços da UE podem não ser suficientes para conter o aumento de emissões a ocorrer, sobretudo na Ásia.

Esta comunicação vem realçar a importância da implementação rápida do pacote de energia limpa, bem como da finalização com objetivos ambiciosos das negociações institucionais em curso no que diz respeito à mobilidade limpa. Importa sublinhar que a comunicação “um planeta limpo para todos” propõe-se ser um pilar de uma visão estratégica de longo prazo que permita à União Europeia fazer uma transição sustentável e justa para uma economia próspera, moderna, competitiva e descarbonizada. A União Europeia está, neste momento, bem-dotada de ferramentas conceptuais e está em vias de dispor das ferramentas legislativas necessárias para aspirar a uma posição favorável para as pessoas, para a economia e para o ambiente no processo de transição energética. A chave, num plano intergovernamental, é a implementação. Os governos têm de dar seguimento a esta legítima ambição europeia e cidadã.

19. Pakiet dotyczący jednolitego rynku (debata)

1-121-0000

Przewodniczący. – Kolejnym punktem porządku dziennego jest oświadczenie Komisji w sprawie pakietu dotyczącego jednolitego rynku (2018/2903(RSP)).

1-122-0000

Elżbieta Bieńkowska, *Member of the Commission*. – Mr President, today we have the opportunity to talk about the communication we have just issued on the Single Market. In March, maybe some of you remember, the European Council asked us to present the state of play of the Single Market. They called on us to assess the remaining barriers, but also to set out opportunities for the future. Of course, there are more reasons why we decided to and why we needed to put this out right now. First, and most obviously, because this Parliament has six months left in this term and this Commission has just under one year. It is right to tell citizens and businesses where each of us stands. It is right that they know what the Commission has done and what the co-legislators have done so far. Second, because everyone in this room knows that the Single Market and the freedoms of the Single Market are really under threat today. Third, because there is no time to lose: what I hear again and again from businesses and entrepreneurs is that every minute we delay in creating the true Single Market is really an extra minute for our competitors in Asia or in the United States.

We need to revive the case for the Single Market. We need to shift the narrative from the traditional – completing the Single Market – to the new one: the Single Market as a tool to improve the lives of our citizens, raise our industrial competitiveness, to boost our standing and influence in the world. The traditional narrative of completing the Single Market really means only ticking the boxes, and this is what really, really a lot of bureaucrats do, but this is not really what we need right now in this moment of history.

Our communication shows that there are very real benefits for our citizens and for businesses, not just in terms of jobs, not just in terms of more growth, but also in terms of freedoms and opportunities for people's lives. It shows also three main areas where we really need to do more. These areas are as follows:

First, we need to adopt the proposals on the table. We have put forward, as a Commission, proposals only where there were the highest priority and all of them passed the most strict impact assessment. We have not flooded both Parliament and the Council with the new proposals, but still the statistics are stark. For instance, out of 67 proposals from the Commission directly relevant to the proper functioning of the Single Market, 44, for now, have still not been agreed by Parliament and the Council. The situation is especially bad on services and on capital markets and the banking union. We also need to agree on some key proposals for our digital Single Market, for example, copyright, e-privacy and platforms to business, just to name a few. We have four months to remedy this. We have four months to find truly intelligent compromises.

Secondly, we need to ensure that the rules deliver in practice. The Single Market needs everybody in the EU to play by the agreed rules. Let me just mention two words: defeat devices. I am currently dealing with over 1 000 infringement cases and this is over 1 000 unfair limitations on our citizens and on our businesses. I don't exempt businesses from the criticism either. We recently, for example, found out that 40% of websites do not allow customers from other Member States to conclude purchases online. Geo-blocking: our geo-blocking regulation enters into force next week, and it needs to be implemented very swiftly.

Third, a real third point, we must continue adapting the Single Market so that it really fits a changing economy. We have to be more precise on how services become more important because they complement products or replace products. We need to be more ambitious in integrating digital technology in our traditional service sectors. The Single Market for services, as we all know, does not work as well as the Single Market for goods, but it offers really great opportunities and it shows enormous untapped potential. We need to look more at how the Single Market supports our trade agenda and we need to reflect more on how to be much more consistent and ambitious on enforcement and how this fits with our competition rules.

Let me conclude by saying that of course I understand that these are not easy issues. I understand that they take political courage and they need strong leadership, but time and again, I hear representatives of different institutions and different Member States declaring their belief in the Single Market outside the negotiating room. Once they enter this negotiation room, the proposals are blocked or watered down. Decent proposals are blocked or watered down. When the European Council addresses or discusses the future of the Single Market next month, I hope that the leaders will renew their commitments, not only in words but also in deeds, and I hope that they will show true leadership on this.

1-123-0000

Andreas Schwab, *im Namen der PPE-Fraktion*. – Herr Präsident, Frau Kommissarin, liebe Kolleginnen und Kollegen! Ich finde es gut, dass die Kommission einige Monate vor den Europawahlen mit dieser Mitteilung nochmals deutlich gemacht hat, dass der Binnenmarkt und

die Zusammenarbeit der Volkswirtschaften der 28 Mitgliedstaaten das Wohlstandspotenzial beinhalten, das uns in Europa Wachstum beschert und letztlich für den Wohlstand von knapp 500 Millionen Bürgerinnen und Bürgern in Europa verantwortlich ist. Leider kann man das am Ende nur mit Zahlen zeigen, und Zahlen führen immer ein Stück weit dazu, dass Emotionen verloren gehen. Aber um mich kurz zu fassen: Dass es uns in Europa heute so gut geht – und das gilt ja statistisch für alle Mitgliedstaaten im Durchschnitt, auch wenn es viele Bürgerinnen und Bürger nicht wahrhaben wollen –, das liegt daran, dass wir in Europa zusammenarbeiten, dass wir ganz häufig statt 28 unterschiedlichen einzelnen Regelungen nur eine europäische haben. Deswegen muss man ganz deutlich sagen: Europa steht nicht für Bürokratie, sondern mit einer europäischen Regelung schaffen wir gleichzeitig 27 ab. Deswegen bedeutet der Binnenmarkt weniger Bürokratie.

Das gilt natürlich insbesondere auch im Hinblick darauf, was Frau Kommissarin angesprochen hat, dass die Mitgliedstaaten, die betroffenen *economic stakeholders* im Außengespräch immer darauf hinweisen, wie stark sie für den Binnenmarkt sind, aber wenn es konkret wird, tun sie sich schwer. Wir haben das mit dem Dienstleistungspaket der Kommission gesehen. Aber ich darf natürlich auch darauf hinweisen, dass das Europäische Parlament in harter Arbeit auch bei manchem Widerstand des Rates dafür gesorgt hat, dass wir jedenfalls zwei der Vorschläge mehrheitsfähig gemacht haben, die sich letztlich genau diesen Anfeindungen in den Mitgliedstaaten auch ausgesetzt sahen.

Deswegen glaube ich, dass wir in den kommenden Jahren viel stärker darauf hinweisen müssen, dass der Binnenmarkt eben nicht nur die Zuständigkeit des Binnenmarktkommissars ist, dass der Binnenmarkt eben nicht nur GD GROW ist, sondern dass der Binnenmarkt von sehr vielen weiteren Zuständigkeiten in der Europäischen Kommission geprägt ist, die alle zusammenarbeiten müssen, damit sie die europäischen Mitgliedstaaten entsprechend überzeugen können.

1-124-0000

Nicola Danti, a nome del gruppo S&D. – Signor Presidente, onorevoli colleghi, voglio ringraziare anche la Commissaria per questa comunicazione. Credo sia importante celebrare questi 25 anni di mercato unico – che è sicuramente una storia di successo dell'Europa – ma cominciare anche ad avere un approccio diverso, perché comunque non tutto va bene, e qui si mette anche il bene in evidenza e, soprattutto, bisogna cominciare a far passare il concetto che il mercato unico non è semplicemente una categoria astratta ma impatta sulla vita dei cittadini ogni giorno: dal *roaming* ai prodotti digitali, ai consumatori. Insomma, un sacco di cose che migliorano la vita dei cittadini.

Io penso che sia importante fare un bilancio di questo fine legislatura: è chiaro che la Commissione ha avuto molte proposte sul tavolo – lo ha ricordato lei Commissaria – è anche vero che molte di queste proposte sono state sostenute con convinzione dal Parlamento. Tra queste: sicuramente l'abolizione del *roaming*, lo sportello unico digitale, il regolamento sulla cooperazione in materia di consumatori, le iniziative in materia dei dati – sia il *free flow* che i dati personali, insomma il *geo-blocking* – lo ha ricordato – tutte cose sulle quali il Parlamento ha dato il contributo in senso migliorativo.

Certamente, abbiamo perso tempo su delle proposte che non erano delle migliori, quelle sul pacchetto servizi; queste non andavano incontro alle esigenze dei cittadini né davano un valore aggiunto alla qualità della loro vita. Penso all'*e-card* – che abbiamo fermato in questo Parlamento – anche se abbiamo trovato poi alcuni compromessi sul test di proporzionalità e sulle notifiche.

Però, Commissaria, me lo faccia dire: ci sono anche delle proposte che sono arrivate tardi. Lei ha ragione, abbiamo pochi mesi davanti a noi, ma abbiamo avuto, solo nell'ultimo anno, proposte importanti che riguardano la tutela dei consumatori, che riguardano il pacchetto beni, che

riguardano le piattaforme. Queste proposte con sei mesi di tempo in più sarebbero state sicuramente portate a termine da questo Parlamento e invece, purtroppo, ci troviamo in queste ore a fare le corse per portare a termine cose molto importanti per i consumatori e i cittadini europei.

Però Presidente, mi faccia dire un'ultima cosa alla Commissaria: io penso che il mercato unico avrà un'evoluzione solo se affronteremo anche il tema fiscale, senza un tema fiscale in Europa il mercato unico avrà sempre maggiori difficoltà ad andare avanti.

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

1-125-0000

Paul Rübiger (PPE), *Frage nach dem Verfahren der „blauen Karte“*. – Ich möchte mich bei Herrn Danti recht herzlich bedanken, weil er angesprochen hat, dass die Roaming-Regelung für unsere Bürgerinnen und Bürger einen echten Nutzen der Europäischen Union darstellt.

Jetzt geht es natürlich darum, dass wir „*roam like at home*“ entwickelt haben – das ist auch bei der Bevölkerung sehr gut angekommen. Aber die SIM-Karten, die wir kaufen, dürfen wir nur in unserem eigenen Mitgliedstaat kaufen. Deshalb ist ein Wettbewerb zwischen den europäischen Mitgliedstaaten bis jetzt nicht möglich.

Glauben Sie, dass es in Zukunft möglich wird, eine SIM-Karte in allen 28 Mitgliedstaaten zu kaufen und echten Wettbewerb zu generieren?

1-126-0000

Nicola Danti (S&D), *Risposta a una domanda "cartellino blu"*. – Signor Presidente, io penso che ancora abbiamo da fare molti passi avanti sul tema della concorrenza a livello europeo. Sicuramente possiamo fare passi avanti. È chiaro che noi dobbiamo però garantire a livello europeo che vi sia una reale concorrenza ed equità anche da un punto di vista fiscale, perché un'azienda che paga poche tasse in un paese rischia di fare concorrenza sleale in questo settore, come in altri settori, alle aziende che invece pagano un livello di tassazione maggiore. Per questo io penso che il mercato unico avrà una grande prospettiva se accompagneremo la parte normativa di rafforzamento del mercato unico con un rafforzamento della politica fiscale.

1-127-0000

Daniel Dalton, *on behalf of the ECR Group*. – Mr President, I'd like to start by thanking the Commission because this report is a stark warning that the Single Market is far from complete, lacks political support from Member States and is, in fact, under threat. At the heart of this report is a goods-services divide. The Single Market in goods is well developed, although often undermined by national regulations, but the Single Market in services has barely got out of the starting gates. Only a third of Single Market-related legislation proposed this term has been approved. If we didn't already have the Services Directive, does anyone really believe that it would be passed today?

The European Parliament is often as guilty as Member States of protectionism. The e-card system, which would have made it easier for professionals to work across borders, was blocked here. The Single Market is supposed to be at the heart of the EU. Services is supposed to be one of the four freedoms – that's what I keep hearing in the Brexit negotiations – yet this Parliament seems to show little interest in it. Try being a hairdresser in Germany or a ski instructor in France. It's virtually impossible, and we are discriminating against other European citizens here. We need to match rhetoric with delivery and real commitment if the Single Market is to progress further. The risk today is that it slips backwards.

1-128-0000

Dita Charanzová, *on behalf of the ALDE Group*. – Mr President, I will start with a quote from the Mario Monti report: ‘the single market is less popular than ever, yet it’s more needed than ever.’

So 20 years since Jacques Delors declared the single market, people now take for granted the benefits it has brought our citizens: from cheaper and safer products to the right to work freely in any Member State, the four freedoms of the single market are the crown jewels of the European Union. It is something to treasure and to protect. The daily benefits of the European Union can be found in the single market. I do share your conclusions, your regret that after 25 years the single market is still not complete. The four freedoms, especially on services, are not fully implemented. So we must do more.

I believe the European Council must commit to a new pledge to further complete the single market by 2025, including a new binding timetable for action as European leaders did in 1985, a new pledge based on a proactive movement towards strengthening the single market and away from a defensive national focus. We must not fall into the trap of returning to national protection measures and new regulatory barriers, such as gold-plating European legislation. Our citizens need to understand that it is the single market and trade that supports jobs and growth, it is not isolationism in the form of new barriers.

1-129-0000

João Ferreira, *em nome do Grupo GUE/NGL*. – Senhor Presidente, Senhora Comissária, o Mercado Único tem ganhadores e tem perdedores. A livre concorrência capitalista no Mercado Único tem efeitos assimétricos, que tendem a acentuar a divergência económica e social. De um lado, as principais economias da União Europeia e da zona euro, e as respetivas multinacionais, que colonizaram mercados do centro às periferias, são os ganhadores. Do outro lado, os países economicamente mais frágeis, expostos a uma concorrência desigual e destrutiva, cujos mercados foram colonizados com forte disrupção do tecido empresarial, são os perdedores.

A política de coesão insuficiente nunca compensou por inteiro este efeito divergente e assimétrico. O aprofundamento do Mercado Único, por outro lado, foi subjugando ao mercado esferas crescentes da vida económica e social, e é indissociável das liberalizações, das privatizações e do ataque aos serviços públicos e às funções sociais do Estado. O retrato idílico que a direita e a social-democracia recorrentemente fazem do Mercado Único corresponde apenas a uma das faces da moeda: a dos interesses que defendem.

Os trabalhadores e os povos não têm razões para se reverem neste retrato.

1-130-0000

Robert Jarosław Iwaszkiewicz, *w imieniu grupy EFDD*. – Panie Przewodniczący! Jednolity rynek to największy, o ile nie jedyny sukces Unii Europejskiej. Jednak w ostatnich latach widać, że wciąż dużą rolę odgrywa na nim indywidualne podejście i interesy państw członkowskich, głównie dobrze rozwiniętych krajów Europy Zachodniej, kosztem słabszych partnerów z krajów nowej Unii. Interesy te wspierane są przez unijną administrację i unijne agencje.

To właśnie bizantyjska administracja tworzy kolejne bariery wejścia na wspólny rynek, tym samym nakładając kaganiec na wolność i wolny handel. W 2017 r. obowiązywało aż 7076 dyrektyw dotyczących jednolitego rynku. Czy to wciąż jest jeszcze wolny rynek? Jeśli chcemy utrzymania wolnego handlu, jeśli chcemy zwiększyć konkurencyjność, jeśli chcemy wzmocnić nasz przemysł, to wstrzymajmy legislacyjną maszynę i pozwólmy firmom na spokojną konkurencję na faktycznie wolnym rynku.

1-131-0000

Dobromir Sośnierz (NI). – Panie Przewodniczący! Jednolity rynek będzie wtedy, kiedy państwa powstrzymają się od jego regulowania. Każda regulacja, nawet próba regulacji wspólnej dla wszystkich państw dokonanej przez Parlament Europejski, prowadzi do tego, że rynek nie jest jednolity. Nawet te wspólne regulacje są bowiem wdrażane przez parlamenty narodowe trochę inaczej i kończy się to – jak ja to mówię – pozłacaniem, czyli tym, że przy wdrażaniu niektóre państwa podważają czasami sens danego aktu, a przynajmniej intencje prawodawcy unijnego.

Poza tym muszę się odnieść do tych nieprawdopodobnych bzdur wygłaszanych przez mojego przedmówcę na temat nieuczciwej konkurencji podatkowej. Nieuczciwe to jest opodatkowanie ludzi w sposób nadmierny. Nieuczciwe jest w ogóle opodatkowanie ludzi, by przeznaczyć uzyskane środki na rzeczy, które nie są absolutnie niezbędne dla funkcjonowania państwa. Nieuczciwe jest zabieranie siłą ludziom pieniędzy i dawanie ich innym ludziom. To jest nieuczciwe. Nie ma nic nieuczciwego w tym, że gdzieś obniża się podatki, bo obniżanie podatków jest właśnie formą uczciwości. Uczciwe jest, kiedy każdy dysponuje tym, co sam wypracował.

1-132-0000

Jiří Pospíšil (PPE). – Pane předsedající, já se zde také hlásím k těm řečníkům, kteří jednoznačně vyzdvihují význam a pozitiva jednotného trhu. Zkrátka a dobře i pro ty občany EU, kteří jsou třeba kritičtí k některým našim politikám, tak politika jednotného trhu je jasně vysvětlitelná a obhajitelná. Nicméně bojujeme pořád s protekcionismem a myšlenky jednotného trhu musíme pořád obhajovat a vysvětlovat.

Paní komisařka ve svém vystoupení položila řečnickou otázku, jestli bude jednotný trh někdy dokončen. Já se domnívám, že jednotný trh nebude nikdy dokončen. Pořád budou oblasti, ve kterých bude vhodné upravovat již přijaté právní předpisy anebo nacházet jednotnou regulaci pro celou Evropu. Kdyby se ty základní institucionální rámce jednotného trhu podařilo přijmout do roku 2025, bylo by to skvělé. V každém případě se domnívám, že je třeba na konci volebního období udělat revizi toho, co nebylo ještě přijato, a tyto věci předat příští administrativě, příští Komisi, příštímu Parlamentu. Bylo by totiž velkou škodou, kdyby příští Parlament a příští Komise začínaly tzv. od nuly a nenavázaly na to, co udělala tato Komise, co schválil tento Parlament.

Vedle toho, co nebylo dokončeno, bychom také měli sdělit vize, kde si myslíme, že by v příštím volebním období měly být cíle Parlamentu i Komise napjaty, je to třeba v oblasti služeb. Já i jako někteří moji kolegové cítím, že v oblasti služeb zkrátka a dobře ta regulace nefunguje příliš efektivně.

1-133-0000

Christel Schaldemose (S&D). – Hr. Formand! Tak for det. Jeg vil starte med og sige tusind tak til fru Bienkowska for at gøre en rigtig vigtig sag for bilindustrien og for det indre marked, nemlig at gå i rette med de medlemslande, der ikke sørger for og overholde vores lovgivning. Tak for det, det er nødvendigt, selv om det er hårdt arbejde. Det indre marked er rigtig rigtig vigtigt for os, og vi fejrer dets 25 års fødselsdag. Men når vi så samtidig alligevel også ser oversigten, og ser, at vi ikke er i mål med alle tingene, så kan det måske også skyldes at vi nogen gange får fokuseret på en smule af det forkerte. Det er altså, rigtig vigtigt, at vi selvfølgelig har de rigtige love på det indre marked. Men implementeringen skal også være i orden, og håndhævelsen skal også være i orden, og det har den ikke været. Måske skal vi fremadrettet være mere fokuserede på at have lidt færre love, vi arbejder med, for at få det indre marked til og fungere. Det skal ikke forstås som om, jeg er imod regulering, jeg vil gerne have regulering, men lidt færre, lidt vigtigere love, og så sørge for, at de bliver vedtaget, implementeret og håndhævet. Det tror jeg er vejen frem for vores gode indre marked.

1-134-0000

1-135-0000

Michaela Šojdrová (PPE). – Pane předsedající, volný pohyb zboží, služeb, lidí a kapitálu je zásadním faktorem pro celoevropskou prosperitu. Vytváříme tak druhou nejsilnější ekonomiku na světě a měli bychom umět tento potenciál využívat.

Přesto zde existují zásadní problémy, např. jednotný trh zboží znamená také jistou neférovost, a proto jsem přivítala iniciativu Komise, která naplnila volání poslanců i některých členských států po jedné kvalitě potravin a zboží. Není možné, aby zde byli spotřebitelé dvojí úrovně. Tedy opatření, které bude zavedeno – tzn., že některé praktiky obchodních řetězců budou považovány za neférové –, považuji za správné řešení.

Další otázkou je volný pohyb služeb, už to tady bylo zmíněno. Volný pohyb služeb by měl být zjednodušován a ne, aby byly budovány nové bariéry, jako je to např. u směrnice pro vysílání pracovníků.

Osobně chci poděkovat paní komisařce za předložení návrhu e-karty, poněvadž jsem ji považovala za velmi dobré zjednodušení služeb pro některé sektory, a bohužel byl to právě EP, který tuto iniciativu Komise prozatím zablokoval. Věřím, že bude obnovena a že na evropském trhu služeb bude zjednodušen tento pohyb.

1-136-0000

Julie Ward (S&D). – Mr President, the Single Market is vital for the prosperity and economic well-being of citizens in the UK and the EU. It gives UK businesses access to the world's largest market, of 500 million people, generating about GBP 10 trillion in economic activity. It is therefore a tragedy that the UK has agreed, in principle, to leave the EU and the Single Market. It is an act of self-harm and beneficial for neither side. It's obvious that the UK's best interests would be served by remaining as a Member State and continuing to be a part of the Single Market, enjoying all four EU freedoms – movement of goods, capital, services and people. EU countries trade twice as much with each other as they do with third countries. The Single Market is responsible for income gains in the UK between 2 and 6% – that's up to GBP 3300 a year per British household. Leaving the EU and the Single Market means that we will GBP 100 billion worse off a year, with our economy reduced by 3.9% by 2030. This will cost the average person, in each year, GBP 1090. Trade between the UK and EU will fall by 46% and foreign direct investment into our shores will fall by 21% and there would also be a fall in (*off mike*) revenue, up to GBP 23 billion less to spend on public services, pay ...

(The President cut off the speaker)

1-137-0000

Ruža Tomašić (ECR). – Poštovani predsjedavajući, jedinstveno tržište najveća je snaga Europske unije jer osigurava ekonomski prosperitet, a pristup njemu može se koristiti kao važna karta u odnosima s drugim globalnim igračima, jer svi žele prodavati svoje proizvode i usluge na velikom i bogatom tržištu.

Umjesto što gubimo vrijeme na daljnju političku integraciju koja je izazvala odlazak Ujedinjene Kraljevine i potiče rast nepovjerenja u Uniju kod građana, trebamo se fokusirati na ono što dokazano funkcionira, a to je jedinstveno tržište. Potrebna nam je daljnja ekonomska, a ne politička, integracija.

Stoga se nadam da će do kraja ovog mandata Komisija nastaviti s jačanjem jedinstvenog tržišta, smanjenjem administrativnog tereta i uklanjanjem barijera koje još uvijek postoje u finansijskom sektoru, uslugama i energetici.

1-138-0000

Tibor Szanyi (S&D). – Tisztelt Elnök Úr! Kontinensünk tartós békéje mellett az egységes piac az európai integráció legjelentősebb eredménye. Jelentőségét a belső integrációellenes politikai nyomás, és a nemzetközi versenytársak részéről jelentkező új kihívások erősödése ma még inkább aláhúzza.

Többek között a tőkepiaci unió és a digitális egységes piac példái nyomán áttörésre van szükség a szolgáltatások, a foglalkoztatás és a szociális rendszer, a körkörös, illetve a fenntartható gazdasági fejlődési modellek, vagy a mesterséges intelligencia oldaláról jelentkező újszerű kihívások megválaszolása érdekében.

Külön hangsúlyozom az adópolitikát, ahol meggyőződésem szerint az ÁFA rendszerek, és a közös konszolidált adóalap egységesítése irányába tett lépések nyomán reális cél lehet a fiskális unió teljeskörű megvalósítása.

1-139-0000

Seán Kelly (PPE). – Mr President, without doubt the single market is probably the single best example of what Europe has done in its time, and I suppose it has helped to create jobs, it has helped to create wealth. My own country is probably as good an example as you'll get. One of the poorest countries when we joined in 1973, now one of the wealthiest and fastest growing economies, because it opened up a market of 500 million people to us basically free of charge.

My friend Paul Rubig mentioned what we can achieve when we work together, particularly in relation to the roaming charges, which has been hugely beneficial to businesses and indeed individuals, probably knocking 50% off their phone bills every month. So for that reason one wonders why is there a reluctance to complete the single market. I just don't understand it, and my question for Commissioner Bieńkowska is how much can she achieve in the next 12 months? Maybe not all but everything would be a help. How much realistically can be achieved?

1-140-0000

Maria Grapini (S&D). – Domnule președinte, doamnă comisar, cred că măcar o concluzie avem: că piața unică este importantă și că nu am finalizat-o.

Pornind de la aceste idei, eu aș vrea să adaug la cele discutate aici și câteva lucruri și, poate, puteți în răspuns să și aduceți informații noi. Funcționarea pieței unice, sigur, depinde foarte mult și de alte lucruri care nu sunt în portofoliul dumneavoastră, eu cred că Comisia în ansamblu trebuie să lucreze pentru funcționarea pieței unice. Avem foarte multe probleme încă cu uniunea vamală. Dacă uniunea vamală nu funcționează unitar, evident că sunt efecte asupra pieței unice. Avem o segmentare a pieței unice. Nu avem piață unică, pentru că avem Schengen și non-Schengen, avem euro și non-euro, avem probleme cu foarte multe directive, plățile întârziate, de exemplu, sau directiva pe achiziții și foarte multe exemple vă mai pot da, euro și non-euro.

Ce ne propunem să facem concret, pentru că avem foarte puține realizări din punctul meu de vedere, le-au nominalizat colegii, nu le mai spun și eu, dar, poate, în răspunsurile dumneavoastră, puteți, sintetic, să ne spuneți care sunt următoarele lucruri pe care le-am putea rezolva în piața unică, pentru că aici avem nevoie de locuri de muncă, de sustenabilitate pentru IMM-uri, de creștere economică, în competiția aceasta globală.

1-141-0000

Inmaculada Rodríguez-Piñero Fernández (S&D). – Señor presidente, muchísimas gracias comisaria. Sin duda alguna el mercado único es uno de los principales logros de la Unión Europea. Pero estoy muy de acuerdo con lo que acaba de decir quien ha utilizado la palabra antes que yo,

para señalar la dificultad de no tener una auténtica unión aduanera, porque eso implica que no hay un auténtico mercado único.

Una unión arancelaria es una cosa, una unión aduanera requiere que haya un criterio homogéneo en materia de inspecciones, en materia de sanciones, en materia de controles; y me gustaría que la comisaria me escuchara porque me gustaría que me pudiera responder a mis preguntas. Le quiero preguntar: ¿cuál es la coordinación que tiene como comisaria con el comisario responsable de finanzas para poner fin a este problema? No podemos seguir defendiendo un mercado único sin una auténtica unión aduanera que garantice la competencia leal a nuestros productores frente a la competencia desleal de productos que llegan a otros puertos que incumplen las normas. Desgraciadamente veo que no me ha escuchado.

1-142-0000

(Koniec zgłoszeń z sali)

1-143-0000

Elżbieta Bieńkowska, *Member of the Commission*. – Mr President, thank you very much for your input, for your questions. I think all of us agree that, because it was repeated many times, the Single Market is one of the greatest achievements of the European Union, but of course, we have to face the truth, we have to face the reality that we are not using the full potential of this greatest achievement. We are not using it in 100% as was said, mostly in the services sector. The goods sector is more unified under the Single Market.

I welcome very much your constructive approach on the various issues, although I very much do not agree on one of the statements saying that some of our proposals were a waste of time. It was not a waste of time, for example, the e-card proposal was – I'm completely sure – a step in a good direction, it was a step to allow our companies to go cross border and to trade cross border and to provide their services cross border. Unfortunately, it was blocked, as some other proposals were.

I definitely also want to state that a fully functioning Single Market – because it is also under the framework of this communication – together with a properly functioning standardisation system will make the European Union, in an economic sense, more attractive, more powerful internationally and at the same time, ensure the high standards in the various sectors of our lives. Of course, those benefits should not be taken for granted. As we see also under this term of the Commission, of the Parliament, there is a lot of untapped potential.

The question was what else we can achieve in the next month to come. Let me say – and I regret it very much – that three of our proposals, notification, e-card and Single Market Information Tool (SMIT), were blocked either in the Parliament or in the Council. Still to go are the single digital gateway, mutual recognition, market surveillance and some parts of type approval in different sectors. There are still proposals that are being negotiated in trilogue. Some of them have not started yet, but I think we'll be able to deliver on all of those that I have just listed now before the end of this term. Definitely, those three, notification, SMIT and e-card, although seen by some as not highly ambitious, were really very important and substantial steps in a good direction, as I said.

1-144-0000

Przewodniczący. – Zamykam debatę.

Głosowanie odbędzie się podczas następnej sesji miesięcznej.

Oświadczenia pisemne (art. 162)

1-144-1250

Cristian-Silviu Buşoi (PPE), *in writing*. – The European Single Market is, unquestionably, one of the European Union's paramount achievements which significantly improves our citizens lives on a daily basis. However, our common market needs immediate adaptation to a fast-changing global economic environment, emerging business models and evolving digital technologies. I stress that existing fragmentations of the Single Market are to a high degree detrimental to EU's overall global competitiveness and its role within a world-connected economy that gathers ambitious and aggressive actors. I strongly believe that a fast, feasible solution would be to focus on implementation, instead of new legislation, especially in those cases where transposition overlaps existing national laws and standards.

1-144-2500

Lidia Joanna Geringer de Oedenberg (S&D), *in writing*. – The Single Market is one of the most basic and biggest successes of the European Union. We have accomplished the creation of the Single Market, but we have not completed it yet. Now it is time to implement needed improvements for the benefit of consumers and businesses. As achievements, we can mention the elimination of roaming, the recognition of qualification and university degrees across the EU, the enforcement of passengers' rights facing delays and inconveniences or removing obstacles in claiming social security abroad. The Single Market solutions bring tangible benefits to the everyday lives of European citizens.

Nevertheless, there is still work to be done. The proposals regarding copyright, the free flow of non-personal data, e-privacy and other crucial files need to be finalised before the end of the parliamentary term. The main challenges have not changed: explaining the idea and advantages of the Single Market; facing protectionist flows at various levels of governance; and the lack of a concrete deadline by when the Single Market will be completed. Every month of delay harms the competitiveness of the European Union market.

1-144-5000

Juan Fernando López Aguilar (S&D), *por escrito*. – A petición del Consejo, la Comisión realiza esta Comunicación donde recalca que no se puede perder más tiempo a la hora de legislar en el mercado único. Se cumplen 25 años de la creación de este, no obstante, actualmente sus libertades están bajo amenaza. Debemos abandonar la narrativa tradicional y ser más ambiciosos para poder alcanzar un mercado interior plenamente armonizado y eficiente, realmente justo, transparente y equitativo. Asimismo, debemos ser mucho más ambiciosos a la hora de integrar la economía digital, la cual crece a un ritmo 5 veces mayor que la «analógica». El Parlamento ha apoyado a la Comisión en sus iniciativas, pero tristemente parte de ellas están siendo bloqueadas por algunos Estados miembros en el Consejo. De igual manera, debemos tratar de forma prioritaria las cuestiones fiscales. Para alcanzar una competitividad real en el mercado único es imprescindible que la fiscalidad sea la misma para todas las empresas, independientemente del Estado miembro en el que estén basadas. Si una empresa paga menos impuestos que otra, pero compite en el mismo mercado, está compitiendo «de forma desleal». Para avanzar en la armonización y cohesión de nuestro mercado único, también debemos avanzar de forma conjunta en materia fiscal.

20. WTO: Przyszłe działania (debata)

1-146-0000

Przewodniczący. – Kolejnym punktem porządku dziennego jest debata nad sprawozdaniem sporządzonym przez Berndą Langego i Paula Rübiga w imieniu Komisji Handlu Międzynarodowego w sprawie WTO: Przyszłe działania (2018/2084(INI) (A8-0379/2018).

1-147-0000

Bernd Lange, *Berichterstatter*. – Herr Präsident, Frau Kommissarin! Wir haben eine globale ökonomische Realität, die von globalen Wertschöpfungsketten geprägt ist.

Da geht es in der Tat um Regeln für diese globalen Wertschöpfungsketten. Es geht darum, sicherzustellen, dass auf allen Stufen dieser globalen Wertschöpfungsketten vernünftige Arbeitsbedingungen vorherrschen. Alles das heißt eigentlich, dass wir mehr internationale Regeln, mehr multilaterale Regeln, brauchen. Da kommt natürlich die WTO in den Blick.

Auf der anderen Seite haben wir die Tendenz, dass einzelne Länder, genau diese so notwendig gebrauchten Regeln unterlaufen. Deswegen ist eine der ersten Aussagen in unserem Bericht, alle Partner, alle 164 Partner in der WTO, zu ermahnen, dieses Regelwerk nicht in Frage zu stellen, sondern weiterzuentwickeln.

Das gilt natürlich insbesondere für die Vereinigten Staaten, die immer noch blockieren, dass die Gerichtsbarkeit der WTO funktionieren kann und dass Richterinnen und Richter wieder nominiert und neu ernannt werden, und die auch in anderen Bereichen ihrer Handelspolitik die Regeln der WTO nicht akzeptieren und nicht respektieren.

Wenn das Schief macht, Regeln nicht mehr zu akzeptieren, dann bricht natürlich das ganze System auseinander, und das hat immense politische und wirtschaftliche Konsequenzen. Deswegen ist es so wichtig, dass wir jetzt darangehen, dieses Instrument zu erhalten, aber gleichzeitig auch weiterzuentwickeln, weil wir natürlich sehen, dass dieses Instrument, das 1994 gegründet worden ist, Reformen bedarf.

Deswegen wollen wir den Reformweg gehen und unterstützen dabei auch die Aktivitäten der Kommission, in allen drei Bereichen zu sagen: Wir müssen die Regeln überprüfen, sowohl zu gucken, dass Entwicklung für weniger entwickelte Länder gefördert werden kann, aber auch neue Elemente – wie elektronischen Handel – mit zu integrieren, so dass wir auch hier ein modernes Regelwerk der Welthandelsorganisation haben.

Wir müssen auch noch mal gucken, wie die Gerichtsbarkeit funktioniert, der zweite Pfeiler der Welthandelsorganisation. Ob man da vielleicht mehr Transparenz hineinbringen kann, die Prozesse auch schneller abwickeln kann und auch die Frage der Nominierung und der Funktionsweise des Gerichts reformieren kann, so dass Kritikpunkte damit aufgefangen werden.

Zum Dritten müssen wir uns auch die Arbeitsmethoden angucken. Zu meinen, dass alle 164 Partner alles zusammen auf einmal entscheiden können, dieses *single undertaking*, das glaube ich, ist eine Illusion. Wir müssen flexible *Facing in*-Methoden entwickeln, wie wir das ja auch schon beim *trade facility agreement* und bei anderen Abkommen auch gemacht haben, dass Gruppen von Ländern vorangehen können, ohne andere Länder zurückzulassen und dabei auch darauf zu achten, dass jedes Land die Möglichkeit hat, mitzumachen, also einen Kapazitätsaufbau zu organisieren, so dass hier wieder Dynamik in den Verhandlungsprozess hineingelangen kann.

Alles in allem müssen wir natürlich darauf achten, dass die WTO auch mit anderen internationalen Herausforderungen, wie den globalen Nachhaltigkeitszielen den SDGs kohärent ist, und die gilt es auch zu integrieren.

1-148-0000

Paul Rübiger, Berichterstatter. – Herr Präsident! Ich möchte mich zuerst beim Kollegen Lange recht herzlich bedanken, weil wir in diesem Bereich wirklich gut zusammenarbeiten.

Die WTO ist die Grundlage dafür, dass wir Kaufkraft weltweit stärken. Kaufkraft entsteht durch Export auf der einen Seite, weil hier neue Jobs entstehen und gute Löhne verdient werden können, und sie dient den Arbeitnehmern dazu, ihren Job zu sichern und ein noch besseres Einkommen zu

haben. Der Import dient uns allen. Wir alle sind Konsumenten. Wenn wir Produkte billiger und besser von irgendwo auf der Welt kriegen können, dann erhöht das auch unsere Kaufkraft. Also Export und Import verdoppeln die Kaufkraft unserer Bevölkerung. Ich glaube, das ist das wesentliche Merkmal des Handels, er dient beiden Seiten und es ist eine globale positive Entwicklung, wenn wir Handel fördern, und letztlich sichert Handel auch Demokratie.

1995 wurde die WTO gegründet. Ich muss sagen, ich war das erste Mal 1999 in Seattle dabei, wo es nur Demonstrationen auf den Straßen gegeben hat, wo man sich gegen Handel und für Protektionismus ausgesprochen hat. Ich werde es nie vergessen, dass der Präsident damals zu den Hafentarbeitern gefahren ist und gesagt hat: Wir machen die Grenzen dicht, ich helfe euch – was ich nie verstanden habe. Wir haben dann 2001 die Doha-Runde gehabt. Pascal Lamy hat hier die Idee verfolgt, dass wir Handelserleichterungen in den Mittelpunkt stellen. Dieses Kapitel wurde positiv abgeschlossen.

Wir haben natürlich auch die Frage der Landwirtschaft, wo es noch viel zu diskutieren gibt, und *aid for trade* liegt eigentlich im Zentrum unserer Entwicklungspolitik. Ich glaube, dass in diesem Bereich die nachhaltigen Entwicklungsziele eine ganz wichtige Rolle spielen: Nr. 2 – sichere Ernährung, nachhaltige Ernährung; Nr. 6 – *sanitation*, sauberes Wasser; Nr. 7 – erneuerbare Energie. Hier gibt es wirklich Handlungsbedarf, und hier können wir die Kaufkraft nicht nur in Europa, sondern auch in den Ländern, denen es wirklich schlecht geht, erhöhen und sie damit auch unterstützen.

Ich kann mich noch gut daran erinnern, wie wir dann 2002 gesagt haben: Es kann doch nicht nur Aufgabe der Minister und unserer hervorragenden Beamten sein, dieses Thema international zu bearbeiten. Wir haben dann begonnen, die Konferenz der Parlamentarier für die WTO zu gründen. Ich kann mich noch daran gut erinnern, mit Erika Mann haben wir gemeinsam mit der internationalen Parlamentarierunion auf gleicher Augenhöhe diese Konferenz der Abgeordneten geschaffen. Und das letzte Mal, in Buenos Aires, haben wir 300 bis 400 Abgeordnete gehabt, wo die Minister und die Verhandler Rede und Antwort standen. Das gehört auch dazu, dass die Abgeordneten, nicht nur die Regierungsparteien, sondern auch die Opposition, gerade in den *least developed countries* die Möglichkeit haben, diesen Entwicklungen zu folgen. Das ist aus meiner Sicht entscheidend, dass wir auch versuchen, die Erfolge zu kommunizieren. Wenn wir sehen, dass aus vielen *least developed countries* jetzt hochentwickelte Industrieländer geworden sind, dann ist das auch ein Erfolg der WTO. Dass wir Handelsstreitigkeiten vor Gericht lösen können, vor dem *Appellate Body*, und nicht mehr mit militärischen Mitteln austragen müssen, das ist auch ein Riesenerfolg der WTO. Und wir wissen schon, dass mit 164 Staaten ein einstimmiges Ergebnis zu erzielen, viel Arbeit und viel Zeit bedeutet. Und ich weiß, dass wir in der Konferenz der Parlamentarier der WTO inzwischen schon 42 Meetings gehabt haben und dass sich diese 16 Jahre wirklich gelohnt haben, weil natürlich die Aufmerksamkeit für Welthandelsfragen dementsprechend stärker geworden ist.

Jetzt ist es wieder Zeit für eine Reform, in die nächste Runde zu gehen. Das System hat sich bewährt, wir müssen es zukünftig noch verbessern.

1-149-0000

Cecilia Malmström, *Member of the Commission*. – Mr President, I would like to thank the two rapporteurs, Mr Lange and Mr Rübzig, for your report. It is very timely and you highlight many of the challenges that the World Trade Organisation (WTO) is facing. You also point at ways forward and they are very much in line with what we are trying to do in the Commission with support from you and Member States. It also sends a political signal in this moment that the European Union is strongly committed to strengthening and to modernising and to preserving the WTO.

As you said, the multilateral trading system has been good for Europe. It has been good for the world. We have had clear rules. It has been good for companies. It's been good for economies. It has helped economies to grow, lifting hundreds of millions out of poverty and promoting stability and peace. As you say, the WTO is now under huge pressure and experiencing a very, very severe crisis and, even though the WTO is not perfect, without the WTO, we would not be well off. That would be bad for us in Europe and it would be really bad for the most vulnerable countries in the world.

We in the European Union depend on open, rule-based, fair trade. That is essential for our economic prosperity and that is why the European Council, already in June last year, asked the Commission to take forward comprehensive approaches to modernising the WTO in its main functions – rulemaking, monitoring and dispute settlement – as a way out of the crisis. This was also echoed in the G20 meeting, for instance, so this is something that the whole world is aligned on.

There are many threats to the WTO. The Appellate Body is the most urgent one and there is a clear realisation about the need to resolve the Appellate Body crisis. Until recently, we hadn't seen a real strong awareness in the WTO community about the urgent need to reform, but I think this is gradually changing. The European Union is leading the reform efforts here and working with many other countries as well, and we are deepening and accelerating the work that I presented to you in September. There is a long list of challenges that need to be addressed – you mentioned them in your report – and it is absolutely necessary to put the WTO at the centre of a rules-based, multilateral trading system. As I said, the Appellate Body is the most urgent challenge. We believe that the proposal that we put on the table this week, together with 11 other countries, is a credible basis to engage with the WTO and show a way forward that would lead to a strengthened and modernised Appellate Body. We have also tabled, together with the US, Japan and a handful of other countries, a proposal on transparency and notification, which is important for trust and the functioning of the WTO internal procedures.

We also need to address gaps in the WTO rulebook. Mr Lange said that the rulebook is from 1995. Absolutely. So, of course, we need to update it. We need to address issues such as non-market policies, forced technology transfer and other items. We are working with the US and Japan to try to see if we can draft new rules in the WTO on these, and, of course, there are many other issues as well.

We are working together with a large group of WTO members on e-commerce. There were more than 80 countries engaging in this in Geneva as a result of the joint statement made in Buenos Aires almost a year ago – many of you were there – and that has translated to very active engagement and that is really good news.

Of course, there are the outstanding Doha issues, the development issues, which are not to be forgotten. We need to address them as well.

Finally, I agree with you that more should be done to contribute to achieving the Sustainable Development Goals, as we set out in the September paper. This is a vital strand of the WTO modernisation. We are engaged in the fisheries subsidies. That is one key in this, of course, but we are also working on identifying how the WTO could contribute to achieving the Sustainable Development Goals.

I am committed – and so are we all – to continuing to make every effort to engage with the WTO membership. The members of the Council of the EU countries are all supporting this strategy.

We're engaging with major trading partners, as well, to support our ideas and to push this forward. Prospects are uncertain. They are gloomy and, therefore, I very much appreciate not only the support that you are giving to the Commission, but also the hard work that you are doing and I encourage you to continue reaching out to parliamentarians across the world to support this as well.

Thank you very much for this very timely debate and I am looking forward to the debate.

1-150-0000

PRESIDENZA DELL'ON. DAVID-MARIA SASSOLI

Vicepresidente

1-151-0000

Linda McAvan, *deputising for the rapporteur for the opinion of the DEVE Committee*. – Mr President, I'm speaking tonight on behalf of Lola Sánchez, who was the rapporteur for opinion in the Committee on Development (DEVE).

There are two key messages from our committee which tie in with what people have already said. The first is that, yes, we need a rules-based system, but this is particularly important for developing countries, because in a multilateral system they've got a better chance of getting a level playing field, of getting a seat at the table and having their voice heard, unlike in bilateral deals where bigger economies can call the shots.

Secondly, our key message is that the multilateral trade system must be fair to all countries including the least developed countries (LDCs) and be set in the context of the sustainable development goals (SDGs). Free trade alone will not be enough to lift all boats, and so we need trade agreements which are broadly based, cover human rights, social and environmental aspects, and not just tariffs and trade liberalisation issues.

We also need concrete steps to deliver on this agenda, like supporting the UN process to negotiate a UN binding treaty on business and human rights, and we need initiatives on the value chains that Bernd Lange spoke about. We have two areas where we could make quick progress: the first is cocoa and the second is textiles. These are areas where there is a growing mood to get something done, and I think we could work with businesses and Member States to get things done. Otherwise, we're going to see national legislation and patchworks of national laws instead of having an EU law.

1-152-0000

Christofer Fjellner, *för PPE-gruppen*. – Herr talman! Världshandelsorganisationen, WTO, möter två hot just nu. För det första den tilltagande protektionismen i världen, där allt fler länder utmanar den regelstyrda handeln, tydligast USA. Detta har vi dock pratat mycket om.

För det andra, vilket är minst lika viktigt, det allvarliga hotet om att WTO blir omodernt, att det faktiskt inte klarar av vår tids, och framtidens, utmaningar: kinesisk statskapitalism, tjänstehandeln, den digitala handeln och våra alltmer överreglerade samhällen. Därför menar jag att den som värnar världshandeln och Världshandelsorganisationen, värnar en reform av Världshandelsorganisationen. Därför är kommissionens förslag väldigt bra.

Lyckas vi inte med det, så kommer vi att lämna den regelstyrda handeln. Då blir Europa och länder som Sverige de största förlorarna. Då lämnar vi en ordning där regler styr handeln, och det blir i stället den starkes rätt som styr. Det måste vi till varje pris förhindra, och detta arbete har bara börjat.

1-153-0000

Inmaculada Rodríguez-Piñero Fernández, *en nombre del Grupo S&D*. – Señor presidente, señora comisaria, la Comisión de Comercio Internacional manifestó un apoyo casi unánime al informe que han hecho y que mañana será votado en el Pleno. Y, por cierto, felicito a los dos copONENTES porque creo que levantamos la voz alta clara, fuerte y firme en representación de quinientos millones de ciudadanos en defensa del multilateralismo, en defensa de un orden internacional basado en el diálogo, basado en la democracia, basado en el respeto mutuo que algunos parecen haber olvidado —o puede que nunca lo tuvieron—.

Pero esas son las bases para poder avanzar y, para avanzar, es fundamental —usted lo ha dicho, señora comisaria— modernizar la OMC para hacer frente a los retos que tenemos que abordar y dar soluciones, como es el comercio digital, como son, efectivamente, los objetivos de desarrollo sostenible, como es la normalización en los derechos laborales.

Pero necesitamos también —no lo olvidemos— resolver los problemas que han quedado pendientes de la Ronda de Doha y hacer más fuerte a la Organización Mundial del Comercio, porque es la mejor garantía de poder resolverlos y plantar cara a los que defienden el proteccionismo. Y, desde luego, hay que manifestar mañana todo el apoyo al esfuerzo que está haciendo la Comisión en defensa de esa reforma, buscando la alianza con los socios solidarios. Creo que es el mejor mensaje que podemos dar a los ciudadanos: juntos por un futuro mejor.

1-154-0000

Elsi Katainen, *ALDE-ryhmän puolesta*. – Arvoisa puhemies, kuten hyvin tiedetään, WTO on hyvin monella tavalla umpisolmussa. Maailman kauppajärjestön toiminta on rampautunut, kun sen tärkein osa - riitojenratkaisuelin - on muuttunut toimintakyvyttömäksi.

Tämä heikentynyt järjestelmä murtaa globaalin kaupan pelisääntöjä, heikentää eurooppalaisten yritysten mahdollisuuksia, kun kaupan ennakoitavuus ja säännönmukaisuus ei ole taattu, ja siihen asiaan on saatava muutos.

Avoimen, sääntöpohjaisen ja syrjimättömän kauppajärjestelmän säilyttäminen on elinehto eurooppalaisille yrityksille, jotka elävät viennistä. WTO on tärkeää toimija monien globaalien kysymysten ratkaisemisessa, kuten ruokaturvallisuuden varmistamisessa. Samoin se antaa mahdollisuuden edistää ilmastotavoitteiden toteutumista globaalisti, jossa ratkaisujen on löydettävä globaalilla tasolla.

Mikäli me haluamme säilyttää yhteisen maailmankaupan pelisääntöjä valvovan järjestön, meidän tulee muuttaa sen sääntöjä. Komission esittämä aloite kauppajärjestön uudistamisesta on aivan välttämätön. EU:n tulee toimia tässä keskustelussa kaupan puolustajana ja löytää samanmieliset WTO:n jäsenet, joiden kanssa uudistusten kehittäminen on mahdollista.

1-155-0000

Klaus Buchner, *im Namen der Verts/ALE-Fraktion*. – Herr Präsident! Wir brauchen eine Welthandelsorganisation, die einen fairen Handel garantiert.

Heute bestimmen oft die internationalen Konzerne das Geschehen, das manchmal alles andere als fair ist. Wir haben z. B. eine hochsubventionierte Produktion von Milch und Hühnerfleisch. Wenn wir das exportieren, können die einheimischen Bauern mit den Preisen nicht mithalten; ihnen wird die Existenzgrundlage entzogen.

Unsere Freihandelsabkommen machen es möglich, dass Landraub geschieht, bei dem die Bauern aus ihrem angestammten Gebiet vertrieben werden. Wir bekommen billige Waren, wie Kaffee, Kakao und so weiter, von diesen Ländern aus Gebieten, die eigentlich für den Anbau der Nahrung

für die eigene Bevölkerung erhalten müssten. Dadurch erzeugen wir Flüchtlingsströme. Eine Reform der Welthandelsorganisationen kann hier Abhilfe schaffen.

1-156-0000

Helmut Scholz, *im Namen der GUE/NGL-Fraktion*. – Herr Präsident, Frau Kommissarin, liebe Kollegen und Kolleginnen! Wie selten zuvor in den letzten Jahren sind Fragen der Handelspolitik, der Regulierung der internationalen Handelsströme und über sie auch die Fragen, wie produzieren wir eigentlich, wie konsumieren wir, in den Mittelpunkt des öffentlichen Interesses gerückt.

Eine stärkere An- und Verbindung der WTO mit der IAO, mit der UNCTAD mit anderen internationalen Organisationen ist, für den Erhalt und die Stärkung eines verbindlichen, regelbasierten und transparenten internationalen Systems wichtig und notwendig und eins zu eins auf das gesamte, multilaterale Handelsarchitekturgebäude zutreffend. Nicht der wirtschaftlich Stärkere darf die Spielregeln setzen und entscheiden, vielmehr müssen partnerschaftliches Agieren und eine auf Problemlösung ausgerichtete Herangehensweise Maßstab für das Handeln, auch bei der Reform der WTO, sein – einschließlich der WTO Gerichtsbarkeit.

Die WTO zukunftsfähig zu machen, erfordert von uns klar, auch zu beantworten, wie weit wir als Parlament und Regierung in der Lage sind, globale Wertschöpfungsprozesse und das Agieren der transnationalen Unternehmen und der an den Finanzmärkten agierenden Kapitalgruppen im Interesse der Menschen und der Umwelt einzuhegen und zu regulieren.

1-157-0000

France Jamet, *au nom du groupe ENF*. – Monsieur le Président, mes chers collègues, ce projet de rapport tend curieusement à renforcer le dogme passéiste du libre-échange globalisé, qui est rejeté par de plus en plus de pays.

Pourquoi demander à l'OMC de la transparence dans les négociations et se dire garant du multilatéralisme alors qu'ici même toutes nos compétences commerciales ont été dévolues à la Commission de M. Juncker? Pourquoi engager l'OMC à renforcer ses pouvoirs afin de forcer la main aux États alors que c'est, avant tout, nos intérêts que l'Union devrait ici défendre? Non, le libre-échange ne crée pas d'emplois. Non, les tribunaux d'arbitrage ne protègent ni les États ni les consommateurs. Oui, un protectionnisme intelligent, à l'instar de l'ALENA renégocié, peut être une solution.

S'il y avait une seule réforme à proposer, dès aujourd'hui, dans le cadre d'un juste échange, ce serait d'ores et déjà de sortir l'agriculture de la compétence de l'OMC et des accords de libre-échange.

Le principe d'autosuffisance et la sécurité alimentaire n'appartiennent pas aux firmes mais aux nations.

1-158-0000

Jarosław Wałęsa (PPE). – Mr President, while the WTO has been at the centre of trade liberalisation, free trade agreements (FTAs) have also been a part of pushing free trade forward. It has actually been the interplay between the FTAs and successive GATT rounds that drove liberalisation forward, but now this has changed. Why? Among others, we reduced our tariffs and non-tariff barriers. We also grant generalised system of preferences (GSP) tariff privileges to developing countries. We did all this for the benefit of our consumers and industrial users, but now we have almost nothing to offer to our developing trading partners.

Also I don't think we have done enough in our trade system to protect our industry from those imports that have contributed to high CO2 and other greenhouse gas emissions. I note that there is an opinion from the Committee on Development (DEVE) that calls for a carbon emission tax. I think we should follow this call. Our EU industries are very efficient at reducing CO2 emissions.

We should consider imposing fees on imports that are not subject to similar achievements in the place of production.

1-159-0000

David Martin (S&D). – Mr President, I think we're nearly all agreed in this Chamber that the World Trade Organisation (WTO) is in crisis. Our message should be that this is the occasion for fundamental change and not an excuse for postponing it.

We need to use this opportunity to trigger negotiations on social and environmental standards in order to make sure that trade delivers on sustainable development.

We need to start the discussion on ending the present consensus rule because as it stands, it threatens to paralyse the whole system.

We need to rethink the definition of a developing country. Should China, given its prominent role in global trade, still be considered a developing country? Surely this is unfair on real developing countries which are in most need of special and differential treatment.

The WTO needs saving. We need a strong rules-based global trading system, but if we don't act soon I'm afraid it will wither on the vine.

1-160-0000

José Ignacio Salafranca Sánchez-Neyra (PPE). – Señor presidente, señora comisaria, señorías. La Unión Europea, con el 6 % de la población mundial, es el principal bloque exportador de bienes, el principal bloque exportador de servicios, uno de los principales importadores y, al mismo tiempo, el principal emisor y receptor de inversión extranjera directa. Sobre esta base es evidente, señora comisaria, que la Unión Europea tiene que liderar los esfuerzos para la reforma de la Organización Mundial de Comercio sobre la base de las Conclusiones del Consejo de junio y adaptarlo, evidentemente, a las nuevas circunstancias económicas. Un modelo basado en principios, basado en valores, basado en reglas que sea predecible y, sobre todo, que sea eficaz para nuestras empresas.

Por eso, apoyamos los esfuerzos de la Comisión para esta reforma, sus contactos con el conjunto de los organismos internacionales y, por supuesto, su dinámica de acuerdos preferenciales comerciales. Usted sabe muy bien, señora comisaria, cuál es mi tendencia clara en un acuerdo muy particular, y espero que en esta reunión del G20 en Buenos Aires podamos hacer avances sustanciales y culminar los trabajos que usted viene desempeñando.

1-161-0000

Procedura "catch the eye"

1-162-0000

Ruža Tomašić (ECR). – Poštovani predsjedavajući, promjenom političke karte na Zapadu slobodna globalna trgovina izgubila je dio podrške. I u Americi i u Europi jačaju pozivi za protekcionističkim mjerama. Mnogi bi to rado svalili na Brexit i Trumpa, ali prava je istina da je Europa odavno utonula u to ludilo.

Možemo se slobodno podsjetiti kako su CETA i TTIP primljeni diljem kontinenta i kako je lijevi spektar u ovome domu na njih reagirao. I Europa snosi svoj dio odgovornosti za sužavanje prostora slobode u globalnoj trgovini, ali moram priznati da se stanje mijenja nabolje, makar i samo zbog otpora Trumpu. U tom se smislu on pokazuje jako korisnim.

WTO se mora prilagoditi novonastalim okolnostima, ali i novim trendovima na svjetskom tržištu. Prije svega, digitalizaciji trgovine. EU u tome mora biti podrška i glavni zagovaratelj slobodne trgovine.

1-163-0000

Jean-Luc Schaffhauser (ENF). – Le commerce, pour être durable et avoir un avenir, doit être juste. Tel était le principe – je l’ai déjà dit ici, M^{me} Malmström le sait et je pense qu’elle connaît la charte de La Havane: pas trop de déficits, pas trop d’excédents.

Le commerce ne doit pas devenir une guerre économique qui appauvrit les autres, parce qu’alors, s’il se transforme en guerre économique, il ne peut pas avoir d’avenir. Et pour cela, la charte de La Havane proposait des équilibres.

Mettez-vous à la place des États-Unis: ils ont plus de 600 milliards de déficit, 400 milliards avec la Chine; sur la moitié – 200 milliards –, ils veulent mettre des droits de douane. Il faut les comprendre: auparavant, évidemment, ils étaient pour un commerce ouvert puisqu’ils dominaient le monde. Mais dans les nouveaux équilibres, ils sont pour rétablir les équilibres, ils retrouvent la charte de La Havane.

Et nous, l’Europe, nous devrions faire de même, Madame Malmström. Nous avons 120 milliards d’excédent avec les États-Unis, nous devrions nous poser la question de savoir comment équilibrer nos échanges et nous devrions nous poser la question de savoir comment équilibrer nos 170 milliards de déficit avec la Chine.

Prenons une nouvelle organisation, retrouvons l’esprit de la charte de La Havane.

1-164-0000

João Ferreira (GUE/NGL). – Senhor Presidente, instaurar uma nova ordem mundial, assente na desregulação e na liberalização do comércio internacional – ou seja, uma nova forma de protecionismo dos ricos, uma ditadura das multinacionais, forçando a concorrência da força de trabalho com proveniências geográficas distintas para obter a desvalorização geral da força de trabalho – foi, e é este, em grande medida, o intuito da Organização Mundial do Comércio.

Os últimos anos foram marcados por uma substantiva alteração das relações de forças no plano mundial, pela ascensão e crescente preponderância das economias emergentes e pela quebra da hegemonia relativa dos Estados Unidos e, também, da União Europeia e do Japão, o que ditou contradições, constrangimentos e bloqueios no seio da OMC, com os quais estas potências imperialistas não conseguiram lidar da forma que queriam.

Surgem, assim, as teses da reforma da OMC para superar bloqueios e contradições. Há que conformar melhor a OMC aos interesses ao serviço dos quais foi criada. Não correspondem seguramente aos interesses dos trabalhadores e dos povos. Esses reclamam uma outra ordem, assente no comércio justo e regulado, na complementaridade, no progresso social e no benefício mútuo.

1-165-0000

Bogdan Andrzej Zdrojewski (PPE). – Panie Przewodniczący! WTO jest w kryzysie. Co do tego wszyscy się zgadzają, jednak nie ma jednolitej opinii, czy wystarczy tylko lifting czy potrzebna jest głęboka reforma. Wiemy, że brakuje aktualnych rozwiązań prawnych. Wiemy, że nowoczesne technologie umykają WTO, i to w dwóch aspektach: przede wszystkim jako przedmiot handlu, a także coś, co może temu handlowi służyć jako instrument nie tylko kontroli, ale także rozwiązań. Z mojego punktu widzenia istotne jest przede wszystkim antycypowanie sytuacji.

Natomiast chciałbym się przeciwstawić opinii, która się tutaj pojawiła, że niewiele zrobiono w ostatnim czasie. Otóż ja uważam, że jeżeli chodzi o zmiany w WTO, przeprowadzono naprawdę dość dużo różnych działań, choć są one dziś oczywiście niewystarczające.

1-166-0000

(Fine della procedura "catch the eye")

1-167-0000

Cecilia Malmström, *Member of the Commission*. – Mr President, we are discussing a lot of issues here, but let me just focus on the World Trade Organisation (WTO) reform and the reports that are in front of us here.

You're absolutely right that there's a lot to be done. When the WTO was created the world looked very different to the one we have today, so it needs to be updated. But it's also an international organisation with 164 members operating by unanimity. We have difficulties agreeing among 28 countries, but with 164 countries is indeed complicated. Nevertheless, it is in urgent need of strengthening, updating and modernisation, to live up to the demands that we face.

So it's far from perfect, but if we did not have the WTO we would be much worse off. We would have total anarchy and those who would suffer the most, I have to repeat that, would be the poorest countries. It has been good for them to have these rules, this predictability, to be helped, to be inside the global system with the multilateral rules, and that's what we need to preserve, strengthen and develop.

But there's so much to do. We need to develop the internal function. Here the EU has been in the lead, together with a couple of other countries, to try to emphasise the need for continued transparency and notification. That is key for the WTO to function and to have its trust.

We need to make sure that the rules that we have agreed upon in the WTO are enforced. It is the appellate body, it has served us well in the European Union, it has served many other countries well as well, and that's what the most urgent need is. We have proposed here, with several other countries joining up, a way to come out of that deadlock and I hope this will be discussed in the coming weeks.

We do need to address the so-called old issues, the old Doha issues, absolutely we need to do so, and we are engaging with other countries to try to see if there's a way we can break the deadlock here.

We need to address new issues. As I said, we are talking about e-commerce and digital trade with many other countries. That is a good thing. Furthermore, we are discussing how women can be included in a more systematic way in trade, and we need to discuss, I fully agree with you, how the WTO can play a greater role in living up to the sustainable development goals.

We need to find ways there where we can work with all the other members and we need of course to make sure that we have modern rules, that the rule book is updated. And here, as I said, we are working with the US and Japan, but also with other countries.

So we are trying to put forward proposals. We will continue to do so. We will continue to ally with countries across the globe to work on this, but we do need your strong support here, and therefore I really appreciate the reports that we have been discussing, I thank again the two rapporteurs and also for the opinion of the Committee on Development (DEVE), I think that is very useful. So thank you very much for this and I think we will see each other again to discuss this further as the issue develops.

1-168-0000

Bernd Lange, *Berichterstatter*. – Herr Präsident, Frau Kommissarin! Es gibt zunehmend Menschen, die Globalisierung sehr kritisch sehen. Da sind ja auch viele Ursachen mit verbunden, was ihre eigene Lebensperspektive und die Möglichkeit, Zukunft zu gestalten, anbetrifft.

Dann ist die Frage: Welche Lösung gibt es eigentlich für diese Ängste? Es gibt einige, die meinen, man müsse zurück zum Nationalstaat und alles dann dort organisieren. Ich bin der festen Überzeugung, in einer Welt von heute ist das eine absolute Illusion.

Wir können unsere Zukunft nur gemeinsam gestalten und dann brauchen wir auch starke internationale Regeln. Darum geht es doch: Diese Globalisierung mit Leitplanken zu versehen, so dass das Leben der Menschen dadurch gestärkt werden kann. Wenn man sich global umguckt, haben wir im Grunde global nur eine Institution: die WTO, die Gleichberechtigung in dem Stimmverhalten der Länder organisiert und die eine Gerichtsbarkeit hat.

96 % der Richtersprüche werden eingehalten. Das haben wir bei der UNO nicht, das haben wir bei keiner anderen globalen Institution. Dieses Gut, das sollten wir wirklich verteidigen, erweitern und ausbauen. Das wir wirklich für die Globalisierung Leitplanken haben, die gerecht die Interessen der Nationen im Sinne einer nachhaltigen Entwicklung gestalten können.

Ich glaube, wir müssen auch viel stärker öffentlich diskutieren, was für eine Möglichkeit wir damit haben. Die WTO führt so ein bisschen ein Schattendasein. Sie ist nicht so im Zentrum der Öffentlichkeit. Da müssen wir, glaube ich, alle daran arbeiten, zu sagen: Das ist ein Instrument, was wir gemeinsam weiterentwickeln wollen, damit Globalisierung gerecht gestaltet werden kann.

1-169-0000

Paul Rübig, *Berichterstatter*. – Herr Präsident Sassoli! Es freut mich auch, dass die Ratspräsidentschaft bei dieser wichtigen Reform anwesend ist, und Staatssekretärin Edtstadler weiß, wie wichtig Handel ist. Ich glaube, dass wir gemeinsam mit der Kommission und mit der Kommissarin Malmström Folgendes erkannt haben: Wenn es keinen Handel gibt, gibt es keine Kaufkraft, und wenn es keine Kaufkraft gibt, dann gibt es Armut für alle. Wir sehen das in Nordkorea: Wenn die Grenzen dicht sind, Diktatur herrscht, dann leiden die Menschen Hunger und die Armut ist dort bitter. Man kann sich das anschauen, wie es den Menschen geht, wenn wir keinen Handel treiben.

Ich glaube, dass wir auch mehr Respekt brauchen gegenüber unseren Partnern, wenn wir verhandeln. Nicht immer ist das, was wir glauben, in der Politik das Ideale. Wir können auch von anderen lernen und gemeinsam eine bessere Basis schaffen. Deshalb sollten wir gegen Protektionismus auftreten, sollten schauen, wo ist Reziprozität sinnvoll, und letztlich sollten wir auch tolerant sein. Toleranz gehört dazu, zuhören zu können, wo unsere Partner Probleme im Handel mit uns sehen, und dass wir auch Standards setzen, die für beide Seiten nützlich sind.

Letztlich ist Handel eine Win-Win-Situation. Wir wissen, dass Militär in der Regel genau den Gegenauftrag hat, *lose-lose*, beide Seiten verlieren, wer am meisten verloren hat, ist der Loser.

Nein, Politik heißt etwas anderes: Wir wollen gewinnend sein für unsere Menschen, wir wollen die Kaufkraft stärken, wir wollen Arbeitsplätze schaffen, nicht nur in Europa, sondern vor allem in den ärmsten dieser Länder, und dazu kann die WTO einen wesentlichen Beitrag leisten. Die Streitbeilegung ist natürlich etwas Substanzielles. Wir wollen mit der Rechtsstaatlichkeit, mit den Rechtssetzungsmaßnahmen für beide Seiten faire Bedingungen schaffen. Ich glaube, das ist in der Zukunft das Entscheidende. Und deshalb freut es mich, dass die Reform der WTO im Mittelpunkt steht.

1-170-0000

Presidente. – La discussione è chiusa.

La votazione si terrà domani.

Dichiarazioni scritte (articolo 162)

1-170-5000

Birgit Collin-Langen (PPE), schriftlich. – Ich habe für diesen Bericht gestimmt. In einer Welt, in der wir wieder mit Straf- und Schutzzöllen zu kämpfen haben, spielt die WTO eine wichtige Rolle, um den Welthandel weiterhin zu gestalten. Die WTO hat seit ihrer Gründung entscheidend zur Stärkung des Multilateralismus, zur Förderung einer inklusiven Weltwirtschaftsordnung und zur Stärkung eines offenen, regelgestützten und diskriminierungsfreien multilateralen Handelssystems beigetragen. Ungeachtet dessen muss sich auch die WTO der Zeit anpassen. Globale Wertschöpfungsketten, digitaler Handel, ökologische und gesellschaftliche Herausforderungen, um nur einige Punkte zu nennen, bei denen die WTO Nachholbedarf hat.

1-171-0000

Karol Karski (ECR), na piśmie. – Grupa ECR chciałaby wyrazić swoje poparcie dla tekstu sprawozdania odzwierciedlającego podejście KE do modernizacji WTO, która ma usprawnić wielostronny system handlowy, tak by stał się on bardziej sprawiedliwy oraz przejrzysty. Zgadzamy się w zupełności, iż najbardziej problematyczne kwestie dotyczą dotacji zakłócających rynek, przymusowego transferu technologii, impasu w dauhańskiej agencji rozwoju oraz utrudnień w mianowaniu przez USA nowych członków Organu Apelacyjnego.

Chciałbym skorzystać z okazji i podkreślić również, że niewłączenie norm i standardów dotyczących praw człowieka do globalnych zasad regulujących handel i inwestycje w znacznym stopniu utrudni pociąganie przedsiębiorstw do odpowiedzialności. Jest to niezmiernie ważne w kontekście przywrócenia równowagi między prawem handlowym a prawami człowieka. Uważam za bardzo słuszne aktywne zaangażowanie UE w prace międzyrządowej otwartej grupy roboczej ONZ ds. korporacji transnarodowych i innych przedsiębiorstw w kontekście praw człowieka oraz obronę nadrzędności praw człowieka w stosunku do interesów handlowych korporacji. Powinno być to wsparcie instytucji UE i ESDZ, w tym przedstawicielstwa UE przy ONZ w Genewie, dla przyjęcia w tym zakresie traktatu. Jednocześnie mój niepokój wzbudza niedoprecyzowanie roli Parlamentu Europejskiego w tej kwestii. Apeluję o rzeczywistą ochronę praw człowieka oraz ustanowienie skutecznych i dostępnych dla obywateli mechanizmów dochodzenia roszczeń w celu rozstrzygnięcia sporów dotyczących wspomnianych naruszeń.

1-171-2500

Tokia Saïfi (PPE), par écrit. – L'OMC traverse une crise sans précédent et il est urgent de rappeler notre soutien au multilatéralisme. Il permet en effet de développer un commerce international basé sur des règles et de lutter contre les pratiques concurrentielles déloyales. L'OMC est aujourd'hui dans une impasse: le cycle actuel est bloqué et les dernières réunions ministérielles n'ont pas permis d'aboutir à des accords significatifs.

La réforme et la modernisation de l'OMC sont la clé de voûte d'un nouveau souffle pour l'organisation. L'OMC doit désormais répondre et prendre en compte les défis actuels et ceux de demain que sont le numérique, le commerce des services, le rôle moteur des PME, la lutte contre le changement climatique ou encore l'égalité femmes-hommes. L'UE doit être leader dans la modernisation de l'OMC afin de garantir un commerce juste, équitable, fondé sur des règles et mené dans un esprit de réciprocité et de bénéfices mutuels.

Enfin, il est plus qu'urgent qu'une solution soit trouvée concernant le blocage par les États-Unis du renouvellement des juges de l'organe d'appel du mécanisme de règlement des différends de l'OMC.

Ce blocage met gravement en danger la pérennité de l'OMC et là aussi, nous comptons sur l'impulsion européenne pour aboutir à une solution.

1-171-5000

Tom Vandenkendelaere (PPE), *schriftelijk*. – De afgelopen decennia heeft de Wereldhandelsorganisatie mee helpen zorgen voor een stabiel en voorspelbaar kader voor bedrijven in de hele wereld. Zo zorgde de WTO mee voor significante groei van vele economieën. Maar de wereld verandert en helaas is de WTO niet altijd mee geëvolueerd.

Ik schaar mij achter het mandaat dat de Commissie in juni dit jaar van de Europese Raad heeft ontvangen om een versnelling hoger te schakelen en de WTO de 21e eeuw te helpen inloodsen. Voor mij zijn twee zaken van belang. Ten eerste moet de rol van de WTO als mediator in handelsconflicten worden versterkt. Dat kan door de handelsregels aan te passen aan de technologische en economische ontwikkelingen van de laatste 20 jaar. Er ligt ook nog te weinig nadruk op duurzaamheid en sociale uitdagingen. Meer flexibiliteit kan een deel van het antwoord zijn. Daarnaast moeten we waken over het gelijk speelveld van marktdeelnemers door marktversturende subsidiëring aan te pakken.

Tot slot wil ik nog benadrukken dat de huidige politieke tendensen in verschillende delen van de wereld, nota bene de VS en de situatie in het VK, opnieuw en meer dan ooit de noodzaak benadrukken van een goed presterende en doeltreffende WTO.

21. Composizione delle commissioni e delle delegazioni : vedasi processo verbale

22. Relazione 2018 sulla Serbia (discussione)

1-174-0000

Presidente. – L'ordine del giorno reca la relazione di David McAllister, a nome della commissione per gli affari esteri, sulla relazione 2018 della Commissione sulla Serbia [2018/2146(INI)] (A8-0331/2018)

1-175-0000

David McAllister, *Rapporteur*. – Mr President, let me start by thanking the shadow rapporteurs, who are all present here tonight, for this report. Let me also welcome Commissioner Hahn and thank him personally for his dedication and good work in the Western Balkans region.

Today we are debating the European Parliament's last annual report on Serbia in this legislative term. It has often been said, including in this Chamber, that Serbia is moving towards the European Union. I would like to underline this by looking back at the beginning of this legislature in 2014, when the accession negotiations had just started and, concerning the opening of chapters, Serbia literally started from zero. Today, four and a half years later, 14 chapters have been opened in the negotiation process while two have already been provisionally closed. I sincerely hope that at least three more chapters will be opened at the intergovernmental conference in December.

Three points are of utmost importance on Serbia's path towards the European Union. Firstly, the rule of law. I would like to use this opportunity to recall that Serbia's progress on the rule of law – Chapters 23 and 24 – remains essential for the overall pace of the negotiating process. Judicial independence has to be assured in practice. Corruption and organised crime still remain an obstacle, not only to Serbia's but to all Western Balkan countries' democratic, social and economic development.

On another note, I agree with the European Commission and the Council on guaranteeing unhindered exercise of the freedom of expression and media. Shortcomings in this area should be addressed as a matter of priority.

Secondly, the economy. The criteria for membership are intended to help Serbia to stand on its own feet and become fit for the European Union, the common market, and for the global economy in general. The government in Belgrade is implementing an impressive agenda of economic and structural reforms. This has already yielded results in terms of growth prospects and reduction of domestic and external imbalances.

Thirdly, regional cooperation and good neighbourly relations. We all know Serbia's EU accession process is closely linked to the normalisation of relations with Kosovo. Agreements need to be concluded and, afterwards, implemented. That said, both sides – Belgrade and Priština – should continue to move forward with the full implementation of the already-reached agreements in good faith and in a timely manner. Serbia and Kosovo have expressed on many occasions concerns about their relations. The format where these concerns should be addressed is the Brussels dialogue. The decision of the Kosovo government to increase tax on goods from Serbia and from Bosnia and Herzegovina to 100% clearly violates the CEFTA Agreement and the spirit of the EU-Kosovo stabilisation and association agreement. I call on the government in Priština to revoke this decision immediately.

A final remark – effective communication is key. We, as the European Union, are by far the most important donor in the Western Balkans. We are engaged in several thousand projects to support reform efforts and assist in preparations for EU membership. If too many people in the region are voicing a sentiment of being left alone by the EU, we need to take this seriously. It shows that there is an urgent need for the European Union to communicate effectively about the extent of our engagement.

1-176-0000

Karoline Edtstadler, *President-in-Office of the Council*. – Mr President, on behalf of the Austrian Presidency, it is my great pleasure to participate in your discussion on the series of annual reports from the Commission, starting with the one on Serbia.

As you know, this year the Western Balkans have been in the spotlight of the European Union, highlighted in particular by the EU leaders meeting with the Western Balkans leaders in Sofia in May and the adoption of the Council conclusions on Enlargement and Stabilisation and Association Process in June. During our Presidency, we have continued to pursue the Union's engagement with the region, aiming to achieve further progress in the accession negotiations. This is one of the priorities of our Presidency.

Serbia has made important progress since the last country report by the Commission in 2016 and accession negotiations have advanced at a steady pace, as has already been mentioned by the rapporteur. We hope to keep up the momentum in Serbia's accession negotiations under our Presidency by opening further negotiation chapters. In the June Council conclusions, we welcomed the reaffirmed commitment of the Serbian Government to EU integration as its strategic objective. This also needs to be further demonstrated by Serbia's commitment to reforms, because progress on the rule of law and fundamental rights chapters, as well as on the normalisation of Serbia's relations with Kosovo, as set out in the negotiation framework, is essential and will continue to determine the pace of accession negotiations overall.

Many areas which require further reform efforts are rightly spelt out in your draft resolution. The implementation of interim benchmarks for Chapters 23 and 24 and of the respective action plans should continue to guide the reform process as the rule of law continues to be at the heart of the enlargement process. As you do in your draft resolution, we consider that Serbia needs to significantly step up its reform efforts in this area and, in particular, to ensure the independence and overall efficiency of the judicial system.

Special focus should be put on tangible results and a sustainable track record, notably as regards the fight against corruption, organised crime and money laundering. The lack of progress in the area of freedom of expression raises increasing concerns. We strongly believe that the authorities should guarantee a safe climate conducive to the unhindered exercise of freedom of expression and the independence of the media as a matter of priority.

Serbia also needs to pay particular attention to full respect for fundamental rights, including the protection of the most vulnerable groups, as well as the non-discriminatory treatment of national minorities throughout Serbia. Guaranteeing the rule of law and fundamental rights would also contribute to improving the business environment in Serbia and underpin the current positive economic developments and the continuous progress made in this area.

The normalisation of relations with Kosovo continues to be essential for the overall pace of negotiations. The Council will continue to monitor closely Serbia's engagement towards visible and sustainable progress here so that Serbia and Kosovo can continue on their respective European paths. We continue to call on Serbia to progressively align with EU common foreign and security policy, in line with the negotiation framework. Serbia should also refrain from diverging from the EU common visa policy as Serbia's conclusion of visa liberalisation agreements with certain third countries has raised real concerns. We note that Serbia has, in the meantime, revoked again its visa liberalisation regime with Iran.

We stress the importance of regional cooperation and good neighbourly relations. We encourage Serbia to continue sustained efforts to strengthen good neighbourly relations and to resolve outstanding bilateral issues. In this context, actions undermining regional cooperation are not helpful. We regret the introduction of tariffs by Kosovo on products originating from Serbia and Bosnia and Herzegovina. There is an urgent need for calm and de-escalation in the interest of the whole region. We welcome Commissioner Hahn's offer of help to work on rapid practical solutions to the various trade issues at hand.

I will conclude my intervention by again welcoming the continued progress in Serbia's EU accession negotiations and the continued good cooperation with the EU and within the region.

Finally, let me also recall our appreciation for the constructive contribution of Parliament, and in particular of your rapporteur, David McAllister, to advance Serbia's accession process to the EU. I can assure you that we pay particular attention to the views of Parliament in this regard.

1-177-0000

Johannes Hahn, *Member of the Commission*. – Mr President, honourable Members, State Secretary, I would like to congratulate, first and foremost, David McAllister for his outstanding report on Serbia. This is a balanced and accurate assessment of Serbia's progress on its path to the European Union. It's also in line with the findings of our own report of April this year and the Commission's assessment since then.

I share your view that Serbia has made good progress towards EU membership. With 14 chapters opened and two provisionally closed, Serbia's prospects for joining the EU are tangible, and this shows our firm commitment to Serbia's EU path. This European perspective is even more

important today when we witness a resurfacing of tensions between Belgrade and Priština. Let me stress once again that both sides need to resume dialogue. There is no alternative to this if they want to make progress on their European paths. No country can join the Union without having resolved outstanding bilateral issues. For Serbia, this means that it needs to conclude a legally binding agreement with Priština before it can join the Union.

However, let me also stress that the solution with Kosovo is not the only prerequisite on Serbia's path to the Union. Reforms in the area of rule of law, fundamental rights and good governance, remain at the heart of the country's accession process. And, similar to the findings in your report, we found a mixed picture in our recent assessment on the rule of law in Serbia. Serbia has adopted some important pieces of legislation and carried out necessary institutional reforms. However, delays have been building up in important areas and concrete results are still difficult to demonstrate. It's therefore crucial that efforts increase in fields such as the reform of the judiciary, anti-corruption and fundamental rights, including media freedom.

In addition, and this is particularly relevant for this House, we have concerns about the process of adopting legislation in the Serbian Parliament. The continued use of urgent procedures, as well as other practices, limits legislative scrutiny and debate. I also share your views that strategic communication is of key importance. It will ensure public support for European values and understanding of the benefits and obligations of EU accession. The Union is by far Serbia's most important partner, including on assistance, and without any possible comparison with other global players. This needs to be put up in lights.

Finally, whatever the difficulties – and they are real – Serbia should not lose sight of its EU membership goal. It should keep focusing on fundamental reforms, with continued EU support, and I really appreciate that the European Parliament is on the same page. I thank you, not only for your attention, but for your strong commitment, engagement and support on the ground.

1-178-0000

Cristian Dan Preda, în numele grupului PPE. – Domnule președinte, aș vrea întâi de toate să îl felicit pe David McAllister pentru raportul pe care îl prezintă Parlamentului. Este, cum spunea și comisarul Hahn, un raport foarte echilibrat. M-aș bucura foarte tare ca Serbia să devină stat membru al Uniunii Europene în 2025, dar, sigur, sunt multe de făcut în această privință. Cred că dialogul cu kosovarii e un dialog-cheie. Din păcate, iată, apar obstacole pe care nu putem decât să le privim cu stupefacție. Recenta decizie a kosovarilor de a introduce taxe pentru produsele din Serbia și Bosnia și Herțegovina este o mare greșală. Nici sârbii nu se lasă mai prejos. Am auzit-o recent pe doamna prim-ministru Brnabić explicând că Srebrenica nu a fost un genocid pentru că au fost uciși doar bărbați și băieți, nu și femei și fete. Este inacceptabil așa ceva și, din păcate, știu că și în Republika Srpska, parlamentul de la Banjaluka a hotărât să revoce raportul prin care declara Srebrenica genocid. Cred că influența Serbiei în Bosnia și Herțegovina și în general în regiune trebuie să fie una pozitivă, bazată pe moderație și orice declarație de genul celei recente a primului ministru de la Belgrad cred că trebuie evitată.

1-179-0000

Tanja Fajon, v imenu skupine S&D. – Po nedavnem obisku v Srbiji žal ne morem biti preveč optimistična.

Zdi se, da je razkol med zapisanim v dokumentih Unije in dejanskim stanjem v državi izjemen.

Medtem ko ima Srbija ugodne gospodarske kazalce, pa skrb ostaja vladavina prava, globoka polarizacija družbe in svoboda medijev. Tu je primer ene od naslovnice v Srbiji: „Psi so spuščeni“ s fotografijo peščice tistih, ki še vedno uspejo kritizirati na glas, in to je nesprijemljivo, Srbijo oddaljuje od Unije.

Ljudje v Srbiji mi pravijo, da želijo biti del Unije, želijo več delovnih mest in višje plače, manj korupcije, delujoč pravni sistem.

Unija ne bo nikoli popolna brez Srbije, vendar takšne Srbije, v kateri namesto novic o pretepenih članih opozicije beremo o zdravi demokraciji, v kateri so namesto nacionalističnega podajanja žoge urejeni odnosi s Kosovom, na katero so mladi ponosni in imajo vizijo doma.

In takšno Srbijo vidim v Uniji in za takšno Srbijo se bom še vedno zavzemala.

1-180-0000

Ruža Tomašić, *u ime kluba ECR*. – Poštovani predsedavajuči, postopak pridruživanja trebao bi biti proces koji se temelji na zaslugama i koji u potpunosti ovisi o objektivnom napretku svake države kandidatkinje za članstvo.

U tom smislu, držim iznimno zabrinjavajućim umjereni ton kojim ovo izvješće pristupa pitanju kažnjavanja ratnih zločina u Srbiji. Sam od sebe nameće se zaključak da se Srbiji ili gleda kroz prste, ili nije vršena detaljna i dubinska analiza. Oba scenarija su uznemiravajuća.

Ratni zločinci u Srbiji niti se istražuju, niti se kažnjavaju. Trenutno, vladajuća garnitura u Srbiji koristi se nedopustivim metodama kako bi prikrila zločine počinjene u Hrvatskoj i Bosni i Hercegovini. U predmetu Ovčara, koji se odnosi na pokolj gotovo 300 ranjenika iz vukovarske bolnice, vlast štiti zločince, daje im imunitet, nove identitete te opstruira rad drugih država u istraživanju tih zločina.

Stoga, iz ovog visokog doma pozivam sve svoje kolege u Europskom parlamentu i nadležne povjerenike da konačno otvore oči kako bi spriječili da po Europskoj uniji uskoro slobodno hodaju notorni zločinci odgovorni za smrt stotina ljudi te kako takve metode ne bi postale sastavni dio europskog pravosudnog sustava.

1-181-0000

Ivo Vajgl, *v imenu skupine ALDE*. – Spoštovani predsednik, spoštovani komisar, zahvaljujem se za vestno in kvalitetno delo, ki ga je opravil poročevalec gospod David McAllister. V imenu skupine ALDE lahko zagotovim, da podpiramo vključevanje Srbije v Evropsko unijo, in izražam zadovoljstvo nad dosedanjim potekom pogajanj o prilagoditvi zakonodaje, ki bodo to omogočili.

Kot poročevalec v senci pa bi želel izpostaviti tudi nekaj kritičnih pripomb: Srbija bo morala storiti več za spoštovanje vladavine prava, za vzpostavitev resnično pluralnih, demokratičnih odnosov v svojem parlamentu in spoštovanje opozicije in njene vloge, zagotavljanje svobode medijev, ki je resno ogrožena, varnosti in integritete novinarjev, posebno raziskovalnih, tistih, ki so kritični do vlade.

Potreben je višji nivo kulture komuniciranja, odprava sovražnega govora, tako v domači rabi kot v mednarodnem komuniciranju Srbije s sosedi.

Takšna in samo takšna Srbija bo dobrodošla članica Evropske unije v prihodnje.

1-182-0000

Igor Šoltes, *v imenu skupine Verts/ALE*. – Najprej seveda zahvala kolegu McAllisteru za odlično opravljeno delo pri pripravi tega poročila.

Nedvoumno uvodoma gre ugotoviti, da je Srbija v opazovanem obdobju naredila napredek na več področjih: reforma javne uprave, tržno gospodarstvo, gospodarska rast, makroekonomska, monetarna stabilnost in napredek v boju proti korupciji in organiziranemu kriminalu.

Ker pa je seveda Srbija pomemben igralec v sami regiji, je toliko bolj pomembno spremljati in tudi reagirati na določene izjave najvidnejših predstavnikov, ki včasih lahko izzvenijo v napačno smer. Zato so tudi predloženi določeni amandmaji.

Tisto, kar bi želel ... (*Predsednik govorniku odvzame besedo.*)

1-183-0000

Jaromír Kohlíček, za skupinu GUE/NGL. – Pane předsedající, v úvodu zprávy o Srbsku se považuje za normální vyjádření Mezinárodního soudního dvora v souvislosti s rezolucí Valného shromáždění OSN 64/298 z roku 2010, které de facto vzalo na vědomí jednostranné vyhlášení samostatnosti Kosova. Jaké pokrytectví!

Srbsko, přes všechny snahy o jeho oslabení, je i po krvavé agresi NATO stále klíčovou zemí uprostřed Balkánu. Navíc, jeho vedení bylo při posledním hodnocení kandidátských zemí onačeno za premianta. Zásadně protestuji proti snaze určovat této kandidátské zemi, s kým může a s kým nesmí spolupracovat v zahraniční a obranné politice. Upozorňuji vážené kolegy na dlouhodobé mírové soužití desítek národnostních menšin v severovýchodní části země. Kéž by podobné podmínky považované autorem zprávy za nedostatečné měly menšiny v baltských zemích či v jiných zemích EU.

I přes dobrou vůli Srbska, avšak kvůli malé součinnosti ze strany Kosova, se nedaří uspokojivě řešit technické problémy spojené s nezákonným vydělením tohoto území ze Srbska. Toto je však úkol hlavně pro Evropskou komisi. Paní Tomašicová, ani vrazi z Chorvatska by neměli běhat po EU, nejen z jiných balkánských států.

1-184-0000

Mario Borghezio, a nome del gruppo ENF. – Signor Presidente, onorevoli colleghi, la relazione, indubbiamente equilibrata, saluta con favore il costante impegno della Serbia sulla via dell'integrazione nell'Unione europea e si chiede se questa decisione strategica venga attivamente promossa fra il pubblico serbo; compito non facile, conoscendo il favore popolare verso la prospettiva di un inserimento della Serbia nella strategia euroasiatica di Mosca. Bisogna tenerne conto, perché può avere un ruolo molto importante anche nei rapporti fra l'Europa, l'Unione europea e il mondo che fa capo a Mosca. Non dobbiamo dimenticare il messaggio che il Presidente Putin ha inviato direttamente a Vučić: entro poche ore possa inviare una forza di intervento rapido per difendere i serbi del Kosovo. L'Europa fa montagne di carta; Putin reagisce.

È centrale, l'irrisolto problema del Kosovo. Di recente, Kosovo e Serbia si sono incontrati e parlati per cercare di normalizzare i rapporti, passo evidentemente necessario ai fini dell'integrazione nell'Unione europea. A settembre, erano arrivati a un passo dal firmare un accordo e poi tutto è stato compromesso, nonostante ci fosse l'intesa per restituire al Kosovo i territori serbi abitati da persone di etnia albanese maggioritaria in Kosovo e alla Serbia quei territori kosovari a maggioranza etnica serba. All'ultimo minuto l'accordo era saltato ed è emerso il rischio evidente che le tensioni degli ultimi giorni, specialmente quelle legate all'introduzione inconscia dei dazi, possano bloccare o rallentare i nuovi tentativi di riconciliazione fra i due Stati, che noi evidentemente vediamo con grande speranza e favore.

1-185-0000

Zoltán Balczó (NI). – Tisztelt Elnök Úr! A jelentés felkéri a szerb kormányt, hogy hajtsa végre a nemzeti kisebbségek jogaira vonatkozó nemzetközi szerződéseket. Megállapítja, hogy a nemzeti kisebbségek jogainak garantálása terén nem történt előrehaladás, nem kielégítő az, ami megtörtént. Létezik cselekvési terv, de azt teljes körűen végre kellene hajtani. Felhívja Szerbia figyelmét a kisebbségi nyelvhasználat biztosítására az oktatásban, a közigazgatásban, és a médiában.

Sajnálatos, hogy pont ugyanezek a megállapítások szerepelnek az előző jelentésben is, vagyis nincs előrelépés, miközben a nemzeti kisebbségek jogainak védelme az uniós csatlakozás előfeltétele. Ideje lenne megállapítások helyett felszólítani Szerbiát ezek teljesítésére. Nem kívánunk többet a Szerbiában élő nemzeti kisebbségeknek, köztük a vajdasági őshonos magyar népességnek, mint amilyen jogokat Szerbia elvár a koszovói szerbek számára.

1-186-0000

Victor Boștinaru (S&D). – Mr President, I will start by congratulating David McAllister for his excellent and very balanced report.

I would like to emphasise the most important thing, which is that Serbia has made tremendous efforts to implement the most needed democratic reforms and Serbia is to be judged on its own merits. This is the only way forward for the enlargement process to remain credible and give a clear perspective to the Serbian people and to the people from the region as well.

Of course, there are still important steps to be taken in order to achieve the full alignment of Serbia's foreign and security policy with the EU one – and I am referring notably to the problems relating to its relations with Russia.

We Socialists and Democrats remain concerned about the situation regarding freedom of expression and freedom of the media. At the same time, I have to repeat, and I will never stop saying – people in Belgrade, the ruling coalition, should treat the opposition fairly and should work with the opposition, in their country's best interests.

Finally, I welcome Serbia's engagement in the normalisation of relations with Kosovo. But in this situation I do condemn the decision taken by Priština by increasing to 100% the taxes on imports from Serbia and Bosnia and Herzegovina.

1-187-0000

PRZEWODNICTWO: BOGUSŁAW LIBERADZKI

Wiceprzewodniczący

1-188-0000

Jean-Luc Schaffhauser (ENF). – Monsieur le Président, Monsieur le Commissaire, mes chers collègues, je voudrais d'abord rendre hommage à la Serbie à l'occasion du centenaire de la Première Guerre mondiale. 16 % de sa population périt dans cette guerre. La Serbie fut la première victime de cette guerre mondiale en pourcentage, la France en nombre. Une fois de plus, ce sont les empires qui ont fait cette guerre, voulue par le Deuxième Reich, entre autres, et les nations, comme la Serbie et la France, qui l'ont subie.

Mais la Serbie subit de nouveaux martyrs: l'Union exige que Belgrade choisisse entre l'Est et l'Ouest, contre son histoire, sa culture, son identité. Elle est un pont. L'Union l'oblige à reconnaître également l'indépendance du Kosovo, territoire qui lui fut arraché par une guerre d'agression illégale menée en 1999 avec l'OTAN.

L'Union, quelque part, c'est un coup d'État permanent contre les peuples, les nations et leur identité.

Veut-on ainsi forcer la Serbie à choisir un camp contre l'autre, alors qu'elle est de ces deux histoires communes? Veut-on l'empêcher de retrouver son histoire lorsque le Kosovo et son pouvoir légitime est donné à une mafia déguisée en État? Il faut arrêter cette politique du *Drang nach Osten*. Elle ne conduit qu'à la guerre et elle ne peut conduire qu'à la guerre.

1-189-0000

Zgłoszenia z sali

1-190-0000

Eduard Kukan (PPE). – Mr President, this is a really good report on Serbia. I would like to thank David McAllister. The report strikes the right balance with points that underline the progress Serbia has made over the last year, but also the areas where we would like to see more done.

The accession process should not be taken for granted. It's a chance to reform, not only in terms of technical requirements, but also to adjust to the values and principles of the European Union. We have seen good progress in some reforms. Yet there are still many key areas where more effort is needed. Let us be clear: the rule of law and the independence of the judiciary is one of the fundamentals of the accession process. Serbia needs to engage seriously in these reforms, strengthening the accountability, impartiality, professionalism and overall efficiency of the judiciary. I would also like to underline the need to improve the atmosphere concerning freedom of the media.

1-191-0000

Ivan Jakovčić (ALDE). – Poštovani predsjedavajući, htio bih odmah na početku podržati ovaj izvještaj i reći da se nalazimo u jednoj klasičnoj poziciji. Svi znamo da je Srbija puno toga napravila, a da treba još jako puno toga učiniti. Svi želimo vidjeti Srbiju u ovome domu jednog dana, vidjeti zastupnice i zastupnike ovdje i svi je želimo poduprijeti, ali domaću zadaću Srbija mora odraditi.

Kao čovjek koji je u Hrvatskoj učinio sve što je bilo moguće da pomogne srpskoj manjini kada je bila ugrožena na mjestima gdje je bila ugrožena, želim isto sada jasno reći da želim podržati hrvatsku manjinu koja je u Srbiji i da o tome treba razgovarati jer to je isto tako jedan od problema u Vojvodini.

Ostali su govorili o ostalim potrebama koje Srbija treba ispuniti, ali važno je da govorimo i o ljudskim i manjinskim pravima i, naravno, onome što je, nažalost, još uvijek teška ostavština sukoba na Balkanu koji je bio 90-ih godina.

1-192-0000

Igor Šoltes (Verts/ALE). – Žal sem bil prej prekinjen pred koncem samega govora, tako da bi še par misli v nadaljevanju.

Dejstvo je, da poleg teh znakov napredka in poglavij, kjer se kaže, da gre Srbija po pravi poti, pa so seveda še druge teme in področja, kjer je pa veliko manevrskega prostora za izboljšave.

Kolegi so že večkrat omenili svobodo izražanja in pa svobodo medijev. Zlasti opozorila nevladnih organizacij Srbije pričajo o tem, da je tukaj še ogromno prostora za izboljšave. In ravno ta komunikacija z nevladnim sektorjem mislim, da je ena od priložnosti zato, da se popolnoma različni sliki o stanju v Srbiji, ki jo predstavlja recimo vlada ali pa nevladna organizacija, počasi začenjajo zblíževati.

In kot poročevalec za Kosovo bi si seveda želel, da tudi konstruktivnost dialoga med Beogradom in Prištino se nadaljuje. Seveda pa ni pravi odgovor na to tudi zviševanje carin in mislim, da seveda obe strani se morata vzdrževati aktivnosti, ki poslabšujejo odnose.

In tu je še potreben velik napor in napredek.

1-193-0000

Fabio Massimo Castaldo (EFDD). – Signor Presidente, onorevoli colleghi, nei Balcani occidentali si gioca una sfida importante per il futuro e per la stabilità del nostro intero continente e noi

vogliamo dare il nostro contributo per vincerla. La Serbia è un paese amico, vicino geograficamente ma anche vicino ai nostri valori, nelle tradizioni e nella cultura e nello spirito europeo. Ringrazio il relatore per i suoi importanti sforzi e in questa relazione sottolineo i passi avanti compiuti dalla Serbia in questi anni, anche riguardo a tematiche delicate, come la cooperazione regionale, i diritti delle minoranze, il sistema giudiziario e lo Stato di diritto.

Certo, sono necessari ulteriori passi in avanti nella lotta contro la corruzione, alla criminalità organizzata, nell'indipendenza dei media: ma siamo e restiamo fiduciosi e ottimisti. Il nostro voto favorevole vuole proprio sottolineare questi sforzi del popolo serbo nel suo cammino di adesione verso l'Unione europea, senza però chiedergli di snaturare i rapporti tradizionali che la Serbia ha con altri partner. Le recenti tensioni con il Kosovo ci preoccupano ma voglio ribadire che non può esserci un'Europa veramente unita senza i Balcani incidentali o senza la Serbia. Per questo auspichiamo l'apertura di ulteriori capitoli negoziali per scrivere presto insieme un nuovo capitolo importante della storia europea: obiettivo 2025.

1-194-0000

Λάμπρος Φουντούλης (NI). – Κύριε Πρόεδρε, το μόνο που έχω να πω προς το φιλικό έθνος των Σέρβων είναι ότι θα πρέπει να το σκεφτούν πολύ καλά πριν αποφασίσουν να ενταχθούν στην Ευρωπαϊκή Ένωση. Η Σερβία διαθέτει ήδη μια ανεπτυγμένη βιομηχανία και έχει όλες τις προϋποθέσεις για να αποτελέσει στο μέλλον μια σταθερή δύναμη στην περιοχή της. Η οικονομία της συνεχώς αναπτύσσεται, μετά τις προηγούμενες δύσκολες δεκαετίες, και έχει κάθε λόγο να ατενίζει με αισιοδοξία το μέλλον. Η ένταξη στην Ένωση μπορεί αρχικά να φαίνεται ως μια συμφέρουσα επιλογή, όμως σε βάθος χρόνου δεν είναι. Για κάθε ένα ευρώ οικονομικής βοήθειας που δίνει η Ένωση ζητάει και ένα τμήμα της εθνικής ανεξαρτησίας.

Δυστυχώς, εμείς στην Ελλάδα γνωρίζουμε πλέον πολύ καλά το τίμημα της ένταξης. Είδαμε στην πράξη τι σημαίνει ευρωπαϊκή αλληλεγγύη όταν, κατά τη διάρκεια της οικονομικής κρίσης, οι Ευρωπαίοι προσπάθησαν -και προσπαθούν ακόμη- με κάθε μέσο να υπαρπάξουν την ελληνική δημόσια περιουσία, αδιαφορώντας ταυτόχρονα για τα δεινά που προκάλεσαν και προκαλούν στον ελληνικό λαό. Οι Έλληνες θα στηρίξουμε κάθε απόφαση της Σερβίας, αρκεί αυτή να έχει ληφθεί με γνώμονα τη θέληση του σερβικού λαού και το συμφέρον της χώρας.

1-195-0000

Andor Deli (PPE). – Mr President, during the summer we could see some promising signals connected to the Belgrade-Priština negotiations, but recent economic measures and other acts of provocation by the Kosovo government triggered events which are undermining not just bilateral relations but also EU efforts in the region, such as with the Common Economic Area.

It is high time for the Council to take action. The lack of European leadership in the Western Balkans is getting more and more obvious and pressing. The Commission does play a very important role but political decisions must be made by political bodies such as the Council, together with the Member States. They must stop hiding behind the Commission's skirt of technocratic and bureaucratic criteria, benchmarks and checklists. Hoping that legal harmonisation and reaching European standards will automatically solve the issues on the Balkans are illusory and naive. They must take these matters seriously, otherwise we will have, as was always the case, the US and Russia rushing in solving European issues.

1-196-0000

Γεώργιος Επιτήδειος (NI). – Κύριε Πρόεδρε, όπως προκύπτει από την ισορροπημένη έκθεση του κυρίου McAllister, η Σερβία καταβάλλει προσπάθειες για να εναρμονιστεί με τις απαιτήσεις των κριτηρίων της Κοπεγχάγης, ώστε να γίνει μέλος της Ευρωπαϊκής Ένωσης. Έχει υποχρέωση να εξομαλύνει τις σχέσεις της με το Κοσσυφοπέδιο. Αυτή είναι μία υποχρέωση συναισθηματικά επαχθής για τη Σερβία, διότι όλοι γνωρίζουμε ότι το Κοσσυφοπέδιο είναι το λίκνο του σερβικού πολιτισμού, είναι το βίβλος της καρδιάς της Σερβίας.

Παρά ταύτα, το Κοσσυφοπέδιο προκαλεί τη Σερβία και δυσχεραίνει τις προσπάθειες εξομάλυνσης των σχέσεων. Προκαλεί, όπως είπαμε, τη Σερβία και η μεγαλύτερη πρόκληση είναι αυτήν τη στιγμή η αύξηση κατά 100% των δασμών για τις εισαγωγές προϊόντων από τη Σερβία και τη Βοσνία. Οφείλει η Σερβία να αντιδράσει και οφείλει η Ευρωπαϊκή Ένωση να μην πιέζει μόνο τη Σερβία να αλλάξει την πολιτική της απέναντι στη Ρωσία, αλλά και το Κοσσυφοπέδιο. Ως Έλληνας, εύχομαι οι προσπάθειες της Σερβίας να ευδοκιμήσουν και να ενταχθεί στην Ευρωπαϊκή Ένωση με καλές συνθήκες.

1-197-0000

Bogdan Andrzej Zdrojewski (PPE). – Serbia nie jest łatwa do oceny zwłaszcza, że nie można jej wyrwać z kontekstu gorących Bałkanów. Z tego też powodu gratulacje dla Davida McAllistera, nie tylko za przygotowany raport, ale także za opinię, która mu towarzyszy. Zwłaszcza za te dwa kluczowe zdania, które dotyczą oceny praworządności, a zwłaszcza wymienienia 23 i 24 rozdziału jako rzeczywiście kluczowych, które będą przesądzać czy Serbia, ewentualnie, po akcesji nie będzie źródłem problemów prawnych związanych z praworządnością.

Podzielam także ocenę, tę drugą dużo korzystniejszą, jeżeli chodzi o zmiany w gospodarce. Rzeczywiście w tej materii Serbia dokonała sporo, można to ocenić pozytywnie i trzymać kciuki za pozostałe paragrafy, rozdziały, aby rzeczywiście to przygotowanie nie budziło wątpliwości.

1-198-0000

Marijana Petir (PPE). – Poštovani predsjedavajući, cijenim napore koje izvjestitelj David McAllister ulaže kako bi dao podršku europskoj perspektivi Srbije. Žao mi je što na ispruženu ruku podrške Srbija ne daje zadovoljavajući odgovor.

Ponekad mi se čini da značajnih pomaka nema, zato što ne postoji politička volja. Kako drugačije objasniti da Srbija i dalje krši prava hrvatske nacionalne manjine, da do danas nije dostavila podatke o zatočenima i nestalima i da svoje ratne zločince ne procesuiraju, već im omogućavaju da budu politički aktivni, pa čak i zastupnici u Skupštini? Kako protumačiti srbijanski zakon kojim si je Srbija uzela ulogu malog Haaga i koji je prijatnija za sve hrvatske branitelje? Nije prihvatljivo da srbijanska granična policija uhiti hrvatske građane, koji su ujedno branitelji, izvrgne ih poniženju i prijatnjama kako bi ih zastrašila da prestanu istraživati ratne zločine, koji su posljedica velikosrpske agresije na Hrvatsku.

Sve to govori u prilog tezi da Srbija ide stranputicom, a ne europskim putem, i jedino što mogu jest izraziti žaljenje zbog toga.

1-199-0000

Franc Bogovič (PPE). – Čestitke, David, za odlično in uravnoteženo poročilo. Strinjam se tako s tistim delom, kjer opozarjaš na pomanjkljivosti v napredku na področju pravne države, svobode medijev. Veseli me, da lahko tudi izpostaviš napredek na področju gospodarstva, ki je ključno, da bo tudi Srbija prosperirala in da bodo mladi ostali v Srbiji, kar je ključni pogoj.

Čestitam in zahvaljujem se tudi gospodu Hahnu, ki je opravil odlično delo na Zahodnem Balkanu, in mislim, da opravlja to, kar je najbolj potrebno, da izboljša regionalno sodelovanje. Iz zadnjih primerov carin iz Kosova, ki jih strogo obsojam, je vidno, kako zahtevno je to delo, in čestitke za vaše delo.

Prepričan sem, da bo na tem področju potrebno nadaljevati, kajti razmere v relaciji tako Srbije-Kosova, Srbije-Hrvaške in ostale rabijo moderiranje s strani Evropske unije.

Podpiram, da se čim več poglavji še odpre, da gre napredek naprej. Brez ureditve regionalnih razmerij, kjer bo igrala Evropska unija ključno vlogo, si pa težko predstavljam vstop Srbije v Evropsko unijo.

1-200-0000

(Koniec zgłoszeń z sali)

1-201-0000

Johannes Hahn, *Member of the Commission*. – Mr President, honourable Members, State Secretary, again thank you for this very interesting and ultimately encouraging debate, which reflects the importance of the enlargement process and of our relations with Serbia.

I fully appreciate the sensitivity of bilateral issues. Clearly, further efforts will be needed to overcome the legacy of the past and to foster trust and reconciliation. At the same time we should ensure that bilateral issues don't hamper the firm prospect of EU membership, which continues to drive transformation and anchor stability and security in Serbia and elsewhere in the region. Today this is more important than ever.

At the same time we should focus on good neighbourly relations, democratic values and respect for the rule of law, protection of national minorities, freedom of expression and of the media, the ability to address the legacy of the past, and war crimes issues. Those are core European values and these are simply not negotiable.

Thank you for your attention and also for your strong commitment.

1-202-0000

Karoline Edtstadler, *President-in-Office of the Council*. – Mr President, to conclude, I would like to thank honourable Members very much for this really useful debate. I have listened attentively to the views expressed. We look forward to continuing this constructive dialogue and engagement.

When moving ahead in the accession process with Serbia, I would like to assure you that we closely monitor its progress, paying particular attention to the area of the rule of law, freedom of the media, the Belgrade-Priština dialogue and the other important issues which were mentioned here today.

1-203-0000

David McAllister, *Berichterstatter*. – Herr Präsident, sehr verehrte Frau Staatssekretärin, sehr geehrter Kommissar! Ich darf mich zunächst bei Ihnen beiden bedanken für die freundlichen Worte und die sachlichen Hinweise zu meinem Bericht. Ich darf mich ebenso bedanken bei allen Kolleginnen und Kollegen, die sich an dieser – aus meiner Sicht weitestgehend sehr sachlichen – Debatte beteiligt haben. Ich bedanke mich für das Lob, ich bedanke mich auch für kritische Hinweise. Ich möchte ausdrücklich die Botschafterin der Republik Serbien, Frau Hrustanović, auf der Tribüne begrüßen, die, glaube ich, heute auch gesehen hat, dass wir in dieser Debatte über Fraktionsgrenzen hinweg deutlich gemacht haben, dass wir bereit sind, Serbien auf einem langen, nicht immer einfachen aber steten Weg in Richtung Europäische Union positiv zu begleiten.

Ich glaube, es gibt viel Potenzial in diesem Land. Serbien ist eine europäische Kulturnation. Ich begrüße es ausdrücklich, dass dieses Land so klar auf einer proeuropäischen Ausrichtung unterwegs ist. Ich glaube, wichtig ist jetzt im Dezember, verehrte Frau Staatssekretärin, wenn der Rat tagt, dass die Mitgliedstaaten sich dafür entscheiden, weitere Kapitel zu eröffnen, damit der Reformprozess auch weiterhin in Serbien eine aktive Unterstützung findet.

Nochmals herzlichen Dank für die gute Zusammenarbeit, für die vielen Änderungsanträge, die wir in Kompromissen zusammengeführt haben. Es wäre schön, wenn wir morgen mit einer breiten parlamentarischen Mehrheit diesen Bericht beschließen, um deutlich zu machen, dass das Europäische Parlament an der Seite der proeuropäischen Kräfte in diesem großartigen Land steht.

1-204-0000

Przewodniczący. – Zamykam debatę.

Głosowanie odbędzie się w czwartek 29 listopada 2018 r.

Oświadczenia pisemne (art. 162)

1-204-5000

Dominique Bilde (ENF), *par écrit*. – Que dire de ce rapport sans nuances duquel transpire à chaque ligne un parti pris antiserbe que le rapporteur ne tente même pas de dissimuler?

Tout d'abord, il est inacceptable d'assimiler un possible échange de territoires entre la Serbie et le Kosovo à la création d'un État «ethniquement pur». Deuxièmement, à l'heure où l'Union européenne se fait fort d'imposer à la Serbie la reconnaissance du Kosovo, elle ne parvient pas en revanche à exiger de ce dernier le retrait de sa mesure appliquant des droits de douane de 100 % aux importations serbes.

Du reste, l'échec cuisant ce lundi du Commissaire européen Johannes Hahn en visite à Priština dit tout ce qu'il faut savoir sur l'influence réelle de Bruxelles dans une poudrière des Balkans où l'étincelle n'est jamais loin, et ce en dépit des privilèges divers et variés généreusement accordés au Kosovo, à l'instar de sa participation anticipée à certains programmes européens.

Mais le plus inadmissible est le véritable chantage exercé contre la Serbie concernant ses relations avec la Russie, qui révèle l'essence même d'un projet européen résolument contraire aux intérêts nationaux.

23. Sprawozdanie za rok 2018 dotyczące Kosowa (debata)

1-206-0000

Przewodniczący. – Kolejnym punktem porządku dziennego jest sprawozdanie sporządzone przez Igora Šoltesa w imieniu Komisji Spraw Zagranicznych w sprawie sprawozdania Komisji za rok 2018 dotyczącego Kosowa (2018/2149(INI)) (A8-0332/2018).

1-207-0000

Igor Šoltes, *Rapporteur*. – Najlepša hvala predsedujoči za besedo. Lep pozdrav seveda tudi spoštovanemu komisarju in predstavnici Sveta.

Najprej bi se želel zahvaliti vsem poročevalcem v senci za odlično opravljeno delo in pa za vse sugestije in amandmaje, ki smo jih prejeli v tem času priprave poročila. Vodilo pri pripravi poročila je predvsem to, da je na neki... način refleksija področja, kjer je bil napredek storjen, in tudi opozorila na teme in pa na področja, kjer še vedno obstajajo pomanjkljivosti in kjer so potrebne izboljšave.

Če izpostavim nekaj ključnih točk iz poročila, bi začel tako:

Kosovo je seveda v opazovanem obdobju naredilo pomemben korak naprej, napredek, ki pa ni bil povsem takšen, kot smo si želeli. Na mnogih področjih bi si želeli več, na mnogih področjih so še vedno vidni deli, ki ji bo treba izboljšati.

Razlog gre iskati v zunanjih okoliščinah, predvsem pa tudi v notranjih, ker včasih se zdi, da politične skupine v parlamentu težko dosežejo konsenz, in tudi včasih manko v komunikaciji med političnimi skupinami botruje, da se včasih zakonodaja, ki bi morala biti sprejeta, težje prebije v parlament. Predvsem pa je pomembno, da zakoni, ki se sprejmejo v parlamentu na Kosovu, potem doživijo tudi implementacijo. Ker ne pomaga veliko, če imamo še tako dobre zakone, ki pa jih ne uporabljamo.

Bi pa na tem mestu seveda opozoril še na eno od tem, ki je izjemno pomembna, to je vizumska liberalizacija. Že večkrat smo ponovili, da je Kosovo izpolnilo vse zahtevane kriterije, med drugim tudi ratifikacijo meje s Črno goro, ki se je po več kot dveh letih pogajanj zgodila marca letos, in s tem pravzaprav odprlo vrata za vizumsko liberalizacijo. In temu sta tako Komisija kot Parlament dala zeleno luč. In zaradi tudi verodostojnosti evropskih institucij mislim, da je zdaj tudi na strani Evrope, da izpolni svoj del dogovora in to je, da omogoči vizumsko liberalizacijo ljudem na Kosovu in jih na ta način izenači z vsemi drugimi v regiji.

Ko sem omenil zakone, moram reči, da je Kosovo sprejelo kar nekaj pomembnih zakonov, ki jih lahko štejemo kot napredek. Je pa, kot rečeno, v poročilu omenjena tudi problematika korupcije in organiziranega kriminala, ki sta še vedno prisotna in zdi se, da bo potreben še velik dodaten napor za čim večjo neodvisnost tudi sodne veje oblasti in pa to, da se še okrepi delovanje na področju vodenja evidenc o preiskovanju pregona korupcije na visoki ravni. Tu bo potrebno sodelovanje mnogih vpletenih, tudi v regiji.

Seveda na koncu ne morem mimo dialoga med Beogradom in Prištino in vsi si želimo, da se razmere čim bolj normalizirajo in da se preide in nadaljuje s pogovori v iskanju rešitve in izpolnjevanju tistih zahtev, ki... h katerim sta se zavezali obe državi. In to seveda Evropska komisija kot Parlament skrbno spremljata.

Bi pa seveda omenil, in brez tega ne gre, da se dvostranski odnosi ne rešujejo s prekomernimi ukrepi in tudi ta uvedba carin ne izboljšuje odnose med Prištino in Beogradom. In prepričan sem, da je potreben razmislek in drugačno ukrepanje in umik tovrstnih odločitev.

In na koncu še to, da seveda si želimo vsi, da se Kosovo tudi na teh odprtih vprašanjih premakne naprej. In tu sem prepričan, da tudi EU lahko nudi svojo podporo in sodelovanje.

1-208-0000

Karoline Edtstadler, *President-in-Office of the Council*. – Thank you Mr President, honourable Members, dear Commissioner, dear rapporteur Šoltes.

Let me start by underlining the importance of the Stabilisation and Association Agreement. This agreement offers Kosovo an opportunity for sustainable progress and rapprochement with the European Union.

It is therefore essential for Kosovo to continue working on the implementation of the agreement. Here we concur with your view that Kosovo should pay particular attention to improving the rule of law, including traditional independence and due process of law. Kosovo also needs to continue its fight against organised crime and corruption, which should be a clear priority of the authorities.

Consensus across the political spectrum is key to advancing Kosovo's European agenda. We share your view that the Assembly is the key forum for legislative work and political dialogue. A strong political will is required from all political actors to move Kosovo forward.

Turning to the EU-facilitated dialogue between Belgrade and Pristina, we welcome the commitment of both sides to work with the High Representative on a comprehensive normalisation of relations, including in the form of a legally binding agreement.

We both agree that this is key for their respective European paths and essential for sustainable regional stability. The Council will continue to monitor closely Kosovo's engagement towards

visible and sustainable progress here so that Serbia and Kosovo can continue on their respective European paths.

We stress the importance of regional cooperation and good neighbourly relations. We encourage Kosovo to continue sustained efforts to strengthen good neighbourly relations and to resolve outstanding bilateral issues.

In this context, actions undermining regional cooperation are not helpful. We regret the introduction of tariffs by Kosovo on products originating from Serbia and Bosnia and Herzegovina. There is an urgent need for calm and de-escalation in the interests of the whole region and, again, we welcome Commissioner Hahn's offer of help to work on rapid and practical solutions for the various trade issues at hand.

Let me add a few comments on the visa liberalisation process, which as we know is high on the political agenda in Kosovo. We join the European Parliament in welcoming the ratification by the Kosovo Assembly of the border boundary agreement with Montenegro in March 2018. This fulfilled one of the key criteria for Kosovo's visa liberalisation and was an important achievement in the spirit of good neighbourly relations.

Let me recall here the Commission proposal in May 2016 to transfer Kosovo to the Schengen visa-free list and the Commission's report on the fulfilment of the remaining benchmarks in July 2018. We note that the Parliament has adopted its mandate and is ready to start negotiating with the Council on the proposal to waive visa requirements for Kosovo.

However, as you are aware, the decision on the Commission proposal is currently under consideration in the Council. Today in our discussions we focus on Kosovo's progress in 2017. However, also more generally, I would like to stress that the EU will continue to support Kosovo by putting particular emphasis on furthering Kosovo's socio-economic reform agenda, including through financial and technical assistance. Economic growth and creating employment is a main concern of its people.

Let me finally welcome the agreement reached on the extension of the EULEX mission and underline the importance of continued close and effective cooperation with EULEX.

1-209-0000

Johannes Hahn, *Member of the Commission*. – Mr President, first of all, I would like to thank the Parliament, and in particular the rapporteur, Mr Šoltés, for the report on Kosovo. I believe that it is a balanced report and is in line with the main findings of our 2018 Commission report regarding progress and challenges in Kosovo.

But we cannot hide the fact that today the discussion is overshadowed by what has been happening in recent weeks in Kosovo. The recent decisions by the Kosovo Government to impose a trade tariff increase of up to 100% against Serbia and Bosnia and Herzegovina are very concerning and doing real harm to relations with Kosovo and regional cooperation ambitions. As we have said clearly, these decisions are a clear violation of the Central European Free Trade Agreement and contrary to the spirit of the Stabilisation and Association Agreement between the European Union and Kosovo.

This is why the European Union has called on the Kosovo Government to immediately revoke these decisions. Imposing blanket measures is not the appropriate way to address trade concerns. They must be addressed in the appropriate fora. I have already spoken with the Prime Minister and the President, who agreed on the urgent need to calm and de-escalate, in the interests of the

country and the whole region, and offered a rapid and practical solution for the various trade issues at hand between Kosovo and Serbia. I will also use the opportunity of my planned visit to Pristina next week to help find a way out of this crisis.

But now let me turn back briefly to the assessment in our 2018 report on Kosovo. As already noted also in Parliament's report, the picture is a mixed one. We underline progress in certain areas, such as on the investment climate. We also welcome the ratification by the Kosovo Assembly of the Agreement on Border Demarcation with Montenegro last March, which was an important breakthrough. However, our overall conclusion is that Kosovo's pace of EU-related reforms is too slow. This is partly due to a very high political polarisation and the fact that the Assembly has not been functioning as it should. Unfortunately, these conclusions are still valid today. We therefore expect all political actors to increase efforts to build consensus on strategic issues for Kosovo, in particular EU-related priority reforms and on the dialogue with Serbia.

Let me now turn to visa liberalisation, which is of particular importance to Kosovo's citizens. Kosovo has worked hard in recent years to meet its visa liberalisation roadmap criteria. Last July, the Commission confirmed that Kosovo had fulfilled all outstanding criteria. We continue to stand by our assessment that all benchmarks have been met and continue to be met. I welcome Parliament's clear support for the Commission's proposal on visa liberalisation. Your report also – rightly so – insists that the authorities in Kosovo demonstrate sustained efforts in the fight against organised crime and corruption. The ball is now in the Council's court. I hope that the Council will demonstrate that when our partners deliver, the EU delivers too. In that respect I would like to thank the Austrian Presidency for its efforts to put this on the agenda and to try to start negotiations on this subject.

The Commission remains committed to Kosovo and to giving Kosovo a real European perspective. We will continue to support Kosovo in its reform processes in important areas such as the rule of law, public administration, the economy and education. However, we need to see a clear commitment from Kosovo's leaders to focus their attention on measures that will bring Kosovo closer to Europe.

1-210-0000

Eduard Kukan, *on behalf of the PPE Group*. – Mr President, Kosovo has seen turbulent political months. While some issues have moved forward, not much overall progress has been achieved. We are expecting more from the political leaders of Kosovo. We need to see a genuine commitment to the reform process, especially in the rule of law and the fight against corruption. However, political polarisation, and the lack of consensus and efficient work of the Kuvendi hinders progress on EU-related issues. Moreover, escalating tensions between Belgrade and Pristina resulted in unprecedented tariffs and the waste of very valuable time in reaching the agreement.

Finally, the last reporting period in Kosovo has been marked by the fulfilment of requirements for a visa-free regime. This was confirmed by the Commission in July and by this House in September 2018. I will, therefore, appeal to the Council, and especially to the Austrian Presidency, to recognise this progress and move forward with granting a visa-free regime for Kosovo.

1-211-0000

Pier Antonio Panzeri, *a nome del gruppo S&D*. – Signor Presidente, onorevoli colleghi, ringrazio innanzitutto il relatore per il testo completo e inclusivo che è stato realizzato; nella relazione sono evidenziati i progressi ma, allo stesso tempo, quanto resta ancora da fare, in particolare per quanto concerne la pubblica amministrazione, il sistema giudiziario e la lotta alla criminalità. Inoltre, in tema di diritti umani, chiediamo una maggiore integrazione delle politiche di genere, la protezione delle minoranze, in particolare i rom e gli ashkali, e la discriminazione delle persone LGBT.

Pur sottolineando, come ha fatto il Commissario, la problematicità delle scelte fiscali fatte recentemente dal Kosovo, ricordo che a luglio la Commissione europea ha affermato che il Kosovo ha finalmente soddisfatto tutte le condizioni necessarie per ottenere la liberalizzazione dei visti. Dopo il voto del Parlamento europeo, la decisione deve essere ora presa in Consiglio; raggiungere questo risultato è fondamentale per la stabilizzazione, l'integrazione e la cooperazione con questa regione geograficamente fondamentale per l'Unione europea. Infine, è importante, per la normalizzazione delle relazioni con la Serbia, che i cinque paesi europei che non l'hanno ancora fatto riconoscano il Kosovo, grazie.

1-212-0000

Ангел Джамбазки, *от името на групата ECR*. – Първо искам да поздравя колегата Шолтес за доклада, който е направил. Той е изключително подготвен и изключително добре мотивиран и в дълбочина разследва и изследва ситуацията, в която се намира Косово в момента. Всички с тревога, вероятно всеки един от Вас ще се присъедини към тази тревога, следим ситуацията в момента, нарастващото напрежение в отношенията с един от съседите на Косово, както и продължаващото вътрешно напрежение в самата държава, което не е в интерес нито на косовските граждани, нито помага на промените, на реформите в Косово и на пътя му на интеграция в Европейския съюз, където е пътят на тази държава.

Уважаеми г-н Комисар, искам да се обърна специално към Вас да обърнете по-сериозно внимание на правата и законните интереси на различните малцинства в Косово, защото има съществени проблеми и провокации. Те са видими, а не могат да бъдат оставени по този начин. По-специално, разбира се, обръщам и на правата и на законните интереси на българската общност в Косово.

1-213-0000

Jasenko Selimović, *on behalf of the ALDE Group*. – Mr President, my thanks go to the rapporteur for the excellent report that shows that certain things are developing in a good direction in Kosovo, especially when it comes to the economy and economic criteria. However, certain other issues have to be worked on: relations with Serbia, certainly, and the rights of minorities, while the informal economy remains an issue, a big one.

However, the ratification of the border agreement with Montenegro in March 2018 was important, a major breakthrough. On this matter, Kosovo showed that it fulfilled the criteria, together with the development of the economic area and together with the fight against corruption. It shows that it fulfilled the criteria to get the visa liberalisation, as the Commissioner has stated. Now it's up to the Council to do its job. We cannot play with Kosovo, they fulfilled the criteria, we have to give them what we have promised.

1-214-0000

Jaromír Kohlíček, *za skupinu GUE/NGL*. – Pane předsedající, Kosovo, správně Kosovo a Metohije, je kolébkou srbského státu. Protiprávní odtržení tohoto území od Srbska, které je navíc v rozporu s rezolucí 1244 Rady bezpečnosti OSN, je dostatečným zdůvodněním pro neuznání samostatnosti tohoto uměle vytvořeného státu.

Jestliže se hovoří o Balkánu jako o místě největší korupce v Evropě, o místě, odkud vychází cesty distribuce drog, kde se nedaří odsoudit zločince z teroristických skupin, kteří zde mají své zázemí, a kde právní stát je absolutní fikcí, pak tento popis nejlépe vystihuje situaci v Kosovu. Zpráva se nezmiňuje ani o protiprávní existenci největší základny USA v Evropě, *Bond Steel*, naopak se snaží najít alespoň náznaky pozitivního vývoje.

Je namístě vyslovit hluboké znepokojení nad některými kroky místní administrativy, včetně praktické nevymahatelnosti práva a technických excesů, jako je narušení evropské propojené elektrizační soustavy nevhodnou činností místních autorit.

S takto formulovanou zprávou nemohu rozhodně vyslovit souhlas. Komisi blokování jednání místními orgány nevadí? S tímto státem chcete udělat vízovou liberalizaci, pane komisaři?

1-215-0000

Dominique Bilde, *au nom du groupe ENF*. – Monsieur le Président, les rapports de la Commission sont toujours l'occasion d'un foisonnement d'euphémismes. Celui relatif au Kosovo n'échappe pas à la règle.

Nous apprécions la mention de «stade précoce de la lutte contre le crime organisé», dans cet État au cœur de trafics en tous genres. Pire, comment la Commission peut-elle vanter l'engagement du Kosovo dans le processus de normalisation avec la Serbie quand les provocations s'enchaînent à une cadence qui donne le tournis? En témoigne l'annonce récente d'une taxation de 100 % sur les importations serbes, comble de l'ironie à l'heure où Bruxelles se pose en chantre du libre-échange face à Donald Trump.

Enfin, de quelle normalisation parle-t-on quand, fin octobre, des pèlerins orthodoxes ont été accueillis au monastère de Studenica à coups de pierres?

La levée des visas est d'ailleurs d'autant plus inconcevable qu'elle portera peut-être bientôt sur un monde révolu, à en juger par l'appel du Premier ministre albanais à une Grande Albanie, qui achève de mettre le feu à la poudrière des Balkans.

1-216-0000

Tonino Picula (S&D). – Poštovani predsjedavajući, čestitam kolegi Šoltesu na kvalitetnom izvješću. Jasna perspektiva članstva u Europskoj uniji mora ostati jedan od poticaja za provedbu prijeko potrebnih reformi u zemljama Zapadnog Balkana, pa tako i u slučaju najmlađe europske države.

Dobru vijesti s Kosova, u pogledu ispunjavanja uvjeta za liberalizaciju viznog režima, ovoga puta ne prate dobre vijesti iz Europske unije. Parlament i Komisija poslali su jasnu poruku i podržali ukidanje viza građanima Kosova kako bi im olakšali putovanja, poslovanje te pomogli u borbi protiv krijumčarenja ljudi. Iskazujem žaljenje što Vijeće još uvijek nije omogućilo konačnu liberalizaciju viznog režima. To bi bila jasna poruka Kosovu, ali i regiji, da ispunjavanje obveza uvijek donosi korist, u suprotnom rastu frustracije.

Pred Kosovom je i dalje veliki posao u jačanju vladavine prava, procesuiranju politički motiviranih ubojstava, borbi protiv organiziranog kriminala i korupcije. Jedino opipljivi reformski rezultati opravdavaju daljnju europsku podršku koja, međutim, u slučaju Kosova mora prijeći s obećanja na provedbu istih.

1-217-0000

Ryszard Czarnecki (ECR). – Panie Przewodniczący! Panie Komisarzu! Byłem w Kosowie. Nie ma co ukrywać, że to państwo było przedmiotem kontrowersji. Powstawało przy wielkiej pomocy amerykańskiej, na co z pewnym sceptycyzmem patrzyły niektóre państwa członkowskie Unii Europejskiej. Z perspektywy lat możemy powiedzieć, że na pewno warto, aby Unia Europejska inwestowała w ogóle w Bałkany Zachodnie i że integracja tych państw z Unią jest elementem stabilizacji. Stworzenie europejskiej perspektywy – nie jutro, nie pojutrze, lecz nawet w dłuższym czasie – sprawi, że mówiąc wprost, wpływy rosyjskie w tamtym regionie będą mniejsze. Rosja bowiem cały czas stara się grać kartą Bałkanów Zachodnich, także gdy chodzi o Kosowo, i trzeba to dostrzec.

1-218-0000

1-219-0000

Dubravka Šuica (PPE). – Poštovani predsjedavajući, želim se nakratko priključiti ovoj raspravi budući da sam bila izvjestiteljica u sjeni ovoga izvješća, ujedno sam i nekoliko puta, kao članica delegacije, posjetila Kosovo. Poznato mi je stanje u regiji, poznato mi je stanje na Kosovu.

Odnosi između Srbije i Kosova vrlo su komplicirani, to je svima jasno ovdje i povjerenik je to rekao. Normalizaciji tih odnosa uvođenje carina i tarifa sigurno neće doprinijeti, ali, isto tako, liberalizacija viza je nešto što smo im obećali, nešto što je ovaj Parlament velikom većinom izglasovao i sigurno da građani Kosova očekuju da im se omogući liberalizacija viza. Ja očekujem da će Vijeće o tome uskoro odlučivati, u protivnom to neće biti dobar znak da bi građani doživljavali taj europski put.

Isto tako, neophodna je borba protiv korupcije, neophodne su reforme, to je evidentno, ali isto tako Kosovo je vrlo važno za regiju i stanje na Kosovu važno je za cijelu Europu, a posebno za jugoistok Europe.

1-220-0000

Julie Ward (S&D). – Mr President, as a friend of Kosovo, I am saddened to see that its participation in the European processes – in fact, its very existence, even – is still called into question in this House.

On the contrary, colleagues, we should be putting all our efforts into Kosovo's accession to the EU. As we engage with the country, I believe one of our priorities should be the fight against anti-gypsyism. Roma people remain a very marginalised group who face daily discrimination in all areas of life in Kosovo and everywhere else.

We must double our efforts to achieve full equality for Roma people and this process should start with holding ourselves to account.

In a country where the European Parliament was instrumental in ensuring compensation will be paid to women victims of sexual violence during the conflict, I'm appalled to see that the UN refuses to provide proper compensation for Roma, Ashkali and Egyptian people affected by lead poisoning in the UN-run camps.

So the UN and us should lead by example. We must take responsibility for anything that caused wrongdoings or lifelong damage to affected ... *(The President cut off the speaker).*

1-221-0000

Ivan Jakovčić (ALDE). – Poštovani predsjedavajući, jedna riječ je dovoljna da opiše odnose između Kosova i Europske unije u današnjem trenutku. Ta riječ je za mene vjerodostojnost.

Vjerodostojnost Europske unije kada govorimo o liberalizaciji viza. Nakon glasanja ovoga Parlamenta očekujem glasanje u Vijeću jer u pitanju je naša vjerodostojnost budući da je Kosovo, barem u ovom dijelu, ispunilo svoje uvjete koje smo im dali.

S druge strane, vjerodostojnost Kosova dovedena je u pitanje i njihova namjera ulaska u Europsku uniju dovedena je u pitanje s nametanjem carina Bosni i Hercegovini i Srbiji u stopostotnom iznosu. Ako netko želi Berlinski proces, ako netko želi ući u Europsku uniju, ako netko želi ući na jedinstveno tržište, ako netko želi regionalnu suradnju, ne može uvesti stopostotnu carinu.

Dakle, vjerodostojnost s naše strane da bi vjerodostojno mogli tražiti od Kosova da se oni prilagode nama.

1-222-0000

Jordi Solé (Verts/ALE). – Mr President, I regret that five EU Member States still don't recognise Kosovo as an independent state and I welcome the fact that the report from my colleague, Igor Šoltes, invites them to do so.

One of the states that still denies this recognition is Spain. The controversial Foreign Affairs Minister, Josep Borrell, recently reiterated that his government wouldn't change this position. This is the same minister who, in 2008, in a not very visionary and even less rigorous way, stated that the secession of Kosovo was illegal from the point of view of international law. This opinion was clearly discredited by the International Court of Justice which, in its 2010 opinion, established that general international law does not provide for prohibitions on declarations of independence, and therefore the declaration of Kosovo didn't violate international law.

For the sake of reconciliation in the Balkans and for the sake of European integration, Spain should recognise the states that are born of democratic decisions by their national parliaments.

1-223-0000

Fabio Massimo Castaldo (EFDD). – Signor Presidente, onorevoli colleghi, questa relazione sottolinea in maniera bilanciata i piccoli progressi e le diverse sfide a cui il Kosovo deve ancora far fronte e che scandiranno il ritmo del suo cammino verso l'integrazione europea. Un cammino lungo e irto di ostacoli, che richiede un impegno costante, determinazione e pazienza per realizzare quelle riforme di cui il paese ha urgentemente bisogno. In questo senso va letta la relazione del collega Šoltes, che ringrazio: un ulteriore stimolo a fare meglio, soprattutto in alcuni campi, come la lotta alla corruzione, alla criminalità organizzata, al traffico di esseri umani, al narcotraffico, alla radicalizzazione e a qualsiasi tipo di discriminazione.

Le relazioni bilaterali con la Serbia sono indubbiamente di fondamentale importanza e devono essere impostate su un dialogo stretto, affidabile, trasparente e verso un accordo di normalizzazione vincolante ed esaustivo, concordato da entrambi i paesi. Ecco quindi che invito le autorità kosovare a non prendere decisioni avventate, che compromettano gli sforzi di cooperazione regionale. Mi riferisco in particolare alla recente imposizione di dazi sulle merci importate dalla Serbia che violano le regole di libero commercio nell'accordo CEFTA. Ancora una volta il dialogo deve tornare protagonista nel risolvere i problemi nei Balcani occidentali.

1-224-0000

Σωτήριος Ζαριανόπουλος (NI). – Κύριε Πρόεδρε, μεγάλη διαφθορά, οργανωμένο έγκλημα, εμπορία ναρκωτικών, εμπορία ανθρώπων, τζιχαντιστές. Αυτή είναι η εικόνα του Κοσόβου, αλλά και της Αλβανίας -σε διαφορετική έκταση. Δεν το λέμε εμείς· εσείς το λέτε στην έκθεσή σας. Ασκείτε πιέσεις για την προοπτική προσχώρησης του Κοσόβου στην Ευρωπαϊκή Ένωση και για την ένταξη της Αλβανίας και των Σκοπίων. Η διεύρυνση της επιρροής, της δικής σας και του NATO -πρωτοστατούσης της κυβέρνησης ΣΥΡΙΖΑ-ΑΝΕΛ στην Ελλάδα, και ο έλεγχος των βαλκανικού διαδρόμου κόντρα στη Ρωσία είναι αυτά που σας ενδιαφέρουν και μόνον· ούτε τα κριτήριά σας, ούτε -βέβαια- τα συμφέροντα των λαών. Το Κόσοβο, ένα προτεκτοράτο-αμερικάνικη βάση που είναι κατασκευάσμα των βομβαρδισμών και της διάλυσης της Γιουγκοσλαβίας, συνεχίζει την αλλαγή συνόρων για να συμμετάσχει στη Μεγάλη Αλβανία, το αγαπημένο παιδί των Αμερικανών, του NATO και της Ένωσης, ανοίγοντας την όρεξη για εδαφικές διεκδικήσεις και άλλων, όπως των Αλβανών για την Τσαμουριά και των Τούρκων για το Αιγαίο και τη Δυτική Θράκη. Το «διαίρει και βασίλευε», που υποδαυλίζεται με εθνικισμούς, είναι κίνδυνος-θάνατος για τους λαούς, οι οποίοι πρέπει να απαντήσουν με συντονισμένη πάλη και κόντρα στα πολεμικά σας σχέδια, για πραγματική συνεργασία, ασφάλεια και ειρήνη.

1-225-0000

(Koniec zgłoszeń z sali)

1-226-0000

Johannes Hahn, *Member of the Commission*. – Mr President, I intend to travel to Pristina next week. The focus will be on the tariff decisions, but I'm also going to assess the implementation of the European Reform Agenda. I will be insisting that the Kosovan authorities need to get back to the issues that matter for Kosovo's future, namely reforms and engagement in the dialogue. Kosovo's priorities should remain the rule of law, economic development and education. Kosovo needs to become an attractive place for business, provide citizens with high-quality education and reduce the very high unemployment levels, in particular among young people.

It's also crucial that Kosovo continues to build confidence by demonstrating sustained progress in the fight against organised crime and corruption. The Commission is providing strong support for the implementation of these priorities through substantive financial assistance and technical advice. For this part Kosovo needs to keep pace with the rest of the region to promote economic growth and foster political stability, which is essential for the security of the Western Balkans as a whole.

Regarding dialogue, it's vital that Kosovo and Serbia remain committed to the full normalisation of their relations. A comprehensive, legally binding normalisation agreement should be reached as soon as possible. Both Kosovo and Serbia have expressed on many occasions concerns and grievances about their relations. They should be addressed through the dialogue which the European Union is committed to continue to facilitate.

I would like to conclude by saying that the Commission remains strongly committed to driving forward Kosovo's European agenda despite the current difficult political context.

1-227-0000

Karoline Edtstadler, *President-in-Office of the Council*. – Mr President, at the outset of my concluding remarks, let me express my sincere gratitude to the rapporteur of the European Parliament on Kosovo, Igor Šoltes.

I would like to reiterate that stability in the neighbourhood and the enlargement of the European Union is a priority of the Austrian presidency. The EU will continue to assist Kosovo, including through its presence on the ground. And of course this applies also to visa liberalisation, but the Council's deliberations are currently ongoing and the outcome cannot be pre-judged.

The Austrian Presidency remains committed to moving the process forward. However, the primary responsibility for progress lies with Kosovo, its leaders, institutions and civil society. Reforms are crucial and they will require consensus across the political spectrum, and the political leaders to live up to their responsibilities for the good of Kosovo and of its citizens.

1-228-0000

Igor Šoltes, *poročevalec*. – Torej to, kar smo poslušali danes, in to, kar tudi piše v samem poročilu, Kosovu ne bo zmanjkalo dela tudi v prihodnjih letih, to je definitivno, ampak tri stvari bi želel za zaključek povedati.

Upam, da je tudi Svet danes slišal to, kar smo povedali, da Kosovo je izpolnilo svoje pogoje glede vizne liberalizacije, in dogovori obstajajo zato, da se seveda spoštujejo, in če je ena stran to izpolnila, utemeljeno se pričakuje, da to stori tudi druga stran.

Verjemite, da ljudje na Kosovu že nestrpno pričakujejo, da niso predmet diskriminacije še naprej, in pričakujejo, da bo Evropska unija tudi v imenu verodostojnosti izpolnila svoj del obveznosti.

Drugo, mislim, da je vlada v Prištini danes slišala, da nismo najbolj navdušeni nad uvedbo oziroma nad povišanjem carin za 100 procentov kot sredstvo za reševanje sporov med Beogradom in Prištino, in upam, da bo ponovno razmislila, ali je to je res primeren ukrep, ker reševanje sporov se odvija oziroma rešuje tudi na drugačen način.

Zadnja stvar, ki bi jo želel še izpostaviti, je okolje, okoljevarstvena problematika.

Mislim, da premalo izpostavljamo tudi problematiko okolja na Kosovu, zlasti bi tukaj opozoril na resen problem, s katerim se srečuje Priština, to je onesnaženost zraka, ki je ena najvišjih v Evropi.

In mislim, da tukaj je potrebno storiti več na tem področju in tudi vložiti sredstva za izboljšanje. To pa je povezano seveda tudi z elektrarnami in onesnaževalci v regiji, zato mislim, da je tudi to ena od stvari, kjer lahko Evropska unija in Kosovo dobro sodelujeta.

1-229-0000

Przewodniczący. – Zamykam debatę.

Głosowanie odbędzie się w czwartek 29 listopada 2018 r.

24. Powitanie

1-231-0000

Przewodniczący. – Zanim przejdziemy do odpowiedniego punktu porządku obrad, niech mi wolno będzie najpierw powitać obecną na sali delegację byłej jugosłowiańskiej republiki Macedonii. Serdecznie witam Państwa, szczególnie wiceministra spraw zagranicznych Andreja Žernovskiego oraz wielopartyjną delegację parlamentu macedońskiego. (*Oklaski*) Dziękuję bardzo Paniom i Panom Posłom za tak życzliwe i gorące przyjęcie.

Drogi Panie Wiceministrze! Drodzy Państwo Posłowie! Chciałbym Was zapewnić, że Parlament Europejski nadal będzie wspierał Wasz kraj w wysiłkach zmierzających do przeprowadzenia reform, w tym do wdrożenia umowy z nad Prespy, które stanowi pozytywny sygnał o porozumieniu dla całego regionu.

Jeśli mogę sobie pozwolić na osobistą uwagę, to kiedyś jako student miałem przyjemność przebywać trzy miesiące w Skopje na stypendium, stąd i miasto, i naród macedoński są mi bardzo bliskie. Dziękuję za danie mi wtedy tej możliwości.

25. Sprawozdanie za rok 2018 dotyczące byłej jugosłowiańskiej republiki Macedonii (debata)

1-233-0000

Przewodniczący. – Kolejnym punktem porządku dziennego jest sprawozdanie sporządzone przez Ivo Vajgla w imieniu Komisji Spraw Zagranicznych w sprawie sprawozdania Komisji za rok 2018 dotyczącego byłej jugosłowiańskiej republiki Macedonii (2018/2145(INI)) (A8-0341/2018).

1-234-0000

Ivo Vajgl, poročevalec. – Gospod predsednik, hvala za teh nekaj vaših osebnih ljubeznivih besed, ki ste jih namenili Makedoniji.

Zaradi časa bom jaz nekoliko skrajšal svoj predvideni nastop in se omejil na najbolj bistvene stvari.

Članstvo Makedonije v Evropski uniji, ko bodo za to izpolnjeni pogoji in ko bodo izpolnjene naše obljube tej državi, ki je bila predolgo v čakalnici, bo gotovo zagotovilo najbolj zanesljivo prihodnost državi, sedanjim in bodočim generacijam njenih državljanov, in bo hkrati konkreten prispevek k stabilnosti, varnosti in napredku celotne regije jugovzhodne Evrope.

Pot do današnjega trenutka Makedonije je bila strma, lahko pa ugotovimo, da je v državi prevladala demokratična volja ljudi, kreativno in odgovorno odzivanje politike, ki je izbrala poti sporazumevanja, vzpostavljanja ravnovesja v večnacionalni skupnosti, iskanja zaveznikov v mednarodni skupnosti in novih poti za krepitev plodnih in prijateljskih odnosov s sosednjimi državami.

V resoluciji, ki jo danes obravnavamo, je zato poudarjena konstruktivna vloga državnikov Makedonije, Grčije in Bolgarije, ki so postavili ob stran podedovane probleme iz preteklosti in se sporazumeli o skupnih interesih v prihodnosti.

Vlado in parlament v Skopju čakajo zahtevne naloge: najprej uresničenje dogovorjenega z grško vlado o spremembi ustave in s tem povezano premostitvijo dolgoletnega spora o imenu, nato pa zahtevno delo na reformah, ki bodo pogoj za začetek pogajanj o prihodnem članstvu države v Evropski uniji, upam in verjamem, da že v naslednjem letu v juniju.

Za vse to bo potrebno ustvariti demokratično, vsevključujoče vzdušje v državi, sodelovanje vseh političnih strank, civilne družbe in državnih institucij.

V skladu s sprejetimi obvezami bo morala država posodobiti zakonodajne postopke, sodstvo, zagotoviti spoštovanje vladavine prava, odpiranje prostora za resnično svobodne in pluralne medije, zaščito novinarjev pred pritiski in nasiljem, učinkovitejši boj proti organiziranemu kriminalu in korupciji.

Potrebne bodo sistemske spremembe v gospodarstvu, izboljšava poslovnega okolja, izvrševanje pogodb, uvedba kontrole in preglednosti podatkov v zvezi z javnimi naročili, državno pomočjo in uporabo sredstev Evropske unije in podobno.

V resoluciji je med drugim opažen napor vlade, da bi izboljšala življenjske pogoje mladih. Vladi je namenjen tudi poziv, naj celovito rešuje problem dolgotrajne nezaposlenosti žensk. Pomembno je stalno in transparentno izpolnjevanje obvez iz ohridskega sporazuma in celovito spoštovanje pravic in zaščite vseh narodnostnih in drugih družbenih manjšin.

Spoštovani, Makedonija je prišla po dolgih letih negotovosti in političnih kriz do položaja, ko si lahko z lastnimi močmi in po svoji volji utre pot v bolj obetavno prihodnost kot članica Evropske unije in zveze Nato. To je pot iz zapletene zgodovine, na Balkanu pogosto začinjene z nasiljem, vojnami in spori, v prihodnost vzajemnosti in skupne odgovornosti. Prav je, da se v državi zagotovi popolna neodvisnost in funkcionalnost pravosodja, ki preiskuje in sankcionira nepravilnosti in kršitve zakonov iz preteklosti.

Žal je v te postopke na nerazumljiv in nesprijemljiv način posegla madžarska oblast. O tem več govori resolucija in amandmaji, ki so jih predložile različne stranke v našem Parlamentu.

Zdi se mi primerno, da na tem mestu poudarim, da je Makedonija kot potencialna članica za članstvo v Evropski uniji vseskozi uživala podporo Evropskega parlamenta in da lahko s to podporo računa tudi v prihodnje.

Mislim, da je prav, da izpostavim tudi napor Komisije, komisarja Johannes Hahna in njegove ekipe, ki je tudi v sodelovanju s tem parlamentom vztrajno iskal in našel način za reševanje zapletenih političnih protislovji, ki so ovirala napredek Makedonije proti članstvu v Evropski uniji.

Za izredno konstruktivno in vsebinsko sodelovanje se zahvaljujem tudi vsem poročevalcem v senci. Ne zahvaljujem se vam, gospod predsednik, ker sem imel šest minut, uporabil sem štiri.

1-235-0000

Karoline Edtstadler, *President-in-Office of the Council*. – Mr President, honourable Members, dear rapporteur, dear Commissioner, ladies and gentlemen, and especially dear Minister, dear Ambassador.

Let me begin by recalling the Council conclusions of last June where the Council decided to respond positively to the progress made by the Former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia and set out the path towards opening accession negotiations in June 2019.

We welcome the European Commission's necessary preparatory work. The country has overcome its deep political crises, including through the continued implementation of the Prespa Agreement, and has made substantial progress on the urgent reform priorities. This is extremely important for the country's further progress.

Let me emphasise that even in the difficult political context, the government has taken significant steps to gradually restore a culture of compromise. It has reached out to all stakeholders, including the opposition, to strengthen democracy and the rule of law and to show a genuine desire to reform in an inclusive and transparent manner.

We welcome the changes in the tenor of atmosphere in the country. We also welcome the first concrete progress towards the restoration of the independence of the judiciary, the improvement of the work of the courts, and a follow-up to the work of the Special Prosecutor's office, which has started to reverse the backsliding of previous years.

Let me here recall the need to find a suitable, sustainable solution for the continuation of the work of the Special Prosecutor's office.

Moreover, we share your calls for the Former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia to intensify efforts to properly implement the judicial reform strategy and to make further efforts to address the outstanding recommendations.

Sustained efforts are needed to ensure implementation of all commitments and to ensure that the judiciary can function independently. The Former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia has achieved progress on the EU reform agenda and continues its efforts. We encourage it to deepen the reform momentum further, in particular showing real results in key rule of law areas such as the fight against corruption and organised crime, where it needs to further deliver.

The institutions in charge of preventing and fighting corruption must have the necessary autonomy and the financial and human resources. The government must also implement other reforms, such as the reform of the intelligence and security services, and of the public administration.

The EU will continue to follow these efforts very closely. We take note of the adoption of the public administration reform strategy and the public financial management reform programme and look forward to their implementation.

We encourage the government to continue to deepen the current reform momentum, including through Plan 18. We welcome the intention to continue working with the opposition parties, civil society and other stakeholders. Therefore, a constructive dialogue between all actors is required. We urge all parliamentary parties to put their divisions aside and work jointly on the common strategic goal of EU integration for the benefit of all citizens.

The implementation of the name agreement is one major step in this regard. Moreover, we welcome the holding of the Jean Monnet Dialogue, initiated by the European Parliament, aimed at improving the atmosphere and culture of compromise among the members of the Assembly as well as the work of the Assembly.

We join you in applauding the country for reaching out to its neighbours in the spirit of good neighbourly relations. In particular, the conclusion of the Treaty on Friendship, Good Neighbourliness and Cooperation with Bulgaria, and the signature of the agreement on the name issue with Greece, have demonstrated the government's determination to resolve all outstanding bilateral issues and build good neighbourly relations with all countries in the region.

Let me finally welcome the continued active participation and the constructive approach of the Former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia in different regional initiatives. Together these have contributed to an improved regional context.

1-236-0000

Johannes Hahn, *Member of the Commission*. – Mr President, I would like to start by thanking the European Parliament, in particular the rapporteur, Ivo Vajgl, for this report. May I also say thank you for your kind words on behalf of my team, not only here in Brussels, but also on the ground in Skopje, and I would like to include in this our previous Ambassador, Aivo Orav, who also did an excellent and outstanding job.

I would also like to use this opportunity to thank the Honourable Members of the Parliament, Knut Fleckenstein and previously John Howarth, but also Eduard Kukan, who together with Ivo Vajgl have shown their commitment to move, not only once but many times, to the country and to contribute to resolving the severe political crisis by engaging together with me in the facilitation of the provisional agreement. They also played a key role in the organising of the first Chamonix dialogue, which aims at creating an atmosphere of compromise among the political parties in the Parliament. These are only a few examples of how this House contributes to reinforcing democratic processes and, hopefully, standards.

Let me underline that overall this draft reflects the main findings of our 2018 report and the latest developments have shown to be crucial. As you have rightly pointed out, the country has finally overcome its political crisis and is now firmly back on its Euro-Atlantic path. In the light of the latest developments, let me emphasise that the rule of law is a fundamental principle of the Union, for Member States and candidate countries alike. After years of backsliding, the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia has been making good progress in this area and it's important that we collectively support this process.

I have been impressed by the energy and efforts invested by the government to strengthen good neighbourly relations, in particular with the bilateral treaty with Bulgaria and later on with the name agreement reached with Greece. This historic agreement sets an example for the region and the Union as a whole. It shows that with vision, leadership and determination, the obstacles of the past can be overcome for once and for all.

Last month, the Parliament took a courageous step by initiating the process of constitutional change. We now expect the national procedures for the implementation of the agreement to continue without delay. In our 2018 report, we stated that we were satisfied that the Pržino agreement has been largely implemented and that substantial progress has been achieved in the implementation of the Urgent Reform Priorities. Therefore, we recommended opening accession negotiations with the country.

In June, our Member States acknowledged the progress achieved in advancing the EU reforms and set out the path towards opening accession negotiations in June 2019. It's important that the current reform momentum continues to deepen, primarily in the interests of the citizens. Over the coming months we look forward to further progress, in particular in key areas such as judicial reform, the fight against corruption and organised crime, public administration reform and the oversight of intelligence services. All these areas have been identified in the so-called Plan 18 of the government.

On a very personal note, I welcome the opening of accession talks with NATO and look forward to cooperating on key reforms of common interest. Finally, let me reiterate the Commission's strong commitment to accompanying the country's reform efforts to advance on its EU path, including through the technical explanation of the *acquis*.

1-237-0000

Tunne Kelam, *on behalf of the PPE Group*. – Mr President, this report is being debated in a hopeful atmosphere and is based on broad political consensus.

I think it's a new spirit of mutual understanding with Macedonia's neighbours that has opened the real EU and NATO perspective for this country. It is really high time for this, because in the meantime Macedonia has made impressive progress in aligning its legislation with the EU *acquis*.

Most importantly, there is now a positive political dynamic. Still, it is all about implementation. In the actual context it is vital for the government to prove the judiciary is truly independent and unbiased to avoid any doubts of possible political misuse of it.

The media environment has clearly improved but the progress has been modest and more should be done to free especially the investigative press from internal and external influences. To make any progress credible it should firmly rely on cross-party cooperation. Broad-based political and moral support for the reforms is the only way to further success.

1-238-0000

Victor Boștinaru, *on behalf of the S&D Group*. – Mr President, Severna Makedonija has implemented robust, democratic reforms. They have taken a clear step towards good neighbourly relations and regional cooperation and the country is demonstrating every day its commitment to pursuing those efforts.

Today it is considered the candidate country that has made the most progress in aligning its legislation and its policy with the EU *acquis*. I trust that the Prespa Agreement, like now the Pržino Agreement, will be ratified, as it has to be, and will send a much needed positive signal for stability and reconciliation in the region. Of course, there is no doubt this brave step by Prime Minister Zaev paves the way for the country's European integration.

This being said, I want to tell you something else. I am very worried about the Gruevski case. We urge Hungary to reject the asylum request and immediately return Mr Gruevski. What Hungary has done in this case is a dangerous precedent without any grounds for asylum. Never in the

history of the EU has a Member State organised such an extraction operation. It is very important to make it clear that the European Parliament and Europe does not tolerate such actions.

(The President cut off the speaker)

1-239-0000

Ангел Джамбазки, *от името на групата ECR*. – Първо поздравявам докладчика. Многократно стана дума за договора за приятелство и междусъседство между България и Република Македония, който ние приветстваме и за който работихме много силно. Това обаче, което нас ни притеснява и ни тревожи, е че от страна на правителството на г-н Заев този договор не се спазва или се спазва изключително бавно. Отдавна трябваше да бъдат приведени редица мерки, като например трябваше да приключи езикът на омразата, трябваше да бъдат издадени учебници на български език, не трябваше да се правят антибългарски изказвания. Нищо от това не се е случило все още. Това тревожи българското общество. Г-н Заев се бави, обещава на всеки всичко, но не изпълнява поетите задължения. И това няма да доведе до добър ефект и до добър краен резултат.

Нашият призив към г-н Заев е да спазва този договор, ако желае да продължи да получава подкрепата и на нас като на европейски представители, и на българското общество като цяло.

1-240-0000

Reinhard Bütikofer, *on behalf of the Verts/ALE Group*. – Mr President, the Prespa Agreement is a key towards a more hopeful future for the Macedonian people. It is a vital step in building the bridges that the Western Balkans needs in order to overcome old divisions. It paves the way towards the EU integration of Macedonia and it helps Europe to continue shaping its common fate together, and to reject foreign interference. I thank all the members of the Macedonian Parliament who facilitated the progress that we are cherishing here, and I hope that next June we will be able to celebrate having a date for the opening of accession talks.

The way forward is still going to be challenging but I'm optimistic that the hurdles can be overcome.

1-241-0000

Σοφία Σακοράφα, *εξ ονόματος της ομάδας GUE/NGL*. – Κύριε Πρόεδρε, έχω δηλώσει επανειλημμένα ότι είμαι κατά της συμφωνίας των Πρεσπών, επειδή πιστεύω ότι είναι ένα κείμενο που δεν μπορεί να εφαρμοστεί. Δημιουργεί αμφισημίες που δεν λύνουν τις διαφωνίες, αλλά τις αναδεικνύουν. Ήδη, οι τροποποιήσεις του Συντάγματος που πέρασαν από το κοινοβούλιο των Σκοπίων παραβιάζουν τη συμφωνία, όπως επισημαίνει άλλωστε και ο ένθερμος υποστηρικτής της συμφωνίας, τέως υπουργός Εξωτερικών, κύριος Κοτζιάς. Δεν αμφιβάλω ότι η ελληνική πλευρά θα κάνει πως δεν βλέπει, γιατί κάποιιοι έχουν επενδύσει την πολιτική τους επιβίωση σε αυτήν τη συμφωνία.

Το αποκορύφωμα της σκοπιμότητας, όμως, είναι η παράγραφος του ψηφίσματος που αναφέρεται στο δημοψήφισμα των Σκοπίων. Τι σημαίνει «λαμβάνουμε υπόψη το αποτέλεσμα», κύριοι συνάδελφοι; Ούτε το 40% δεν πήγε να ψηφίσει. Οι πολίτες της FYROM γύρισαν την πλάτη στη συμφωνία, παρά την απροκάλυπτη προπαγάνδα, τόσο της Ευρωπαϊκής Επιτροπής όσο και του Συμβουλίου, υπέρ του «ναι». Το μόνο που ενδιαφέρει είναι η πάση θυσία άμεση ένταξη της χώρας στο ΝΑΤΟ, σε βάρος και της δημοκρατίας και της ειρηνικής συνύπαρξης των λαών στην περιοχή.

1-242-0000

Κωνσταντίνος Παπαδάκης (NI). – Κύριε Πρόεδρε, η έκθεση του Ευρωκοινοβουλίου για τη FYROM αποτελεί μία ακόμα παρέμβαση της Ευρωπαϊκής Ένωσης σε όλους τους τομείς, σε συνέργεια με εγχώρια συμφέροντα και πολιτικές δυνάμεις. Οικονομία, εξωτερική πολιτική, δικαιοσύνη, παιδεία και άλλα -όλα για την κερδοφορία των ευρωπαϊκών μονοπωλίων! Η χώρα -μέσα σε μια νύχτα- μετατρέπεται από ανέτοιμη σε πανέτοιμη για ένταξη. Ο λόγος βέβαια είναι προφανής: η έκθεση πανηγυρίζει για την ένταξη της χώρας στο ΝΑΤΟ, με βάση την απαράδεκτη συμφωνία των Πρεσπών. Γι' αυτό υπογράφηκε.

Το ΝΑΤΟ, που διέλυσε τη Γιουγκοσλαβία, σπέρνει αλυτρωτισμούς με το «διαίρει και βασιλεύει», αλλάζει σύνορα (βλέπε Κόσοβο) και αναγορεύεται σε ειρηνοποιό από τον σηματοφόρο του, την κυβέρνηση ΣΥΡΙΖΑ-ΑΝΕΛ. Αποκαλύπτονται οι υπερασπιστές της συμφωνίας, αλλά και οι εθνικιστές αρνητές της, που δεν λένε κουβέντα για το ΝΑΤΟ και την Ευρωπαϊκή Ένωση, αποπροσανατολίζοντας μόνο με την ονοματολογία. Βρίσκονται στην ίδια επικίνδυνη πλευρά: την αμερικανο-νατοϊκή. Το ΚΚΕ καταψηφίζει την έκθεση και καλεί τους λαούς της περιοχής σε συντονισμένη πάλη ενάντια στο ΝΑΤΟ και την Ευρωπαϊκή Ένωση, που είναι πηγές πολέμων και κινδύνων.

1-243-0000

Cristian Dan Preda (PPE). – Domnule președinte, aș vrea în primul rând să îl felicit pe colegul Ivo Vajgl pentru raportul pe care îl prezintă în acest an. Cred că este un raport care exprimă foarte bine starea în care se află Macedonia în acest moment. Personal, regret că Macedonia sau Macedonia de Nord, cred că îi putem spune deja în acest fel, nu a primit semnalul începerii negocierilor încă din această vară. Cred că a fost o greșeală să se mai amâne un an. În orice caz, transformarea din Macedonia în Macedonia de Nord cred că este cel mai important lucru care s-a petrecut în Balcanii de Vest în acest an și sper ca Grecia să înțeleagă acest lucru și să sprijine ceea ce s-a întâmplat în această țară candidată. Sper, de altfel, ca și celelalte state membre să sprijine Macedonia.

În particular, nu cred că ceea ce a făcut recent premierul Orbán vine în sprijinul Macedoniei. Cred că este o mare greșeală să acorde azil politic lui Gruevski. De altfel, țin să vă reamintesc că același premier maghiar a acordat azil și unui deputat din România, care tot așa, ca și Gruevski, a fost condamnat definitiv și a găsit azil acolo. Iată că Budapesta devine un azil pentru corupți.

1-244-0000

Knut Fleckenstein (S&D). – Herr Präsident, liebe Kolleginnen und Kollegen! Ich glaube, eines zeigt uns die Entwicklung in Mazedonien ganz besonders deutlich: Man braucht mutige Politiker, und man braucht eine mutige Regierung. Wenn man etwas für richtig hält und für das Land als positiv erachtet, dann muss man es auch durchsetzen wollen, wenn einem der Wind ins Gesicht weht. Das können keine Politiker, die sich morgens erst die Umfrageergebnisse angucken, um dann entsprechend zu handeln. Führung wurde gebraucht in diesem Land, und Führung hat es gegeben. Ich wünschte, der Europäische Rat würde zu ähnlicher Qualität aufsteigen.

1-245-0000

Νότης Μαριάς (ECR). – Κύριε Πρόεδρε, ο Ζαεν και η παρέα του συνεχίζουν τις αλυτρωτικές τους προκλήσεις. Μάλιστα, στο νέο Σύνταγμα των Σκοπίων, στο άρθρο 36, συνεχίζονται οι αλυτρωτικές αναφορές σε δήθεν «Μακεδονία» και δήθεν «μακεδονικό λαό». Επιπλέον, στο προοίμιο του νέου Συντάγματος των Σκοπίων γίνεται αναφορά στη διακήρυξη της πρώτης συνεδρίασης της ASNOM -της γνωστής αντιφασιστικής συνέλευσης- του 1944, όπου, κύριε Hahn, αναφέρεται ρητά το δικαίωμα αυτοδιάθεσης του δήθεν «μακεδονικού έθνους» και του δήθεν «μακεδονικού λαού» και απαιτείται η κατάργηση των συνόρων που δήθεν χωρίζουν, όπως λέει η ASNOM, αδερφό από αδερφό και Μακεδόνα από Μακεδόνα.

Επομένως, με το νέο Σύνταμά τους, τα Σκόπια καπηλεύονται το όνομα της Μακεδονίας μας και της ιστορίας μας και εκφράζουν ακόμη πιο επιθετικά τον αλυτρωτισμό τους σε βάρος της Ελλάδας, παραβιάζοντας κατάφωρα ακόμα και την κατάπτυστη συμφωνία των Πρεσπών. Γι' αυτό τα Σκόπια δεν μπορούν να έχουν καμία θέση στην Ευρωπαϊκή Ένωση και διακηρύσσω, για άλλη μια φορά, ότι είμαι αντίθετος σε οποιαδήποτε μελλοντική ένταξη των Σκοπίων στην Ευρωπαϊκή Ένωση.

1-246-0000

Stelios Kouloglou (GUE/NGL). – Mr President, I welcome the report and also the references to the Prespa Agreement. This is an agreement for peace in the Balkans. It is a model for solving international relations, and it also takes political courage by both Mr Tsipras and Mr Zaev to proceed, because do you know what is happening in Greece? The nationalists and the extreme

right and the neo-Nazis are accusing the government of treason and now they are trying to mobilise secondary school students. You know the system, the main slogan of the mobilisation: democracy is selling out Macedonia, they mean Greek Macedonia. Democracy is betraying Macedonia. That's their slogan and those mobilisations are also supported – and I am referring to my colleagues from the Popular Party – those mobilisations of the extreme right are supported by new democracy. So you have to say to your cameras in new democracy not to play with fire.

1-247-0000

Андрей Ковачев (PPE). – Да повторим още веднъж – подкрепям евроатлантическото бъдеще на Македония. Надявам се процесът на ратификация да завърши в най-скоро време, както в парламента в Скопие, така и в Атина. Това би позволило страната да бъде приета в НАТО още през пролетта на 2019 г. и да започне в най-скоро време преговори за присъединяване към Европейския съюз. Македония винаги е била неизменна част от Европа, както и част от българското наследство. Всички исторически спорове трябва да бъдат разрешени по пътя на добросъседството, толерантността и историческата справедливост. Във връзка с това не мога да скрия моето разочарование от продължаващите антибългарски изказвания в някои македонски медии.

Не само физическите граници трябва да бъдат символични. Нашето общо бъдеще, за което работят правителствата и на България, и на Македония, но и духовните граници, които бяха изградени от тоталитарните режими, говорът на омразата, всичко това трябва да бъде преодоляно по пътя на европейската интеграция. Благодаря много и пожелавам успех на нашите приятели и братя от Вардар.

1-248-0000

Puhetta johti HEIDI HAUTALA
varapuhemies

1-249-0000

Tonino Picula (S&D). – Poštovana predsjedavajuća, čestitam kolegi Vajglu na dobro izbalansiranoj Rezoluciji koja, prije svega, jasno uočava i podržava pozitivne procese u Makedoniji.

Makedonija je primjer dugo očekivane dobre vijesti iz regije opterećene kroničnim, ali i nekim sasvim novim deficitima. Istodobno, od Makedonije očekujemo da nastavi ključne reformske procese, poglavito u jačanju vladavine prava. Na taj princip, na žalost, potrebno je podsjetiti i neke države članice koje su dio Europske unije više od desetljeća. Od Skoplja se traži da prije ulaska u blok ispuni ozbiljne preduvjete kojih se ne pridržava jedna od članica Unije, o čemu svjedoči uloga Mađarske u slučaju Gruevski. Ako želimo ostati vjerodostojna zajednica, poštivanje vladavine prava ne smije biti arbitrarno.

Čestitam makedonskoj Vladi na napretku u implementaciji Sporazuma iz Prespe. Pozivam da ovaj pozitivni momentum iskoriste za nastavak reformi kako bi što skorijim otvaranjem pregovora o članstvu približili mogućnost boljeg života svim svojim sugrađanima.

1-250-0000

László Tóké (PPE) – Elnök Asszony! Előre bocsátom, hogy Magyarország elkötelezett támogatója a nyugat-balkáni országok, köztük Macedónia európai csatlakozásának. Üdvözljük, hogy az ügynevezett névvita megoldásával várhatóan a csatlakozási tárgyalások elkezdődhetnek.

Azt azonban visszautasítjuk, hogy a váratlanul kirobbant Gruevszki-ügy kapcsán a szocialisták és a zöldek a macedóniai országjelentést ideológiai háttérű támadásra használják fel Magyarország ellen. Nikola Gruevszki volt kormányfő megbuktatása, majd elítélése háttérben minden bizonnyal a migrációs kérdés, illetve a Soros-lobby áll. A néppárti politikus menekültstátuszának megadása az illetékes magyar hatóságok törvényes eljárása keretében valósult meg.

Csak egyetérteni lehet a jelentéssel abban, hogy Macedóniában a korrupcióellenes harcot folytatni kell, valamint abban, hogy további erőfeszítésekre van szükség a bírói kar politikai beavatkozással szembeni védelme tekintetében. Az igazságszolgáltatás nem válhat a politika eszközévé.

1-251-0000

Pyynnöstä myönnettävät puheenvuorot

1-252-0000

Eduard Kukan (PPE). – Madam President, may I extend my congratulations to Ivo Vajgl on this report. Macedonia made good progress over the last year, which has been well noted in the report.

I am pleased to see the country moving ahead with many important initiatives and reforms. Also I would like to congratulate the government on the agreement with Greece.

I strongly believe these efforts will open the doors for closer integration of the country and involve the European Union and NATO. At the same time the Macedonian Government needs to concentrate on continuous reforms in the area of the judiciary with the implementation of the judicial reform strategy, in the economy and in the fight against corruption and organised crime. It will be important not to lose this pace and come up with concrete results and records of accomplishments.

1-253-0000

Julie Ward (S&D). – Madam President, I recently attended an important conference organised by the Equal Rights Association in Skopje where I met many brilliant, brave, LGBTIQ+ activists from across the Balkans. I really admire their courage and commitment as they defend the rights of LGBTIQ+ people in sometimes very hostile environments.

In the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, gender based discrimination and the situation of sexual minorities is particularly difficult. The legal framework has significant shortcomings in terms of non-discrimination, legal gender recognition and body autonomy. But the conference I attended was organised in partnership with the Socialist government of FYROM which demonstrated their political commitment to improving the situation of LGBTIQ+ people. It's an excellent example of how governments can work with and support civil society, and we have to make human rights defenders and civil society support one of our priorities in the Balkans.

I know that the Macedonian parliament is currently discussing draft laws aimed at improving the situation of LGBTIQ+ people in the country, and so I hope these discussions will bring tangible results that better fulfil human rights.

1-254-0000

Maria Grapini (S&D). – Doamnă președintă, doamnă secretar de stat, domnule consilier domnule comisar, de la bun început vreau să spun că susțin raportul. Este un raport care reflectă realitatea. De altfel, din prezentarea reprezentantei Consiliului, a domnului comisar, a celorlalți colegi a rezultat foarte clar că Macedonia a făcut progrese.

Eu cunosc țara foarte bine, trăiesc în partea de vest a României, am vizitat țara de foarte multe ori, am vrut să fac investiții acolo și m-au surprins receptivitatea guvernului, instituțiilor, modul cum lucrează, transparența. Deci, cred că merită să meargă pe drumul european și cred că trebuie să votăm și să nu mai întârziem, pentru că orice întârziere frânează de fapt un drum european al unor cetățeni care își doresc acest lucru, sunt foarte ambițioși și le doresc mult succes. Aveți toată susținerea mea.

1-255-0000

Jasenکو Selimovic (ALDE). – Madam President, I just want to remind everybody of something that the rapporteur has hinted at, which is what a tremendous sacrifice the citizens of northern Macedonia have made. It has demanded a tremendous amount of energy and no other single European country would accept to change the name of a country, which is so deeply connected with identity. You can see from the reactions here in Parliament from the nationalists as to how this affected it.

So now I really beg the Council, really beg, to fulfil our part of our obligation and start opening the negotiations as soon as possible. The Commission has hinted it will do it. Parliament will do it. It's up to the Council now, because if we let these people down we will lose every credibility and it will make a mess in the region of outrageous proportions.

(Applause)

1-256-0000

Λάμπρος Φουντούλης (NI). – Κυρία Πρόεδρε, καλό θα είναι το Ευρωκοινοβούλιο να μην τρέφει αυταπάτες και, κυρίως, να μην εκφράζει τις επιθυμίες του ως πραγματικότητα. Αυτό το κακέκτυπο κράτους, που δημιουργήθηκε μόνο για να εξυπηρετήσει τα επεκτατικά σχέδια ενός κομμουνιστή δικτάτορα, όπως και το ίδιο το ιδεολόγημα του δήθεν «Μακεδονισμού» των Σλάβων κατοίκων του, δεν πρόκειται να εισέλθει στην Ευρωπαϊκή Ένωση. Ακόμα και αν αυτή τη στιγμή, στην Ελλάδα, μια προδοτική κυβέρνηση προσπαθεί να επιβάλει τη συμφωνία των Πρεσπών, σύντομα αυτή θα αποτελέσει παρελθόν, όπως και η ίδια η συμφωνία. Όλα τα υπόλοιπα που αναφέρονται στην έκθεση είναι άνευ ουσίας, καθώς πριν από την αποκήρυξη εκ μέρους τους κάθε αναφοράς στο ελληνικότατο όνομα της Μακεδονίας δεν μπορεί να γίνει καμία άλλη συζήτηση.

Τέλος, μιας και αναφέρεται εντός του κειμένου η ικανοποίησή σας σχετικά με το αποτέλεσμα του δημοψηφίσματος, είναι εντυπωσιακή η υποκρισία της Ένωσης, δεδομένου ότι πολύ βολικά ξεχνάτε το γεγονός ότι η συντριπτική πλειοψηφία των πολιτών δεν προσήλθε ποτέ για να ψηφίσει. Η συμφωνία των Πρεσπών αποτελεί, λοιπόν, μια νεκρή συμφωνία η οποία δεν θα εφαρμοστεί ποτέ, μιας και οι δύο λαοί είναι αντίθετοι με αυτήν και μόνο το Βερολίνο, οι Βρυξέλλες και οι κατά τόπους υποτακτικοί τους τη στηρίζουν.

1-257-0000

Marijana Petir (PPE). – Poštovana predsjedavajuća, prošlog tjedna gostovala sam na događaju u organizaciji makedonske nacionalne manjine u Hrvatskoj. Kada je netko u dvorani uzviknuo: „Hej, ti koja voliš Makedoniju!“, ja sam se odazvala jer ja volim Makedoniju. To ne znači da nisam svjesna slabosti koje Makedonija ima i na kojima treba raditi iznutra.

Za većinu njih uzroke treba tražiti na mjestu njihova nastanka, no uvjereni sam da te slabosti ne bi danas bile toliko snažne da je EU bila pravedna prema Makedoniji. Makedonija je, niti kriva niti dužna, postala talac nerazumne politike Europske unije koja 10 godina drži stranu jedne svoje članice, uništavajući tako europsku perspektivu i budućnost Makedonije. Žao mi je da ovo izvješće ne daje objektivan prikaz stanja i ne nudi samokritičan pregled propusta od strane Europske unije.

Smatram da još uvijek nije prekasno da se greška ispravi i da se Makedoniji otvore pregovori, a građanima Makedonije izrazi podrška kako bi se prevladale poteškoće i provele potrebne reforme te osigurala stabilnost u regiji.

1-258-0000

Ivan Jakovčić (ALDE). – Poštovana predsjedavajuća, htio bih se obratiti kolegama na balkonu i kolegicama. Godine 2000. u Zagrebu imao sam prilike ugostiti Ured za europske integracije makedonske vlade i počeli smo, Hrvatska i Makedonija zajedno, europski put.

Dragi prijatelji i prijateljice, ja sam ovdje, a vi ste na balkonu. Šteta je da se nije uspjelo ići zajedno. I ja sam očekivao da će Hrvatska ući barem zajedno s Rumunjskom i Bugarskom u Europsku uniju, ali nismo uspjeli. Žao mi je zbog toga što još uvijek ne sjedite zajedno s nama, ali želim zaista, i vjerujem, da ćete biti sposobni ispuniti tu domaću zadaću koja je pred vama, ambiciozne planove koje ima Vlada i nadam se, pametna opozicija, će omogućiti da Sjeverna Makedonija, nadam se uskoro, otvori sve puteve i napokon dođe ovdje, gdje vam je i mjesto.

1-259-0000

(Pyynnöstä myönnettävät puheenvuorot päättyvät)

1-260-0000

Johannes Hahn, *Member of the Commission*. – Madam President, honourable Members, State Secretary. In the coming months, the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia will have to make important decisions concerning the finalisation of the process of constitutional changes on the one hand and the continuation of the implementation of key reforms on the other. This will require focus and determination to fundamentally improve the lives of citizens.

I count on all political forces to put the interests of the country first and support the common strategic goal of Euro-Atlantic integration.

In that respect I think it's time that everyone starts to accept the outcome of the referendum. Just last Sunday we had several referenda in Switzerland, usually considered one of the role models of mature democracy, and there the turnout rate is usually below 50% but nobody criticises or challenges the democratic result and the consequences. In that respect I can only urge everybody to start to respect the people's vote and the people's thinking by participating in a meaningful way in such a referendum.

The Commission, in any case, will support and continue to support the reform efforts in every way we can in order to prepare the country to open accession negotiations.

So I count on the support of this House to remain engaged and to send common messages of encouragement to the country and in particular to all your sister parties, but even more importantly, to all the citizens of the country.

More than ever, the Union needs to continue to show its unity and fight for our fundamental values and principles.

1-261-0000

Karoline Edtstadler, *President-in-Office of the Council*. – Madam President, let me thank once again Parliament's rapporteur on the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, Mr Vajgl, for his excellent work.

The EU attaches great importance to moving forward with the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, and we hope to see continued progress. Reforms are crucial and will require the political leaders to live up to their responsibilities. The EU remains fully engaged and stands ready to support the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia in its efforts.

1-262-0000

Ivo Vajgl, *poročevalec*. – Spoštovana predsedujoča, jaz bi se rad zahvalil vsem kolegom, ki so sodelovali v tej zelo zanimivi razpravi.

Jaz sem iz te razprave razbral, da je v Evropskem parlamentu še vedno oziroma vedno bolj utrjeno prepričanje, da bo članstvo Makedonije v Evropski uniji dodana vrednost k naši Uniji, da bo tudi dodatna garancija stabilnosti in varnosti tega dela Evrope.

Danes smo slišali tudi nekaj disonančnih mnenj in jaz bi ta mnenja komentiral samo s tem, da ne morem razumeti, da se komu zdi bolj ugodno, če ima soseda, s katerim ima odprte probleme in se prepira, namesto da ima soseda, s katerim ima skupne cilje za prihodnost in skupne interese, zlasti tudi za mlade generacije.

Rad bi rekel to, kar je veliko kolegov danes ugotovilo, da je Makedonija, da je makedonska politika, da so makedonski ljudje bili pripravljeni sprejeti precej pomembno, veliko žrtvovanje, veliko žrtev, s tem ko so pristali na zares težke pogoje: spremembo ustave in spremembo imena države.

Ampak to so naredili in razveseljivo je to, da je tudi makedonska opozicija (tudi s podporo bratskih oziroma sestrskih strank iz tega parlamenta) dojela, da je treba podpreti to priložnost, ki je mogoče v zgodovini Makedonije in njenih ljudi enkratna in neponovljiva.

Zato bi rad s tega mesta tudi naslovil makedonske politike, člane sobranja, da sodelujejo aktivno pri ratifikaciji sporazuma in pomagajo odpreti vrata Evropske unije in tudi Nata za članstvo njihove države v teh organizacijah.

1-263-0000

Puhemies. – Keskustelu on päättynyt.

Äänestys toimitetaan torstaina 29.11.2018.

Kirjalliset lausumat (162 artikla)

1-263-5000

Csaba Molnár (S&D), *írásban.* – A Bizottság macedón országjelentése kapcsán kénytelenek vagyunk újra Orbán Viktorról beszélni. Ki kell mondani: Nikola Gruevszki volt miniszterelnök nem egyszerűen megszökött az igazságszolgáltatás elől, hanem Orbán Viktor személyes utasítására magyar diplomaták csempészték ki. Az akciót a magyar közvélemény jelentős része, az ellenzék és a maradék szabad sajtó is elítélte. Orbán magánakciója ez, amely újra megmutatja, miért volt helyes, hogy az EP megszavazta a Sargentini jelentést. Orbán Viktor újra fittyet hányt a jogállamiságra, nem csak otthon, hanem a Balkánon is. Újra megengedhetetlen módon használta fel az állami szerveket az általa kitalált jogsértések végrehajtására és fedezésére. Most pedig Orbán maffiakormánya vattába csomagol egy hatalmi visszaélésért jogszerűen elítélt politikust. A Külügyminisztérium szöktetési akciója még Orbán Viktor Magyarországon is bűncselekmény. Az, hogy ennek nincsenek következményei, újra bizonyítja, hogy Magyarország ma nem jogállam.

Minden demokrata magyar polgár nevében követelem, hogy a magyar kormány adja ki Nikola Gruevszkit Macedóniának; kövesse meg a macedón, az albán és a szerb kormányt, amiért a magyar diplomáciai testületet törvényellenesen használták fel. Kérem, hogy a Parlament támogassa azokat az S&D indítványokat, amelyek elítélik Gruevszki megszöktetését; felszólítom az Európai Néppártot, hogy vonja le a következtetést Orbán újabb jogsértéséből, és hozza meg a régóta halogatott döntést a FIDESZ kizárásáról a kereszténydemokrata pártcsaládból.

1-264-0000

Bogusław Sonik (PPE), *na piśmie.* – Macedońscy posłowie zatwierdzili wniosek rządu o wprowadzenie poprawek do konstytucji, aby wprowadzić w życie podpisaną w czerwcu umowę z Grecją. Na jej mocy kraj zmieni swoją nazwę i stanie się oficjalnie Republiką Północnej Macedonii. Zakończy to toczony od 27 lat spór z Atenami i otworzy Macedończykom drzwi do akcesji do UE i NATO. Macedonia jest uważana za państwo kandydujące, które poczyniło największe postępy w zakresie dostosowania swojego ustawodawstwa do dorobku prawnego UE.

Mimo tego pozytywnego otwarcia, muszę wyrazić zaniepokojenie faktem, że były premier Macedonii Nikola Gruevski, który zbiegł ze swojego kraju w obawie przed więzieniem, otrzymał na Węgrzech status uchodźcy. W Macedonii został skazany prawomocnym wyrokiem za wywieranie nacisków na urzędników w sprawie zamówień publicznych, dodatkowo toczy się wobec niego jeszcze pięć innych dochodzeń. Trudne do zrozumienia jest dlaczego władze w Budapeszcie przychyliły się do jego wniosku, uznając, że jest prześladowany z powodów politycznych i udzieliły azylu politykowi, który działał przeciwko przystąpieniu Macedonii do UE i NATO.

W pełni popieram zalecenie Komisji i decyzję Rady, według której negocjacje akcesyjne miałyby rozpocząć się w czerwcu 2019 r. Sprawne otwarcie procesu monitorowania i negocjacji ma szansę przyspieszyć tempo reform w Macedonii w jeszcze większym stopniu.

1-265-0000

Tibor Szanyi (S&D), *in writing*. – This report reconfirms that the FYR of Macedonia is a functioning state of law, and has been making important progress in reforming its judicial system to deal with – among other things – corruption-related crimes. That is why in this debate we cannot avoid facing the ongoing Gruevski scandal: the fact that a member of the EU – the Hungarian authorities, acting upon orders from Viktor Orbán himself – have actively assisted the illegal escape of the former Macedonian Prime Minister, and granted asylum to this legally convicted criminal. Orbán's unprecedented provocation, in total contempt of international – and EU – law deliberately damages European interests and jointly agreed CFSP and enlargement policy decisions. The Gruevski scandal raises the responsibility of those who just recently decided to keep Orbán in their ranks, and – naively, or cynically – took his promise to behave more democratically. Well, Mr Weber, you cannot hold this actual dictator on a short leash. What you got from your political friend Orbán is a slap in the face, another humiliating, anti-European provocation, making the PPE an accomplice to his – and Gruevski's – illegal actions... and hopefully the conviction that it is time to act now, to get rid of this source of embarrassment.

26. Albaniaa koskeva vuoden 2018 kertomus (keskustelu)

1-267-0000

Puhemies. – Esityslistalla on seuraavana Knut Fleckensteinin mietintö Albaniaa koskeva vuoden 2018 kertomus (2018/2147(INI) – A8-0334/2018).

1-268-0000

Knut Fleckenstein, *Berichterstatter*. – Frau Präsidentin, liebe Kolleginnen und Kollegen, Frau Staatssekretärin, Herr Kommissar! Ich freue mich, dass die Debatte zum Albanien-Bericht gerade heute auf den Unabhängigkeitstag Albanien fällt, und ich möchte den Menschen in Albanien und in der Diaspora meine herzlichen Glückwünsche dazu aussprechen, sicher auch in Ihrem Namen. Vor der morgigen Abstimmung möchte ich mich zunächst bei den Schattenberichterstattern der anderen Fraktionen für die sehr konstruktive Zusammenarbeit bedanken. Ich habe mich bemüht, die wesentlichen Punkte der einzelnen Fraktionen mit an Bord zu nehmen. Daher bin ich zuversichtlich, dass wir bei der morgigen Abstimmung ein großes Maß an Übereinstimmung zum Inhalt des Berichts erzielen werden.

Ich möchte auf die wesentlichen Botschaften eingehen, die wir als Ausschuss für auswärtige Angelegenheiten mit dieser Entschließung an unsere albanischen Partner, aber auch an Rat und Kommission senden wollen. Es ist mittlerweile mehr als vier Jahre her, dass Albanien von der EU offiziell als Kandidat für den Beitritt zur EU anerkannt wurde. Wir machen deutlich, dass sich dies auch in der praktischen Realität widerspiegeln muss, und unterstützen die Empfehlung der Europäischen Kommission, Beitrittsverhandlungen mit Albanien zu eröffnen. Gleichzeitig

nehmen wir den Beschluss des Rates von vor dem Sommer zur Kenntnis und begrüßen den eindeutigen Pfad, der zum Start dieser Verhandlungen aufgezeigt wurde.

Wir erwarten – und können es wohl auch erwarten –, dass die albanische Regierung die Zeit bis dorthin nutzt, um alle Vorkehrungen für die Verhandlungen zu treffen. Wir erwarten allerdings auch, dass der Rat zu seinem Wort steht und im Juni nächsten Jahres den entsprechenden Beschluss fasst, denn alles andere wäre unverständlich und kontraproduktiv, was die Rolle und die Glaubwürdigkeit der Europäischen Union in der Region angeht.

Natürlich ist der vorliegende Bericht auch und in erster Linie ein Beitrag für die albanische Regierung und die Opposition im Hinblick auf die Arbeit, die in dem Land noch getan werden muss, und auf die Arbeit, die bisher getan wurde. Dabei ist mir wichtig, darauf hinzuweisen, dass diese Reformanstrengungen immer ein Ziel haben müssen: die praktische Lebensrealität der Menschen vor Ort zu verbessern und nicht einem Kommissar oder einem Abgeordneten oder Abgeordneten generell etwas Gutes zu tun.

Im Hinblick darauf, was bereits geleistet wurde, muss man feststellen, dass sich Albanien durch die Umsetzung der geforderten Reformen bei den *key priorities* die Eröffnung der Beitrittsverhandlungen verdient hat – allen voran die sehr ambitionierte Justizreform, die über das hinausgeht, was ursprünglich von der Kommission gefordert worden war. Sie zeigen klare Resultate: Der *Vetting*-Prozess im Justizsektor ist im vollen Gange und zeigt nicht nur erste Ergebnisse, sondern besitzt auch eine abschreckende Wirkung für die Zukunft. Es könnte ein gutes Vorbild sein für alle Regierungen in der Region, die noch nach Wegen suchen, ihre Justizreform durchzuführen.

Lassen Sie mich zum Abschluss noch zwei Punkte anführen: Wir brauchen dringend eine Wahlrechtsreform. Es ist unbedingt notwendig, dass diese Reform im Sinne der Empfehlung der OSZE durchgeführt wird, und zwar schon vor den Lokalwahlen 2019. Und ich bin – noch – sehr hoffnungsfroh und hoffe, dass ich das auch bleiben kann, dass die beiden Vorsitzenden der Ad-hoc-Kommission von der Demokratischen Partei und der Sozialistischen Partei einen gemeinsamen Weg finden, einen guten Vorschlag zu machen. Wir sollten sie dabei auf jeden Fall unterstützen.

Wir müssen Albanien ermutigen, den eingeschlagenen Reformweg weiterzugehen, denn das ist genau der Weg zu gefestigten demokratischen Institutionen und zu einer funktionierenden Rechtsstaatlichkeit, der in die EU führt. Ich freue mich auf die morgige Abstimmung.

1-269-0000

Karoline Edtstadler, *President-in-Office of the Council*. – Madam President, honourable Members, dear Commissioner, dear rapporteur, let me begin by recalling the Council conclusions of June 2018, in which the Council decided to respond positively to the progress made by Albania and set out the path towards opening accession negotiations in June 2019. We welcome the Commission's necessary preparatory work. We concur with your view that Albania has made steady progress in addressing the five key priorities. These are positive signals which show that Albania is on the right path, and we strongly encourage it to continue its efforts. Moreover, Albania is implementing a comprehensive justice reform, as the rapporteur already mentioned; the re-evaluation process for judges and prosecutors – the so-called *vetting* – has started to deliver under the oversight of the international monitoring operation. We encourage Albania to build on the progress made and to pursue the justice reform in order to achieve increased independence, accountability and professionalism of the judicial system. Establishment of the independent judicial structures, as provided for by the constitutional reform, should be finalised. Albania has worked towards the establishment of a solid track record in the fight against corruption and

organised crime. However, it is important that the Government delivers tangible and sustainable results, including against the cultivation and trafficking of drugs. Dismantling organised groups remains an important challenge. We commend Albania for its close cooperation with external law enforcement agencies. We welcome its participation in international police operations and joint investigations, in particular with EU Member States, and urge it to be even more proactive in international police cooperation.

On elections, as set out in your report, we expect Albania to address the outstanding OSCE/ODIHR recommendations, amend its electoral code and introduce measures for further enhancing the independence, impartiality, professionalism and capacity of election administration.

We emphasise the need for legislative and policy measures to reinforce the protection of human rights and anti-discrimination policies, including the equal treatment of all minorities and access to rights for persons belonging to them throughout the country. Albania has made efforts to put in place effective measures to counter the high flow of manifestly unfounded asylum applications lodged to Albanian citizens. These measures need to be further pursued with the countries most affected until sustained results are achieved.

We welcome Albania's constructive engagement in regional cooperation and good-neighbourly relations, which remain an essential element of the enlargement process. I equally want to commend Albania for its full alignment with the EU's common foreign and security policy. Today in our discussion we are focusing on Albania's progress in 2017, on which we have a very similar opinion. However, and more generally, I would like to stress the importance of tangible and sustainable results focusing in particular on the rule of law: this will take Albania closer to the opening of accession talks.

1-270-0000

Johannes Hahn, *Member of the Commission*. – Madam President, I would also like to congratulate the Albanians on their national day, at least as long as we are still on the same day. I would also like to thank the rapporteur and the shadow rapporteurs for their work leading up to this resolution. Clearly, significant coordination efforts resulted in a document which, in my view, is a very balanced one. The resolution captures the progress that Albania has made in the past years and it highlights well the challenges that lie ahead in order to move the country closer to the Union.

Starting with the progress, Albania continues to advance in many crucial areas. The vetting of judges and prosecutors has proven to be a thorough and fair process and continues to yield concrete and tangible results. The ongoing judicial reform is a major demand from Albanian citizens and its successful implementation will foster public trust in state institutions, enhance the credibility and effectiveness of the justice system, and contribute to the embedding of the rule of law throughout the country. We cannot compromise on quality in this very important process and we are monitoring it thoroughly.

As regards current challenges, constructive political dialogue and cooperation across parties is crucial for further advancing in delicate areas such as the restructuring of the judiciary, as well as the electoral reform process. Cross-party consensus is necessary to guarantee that outstanding OSCE/ODHIR recommendations are met. This includes, in particular, the transparency of party financing, as well as the independence and professionalism of the electoral administration.

Strengthening the administrative capacity of institutions is essential, not only for the successful implementation of reforms, but also for the effective preparation of EU accession negotiations.

That is why we continue to encourage Albania to pursue public administration reform by adhering to the highest standards.

Progress in the fight against organised crime and corruption also continues to be necessary for Albania to further advance on its path towards EU accession. Further achievements are expected towards establishing a solid direct record of proactive investigations, prosecutions and convictions in the fight against organised crime and corruption at all levels.

Good neighbourly relations and regional stability are essential elements of the stabilisation and association process. Albania is an important actor in promoting regional cooperation. We appreciate in this regard the full convergence of foreign and security policy between Albania and the European Union, as already highlighted by previous speakers.

The Commission maintains its strong commitment to support Albania's efforts to advance further on its path towards European integration.

I look forward to continuing the fruitful cooperation with the European Parliament in all of these matters in the months ahead.

1-271-0000

Eduard Kukan, *on behalf of the PPE Group*. – Madam President, I want to express my appreciation for the work of Mr Fleckenstein on this report and the very good cooperation of the shadow rapporteurs.

I welcome the Commission's recommendation for opening the accession negotiations as well as the Council decision to reevaluate the progress made by Albania next year.

Albania has achieved good progress in the implementation of justice reform, which is crucial for the further integration process. It has also proved its readiness to go through other difficult reforms. This progress was possible only through constructive political dialogue and cooperation with all the major political parties from the government and the opposition.

Therefore, I can only strongly encourage all political actors in Albania to work together on the consolidation of reforms across all five priorities. I hope this will be also the case in upcoming electoral reforms. Albania is indeed our key partner in the region. We should fully appreciate its full alignment with EU common foreign and security policy and active participation in the regional initiatives.

1-272-0000

Eugen Freund, *im Namen der S&D-Fraktion*. – Frau Präsidentin, Herr Kommissar, Frau Staatssekretärin! Ich sage das gerne noch einmal, was ich schon beim letzten Mal über Albanien gesagt habe: Es ist erstaunlich, wie positiv sich das Land in den vergangenen zwei Jahrzehnten entwickelt hat. So sind zu Beginn der 90er-Jahre noch Tausende über das Mittelmeer nach Italien geflüchtet. Heute ist Albanien ein ernst zu nehmender Beitrittskandidat der Europäischen Union. Gerade der jüngste Bericht stellt fest, dass das Land Fortschritte macht, was die politischen Kriterien und die fünf wichtigsten Prioritäten für die Aufnahme in die EU betrifft.

Dennoch gilt für Albanien, was für alle EU-Beitrittskandidaten ein Maßstab sein muss: Die höchsten Standards müssen erreicht werden. Alle Zweifel müssen ausgeräumt werden, dass Albanien die notwendigen Reformen auch wirklich bis zum Ende führt.

Und bevor es zu einer Erweiterung der Europäischen Union kommt, müssen wir uns ernsthafte Gedanken darüber machen, wie wir die europäischen Institutionen stärken, denn in einer größeren Union darf die Entscheidungsfähigkeit nicht eingeschränkt werden.

1-273-0000

Ελένη Θεοχάρους, εξ ονόματος της ομάδας ECR. – Κυρία Πρόεδρε, ως σκιώδης εισηγήτρια της έκθεσης δεν προέβαλα ενστάσεις, για να βοηθήσω το έργο του εισηγητή τον οποίον εκτιμώ βαθύτατα. Ειπώθηκαν πολλά για την πρόοδο της Αλβανίας, αλλά -δυστυχώς για όλους μας- προχθές ο Rama, με μία μόνο φράση που είπε στην Πρίστινα, τα εξουδετέρωσε όλα· ακύρωσε όλα όσα ειπώθηκαν σήμερα. Είναι σαφές ότι η διεφθαρμένη κυβέρνηση της Αλβανίας συνεχίζει την εγκληματική της δράση εναντίον της ελληνικής μειονότητας. Οι Έλληνες ζουν μέσα στον φόβο, στερούμενοι όλων των ανθρωπίνων δικαιωμάτων, υφίστανται τη βάρβαρη συμπεριφορά των αλβανικών αρχών και οι περιουσίες τους καταπατούνται από το ίδιο το κράτος, ενώ παρεμποδίζεται η εκπαίδευση των παιδιών και η χρήση της ελληνικής γλώσσας. Ο εθνικισμός, ο εξισλαμισμός, η δημογραφική αλλοίωση και η εθνοκάθαρση είναι αυτά που βιώνουν καθημερινά οι Έλληνες στη Βόρειο Ήπειρο. Ένα τέτοιο κράτος δεν έχει καμιά θέση στην Ευρωπαϊκή Ένωση και κάθε ενταξιακή διαδικασία πρέπει να σταματήσει αμέσως, μέχρι να γίνουν σεβαστά τα δικαιώματα των Ελλήνων σε μια δημοκρατική Αλβανία.

1-274-0000

Ivan Jakovčić, u ime kluba ALDE. – Poštovana predsjedavajuća, moram reći da sam iznimno zabrinut za stanje u Albaniji i za ono što je europski put Albanije.

Naime, susreti koje imamo redovito s delegacijom u albanskom parlamentu i u našem parlamentu, i zadnji susret koji smo imali u Bruxellesu ovdje pokazao je da postoji zaista jako podijeljena zemlja. Ja mogu razumjeti da opozicija napušta parlament, da odlazi jer sam i ja to radio 90-ih godina, ali da napušta sjednicu s našom delegacijom, to ne mogu razumjeti jer ja mislim da ako zaista žele ući u Europsku uniju, ako žele biti dio Europskog parlamenta, onda moraju sjediti i razgovarati s nama, a ne dizati se i odlaziti sa sjednice.

Zato sam zabrinut za političku kulturu i političke odnose s Albanijom narednih godina.

1-275-0000

Γεώργιος Επιτήδειος (NI). – Κυρία Πρόεδρε, παρά την προσπάθεια της έκθεσης να ωραιοποιήσει την κατάσταση που επικρατεί στην Αλβανία, η χώρα αυτή απέχει πολύ από το να πληροί τα κριτήρια της Κοπεγχάγης. Δεν εφαρμόζει τις αρχές του κράτους δικαίου και, ως εκ τούτου, παραβιάζει με ωμό τρόπο τα δικαιώματα της ελληνικής μειονότητας στη Βόρειο Ήπειρο. Επιπλέον, αποκορύφωμα αυτής της κατάστασης αποτελεί η δολοφονία του Αριστοτέλη Γκούμα το 2010 και, πριν από έναν μήνα, του Κωνσταντίνου Κατσίφα. Μάλιστα, οι αλβανικές αρχές έφτασαν στο σημείο να ρωτούν τους γονείς του θανόντος, του δολοφονηθέντος, πού βρήκαν τα χρήματα για να κάνουν την κηδεία του. Τον εξύβρισε ο ίδιος ο πρωθυπουργός της Αλβανίας και, επιπλέον, κάθε βράδυ, για να τρομοκρατήσουν τους συμπατριώτες του, πυροβολούν τη νύχτα και διακόπτουν, άνευ λόγου, για δώδεκα ώρες την ηλεκτροδότηση των μειονοτικών χωριών. Τη στιγμή που επικρατεί μια τέτοια κατάσταση, η Αλβανία δεν έχει δικαίωμα να διεκδικεί την ένταξή της στην Ευρωπαϊκή Ένωση και αυτό πρέπει πάση θυσία να το αποτρέψουμε.

1-276-0000

Doru-Claudian Frunzulică (S&D). – Madam President, I welcome this report and congratulate the rapporteur, and recognition of the progress achieved by Albania over the last year. While examining the state of EU-Albanian relations I consider it essential to emphasise Albania's solid commitment to the European Union integration process, and in line with this I support the opening of its accession negotiations in 2019.

The opening of negotiations will give us a tangible incentive for further developments in the positive perspective for the Western Balkans region as a whole. In this respect, I share the opinion that Albania needs to keep the reform momentum, and to intensify its efforts to consolidate the reform achieved and to continue preparing for EU membership obligations across all chapters. Therefore further strengthening is needed, especially of the administrative capacity of institutions and bodies responsible for the implementation of accession-related reforms, for the transposition

of EU-legislation into national law, and for the preparations to be made for EU accession negotiations. To fight corruption has to be also a high...

(The President cut off the speaker)

1-277-0000

Ryynnöstä myönnettävät puheenvuorot

1-278-0000

Κώστας Μαυρίδης (S&D). – Κυρία Πρόεδρε, ένας τρόπος για να αξιολογήσουμε τον βαθμό σεβασμού του κράτους δικαίου και των ανθρωπίνων δικαιωμάτων στην πράξη είναι η διαχείριση των μειονοτήτων. Στην Αλβανία, η μεγαλύτερη εθνική μειονότητα, που είναι αναγνωρισμένη από την ίδια την Αλβανία, είναι η ελληνική μειονότητα, που υπόκειται σε εθνικό ξεκαθάρισμα για το οποίο δεν γίνεται, δυστυχώς, καμία αναφορά στην έκθεση.

Ως Ευρωπαϊκή Ένωση, πρέπει να ενθαρρύνουμε την Αλβανία προς τη δημοκρατία και πρέπει, επίσης, να την ωθήσουμε να ξεφύγει από την τουρκική επιρροή του Ερντογάν. Όμως, μετά το πάθημα από την αντιευρωπαϊκή πολιτική της Τουρκίας -την οποία κάποιος εδώ μέσα ακόμη και τώρα ονομάζουν «στρατηγικό εταίρο»- ελπίζουμε ότι πήραμε το μάθημά μας απέναντι στις διεφθαρμένες κυβερνήσεις και στους διεφθαρμένους ηγεμόνες. Πρέπει να τους αντιμετωπίσουμε με αποτελεσματικά εργαλεία και να ζητείται η εκπλήρωση των κριτηρίων και των υποχρεώσεών τους· αυτή είναι η ουσία από το πάθημα με την Τουρκία.

1-279-0000

Νότης Μαριάς (ECR). – Κυρία Πρόεδρε, σήμερα συμπληρώθηκε ένας μήνας από τη δολοφονία του Κωνσταντίνου Κατσιφά, στη Βόρειο Ήπειρο, από την αλβανική αστυνομία. Οι προκλήσεις, οι απειλές, οι εκφοβισμοί και οι τραμπουκισμοί των αλβανικών δυνάμεων ασφαλείας συνεχίζονται καθημερινά κατά της ελληνικής εθνικής μειονότητας της Βορείου Ηπείρου. Μιας μειονότητας που έχει αναγνωριστεί διεθνώς και η οποία, με βάση το Πρωτόκολλο της Κέρκυρας του 1914, έχει αποκτήσει το αναφαίρετο δικαίωμα της αυτονομίας.

Επιπλέον, παρά τις ρητορικές παρεμβάσεις της Ευρωπαϊκής Ένωσης, συνεχίζεται η αρπαγή των περιουσιών των Βορειοηπειρωτών από τις αλβανικές αρχές, ενώ μόλις χθες ο Edi Rama λαιδόρησε τους ίδιους τους ευρωβουλευτές. Πρέπει, λοιπόν, να ληφθούν μέτρα κατά της Αλβανίας και να διακοπεί κάθε χρηματοδότηση και κάθε ενταξιακή πορεία της, μέχρις ότου αρχίσει να σέβεται τα δικαιώματα της ελληνικής εθνικής μειονότητας της Βορείου Ηπείρου. Διακηρύσσω, για άλλη μια φορά, την πλήρη αντίθεσή μου σε οποιαδήποτε μελλοντική ένταξη της Αλβανίας στην Ευρωπαϊκή Ένωση.

1-280-0000

Κώστας Χρυσόγονος (GUE/NGL). – Κυρία Πρόεδρε, η έκθεση σχετικά με την Αλβανία έχει ιδιαίτερη σημασία ενόψει της έναρξης διαπραγματεύσεων προσχώρησής της στην Ευρωπαϊκή Ένωση τον Ιούνιο του 2019. Δεν συμμερίζομαι, όμως, την αισιοδοξία της έκθεσης ως προς την καταπολέμηση της διαφθοράς και του οργανωμένου εγκλήματος στη χώρα αυτή. Χρειάζεται να γίνουν πολλά περισσότερα από αλβανικής πλευράς, ιδιαίτερα όσον αφορά την καλλιέργεια και τη διακίνηση ναρκωτικών.

Πρέπει, ακόμα, να σταματήσει η δυσμενής διακριτική μεταχείριση σε βάρος της ελληνικής μειονότητας, που πρόσφατα εκδηλώθηκε χαρακτηριστικά, με την υπερβολική και μη αναγκαία χρήση θανατηφόρου βίας από την αλβανική αστυνομία για τη σύλληψη του Κωνσταντίνου Κατσιφά. Δεν αντιλαμβάνομαι, εξάλλου, πώς δικαιολογείται μια υποψήφια προς ένταξη χώρα να απαγορεύει την είσοδο σε ευρωβουλευτές, όπως στην περίπτωση της Ελένης Θεοχάρους. Για τους λόγους αυτούς, θα ψηφίσω λευκό για την έκθεση.

1-281-0000

Λάμπρος Φουντούλης (NI). – Κυρία Πρόεδρε, το αλβανικό κράτος βαρύνεται με την εν ψυχρώ και προμελετημένη δολοφονία του Έλληνα Βορειοηπειρώτη Κωνσταντίνου Κατσιφά. Δεν μπορώ, ως Έλληνας

ευρωβουλευτής, να συμφωνήσω σε οποιαδήποτε είδους αξιολόγηση όσο ο Edi Rama, ο ηθικός αυτουργός της δολοφονίας, δεν έχει λογοδοτήσει για το έγκλημα αυτό. Επιπλέον, όσο η Αλβανία συνεχίζει να καταπιέζει την ελληνική μειονότητα, να τραμπουκίζει και να απειλεί τους Βορειοηπειρώτες, να γκρεμίζει εκκλησίες και να προσπαθεί να εξαλείψει την παρουσία του Ελληνισμού στη Βόρεια Ήπειρο, καμία καλή γειτονία δεν μπορεί να υπάρξει.

Η ίδια η Αλβανία έχει αποδεχθεί το Πρωτόκολλο της Κέρκυρας, βάσει του οποίου η ελληνική μειονότητα δικαιούται αυτονομία. Για πάνω από 100 χρόνια, η Αλβανία αρνείται να συμμορφωθεί. Επιπλέον, έχει δημιουργήσει συνθήκες τέτοιες που μόνο με την ενσωμάτωση της Βορείου Ηπείρου στον εθνικό κορμό θα αποφευχθεί η σχεδιαζόμενη γενοκτονία εις βάρος των Ελλήνων. Τέλος, η αλβανική κυβέρνηση, διαμέσου του πρωθυπουργού Rama, απέδειξε πόσο υπολογίζει την Ένωση και τους θεσμούς, όταν -με εκφράσεις πεζοδρομίου- αναρωτήθηκε πώς ευρωβουλευτές τολμούν να διατυπώνουν γνώμη για αλβανικά ζητήματα. Όπως είναι προφανές, η Αλβανία αποτελεί ένα εχθρικό προς τη χώρα μου κράτος, η δε ένταξή της στην Ένωση μου ακούγεται μάλλον σαν κακόγουστο αστείο.

1-282-0000

(*Pyynnöstä myönnettävät puheenvuorot päättyvät*)

1-283-0000

Johannes Hahn, *Member of the Commission*. – Madam President, State Secretary, honourable Members, thank you for this debate. Albania is expected to advance on the rule of law reforms to move forward on the path towards the Union, but first and foremost, it needs to deliver progress for the daily benefit of all its citizens across the country. We trust that advancing on the rule of law will progressively result in a better business environment which is crucial to create more jobs and hence foster socio-economic stabilisation.

The observations in your resolution provide very good guidance for Albania in all these areas. However, I would like to reiterate one issue that concerns regional cooperation and good neighbourly relations. I think everybody should aim at calming down the situation, especially concerning the Kosovo-Serbia relations. There is no alternative to dialogue and normalisation. This is in the interest of the entire region and its EU perspective, therefore everybody across the region should refrain from unhelpful statements that could be seen as inflammatory or taking sides.

To conclude, I would like to reiterate that the Commission will continue to support Albania while monitoring results thoroughly. Concrete results will not only bring the country closer to the Union but also guarantee that all Albanian citizens can rely on a functioning democratic state that successfully provides welfare, security and opportunities. The EU reform agenda requires broad political support which needs to be matched by concrete efforts from all the parties to engage in constructive dialogue. I hope that all political actors in Albania will also work with this important objective in mind, in particular in the forthcoming months.

1-284-0000

Karoline Edtstadler, *President-in-Office of the Council*. – Madam President, again, let me express my sincere gratitude for the excellent work and commitment of Parliament's rapporteur on Albania, Mr Fleckenstein.

Albania has taken many steps in the right direction and the reform efforts are bearing fruits. We expect the political leaders to overcome internal difficulties and join their forces on advancing on the EU path. In this regard we count on the continued support of the European Parliament to call on all leaders of Albania to cooperate in good faith. Decisive action is now needed to make the required progress. The EU will continue to assist Albania.

1-285-0000

Knut Fleckenstein, *Berichterstatter*. – Frau Präsidentin, liebe Kolleginnen und Kollegen! Nur drei Bemerkungen will ich machen. Die eine Bemerkung ist zu den Minderheiten. Wir haben uns darauf geeinigt, dass wir die Minderheitenrechte nicht nach einzelnen Minderheiten spezifizieren, sondern dass sie für alle gelten müssen und dass sie deshalb auch für alle aufgeschrieben werden. Dennoch – und das wissen Sie ja – wird es einen Antrag geben, der sich exakt um die Tötung des albanischen Staatsbürgers griechischer Herkunft kümmern wird und Fragen stellen wird. Aber von ethnischen Säuberungen zu reden, geht mir entschieden zu weit.

Zweitens. Herr Jakovčić, ich habe auch manchmal Angst und frage mich, ob ein Land eventuell auch nicht in die EU aufgenommen werden kann, weil die Opposition noch nicht so weit ist. Wir kennen das immer nur, wenn die Regierung nichts tut, keine Reformen macht und so weiter. Aber manchmal muss man auch die Opposition ein bisschen daran erinnern, dass sie auch nicht nur Rechte, sondern auch Aufgaben hat, und denen muss sie nachkommen, um dem Land insgesamt ein Antlitz zu geben, das es auch möglich macht, einzutreten.

Und Herr Kommissar Hahn, wenn ich Sie richtig verstanden habe – Sie haben es ja sehr diplomatisch ausgedrückt –, dann haben Sie sich eben vielleicht auf jüngste Begebenheiten bezogen. Und auch da gebe ich Ihnen recht: Wenn man große Hände hat, kann man große Aufgaben anfangen, aber sollte irgendwelche Fingerspiele vielleicht bleiben lassen.

1-286-0000

Puhemies. – Keskustelu on päättynyt.
Äänestys toimitetaan torstaina 29.11.2018.

27. Montenegroa koskeva vuoden 2018 kertomus (keskustelu)

1-288-0000

Puhemies. – Esityslistalla on seuraavana Charles Tannockin mietintö Montenegroa koskeva vuoden 2018 kertomus (2018/2144(INI) – A8-0339/2018).

1-289-0000

Charles Tannock, *Rapporteur*. – Madam President, this report as ever seeks to offer as wide and broad a commentary as possible on Montenegro. On the whole, we see a picture of that country progressing well, with 31 of the 35 chapters now open in total. The government of Montenegro remains positively engaged with the negotiation process and there continues to exist a strong consensus, both in the political arena and in terms of public opinion, for the Euro-Atlantic integrationist agenda.

Obviously, events during the 2016 parliamentary elections, however, show that there is no room for complacency, given the efforts of a big third country to exploit the fears and concerns of a small minority.

Court proceedings concerning the coup plot continue, and whilst we wait to see the final judgments, I have little doubt that events played out in the way that the prosecution is now arguing. The general political climate has improved since then and the handling of this case has proved the robustness of Montenegro, strengthening democracy and legal systems.

I am pleased to see that much of the opposition have now returned to the parliament, and I strongly urge the remaining boycotting parties to do so as well. As a first step, it would be good to see all political parties participating in the working group on reform of the law on the judicial council.

Furthermore, during the reporting period, we have seen presidential elections that passed smoothly and fully in line with the ODIHR/OSCE fundamental freedoms. Clearly there is room for improvement in some of the state electoral commission's working methods, and my report calls for reinforcing the transparency and professionalisation of the electoral administration with that end in mind.

Despite the overall level of progress, there remain concerns about the media landscape in Montenegro. Three successive Commission reports have concluded that no progress has been made in the area of freedom of expression and media freedom – an important issue to satisfy the benchmark requirements of Chapters 23 and 24 of the acquis.

Ongoing disputes about the role of RTCG and changes to the members of its council and leading executives have had a negative effect on public confidence in the network's editorial integrity.

The attack against Olivera Lakić in May of 2018 has highlighted again the plight of journalists and acts of violence against journalists. We cannot forget that this is the second attack against her. Given her involvement in investigating cases of corruption, such incidents highlight the continuing need to fight organised crime and corruption in all its forms and at all levels.

On a more positive note, engagement and cooperation in the fields of CFSP and CSDP remain very positive. Montenegro has for many years been fully compliant in these areas, and its well deserved accession to NATO in June of last year will only cement that cooperation. I particularly welcome Montenegro's full alignment with all the sanctions regimes, particularly those concerning Russia.

I should also say a few words on the elements related to the environment in this report, which has been given a much stronger focus than in previous years. As my two amendments demonstrate, this is being pushed by other political groups in this House, and to my mind has given the subject a slightly disproportionate coverage in relation to the overall balance of my report. As a self-declared ecological state, it could be argued that Montenegro deserves to be held to higher standards than others. However, we must account for the budgetary pressures that this small country faces in this regard, and we cannot seek to be too prescriptive, particularly when calls go beyond the requirements of the *acquis communautaire*.

To conclude, ahead of the wider debate: for some nine years as rapporteur for Montenegro, I have referred to it as the 'good news story' of the Western Balkans. It remains today the leading EU accession candidate, but I hope that it will not be too long until we see it progress from the good news story of negotiations to the success story of accession as an EU Member State.

1-290-0000

Karoline Edtstadler, *President-in-Office of the Council*. – Madam President, Montenegro remains the front-runner in the accession process and has made further progress over the past years, as already mentioned in detail by the rapporteur. With the institutional framework complete and the legal framework largely in place, the entire rule of law system should now deliver more tangible results and a strengthened and sustainable track record. Progress in particular on the rule of law and fundamental rights chapters, as set out in the negotiation framework, will continue to determine the pace of accession negotiations overall. Therefore, Montenegro should now focus its reform efforts on meeting the interim benchmarks for Chapters 23 and 24 and on implementing the respective action plans.

The Council strongly encourages Montenegro to demonstrate real results in the fight against corruption and organised crime, money laundering and trafficking in human beings, including through effective investigations, prosecutions and final convictions, and to improve the seizure

and confiscation of criminal assets. Recent attacks against journalists highlight the urgent need for the authorities to guarantee a safe climate conducive to freedom of expression and the independence of the media.

On economic reforms, the Council has taken positive note of the continuous economic growth and has encouraged Montenegro to take measures to ensure fiscal sustainability, decrease the high public debt, reduce the trade deficit, advance reforms in important areas, such as public procurement and labour market, and improve the business environment.

With regard to elections, Montenegro's authority needs to address all irregularities reported by international observers. Returning the political debate to the parliament remains the responsibility of all parties. The Council has warmly welcomed Montenegro's continued positive role in further developing regional cooperation and advancing good neighbourly relations, strongly commended it also for its consistent cooperation on foreign policy issues and, in particular, for its continuous full alignment with the EU Common Foreign and Security Policy.

The clear messages in your draft resolutions are well appreciated. It is clear that Montenegro has homework to do. Montenegro will have to intensify its focus on implementing reforms with determination and on fulfilling all benchmarks.

To conclude, let me use this opportunity to assure you that we, as the Presidency, will continue to support Montenegro in its reform process and will do our utmost to move the accession negotiations forward. We also count on Montenegro to do its part and maintain the reform momentum.

1-291-0000

Johannes Hahn, *Member of the Commission*. – Madam President, State Secretary, honourable Members, let me start by congratulating the rapporteur Charles Tannock for his well-balanced report on Montenegro. I also want to thank all honourable Members who have contributed to this. Montenegro has indeed made steady progress on its EU path. Montenegro's legal and institutional framework is now largely in place. The country is strongly committed to regional cooperation and has good relations with its neighbours and, in the context of the Western Balkans, this is not a minor achievement. Let me also welcome again Montenegro's complete alignment with the Union's common foreign and security policy positions. Montenegro is a country with a clear EU perspective. It is well in the EU integration process with 31 chapters open for negotiation, three of which are provisionally closed. There's overwhelming support for EU membership among the population and across the political spectrum.

Fully functioning national parliaments play a key role in this process. I am glad that, finally, after a prolonged boycott of parliament by the opposition, there has been real progress in political dialogue with the return of most of the opposition to the parliament.

In October a temporary parliamentary committee for the reform of electoral and other legislation was formed. Its mandate is based on the proposal made by the two civic opposition parties in June. I regret and I fail to understand that these two opposition parties have decided not to participate in the work of this committee. All parties should play an active and constructive role in the work of this committee.

I look forward to the continuation of Montenegro's EU integration process. As ever, the base of negotiations is in Montenegro's hands. We start seeing initial results with concrete cases in some areas, including the fight against corruption and organised crime and investigations into money

laundering. I look forward to now seeing a similar track record for the fight against trafficking in human beings, media freedom and investigations into attacks against journalists.

Attacks against journalists are unacceptable and need to be followed and cleared up. The overall priority for Montenegro remains to meet the interim benchmarks for Chapters 23 and 24 and therefore continue advancing in the accession process.

Further fiscal consolidation measures are also required, combined with the timely implementation of Montenegro's reform priorities, which would lead to a more flexible economy, improved functioning of markets and a good investment climate. I also expect the effective implementation of the public administration reform to ensure effective depoliticisation of the public service and to allocate state administration resources where they are needed for the country's EU accession process.

On its side the European Commission will continue supporting Montenegro on its EU path with both technical and financial assistance, so that the journey towards EU membership already brings concrete benefits to all citizens of Montenegro.

1-292-0000

Andrey Kovatchev, *on behalf of the PPE Group*. – Madam President, this the 12th year that, as an independent state, Montenegro has shown that all the fears related to its sustainability were unfounded. It is now the leading Western Balkan state for EU accession and is a full and reliable member of NATO.

I welcome the progress the country has made in the area of public administration, fundamental rights and regional cooperation. Montenegro has further aligned itself to the EU Common Foreign and Security Policy and to EU legislation in the areas of company law, food safety and agriculture. However, I have to mention the low trust in the electoral framework and the prolonged parliamentary boycott still enacted by some opposition parties. All political actors should share the responsibility in sustaining a healthy democratic political dialogue.

Montenegro still has a lot to do in the area of freedom of expression and the fight against corruption and organised crime. I would like to use this opportunity to remind you of the critical importance that European integration and the EU membership perspective have in holding the Western Balkans together in a peaceful and prosperous way. It is only through Euro-Atlantic integration that the Western Balkan states can be reconciled with their very difficult past and build their stronger future together.

1-293-0000

Νίκος Ανδρουλάκης, *εξ ονόματος της ομάδας S&D*. – Κυρία Πρόεδρε, είναι η τελευταία φορά που συζητάμε στη θητεία αυτή για την ενταξιακή πορεία του Μαυροβουνίου. Ως παιδί, μεγάλωσα με τις εικόνες φρίκης του πολέμου στην τότε ενωμένη Γιουγκοσλαβία. Σήμερα όμως, χαίρομαι ιδιαίτερα που οι χώρες αυτές βελτιώνουν συνεχώς τη θέση τους, προσεγγίζοντας τον στόχο ένταξης στην Ευρωπαϊκή Ένωση. Όμως, παρά τη σημαντική πρόοδο που έχει σημειωθεί τα τελευταία χρόνια και η οποία αποτυπώνεται στις εκδόσεις τόσο της Επιτροπής όσο και του Κοινοβουλίου, απομένουν ακόμα να γίνουν πολλά.

Οι προσπάθειες για την εμπέδωση του κράτους δικαίου, της διαφάνειας και της ενίσχυσης των θεσμών πρέπει να είναι συνεχείς. Χρειάζεται, επίσης, να υπάρξει πρόοδος στην καταπολέμηση της χρόνιας ανεργίας και ιδιαίτερα της ανεργίας των νέων. Η κυβέρνηση έχει δείξει τη θέληση να προχωρήσει στις απαιτούμενες μεταρρυθμίσεις. Πρέπει, όμως, αυτή η θέληση να μετουσιωθεί σε συγκεκριμένες πράξεις. Είμαι σίγουρος ότι, αν τελικά ολοκληρωθεί η αποχώρηση του Ηνωμένου Βασιλείου με το Brexit, τότε το

Μαυροβούνιο, συνεχίζοντας στον ίδιο ρυθμό, θα μπορέσει να γίνει το εικοστό όγδοο μέλος της Ένωσης μας.

1-294-0000

Jozo Radoš, *u ime kluba ALDE*. – Poštovana predsjedavajuća, gospodine povjereniče, kolegice i kolege, ja bih izrazio potporu i zahvalnost gospodinu Tannocku na cjelovitom izvješću i na dobroj suradnji izvjestitelja u sjeni. Želim se posebno osvrnuti na pitanje slobode medija, o kojem je ovdje bilo govora.

Dakle, uz nastavak zastrašivanja i napada na novinare, radi se i o napadima na nezavisnost nacionalnog radiotelevizijskog operatera i vijeća za elektroničke medije. Treba naglasiti da se u sličnom položaju ovisnosti nalaze i lokalni javni mediji, a generalno treba napomenuti da je radno-pravni položaj novinara vrlo težak, nesiguran, s malim plaćama i plaćama koje često kasne i pri tome, naravno, treba napomenuti i nejasnu vlasničku strukturu medija.

U takvim uvjetima, naravno, ne može biti kvalitetnih i slobodnih medija i mislim da bi se tim pitanjima trebali više baviti u našim izvješćima.

1-295-0000

Петър Курумбашев (S&D). – Благодаря Ви, госпожо председател. Вече е станало клише да се каже за Монтенегро или за Черна гора, че е най-напред в преговорите, но кажете ми, какво означава да си първи, когато състезанието е между две държави. Дали е голяма гордост това, че Черна гора е пред Сърбия и няма никакви други състезатели? Позволете ми да изразя разочарованието си, че другите две държави, които трябваше да бъдат поканени през юни на заседанието на Съвета на Европейския съюз, а именно Албания и Македония, не получиха такава покана. Представете си, че Черна гора вече води преговори шест години и в най-щастливия си хоризонт през 2025 г. може би може да стане член на Европейския съюз. Как се чувства една държава и едно общество, което преговаря евентуално поне 13 г. за влизането си в Европейския съюз?

Необходимо е да дадем по-ясни сигнали и да бъдем по-откровени с тези, които преговарят за членство, защото на мен ми е трудно да видя партньори на запад от Австрия и Италия, които имат искрено желание да видят държавите от Западните Балкани действително членове на нашето европейско семейство.

1-296-0000

Puynnöstä myönnettävät puheenvuorot

1-297-0000

Eduard Kukan (PPE). – Madam President, I would like to thank Charles Tannock for his report – unfortunately, his last one, and I think we should also thank him for many years of personal devotion to the country.

Montenegro is advancing towards EU accession at a steady pace with the support of its citizens for the strategic goal of the country. Despite the fact that a partial boycott of the Parliament has concluded, a fully functioning legislative branch with effective oversight of the executive is essential to every modern democracy.

I also strongly condemn the intimidation, smear campaigns and verbal and physical attacks against journalists. We reiterate and this report calls on the authorities to investigate previous attacks. Last but not the least, I would also like to praise Montenegro for its full alignment to the Common Foreign and Security Policy (CFSP) and Common Security and Defence Policy (CSDP). Since our last discussion on Montenegro in this House, the country has become a NATO member. The country should also be applauded for its constructive and positive approach to regional cooperation.

1-298-0000

Νότης Μαριάς (ECR). – Κυρία Πρόεδρε, η ηγεσία της Ευρωπαϊκής Ένωσης προσπαθεί να αντισταθμίσει την αποχώρηση του Ηνωμένου Βασιλείου με την ένταξη των χωρών των Δυτικών Βαλκανίων. Αντιλαμβάνεται κανείς ότι κάτι τέτοιο δεν μπορεί να αναπληρώσει το κενό που αφήνει το Brexit και, βεβαίως, αντιλαμβάνεστε ότι εάν ενταχθούν στην Ευρωπαϊκή Ένωση οι χώρες αυτές, το Μαυροβούνιο, τα Σκόπια, η Αλβανία ή το Κόσοβο, δηλαδή η σφηκοφωλιά των τζιχαντιστών, θα δημιουργήσουν τεράστια προβλήματα. Πρόκειται για χώρες με έλλειψη δημοκρατίας, διαφθορά και οργανωμένο έγκλημα, στις οποίες δεν υπάρχει κράτος δικαίου και τα ναρκωτικά είναι στην ημερήσια διάταξη, και όπου υφίστανται καταπίεση οι μειονότητες. Επομένως, πρόκειται για κράτη τα οποία είναι μια φάρσα αυτήν τη στιγμή και δεν μπορούν να ενταχθούν στην Ευρωπαϊκή Ένωση. Αυτό σύντομα θα το αντιληφθούν οι ίδιοι οι λαοί της Ευρώπης, οι οποίοι θα αντιδράσουν απέναντι στην ηγεσία τους.

1-299-0000

Ivan Jakovčić (ALDE). – Poštovana predsjedavajuća, kako danas stvari stoje, potpuno je jasno da će Crna Gora biti prva zemlja koja će biti novoprimitljena članica Europske unije.

Želim, naravno, vjerovati da će Crna Gora ispuniti svoje obaveze, što je u ovom izvještaju jasno podcrtano, i da će učiniti sve da se i medijske slobode i sve ostale slobode koje građani trebaju imati dovedu na onaj nivo kada zemlja postaje zrela za ulazak u Europsku uniju, ali ja ovdje želim reći i podcrtati naš problem.

Gospodine povjereniče, ja znam da vi jako dugo pratite i odlično radite na zapadnom Balkanu, ali mi smo u situaciji da ćemo morati ovoga puta jasno reći da je „regata princip” princip ulaska u Europsku uniju. Ne blok, ne ne znam što, ne znam koje čekanje, nego regata princip. Tko je prvi došao na cilj, ima pravo ući u Europsku uniju, kao što je to, na kraju krajeva, i Hrvatska napravila.

1-300-0000

Mirosław Piotrowski (ECR). – W przedłożonym sprawozdaniu porusza się wiele bardzo ważnych kwestii dotyczących Czarnogóry. Dobrze, że w punkcie 22 ubolewamy między innymi nad brakiem postępów w zwalczaniu handlu ludźmi i nad zmuszaniem dzieci do żebractwa. Jest to haniebny proceder i żaden kraj mający aspiracje do członkostwa w Unii Europejskiej nie może tego tolerować.

Niepotrzebnie jednak, znów w specyficzny sposób, w sprawozdaniu promuje się ideologię gender. Tym razem niepokojąc się w punkcie 34 trudnościami z akceptacją różnorodności seksualnej w czarnogórskim społeczeństwie. Uważam, że jest to zbędne.

1-301-0000

(Pyynnöstä myönnettävät puheenvuorot päättyvät)

1-302-0000

Johannes Hahn, Member of the Commission. – Madam President, I would like to thank honourable Members very much for this very fruitful debate, just like our other exchanges today. The Commission’s Western Balkan Strategy, the May Sofia Declaration and the June Council conclusions all represent a clear signal of encouragement and the EU’s engagement with Montenegro and the whole region.

As I said earlier, the EU is in a unique position to help address the country’s challenges. The European perspective is of crucial importance for the stability of the whole region and I think we all agree that Montenegro has achieved a lot. It’s firmly committed to its EU path and the EU remains equally dedicated to Montenegro’s future in the Union. However, as you rightly point out in your report, there is work ahead and the focus needs to be kept firmly on the rule of law, the fight against corruption and organised crime, freedom of the media, public administration reform, and a genuine involvement of civil society, to mention only a few of the key areas. The accession

negotiations' benchmarks will help Montenegro to address these and other priority reforms, which will move Montenegro closer to the EU.

Negotiations will continue to proceed on the basis of the own merits principle. The Commission will continue to support the country. The pace of progress as such is entirely in the hands of Montenegro.

I would like to use this opportunity to thank honourable Members for the exchange of views today and I look forward to further progress on Montenegro's EU path. I would also like to use the opportunity to thank the Austrian Presidency for its decision to choose the Western Balkan enlargement as one of its core areas during its Presidency, and not only to choose it, but also – as we could see today and on many other occasions – to pursue it with very strong dedication.

1-303-0000

Karoline Edtstadler, *President-in-Office of the Council*. – Madam President, I wish to thank you for a very useful debate. I take note that our institutions have a very similar approach and assessment. We look forward to continuing this constructive dialogue and engagement. The Council will continue to closely monitor Montenegro's progress, paying particular attention to the area of rule of law and other important issues mentioned here today and also by the Commissioner.

Let me express our appreciation for the constructive contribution of the European Parliament and in particular rapporteur, Charles Tannock, in advancing Montenegro's succession process. I can assure you that we will continue to pay particular attention to the views of Parliament in this regard.

1-304-0000

Charles Tannock, *Rapporteur*. – Madam President, I would like to thank Commissioner Hahn and the Austrian Presidency-in-Office for their comments and take this opportunity, in particular, to thank Commissioner Hahn for his ceaseless efforts in supporting the EU enlargement agenda over the previous five years – not always in the easiest of political climates.

Can I also take the opportunity to thank the shadow rapporteurs and the many other colleagues over the years who helped me compile my annual reports on Montenegro.

When I first became the rapporteur for Montenegro in September 2009 it was a very different country. Montenegro was then a newly independent state with an uncertain future. Today it's a NATO member. It's aligned fully with the EU CFSP. It's prospering economically and it's the front runner amongst those countries wishing to join the European Union.

So my report highlights Montenegro's strong overall progress and is positive about its general direction of travel and excellent regional neighbourly relations with its Western Balkan partners.

With such achievements, however, come greater responsibilities. In this regard, Parliament has clearly laid out its concerns about media freedom in the country and the need to intensify the fight against corruption and organised crime and diversify its economy.

This is my last report as Montenegro rapporteur, but I wish Montenegro well in the future and have no doubt whatsoever about its successful eventual path to EU membership.

1-305-0000

Puhemies. – Keskustelu on päättynyt.

Äänestys toimitetaan torstaina 29.11.2018.

28. Akateemisen vapauden puolustaminen EU:n ulkoisessa toiminnassa (keskustelu)

1-307-0000

Puhemies. – Esityslistalla on seuraavana Wajid Khanin mietintö akateemisen vapauden puolustaminen EU:n ulkoisessa toiminnassa (2018/2117(INI) – A8-0403/2018).

1-308-0000

Wajid Khan, Rapporteur. – Madam President can I firstly thank all the shadow rapporteurs for their input in this report. Academic freedom is not some dry obscure subject. I want to highlight two reasons why academic freedom matters so much. The contributions that academics make and the fact that attacking academics is an early step on a familiar path towards tyranny. The truth is, threats to academic freedom impact everyone in our society, when researchers, professors and students can't explore certain issues, society doesn't get the benefit of their skills and talents looking into important questions. When research on gun violence, tobacco or other health-related issues can't happen, public health is endangered. When research into global warming, pollution and air quality doesn't happen, the whole of society and the environment suffers. Attacks on academic freedom hamper social, political, economic and cultural development.

Today, I hosted an event on academic freedom in the Parliament. I learned that 294 attacks have been reported on higher education communities in 47 countries between September 2017 and August this year.

Thousands of academics and students are threatened, attacked, imprisoned, censored, expelled or even killed each year because of what they teach, write or say. Recently, I was in Turkey as part of a Subcommittee on Human Rights mission. Turkey is a clear example of a country where a crack down on critical thinking occurs with an unprecedented witch-hunt targeting teachers, academics and other professionals. But Turkey is not the only country threatening academic freedom, we also hear reports of the detentions of Uighur scholars and students in China, targeted attacks on scholars in Iran, pressures on student expression in Nicaragua, mounting tensions in the United States and state-driven threats to institutional autonomy in Russia.

I should also address the elephant in the room, the terrible attacks on academic freedom in our own EU Member State, Hungary.

Sadly, violations of academic freedom claims are rarely brought under human rights law. This is in part due to a lack of familiarity with issues of academic freedom amongst human rights advocates; and secondly, the fact that claims often referred to other rights being violated, such as freedom of expression or opinion. As a result, standards in this area are under developed and violations of academic freedom go underreported. Therefore, recognising these incidents as a part of a single global phenomenon is a crucial first step in devising solutions.

There is an urgent need to raise awareness of the importance of academic freedom and to create opportunities to improve the capacity for its advocacy and defence. There is also an urgent need to explain why academics' work is fundamental to democratic societies and the protection of our rights, especially in the current rise of autocratic leaders. There are organisations and universities that already do excellent work monitoring and reporting attacks and assisting those who are under threat.

I have been hugely inspired by the work of Scholars at Risk which launched its EU chapter today in this Parliament. However, they struggle with financial and administrative limitations, which preclude otherwise qualified at-risk academics or students from being able to obtain access to programme opportunities. More needs to be done and the EU could lead in this area, supporting

persecuted and at-risk academics as well as defending and promoting academic freedom worldwide.

Madam President my report deals with the EU's exchange external actions as its title says but we cannot approach and tackle external issues without being honest with what is happening in our own backyard. We cannot talk about the inclusion of academic freedom in the Copenhagen criteria for EU candidate countries without referring to the case of Hungary, a Member State that has been through the accession process. This case provides evidence that there are shortcomings in the accession process and an urgent need to address it. We cannot be hypocrites. The EU global strategy clearly states that living up consistently to our values internally will determine our external credibility and influence. That is why I am saddened and disappointed by some of my EPP colleagues' actions. It seems that, for some, the priority about this report was to ensure that it does not make references to EU Member States actions, it seems that the priority was to protect Mr Orbán.

Finally, to those people we say that we will not be silenced, we will be banging on about this for years to come. We will keep highlighting the importance of academic freedom and institutional autonomy and we will never stop saying that academics must be free to research and publish the truth, in Hungary, throughout the EU and across the world.

(Applause)

1-309-0000

Johannes Hahn, *on behalf of the Vice-President of the Commission / High Representative of the Union for Foreign Affairs and Security Policy*. – Madam President, the Khan report rightly draws attention to the importance of academic freedom for open and stable pluralistic societies. The right to think and speak freely is fundamental for democracy and we see the increasing attacks on academic freedom as part of a general trend of shrinking civil and political rights across the globe.

Let me assure you that we wholeheartedly share the concerns expressed in the report and welcome the initiative by Mr Khan to respond to this crisis, which is building up and threatening to erode our liberal societies.

I note that this morning Mr Khan organised a roundtable on 'Ideas are not crimes' where colleagues from the European External Action Service (EEAS) already had an opportunity to share some of our activities in this area.

Human rights and democratic values are at the heart of our external relations and policies and I thank the European Parliament for its leading role in upholding these values.

The Khan report affirms that ideas are not crimes and that critical discourse is not disloyalty and that academic freedom plays an essential role in educational advancement and the development of humankind in modern society. This is true and our actions show that we mean it.

The Khan report calls for explicitly recognising the importance of academic freedom in public statements, policies and actions relating to the EU's external action.

We are doing this in our relations with partner countries. The most recent statement on Turkey on 16 November 2018 condemns the detention of prominent academics and civil society representatives and calls for a rapid resolution based on the principles of presumption of innocence and in line with the European Convention on Human Rights.

We also address these issues in our human-rights dialogues, raising attacks on basic freedoms like freedom of thought, speech, assembly and association in general terms, and by enquiring about specific cases.

Academic freedom and freedom of thought are closely linked to fundamental freedoms and implicitly covered by some of our human-rights guidelines – notably the EU Guidelines on Freedom of Expression – on-line and off-line (ex 2014), EU Guidelines on Human Rights Defenders (ex 2016), and EU Guidelines on the Promotion and Protection of Freedom of Religion or Belief (from 2013).

These guidelines were drafted to ensure a maximum of coherence, consistency and visibility of human-rights priorities in external relations. They provide practical guidance for the work of delegations in this domain.

On top of these guidelines we have a number of financial instruments which directly support our human-rights agenda which scans for vulnerable groups like journalists, human-rights defenders and religious minorities. Academics have directly or indirectly benefitted from a number of such instruments.

For instance, the PreotectDefenders.eu programme covers all types of human-rights defenders including academics or people defending academic freedom – at least 219 academics with this instrument. The EIDHR (European Instrument for Democracy & Human Rights) emergency fund also covers human-rights defenders including academics at risk helping them with relocation if necessary.

A number of EIDHR projects are implemented by our support universities. Our flagship is the European Masters Programme on Human Rights, which was established in 1997 thanks to the vision of ten pioneer universities.

EMA (The European Master's Programme in Human Rights and Democratisation) is the oldest Masters programme supported by the European Union. Over the years, it has developed according to changing approaches to human rights and democratisation in Europe and in the world and to more integrated strategies in trans-European human-rights education.

Today, EMA counts on the participation of 41 prestigious universities and human-rights centres from all Member States of the European Union. The EIDHR also supports the work of the UN Special Rapporteur on the promotion and protection of the right to freedom of opinion and expression.

Thank you for your attention. It's clear that the recommendations proposed by Mr Khan's report and the actions of the Commission and the EEAS follow the same joint objectives. I therefore look forward to our discussion on how to improve our cooperation on this matter even further.

1-310-0000

Andrea Bocskor, a PPE képviselőcsoport nevében. – Köszönöm szépen, Elnök Asszony, és köszönöm a lehetőséget, hogy a Néppárt árnyékelőadójaként kifejtettem a véleményem erről a jelentésről, melynek a címe: Ajánlások a Tanácsnak, a Bizottságnak és a külügyi főképviselőnek, hogy az EU külügyi tevékenysége során hogyan védjék az akadémiai szabadságot.

A téma nagyon fontos, hiszen az akadémiai szabadság, a kutatás és a tudományos élet megvédése egy nemes cél, és mint tapasztaljuk, szerte a világban számtalan eset van, amikor tanároknak és tudósoknak menekülniük kell, hogy az életüket megmentseék. Amikor olyan oktatási törvényeket alkotnak, hogy több százezer kisebbségi nyelvű diákot és egyetemistát fosztanak meg az

anyanyelven való tanulás jogától – és még sorolhatnám – az általános megfogalmazásokkal tehát egyetérttek.

Azonban sem ezekkel a konkrét jelenségekkel, sem egyetlenegy harmadik vagy partnerországgal nem foglalkozik a jelentés nevesítve, csak Magyarországgal és a CEU-val érdekes módon. Mi ez, ha nem egy újabb politikai koholmány Magyarországgal szemben? Egy újabb lejárató kampány, amit a baloldal, a szocialisták, a zöldek és a liberálisok közösen szerveztek, hogy politikailag lejárássák Magyarországot.

És a legszomorúbb az egészben az, hogy Önök, kedves harcias jogvédők, sosem szólaltak még fel a kárpátaljai magyar iskolarendszer védelmében, amit az új ukrán oktatási törvény alapján akarnak felszámolni, de még a marosvásárhelyi magyar egyetem ügyében sem szólaltak meg, amit a románok szeretnének beolvasztani. Tehát világos, hogy a maguk célja nem az akadémiai szabadság védelme valójában, hanem csupán az, hogy egy újabb támadást indítsanak Magyarország ellen. Sajnálom!

1-311-0000

Clare Moody (S&D). – Madam President, I would like to thank my colleague, Wajid Khan, for his excellent work. This report highlights the need to defend academic freedom when it is under threat. That must also include inside the EU.

Hungary signed up to European values in the Copenhagen criteria, and we have to call out the assault on those values that is happening there today. Forcing the Central European University out of the country is a clear breach of all that Hungary signed up to. Further, European citizens in Hungary are being prevented from following gender studies because the Hungarian Government refuses to accredit them.

We cannot preach values abroad which are ignored in the EU. I hope this Parliament will support the amendments that highlight and condemn undermining European values by any country, inside or outside the EU.

1-312-0000

Judith Sargentini, on behalf of the Verts/ALE Group. – Madam President, in the report on Hungary that this Parliament voted in September, we addressed the issue of the Central European University and its insecure situation in Budapest. Since then, things have got worse. I have to conclude that the Hungarian Government is on purpose trying to ruin a highly regarded university and it sends a message to its people that it looks down on academic debate.

I'm outraged, not only at the Hungarian Government, but also at the 27 Member States that have still not found the courage to correct their fellow Member. How is it possible that, in Europe in 2018, an academic institution is being bullied into closing down? Is this our Europe? This is such a bad example for the rest of the world. I stand with the Central European University, and all prime ministers should do so too.

1-313-0000

Johannes Hahn, on behalf of the Vice-President of the Commission / High Representative of the Union for Foreign Affairs and Security Policy. – Madam President, allow me to conclude by again thanking Mr Khan for raising awareness about the urgent need to continue and step up our action to preserve academic freedom and the right to think and speak freely. I would also like to commend him for his efforts to launch the Scholars at Risk Europe network, which took place this morning on the occasion of the Round Table.

Finally, let me also thank all honourable Members for their interventions, comments and suggestions. It's a topic which unfortunately will accompany us and therefore we need all dedication and commitment to fight against any shrinking of academic space.

1-314-0000

Wajid Khan, Rapporteur. – Madam President, it is great to have a Commissioner Hahn, who actually sounds like 'MEP Khan'. Thank you for your kind words, Commissioner. I'd just like to say, once again, thank you to all colleagues who have worked and made contributions toward this report. Hopefully tomorrow we can vote the amendments through, as well as the final report.

I'm very disappointed that my esteemed colleague, the PPE shadow rapporteur, isn't here to listen to your comments, Commissioner, and to other interventions from esteemed colleagues who have worked on this report.

I'll keep it brief: thank you very much to everybody and I look forward to tomorrow's vote.

1-315-0000

Puhemies. – Keskustelu on päättynyt.
Äänestys toimitetaan torstaina 29.11.2018.

29. Minuutin puheenvuorot poliittisesti tärkeistä asioista

1-317-0000

Puhemies. – Esityslistalla on seuraavana minuutin puheenvuorot poliittisesti tärkeistä asioista työjärjestyksen 163 artiklan mukaisesti.

1-318-0000

László Tóké (PPE). – Elnök Asszony! Ordító ellentmondás, hogy miközben az Európai Parlament és a Bizottság jelentései ultimátumszerű megrovásban részesítik a mélyponton álló romániai jogállamiságot, Jean-Claude Juncker és Antonio Tajani elnökök fesztív módon ünneplik annak a nagy Romániának a jubileumát, mely megalakulásának centenáriumán újabb és újabb merényleteket követ el az európai jogállamiság sérelmére.

A kommunizmus idején elkobzott magyar köztulajdonok visszaszolgáltatásának a megtagadása, másfelől a mégis visszajuttatott Székely Mikó Református Kollégium, a gyulafehérvári Batthyáneum és az ozsdolai közbirtokossági erdők visszaállamosítása egyszerre jelent a magántulajdon rovására elkövetett és a kisebbségi magyarokat diszkrimináló durva jogfosztást. Románia legméltóbb módon a jogosság és a törvényesség helyreállításával, a demokratikus jogállamiság biztosításával ünnepelhetne. Ehhez kérjük Európa, és Ferenc pápa támogatását.

1-319-0000

Julie Ward (S&D). – Madam President, this month the UN reported that the Conservative Party's misogynistic, punitive, mean-spirited and often callous austerity policies have inflicted great misery on people across the UK. A fifth of the UK population live in poverty. In parts of my North West constituency over 50% of children live in poverty. The Tories have brushed aside these expert findings, but it's negligent for any government to dismiss consistent evidence that they have compounded suffering through their domestic legislative agenda.

Meanwhile, in 2017, the EU adopted a European Pillar of Social Rights to encourage poverty reduction and the creation of more equal societies. Brexit hasn't even happened yet, but the effects are already being felt. Austerity continues, the economy suffers and households are already GBP 900 a year worse off since the referendum result. It's the poorest families who have borne the brunt of the sharpest cuts and Brexit will only add to their misery.

1-320-0000

Mirosław Piotrowski (ECR). – Pani Przewodnicząca! Nie tak dawno Parlament przyjął rezolucję potępiającą neofaszyzm i neonazizm, które podobno odradzają się w Europie. Wielu europosłów głosowało przeciwko, gdyż w tekście tym zabrakło potępienia neokomunizmu. O ile dwie pierwsze napiętnowane zbrodnicze ideologie nawiązują do faszyzmu Benita Mussoliniego i narodowego socjalizmu Adolfa Hitlera, o tyle przemilczano komunizm, czyli międzynarodowy socjalizm, który wyszedł z Rosji sowieckiej Józefa Stalina.

Komunizm w jego różnych odsłonach pochłonął na całym świecie więcej ofiar niż dwa napiętnowane totalitaryzmy razem wzięte. Przyzwolenie na rozprzestrzenianie się neokomunizmu może przynieść zgubne dla Europy skutki. Parlament nie może być bierny i powinien zacząć od siebie, delegalizując działającą tu grupę komunisty Altiera Spinelliego, który w manifestie z Ventotene postulował likwidację państw narodowych, zniesienie własności prywatnej i wzniesienie europejskiej rewolucji socjalistycznej. Należy też jak najszybciej usunąć jego wizerunek i nazwisko z gmachu Parlamentu.

1-321-0000

Ivan Jakovčić (ALDE). – Poštovana predsjedavajuća, želim upozoriti Komisiju na najavu mogućega ukidanja sredstava koja su potrebna za talijansku manjinu u Hrvatskoj i Sloveniji.

Nova talijanska vlada, čini se, ignorira vlastite zakone i dovodi u pitanje funkcioniranje organizacije talijanske manjine. Pogotovo će to biti problem ako se ne nađu sredstva za vrtiće, škole i sve ono što je do sada uobičajeno od trećeg mjeseca 2001. godine do danas bilo financirano. Ne vjerujem da će ni hrvatska vlada, ni Istarska županija ni primorsko-goranske općine i gradovi naći lako sredstva. Pogotovo je to važno za dnevnik „La voce del popolo”, dnevnik koji izlazi na talijanskom jeziku i koji doprinosi prepoznatljivosti talijanske manjine.

Želim zamoliti Komisiju i upozoriti da bude budna oko toga jer zaista nema smisla da sada, nakon svega, dovedemo u pitanje talijansku manjinu u Hrvatskoj.

1-322-0000

Liadh Ní Riada (GUE/NGL). – A Uachtaráin, in Éirinn déantar teaghlaigh a chaitheamh amach ó thithe agus ó fheirmeacha ó lá go lá. Leis an gcruatan atá ann go forleathan sna pobail tuaithe agus leis an ngéarchéim tithíochta atá againn inár dtír, tá díbirt ag dul ar aghaidh go laethúil.

Ba cheart go mbeadh náire ar Fhine Gael agus ar Fhianna Fáil, agus tá milleán ar an Aontas Eorpach chomh maith. Nuair atá fiacha neamh-inbhuanaithe i gceist, ba chóir do na bainc glacadh le níos lú airgid. Ba cheart go ndéanadh na bainc idirbheartaíocht as an nua le feirmeoirí agus le húinéirí tí atá ag streachailt.

Ná dearúd go bhfuil na bainc ag baint leas ollmhór as an tarrtháil airgeadais agus ní íocann siad fiú amháin cáin. Tá sé soiléir go gcuireann an AE brú ar na bainc a morgáistí a dhíol ar phraghasanna i bhfad níos ísle ná na luachanna le *vulture funds* móra idirnáisiúnta.

Is slí é seo do *vulture funds* chun talamh a cheannach ar lascainí ollmhóra. Táimse ag rá anois leis an Aontas Eorpach: in ionad cosaint a thabhairt do na bainc ba chóir cosaint agus tacaíocht a thabhairt dár saoránaigh; sin é!

1-323-0000

Ivan Štefanec (PPE). – Vážená pani predsedajúca, útoky Ruska v azovskom mori proti lodiam ukrajinského námorníctva nás majú zastrašiť. Majú ukázať, aké je Rusko silné, hocikedy vraj môže napadnúť slabšieho a že nemusí rešpektovať medzinárodné ani svoje vlastné zákony. V skutočnosti je to však ukážka slabosti. Putin je slaboch a zbabelec. Nezvládol dôchodkovú reformu, ľudia sa búria, ekonomika klesá a tak isto aj jeho popularita. Je pozoruhodné, že naopak

Európska únia je v Rusku vnímaná viac pozitívne ako negatívne, a to prvýkrát od marca 2014. Preto sa Putin uchýlil k osvedčenej zbrani zbabelcov a tou je hrubá sila. Musíme to rezolútne odsúdiť a ukázať, že Európa sa Putina nezľakne. Je dôležité rozšíriť sankcie a potrestať osoby, ktoré za tento útok nesú priamu zodpovednosť. Ukrajina je suverénny štát tak ako každý iný. Musíme sa jej zastať a pomáhať jej, pretože stabilita a mier na Ukrajine je stabilitou a mierom aj v celej Európe.

1-324-0000

Maria Grapini (S&D). – Doamnă președintă, domnule comisar, în această seară voi vrea să vorbesc despre statul de drept și dubla măsură. Statul de drept, domnule comisar, așa cum îl definește Comisia, este total diferit de ceea ce înțelegem noi, parlamentele naționale și statele membre. Statul de drept nu înseamnă că trebuie să legifereze Comisia. Nu înseamnă că trebuie să schimbe șefi de instituții Comisia. Așa cum, recent, în rezoluția pentru țara mea, pentru România au fost scrise aceste măsuri care țin de subsidiaritate, care nu au legătură cu atribuțiile Comisiei Europene. Vreau să vă spun, domnule comisar, îmi pare rău că nu este și Consiliul - se folosește dubla măsură. România îndeplinește - și chiar Parlamentul a constatat acest lucru încă din 8 iunie 2011 - toate condițiile Regulamentului Schengen și nu se află în Schengen. Cetățenii noștri sunt tratați ca cetățeni de mână a doua, țara este discriminată, companiile stau mii de ore - și plătesc pentru acest lucru - la controalele vamale. De ce nu se ia decizia ca România să intre în spațiul Schengen? De ce avem un sistem MCV pentru două state, un sistem care nu are legătură cu tratatul. Vă rog, domnule comisar, să luați în calcul și aceste lucruri!

1-325-0000

Νότης Μαριάς (ECR). – Κυρία Πρόεδρε, επανέρχομαι στο ζήτημα των Σκοπίων, γιατί δεν πήρα, ούτε από τον κύριο Hahn ούτε από τους συναδέλφους, καμία απάντηση στα επιχειρήματα τα οποία έθεσα. Επεσήμανα, κύριε Hahn, το άρθρο 36 του νέου Συντάγματος των Σκοπίων, στο οποίο γίνεται λόγος για δήθεν «Μακεδονία» και δήθεν «μακεδονικό λαό». Συνάδει αυτό με τη συμφωνία των Πρεσπών;

Δεύτερον, σας είπα ότι στο προοίμιο αναφέρονται στην ASNOM. Διαβάστε, λοιπόν, στα αγγλικά τι λέει η ASNOM, η απόφαση του 1944 που κάνει λόγο για δήθεν αυτοδιάθεση «μακεδονικού έθνους», για δήθεν αυτοδιάθεση «μακεδονικού λαού», για κατάργηση των συνόρων και για ενοποίηση των Μακεδόνων με τους Μακεδόνες. Αυτά δεν είναι αλυτρωτικές ρήσεις; Αυτά υπάρχουν στο νέο Σύνταγμα των Σκοπίων. Βεβαίως υπάρχουν και να μου απαντήσετε! Είναι δεδομένα και καλό θα είναι να διαβάσετε! Δεν διαβάζετε ούτε εσείς ο ίδιος τις αλυτρωτικές λογικές των Σκοπίων! Αν θέλετε απαντήστε, λοιπόν, στα θέματα αυτά! Εγώ σας αναμένω ή σας καλώ και σε δημόσιο διάλογο, διότι έτσι είναι τα πράγματα, κύριε Hahn! Να διαβάσετε καλύτερα!

1-326-0000

Csaba Sógor (PPE). – Az elmúlt néhány napban Európának egyik olyan régiójában jártam, amely az elmúlt száz év folyamán nem volt mindig egyike a legbékésebb és legfejlettebb régióknak, de mára méltán nevezhetjük annak. Dél-Tirolról van szó, erről az Olaszországhoz tartozó, de jelentős németajkú lakossággal rendelkező területi autonómiával bíró régióról, amely mára Olaszország és Európa egyik legfejlettebb része.

Az egymás mellett élő népcsoportok között nem volt mindig egyetértés, a történelem viszontagságait nem tudták meg nem törtéنتté tenni, de párbeszéddel, tárgyalással, Olaszország és Ausztira közötti sorozatos egyeztetéssel, egymás szempontjainak figyelembevételével elérték azt, hogy ma harmonikus és békés példáját adják a területi autonómia intézményének, és egyértelműen stabilitást hoztak egy korábbi feszültségektől terhes régióba.

Meggyőződésem, hogy vannak még olyan többnemzetiségi régiói Európának, például a ma Romániához tartozó Erdély, ahol szükség lenne erre a jól bevált módszerre, hiszen száz évvel az első világháború lezárását követően a nemzeti kisebbségek nem tűntek el Európából ... (az elnök megvonja a szót a felszólalótól),

1-327-0000

John Howarth (S&D). – Madam President, I want to speak about a group of citizens tonight who have been badly let down by their Member State government. They settled in European Union countries to live, to work, to pursue their dreams, to retire, as European Union citizens. As of 1 January 2021, they are due to become third country citizens.

I don't believe that we are in the business of removing rights from individual citizens of this Union and I do not believe that the status of these UK citizens in the EU27 should change. I don't believe, and neither do they, that they should lose their freedom of movement rights and be effectively discriminated against, because EU citizens in the UK will retain those rights. This is a wrong, it's a historic wrong; it has not been righted in 12 months. We have time to right this wrong on behalf of those people.

1-328-0000

Alex Mayer (S&D). – Madam President, black Friday is one of the biggest online shopping days of the year, but workers say that they are treated like robots in the rush to get deliveries out to customers. That is why I joined demonstrators outside the Peterborough Amazon warehouse. Workers have told the GMB that they don't have enough time for toilet breaks, 87% are in pain due to their workload and they are fracturing limbs and being taken away in ambulances. It wasn't just in my constituency – protests happened right across the UK and in Italy, France, Germany and Spain. It's international solidarity.

Of course, when you order a book or headphones or a new laptop online you can't wait for them to arrive but for that to happen safely there needs to be enough well trained, well paid staff.

So my message to Amazon is, please get around the table with the union representing your workers and remember, staff can't be treated as robots.

1-329-0000

Claudiu Ciprian Tănăsescu (S&D). – Doamnă președintă, stimați colegi, în luna septembrie, Guvernul României și Confederația Sindicală Meridian, una dintre cele mai mari confederații sindicale europene, au dat publicității o declarație comună despre necesitatea unei tranziții energetice juste în Valea Jiului și în alte regiuni miniere carbonifere din Uniunea Europeană. Documentul cere Comisiei Europene prelungirea dincolo de data de 31 decembrie 2018 a cadrului legal asigurat privind acordarea ajutoarelor de stat pentru producția de cărbune. Încetarea activităților în minele de cărbune nu se poate face decât cu îndeplinirea strictă a obligațiilor pe care unitățile miniere le au față de salariați și de comunitate, dar și a celor legate de protecția mediului înconjurător. Astfel, pentru a evita o criză majoră în zone precum Valea Jiului, pe multiple planuri, de la cel social la cel ecologic este necesară o prelungire a cadrului juridic numărul 787 din 2010 al Consiliului European. Măsura cerută are avizul Comitetului Economic și Social European și nu intră în contradicție nici cu obiectivul Comisiei Europene.

1-330-0000

Stanislav Polčák (PPE). – Paní předsedající, já bych chtěl upozornit na dlouhodobý závažný problém, který se týká radikálních náboženských vůdců, především z řad islámu. Tito imámové a problém s nimi se vyskytuje v Bruselu, samozřejmě v Německu, ve Francii jsou popsány případy a dnes se objevil, zdá se podle zveřejněných informací, i v ČR. Těch informací je poměrně málo, nicméně indicie naznačují, že tento člověk měl být částečně placen Saúdskou Arábií.

Já si myslím, že takovýto postup je dlouhodobě neakceptovatelný a jsme jeho svědky vlastně právě dlouhodobě. Z tohoto důvodu nevolám po žádném legislativním řešení, protože toto je věc samozřejmě především národních legislativ, ale pokud jde o terorismus a bezpečnost, tak to je věc EU a především diplomatického tlaku, který by měl být učiněn. Možná, že právě v těchto chvílích, teď, je možná nejlepší doba se s touto otázkou vypořádat. Ano, podporujte náboženskou

svobodu, samozřejmě i verzi islámu, ale v žádném případě není přípustné v evropském prostoru radikální islám podporovat ze strany Saúdské Arábie.

1-331-0000

Andrejs Mamikins (S&D). – Madam President, this year we celebrate the 70th anniversary of the Universal Declaration of Human Rights. After the terrible Second World War, humanity needed new values and new points of support. For the first time, the Universal Declaration of Human Rights powerfully declared that every person has rights that must be respected by any authority. Its adoption has become a unique embodiment of the great will of people and their leaders.

It's alarming that today such a declaration would hardly have been adopted. Most of the current political leaders would find in it something they didn't like, fail to accept it and start blaming each other. The lessons of the World Wars are forgotten by a new generation. Human rights are no longer popular. For many they cease to be of value, they simply do not comply or are used as a tool against a competitor. Do we need great terror again to come to our senses? Dear colleagues, my answer is yes.

1-332-0000

Maria Gabriela Zoană (S&D). – Doamnă președintă, domnule comisar, stimați colegi nu voi vorbi astăzi despre contraargumentele românilor în ceea ce privește raportul MCV și nici despre modul discreționar în care ați votat Rezoluția referitoare la România în contextul în care Jandarmeria franceză a avut un comportament mult mai dur față de protestatari, însă Parlamentul European nu a sancționat această țară, așa cum a sancționat țara mea.

Vă voi vorbi doar despre un sentiment pe care îl trăim noi, românii. Sentimentul poporului român este acela că suntem nedreptățiți de prevederile raportului MCV. Acest sentiment de nedreptate va rămâne multă vreme de acum înainte în sufletul românilor. De ce? Identitatea românească și mândria de a fi român vor atinge apogeul pe 1 decembrie. Peste exact două zile, România celebrează Centenarul Marii Uniri, 100 de ani de la momentul în care am fost recunoscuți ca o singură națiune de către Europa și întreaga lume. În contrast, românii spun că Europa de acum îi nedreptățește. Nu vrea să înțeleagă resorturile acțiunilor interne și nu îi dorește ca parteneri cu drepturi egale în marea familie europeană. Românii vor sărbători Centenarul peste două zile, având în suflet afirmațiile nefondate din cuprinsul raportului MCV. Românii nu vor fi recunoscători familiei europene anul acesta. Vă solicit...

(Președinta a întrerupt vorbitoarea)

1-333-0000

Puhemies. – Kohdan käsittely on päättynyt.

30. Seuraavan istunnon esityslista: ks. pöytäkirja

31. Istunnon päättäminen

1-336-0000

(Istunto päättyi klo 23.59.)