



C/2024/2818

26.4.2024

VOLLEDIG VERSLAG VAN DE VERGADERINGEN VAN 15 JUNI 2017

(C/2024/2818)

EUROPEES PARLEMENT

ZITTING 2017-2018

Vergaderingen van 12 t/m 15 juni 2017

STRAATSBURG

Inhoud	Bladzijde
1. Opening van de vergadering	4
2. De humanitaire situatie in Jemen (ingediende ontwerpresoluties); zie notulen	4
3. Ontwerpen van een ambitieuze industriële strategie van de EU als strategische prioriteit voor groei, banen en innovatie in Europa (debat)	4
4. Debatten over gevallen van schending van de mensenrechten, de democratie en de rechtsstaat (debat)	16
4.1. De zaak van Afgan Mukhtarli en de situatie van de media in Azerbeidzjan	16
4.2. Pakistan, met name de situatie van mensenrechtenverdedigers en de doodstraf	23
4.3. De mensenrechtensituatie in Indonesië	29
5. Verklaringen van het voorzitterschap	35
6. Samenstelling commissies: zie notulen	37
7. Stemmingen	37
7.1. Verzoek om opheffing van de immuniteit van Marine Le Pen (stemming)	37
7.2. De zaak van Afgan Mukhtarli en de situatie van de media in Azerbeidzjan (RC-B8-0414/2017, B8-0414/2017, B8-0415/2017, B8-0416/2017, B8-0417/2017, B8-0418/2017, B8-0420/2017) (stemming)	37

Inhoud	Bladzijde
7.3. Pakistan, met name de situatie van mensenrechtenverdedigers en de doodstraf (RC-B8-0419/2017, B8-0419/2017, B8-0421/2017, B8-0422/2017, B8-0423/2017, B8-0427/2017, B8-0429/2017)	38
7.4. De mensenrechtensituatie in Indonesië (RC-B8-0424/2017, B8-0424/2017, B8-0425/2017, B8-0426/2017, B8-0428/2017, B8-0430/2017, B8-0431/2017)	38
7.5. De tenuitvoerlegging van het Europees Fonds voor strategische investeringen (A8-0200/2017 - José Manuel Fernandes, Udo Bullmann) (stemming)	38
7.6. Europese agenda voor de deeleconomie (A8-0195/2017 - Nicola Danti) (stemming)	38
7.7. Onlineplatforms en de digitale eengemaakte markt (A8-0204/2017 - Henna Virkkunen, Philippe Juvin) (stemming)	38
7.8. De humanitaire situatie in Jemen (RC-B8-0407/2017, B8-0407/2017, B8-0408/2017, B8-0409/2017, B8-0410/2017, B8-0411/2017, B8-0412/2017, B8-0413/2017) (stemming) ...	38
7.9. Het statuut en de financiering van Europese politieke partijen en Europese politieke stichtingen (B8-0405/2017, B8-0406/2017) (stemming)	38
8. Stemverklaringen	38
8.1. De tenuitvoerlegging van het Europees Fonds voor strategische investeringen (A8-0200/2017 - José Manuel Fernandes, Udo Bullmann)	39
8.2. Europese agenda voor de deeleconomie (A8-0195/2017 - Nicola Danti)	40
8.3. Onlineplatforms en de digitale eengemaakte markt (A8-0204/2017 - Henna Virkkunen, Philippe Juvin)	41
8.4. De humanitaire situatie in Jemen (RC-B8-0407/2017, B8-0407/2017, B8-0408/2017, B8-0409/2017, B8-0410/2017, B8-0411/2017, B8-0412/2017, B8-0413/2017)	41
8.5. Het statuut en de financiering van Europese politieke partijen en Europese politieke stichtingen (B8-0405/2017, B8-0406/2017)	42
9. Rectificaties stemgedrag/Voorgenomen stemgedrag: zie notulen	43
10. Goedkeuring van de notulen van de vorige vergadering: zie notulen	43
11. Uitgebreide interpellaties (debat)	43
11.1. Viering van de internationale dag van het gezin 2017: bevordering van de rol van ouders bij het waarborgen van kwalitatief hoogwaardig onderwijs voor hun kinderen	43
11.2. Videoplatforms en redactionele verantwoordelijkheid	48
12. Besluiten inzake bepaalde documenten: zie notulen	52
13. Ingekomen stukken: zie notulen	53
14. Verzoekschriften: zie notulen	53

Inhoud	Bladzijde
15. Verzending van de tijdens deze vergadering aangenomen teksten: zie notulen	53
16. Rooster van de volgende vergaderingen: zie notulen	53
17. Onderbreking van de zitting	53

VOLLEDIG VERSLAG VAN DE VERGADERINGEN VAN 15 JUNI 2017

VORSITZ: ULRIKE LUNACEK

Vizepräsidentin

1. Opening van de vergadering

(Die Sitzung wird um 9.00 Uhr eröffnet.)

2. De humanitaire situatie in Jemen (ingediende ontwerpresoluties): zie notulen

3. Ontwerpen van een ambitieuze industriële strategie van de EU als strategische prioriteit voor groei, banen en innovatie in Europa (debat)

Die Präsidentin. – Als erster Punkt der Tagesordnung folgt die Aussprache über die Anfrage zur mündlichen Beantwortung an die Kommission über den Aufbau einer ambitionierten industriepolitischen Strategie der EU als strategische Priorität für Wachstum, Beschäftigung und Innovation in Europa von Patrizia Toia, Martina Werner, Dan Nica, Kathleen Van Brempt, Krišjānis Kariņš, Anne Sander, Jerzy Buzek, Massimiliano Salini im Namen der Fraktion der Progressiven Allianz der Sozialdemokraten im Europäischen Parlament und der Fraktion der Europäischen Volkspartei (Christdemokraten) (O-000047/2017 - B8-0319/2017) (2017/2732(RSP)).

Patrizia Toia, autore. – Signora Presidente, onorevoli colleghi, signora Commissario, l'industria europea costituisce la principale attività economica e fa dell'Europa il primo esportatore al mondo. Nell'industria si concentra l'80 % dell'investimento in ricerca e sviluppo e nascono lì molte scoperte e molte ricerche che hanno applicazione in tanti altri campi.

Sappiamo che il settore manifatturiero continentale ha subito negli anni della crisi un forte calo di produttività e si è abbassato il tasso di occupazione. Intere regioni della nostra Europa sono state deindustrializzate e sono entrate in crisi. Solo recentemente c'è una ripresa della quota del settore industriale rispetto al PIL europeo. Ma oggi l'industria è al bivio, tra innovazione e perdita di competitività, e l'Unione europea deve fare la sua parte, deve rilanciare una propria specifica politica industriale.

Questo è il senso e lo scopo dell'interrogazione. Chiediamo una politica industriale europea più specifica e più coraggiosa, con un piano di azione coerente e olistico che vada proprio nella direzione che si sta percorrendo ma che ha bisogno di un impulso ulteriore per sostenere la competitività delle nostre imprese, con un sostegno attivo della Commissione e anche degli Stati membri, sulla base di alcuni assi prioritari.

Il primo è l'innovazione. La rivoluzione industriale sta investendo, sostenendo e scuotendo l'intero settore industriale. L'industria 4.0 è un indispensabile passaggio, soprattutto per le PMI, per le piccole realtà produttive che da sole non ce la fanno. Allora bisogna lavorare a fianco delle imprese. *Smart manufacturing* è il tema forte di questa *policy*. Le ricerche mostrano con evidenza che le aziende che hanno un *digital manufacturing* elevato e avanzato hanno anche un premio di produttività e di fatturato più elevato. Dunque c'è un nesso molto stretto tra *smart manufacturing* e capacità produttiva delle imprese.

L'UE deve incentivare anche la convergenza tra i diversi sistemi nazionali. Non possiamo avere un'Europa con 27 industrie 4.0. Occorre un quadro di convergenza, un quadro comunitario, perché oggi c'è una diversità di performance in questo campo troppo forte. C'è un paese che è *front runner* e gli altri che arrancano, ma questa divergenza non fa bene all'intera economia europea. Ha bisogno l'economia europea di una maggiore convergenza, dunque di far sì che in tutti gli Stati nasca una capacità di *smart manufacturing* più avanzata.

Ma *digital innovation* non è solo innovazione tecnologica, è cambiamento dei modelli di business, è cambiamento del mondo del lavoro. Quindi la politica industriale deve andare anche di pari passo con una politica di formazione, di preparazione delle competenze digitali necessarie.

Il secondo punto sono gli investimenti. Noi abbiamo molti strumenti che sono stati messi in campo. Ma io penso che ci sia bisogno, innanzitutto, di rafforzare quelli che hanno dato più successo, più risultati, e poi di renderli più complementari. Penso ai fondi strutturali, penso a Horizon. Il pilastro industriale di Horizon – lo dico alla Commissaria perché certamente è sensibile a questo – deve essere più gestito anche dall'industria, più forte in termini anche di risorse dedicate, perché ha dimostrato che funziona bene. E poi penso anche al Piano Juncker. Il nuovo piano Juncker, se vuole mettere in campo investimenti significativi per la trasformazione dell'industria europea e dell'economia europea, deve dare molto di più per le piccole e medie imprese e per la loro capacità di innovazione.

Infine l'internazionalizzazione. Qui non basta sostenere gli stimoli all'esportazione, occorre sostenere il rafforzamento delle imprese perché si posizionino all'interno della catena globale di valore, che ormai è europea e internazionale. Ci vuole una politica commerciale più equilibrata nel senso anche di aprirsi, di avere un'economia aperta, ma attenta alla reciprocità e ai mutui vantaggi, sapendosi anche difendere – lo diciamo alla Commissaria che si occupa di commercio internazionale – con più capacità difensiva rispetto alla nostra industria, soprattutto dove ci sono paesi che hanno una sovraccapacità produttiva molto forte.

Il tema della *green economy* e della economia digitale non ho il tempo di trattarlo. Chiudo solo dicendo che c'è tempo e c'è bisogno per un nuovo Consiglio europeo della ricerca.

Françoise Grossetête, auteure. – Madame la Présidente, Madame le Commissaire, chers collègues, l'industrie manufacturière ne représente aujourd'hui que 13 % du PIB en Europe, soit deux fois moins qu'en 1980. Cela veut dire que nous vivons une profonde crise de compétitivité.

Beaucoup d'emplois ont été menacés, ils sont toujours menacés, car nous n'avons pas su anticiper la révolution industrielle. Pendant longtemps, nous avons oublié notre industrie. Résultat: nous devons aujourd'hui nous pencher à son chevet, car nos entreprises ont subi de plein fouet la concurrence internationale et la perte de leur compétitivité.

Le renouveau de l'industrie européenne est une priorité, car notre industrie contribue largement à la recherche et développement. Sans industrie, il n'y a pas d'innovation et il n'y a pas de croissance.

Certaines régions d'Europe, anciennement industrielles, ont vu naître leur premier hub technologique et deviennent des régions où les start-up côtoient les universités. Ce nouveau souffle, c'est l'espoir d'un redéveloppement de l'emploi et d'une nouvelle attractivité pour les investisseurs. Mais nous avons besoin d'une politique industrielle vraiment intégrée. Nous devons faire émerger des champions européens qui exportent à l'étranger. La politique européenne de concurrence ne doit pas venir entraver la création de ces champions. On ne peut pas traiter la politique industrielle avec une vision étiquée. Il est donc indispensable de donner du sens à chacun des outils que nous mettons en œuvre. Je ne vais pas les détailler, ma collègue, M^{me} Toia, en a parlé.

Enfin, notre industrie a besoin de visibilité et de stabilité, fiscale et juridique, afin de pouvoir mener des investissements à long terme. Nous devons aussi pour cela former nos jeunes générations aux métiers de demain, en particulier dans le numérique. Ce sera la condition sine qua non de l'avenir de l'industrie européenne.

Elżbieta Bieńkowska, *Member of the Commission*. – Madam President, I am very happy to have this opportunity for some further discussion of European industrial policy and grateful that European industry is thus being put in the spotlight as – I am quite sure – a major driver of growth, employment and innovation in Europe. The recent Commission reflection paper on harnessing globalisation likewise underlined the need for a strong industrial base in Europe.

Some facts, very briefly: European industry provides 50 million direct jobs, equivalent to 20% of our European workforce. Europe is the global leader in many industrial sectors which supply high-value jobs, such as engineering, chemicals, pharmaceuticals, aeronautics and automotives, and European companies play a leading role in markets for future technologies. The Commission, as you know, has taken a novel approach from the outset to supporting industrial competitiveness and transformation of the EU economy. In every single initiative that we take, we consider the impact on our industry and on jobs.

What have we done so far? For a start, we have been investing in innovation, and, of course, I mean here the opportunities being created by the investment plan and the Horizon 2020 programme. What, I think, is even more important is that direct investment for innovation is improving the climate for private investors. Then there was, for instance, our work last month on the European venture capital funds, added to which are the revamped tax and regulatory environment, the initiatives – over 200 – for further reduction and simplification under the regulatory fitness programme, and, of course, all of the measures under the single market strategy that we are working on.

We are also focusing on skills. Last year we took a radically new approach in our new Skills Agenda for Europe. In this way, for the first time really, as industry is very well placed in our new Skills Agenda, skills have come to the centre of the industrial policy agenda. In addition, we are focusing our policies on new technologies and new approaches. Let me just mention the Circular Economy Package, in which we are now providing very practical ways for industry to turn recycling of resources into strong real business opportunities.

Similarly, we are very clear about the fact that the future is digital. We are deploying all means across the policy agenda. We work from financing research to facilitating standard setting. For example, we want to ensure that our industries make a successful transition to this new digital age and we will soon be reviewing our policy on key enabling technologies. I think that this point should also be stressed because the policy dates from 2008 and a lot has changed since then – 3D printing and autonomous cars were unknown at that stage, so it is high time for a review.

Finally, we are providing sector-specific solutions when needed, from cars to steel, from space to defence. So I personally think, and I know that you know this, that we are now ready and very well prepared, as Ms Toia said, for a coherent 'holistic European industrial strategy'.

This Commission is 100% committed to fostering a strong industrial base in Europe to face both the challenges of globalisation and, of course, the fourth industrial revolution. Our approach is result oriented. We need to take concrete actions to modernise the economy at the EU's different levels – EU, national and regional. And we will coordinate national industrial strategies, in particular those related to digitalisation. One way of doing so is to continue the dialogue with industry and with the Member States, so on the last day of February I inaugurated the first European Industry Day, an event at which we all agreed to explore the priority areas, in other words people, territory and technologies.

Let me just refer briefly to each of them. As regards people, given the major transformation in the EU economy, we really need massive upskilling and reskilling of our workforce to avoid widening social gaps. Regarding territory, industrial transformation really happens at regional and local level, so we need to empower regions and to respond to the challenges that we are facing and, of course, make the best of the opportunities. And as far as technologies are concerned, more needs to be done to accelerate the spread of technology in order to close the productivity gap. That is the major issue here. The recent Commission reflection paper on harnessing globalisation picked out exactly the same three areas and points for Europe's response to globalisation.

In its most recent discussion, last month, the Competitiveness Council adopted conclusions on industry and for the first time in many years showed that there is wide agreement among Member States on the importance of industry and the need for a European industrial strategy. Not a single country was against this, so that was really a very strong signal from the Member States as well. As they say, we are all friends of industry now.

The European Commission is the force for strengthening industrial competitiveness. Our efforts have to be bolstered by the Member States. And we also need Parliament's support to put in place a legislative framework to facilitate industrial modernisation. We need to have an open debate on how Europe, working together, could do more for European industry. Finally, I also want to underline that when measuring our results, the results of our policies and activities, we could look far beyond the 20% target for manufacturing in our economy.

So once again, I would like to thank Parliament for today's discussion. I am quite convinced that we need a common vision for the future of European industry, and your contribution and support are vital to that end.

Massimiliano Salini, *a nome del gruppo PPE*. – Signora Presidente, onorevoli colleghi, signora Commissario, io in un minuto e mezzo non voglio ricordare ancora una volta il valore numerico dell'industria europea. Parleremo tutti durante questa discussione di numeri importanti, di piccole e medie imprese, di grandi aziende e quant'altro. Io farò un'unica sottolineatura: il sostegno che abbiamo deciso di dare qualche anno fa, ribadendolo, in modo chiaro, a partire dalla Commissione, a partire da quanto sostenuto dal suo predecessore, che oggi è il Presidente del Parlamento europeo, Antonio Tajani.

Ci siamo dati come obiettivo di raggiungere il 20 % del prodotto interno lordo derivante da industria, ma questa cosa è rimasta teorica. Oggi siamo al 2017 e siamo al 15 %. Allora, cerchiamo di essere onesti. Se ci diamo degli obiettivi vincolanti, giustissimi, ad esempio nell'ambito delle politiche di tutela ambientale in ordine alla grande emergenza dei cambiamenti climatici, ma non ci diamo obiettivi vincolanti sul settore industriale, facciamo un danno sia alle politiche climatiche che all'industria, perché significa che, se quelli sono vincolanti e questi non lo sono come obiettivi, significa che quelli non hanno l'obiettivo di tutelare l'ambiente, ma di modificare e di indebolire l'industria.

Allora, siccome noi come europei sosteniamo un modello di sviluppo economico in cui l'uomo è protagonista e conta più di un fungo, perché genera valore e genera capacità anche di tutela climatica, rendiamo gli obiettivi industriali vincolanti quanto quelli, e questo sarà un atto di grande sincerità e onestà, industriale e culturale.

Martina Werner, *im Namen der S&D-Fraktion*. – Frau Präsidentin, Frau Kommissarin, Kolleginnen und Kollegen! Bisher hatte ich eigentlich immer das Gefühl, dass wir beim Dialog mit der Europäischen Kommission immer aneinander vorbeigeredet haben. Für mich geht es bei der Industriepolitik nämlich nicht um die Aufzählung, was alles direkt oder indirekt die industrielle Entwicklung beeinflusst. Stattdessen soll eine EU-Industriestrategie Ziele definieren und Maßnahmen benennen, wie sie erreicht werden können.

Der Mainstreamansatz der Kommission kommt in einer Zeit an seine Grenzen, wo Herausforderungen die Stabilität der europäischen Industrie auf den Prüfstand stellen. Das sind der enorme internationale Wettbewerbsdruck und die Digitalisierung. Wenn wir über Industriepolitik reden, müssen wir aber auch zwei Dimensionen im Blick haben – die äußere und die innere.

Im ersten Fall müssen wir die Industriepolitik noch viel stärker mit der Handelspolitik verzahnen. Die Amerikaner profitieren vom Austausch mit der EU – das wird dann auch irgendwann Trump verstehen –, und die Chinesen sind noch auf ausländisches Know-how angewiesen. Diese Hebel sollten wir nutzen. Die chinesische Rhetorik vom freien Handel müssen wir beim Wort nehmen und auf Gegenseitigkeit beim Marktzugang und den Schutz des geistigen Eigentums drängen.

Wenn wir auf Europa schauen, ist es mir besonders wichtig, dass Wettbewerbs-, Umwelt-, Sozial- und Handelspolitik besser ineinandergreifen. Eine stärkere Verzahnung von Politikbereichen heißt aber auch, dass wir auch viel mehr auf die gesellschaftliche Akzeptanz achten müssen, und die gibt es nur in einem Dialog mit Gewerkschaften und Arbeitgebern. In Deutschland arbeitet zum Beispiel das Bündnis Zukunft der Industrie erfolgreich, und ich bin sicher, dass es ähnliche Foren auch in anderen Mitgliedstaaten gibt.

Aus einem europäischen Dialog heraus kann eine Industriestrategie entstehen, die branchenübergreifende und sektorale Elemente sinnvoll miteinander verbindet. Sie muss Antworten finden auf Fragen: Wie halten wir die Wertschöpfung und Know-how in Europa, und welche Zukunftsfelder sind eigentlich entscheidend? Und erst danach macht es Sinn, den Rechtsrahmen anzupassen oder etwa die Schwerpunkte für die Forschungs- und Infrastrukturförderung nach 2020 festzulegen. Deswegen ist jetzt der richtige Zeitpunkt für eine Reflektion über die Industriepolitik, und dafür, dass die Kommission dann endlich einen Vorschlag dazu macht.

Evžen Tošenovský, za skupinu ECR. – Paní předsedající, v globalizovaném světě je velmi důležité udržet konkurenceschopnost našeho průmyslu. EU potřebuje strategický přístup k průmyslové politice a v tomto smyslu nás rovněž zajímá, co dokázala a na čem pracuje Evropská komise.

EU ale především potřebuje rozumný přístup v širším kontextu evropských politik. Při neustále se zvyšujících omezeních, ať již jsou založena na snižování emisí a dalších normách či předpisech sociální ochrany, se samozřejmě zvyšují fixní náklady oproti zemím, kde nejsou tak přísná pravidla jako v EU.

Pokud se vrátím k průmyslové politice v užším smyslu, ta musí být založena na podpoře výzkumu, co nejrychlejším uplatňování inovací a zrychlení vývoje nejmodernějších technologií a jejich aplikace v samotné výrobě. Využití ohromného potenciálu v digitálních technologiích, v chemickém výzkumu, ve špičkovém strojírenství, v nanotechnologiích a v kosmických technologiích dává naději na budoucí růst průmyslu v členských zemích EU.

Enrique Calvet Chambon, en nombre del Grupo ALDE. – Excelentísima señora comisaria, excelentísima señora presidenta. Vamos a ver, por fin, por fin parece que se toma en serio una política industrial para Europa. Pero, dicho esto, debo decir con todo respeto que me ha desilusionado un poco la postura de la señora comisaria.

De nuevo, volvemos a hablar de la innovación. Está muy bien. Por supuesto, ¿quién no va a ir a por la innovación? Y, sobre todo, ligada al medio ambiente. Está muy bien. De nuevo, volvemos a hablar, en las soluciones, de la economía circular, que, por supuesto, el Grupo ALDE apoya, etcétera.

No, mire usted, eso sigue siendo echar balones fuera. Porque sí podemos decir «mire usted lo que innovan los Estados Unidos». Sí, pero los Estados Unidos tienen diez portaviones paseándose por el mundo con toda la flota acompañante. Y no hay, no hay gran complejo económico que tenga su independencia, su fuerza negociadora, la prosperidad y la libertad de su pueblo si no tiene un amplio complejo industrial o militar con investigación. Y de eso estamos hablando. Y de eso hablaba el señor Tajani cuando era comisario de Industria, de ese 20 %.

Lo que hay que hacer es tomarse muy en serio que la libertad, la prosperidad, el futuro en independencia o interdependencia teniendo palabra en el mundo radica en tener una fuente política industrial que fabrica cosas, no solo que innova. Y eso depende de que la Comisión se lo tome como prioridad, palabra clave de nuestra pregunta. Como prioridad, invirtiendo en racionalizar la política de competencia, invirtiendo en empleo de calidad, estable, con enorme valor añadido. Las pymes se van a beneficiar, porque viven en perfecta simbiosis con las grandes empresas y los grandes planes industriales. Estabilidad. Queremos estabilidad.

Y, al final, hay que explicarle a la gente que todo ese esfuerzo económico será para su libertad, como, por ejemplo, Galileo.

Paloma López Bermejo, *en nombre del Grupo GUE/NGL*. – Señora presidenta. Una política industrial ambiciosa debe basarse necesariamente en cuatro aspectos: la intervención pública, la cohesión territorial, los derechos sociales y un nuevo marco para el comercio global.

Sin regulación, la industria se convierte en el rehén de las finanzas y los rentistas, como el oligopolio eléctrico, pendiente solo de sus beneficios y no del desarrollo productivo del país. Por lo tanto, el objetivo del 20 % del PIB industrial no puede conseguirse si estos sectores no se ponen al servicio del interés general.

Nuestra organización aboga por la nacionalización de la energía y de la banca, pero incluso en el marco actual precisamos de reformas para abaratar los costes industriales.

Pensemos en los contratos bilaterales entre generadores e industria o dentro de los polígonos industriales, posibilidades muy poco explotadas, por ejemplo, con gobiernos de países como España.

Asimismo, necesitamos luchar contra las asimetrías en el seno de la Unión Europea: mientras algunos países acumulan superávit comerciales, otros tenemos una industria anémica, lo que nos impide desarrollar un modelo productivo y nos condena al paro y la precariedad. Solo un auténtico plan de inversión dirigido a aquellas regiones menos industrializadas asegurará que estas se desarrollen a largo plazo.

Hablemos también de los derechos laborales: relocalizaciones, externalizaciones y subcontratas industriales se multiplican para debilitar al movimiento obrero. Si queremos una industria fuerte, tenemos que adaptar la legislación para reforzar la negociación colectiva. Si Europa quiere liderar la transición industrial, tiene que hacerlo desde la productividad y no desde la precariedad.

Finalmente, necesitamos otra visión del comercio global. Está en manos de este Parlamento y del Consejo decidir si aceptan la liberalización unilateral de los intercambios con China o si quieren acelerar la destrucción del empleo industrial a través de acuerdos comerciales como el TTIP.

Necesitamos nuevas formas para el comercio global, normas que protejan los estándares sociales, medioambientales y que luchen contra el *dumping*.

Reinhard Bütikofer, *im Namen der Verts/ALE-Fraktion*. – Frau Präsidentin, Frau Kommissarin, liebe Kolleginnen und Kollegen! Ich freue mich sehr über diese Diskussion und möchte mich ausdrücklich bedanken bei den Kollegen, die das initiiert haben.

Frau Bieńkowska, wenn Sie gut zugehört haben, sollten Sie aus dieser Diskussion jetzt schon eine Lehre ziehen: Hören Sie auf, sich selbst auf die Schulter zu klopfen, als würden Sie schon alles richtig machen! In einer Zeit, in der eine Revolution unterwegs ist, muss man großen Gestaltungsehrgeiz an den Tag legen, wenn man nicht in der Sackgasse landen will. Diesen Gestaltungsehrgeiz sehe ich bei Ihnen noch nicht.

Sechs Grundsätze sehe ich notwendig für diese industriepolitische Initiative, um die es hier geht. Erstens: Wir brauchen eine europäische Strategie, nicht nur eine Agglomeration von nationalen Strategien. Zweitens: Innovation muss im Zentrum stehen. Das sagen hier alle. Drittens: Wir brauchen eine Querschnittspolitik statt der Addition von versäulten Versuchen. Viertens: Wir brauchen Inklusivität, und Inklusivität bezieht sich sowohl auf die Arbeitnehmerinnen und Arbeitnehmer, von denen Frau Werner gesprochen hat, als auch auf die Regionen, von denen wir keine abhängen dürfen. Fünftens: Wir brauchen einen holistischen Ansatz, wie Frau Toia gesagt hat.

Holistischer Ansatz heißt aus meiner Sicht auch, dass wir Wettbewerbsfähigkeit und Nachhaltigkeit zusammennehmen müssen; das hat dieses Parlament schon mal beschlossen. Bei Ihnen, Frau Bieńkowska, kommt das Wort gar nicht vor. Das einzige Mal, wo Sie überhaupt in die Richtung gehen, reden Sie vom Klima, aber nur von Investitionsklima. Da ist ein großes Loch in Ihrer Vision! Sie sehen gar nicht, was die Basis für eine erfolgreiche europäische Industriepolitik der Zukunft ist, nämlich die Kombination von Wettbewerbsfähigkeit und Nachhaltigkeit, die Kombination von Digitalisierung und Ökoeffizienzstrategien.

Und sechstens: Wir brauchen auch Rahmenbedingungen. Wir haben gestern über die Frage von ausländischen Direktinvestitionen in sensiblen Bereichen diskutiert. Wir müssen über Wettbewerbsrecht diskutieren.

Das alles gehört zusammen – ich freue mich darauf.

Raymond Finch, *on behalf of the EFDD Group*. – Madam President, all the talk here has been about what the EU can and should do to enable growth, employment and innovation in Europe. I have an idea that to all of you might seem strange and against all precedent, but will, I think, work. Do nothing. In fact, stop what you are doing now. Roll it back. Let our nation-states do what they think is best for their peoples. Every nation is different, every nation has different strengths, circumstances and psyches. Your overarching one-size-fits-all strategies simply do not work and will only cause more hardship across our continent. Stop trying to harmonise everything. All your big plans do is give influence to the tens of thousands of lobbyists and their paymasters in tax-eating mega businesses and NGOs which infest your corridors of power and restrict innovation.

Let nations set their own tax rates. Let them do what they think best. Let national governments and their peoples again have the freedom they need to innovate and to create employment. This incessant desire to do something is actually a drag on innovation and employment. Do not follow the five-year plan mentality of social cooperative-style ideology. You cannot legislate yourselves into prosperity. Step back. Stop piling administrative burdens onto businesses and governments and let people work in their own enlightened economic self-interest. Innovation happens only when people have the freedom to innovate. Forcing people into your perception of what they should do is not only morally wrong: it is counterproductive. Resist the prescriptive urge. That is the only path to prosperity.

This constant desire to do something, anything, merely brings into existence a boa constrictor that chokes life and spirit from free peoples. Resist it. Let small businesses breathe. Take your fingers off your legislative trigger and burn some of the red tape you have already created. We will all be much happier for it.

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

Barbara Kappel, *im Namen der ENF-Fraktion*. – Frau Präsidentin, Frau Kommissarin Bieńkowska! Die Finanzkrise hat uns gezeigt, dass eine starke Realwirtschaft und eine starke industrielle Basis wesentlich sind, um Wachstum und Beschäftigung zu schaffen. Länder mit einer starken industriellen Basis haben die Krise viel schneller überwunden als andere, und deshalb ist es auch umso wichtiger, eine ambitionierte und zukunftsweisende Industriestrategie zu entwickeln, eine Industriestrategie, die mittel- und langfristige Ziele konkret festlegt und auch einen Aktionsplan mit Maßnahmen, wie diese Ziele umgesetzt werden können, dazu festlegt.

Es bedarf dazu eines *efforts* der Kommission gemeinsam mit den Mitgliedstaaten, denn viele Faktoren, die die Wettbewerbsfähigkeit und die Nachhaltigkeit der Industriebeschäftigten beeinträchtigen, sind dieselben. Es sind dies zu wenige Investitionen, Schwierigkeiten beim Zugang von Finanzmitteln und Märkten, hohe Energiepreise, hoher Administrations- und Verwaltungsaufwand und, heute mehr als je zuvor, insbesondere im Bereich der Digitalisierung, fehlende Ausbildungsinhalte.

Die Mitgliedstaaten sind besonders gefordert, die steuerlichen Rahmenbedingungen für die Unternehmen bereitzustellen, mit einer modernen Unternehmensbesteuerung administrative Hürden abzubauen, in Forschung und Entwicklung zu investieren und das zu fördern, die Verkehrs-, Energie- und Kommunikationsinfrastruktur auszubauen – insbesondere die digitale Infrastruktur für Industrie 4.0 –, Strukturreformen umzusetzen und eine verantwortungsvolle Haushaltspolitik zu führen.

Die Kommission hat eine sehr wichtige Rolle, insbesondere was den Zugang zu Finanzierungsoptionen betrifft, neben Bankfinanzierungen auch den Zugang zu bankunabhängigen Finanzierungen – „Kapitalmarktunion“ ist das Stichwort. Auch bei der Handelspolitik – es wurde schon angesprochen – ist es ganz wesentlich, diese europäische Handelsstrategie in einem globalen Kontext zu sehen und auch den europäischen Unternehmen den Zugang zu sichern, Rohstoffversorgung zu gewährleisten – ebenso eine gemeinsame Klima- und Energiestrategie sowie eine digitale Strategie.

Wenn wir das Ziel erreichen wollen, einen 20 %igen Anteil am BIP der Industrie zu erreichen oder vielleicht mehr als 20 %, wie Sie es sagten, Frau Kommissarin – sehr gerne. Aber dann muss es diesen gemeinsamen *effort* geben, dann brauchen wir diese gemeinsame Industriestrategie, und dann müssen alle – die Kommission, der Rat und auch das Parlament – an einem Strang ziehen.

Λάμπρος Φουντούλης (NI). – Κυρία Πρόεδρε, δυστυχώς η βιομηχανική παραγωγή στην Ένωση βαίνει διαρκώς μειούμενη. Ειδικά σε ορισμένες χώρες έχει επέλθει σχεδόν πλήρης εξαφάνιση της βιομηχανικής δραστηριότητας. Στην Ελλάδα, η Επιτροπή συμμετέχει ενεργά στην επιβολή ενός ασφυκτικού φορολογικού και ασφαλιστικού πλαισίου, το οποίο καταστρέφει τόσο τις εμπορικές επιχειρήσεις όσο και τις βιομηχανίες και βιοτεχνίες. Μέσω των συμφωνιών που προωθεί η Ένωση με τις αδασμολόγητες εισαγωγές και το ελεύθερο εμπόριο από τρίτες χώρες, δίνει το τελειωτικό χτύπημα σε έναν ήδη πληγωμένο τομέα της οικονομίας, ο οποίος μπορεί να δημιουργήσει μαζικά θέσεις εργασίας, ενώ τα δικαιώματα των εργαζομένων είναι σχετικά ευκολότερο να διασφαλιστούν στις μεγάλες βιομηχανίες σε σχέση με τις μικρές και δύσκολα ελεγχόμενες επιχειρήσεις. Επίσης, με την απαξίωση της βιομηχανικής παραγωγής, τίθεται σε κίνδυνο η έρευνα και ανάπτυξη νέων τεχνολογιών. Απαιτείται μία άμεση αλλαγή της πολιτικής της Ενώσεως με σκοπό τη δημιουργία ενός δίκαιου οικονομικού και φορολογικού υπόβαθρου για τις βιομηχανίες, οι οποίες μπορούν και πρέπει να αποτελέσουν την ατμομηχανή της ανάπτυξης. Ταυτόχρονα, θα πρέπει να εξασφαλιστεί και εκ μέρους των βιομηχανιών η προστασία των δικαιωμάτων των εργαζομένων και του περιβάλλοντος.

Herbert Reul (PPE). – Frau Präsidentin, Frau Kommissarin! Industrie ist wichtig für den Wohlstand und das Wohlergehen der Menschen in Europa. Offensichtlich läuft es nicht gut – das ist der Bestand. Der Industrieanteil in der Welt geht zurück, der europäische Anteil wird weniger. Also muss da etwas getan werden. Deswegen kann auch nicht alles richtig gewesen sein. Und jetzt gibt es darüber Streit, was das Richtige ist. Die einen sagen: noch einen Dialog, noch ein Gespräch; manche haben sogar gesagt: noch mehr Gesetze; andere haben gesagt: mehr Geld.

Ich glaube, das ist alles verkehrt. Ich glaube – das haben einige Kollegen hier auch vorgetragen –, Industrie in Europa hat dann eine Chance, wenn wir an den Stellen helfen, wo wir helfen können, aber der Industrie auch die Möglichkeiten geben, sich selbst entwickeln zu lassen.

Der Schlüssel ist Innovation – ja klar! Was machen wir bei Horizon? Wir kürzen. Super, super Beitrag. Strukturreformen realisieren in den Ländern: Da sind die Mitgliedstaaten zuständig. Da, wo Mitgliedstaaten nicht richtig vorankommen, helfen wir, machen wir Druck – halbherzig. Halbherzig – nicht immer ergreift die Kommission die Möglichkeiten, die da sind.

Den Handel vorantreiben, internationale Handelsbeziehungen vorantreiben: Wir streiten uns darüber, ob CETA richtig ist, ob TTIP richtig ist – die Hälfte der Veranstaltung hier im Saal will das gar nicht.

Ja, und dann geht es um die Frage: Hat die Industrie, haben die Unternehmen auch Spielräume, wo sie sich entwickeln können, natürlich innerhalb von vorgegebenen Regulierungen? Und da beschließen wir munter weiter Regulierung. Die Wahrheit ist: Wir beschließen einen Großteil der Belastungen, die die europäische Industrie zu ertragen hat, wenn Sie den ganzen Bereich von Industrie, Klimaschutz, Energiepolitik und Sonstigem angucken. Und das macht keinen Sinn so. Es geht nicht ums Prinzip, sondern es geht um das Ausmaß. Und wir übertreiben maßlos.

(Der Redner ist damit einverstanden, eine Frage nach dem Verfahren der „blauen Karte“ gemäß Artikel 162 Absatz 8 der Geschäftsordnung zu beantworten.)

Reinhard Bütikofer (Verts/ALE), Frage nach dem Verfahren der „blauen Karte“. – Herr Kollege Reul! Da Sie gerade so scharf kritisiert haben, dass wir ständig Belastungen auf die Industrie häufen, würde ich Sie bitten aufzuzählen: Welche Belastungen hat dieses Parlament auf Initiative der Juncker-Kommission seit 2014 beschlossen, die Sie so hart kritisieren?

Herbert Reul (PPE), Antwort auf eine Frage nach dem Verfahren der „blauen Karte“. – Gerne. Sie wissen doch, dass bei der Frage Emissionshandel meines Erachtens übertrieben wird. Da haben wir versucht, als Parlament noch zu korrigieren. Ich bin mal gespannt, was rauskommt. Sie und Ihre Fraktion sind doch locker dabei, immer höhere Anforderungen bei Energieeffizienz, bei höheren Anteilen von erneuerbaren Energien zu haben. Das treibt die Kosten in die Höhe.

Das sind nur zwei kleine Beispiele, die ich nenne. Ich hätte noch ein paar mehr, aber ich darf nicht länger reden.

Edouard Martin (S&D). – Madame la Présidente, Madame la Commissaire, heureux de vous revoir, j'étais inquiet, j'ai même failli lancer une alerte enlèvement, car vous êtes aux abonnés absents.

Depuis votre audition de 2014, vous annoncez vouloir faire passer le poids de l'industrie à 20 % du PIB européen, vous voulez redevenir leader sur un certain nombre de segments, etc. Certes, vous avez habilement surfé sur l'héritage de vos prédécesseurs, je pense notamment à Galileo, mais vous, qu'avez-vous engagé vous-même?

Le compte n'y est pas. Il est donc plus que temps que vous mettiez sur la table une feuille de route pour atteindre l'objectif que nous nous sommes collectivement fixé. Cela ne peut pas se limiter à l'organisation de réunions de haut niveau ou autres réunions de pince-fesses, cela ne fait en rien avancer la cause. Cette feuille de route ne saurait être non plus la simple addition de politiques sectorielles que vous vantez régulièrement, mais dont, bien souvent, les leviers vous échappent.

Nous avons besoin d'une véritable stratégie pour redonner un avenir à l'industrie européenne. Nous, les socialistes, la déclinons sous trois aspects.

D'abord, une industrie durable. Il ne suffit pas de se gargariser de la COP21. Nous pouvons maintenir l'activité industrielle, y compris lourde, sur le territoire européen, à condition de faire de la durabilité le premier élément de compétitivité. Le gavage de quotas de CO₂, malheureusement, promeut le non-investissement. Il faut aussi accélérer les politiques comme l'économie circulaire. Vous en avez parlé, nous attendons des actes.

Ensuite, une concurrence équitable à l'international. Cela touche à la fois au commerce international, ce que d'aucuns appellent le protectionnisme intelligent ou, du moins, la fin de la naïveté européenne (je pense notamment à l'exemple chinois), au droit à la concurrence et à la réévaluation du marché pertinent, prenant en compte la réalité de la mondialisation et une plus grande souplesse quant à l'émergence de champions européens.

Enfin, nous avons besoin d'une industrie riche de ses savoirs et respectueuse du dialogue social. Il ne peut y avoir d'industrie européenne sans travailleurs bien formés, correctement protégés contre les aléas d'une économie de plus en plus financiarisée et en mesure de jouer pleinement leur rôle, en bons connaisseurs de leur outils de travail, dans la bonne gestion et les décisions stratégiques de leur entreprise.

Bronis Ropė (Verts/ALE). – Iš tikrųjų manau, kad klausimas yra pakankamai svarbus ir nevienodas atskirose valstybėse – vienoms valstybėms jis mažiau svarbus, kitoms – daugiau svarbus, bet jis turi spręsti tuos klausimus, kurie šiandien yra užsienėje, ypač tose šalyse, kur yra žemas užimtumo lygis ir mažos pajamos. Ne tik turi kurti darbo vietas, bet tos darbo vietos turi būti ir pakankamai normaliai apmokamos. Priešingu atveju mes neišspręsim skirtumo tarp regionų atskirose šalyse ir skirtumų tarp šalių Europoje. Jeigu mes nespręsim kartu ir šitų klausimų, tai migracijos procesų – tiek vidinių migracijos procesų, tiek išorinių migracijos procesų – nesuvaldysime. Ir aš matau dar vieną įrankį – tai daugiau įtraukti vietos valdžios organus, būtent į pramonės plėtrą, ir susieti naudą, kurią gauna pramonė, kad ją gautų ir vietos valdžia, vietos gyventojai, kad jie būtų tuo suinteresuoti.

Dominique Bilde (ENF). – Madame la Présidente, cela fait plus de vingt ans que les États membres de l'Union se désindustrialisent. Pour les États appartenant à la zone euro, exception faite de l'Allemagne, où l'euro est fort et maintenu, la désindustrialisation se fait encore plus vite.

La doctrine européenne de l'économie de la connaissance a contribué depuis le début des années 2000 à la perte de compétitivité de nos industries face aux pays émergents. L'Union n'a pas su innover, se laissant distancer par les pays asiatiques et les États-Unis faute d'investissements suffisants. Elle n'a pas su davantage se prémunir de la concurrence des régions n'ayant pas nos normes sociales. Ce sont là les véritables raisons des délocalisations progressives, parfois même quand les usines tournent bien. Ce n'est pas un hasard si la part de l'industrie européenne dans le PIB mondial a régressé de 30,4 % en 2008 à 23,8 % aujourd'hui.

Les déclarations d'intention de la Commission européenne face à cette réalité semblent frappées du sceau de l'hypocrisie et de l'incompétence. Le report à 2030 de l'objectif de porter à 20 % la part de l'industrie dans le PIB de l'Union d'ici à 2020 en est la preuve.

La Commission cherche à calmer les colères dues aux multiples fermetures d'usines et au démantèlement de pans entiers de notre industrie, alors qu'elle est grandement responsable de l'absence totale de contrôle et de la mondialisation, en ressassant inlassablement l'idée de la concurrence libre pendant que nos concurrents développent des systèmes protecteurs.

Les cas Alstom et Caterpillar illustrent de manière exemplaire les errements d'une économie européenne incapable de fixer une stratégie et de se défendre. Pourquoi continuer à cautionner des politiques qui nous ruinent?

Il est temps que nous retrouvions la maîtrise de notre destin et de nos instruments de souveraineté. Vous voulez être ambitieux? Alors, ayez le courage de renoncer à vos idéaux et, enfin, de défendre notre industrie. C'est maintenant qu'il faut le faire. Après, il sera trop tard.

Anne Sander (PPE). – Madame la Présidente, Madame la Commissaire, nous le savons, la politique industrielle de l'Union européenne n'a jamais été véritablement ambitieuse. En privilégiant les services au détriment de l'industrie, nous avons laissé de côté des pans entiers de notre économie, ce qui a conduit à la suppression de 3,5 millions d'emplois industriels entre 2008 et 2014. Cette absence de stratégie pose des problèmes majeurs d'emploi, d'innovation, ainsi que de cohésion sociale et territoriale.

Aujourd'hui, au-delà des approches sectorielles, il nous faut un cadre, une vision, une feuille de route à moyen et long terme. Il nous faut absolument une articulation cohérente entre les politiques commerciales, environnementales, énergétiques, d'investissement, de concurrence et d'emploi.

L'Europe dispose d'atouts industriels importants, avec des leaders mondiaux dans les domaines de la pharmacie, de l'automobile, de la chimie, de la sidérurgie ou encore dans le ferroviaire.

Ne laissons pas nos concurrents nous distancer en étant trop naïfs ou trop timides.

Bernd Lange (S&D). – Frau Präsidentin! Frau Kommissarin, wir haben Ihnen fünf relativ konkrete Fragen gestellt. Ich habe aber keine Antworten gehört. Das häufigste, was Sie in Ihrer Rede formuliert haben, ist „man müsste“ oder „wir müssten“, und das ist keine Antwort auf eine Frage – weil wir in der Tat erwarten, dass wir auf die Entwicklung reagieren.

Wenn man sich das anguckt: Da fährt ein Schnellzug, getrieben von Globalisierung, getrieben von Digitalisierung, und wir gucken, was die alte Dampflok macht, und versuchen, an der einen oder anderen Stellschraube zu drehen. Das ist keine Lösung! Wir brauchen, wie Frau Toia gesagt hat, eine integrierte Strategie innerhalb der EU und innerhalb der unterschiedlichen Sektoren. Deswegen brauchen wir Antworten auf die Frage, wie Sie den Innovationsvorsprung halten wollen, wie Sie die Teilhabe von Arbeitnehmerinnen und Arbeitnehmern sichern wollen, wie Sie sichern wollen, dass der europäische Anteil an globalen Wertschöpfungsketten gestärkt wird. Also nicht „man müsste“, sondern „wann?“ und „was?“!

Markus Pieper (PPE). – Frau Präsidentin! Die Aufträge der Industrie und ihre Exporte bringen Einkommen in die Region. Daraus entstehen Arbeitsplätze und Kaufkraft, daraus entstehen Steuereinnahmen, daraus finanzieren wir soziale Errungenschaften. Das ist ein Teil des sozialen Europas – der wohl wichtigste Teil. Wir sollten die Industrie deshalb hüten wie unseren Augapfel und Warnzeichen ernst nehmen.

Erstens: Investitionen bei energieintensiven Betrieben im Inland sind geringer als Abschreibungen – das ist schleichende Deindustrialisierung. Wir sind Klima- und Umweltweltmeister – überdrehen wir diese Schraube weiter, machen andere Regionen unser Business. Verlierer sind Klima und Arbeitsplätze. Deshalb muss unsere Klimapolitik endlich wieder die Wettbewerbsfähigkeit der Wirtschaft im Auge haben.

Zweitens: Die großen Datenfirmen kommen nicht aus Europa – von der Automobilindustrie bis zum Ladenbau. Wer aber die Daten zum Kundenverhalten heute kennt, bestimmt die Produkte von morgen. Deshalb müssen wir auf Digitalisierung und Breitband setzen. Deshalb sind aber auch Daten mehr Rohstoff als Gefahrenquelle. Das muss mehr ins Bewusstsein unserer Politik.

Pilar del Castillo Vera (PPE). – Señora presidenta, señora comisaria, hoy es un día en el que demostramos cuál es el camino por el que tiene que avanzar la Unión Europea. El camino de las realizaciones concretas. Insisto, el camino de las realizaciones concretas. Como el fin del *roaming*, que ha empezado hoy. Una realización concreta que beneficia a más de quinientos millones de personas y a toda la industria europea, en especial a las pequeñas y medianas empresas, y que supone un paso importante en el desarrollo del mercado único digital.

La competitividad de la industria europea necesita avanzar por ese camino de realizaciones concretas. Y en esa dirección es urgente contar con las infraestructuras de redes fijas y de banda ancha para desarrollar la mejor conectividad, que permita a su vez, desarrollar el 5G y, con ello, tener un instrumento para que la industria europea se beneficie de tecnologías digitales como el internet de las cosas, que constituyen una extraordinaria oportunidad para la competitividad global de la industria de manufacturas.

Jiří Pospíšil (PPE). – Paní komisařko, já jsem velmi pozorně poslouchal vaše vystoupení a musím říct, že mě také zklamalo. Po třech letech, kdy funguje Komise, říkat pouze obecné věty, to podle mě evropskému průmyslu příliš nepomůže. Já si stejně jako někteří moji kolegové myslím, že je nutné vytvářet lepší podmínky pro evropský průmysl, ale že to určitě není cestou regulací. Naopak bourání regulací je to, co je třeba ze strany Evropské komise dělat. Je třeba zlepšovat a zkvalitňovat vnitřní trh. Mnohokrát zde byla zmiňována digitální agenda. Kdyby alespoň v této oblasti se podařily konkrétní kroky ještě v tomto volebním období, pak by to průmyslu určitě pomohlo. Určitě je nutné hovořit o konkrétních investicích do inovací a do výzkumu, to je také důležitá věc. Já bych chtěl ještě zmínit v tom krátkém čase, který mám, mezinárodní obchodní politiku Evropské unie. Výrazně pomáhají smlouvy o volném obchodu, o tom jsme se mohli přesvědčit například u smlouvy s Jižní Koreou, kterou jsme nedávno vyhodnocovali.

Catch-the-eye-Verfahren

Seán Kelly (PPE). – Madam President, I listened to Mr Reul's answer to the question by Mr Bütikofer and I think it made sense, because there is a tendency – especially in this mandate – for Parliament, whenever the Commission makes a proposal, to have to change it, be it good or bad. We have to go either above or below what the Commission says. Sometimes this does not make sense, and I think we have to look at it, especially if we want to grow industry in Europe, to do what is practical, and not to be overburdening them with all sorts of regulations, etc., that are unnecessary.

The second point I would make is that talent is vital as well. Recently, BorgWarner in the town where I live, close to Tralee in Ireland, expanded. They said that the reason they did so was that the local institute of technology (IT) was producing the talent they needed. We have to support the ITs in particular, in order to bring the talent that is needed for the industries of the future.

Nicola Caputo (S&D). – Signora Presidente, onorevoli colleghi, l'Unione europea deve dotarsi di una strategia di politica industriale in grado di proteggere gli interessi degli Stati membri, una strategia improntata al mantenimento della competitività dell'industria europea a livello globale. La Commissione ha più volte sottolineato l'obiettivo di riportare la quota dell'industria rispetto al PIL dell'Unione europea al 20 % entro il 2020, obiettivo difficilmente realizzabile se non mettiamo in campo una maggiore ambizione puntando maggiormente su innovazione e sostenibilità.

Occorre una strategia di politica industriale olistica, in grado di guidare la politica industriale integrando l'obiettivo del 20 % di PIL con gli obiettivi in materia di clima ed energia per il 2030. La *green economy* è la via della nuova rivoluzione industriale. Solo se avremo il coraggio e la capacità di puntarci seriamente determineremo un vantaggio competitivo per il nostro sistema. L'azione va incentrata sulle piccole e medie imprese, favorendo la collaborazione produttiva attraverso la gestione intelligente dei canali distributivi, la gestione integrata della logistica in rete e l'interoperabilità dei sistemi informativi.

Ελευθέριος Συναδινός (NI). – Κυρία Πρόεδρε, η ανάπτυξη της βιομηχανίας στηρίζεται στην ικανότητά της να προσαρμόζεται και να καινοτομεί. Όμως, η έλλειψη ενωσιακής στρατηγικής και οι άστοχες φορολογικές πολιτικές έχουν επιφέρει καταστροφικά αποτελέσματα. Η μείωση των δαπανών παραγωγής δεν στηρίχθηκε στη βελτίωση της ενεργειακής και τεχνολογικής απόδοσης, αλλά μετατοπίστηκε στην αντίστοιχη μείωση του μισθολογικού κόστους και των συνταξιοδοτικών εισφορών. Η έλλειψη επαρκούς πρόσβασης σε κατάλληλη χρηματοδότηση και η αποτυχία περιορισμού της γραφειοκρατίας και των διοικητικών διατυπώσεων επιβαρύνουν υπέρμετρα τις μικρομεσαίες βιομηχανικές επιχειρήσεις και τις εξαναγκάζουν στη φοροαποφυγή. Η επιδίωξη υψηλής εξειδίκευσης έχει εγκαταλειφθεί. Η διασύνδεση της ερευνητικής κοινότητας με τη βιομηχανία συνεχώς εξασθενεί, ενώ τα μέτρα έναντι αθέμιτων εμπορικών πρακτικών και η έλλειψη στρατηγικής αυτονομίας σε κρίσιμους τομείς, όπως αυτός της άμυνας, κρίνονται επιεικώς ανεπαρκείς. Η ανάπτυξη της βιομηχανίας δεν επιτυγχάνεται με την παγκοσμιοποίηση και το ελεύθερο εμπόριο. Επιτυγχάνεται με την έμπρακτη στήριξη των βιομηχανικών επιχειρήσεων, τον περιορισμό των γραφειοκρατικών δυσχερειών και τη συνδεσιμότητα της βιομηχανίας με τους λοιπούς τομείς της έρευνας και της τεχνολογίας.

Doru-Claudian Frunzulică (S&D). – Madam President, I believe that it is essential for the Commission to outline what concrete results have been achieved by mainstreaming industrial competitiveness into EU policy. In the light of, on the one hand, the decline in the role of industry in the overall economy and, on the other hand, of the critical challenges facing Europe, we should be aware of the Commission's possible reactions and know what action will it take to deal with the factors impacting the global competitiveness of European Union industry.

I believe that the Commission should respond to the calls to provide an assessment of the impact of mainstreaming industrial policy into the EU strategic initiatives and to submit a holistic EU industrial policy strategy together with a corresponding action plan. This is a must, Commissioner, and it should include an initiative in the Commission's 2018 work programme.

(Ende des Catch-the-eye-Verfahrens)

Elżbieta Bieńkowska, Member of the Commission. – Madam President, first I would like to thank you for this discussion. I think that, for me especially, it was very valuable. I share most of your views. I also think that the time has come that we need a holistic, as you call it, coherent European industrial strategy.

But what I cannot agree with is that we have in a way – of course nobody has said it – that we have wasted these two and a half years. I will still defend our approach so far. With our communication on smart industry, on clean industry, in our work on the circular economy, with mainstreaming industrial policy through all of our documents and our projects, with our Industry Day which I want to repeat every year, I think we have a very good base now to have the coherent strategy.

I also agree that it is quite difficult, much more difficult, to use existing instruments if we do not have such a common approach, but definitely those two and a half years were not wasted. We are prepared quite well, but we need the support of everyone and every actor to have and to start the work on such a strategy.

I also want to assure you, and especially Mr Martin – I am happy that I made you happy – that I have not disappeared. I have prepared two major industrial strategies: the space strategy that was adopted last December and the European defence action plan with very concrete actions, very concrete money and a very detailed programme for European industry in this sector. In addition of course, to all of our activities in the single market strategy: services package, goods package, compliance package and public procurement. So I can assure you that with this portfolio I will not be able to disappear!

Die Präsidentin. – Die Aussprache ist geschlossen.

Die gemäß Artikel 128 Absatz 5 GO einzureichenden Entschließungsanträge werden zu einem späteren Zeitpunkt bekannt gegeben.

Die Abstimmung findet während der nächsten Tagung statt.

Schriftliche Erklärungen (Artikel 162 GO)

András Gyürk (PPE), írásban. – Vannak divatos policy-témák, amelyekről sok szó esik. Az a benyomásom, hogy az európai közös ipari stratégia nem tartozik ezek közé. Holott a tét nagy: munkahelyek, tudás és hagyomány. Nem kérdés, hogy az európai ipar sikerének záloga a minőség, a kitűnő ár-érték arány. Ezért két pillérre érdemes koncentrálni: az innovációra és a versenyképes árra. Először is, megfelelő szabályozással elő kell segíteni a kutatás-fejlesztési kiadások növelését, technológiasemleges módon. Másodszor, minden segítséget meg kell adnunk az ipar szereplőinek ahhoz, hogy termékeiket a globális piacon is versenyképes áron tudják értékesíteni. Az energiaintenzív iparágak esetében az energiaárak szintje meghatározó jelentőségű. Az egységes energiapiac kialakításával elindultunk az energiaárak csökkenésének irányába. Azonban még mindig van néhány olyan függő energiapolitikai ügy, amely negatívan hathat a piacok fejlődésére. Erre kitűnő példa az Északi Áramlat gázvezeték bővítésének engedélyezése, amely néhány tagállamban hozzájárulhat az energiaárak növekedéséhez. Felhívom a Bizottság figyelmét, hogy a felsorolt szempontokat – innováció és versenyképes energiaár – kiemelt fókusszal kezeljék az ipari stratégia további kidolgozása során.

Carolina Punset (ALDE), por escrito. – La modernización de la industria debe asumir los compromisos climáticos. Hoy por hoy no puede desarrollarse ninguna técnica industrial que no busque satisfacer las necesidades de la ciudadanía, como el bienestar o el empleo, pero, sobre todo, la política industrial debe estar en sintonía con la reducción de emisiones de gases de efecto invernadero en todo el proceso productivo, desde la innovación hasta la distribución. La población exige cada vez más elementos de consumo respetuoso con el medio ambiente y el desarrollo de la economía verde es una oportunidad que Europa no debe desechar. En las evaluaciones de impacto de la Comisión Europea sobre el desarrollo de la industria de generación de energías renovables y sobre las mejoras del sector de la construcción en eficiencia energética, se calcula, entre otras estimaciones, que se crearán más de 800 000 empleos en ambos sectores industriales. A pesar de las trabas legislativas, sabemos que países como Dinamarca o España son referentes mundiales en el desarrollo de aerogeneradores. La descarbonización de la economía, cada vez más demandada por los consumidores, es una oportunidad para la industria europea: debemos contemplarla como una oportunidad para producir, en clara distinción con otras economías que no apuestan por el futuro.

4. Debatten over gevallen van schending van de mensenrechten, de democratie en de rechtsstaat (debat)

4.1. De zaak van Afgan Mukhtarli en de situatie van de media in Azerbeidzjan

Die Präsidentin. – Als nächster Punkt folgt die Aussprache über sechs Entschließungsanträge zum Fall des aserbajdschischen Journalisten Äfqan Muxtarlı (2017/2722(RSP)).

Charles Tannock, author. – Madam President, the alleged abduction of Azerbaijani citizen Afgan Mukhtarli on Georgian soil is an extremely concerning and serious case, particularly given his background as a journalist who has fled there in search of a safe haven from persecution by the Azerbaijani authorities. Allegations that the Georgian security services may have in some way been complicit with these events is also of deep concern, and I welcome the calls in the resolution today for a full investigation of these claims.

Investigative journalism that seeks to uncover corruption and abuses of justice is vital in all countries, but especially so in countries such as Azerbaijan, which are marked by distinct deficiencies in the democratic processes and the rule of law. Incidents such as this undermine the efforts to encourage journalists such as Mukhtarli to continue their work in freedom, and to believe that sanctuary can be found if necessary. I hope, as investigations into the affair proceed, that we will at the very least see the release of Mukhtarli, and that all charges filed by the Azerbaijani authorities against him in this regard are dropped.

Rebecca Harms, Verfasserin. – Frau Präsidentin, sehr geehrte Kollegen! Herr Tannock hat die Situation sehr gut beschrieben. Das Erschreckendste an diesem Fall des Journalisten Äfqan Muxtarlı ist aber, dass die Unrechtsjustiz offensichtlich nicht nur in Aserbajdschan funktioniert, sondern dass der Arm aus Aserbajdschan bis Georgien reicht. Und uns ist sehr wichtig, dass dieser Fall insgesamt aufgeklärt wird und dass unabhängige Untersuchungen dazu nicht nur in Aserbajdschan, sondern auch in Georgien stattfinden.

Ich hoffe sehr, dass wir mit unserer Entschließung Äfqan Muxtarlı helfen können. Ich setze darauf, dass Kommissar Hahn, der morgen in Baku sein wird, dazu verhandeln wird. Und ich hoffe, dass auch alle anderen Fälle von Unrechtsjustiz Thema sein werden für die Beziehungen zwischen den europäischen Institutionen und Aserbaidtschan. Unsere Entschließung fordert nicht nur die sofortige Freilassung von Äfqan Muxtarlı, sondern von Dutzenden anderen Journalisten und Menschenrechtlern, die in Aserbaidtschan zu Unrecht im Gefängnis sind und die auch gefoltert werden.

Soraya Post, author. – Madam President, on 29 May 2017 the Azerbaijani journalist Afgan Mukhtarli disappeared from his exile in Tbilisi, Georgia. He was abducted and, according to his own account, beaten up and thrown into a car. The next day he was in Baku, Azerbaijan. Mukhtarli has since then been sentenced to prison.

We are happy that the European Union has a broad cooperation with Azerbaijan, and we would like to deepen that. But let us be very clear that to breach the sovereignty of other countries to abduct, beat up and imprison journalists and critics of the government is completely unacceptable. We utterly condemn what has happened to Mr Mukhtarli and call on the Georgian Government to ensure a prompt investigation. We call on the Azerbaijani Government to immediately drop all the bogus charges against Afgan Mukhtarli and release him from prison and, with him, let all the political prisoners go.

Petras Auštrevičius, author. – Madam President, we all – and people of Azerbaijan in particular – need a democracy and value-based partnership, but not an illusion of it. Only full respect of basic freedoms and the rule of law will enable us to build solid and lasting political and trade relations. Otherwise, this partnership will be simply doomed, as it proved to be in the cases of Russia and Turkey, among others.

Therefore, the abducted journalist Afgan Mukhtarli must be immediately released and officially pardoned by Baku. Prompt and transparent investigation must be conducted in both Georgia and Azerbaijan.

Finally, the release and rehabilitation of all political prisoners must be at the core of the partnership agreement. This is where the EU must stand firm. Today, we have to repeat it once again: Baku and Tbilisi must be partners in the investigation, and we have to receive all and final information on this case, otherwise there are many doubts about future partnerships.

Helmut Scholz, Verfasser. – Frau Präsidentin, liebe Kolleginnen und Kollegen! Ich möchte einer Verschiebung der Abstimmung über die Entschließung zum Fall Äfqan Muxtarlı, wie es diskutiert wird, ausdrücklich zustimmen. Wie so oft üben wir den Spagat zwischen den Erwartungen eines in seinen Rechten Verletzten und der Suche nach einem geeigneten Weg, universellen Rechten zum Durchbruch zu verhelfen. Der Dialog – egal auf welcher Ebene er geführt wird – ist hierbei tausendmal besser als eine im Kern sprachlose Konfrontation.

Vor wenigen Tagen konnte ich im südlichen Kaukasus selbst beobachten, wie komplex die gesellschaftlichen Transformationsprozesse in der Region verlaufen, wie groß der Bedarf an gemeinsamen gesellschaftlichen Lernprozessen und Verabredungsprozessen ist. Die menschenrechtlichen Forderungen unserer Entschließung ordnen sich hier klar ein. Äfqan Muxtarlı ist umgehend freizulassen, und die Anklage gegen ihn ist aufzuheben, denn am Ende kann nirgendwo Recht gesprochen werden, welches auf einem fundamentalen Unrecht basiert. Die so offensichtliche Entführung eines vor Verfolgung Geflohenen und seine Überstellung an das Land, aus dem er floh, ist Unrecht. Es gilt auch unsere Forderung: Das Land, welches vorgab, ein sicherer Fluchtort zu sein, muss widerspruchsfrei nachweisen, dass es mit der Entführung nichts zu tun hat.

Aserbaidtschan hat sich in Bezug auf die Menschenrechte widersprüchlich entwickelt. Wir lernen erneut daraus, dass unsere Forderungen nur dann nachhaltig umgesetzt werden können, wenn sich an den Systemen der Machtausübung etwas verändert. Die Kriminalisierung von Kritik und Kritikern wird immer weiter gehen, wird sie am Ende nicht selbst unter Strafe und Strafverfolgung gestellt. Waffengleichheit in Konflikten zwischen Staat und Individuum kann es ebenso nicht geben, wird dieses nicht per Gesetz garantiert.

Wir sind bereits in der Phase der intensiven Vorbereitung des nächsten Gipfels zur östlichen Nachbarschaft. Ich möchte der Kommission im Kontext dieser Diskussion mit auf den Weg geben, auch darüber nachzudenken, wie die EU ihre entsprechenden Instrumente weiterentwickelt. Das Europäische Parlament ist daran interessiert, weniger Donnerstag-Entschlüsse zu produzieren und viel mehr zu realen Veränderungen in unseren Partnerländern zu kommen.

Željana Zovko, *author*. – Madam President, the joint motion for a resolution relates to the case of the Azerbaijani journalist Afgan Mukhtarli, who was subjected to forced disappearance in Georgia, resurfaced in Baku a few hours later, and ended up in prison. We spoke to his wife this morning. The text produced by several groups is a solid one and critical of Azerbaijan as well as Georgia. As regards Azerbaijan we criticise the human rights situation and the ongoing crackdown on NGOs, human rights activists and journalists. We demand the immediate release of Mr Mukhtarli as well.

However, we have been requested by Commissioner Hahn to postpone the vote on the resolution. He will be in Baku on Friday. The adoption of the resolution, as he said, will make his mission virtually impossible. As saving face is usually very important for the Azerbaijani side, the Commissioner might encounter additional difficulties in Baku. Indeed, postponing the vote could serve as additional leverage for the Commission.

I strongly support postponing the vote and silent diplomacy instead of having this resolution adopted today.

Cristian Dan Preda, *au nom du groupe PPE*. – Madame la Présidente, je condamne, comme mes collègues, l'enlèvement et la détention du journaliste Afgan Mukhtarli, c'est une atteinte à la liberté de la presse qui est, comme on le sait, une valeur non négociable pour nous.

Je sollicite donc la libération immédiate d'Afgan Mukhtarli ainsi que des investigations approfondies et honnêtes sur son enlèvement, à la fois en Azerbaïdjan et en Géorgie.

En février, quand le président Ilham Aliyev est venu à Bruxelles, nous avons montré notre ouverture à renforcer la coopération avec l'Azerbaïdjan dans divers domaines, qui vont de l'énergie au commerce, mais aussi à discuter plus souvent du fondement sur lesquels cette coopération doit être bâtie: le respect des libertés fondamentales.

J'invite donc nos partenaires azerbaïdjanais à discuter avec nous de manière ouverte, notamment dans le cadre de notre coopération parlementaire, sur les meilleures façons de mettre en œuvre ces valeurs, les seules sur lesquelles la prospérité et la stabilité peuvent se fonder.

Je suis certain que la présence du commissaire Hahn à Bakou, la semaine prochaine, enverra ce même message: notre volonté de coopérer, mais aussi l'importance que nous accordons aux valeurs de liberté.

Kati Piri, *namens de S&D-Fractie*. – Op klaarlichte dag ontvoerd worden in Tbilisi, de Georgische hoofdstad, je plots aan Azerbeidzjaanse grens bevinden en de volgende dag wakker worden in een gevangenis. Het overkwam onderzoeksjournalist Afgan Mukhtarli, die 2 weken geleden onder valse voorwendselen werd opgepakt en nu uitzicht heeft op een langdurig politiek gemotiveerd proces in Azerbeidzjan. De situatie past in een reeks zorgwekkende ontwikkelingen, waarbij de regering in Bakoe critici het zwijgen oplegt, van verzonnen strafbare feiten tot onderdrukkende wetgeving en bureaucratische regels voor maatschappelijke organisaties. Het resultaat? Vandaag de dag zitten ruim 100 politieke gevangenen vast zonder uitzicht op ook maar iets wat op een eerlijk proces lijkt. Maar de repressie kent nu een nieuwe fase. Nu zijn ook politieke vluchtelingen in buurlanden kennelijk niet meer veilig. Volgens Mukhtarli spraken zijn ontvoerders Georgisch. Dat roept ernstige vragen op over de mogelijke betrokkenheid van de Georgische veiligheidsdiensten. Daarom moet dit ook tot op de bodem worden uitgezocht. Het maakt namelijk dat honderden Azerbeidzjanen die in ballingschap in Georgië leven, zich plotsklaps zorgen moeten maken over hun veiligheid.

Let me say the last words in English so that we can have the debate here in the Parliament. There is this proposal to postpone, for the first time, a vote on a matter of urgency. I think the word "urgency" says it all: we are talking here about an individual human rights case, and this Parliament should not postpone a vote on such a severe situation, because it will set a precedent which we should not want. I hope today we can go to a vote on a very good resolution which has been negotiated.

(The speaker agreed to take a blue-card question under Rule 162(8))

Reinhard Bütikofer (Verts/ALE), *Frage nach dem Verfahren der „blauen Karte“*. – Frau Kollegin Piri! Würden Sie den Vorschlag auch machen, wenn Herr Kommissar Hahn ein Sozialdemokrat wäre?

Kati Piri (S&D), *blue-card answer*. – I'm sorry, but I think this is a very crazy question: we don't make judgments about who does the request. We make judgments on the case itself. All the groups were in favour of having this resolution because of its seriousness. All the groups negotiated a request. This is not a political colour question, and I find your question, to be honest, actually very disgraceful.

Anna Elżbieta Fotyga, *on behalf of the ECR Group*. – Madam President, as a friend of both Georgia and Azerbaijan, I am most concerned by the case of Afgan Mukhtarli. His abduction, allegedly by Georgian services, is a serious blow to the reputation of that country. The triggering mechanism and unfortunate violent finish was somewhere in Azerbaijan. The investigation, as energetic as possible, should be carried out in both countries, and we have to support the silent diplomacy of Commissioner Hahn, postponing the vote on the resolution.

Pavel Telička, *on behalf of the ALDE Group*. – Madam President, we all agree on the substance of the evaluation, so where we differ on is what the best approach is in order to release Mr Mukhtarli. Now the question is [...]

Colleagues, I listened to you; Mr Bütikofer, it is not easy if you are shouting a few metres away from me. I do apologise, Madam President.

Once again, we differ on how to proceed, and what the best tactics are. If we were dealing with a different government with a different regime, I could understand the appeal of Mr Hahn, but the abduction happened a few days after a European Parliament high-ranking delegation spoke for an hour and a half with the President of the country, Mr Aliyev – so that is the message.

The other message would be that if we postpone it today and Mr Hahn goes, what is the message that we are sending? For the first time, we have postponed an urgency resolution, and we are not united. I disagree with Mr Hahn, because I think that he can go to Baku and have behind him a resolution which puts pressure on him. For me, in that current situation with this regime, with the disrespect to Parliament that Mr Aliyev has shown, it is the only possible way.

Heidi Hautala, *on behalf of the Verts/ALE Group*. – Madam President, however we are going to decide on this, it is clear that this is an unforeseen, unprecedented case. Two friendly countries, two EU eastern neighbours, and what happened was that there was a reported abduction from the territory of an independent country. I fully see why the President Margvelashvili of Georgia has said that this is not only a question of upholding human rights and freedom of the media, but it is also about defending Georgian statehood. That is why we all have reason to believe that Georgia is conducting a totally transparent and independent investigation into what happened. We are faced with two completely different stories on what happened and we need to get this right, because this should never happen again.

The main thing is that, whatever we decide today about voting today or in three weeks' time, the Commission has to do their utmost to get Mr Afgan Mukhtarli free.

Krzysztof Hetman (PPE). – Pani Przewodnicząca! Nie kłóćmy się dzisiaj na tej sali o to, w jakim terminie powinniśmy głosować nad tą rezolucją. Mówmy o wolności słowa, która jest niewątpliwie jedną z najważniejszych wartości, wyjątkowo bliską każdemu Europejczykowi. Dlatego zdecydowanie powinniśmy sprzeciwiać się wszelkim formom jej naruszania. Szczególnie nie wyrażamy zgody na tak brutalne formy jej tłamszenia, jak ma to miejsce w przypadku Afgana Mukhtariego, który, będąc niezależnym dziennikarzem otwarcie krytykującym działania rządu azerbejdżańskiego, został porwany w Gruzji, siłą przewieziony do Azerbejdżanu i aresztowany pod wątpliwymi zarzutami. Należy także podkreślić, że przypadek A. Mukhtariego nie jest odosobniony. Dlatego podkreślam z całą mocą, że nie może być zgody Unii Europejskiej na więźniów politycznych, i wzywamy rząd Azerbejdżanu do ich uwolnienia. Sądzę, że postulat ten musi być także jednym z punktów negocjowanej od lutego tego roku umowy o partnerstwie między Unią a Azerbejdżanem.

Kosma Złotowski (ECR). – Pani Przewodnicząca! Aresztowanie Afgana Mukhtariego to zdarzenie budzące niepokój u wszystkich osób, którym na sercu leży pokój i stabilizacja w regionie południowego Kaukazu. Jeśli potwierdzą się ostatecznie wątpliwości co do miejsca i przebiegu jego aresztowania oraz postawionych mu zarzutów, nie będzie to z pewnością korzystne dla wzmacniania obustronnej współpracy między Unią Europejską, Azerbejdżanem oraz Gruzją, której służby również, zdaje się, odegrały w tej sprawie niechlubną rolę. Cieszę się jednak, że wspólny tekst rezolucji mówi także o tym, co udało się osiągnąć w ostatnim czasie, szczególnie w zakresie współpracy w ramach Zgromadzenia Parlamentarnego Euronest. Budowa demokratycznego państwa w tak trudnych warunkach geopolitycznych to ogromne wyzwanie, z którym zмага się wiele krajów w obszarze postradzieckim. Bez wątpienia musimy robić więcej, aby ten proces wspierać, także w wymiarze gospodarczym.

Wracając do sprawy Afgana Mukhtariego: jeśli istnieje choćby cień szansy na powodzenie misji komisarza Hahna, powinniśmy to głosowanie odłożyć.

Norica Nicolai (ALDE). – Doamnă președintă, vorbesc în calitatea mea de raportor al Parlamentului pentru Azerbaidjan. Am urmărit cu foarte mare atenție luările dumneavoastră de poziție și un lucru mi-a atras atenția: mulți dintre dumneavoastră vorbiți în termenii „dacă ar fi adevărate acestea alegeri, ar putea să fie complice”. Cred că un parlament are obligația să se pronunțe printr-o rezoluție de urgență pe chestiuni foarte clare.

În momentul de față se fac două anchete: una la Baku și una la Tbilisi. Dacă Azerbaidjanul știm foarte bine cu toții că nu este o țară care să aibă performanțe în protejarea drepturilor omului, cred că nimeni din această sală nu are îndoieli cu privire la Georgia. Cred că demersul comisarului Hahn este unul legitim, corect și coerent din punctul de vedere al politicii Parteneriatului estic. Întâi avem obligația să clarificăm o situație și apoi să reacționăm cu toate mijloacele pe care Parlamentul și Uniunea le au. Pornind de la astfel de alegeri, riscăm să tensionăm foarte mult relațiile în zonă. Pentru mine este foarte important să avem o abordare solidă și serioasă și să amânăm acest vot, după ce vom avea o percepție foarte clară a Comisiei.

Ivo Vajgl (ALDE). – Madam President, dear colleagues, two weeks ago an official delegation of the Committee on Foreign Affairs (AFET), with seven Members, visited Azerbaijan, Armenia and Georgia. We met the highest State representatives from civil society and diplomacy. After a long period of interrupted dialogue with Baku, caused by over-sensitive reactions to a similar urgency resolution some years ago, we received assurances of a strong interest in closer cooperation based upon common strategic interests and values. The delegation paid a visit to two places which symbolised the complexity of history and the present day: a camp for refugees from occupied Nagorno Karabakh near Baku, and an Armenian memorial for genocide in Yerevan. The EU is offering to all countries of the Caucasus a partnership based upon human rights, the rule of law and freedom of expression. This means that one single journalist or human rights defender in jail is one too many. Negotiations with Azerbaijan on the comprehensive Partnership Agreement has been started. Open issues from these resolutions should be dealt with in this framework. I believe in active politics and diplomacy, therefore I cannot support this resolution, which still has too many question marks.

Catch-the-eye-Verfahren

José Inácio Faria (PPE). – Senhora Presidente, no passado dia 29 de maio, o jornalista Afgan Mukhtarli foi raptado por homens não identificados que, alegadamente, envergavam uniformes da Polícia Judiciária da Geórgia, para mais tarde vir a ser solto às mãos das autoridades do Azerbaijão. Afgan Mukhtarli foi espancado e conduzido à fronteira do Azerbaijão com uma avultada soma em dinheiro, com o único propósito de permitir às autoridades azerbaijanas instaurarem-lhe um processo-crime por atravessamento ilegal da fronteira e por contrabando.

As provas foram manipuladas por forma a permitir a sua detenção e condenação a uma pena de prisão de vários anos. A verdade, caros Colegas, é que esta prática de intimidação, repressão e perseguição, é aplicada recorrentemente no Azerbaijão a dirigentes de organizações não-governamentais, a defensores de direitos humanos, a membros da oposição e a jornalistas.

Num momento em que decorrem as negociações para a implementação da nova parceria entre a União Europeia e o Azerbaijão, o Parlamento Europeu deve condenar, de forma inequívoca, a prisão arbitrária do jornalista Afgan Mukhtarli e exigir a sua imediata libertação.

Entendo que a União Europeia não pode pactuar com regimes que descarada e reiteradamente desrespeitam os direitos humanos e as liberdades fundamentais e tudo deve fazer para que as violações da lei internacional sejam devidamente sancionadas.

Maria Grapini (S&D). – Doamnă președintă, doamnă comisar, sigur, aici s-a dezbătut o situație, așa cum spunea și colega noastră Norica Nicolai, în care nu avem totuși toate datele relevante. Cred că trebuie să fim un Parlament responsabil. Și eu fac parte din Adunarea Parlamentară Euronest. Cunoaștem problemele din Azerbaidjan și din celelalte țări. Știm că Azerbaidjanul este important în Euronest și are o agendă legată de Uniunea Europeană, dar și eu cred că trebuie să amânăm această rezoluție, pentru a ne documenta și pentru a veni cu lucruri extrem de precise. Este vorba, sigur, de viața unui om. Este vorba de libertatea presei. În același timp, trebuie să avem toate argumentele, înainte de a lua decizii, și asta este punctul meu de vedere.

(Vorbitorul a acceptat să răspundă unei întrebări adresate în conformitate cu procedura „cartonașului albastru” (articolul 149 alineatul (8) din Regulamentul de procedură))

Heidi Hautala (Verts/ALE), blue-card question. – I would like to ask my good colleague, Maria Grapini, whether she would look into the resolution again, because it's precisely asking for an investigation. So it's not that we want to postpone the investigation; we want to have a serious, independent, transparent investigation on what actually happened, and this is the point in the resolution. Both sides of the border.

Maria Grapini (S&D), răspuns la o întrebare adresată în conformitate cu procedura „cartonașului albastru”. – Am înțeles întrebarea colegei și o apreciez foarte mult. De altfel, am toată aprecierea față de colega noastră. Îi știu activitatea în Parlament și în comisie. Da, sigur, am citit rezoluția. Spuneam doar că nu e nevoie de o rezoluție, ci că, din punctul meu de vedere, este pript să facem atât de rapid o rezoluție, fără a aștepta, așa cum spunea și comisarul, o documentare mai aprofundată. Nu că nu e nevoie. Susțin că este nevoie să avem o rezoluție pentru Azerbaidjan, dar nu acum.

Fabio Massimo Castaldo (EFDD). – Signora Presidente, onorevoli colleghi, Afgan Mukhtarli il 29 maggio passeggiava tranquillamente per le vie di Tbilisi, dopo una serata con i suoi colleghi, fino a quando alcuni uomini con una divisa della polizia criminale georgiana lo fermano, lo incappucciano, lo spingono in macchina, lo picchiano e lo depositano oltre il confine con l'Azerbaigian, con 10 000 euro in tasca.

Adesso Afgan è a Baku, in custodia della polizia frontiera, e davanti a lui pendono le accuse di contrabbando, attraversamento illegale della frontiera e violenza contro le autorità di polizia. Afgan è un coraggioso giornalista d'inchiesta come sua moglie. Era già scappato in Georgia nel 2015, temendo per la propria incolumità, pur continuando a investigare sulle holding della famiglia del Presidente azero Aliyev, e si sa che chi vuole curiosare troppo negli affari del Presidente azero non ha mai vita facile nel suo paese.

La domanda è: come si può sparire a Tbilisi e a ritrovarsi a Baku? Chiediamo un'inchiesta veloce e trasparente, ma non possiamo accettare che l'Azerbaigian da un altro lato faccia sempre un passo avanti e due indietro. Devono essere liberati i prigionieri politici, si deve smettere di perseguire i giornalisti...

(Il Presidente toglie la parola all'oratore)

Michaela Šojdová (PPE). – Já si velmi vážím toho, že EP se systematicky zabývá dodržováním lidských práv zemí Východního partnerství. Toto naše usnesení reaguje na konkrétní informaci o únosu Afgana Muchtarliho z Tbilisi do Baku, kde je vězněn. Skutečnou příčinou jeho věznění je to, že působil v nezávislém médiu – rádio *Free Europe* – a je znám jako kritik ázerbájdžánského režimu. Bohužel takových politických vězňů je v Ázerbájdžánu více a naše usnesení je zmiňuje, všechny je vyjmenovává.

EP vyzývá k jejich propuštění, včetně novinářů. Tento poslední případ zatčeného novináře silně připomíná diktátorské praktiky, které dobře známe z komunistických režimů. Proto podporuji stanovisko EP, aby propuštění politických vězňů, novinářů a konec jejich pronásledování byly jasnou podmínkou další dohody mezi EU a Ázerbájdžánem. Oceňuji zejména politickou shodu na tomto usnesení.

Seán Kelly (PPE). – Madam President, the disregard for the fundamental right of freedom of expression demonstrated by the Azerbaijani Government, as evidenced in the case of Afgan Mukhtarli, is an issue of great concern to both my colleagues and me in the European Parliament, as is evidenced by this resolution and the speeches made by colleagues here this morning. Afgan Mukhtarli's abduction and imprisonment is a clear violation of international law, and it is crucial that the Azerbaijani Government be held accountable. The alleged involvement of Georgian officials in this case must also be scrutinised in terms of respect for fundamental rights and the integrity of government, especially as he fled there and finished up in Baku. That was some safe haven in Tbilisi. Looking forward, the safeguarding of freedom of the press and freedom of expression should be prioritised as a central facet to the future of EU-Azerbaijani relations.

Dá bhrí sin, a Uachtaráin, caithfidh gach iarracht a dhéanamh chun an sprioc sin a bhaint amach agus brú níos mó a chur ar rialtas na hAsarbaiseáine chun Mukhtarli a ligean saor láithreach bonn agus más féidir sin a dhéanamh, beidh jab maith déanta againn.

Ana Gomes (S&D). – Apesar da libertação de ativistas dos direitos humanos no Azerbaijão nos últimos dois anos, repressão aos *media* independentes, ataques à liberdade de expressão têm-se tornado cada vez mais brutais, incluindo prisão, acusações criminais fabricadas, vigilância intimidatória, tortura e até a morte sob custódia do Estado, como aconteceu com o *blogger* Mehman Huseynov em abril passado. Intolerável é também a recusa do Governo do Azerbaijão em acatar julgamentos do Tribunal Europeu dos Direitos Humanos.

Condenamos firmemente o sequestro de Afgan Mukhtarli na Geórgia, a sua transferência forçada para uma prisão do Azerbaijão. Quem esteve envolvido neste sequestro tem de ser investigado e levado a tribunal na Geórgia, país que deve acolher todos os requerentes de asilo que escapam a perseguição política nos países vizinhos, como o Azerbaijão, a Turquia ou a Rússia. Afgan Mukhtarli e todos os outros prisioneiros políticos devem ser libertados de imediato no Azerbaijão e as acusações pendentes devem ser retiradas.

Espero que as diligências do Comissário Johannes Hahn em Baku sejam atendidas pelo governo do Azerbaijão já, e não daqui a meses. Aqui, neste Parlamento, há muitos de nós que não trocamos direitos humanos por petróleo nem por subornos da cleptocracia que oprime o povo do Azerbaijão.

(Ende des Catch-the-eye-Verfahrens)

Elżbieta Bieńkowska, Member of the Commission. – Madam President, the EU observes attentively the narrowing of space for exercising fundamental freedoms in Azerbaijan. We have taken careful note of the arrest and sentencing of the number of persons who have criticised the authorities, as well as systemic measures to curb freedom of expression, such as a decision to permanently block five online media outlets or increase criminal penalties for insulting the President.

The number of government critics behind bars has increased rapidly since last summer. The charges are not always related to the exercise of freedom of expression, but range, of course, from drug-related charges to liberal and financial irregularities. What these cases have in common is the ease with which the arguments of the defence have been dismissed. On 30 May, the EU reacted immediately to the apparent abduction of a journalist in another country in order to imprison him in Azerbaijan, recalling that civil rights and due process of law must be respected.

These developments ran counter to the broader renewal of recent positive engagement between the EU and Azerbaijan following a number of positive developments since 2015, including the release of several high-profile human rights defenders, activists and journalists. Positive interparliamentary cooperation has also resumed and the visit by the Committee on Foreign Affairs to Azerbaijan in May was welcomed as a part of this renewed engagement. We will step up our diplomatic effort to return to this path. In a statement on 4 June, the spokesperson for the High Representative of the Union for Foreign Affairs and Security Policy/Vice-President of the Commission called for an immediate review of the case and the release of all individuals detained as a result of exercising their fundamental freedoms.

The issue will also be raised by Commissioner Hahn, as you noticed, who will be visiting Baku as of tomorrow, including with President Aliyev. The EEAS has also raised this point in a meeting with their counterparts. Our main tool for steering our relationship with Azerbaijan is, of course, the new agreement that is currently being negotiated. The latest round took place earlier this week and human rights were again one of the main issues discussed. We will pursue relentlessly an agreement that puts respect for human rights at the core of our relationships.

PRZEWODNICTWO: RYSZARD CZARNECKI

Wiceprzewodniczący

Przewodniczący. – Zamykam debatę.

Głosowanie odbędzie się w czwartek 15 czerwca 2017 r.

4.2. Pakistan, met name de situatie van mensenrechtenverdedigers en de doodstraf

Przewodniczący. – Kolejnym punktem porządku dnia jest debata nad sześcioma projektami rezolucji w sprawie Pakistanu, w szczególności sytuacji obrońców praw człowieka i stosowania kary śmierci(2017/2723(RSP)).

Branislav Škripek, author. – Mr President, I am very glad that this debate is taking place. The situation regarding human rights in Pakistan is very difficult. Ethnic and religious minorities experience huge difficulties if they are different from – or think differently to – the government or the majority of the Pakistani people. Several minority people have been killed or persecuted because they were not protected by the government.

One issue I want to highlight in particular is the so-called blasphemy laws. I would like to ask the High Commissioner to urge the Government of Pakistan to review these laws or, even better, to abolish them. These laws are wide open to misuse as tools for setting personal vendettas and oppressing minorities. The Pakistani Government therefore also should make sure that, until the laws are revised, people will not suffer as a result of them for false purposes.

Soraya Post, author. – Mr President, these days many of us have written something on social media that we have later come to regret. That can be a worry – not least if you are a politician. In some places, however, it can mean that you put your life at stake. A man has just been sentenced to death in Pakistan for insulting the prophet on Facebook. Of 50 Muslim-majority countries around the world, only 13 – including Pakistan – have a death penalty for blasphemy. Islam is a religion of peace, not of death. We welcome the Pakistani Government's decision to adopt the Human Rights Action Plan; we call on them to repeal capital punishment for blasphemy and immediately release all prisoners held under these charges. Only a country that allows people to speak out freely can truly be called righteous.

Jozo Radoš, autor. – Gospodine predsjedniče, smrtna kazna i zakon o blasfemiji u Pakistanu osobito pogađaju, naravno, novinare i borce za zaštitu ljudskih prava i jednako tako pripadnike manjina. Posebno zabrinjava da su među žrtvama takve politike i tih odredbi zakona u Pakistanu maloljetnici, dakle, osobe koje nisu punoljetne.

Želim posebno naglasiti, skrenuti pozornost i izraziti zabrinutost zbog pritiska pakistanskih vlasti prema internetskim platformama, Facebooku i Twitteru, da se otkrije identitet korisnika tih platformi kako bi se moglo progoniti ljude zbog blasfemije i eventualne prijetnje smrtnom kaznom.

Pozdravljam donošenje Akcijskog plana za ljudska prava u Pakistanu i nadam se da će taj Akcijski plan pomoći da se poboljša stanje ljudskih prava u Pakistanu i riješi pitanje smrtne kazne i zakona o blasfemiji.

Miguel Urbán Crespo, *Autor*. – Señor presidente, desde el trágico atentado de diciembre de 2014, en el que murieron más de cien personas —la mayoría niños y niñas—, el Gobierno de Pakistán ha activado el Plan de acción nacional para combatir el terrorismo. Entre otras cosas, este plan incluye la ejecución de sentencias de muerte para encausados por terrorismo.

Por desgracia, hemos podido comprobar cómo, dentro del paraguas de la acusación de terrorismo, el Gobierno de Pakistán está incluyendo todo tipo de casos, sobre todo para perseguir a la oposición política y social. Especialmente significativo es el caso del activista Baba Jan y otros doce manifestantes pacíficos, condenados a cadena perpetua en 2014 por el Tribunal Antiterrorista. Desde aquí les mandamos un fuerte saludo y abrazo.

Esta situación es un claro paso atrás desde la moratoria de 2008, que alivió parcialmente la ejecución de civiles. Pero desde comienzos de 2015 esta moratoria ha finalizado completamente para todos los sentenciados por delitos capitales.

Desde aquí queremos exigir no solo juicios justos y con garantías y la libertad para los activistas políticos encarcelados de manera injusta en Pakistán como Baba Jan, sino que queremos levantar nuestra voz por la abolición global de la pena de muerte.

En nuestra opinión, esta situación muestra, una vez más, las vergüenzas de una Unión Europea y, en particular, de la Comisión que permiten que Pakistán sea uno de los ocho países que se benefician del Sistema Generalizado de Preferencias —el SPG—, por el que se obtienen tarifas preferenciales a cambio del compromiso de respetar los derechos humanos, que Pakistán no respeta.

A día de hoy, el sistema de monitoreo y el propio SPG quedan claramente en entredicho, una vez más. Seguramente, este sistema ha contribuido mucho a impulsar muchos negocios. Sabemos, por ejemplo, que muchas empresas europeas importan productos textiles manufacturados de Pakistán y seguramente se benefician de este marco.

Lo que es intolerable es que a cambio de esto, de esos negocios, la Comisión haya mirado a otro lado ante la violación sistemática de los derechos humanos en Pakistán. Esto no puede seguir así.

Tunne Kelam, *author*. – Mr President, Pakistan is an important partner for the EU. However, this Parliament is seriously concerned about the human rights situation, especially about the number of executions after Pakistan reinstated the death penalty. Most alarming is the use, or rather misuse of the so-called blasphemy law, which carries a mandatory death penalty. On 10 June 2017, the Pakistani court passed a death sentence to Taimoor Raza for committing blasphemy on Facebook.

We call on the Pakistani authorities to introduce some immediate measures that could reverse this present trend, first on all executions on any offense other than intentional killing. Second, stop executing juvenile offenders. Third, provide a moratorium on executions on those whose appeals are pending. Fourth, reinstate a moratorium on all executions as soon as possible and provide also maximum state guarantees for normal work of journalists, NGOs and human rights defenders.

Jiří Pospíšil, *za skupinu PPE*. – Já chci velmi výrazně podpořit toto usnesení, které kritizuje to, jak je trest smrti zneužíván v Pákistánu.

Já jsem celoživotní odpůrce trestu smrti a jsem velmi rád, že EU má tuto filozofii a kritizuje využívání a zneužívání trestu smrti v jednotlivých státech celého světa. Je třeba říci nejen to, že Pákistán odstoupil od moratoria z roku 2015 a trest smrti opět využívá. On ho původně chtěl využívat pouze proti nejzávažnějším trestům, jako je terorismus, vraždy atd., ale již moji předchůdci jasně řekli, že v tuto chvíli je tento trest zneužíván, a to v zásadě za i politické činy, jako je tzv. rouhačství.

Je třeba kritizovat vedle trestu smrti zákon proti rouhačství, který zde také byl několikrát zmiňován. Je to jasně zaměřeno, trest smrti, proti svobodě projevu, svobodě slova a my bychom měli Pákistánu jasně říci, že pokud chce být do budoucna partnerem EU a mít privilegované postavení, tak nemůže takto zneužívat trest smrti a nemůže takto ohýbat lidská práva ve své zemi.

Neena Gill, *on behalf of the S&D Group*. – Mr President, in 2014 the EU allowed Pakistan access to GSP+, an exceptional tool to help kick-start the economy, and which, crucially, encourages progress on improving human rights. It has proved its value in many countries, but I question whether this is the case in Pakistan. A Parliament delegation visited Pakistan in April and, from our meetings with government officials and civil society, it became glaringly clear that a lack of the rule of law permeates Pakistani society, and human rights are violated instead of advanced. In March 2017, military courts that can try civilians were reinstated for two more years. The basic rights of foreigners brought to trial are

trampled on, with no access to consular rights. People who work for NGOs face harassment, arrest or, worse, death. How many people are on death row under the vague blasphemy laws? We do not know, because there is no transparency. Anyone going about their business can be accused of blasphemy and then lynched by mobs. Those who belong to vulnerable groups like the Ahmadis live their lives in fear, with no democratic rights, yet the government fails to protect them. It is high time to see real progress on human rights and the strengthening of the civil judiciary in Pakistan. If not, GSP+ has to be reviewed.

Sajjad Karim, *on behalf of the ECR Group*. – Mr President, our non-legislative and non-binding resolutions quite often lead to complaints from third countries of factual inaccuracies. Today, I intend to concentrate only on one aspect of what is in the resolution and do not in any way seek to take away from some of the very accurate comments that have been made by colleagues, whilst recognising that there are various inaccuracies as well.

Any consideration by an independent and informed eye of this resolution actually betrays an acceptance that external and externally sponsored internal actors in Pakistan are facilitating the terrorist targeting of innocent civilians. The people of Pakistan have carried a very heavy burden on behalf of the international community for a very long time – sometimes on very weak shoulders. But it remains the case that our EU policy to support Pakistan and the people of Pakistan in facing the challenges of terrorism remains the right approach.

(The speaker agreed to take a blue-card question under Rule 162(8))

Maria Grapini (S&D), *întrebare adresată în conformitate cu procedura „cartonaşului albastru”*. – Stimate coleg, mă bucur că aţi vorbit de poporul pakistanez, pentru că, de foarte multe ori, noi confundăm cetăţenii dintr-o ţară cu deciziile unor lideri. Însă această rezoluţie consider că este necesară şi vă întreb: se poate pune ceva în balanţă cu viaţa oamenilor? Avem acolo încă pedeapsa cu moartea. Sunteţi de acord să existe în Pakistan încă pedeapsa cu moartea şi să riscăm ca oameni nevinovaţi să ajungă să îşi piardă vieţile, pentru o decizie a unor temporari conducători?

Sajjad Karim (ECR), *blue-card answer*. – When a certain mind-set of individuals attack, maim and kill European citizens in Paris we all say that is wrong, but I say this to you, colleagues: when that mind-set of individuals attack us, they attack us for our values, and it is that same mind-set that then attacks innocent children in Peshawar. If we have the right to stand by our values, we must also stand by those innocent children when they are attacked.

Fabio Massimo Castaldo, *a nome del gruppo EFDD*. – Signor Presidente, onorevoli colleghi, come sappiamo ormai in Pakistan è finita la moratoria sulla pena di morte da tempo e il Pakistan si ritrova ad avere una delle più importanti popolazioni al mondo nel corridoio della morte, oltre 8 000 persone. Contestualmente, ancora esiste l'articolo 295 del Codice penale, la famosa legge sulla blasfemia, che in realtà, molto spesso, è invocata per punire questioni tutt'altro che religiose e invece per perseguire innocenti e addirittura per tenere sotto schiaffo le minoranze religiose dissidenti e organizzazioni non governative.

Il bando dei *social media* è oltretutto un'ulteriore pagina nera nella storia del paese, da quando il premier Nawaz Sharif ha ordinato alle autorità di rimuovere tutti i contenuti blasfemi dalle pagine Internet e assicurare i responsabili alla giustizia, con uno studente di giornalismo di ventitré anni, Mashal Khan, che si è ritrovato addirittura ad essere linciato da parte dei suoi compagni di università per aver offeso l'Islam durante una discussione.

Il Pakistan è per noi un partner commerciale fondamentale e deve comportarsi come tale. Chiediamo quindi che si ritorni finalmente alla moratoria sulla pena di morte e che venga finalmente rivista una legislazione sulla blasfemia che ha troppi buchi e troppe pagine nere.

Γεώργιος Επιτήδειος (NI). – Κύριε Πρόεδρε, το Πακιστάν είναι μία από τις χώρες με τις οποίες συνομιλεί και συνεργάζεται η Ευρωπαϊκή Ένωση στα πλαίσια ενός πενταετούς σχεδίου. Επίσης, η χώρα έχει περιληφθεί στο ενισχυμένο Σύστημα Γενικευμένων Προτιμήσεων. Παρ' όλα αυτά, η κυβέρνηση της χώρας παραβιάζει τα ανθρώπινα δικαιώματα, διώκει τους υπερασπιστές τους, διάφορες ΜΚΟ, δημοσιογράφους, συντάκτες ιστολογίων και, γενικώς, καθέναν που την επικρίνει. Ακόμη χειρότερο, έχει στη νομοθεσία της τη θανατική ποινή, την οποία εφαρμόζει μετά και από προβληματικές ακόμη δίκες και σε εφαρμογή του νόμου περί βλασφημίας. Το Πακιστάν έχει το θλιβερό προνόμιο να είναι η χώρα εκείνη στον κόσμο που έχει τις περισσότερες θανατικές καταδίκες. Δυστυχώς, εκτελεί ακόμη και ανηλικούς και ανθρώπους διανοητικά ανάπηρους. Αυτή η κατάσταση είναι απαράδεκτη. Η Ευρωπαϊκή Ένωση οφείλει να πιέσει την κυβέρνηση του Πακιστάν να αφαιρέσει από τη νομοθεσία της τη θανατική καταδίκη και να σέβεται τα ανθρώπινα και τα εργασιακά δικαιώματα. Οφείλει να της επισημάνει ότι, αν δεν συμμορφωθεί και αν δεν εφαρμόσει τις 27 διεθνείς συνθήκες, όπως έχει δεσμευτεί, και τις αρχές της σωστής διακυβέρνησης, θα της αφαιρεθεί το δικαίωμα να συμμετέχει στο καθεστώς του ενισχυμένου Συστήματος Γενικευμένων Προτιμήσεων.

Pavel Svoboda (PPE). – O situaci v Pákistánu jsme zde již hovořili několikrát. Vždy jsme museli konstatovat, že ochrana lidských práv v Pákistánu je ve velmi špatném stavu a jejich obránci čelí pronásledování, nespravedlivým soudům nebo jsou dokonce zabíjeni či mizí.

Tolikrát kritizované obnovení trestu smrti trvá, stejně jako zákon o rouhání, jehož obětí je již také 7 let uvězněná Asia Bibi, která je odsouzena k trestu smrti. Za její případ jsme také několikrát intervenovali. Naposledy jsem žádal, aby byl pozastaven 5letý akční plán ve vztahu k Pákistánu, nebude-li Asia Bibi propuštěna. V listopadu se konalo vyhodnocení tohoto plánu a zdá se, že se v něm bude pokračovat přesto, že jsou lidská práva v Pákistánu stále pošlapávána a dokonce jsou zde i snahy o zrušení nevládních organizací.

Žádám proto znovu, dokud nebude Asia Bibi propuštěna, dokud nebude na znovu zavedený trest smrti uvaleno moratorium, neuzavírejte tento akční plán s Pákistánem znovu.

Doru-Claudian Frunzulică (S&D). – Mr President, even though I understand the Pakistani position and Pakistan's peculiar situation, I still believe that the current situation is not acceptable. The death penalty is a cruel and inhumane punishment that fails to act as a deterrent, and risks irreversible miscarriages of justice. I strongly support the call for the universal abolition of capital punishment, and the call on Pakistan to reinstate a full moratorium on the death penalty.

The Pakistani authorities should also launch an investigation into the credible concerns of individuals with mental or intellectual disabilities or disorders who have been sentenced to the death penalty. I support the creation of a public prosecutor to investigate and prosecute attacks against journalists in Pakistan. Finally, I believe the Pakistan authorities should grant access to international observers and human rights organisations to monitor their inappropriate use of military courts. Last, but not least, I would like to mention – and also to underline – the importance of EU relations with Pakistan.

Amjad Bashir (ECR). – Mr President, the urgent resolution on Pakistan is regrettable, misguided and misleading. I stand against abuse of human rights, wherever it may arise, but such grave allegations as these should be based on fact, not fantasy. The despicable crimes detailed are just that: crimes, against the law of the land. They are repugnant to the majority of Pakistani people and condemned by the government.

To suggest that the State is behind them, has condoned them or turns a blind eye to them is simply not true. And this Parliament will demean itself if it supports the resolution. Interestingly, the text makes no mention of the delegation of the Committee on Foreign Affairs (AFET) to Pakistan last April, when we were welcome to raise any thorny issue we chose in the presence of senior government authorities, opposition parties, NGOs, think tanks and civilians, unlike similar trips to India.

Pakistan relies on our help to deliver on human rights and the rule of law, as a genuine ally and economic partner of the EU and the West. This resolution sends the wrong signals altogether.

(The speaker agreed to take a blue-card question under Rule 162(8))

Maria Grapini (S&D), întrebare adresată în conformitate cu procedura „cartonaşului albastru”. – Domnule preşedinte, stimată coleg, o să fiu foarte scurtă. Nici nu folosesc cele 30 de secunde. Scurt: dumneavoastră consideraţi o fantezie faptul că există pedeapsa cu moartea şi că sunt oameni care sunt pedepsiţi să li se ia viaţa? Consideraţi asta o fantezie? Pentru că aţi spus că rezoluţia este o fantezie.

Amjad Bashir (ECR), blue-card answer. – I am against the death penalty. But if you mention the death penalty, how many times have you criticised one of the biggest proponents of the death penalty: the United States of America?

Zgłoszenia z sali

José Inácio Faria (PPE). – Senhor Presidente, caros Colegas, há três dias o paquistanês Taimoor Raza foi condenado à pena de morte por ter publicado diversos comentários no Facebook, nos quais terá blasfemado o profeta Maomé e as suas mulheres.

Desde que o Governo aprovou a abolição da moratória sobre a execução da pena de morte, há três anos, o Paquistão tornou-se num dos países que atualmente mais a aplicam. Mas esta é a primeira vez que ela recai sobre um acusado de cometer blasfémia nas redes sociais. Esta condenação representa também mais um triste exemplo da total instrumentalização da lei da blasfémia para a repressão das minorias religiosas, para o silenciamento de intelectuais e defensores dos direitos humanos e para o incentivo da vingança violenta contra os acusados e contra as suas famílias e defensores.

O linchamento de Mashal Khan, há dois meses, pelos seus colegas universitários mostra-o bem. A onda crescente de repressão no país, incluindo a exercida contra os grupos de ajuda humanitária e organizações não-governamentais, não pode ser ignorada pela União Europeia na próxima cimeira bilateral e deve condicionar os progressos na implementação do plano de cooperação estratégica.

Nicola Caputo (S&D). – Signor Presidente, onorevoli colleghi, in Pakistan, oltre ad una vera e propria emergenza umanitaria – dal 2014 sono morti 1 340 bambini a causa della malnutrizione –, ci troviamo di fronte anche ad una grave e compromessa situazione sotto il profilo del rispetto dei diritti umani.

Il Pakistan, secondo un rapporto di Amnesty International, è uno dei cinque paesi al mondo dove si comminano più condanne a morte. Nel paese sono sempre più sotto attacco attivisti, avvocati e tutti coloro che difendono i diritti umani, permangono leggi odiose, come quella sulla blasfemia, e non si sono fatti passi in avanti riguardo alla moratoria della pena di morte.

È chiaro che l'Europa non ha fatto tutto quello che poteva. È però giunto il momento di fare maggiori pressioni su paesi come il Pakistan, affinché pongano fine alla repressione nei confronti di tutti quelli che sono impegnati contro la pena di morte e per la difesa dei diritti fondamentali.

Bas Belder (ECR). – Ik heb een concrete vraag aan de Commissie. Mij bereikte uitvoerige documentatie over intolerantie in het Pakistaanse onderwijssysteem: haatpreken tegen minderheden en vooral tegen christenen. Mijn vraag is: is u dat bekend? En bovenal: gaan er Europese financiën naar het Pakistaanse onderwijssysteem, wat zou betekenen dat het publiek onderwijssysteem en vooral de islamitische madrassa's, in feite christenen discrimineren en eigenlijk wegzetten? Ik wil graag hier de invloed van de EU duidelijk maken via de Commissie. Graag een reactie.

Stanislav Polčák (PPE). – Já nejsem obecně příznivcem toho, aby EU vyvážela celý svůj katalog práv. Naše pojetí charty je poměrně široké a myslím si, že je určeno pro náš prostor, ale pokud jde o trest smrti – to patří do železného základu katalogu lidských práv a tento je skutečně nepřijatelný.

Myslím si, že bychom měli trvat na tom moratoriu, které bylo donedávna platné, a má-li být naše politika účinná a nemá-li být tedy bezzubá, tak by skutečně Pákistán měl reagovat na naše zásadní připomínky.

Takže já bych byl velmi rád, kdyby se nám podařilo i díky činnosti Komise protlačit jak moratorium na trest smrti, tak samozřejmě i zrušení zákona o rouhačství nebo jeho nejpalcivějších částí. Rovněž by bylo dobré, aby každý z nás ve svém vlastním přístupu reagoval na tu situaci, tzn. v rámci *fair trade* nenakupoval zboží, které prostě jde z těchto oblastí, kde se zásadním způsobem porušují lidská práva. Je to i o každém z nás, o našem osobním přístupu.

Jean-Paul Denanot (S&D). – Monsieur le Président, chers collègues, on ne connaît que trop bien les erreurs dramatiques qui ont pu découler de l'utilisation de la peine de mort. Or, non seulement le Pakistan a recours à la peine de mort, mais en plus, il en fait une utilisation dénuée de tout encadrement.

On ne peut tolérer qu'une telle sentence soit utilisée contre des mineurs, et il est inacceptable qu'elle soit mise en pratique avant même que soit prononcé un jugement définitif. Il y a eu des cas d'exécutions effectuées avant que le procès ne soit terminé.

L'absence de garde-fou total à un instrument aussi dangereux et inhumain fait peser une menace terrible sur tous les citoyens, la peine de mort étant d'ailleurs prononcée pour des infractions qui, dans d'autres pays, ne font pas l'objet d'une telle qualification. Le cas du blasphème, qui a été évoqué à plusieurs reprises, en est un exemple.

Nous devons donc fermement condamner les dérives du gouvernement pakistanais et exiger qu'il cesse d'avoir recours à une telle sentence. La coopération de l'Union européenne avec le Pakistan nous y oblige.

Marijana Petir (PPE). – Gospodine predsjedniče, problem kršćana posljednjih godina je u stalnom porastu kao i broj zemalja u kojima se događa. Vijesti o novim progonima sada dobivamo sa svih kontinenata. Već drugu godinu za redom, kršćani su najprogonjenija skupina na svijetu. Tragična je činjenica da je preko 100 000 ljudi život izgubilo zbog svoje gorljive vjere u Krista u samo godinu dana u 2016. godini.

Postoje države koje se ne nalaze tako daleko od sigurnosti naših europskih domova, a gdje je biti kršćanin najopasnija stvar na svijetu. Jedno od takvih mjesta je i Pakistan. Naime, Pakistan je prema Ustavu islamska država koja islam smatra načinom života i kaznenim zakonom predviđa smrt optuženih i osuđenih za blasfemiju, što postaje oružje novih kako bi prstom uprli upravo u kršćane.

Optužbe, kao i osude za blasfemiju, su najčešće arbitrarne i zlonamjerne, a posljedice tragične. Kršćani cijelog svijeta, a posebno u Pakistanu, posebno na Bliskom istoku, u potpunosti će biti istrijebljeni ukoliko udruženim snagama ne stanemo u njihovu obranu.

(Koniec zgłoszeń z sali)

Elżbieta Bieńkowska, Member of the Commission. – Mr President, we consider Pakistan as a key player in the region and we are committed to strengthening our dialogue on many issues. I could just mention they are areas as diverse as peace and security, the rule of law, good governance, human rights, migration, trade and investment, sustainable development, climate change, energy, education, culture, science and technology.

This is the reason why we aim at deepening our partnership with Pakistan through a strategic engagement plan which is currently under preparation. Still, despite some progress made in the GSP+ process, the gap between the institutional human rights framework and the situation on the ground in Pakistan continues to be significant.

In all its contacts with Pakistan the EU continues to stress the importance of reintroducing the moratorium on executions. The number of executions has been reduced in the second half of 2016 and the first half of this year. We hope that this trend will lead to a definitive stop of executions and hope that this will set a direction towards finally abolishing the death penalty and towards the full respect of all international human rights obligations by Pakistan.

Yet, the extension of the military courts for another two years really constitutes a worrying element and the EU has been repeatedly calling for a comprehensive judicial reform. We are equally very concerned about the situation of human rights defenders in Pakistan. Apart from pressure and intimidation by the authorities, human rights defenders are also subject to threats, violence and even murder by extremist militant groups, and an even more worrisome trend is that allegations of blasphemy are being used to silence human rights defenders.

Yet Pakistan has established a national commission for human rights. It has adopted a human rights action plan and introduced legislation for the protection of women and children. However, there are big differences among the provinces of Pakistan as well as strong resistance against any change from religious political parties.

The EU is supporting several projects to improve human rights awareness and protection in Pakistan with a total amount of EUR 97 million. We therefore encourage Pakistan to improve its human rights record and we stand ready to continue working together with Pakistan in addressing this challenge, and of course, I will pass all of your questions to the Vice-President/High Representative Ms Mogherini.

Przewodniczący. – Zamykam debatę.

Głosowanie odbędzie się w czwartek 15 czerwca 2017 r.

Oświadczenia pisemne (art. 162)

Mara Bizzotto (ENF), *per iscritto*. – In Pakistan, il governo sta attuando una politica di repressione gravissima. Sono all'ordine del giorno persecuzioni, intimidazioni e torture, nei confronti di difensori dei diritti umani, oppositori politici e membri delle minoranze religiose. La pena di morte è tra gli strumenti più usati dalle autorità pakistane, per mettere a tacere veri e presunti oppositori, e tutti coloro che sono accusati di blasfemia. Di fronte a questa situazione, sono molto preoccupata per la vita di tutte quelle persone innocenti che subiscono la repressione del governo di Islamabad. Come può l'Unione europea tollerare questa situazione? Ricordo che l'azione dell'Unione europea con i paesi terzi, si fonda proprio sull'opposizione alla pena capitale e sul rispetto dei diritti umani.

Per questi motivi, la Commissione ha il dovere di sollecitare il Pakistan, ad abolire la pena di morte e a ripristinare uno stato di democrazia e rispetto dei diritti della popolazione pakistana. Ritengo fondamentale che l'Unione europea faccia particolare attenzione nei negoziati presenti e futuri con il Pakistan, per non scendere a compromessi sul rispetto dei diritti umani da parte del governo di questo popoloso paese asiatico, che conta quasi 200 milioni di persone.

Luigi Morgano (S&D), *per iscritto*. – Ho votato in favore della risoluzione sulla situazione dei diritti umani e della pena di morte in Pakistan, poiché l'UE non può rimanere indifferente alle violazioni dei diritti umani e a chi li difende. In particolare, nella risoluzione è riportato il drammatico caso di Asia Bibi: a tale riguardo ritengo doveroso che l'UE esorti con fermezza il governo pakistano a risolverlo, e a non consentire che possa ripetersi. Asia Bibi, la donna pakistana cristiana che nel 2010 era stata dichiarata colpevole di blasfemia, da un tribunale pakistano e condannata a morte per impiccagione, nonostante la sospensione dell'esecuzione, si trova tutt'ora in carcere e la sua famiglia costretta a vivere in un luogo nascosto. Peraltro, in caso di esecuzione della sentenza, Asia Bibi sarebbe la prima donna a essere giustiziata «legalmente» in Pakistan, per blasfemia. Sono convinto che il governo del Pakistan, dovrebbe fare tutto il possibile, per garantire la sicurezza di Asia Bibi e della sua famiglia, anche alla luce del trattamento riservato «storicamente» alle vittime di accuse di blasfemia e ai loro difensori, come nel caso dell'assassinio del ministro delle minoranze cristiane Shahbaz Bhatti e del politico musulmano Salmaan Taseer.

Rolandas Paksas (EFDD), *raštu*. – Pagarba žmogaus teisėms ir teisinės valstybės principams turi būti kiekvienos valstybės prioritetas. Todėl labai svarbu, kad Pakistanas darytų konkrečią pažangą ir laiku bei tinkamai įgyvendintų savo priimtą Veiksmų planą žmogaus teisių srityje. Atkreiptinas dėmesys į tai, jog šalyje stiprėja religinė netolerancija. Šventvagystės įstatymas stiprina diskriminaciją bei kursto neapykantą ir prievartos taikymą. Be to, mirties bausmės už šventvagystę taikymas pažeidžia tarptautinius Pakistano įsipareigojimus gerbti ir ginti žmogaus teises, įskaitant tikėjimo ir žodžio laisvę. Atsižvelgiant į tai, labai svarbu, kad Pakistano vyriausybė nedelsiant imtųsi veiksmų, kad nacionalinių teisių aktų nuostatos dėl mirties bausmės būtų suderintos su tarptautine teise ir standartais ir būtų padaryta matoma pažanga šioje srityje.

4.3. De mensenrechtensituatie in Indonesië

Przewodniczący. – Kolejnym punktem porządku dnia jest debata nad sześcioma projektami rezolucji w sprawie sytuacji w zakresie praw człowieka w Indonezji (2017/2724(RSP)).

Bas Belder, *Auteur*. – Mevrouw de commissaris, een uur geleden belde ik een christen, een theoloog in Jakarta, en tijdens dat langdurige gesprek merkte ik hoe diep christenen in Indonesië getroffen zijn, geraakt zijn door de blasfemie-zaak en ook de veroordeling uiteindelijk van de oud-gouverneur van Jakarta Ahok. Dus een urgente vraag: is er nu nog wel vrijheid van godsdienst in Indonesië? Ik hoop dat de Europese Commissie de Indonesische regering ook zal blijven aanspreken op vrijheid van geloof en zeker op het feit dat christenen, laat staan dubbel gediscrimineerde Indonesische staatsburgers, christenen en Chinees, momenteel monddood worden gemaakt door fanatieke moslims, die bovendien ook de gematigde moslims nog bedreigen. Gelukkig moet ik zeggen dat uit mijn contacten blijkt dat er wel degelijk gematigde moslims zijn die het opnemen voor christenen. Een voorbeeld voor Europa.

Barbara Lochbihler, *Verfasserin*. – Herr Präsident! In Indonesien ist Homosexualität bisher nicht verboten. Allerdings wird seit Januar 2016 vom Verfassungsgericht eine Petition geprüft, die die Kriminalisierung von sexuellen Beziehungen zwischen Homosexuellen wie auch von jeglichen einvernehmlichen sexuellen Beziehungen außerhalb der Ehe beabsichtigt.

Im vergangenen Jahr gab es einen nie dagewesenen Anstieg an Diskriminierung, an Einschüchterungen und an verbalen Angriffen gegen LGBTI-Personen, ein Trend, der sich 2017 fortgesetzt hat. Es war deshalb sehr positiv, dass Präsident Joko Widodo sich im vergangenen Oktober öffentlich gegen diese Diskriminierung ausgesprochen hat. Nun ist es notwendig, dass konkrete Maßnahmen zum Schutz von LGBTI-Personen vor Intoleranz und Menschenrechtsverletzungen ergriffen werden.

In der unabhängigen Provinz Aceh gilt Schariarecht. Dort werden gleichgeschlechtliche Beziehungen sogar noch mit Peitschenhieben bestraft – eine Strafe, die der Folter gleichkommt. Diese demütigende und inhumane Praxis muss umgehend beendet werden. Letztlich ist Homosexualität auch in Aceh zu legalisieren.

Soraya Post, *author*. – Mr President, during the night of 28 March 2017, men forced their way into a private home in Banda Aceh. Two young men were beaten and insulted, then taken to the police and convicted for consensual same-sex relations. They were punished with 83 lashes in front of a jeering crowd.

Such humiliating, degrading and inhuman treatment is an outrageous breach of their human rights. It may amount to torture under international law. LGBTI people in Indonesia are experiencing grave violations of their human rights. Discrimination, abuse, police raids, mandatory HIV retesting, and directives against 'LGBTI propaganda'.

The situation is particularly severe in the Aceh region of Indonesia, governed by Sharia law. The Indonesian government must take immediate action to safeguard their LGBTI citizens' human rights and human dignity.

Hilde Vautmans, *Auteur*. – Indonesië is een prachtig land. Vorig jaar gingen 16 miljoen toeristen het bezoeken voor de prachtige eilanden, de adembenemende natuur, de gastvrijheid van de mensen. Maar vandaag zijn wij hier vooral bezorgd over alle beelden en gegevens die ons vandaag bereiken. Vorige week een filmpje op het internet waarin mannen zweepslagen krijgen, gewoon omdat ze de liefde met elkaar hadden bedreven. Dat gebeurt op dit ogenblik in het prachtige Indonesië. Het is niet alleen in de provincie Atjeh, het is ook in de rest van het land dat LGBTI-personen gediscrimineerd worden, vervolgd, uitgejouwd. Dat moeten we een halt toeroepen. Ook de vrouwen en de meisjes zijn slachtoffers. Weet u dat op dit ogenblik de helft van de meisjes jonger dan 14 jaar besneden wordt in dat prachtige Indonesië? Mevrouw de commissaris, collega's, laten we vanuit Europa de lead blijven nemen. Wij moeten mensenrechten voorop stellen. Wij moeten vragen dat die gruwelpraktijken stopgezet worden.

Marie-Christine Vergiat, *auteure*. – Monsieur le Président, l'Indonésie est un grand pays, longtemps décrit comme un modèle de tolérance, notamment religieuse, si l'on excepte la période de Suharto, qui fit au moins 500 000 victimes, parmi lesquelles de nombreux militants communistes ou supposés tels.

Il serait temps de traduire en justice les responsables des crimes de 1965, qualifiés par le président de la République lui-même de crimes contre l'humanité, comme le demande la commission des droits de l'homme des Nations unies depuis 1972. La répression contre l'athéisme dans ce pays est le plus souvent un triste reliquat de cette période.

Le pays évolue mal sur de nombreux sujets. La peine de mort est de plus en plus utilisée dans la lutte contre le trafic de drogue, y compris à l'égard des étrangers. Le cas du français Serge Atlaoui en est un exemple.

Les atteintes à la liberté de la presse, y compris à l'égard de journalistes étrangers, se multiplient. Ainsi, Franck Escudié et Basile Longchamp, journalistes français, ont été expulsés le 17 mars dernier.

Même chose pour la répression politique que subissent notamment les militants pacifistes papous. Au moins 2 200 d'entre eux ont été arrêtés entre avril et septembre 2016.

Même chose pour le blasphème, accusation dont le gouverneur Ahok a été victime.

En outre, les violences à l'égard des LGBTI sont de plus en plus nombreuses, aggravées par des discours politiques d'une violence inouïe. L'arrestation de 141 personnes dans un club gay, au motif de pornographie, le 21 mai dernier, en est un triste exemple, comme les deux hommes fouettés en public, accusés de sodomie.

Cette dégradation inquiétante de la situation ne peut rester sans conséquence dans les relations de l'Union avec l'Indonésie. Il est temps d'agir et de réagir en utilisant tous les moyens qui sont à notre disposition, notamment pour demander l'abrogation des dispositions pénales qui permettent ces incriminations.

Il faut aussi obtenir la libération de tous ceux qui sont victimes de ces législations d'un autre âge et l'abandon de toutes les poursuites contre eux.

Jeroen Lenaers, *author*. – Mr President, Indonesia is a longstanding and important partner of the EU, and this is a partnership that is based on the shared values of human rights, democracy and the rule of law. It is against this background that we share our concerns here today. Concerns about what seems to be a growing intolerance against religious, ethnic and sexual minorities in Indonesia; concerns about the rising number of people that are prosecuted and imprisoned under the blasphemy laws; concerns and outrage about the situation in Aceh where two young men were publicly lashed for the simple reason that they were in love with each other.

We cannot stress enough the need to protect all human rights, and particularly those of minorities. Therefore, this resolution of the European Parliament is not only criticism, it is not only concerns; it is also an open invitation to the Indonesian authorities and to our colleagues in the Indonesian Parliament to strengthen our relations and to discuss these issues with each other in a very open and frank manner.

Tomáš Zdechovský, *za skupinu PPE*. – Přestože je Indonésie muslimskou zemí, žijí zde oficiálně hned zástupci šesti rozdílných náboženství, křesťanství nevyjímaje. Přestože se zde hodně hovořilo o lidských právech, málo se tady hovořilo o tom, že Indonésie byla vnímána jako země, kde je stabilně zaručena náboženská svoboda.

Bohužel v posledních měsících můžeme vidět, že právě na těchto menších náboženstvích jsou páčány různé zločiny. Zástupci těchto náboženských menšin, především křesťané, jsou brutálně napadáni. To vše se děje, přestože se Indonésie hlásí ke stejným hodnotám jako EU, tj. lidská práva a demokracie. Je pro to nutné, aby se vysoká představitelka EU proti těmto praktikám ozvala a vyzvala Indonésii k nápravě. Nerad bych, aby se Indonésie zařadila na seznam zemí, které nemohou být partnerem EU, protože se odklonily od našich hodnot.

David Martin, *on behalf of the S&D Group*. – Mr President, Indonesia and the EU do enjoy very good relations, and, as the trade rapporteur, I am working to strengthen our trade and economic relations with Indonesia. However, it is important – as Mr Lenaers said – that friends speak openly and honestly to each other. The jailing of the Governor of Jakarta for blasphemy, the public flogging of two homosexual men and the other negative developments taking place in Indonesia seriously undermine our relationship.

I urge the Indonesian Government to review its blasphemy law, which puts religious minorities under threat and encourages persecution. I also urge it to review the application of Sharia law, which I think is being abused even under its own terms and is certainly being used by certain sections of society to discriminate against LGBTI persons. That has no place in a modern democracy. Indonesia should act to keep itself a safe country and to keep good relations with the Western world, including the European Union.

Marek Jurek, *w imieniu grupy ECR*. – Panie Przewodniczący! W Indonezji w ciągu ostatnich lat spalono pięćset kościołów. Jeszcze niedawno dochodziło do gwałtownych wystąpień przeciwko budowie kościoła w samym sercu kraju, w Dżakarcie. Bardzo symboliczny, jeżeli chodzi o nienawiść antychrześcijańską, był proces gubernatora Dżakarty Ahoka, który został skazany na dwa lata więzienia za to, że powiedział, że muzułmanie mogą wybrać na urząd publiczny chrześcijanina. To proste stwierdzenie, że społeczeństwo ma prawo wybrać kompetentnego polityka, uznano za bluźnierstwo przeciwko Koranowi, czyli – jakbyśmy powiedzieli w naszym języku – za islamofobię.

Proszę Państwa! Czas naprawdę, żeby ten parlament stwierdził istnienie w różnych częściach świata nienawiści antychrześcijańskiej, żeby nazwać ją po imieniu. To jest również moja zachęta do tego, żeby pani komisarz – w momencie podsumowywania debaty – skorzystała z okazji i potępiła *expressis verbis* nienawiść antychrześcijańską, którą widzimy tam i w bardzo wielu innych miejscach świata.

Dita Charanzová, on behalf of the ALDE Group. – Mr President, for the last week, the world has been retweeting this photo of Indonesian football players: all praying together in harmony. A Hindu, a Christian and a Muslim – a sign of unity and tolerance. The Indonesian Government would do well by following this example.

Unfortunately, there are still many serious human rights abuses which involved the recent spike in the intolerance, harassment and violence towards various minority groups in Indonesia. The verbal attacks and acts against other religions, such as convicting and jailing the Christian Governor of Jakarta for blasphemy, must stop. The cruel punishment of sexual minorities through Sharia law by regional governments must stop. The government must put an end to discrimination by condemning and investigating all verbal and physical attacks on minority groups. Blasphemy laws must be urgently revised.

Given our even closer partnership, the EU should actively help Indonesia to fulfil its human rights obligations.

Ignazio Corrao, on behalf of the EFDD Group. – Mr President, the European Union is negotiating a new economic partnership agreement with Indonesia, a country that has so far benefited from an ever-closer relationship in various fields, especially the economic and commercial ones. Over the last decade, the Indonesian economy has more than tripled, and this is largely due to the European Union's contribution, which is the preferred destination of Indonesian exports, as well as one of the largest investors. In addition to that, Indonesia benefits from the Generalised Scheme of Preferences (GSPs).

In this context, there is a wave of growing intolerance towards ethnic, religious and sexual minorities and, in general, we have not seen the protection of human rights and the respect of international obligations. Therefore, as long as this situation persists, I strongly believe that we cannot make a new agreement. There cannot be future arrangements as long as the Indonesian Government resorts to the death penalty and fundamental freedoms of citizens are injured. An agreement will be possible only if we see concrete action and real change in government legislation.

Ελευθέριος Συναδινός (NI). – Κύριε Πρόεδρε, η Ινδονησία είναι ένα πολλούς συνεργαζόμενο κράτος που αλληλεπιδρά με την περιφερειακή και διεθνή κοινότητα και επιτρέπει οικειοθελώς την επιθεώρηση ζητημάτων από τρίτα κράτη και οργανισμούς, αν και επικρατεί μισαλλοδοξία κατά των χριστιανών. Κατ' αρχήν, τα θεμελιώδη δικαιώματα που θεωρητικά διέπουν την κοινωνία μας, τα δέχεται μερικώς και η Ινδονησία. Προφανώς, παρά την αντίστοιχη πρόοδο, υπάρχει περιθώριο σημαντικής βελτίωσης, ιδίως σε θέματα θρησκείας. Η Ένωση, αν σκοπεύει να φανεί χρήσιμη και επικαιρή, δίχως να υπερβαίνει την εντολή της, πρέπει να επικεντρωθεί σε υποστηρικτικές δράσεις έπειτα από κυρίαρχη απόφαση και πρόσκληση των νόμιμων αρχών. Άλλωστε, όταν παραβιάζονται τα ανθρώπινα δικαιώματα και τελούνται εγκλήματα κατά της ανθρωπότητας, τότε κινητοποιούνται διεθνείς μηχανισμοί με νομικά δεσμευτικές αποφάσεις και κατάλληλα μέσα λήψης δράσεων. Ο ρόλος της Ένωσης, εξ ορισμού, περιορίζεται στην επισήμανση των παραβιάσεων ανθρωπίνων δικαιωμάτων. Μπορεί να ηγηθεί δια του παραδείγματος, εφαρμόζοντας όσα υποτίθεται πως πρεσβεύει στους λαούς των κρατών μελών, εξασφαλίζοντας την ευημερία των πολιτών της και την επίλυση των εσωτερικών ζητημάτων. Η Ένωση δεν αρκεί να δηλώνει πρωτοπόρος στα ανθρώπινα δικαιώματα, οφείλει και να το αποδεικνύει στην πράξη.

Csaba Sógor (PPE). – Mr President, the blasphemy laws of the world's largest Muslim-majority democracy represent an unlawful restriction on the freedom of expression, which disproportionately target persons belonging to religious minorities, traditional religions, non-believers and political dissidents.

Of great concern are also the serious actions against the freedom of the media, the physical abuse of journalists and general growing intolerance against minorities, which are increasing together with the influence of fringe Islamist groups.

I sincerely hope that, for the sake of promoting a tolerant society, Indonesia will repeal all legal provisions unduly restricting fundamental freedoms and human rights, which go beyond the provisions of the international human rights obligations it subscribed to.

Ana Gomes (S&D). – Democracia de maioria muçulmana no quarto país mais populoso do mundo, sociedade diversa e aberta: esta é a Indonésia que mantém relações fortes com a União Europeia. E, por isso, como amigos e parceiros da Indonésia, estamos preocupados com a prisão do governador Ahok por blasfémia e com crescentes incidentes de intolerância contra minorias étnicas, religiosas e sexuais e de restrição das liberdades da maioria dos cidadãos, que são as mulheres, fomentadas, do exterior, por correntes fundamentalistas financiadas pela Arábia Saudita e outros países do Golfo e, do interior, por agentes nostálgicos do regime militarista e repressiva de Suharto.

Esta resolução visa encorajar o presidente Widodo e todas as autoridades indonésias a prosseguir e redobrar esforços para combater tentativas de restringir as liberdades democráticas e o respeito pela diversidade que é inerente ao moto nacional «*bhineka tunggal ika*» e à filosofia de tolerância religiosa do Pancasila. É inaceitável que a *sharia* no Aceh sirva para oprimir as mulheres e as minorias LGBTI e violar outras liberdades básicas duramente conquistadas com a democracia, na Indonésia. É intolerável que práticas medievais de flagelação pública sejam introduzidas a pretexto de uma versão pseudorreligiosa pervertida que não tem nada a ver com a forma exemplarmente tolerante como o Islão é praticado pela maioria dos muçulmanos na Indonésia.

Zgłoszenia z sali

Jiří Pospíšil (PPE). – Já se chci přihlásit k tomuto návrhu usnesení a vyjádřit mu podporu, protože si myslím, že je správné, že v navrženém usnesení upozorňujeme na to, že v Indonésii narůstá nesnášenlivost vůči menšinám – etnickým, náboženským a sexuálním – a že zvláště upozorňujeme na problémy, které v poslední době zažívá sexuální menšina v Indonésii. Vrcholem je pak samozřejmě situace v provincii Aceh, kde platí právo šaria a kde je homosexualita jako taková trestná a je tam dokonce už vykonáván trest několik desítek ran za tuto formu sexuálního projevu.

Je tedy správné, abychom v rámci obhajoby hodnot lidských práv a svobody a demokracie upozornili Indonésii, která je naším klíčovým partnerem, na to, že takovýmto způsobem se k menšinám není možné chovat, a abychom to při všech jednáních s Indonésií permanentně opakovali.

José Inácio Faria (PPE). – Senhor Presidente, depois da abertura democrática que a queda do regime autoritário de Suharto representou na Indonésia, assistimos, hoje, a um preocupante retrocesso na garantia dos direitos humanos naquele que é o maior país muçulmano do mundo.

Neste país, a mulher ainda é colocada em situações de submissão extrema e metade das meninas são vítimas de mutilação genital, os homossexuais e LGBTI sofrem todo o tipo de maus-tratos, detenções e prisões arbitrárias e a lei da blasfémia tem sido pretexto para a violação da proteção constitucional de que gozam as várias minorias religiosas hindu, budista e, sobretudo, cristãs.

A União Europeia não pode deixar de condenar estas violações e de condicionar as negociações do acordo de comércio livre com a Indonésia ao cumprimento das obrigações internacionais em matéria de direitos humanos que vinculam aquele país, incluindo o restabelecimento da moratória à pena de morte com vista à sua abolição e ao respeito pelo próprio lema do escudo indonésio que nós, europeus, também partilhamos: «unidos na diversidade».

Jean-Paul Denanot (S&D). – Monsieur le Président, nous pouvons effectivement nous féliciter des progrès réalisés en matière économique et sociale en Indonésie, grâce notamment au partenariat avec l'Union européenne. Mais nous devons rester très vigilant sur les questions des libertés et droits de l'homme.

Nous devons notamment récuser toutes les atteintes aux libertés religieuses et aux préférences sexuelles. Chacun doit, en effet, pouvoir vivre selon ses aspirations et ses orientations personnelles.

La montée de l'intolérance, notée d'ailleurs par de nombreux observateurs internationaux, est particulièrement préoccupante.

Nous devons donc exhorter le gouvernement central à la vigilance sur ces questions de droits et de libertés et lui demander avec force de revoir les législations liberticides d'un autre âge. La séance de torture d'Aceh doit l'inciter à surveiller particulièrement ce qui se passe dans ses provinces. Et puis, en Indonésie comme ailleurs, nous ne pouvons accepter que la liberté d'expression soit bafouée et que des journalistes soient emprisonnés.

L'Union européenne doit peser sur l'Indonésie pour que ce pays revienne à la raison.

Stanislav Polčák (PPE). – Indonésie je demokratickou zemí, nicméně zemí, v níž narůstají projevy nesnášenlivosti. Byť tato země učinila nepopíratelný pokrok v oblasti ekonomického rozvoje, zajištění řekněme sociálních jistot pro své občany, tak pokud jde o náboženskou svobodu, násilí na ženách anebo dokonce tedy vůči sexuálním menšinám, tak ta situace se vyvíjí skutečně nedobře, tragicky.

Několik desítek ran, které jsou trestem pro osoby, které žijí svůj privátní vztah s druhou osobou stejného pohlaví, tak to si myslím, že je naprosto nepřijatelné. Dokáží pochopit to, pokud stát reguluje jakési veřejné projevy, ale pokud někdo v privátní sféře žije svůj vlastní život, ať náboženský nebo sexuální, tak to si myslím, že by mělo zůstat v jeho svobodě, a proti takovému trestání bychom se měli jednoznačně ozvat.

(Koniec zgłoszeń z sali)

Elżbieta Bieńkowska, Member of the Commission. – Mr President, as many Members noted, the European Union has friendly and close relations with Indonesia based on the solid framework of our EU-Indonesia Partnership and Cooperation Agreement. We value our close partnership with this country. The EU has always had the highest regard for Indonesia's tradition as a pluralist, diverse and tolerant society but we acknowledge incidents that might call this tradition into question now.

Members of this House have raised a number of human rights issues in Indonesia, including the situation of the LGBTI community, media freedom, the application of the blasphemy law, the rights of the minorities, women's rights and Christians' rights. The EU has established a constructive and cooperative engagement on human rights in the form of a regular human rights dialogue with Indonesia, which allows for an exchange also on very sensitive subjects. We had the sixth Human Rights Dialogue last June and we are planning for the next meeting later in this year.

We also use other available opportunities to discuss human rights issues, through traditional diplomatic tools. The EU has encouraged Indonesia to abide by its international human rights commitments under the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights (ICCPR) and to ensure that national and regional laws, both in their formulation and implementation, do not discriminate against any of its citizens.

In regard to LGBTI persons, we welcome the statement by President Joko Widodo last October, when he said the police must act, that there should be no discrimination against anyone and that protection should be ensured.

The right to freedom of religion or belief is guaranteed in Indonesia's constitution. The European Union has consistently stated that laws that criminalise blasphemy can, when applied in a discriminatory manner, have a serious inhibiting effect on freedom of expression and on freedom of religion or belief. We note that the Constitutional Court reviewed the blasphemy law in 2010 but found it not to be in violation of the constitution. We note renewed debate about the law in Indonesia, where the EU has made its voice very hard.

Let me add that several projects are funded under the European Initiative on Democracy and Human Rights, on freedom of religion and belief and protection of minority groups. Be assured that the EU will continue to use every opportunity, including the next EU-Indonesia Human Rights Dialogue, to continue to raise the relevant issues with our Indonesian counterparts.

Przewodniczący. – Zamykam debatę.

Głosowanie odbędzie się w czwartek 15 czerwca 2017 r.

(Posiedzenie zostało zawieszone o godz. 11.40 i wznowione o godz. 12.00)

PRESIDENZA DELL'ON. ANTONIO TAJANI

*Presidente***5. Verklaringen van het voorzitterschap**

Presidente. – Dopo le barbarie degli attentati terroristici delle ultime settimane, un'altra orrenda tragedia ha colpito la città di Londra. Abbiamo di nuovo assistito tutti quanti a scene drammatiche: un grattacielo in fiamme, con molti morti, purtroppo, con molti dispersi. Sono scene che non vorremmo mai vedere. Purtroppo rischiamo che la situazione peggiori e che ci siano altre vittime. Questa vicenda rappresenta un dramma per la città di Londra, un dramma per il Regno Unito, un dramma per tutti quanti noi.

A nome del Parlamento europeo, voglio ringraziare tutti coloro che si sono impegnati nelle operazioni di soccorso, centinaia e centinaia di vigili del fuoco, donne e uomini della polizia. Persone che hanno rischiato la vita per salvare la vita di altri.

Cari colleghi, per questo vi chiedo, ancora una volta, di unirvi a me in un minuto di silenzio per ricordare le vittime innocenti della tragedia di Londra.

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

Una notizia positiva non può certamente cancellare il dolore che colpisce il popolo britannico e le famiglie delle vittime anche, pare, di altri paesi dell'Unione europea.

Però, oggi, mi sento orgoglioso di ricordare che si chiude l'epoca del *roaming* nell'Unione europea. Si tratta di un grande risultato.

(Applausi)

I cittadini, gli studenti, chi viaggia per lavoro e i turisti potranno muoversi in tutta l'Unione senza costi aggiuntivi per le loro chiamate o per l'utilizzo della rete Internet. Realizziamo un altro importante tassello del nostro mercato unico, del nostro essere europei.

Ringrazio il Parlamento per aver portato a positiva conclusione una battaglia durata anni, se pensiamo che la prima volta che quest'Aula si è espressa contro i costi eccessivi del *roaming* è stata nel lontano 2005. Da allora ci siamo battuti ottenendo una loro costante diminuzione, fino ad arrivare alla completa abolizione del *roaming* che possiamo verificare a partire da oggi.

Vorrei ringraziare per nome tutti coloro che hanno contribuito a questo straordinario risultato nel corso dell'ultimo decennio, ma la lista sarebbe troppo lunga. Tuttavia, permettetemi una menzione dei colleghi che in questo Parlamento hanno condotto a buon fine questa lunga battaglia: del Castillo, Kumpula-Natri, Toia, Ford, Rohde, Harbour, Matias, Reimon, Tamburrano, Rübig, Tošenovský, Ferreira, Borrelli, Fontana.

(Applausi)

E una menzione particolare alla nostra collega, nonché vicepresidente della Commissione europea Viviane Reding, a cui tutti noi siamo riconoscenti per il suo grande contributo.

(Applausi)

Merci beaucoup, Viviane, pour ton engagement et pour ton travail.

Quand j'étais vice-président de la Commission, j'étais à tes côtés et je peux témoigner de ton travail sur le roaming.

Merci beaucoup.

(Applaudissements)

Ringrazio quest'Aula per la forza e la tenacia nel portare avanti per anni una battaglia giusta. Mi auguro che gli Stati membri applichino le norme concordate in modo serio e diligente. Posso confermare, credo a nome di tutti voi, che il Parlamento europeo vigilerà affinché da oggi tutti possano davvero godere di questo beneficio. È un altro importante passo per un'Unione più forte e più vicina ai nostri cittadini. Vi ringrazio.

IN THE CHAIR: MAIREAD McGUINNESS

Vice-President

President. – Mr Gollnisch has raised a point of order, and then I will give you the floor, bear with me.

Bruno Gollnisch (NI). – Madame la Présidente, mon rappel a trait à l'article 150 de notre règlement.

Je suis un membre, hélas, déjà très ancien de ce Parlement et je dois dire que j'observe avec beaucoup d'inquiétude la diminution des garanties que représente l'immunité parlementaire, dont la seule finalité légitime est de garantir la liberté d'expression politique du député lorsqu'il est poursuivi par des adversaires politiques ou lorsque, membre de l'opposition, il est poursuivi par un gouvernement ou par des autorités administratives hostiles qui agissent par parquets interposés.

Ceci n'est plus le cas. Il est tout à fait scandaleux que dans un Parlement comme le nôtre, qui se dit garant des libertés publiques et de la présomption d'innocence, l'intéressé n'ait pas la possibilité de s'exprimer en séance, que la commission juridique soit convoquée dans des conditions absolument chaotiques, qui sont indignes de notre règlement, que ce ne soient pas les mêmes députés qui assistent à l'audition de l'intéressé et qui prennent la décision, ce qui évidemment vicie la décision en question...

(La Présidente retire la parole à l'orateur)

President. – Please, colleagues, may I have order? Mr Gollnisch, I will close your microphone now and I will respond. Mr Gollnisch, please listen to the Chair.

Mr Gollnisch is referring to our first vote, which we will get to presently. I will reply to your concerns. Mr Ehler, you have a point as well. Please raise it now.

Christian Ehler (PPE). – Frau Präsidentin, meine Kollegen! Die meisten von Ihnen werden es wissen: Gestern ist es zu in Washington einem schweren Anschlag auf Kollegen des amerikanischen Kongresses gekommen. Im Vorfeld einer Benefizveranstaltung auf einem Sportfeld ist der *majority leader* des amerikanischen Kongresses durch einen Bauchschuss schwer verletzt worden. Auch andere Abgeordnete sind durch Schüsse verletzt worden. Polizeibeamte haben das Schlimmste verhindert, haben ihr Leben gerettet und sind selber verletzt worden.

Ich glaube, es ist Ausdruck unserer transatlantischen Solidarität und unserer guten Beziehungen zum amerikanischen Kongress, dass wir den Schwerverletzten unsere Besserungswünsche übermitteln und dass wir diesen Anschlag aufs Tiefste verurteilen und den Polizeibeamten, die das Leben der Abgeordneten gerettet haben, um parlamentarische Freiheit und Sicherheit zu garantieren, danken.

President. – Thank you, Mr Ehler. We all support your kind and important remarks.

I refer now to the question about immunity and I will read the rules. Rule 9(6) provides that the Member concerned is given the opportunity to be heard by the committee responsible and the Member concerned – and we will vote shortly – was invited twice to appear before the committee, but did not accept either of those invitations.

6. Samenstelling commissies: zie notulen

7. Stemmingen

President. – The next item is the vote.

(For the results and other details of the vote: see Minutes)

7.1. Verzoek om opheffing van de immuniteit van Marine Le Pen (stemming)

7.2. De zaak van Afgan Mukhtarli en de situatie van de media in Azerbeidzjan (RC-B8-0414/2017, B8-0414/2017, B8-0415/2017, B8-0416/2017, B8-0417/2017, B8-0418/2017, B8-0420/2017) (stemming)

— *Before the vote:*

Cristian Dan Preda (PPE). – Madame la Présidente, dans le débat que nous avons eu aujourd'hui, des membres de différents groupes politiques, celui dont je fais partie, le groupe socialiste et le groupe libéral, ont exprimé le désir de reporter le vote.

Par conséquent, je vous invite à mettre ce souhait au vote.

President. – The proposal is to postpone the vote. Would anyone like to speak against the proposal?

Charles Tannock (ECR). – No, just to confirm that the ECR Group will endorse and support the position of the EPP in asking for a delay in the vote, as suggested by Commissioner Hahn.

President. – I am asking whether there is anyone in the Chamber who wishes to speak against. You have the floor.

Pavel Telička (ALDE). – Madam President, in fact we had a debate today in the plenary, and it was consensual in terms of the assessment of the situation; there was not a single voice that would evaluate the abduction in a different way. So the question is, what is the best tactic? Some of the colleagues have proposed postponement for one reason, and that is that Commissioner Hahn will have an opportunity, travelling to Baku, to raise the issue – or he has already travelled – but the point is, we have considered this an urgency and all political groups have agreed. Everyone knows, including the person detained, as well as the Azerbaijani Government, that we are discussing and eventually postponing it on the request of Mr Hahn, for the reason that he would like to be in a better position. That is not correct. My assessment is different. If we postpone it, that basically means that we accept the disrespect of President Aliyev in that a few days before the abduction he received for an hour and a half an EP high ranking delegation discussing human rights, and then this is done. I do not believe that that will achieve the goal.

A final remark – what will achieve the goal is if the Commissioner has in hand a well-balanced wording of a resolution that will help to strengthen his position in order to release the gentleman.

(The proposal to postpone the vote was rejected)

— *Before the vote on the motion for a resolution.*

Heidi Hautala (Verts/ALE). – Madam President, it is important to check all the possible facts and mistakes, and there is one factual mistake in paragraph 8. In fact, the body of Mehman Galandarov, the blogger and activist who died in the custody of Azerbaijani authorities on 28 April this year was returned to his family, so can I propose as an oral amendment that we delete the last part of paragraph 8 which is as follows 'and whose body was not returned to his family?'. It was returned.

(The oral amendment was accepted)

7.3. Pakistan, met name de situatie van mensenrechtenverdedigers en de doodstraf (RC-B8-0419/2017, B8-0419/2017, B8-0421/2017, B8-0422/2017, B8-0423/2017, B8-0427/2017, B8-0429/2017)

7.4. De mensenrechtensituatie in Indonesië (RC-B8-0424/2017, B8-0424/2017, B8-0425/2017, B8-0426/2017, B8-0428/2017, B8-0430/2017, B8-0431/2017)

7.5. De tenuitvoerlegging van het Europees Fonds voor strategische investeringen (A8-0200/2017 - José Manuel Fernandes, Udo Bullmann) (stemming)

7.6. Europese agenda voor de deeleconomie (A8-0195/2017 - Nicola Danti) (stemming)

7.7. Onlineplatforms en de digitale eengemaakte markt (A8-0204/2017 - Henna Virkkunen, Philippe Juvin) (stemming)

7.8. De humanitaire situatie in Jemen (RC-B8-0407/2017, B8-0407/2017, B8-0408/2017, B8-0409/2017, B8-0410/2017, B8-0411/2017, B8-0412/2017, B8-0413/2017) (stemming)

7.9. Het statuut en de financiering van Europese politieke partijen en Europese politieke stichtingen (B8-0405/2017, B8-0406/2017) (stemming)

President. – That concludes the vote.

PRZEWODNICTWO: RYSZARD CZARNECKI

Wiceprzewodniczący

8. Stemverklaringen

Przewodniczący. – Zgodnie z Państwa sugestią odczekaliśmy chwilę, aby wszyscy zainteresowani udziałem w debacie zostali, a ci, którzy nie są nią zainteresowani, wyszli. Apeluję do kolegów, którzy jeszcze są na sali, a nie zabierają głosu, żeby przenieśli swoje dyskusje wewnętrzne poza salę obrad.

Przechodzimy do wyjaśnień do głosowania.

8.1. De tenuitvoerlegging van het Europees Fonds voor strategische investeringen (A8-0200/2017 - José Manuel Fernandes, Udo Bullmann)

Ustne wyjaśnienia dotyczące głosowania

Момчил Неков (S&D). – Европейският фонд за стратегически инвестиции е в сила от близо две години. Разделението изток-запад в него обаче все още е силно видимо. Към 30 юни 2016 г. от подкрепата от ЕФСИ държавите от ЕС-15 са получили 91% от фонда, докато държавите от ЕС-13 са получили едва 9%.

С притеснение разбрах, че вместо да бъде в подкрепа на по-различни проекти, Европейската инвестиционна банка използва гаранцията на Европейския съюз за насърчаване на проекти, които пораждаат съмнения относно това дали са в съответствие с установените критерии за подбор на проекти.

Бих искал да допълня, че вече над година чуваме от представители на ГЕРБ как с помощта на този фонд в България щял да се финансира проект за интерконектор с Гърция. Това обаче все още остава само на думи и обещания. Този проект най-накрая трябва да получи приоритет, а не да бъде използван само в PR кампании, защото е в интерес на националната сигурност.

Rosa D'Amato (EFDD). – Signor Presidente, onorevoli colleghi, l'oste ci ha detto che ha del vino buono ma ci faremmo molto male se ci ubriacassimo con i numeri che continua a dare. Sono state intessute le lodi dell'EFSI stando ai dati forniti da chi l'EFSI l'aveva progettato. Non c'è stata alcuna valutazione indipendente e ci siamo bevuti la narrativa di un piano di successo per gli investimenti che sostiene le piccole e medie imprese, che ha un valore aggiunto e che spinge la crescita e l'occupazione. Invece, nulla di tutto ciò, mancano dati disaggregati sui benefici reali, l'effetto moltiplicatore è stato sopravvalutato, non ci sono informazioni sui posti di lavoro creati, le modalità operative sono opache e le cifre talvolta risultano segrete.

Persino la Corte dei conti europea ha detto chiaramente che l'EFSI ha un impatto limitato. Non solo, molti progetti hanno elevate emissioni impattanti. Ci sono molti interventi per fonti fossili come petrolio e gas e si fa davvero poco per le rinnovabili e per sostenere l'autoproduzione energetica. Nel frattempo si moltiplicano gli strumenti finanziari a elevato rischio per un'EFSI che ammicca alle banche e agli intermediari finanziari, ma che rischia di essere una bomba a orologeria per le economie reali. Per questo motivo abbiamo votato contro.

President. – Ms D'Amato, your metaphor about wines was very interesting!

Daniel Hannan (ECR). – Mr President, it is always about the money, is it not. How much time we spend in this Chamber talking about transfers of cash! We never think about the debilitating effect it can have on individuals, on whole professions, consultants and contractors, and the people who have learned how to make a living out of the Brussels institution, even on whole nations who are encouraged to look beyond their borders for every rise in life.

We have evolved a whole special vocabulary to talk about how we keep the money going round. For example, the word 'greed' is always used for somebody who has a claim on somebody else's money. It is never used for somebody who wants to keep his own resources. The word 'solidarity' is used when we European politicians arrange a transfer.

I would make one warning, one note of caution. If you vote for politicians who have promised to give you somebody else's money, do not complain when they take your money to spend on somebody else, or indeed to spend on themselves.

Andrejs Mamikins (S&D). – Mr President, I would like to draw your attention to the fact that the European Fund for Strategic Investments has benefited mainly those countries that do not have big investment gaps and it creates an unequal geographical distribution of funded projects. Now the competition is going on: which comes first? The positive result of cohesion and investment policies for the Latvian economy or huge demographic change in Latvia.

Many people have left the country because they are tired of waiting for the Latvian economy to reach western and Nordic EU economy levels. They prefer to emigrate with their families. The shrinking working-age population will not offer any prospects for those who remain in the country. As a result, we will see a beautiful but empty country with a small, old and poor population.

The Latvian economy needs investment from the European Fund for Strategic Investments, and distribution should be made without any discrimination. I support the report and especially the idea of providing technical assistance to those countries and regions which have benefited less from the European Fund for Strategic Investments.

Anna Záborská (PPE). – Vážený pán predseda, podporila som uznesenie k správe o vykonávaní Európskeho fondu pre strategické investície, pretože ide o jeden zo spôsobov, ako zvýšiť investície v Európskej únii na projekty, ktoré by mohli zvyšovať zamestnanosť a prosperitu. Táto iniciatívna správa obsahuje mnoho dobrých návrhov ako zlepšiť fungovanie tohto nového nástroja a zlepšiť komunikáciu smerom k občanom aj podnikateľom. Chcem však zdôrazniť, že zlepšenie investičného prostredia nemôže byť len otázkou verejných investícií, ale predovšetkým súkromných zdrojov.

Ďakujem.

8.2. Europese agenda voor de deeleconomie (A8-0195/2017 - Nicola Danti)

Ustne wyjaśnienia dotyczące głosowania

Tibor Szanyi (S&D). – Elnök Úr! Szavazatommal támogattam a közösségi gazdaságra vonatkozó európai menetrendről szóló jelentést. A jelentéshez hasonlóan üdvözlöm, hogy a közösségi gazdaság fellendülése fokozza a versenyt, ugyanakkor azt is helyeslem, hogy a munkaerőpiacra és a munkavállalók jogaira gyakorolt hatással is foglalkozik a szöveg. Szavazatomat szintén pozitívan befolyásolt a tény, hogy a jelentés több ponton is kitért a vidéki területek igényeire. Egyetértek azzal, hogy a közösségi gazdaság számottevő lehetőséget teremthet a belső perifériák, a vidéki térségek és a hátrányos helyzetű területek számára.

Andrejs Mamikins (S&D). – Mr President, the collaborative economy creates new opportunities for our societies and would make an important contribution to jobs and growth in the European Union. but the main challenge is to find a proper definition of what the term ‘collaborative economy’ means. An answer should be found for some important issues related to consumer protection, employment relationships, tax rules and other issues. The collaborative economy enables people to work according to flexible arrangements. This makes it possible for them to become economically active where more traditional forms of employment are not suitable.

But at the same time we should be careful. Sometimes new platforms and technologies are only used to avoid labour and tax legislation. This creates unfair advantages and puts pressure on other market participants to do the same. As a result, we see a race to the bottom that can have a very unpleasant and unpredictable economic, social and political outcome. I think this report is a step in the right direction.

Lucy Anderson (S&D). – Mr President, the collaborative economy in areas such as travel and leisure has had a large potential to enhance the everyday lives of citizens and to create quality jobs. But it must be regulated responsibly to protect from exploitation workers and consumers involved in or relying upon these new business models. Equally, it is essential to ensure that taxation and other public policy priorities are regulated by this and are dealt with properly in the collaborative economy.

The text of this report reflects these concerns and I was pleased to vote for it.

Anna Záborská (PPE). – Vážený pán predseda, podporila som predloženú správu o kolaboratívnom hospodárstve, aj keď s určitými rozpakmi. Až do jej prečítania som si totiž myslela, že medzi kolaboratívnym a trhovým hospodárstvom nie je rozdiel. Som preto rada, že iniciatívne správy, ako je táto, rozširujú aj môj myšlienkový obzor a dávajú mi príležitosť pozrieť sa na známe javy, akými je napríklad deľba práce, špecializácia a následne nevyhnutná spolupráca pri výmene tovarov a služieb, celkom novými očami. Pravdepodobne však uplynie ešte veľa času, kým sa diskurz o kolaboratívnej ekonomike dostane aj do európskej legislatívy.

Ďakujem.

8.3. Onlineplatforms en de digitale eengemaakte markt (A8-0204/2017 - Henna Virkkunen, Philippe Juvin)

Ustne wyjaśnienia dotyczące głosowania

Момчил Неков (S&D). – Разпокъсаността на цифровия пазар на Европейския съюз отслабва значително неговата конкурентоспособност на световно ниво. Липсата на финансиране на новите пазарни технологии, както и правната несигурност, представляват сериозна пречка пред европейските стартиращи предприятия.

Малкият и среден бизнес представлява гръбнакът на европейската икономика и трябва да осигурим необходимите стимули за неговото развитие. Призовавам Европейската комисия да продължи да насърчава растежа на онлайн платформите в Европейския съюз, защото те осигуряват така необходимите предимства на малките и средните предприятия като достъп до световните пазари и възможност за растеж.

Също така трябва да отбележим, че осигуряването на онлайн достъп за стартиращите предприятия (startups) им спестява непосилните инвестиции в цифрова инфраструктура, като им осигурява широко разпространение. И още повече, изглежда ми безумно, че говорим за разпространение на 5G мрежи, докато в същото време в повечето селски райони в България, например, няма 3G и 4G покритие. Поради тези причини дадох подкрепата си за доклада.

Tibor Szanyi (S&D). – Elnök Úr! A jelentés számos megfontolandó, az online platformokat és a digitális egységes piacot érintő javaslatot tett. Ezek közül az egyik legfontosabb a nagysebességű szélessávú hálózatok, és az egyéb digitális infrastruktúra kiterjesztésére szánt, megfelelő mértékű beruházás biztosítására vonatkozó felhívás. Külön üdvözlöm, hogy az infrastruktúrába való beruházás tekintetében a jelentés kitért a vidéki területekre is, valamint, hogy felszólalt a technológiákhoz való egyenlőtlén hozzáférés ellen.

A tagállamoknak aktívan kell tenniük az ellen, hogy szakadékok alakuljanak ki a digitális készségek hiánya, vagy a technológiákhoz való egyenlőtlén hozzáférés következtében. Támogatom, ezentúl a szociális dimenziók fejlesztésére vonatkozó felhívást, valamint szintén szorgalmazom, hogy a tagállamok gondoskodjanak az önálló vállalkozók megfelelő szociális biztonságáról. Egyetértek továbbá a hamis hírek terjesztése elleni fellépés fontosságát, a személyes adatok védelmét, valamint a fogyasztók tájékoztatását érintő megállapításokkal.

Seán Kelly (PPE). – I voted in favour of this report in the light of the hard work that the rapporteurs, Ms Virkkunen and Mr Juvin, have done to evaluate the issues central to the consolidation of online platforms and a digital single market in the European Union.

I welcome the report's thorough appraisal of innovative opportunities and regulatory challenges in this sphere. Essentially, the report also evaluates the digital transformation of Europe in terms of the collaborative economy and the transparent processing of data across digital platforms. By identifying the means of responding to these challenges we can bolster the digital single market and the competitiveness of our markets for the future. I wish to note the vital contributions of my colleagues in the Committee on Industry, Research and Energy towards the finalisation of this report. I am pleased to voice my support, and I am expecting SMEs and citizens to benefit as we create a digital single market.

8.4. De humanitaire situatie in Jemen (RC-B8-0407/2017, B8-0407/2017, B8-0408/2017, B8-0409/2017, B8-0410/2017, B8-0411/2017, B8-0412/2017, B8-0413/2017)

Ustne wyjaśnienia dotyczące głosowania

Andrejs Mamikins (S&D). – Mr President, conflict in Yemen is not a popular theme of discussion in European media. This is leading to our usual European problem: selective blindness. One part of this blindness exists because of a lack of concentration in European society. The problem exists only if people see the emotional stories on TV or in social media. If not, the problem does not exist in people's minds at all. As a result, politicians are free to do nothing to resolve this bloody conflict.

Many European politicians are not being frank about the situation in Yemen. The political elite of some EU countries are silent because of the interest in the arms trading deal with Saudi Arabia. Money has no smell. We Europeans are also responsible for the victims of this ongoing conflict because of our silence, and are fuelling this war by selling weapons to groups in the conflict zone. We in the European Parliament like to criticise other countries, but we are not critical of ourselves.

I supported all the amendments of the GUE Group and the Greens in this resolution.

8.5. Het statuut en de financiering van Europese politieke partijen en Europese politieke stichtingen (B8-0405/2017, B8-0406/2017)

Ustne wyjaśnienia dotyczące głosowania

Tibor Szanyi (S&D). – Elnök Úr! Szavazatommal támogattam az európai politikai pártok és alapítványok jogállásáról és finanszírozásáról szóló állásfoglalási indítványt, amelyhez hasonlóan úgy vélem, hogy a számos hiányosság miatt szükség van az 1141/2014. számú rendelet átdolgozására. Főleg a társfinanszírozás szintjét, illetve a képviselők több pártban való tagságának lehetőségét tekintve. Éppen ezért az indítvánnyal egyetértve szorgalmazom, hogy a Bizottság tanulmányozza a hiányosságokat, és tegyen javaslatot a rendelet felülvizsgálatára.

Michaela Šojdrová (PPE). – Já jsem dnes podpořila usnesení EP o financování politických stran a nadací na evropské úrovni. Domnívám se, že potřebujeme větší transparentnost. Evropská demokracie potřebuje demokraty, svobodné a odpovědné občany, protože jedině tak bude životaschopná.

Myslím, že je chybou, že současný systém financování politických stran parazituje. Na tomto systému parazitují uskupení prosazující protievropskou agendu. Proto jsme dnes také vyzvali Komisi, aby co nejdříve stávající nařízení přezkoumala a předložila jeho revizi, která bude proti zneužívání veřejných prostředků.

Osobně podporuji zejména transparentnost při úpravě podmínek financování, zvednutí povinného limitu členství poslanců EP v evropské politické straně z jednoho alespoň na tři poslance a požaduji jasnou politickou příslušnost poslanců EP.

Anna Záborská (PPE). – Vážený pán předseda, Európsky parlament vo svojom uznesení požaduje, aby Komisia pripravila novelu pravidiel pre financovanie európskych politických strán a nadácií. V istom zmysle súhlasím s navrhovateľmi v tom, že nejaké zmeny sú asi potrebné.

Rozumiem však obavam malých politických strán a nadácií, pre ktoré by niektoré typy zmien mohli mať priam likvidačné dôsledky. Aj preto som presvedčená, že tak Komisia, ako aj tento Parlament, by mali v tejto veci postupovať citlivo a uvažlivo. My, ako poslanci Európskeho parlamentu, musíme sledovať tento proces, musíme ho pripomienkovať a musíme byť aktívni. Nemôžeme čakať až do finálneho textu, keď už nebude možné veľa zmeniť. Rovnako trvám na tom, že ak by sme v budúcnosti mali meniť pravidlá, mali by byť účinné až od začiatku nového volebného obdobia.

Ďakujem.

Branislav Škripek (ECR). – Mr President, every few years this House tries to change the rules governing European parties. Apart from entailing a lot of work in each successive debate, this is not good for stable democracy in the EU. That is my opinion. The proposal raising the number of MEPs needed to create a European party is unhelpful for the much-needed dialogue between the EU institutions and citizens in the EU. It gives a strong impression that you need to be inside the Brussels bubble in order to become part of it.

If you need three to five MEPs to create a European party, that will close the door to any initiative from the bottom up, the kind of initiative that the EU now needs most. Not all small and new parties are anti-EU. This measure will not stop far right groupings, but it will be undemocratic, as it closes the doors on basically all new parties in the future. That is not the message which we should send to our citizens.

Przewodniczący. – Niniejszym zamykam wyjaśnienia dotyczące głosowania.

9. Rectificaties stemgedrag/Vorgenomen stemgedrag: zie notulen

(Posiedzenie zostało zawieszone o godz. 13.00 i wznowione o godz. 15.00)

VORSITZ: EVELYNE GEBHARDT

Vizepräsidentin

10. Goedkeuring van de notulen van de vorige vergadering: zie notulen

11. Uitgebreide interpellaties (debat)

11.1. Viering van de internationale dag van het gezin 2017: bevordering van de rol van ouders bij het waarborgen van kwalitatief hoogwaardig onderwijs voor hun kinderen

Die Präsidentin. – Als nächster Punkt der Tagesordnung folgt die Aussprache über die Große Anfrage gemäß Artikel 130b der Geschäftsordnung von Beatrix von Storch, Daniela Aiuto, Kristina Winberg, Joëlle Bergeron im Namen der EFDD-Fraktion über die Begehung des Internationalen Tags der Familie 2017: Förderung der Rolle der Eltern bei der Gewährleistung einer hochwertigen Bildung für ihre Kinder (O-000030/2017/rév.1 - B8-0315/2017) (2017/2736(RSP)).

Beatrix von Storch, Verfasserin. – Frau Präsidentin! Anlass für diese Aussprache heute ist der internationale Tag der Familie, und die Vereinten Nationen haben dafür eine Handreichung herausgegeben. Danach sind Mutter und Vater der wichtigste Bezugspunkt im Leben der Kinder und insbesondere der Kleinkinder, sagen die Vereinten Nationen. Die Sozialisierung von Kleinkindern findet am besten in der Familie statt – innerhalb der Familie und nicht außerhalb der Familie, sagen die Vereinten Nationen. Und je mehr sich Väter und Mütter um ihre Kinder selber kümmern, umso besser läuft es im Leben der Kinder, sagen die Vereinten Nationen. Die Erziehungsleistungen von Eltern sind messbare Leistungen, die wirtschaftlich und gesellschaftlich relevant sind und die deswegen gefördert werden müssen, sagen die Vereinten Nationen. Zusammengefasst sagen die UN: Das Wichtigste für Kinder in ihrem Leben sind Vater und Mutter – ihre Eltern –, und nicht ein Ganztageskindergarten oder die Fremdbetreuung.

Sie merken, das ist das exakte Gegenteil von dem, was hier in diesem Hause Religion zu sein scheint. Die Europäische Union fördert am liebsten Wochenkrippen wie im Ostblock und wie in der DDR. Mütter sollen sich nicht um ihre Kleinkinder kümmern, sondern sie sollen sich an der Werkbank verwirklichen, denn nur das ist wahre Leistung und Karriere. Und im Bericht Noichl haben wir doch tatsächlich beschlossen, dass Ehe – natürlich nur die traditionelle Ehe und nicht die Homoehe – und die Rolle als Vater und Mutter gesundheitsgefährdend sind. Das ist wahrscheinlich auch der Grund dafür, dass heute nicht die zuständige Kommissarin Jourová hier sitzt, sondern der Kommissar für Gesundheit. Familie ein Gesundheitsrisiko. Die EU will die Bedeutung der Familie und die Rolle von Vater und Mutter einfach nicht anerkennen, obwohl es das Wichtigste im Leben eines Kindes ist.

Aber es gibt Mitgliedstaaten, die auf dem richtigen Weg sind. Ungarn beispielsweise hat kürzlich einen Demografiepfad abgehalten unter der Regierung Orbán. Sie hatten zuvor eine Reihe von familienpolitischen Maßnahmen auf den Weg gebracht, die genau das tun – die Förderung von Vätern und Müttern für ihre Kinder und für die frühkindliche Erziehung. Es gibt sie also, diese Mitgliedstaaten, die den richtigen Weg eingeschlagen haben, und ich wünsche mir für Deutschland und auch für die Europäische Union, aber insbesondere natürlich für mein Land Deutschland, dass wir diesen ungarischen Weg in Sachen Familienpolitik einschlagen. Und das bedeutet, dass wir uns vollständig entfernen müssen von dem Weg, der hier in diesem Hause gegangen wird, und uns hinwenden zu dem Weg, den die Vereinten Nationen beschreiben: Das Wichtigste im Leben für ein Kind sind Vater und Mutter und Familien und nicht der Staat als Oberinstanz; das ist der Glaube hier, das ist grundverkehrt.

(Der Redner ist damit einverstanden, eine Frage nach dem Verfahren der „blauen Karte“ gemäß Artikel 162 Absatz 8 der Geschäftsordnung zu beantworten.)

Stanislav Polčák (PPE), otázka položená zvednutím modré karty. – Mě poměrně vyprovokoval projev paní kolegyně, byl v mnohém zajímavý, ale já se chci zeptat paní kolegyně, zda vzhledem k jejímu politickému zařazení projev znamená, že chce, aby věci, které souvisí s rodinou, byly regulovány, resp. upravovány z evropské úrovně. Rozumím tomu správně, že tímto způsobem chcete vlastně vstupovat, podle mého názoru, do docela svébytného postavení členských států EU?

Beatrix von Storch (EFDD), Antwort auf eine Frage nach dem Verfahren der „blauen Karte“. – Vielen Dank für diese Frage. Das ist natürlich genau nicht der Fall, auf gar keinen Fall. Die Familien sollen ohne staatliche Eingriffe und insbesondere ohne Eingriffe von der Europäischen Union sein. Es ist überhaupt nicht die Zuständigkeit der Europäischen Union, sich irgendwo einzumischen. Aber was wir tun aus diesem Hause – wir mischen uns ein, wir machen Sensibilisierungskampagnen und Kampagnen für alle möglichen Lebensformen und so weiter, gegen Väter, gegen Mütter. Das sollen wir genau unterlassen.

Also, erstens mischen wir uns ein und dann auch noch in der falschen Weise. Keine Einmischung, nationale Zuständigkeit – das ist eine ganz klare Ansage.

Vytėnis Povilas Andriukaitis, Member of the Commission. – Mr President, I will not repeat questions, but simply say 'question 1', etc. Let me stress that EU Member States may observe the International Day of the Family in their capacity as United Nations members. Observing the day offers a good opportunity to discuss the role of families and the impact of family-oriented policies in promoting overall well-being in Europe and worldwide, and in the world of work more generally.

As you know, Member States are, first and foremost, responsible for social policies addressed to families. Nevertheless, the Commission has been supporting Member States through political guidance in the context of the European Semester. European Union financial support is also available through the European Social Fund, the European Regional Development Fund and the Fund for European Aid to the Most Deprived. Concerning the roles of families in educating their children, the Commission reiterated in our recent communication on school development and excellent teaching that the cooperation of educational institutions and parents is key. We will continue to use the tools under the Education and Training 2020 Strategy and the Erasmus Plus programme to support Member States who wish to develop school policies that deepen parental involvement.

Second question: we share your view on the important role played by families in the welfare of our societies, in particular when it comes to providing care for children and other dependent family members. This is precisely why the European Pillar of Social Rights adopted on 26 April 2017 recognises the role of family members as caregivers and states that parents and people with caring responsibilities have the right to suitable leave, flexible working agreements and access to care services.

As a concrete deliverable of the Pillar, our new initiative on work-life balance for parents and carers aims to modernise the way in which work-life balance policies are designed to improve the daily lives of many parents and carers. In addition to supporting the provisions of formal care services, we intend to update the European Union legal framework in the areas of family-related leave and flexible working arrangements in order to enable working parents and carers to better reconcile their professional and caring responsibilities.

In addition, the Pillar includes the right to affordable early childhood education and care of good quality. It also states the right to protection from poverty and the right to specific support measures to enhance equal opportunities for children from disadvantaged backgrounds. Early childhood education and care is precisely such a specific measure which helps to break the cycle of disadvantage. This is why the Commission supports Member States in improving access to, and the quality of, early childhood education and care. We acknowledge that family is the first and most important place for children to grow and develop. At the same time, the Commission sees early childhood education provision and the family's role in education as complementary. Participating in early education is in the best interests of children and their families. It is in these formative years that we can lay the foundations for a successful life, social integration and employability. The Commission therefore considers that the provision of early childhood education is an indispensable part of an efficient and modern social infrastructure.

We are also monitoring the implementation of the 2013 recommendation on investing in children. In the context of the European Semester, the Commission has provided targeted, country-specific recommendations to those Member States with the biggest challenges, and we are supporting the exchange of good practices in the area of child and family policy through the European Platform for Investing in Children and the Erasmus+ programme. The Commission also provides financial support to various NGOs, including Eurocarers, the Confederation of Family Organisations in the EU, Eurochild and the European Network on Independent Living. The actions undertaken by these NGOs substantially contribute to raising awareness of issues related to the work of family members.

Third question: we share your concern regarding the invisible or unpaid work of working parents and carers. This is why the Commission put forward this new initiative on work-life balance for working parents and carers. This sets out a comprehensive package of complementary legal and policy measures which will enable both parents to care for their children, thus enhancing their children's cognitive development and well-being.

As regards European Union funds, the funding possibilities for children in the existing EU financial instrument have been significantly strengthened in the current 2014-2020 programming period. Approximately EUR 21.2 billion of the total European Social Fund's allocation was earmarked for social inclusion measures, of which EUR 3.9 billion is set aside for access to services, including childcare, and EUR 8 billion was earmarked for measures to prevent early school leaving. Moreover, around EUR 11 billion from the European Regional Development Fund is planned for measures promoting social inclusion and combating poverty, while around EUR 6 billion are planned for investment in educational infrastructure.

Michaela Šojdřová, za skupinu PPE. – Myslím, že všichni si uvědomujeme primární roli rodičů ve výchově dětí. Rodiče mají a musí mít i nadále svobodnou volbu a také odpovědnost za výchovu a vzdělávání svých dětí.

Chceme, aby rodiče byli pro školu partnerem. Všichni jsme upozornili na riziko ohrožení chudobou, ve které žije dnes stále ještě téměř jedna třetina dětí v Evropě. Mezi ty nejohroženější patří ty, které žijí s jedním rodičem nebo dokonce bez stabilního rodinného zázemí.

Přestože se podařilo snížit průměr nedokončeného středního vzdělání, stále více než 10 % dětí nedokončí vzdělání a jsou ohroženy životním neúspěchem. Úloha rodičů i prarodičů je nezpochybnitelná. Stejně jako je nezpochybnitelná kompetence členských států v rodinné a vzdělávací politice.

EU by jim v tom poslání měla pomáhat. Společnost Evropy stárne a bude stárnout, pokud si neuvědomíme, že dítě je investicí. Proto bychom měli zde z EP vyzdvihnout rodičovskou péči o děti jako tu nejdůležitější lidskou práci, které si vážíme, a musíme ji také finančně ocenit. Apeluji na Komisi i na členské státy. Vytvořme rodičům podmínky, aby mohli a chtěli mít a vychovávat děti. Je to ta nejlepší investice do naší budoucnosti.

Urszula Krupa, w imieniu grupy ECR. – Pani Przewodnicząca! Chciałam także zauważyć, że niestety wiele działań nie do końca sprzyja rodzinie, która – jak wiemy – jest naturalnym środowiskiem wychowania dziecka. Cele barcelońskie zachęcają kobiety do pracy, mimo że według badań znaczna część pragnie osobiście opiekować się dzieckiem po jego urodzeniu. Tymczasem proponuje się, aby większość dzieci była objęta edukacją przedszkolną.

Według norweskich badań poziom stresu u dzieci w żłobkach jest aż o 30 % większy niż u pozostających w domu. Szczególnie u małych dzieci długotrwały stres ma bardzo negatywny wpływ na rozwój, zwłaszcza mózgu. Dowiedziono, że im więcej czasu dzieci spędzają w żłobku, tym więcej wykazują postaw antyspołecznych, a nastolatki wychowywane w żłobkach po przekroczeniu piętnastego roku życia częściej sięgają po alkohol, papierosy czy narkotyki.

Osobiście jestem także przeciwna wprowadzaniu szczególnych zachęt dla ojców, aby zamiast matki wychowywali noworodki, gdyż te potrzebują osobowości delikatniejszej, opiekuńczej i wrażliwej na potrzeby nowonarodzonego.

W prawidłowym rozwoju ogromną rolę odgrywa okres dzieciństwa, kiedy to do drugiego roku życia dziecko nieświadomie identyfikuje się z matką. Potem dla dziecka płci żeńskiej matka nadal pozostaje wzorem, natomiast dla chłopców w trzecim roku życia rozpoczyna się identyfikacja z ojcem. Odmienność zainteresowań dzieci płci męskiej i żeńskiej jest zauważalna od najwcześniejszych chwil życia, co świadczy o tym, że zróżnicowanie płciowe jest wbudowane w proces poznawczy w łonie matki.

Ivan Jakovčić, u ime kluba ALDE. – Gospođo predsjednice, vrlo mi je drago da je ova točka danas na dnevnom redu našeg Parlamenta jer želim potpuno jasno reći da je jako dobro da obilježavamo Međunarodni dan obitelji, jer je obitelj svakako jedan od temelja društva. Međutim, s druge strane želim jasno reći da ne dozvoljavam monopol na obitelj nekome tko dolazi samo s desnog političkog spektra, obitelj pripada svima nama. Ja ovdje govorim i kao ponosan otac troje uspješne djece, koja već imaju svoju djecu, dakle imam i unuke, i vrlo sam radostan i sretan zbog toga.

Uvjeran sam s druge strane, kao čovjek koji nije isključiv, da sve ono što može učiniti naša šira zajednica, javne ustanove za odgoj i obrazovanje djeteta, također nema alternativu. Ono što roditelji mogu napraviti, nema alternativu. Ali ono što javne ustanove mogu napraviti sa znanjem i iskustvom koje imaju ljudi koji rade u javnim ustanovama, ne smijemo podcijeniti. Ono što još želim naglasiti jest da naravno nemamo uvijek i svugdje samo sretne brakove, imamo i niz problema, prema tome moramo i o tome razgovarati. Moramo razgovarati i o činjenici postojanja istospolnih brakova, to je tema koju ne smijemo odbaciti i ne smijemo odbaciti djecu koja su odgajana u takvim brakovima.

Podržavam ovu raspravu, mislim da je ona dobrodošla, ali isto tako, očekujem od Komisije da također usmjeri ovu raspravu na jedan balansirani i prihvatljiv način za sve nas koji smo u ovom Parlamentu.

Jean-Luc Schaffhauser, au nom du groupe ENF. – Madame la Présidente, chers collègues, la famille est la cellule de base de la société. Elle repose sur la complémentarité naturelle hommes-femmes, sur l'accueil de la vie dès la conception, sur l'éducation, qui se fait par les familles et non par les États, qui doivent aider les familles.

Peut-on cependant dire que ce Parlement ou cette Commission sont du côté des familles? Non, malheureusement non. Peut-on parler de familles et d'aidants face à la politique d'austérité qui a détruit les budgets familiaux de nombreux États membres, qui détruit et réduit l'espérance de vie, comme en Italie, avec l'hiver démographique dont souffrent nos nations, particulièrement dans le sud?

Peut-on parler de famille quand nous tenons à imposer aux États membres des modèles familiaux minoritaires à travers la propagande agressive LGBT et du genre, chaque fois répétée, répétée et répétée dans n'importe quelle motion?

Peut-on parler de famille lorsqu'on laisse des milliers d'Européens sans espoir d'un avenir meilleur pour leurs enfants et quand on ouvre à l'immigration, alors que nous avons déjà 50 % de chômage dans nos zones, les politiques, selon les termes des Nations unies?

Madame, j'ai deux minutes.

(La Présidente retire la parole à l'orateur)

Anna Záborská (PPE). – Vážená pani predsedajúca, diskusiou o vplyve európskej politiky na rodinu by mala začínať a končiť každá schôdza Európskeho parlamentu. Čelíme problémom spojeným s nízkou pôrodnosťou a zvyšujúcim sa priemerným vekom obyvateľstva. No stále odmietame vidieť nielen neplatenú prácu, ktorú vykonávajú ženy-matky v oblasti starostlivosti o deti, členov rodiny a domácnosť, ale aj významnú úlohu rodičov pri zabezpečovaní kvalitného vzdelávania a výchovy detí.

Náš pracovný trh aj dôchodkové systémy trestajú otcov aj matky, ktorí sa rozhodnú vychovávať deti. Čas, ktorý im venujú, je prekážkou pre zamestnávateľov a vedie k nižšiemu platu a dôchodkom. Byť rodičom sa neoplatí.

Riešením nie je individualizácia politík, ale family mainstreaming. Každá politika má dopad na rodinu, a ten treba kvantifikovať dopredu. Len tak môžeme robiť politické rozhodnutia, ktoré povedú k zlepšeniu situácie rodín a omladeniu Európy a udržateľnej prosperite.

— Madam President, allow me to say one remark to the Commissioner. Mr Commissioner, I would like to ask you not to use „reconciliation of private and professional lives“; it is „family and professional life“. Private and professional is not the same.

Die Präsidentin. – Herr Schaffhauser! Ich habe das noch einmal nachprüfen lassen. Ihre Fraktion hat zwei Minuten insgesamt – eine Minute für Sie und eine Minute für Frau D’Ornano. Bitte, Frau D’Ornano, Sie haben das Wort.

Mireille D’Ornano (ENF). – Madame la Présidente, Monsieur le Commissaire, cette journée de la famille intervient alors que cette structure sociale fondamentale est menacée, si l’on en juge par la multiplication des familles monoparentales et le déclin de la natalité.

Le rappel du rôle de la famille dans l’éducation des enfants est essentiel, d’autant plus à l’heure où l’on confie trop souvent cette mission à l’école, qui est déjà chargée de l’instruction.

Pour autant, de nombreuses études confirment le lien entre environnement familial favorable et réussite scolaire. Il est donc indispensable de protéger l’enfant en lui garantissant l’équilibre familial auquel il a droit.

Je soutiens, bien évidemment, la prise en compte du travail invisible accompli par les mères et les pères. Néanmoins, comme l’énonce la résolution des Nations unies, citée à l’appui de ce texte, le respect de la diversité des systèmes sociaux des États membres justifie des mesures au niveau national.

Catch-the-eye-Verfahren

Maria Grapini (S&D). – Doamnă președintă, domnule comisar, dați-mi voie mai întâi să spun „la mulți ani” tuturor familiilor din lume. Sunt o familistă convinsă, tocmai am împlinit patruzeci de ani de căsătorie.

Trebuie să recunoaștem aici că există două cauze pentru care avem probleme cu copiii în familii. Pe de o parte, sărăcia, unde familiile nu pot nici să-și întrețină, nici să facă educație și, acolo, în mediul rural, avem nevoie de creșe, grădinițe, dar trebuie, în același timp, să creștem nivelul de trai, încât copiii să stea lângă părinți.

A doua cauză: eu am identificat-o în multe țări și recent este cazul din Finlanda. Există portite prin care, prin legislațiile naționale, există un exces de zel în a prelua copiii de lângă părinți, pe un motiv sau altul. Avem cazul acelei doctoressă din Finlanda, în care cei doi copii, chiar acum când noi vorbim, sunt separați de mamă, mama fiind medic și putând să îi îngrijească. Niciunde copiii nu pot să simtă dragostea și liniștea, doar lângă părinți și eu cred că aici trebuie să acționăm.

Există subsidiaritatea, dar cred că putem să intervenim ca, pe de o parte, să nu fie excese în luarea copiilor din familie și instituționalizarea lor și, pe de altă parte, să vedem cum investim în educație, în posibilitatea de a crește veniturile familiilor, pentru ca să se recunoască, de exemplu, la pensie, concediile de maternitate să fie într-un cuantum mai mare, încât să și motivăm, pentru că nu stăm bine cu demografia.

Tibor Szanyi (S&D). – Elnök Asszony! Három dolgot szeretnék röviden említeni. Ebből legalább egyet Biztos úr figyelmébe is ajánlanék, éspedig azt, hogy Magyarországon, bár a kormány nagyon dicsekszik azzal, hogy rendkívül sok családbarát intézkedést hoz, ezt mind az adórendszeren keresztül teszi, magyarul a tehetősebb családok élvezhetik a családtámogatási kedvezményeket, a munkanélküliek vagy alacsonyabb jövedelműek pedig kiesnek ebből.

Én szeretném, hogyha Biztos úr segítene abban, hogy olyan szabályozás szülessen európai szinten, ami hátrébb sorolja ezt a gyakorlatot. A másik, amit szeretnék szóba hozni, és ez egy nagy fájdalom Magyarországon, hogy nagyon sok menekült család is van, akik például a magyar határon szó szerint börtönbe vannak rakva, mindaddig, amíg a vizsgálat, a menedékkérelmük elbírálása tart, és hogyha valaki fölemeli ez ellen a szavát, akkor Orbán Viktor azt mondja, hogy az Európai Unió a terroristákat támogatja. Na, ezeket kéne megszüntetni.

(Ende des Catch-the-eye-Verfahrens)

Vytenis Povilas Andriukaitis, *Member of the Commission*. – Madam President, first of all I would like to congratulate all in this room and all around the walls on International Family Day. I am a father of three children and grandfather of three grandchildren. I am a medical doctor; I have spent a lot of time doing my job, and know all about the complexity.

Of course we must all agree about all human rights, about family lives, about children's lives; of course we must seek balance and how to move forward with progress, and of course our common goals remain to improve the life chances of every family and every European Union citizen. This is why we put forward ambitious proposals such as the European pillar of social rights and the work-life balance package. This can address issues with work and life at home and what you mentioned about private and other things.

This is an agenda which needs to fully engage all stakeholders, in particular Member States. Of course, it must be in line with the subsidiarity principle, because we have no chance to intervene in the Member States' area of responsibility: absolutely, it is crystal clear. We must also look at the situation of proportionality. We are ready to play our part, but the centre of gravity of social policies such as family-oriented policies is – and will remain – with national, and especially local, authorities, because they are very close to families.

The primary responsibility for making social rights a reality lies with national governments, national parliaments and social partners, and we will continue in this way of cooperation and support and see how we can move forward.

Die Präsidentin. – Dankeschön, Herr Kommissar.

Lassen Sie mich bitte auch mal etwas Persönliches loswerden: Meine Eltern waren beide immer erwerbstätig, und ich bin in einer sehr glücklichen Familie aufgewachsen. Dafür bin ich auch sehr, sehr dankbar.

Die Aussprache ist damit geschlossen.

11.2. Videoplatforms en redactionele verantwoordelijkheid

Die Präsidentin. – Als nächster Punkt der Tagesordnung folgt die Aussprache über die Große Anfrage gemäß Artikel 130b der Geschäftsordnung von Curzio Maltese, Martina Michels im Namen der GUE/NGL-Fraktion über Videoplattformen und redaktionelle Verantwortung (O-000035/2017 - B8-0318/2017) (2017/2737(RSP)).

Curzio Maltese, *autore*. – Signora Presidente, onorevoli colleghi, dovendo discutere di piattaforme online, mi aspettavo di discutere con un altro Commissario, ma la ringrazio della sua presenza.

Vorrei anche impostare il discorso in modo che riguardi la salute e anche la famiglia, che sta a cuore a tutti noi. Per esempio, noi avremmo potuto essere i genitori di una ragazza italiana di Napoli, Tiziana, che un anno fa si è uccisa perché i filmati dei suoi rapporti sessuali erano finiti in rete, su Facebook, per una vendetta del suo ex fidanzato ed erano diventati virali. La ragazza non ha più potuto uscire di casa, è stata vittima di persecuzioni, molestie, di una specie di stupro collettivo, finché si è impiccata. Per molti mesi i video della ragazza morta hanno continuato a circolare su Facebook, in una macabra ascesa di audience, finché una sentenza di un tribunale italiano li ha bloccati.

Ma i legali di Facebook in Irlanda, che curano gli interessi di Facebook in Italia per non pagare le tasse in Italia, hanno ottenuto che comunque l'azienda non subisse nessuna sanzione e si sono appellati per questo alla normativa europea. Non so se vi sembra giustizia questa, a me non pare. Noi abbiamo una direttiva sull'*e-commerce* che esclude le piattaforme online dalla responsabilità editoriale. Una direttiva che è vecchia di diciassette anni, quando l'*e-commerce* non esisteva, le piattaforme erano appena nate ed erano davvero un puro veicolo di condivisione di contenuti e informazioni, e in più le tecnologie non permettevano di controllare ex ante i contenuti immessi in rete.

Oggi il mondo è cambiato, lo sapete tutti. L'*e-commerce* è il più grande *business* in espansione del pianeta, le piattaforme sono dei *players* globali, dei colossi economici che divorano interi settori produttivi, concentrano quantità di risorse e potere, minacciano il pluralismo dei media. Per fortuna, però, i progressi della scienza ci permettono oggi, con degli algoritmi sempre più sofisticati, di controllare i contenuti in rete in un tempo rapidissimo.

Nonostante questo, Facebook e Google, che sono in grado di distruggere in un'ora la reputazione di una persona o di influenzare il risultato di una campagna elettorale, ospitando campagne di *fake news*, continuano a essere meno responsabili rispetto a una piccola emittente locale, un piccolo giornale di provincia, che per una causa possono rischiare la chiusura.

Ma il tratto più grave riguarda proprio noi come genitori, perché l'elemento più debole di questo mercato sleale e malato solo i minori, sono i ragazzi, i bambini, che sono esposti a un bombardamento di pubblicità ingannevoli attraverso pubblicità ingannevoli del *product placement*, sono esposti a un bombardamento di cattive abitudini, come *junk food*, e naturalmente sono vittime di altri preoccupanti fenomeni in espansione sulla rete come i discorsi d'odio o la pedopornografia.

Invece di fare retorica sulla famiglia, cerchiamo di difendere i nostri figli da questi rischi. Allora non pensa la Commissione che questo mercato sleale ormai vada finalmente regolamentato con criteri equi e moderni, che proteggano i consumatori, soprattutto i più deboli, soprattutto i minori, mettendo mano al più presto alla revisione della direttiva sull'*e-commerce* come cominciano a chiedere molti paesi europei a cominciare dall'Italia?

Vytėnė Povilaitis Andriukaitis, *Member of the Commission*. – Madam President, the Commission shares broadly the problem analysed and presented by the honourable Member. One of the main objectives of the European Union is to protect vulnerable groups, including minors, consumers and citizens in general through harmonisation of laws. The Commission is fully committed both to safeguarding freedom of expression and protecting vulnerable viewers – children in particular – from harmful content, and all citizens against hate speech.

Article 14 of the e-commerce directive needs to be interpreted on a case-by-case basis. While the e-commerce directive prohibits Member States from imposing a general monitoring obligation on providers, it requires providers to act upon obtaining actual knowledge of illegal activity in order to avoid liability.

The Commission believes that progress can be made without reopening the e-commerce directive, which has been a major contributor to innovation and societal benefits. The European Union has proposed targeted measures to ensure that platforms take action against specific problems, such as illegal hate speech and terrorist propaganda.

The Commission has also initiated and strongly supported co-regulatory efforts. The Commission communication on the mid-term review of the Digital Single Market of 10 May 2017 announced a better coordination of dialogues with platforms, focusing on the mechanisms and technical solutions for the removal of illegal content. This communication also announced the Commission's guidelines on two topics: first, coherent procedural aspects such as the notification and removal of illegal content; second, on liability rules and support to platforms on voluntary measures taken by the platform when they work proactively to remove illegal content, acting in good faith. The Commission is currently reflecting on the most appropriate form for such guidance.

The issue of protection of minors and hate speech on video-sharing platforms is addressed by the proposals of a review of the Audiovisual Media Service Directive adopted on 25 May 2016, which is currently under discussion by the Council and Parliament. The Commission proposal foresees a limited extension of its scope to video-sharing platforms, for example YouTube. The proposed system seeks to keep the balance between the fundamental right of freedom of expression and important public interest objectives, such as the protection of minors against harmful content and the protection of all citizens against hate speech.

According to the proposals, only those rules that are necessary to protect the viewers from the most harmful content will apply to video-sharing platforms. Member States should ensure that video-sharing platforms put in place measures to 1) protect minors from harmful content, access to which would have to be restricted, and 2) protect all citizens from incitement to hate.

The measures consist, where appropriate, in establishing and operating flagging and reporting mechanisms, age verification systems, systems to read the content by the uploaders or users, or parental control systems. It is important to stress that none of the measures included in the proposal entail a general obligation to monitor or ex-ante control; it is fully in line with the e-commerce directive.

Member States are encouraged to implement the new rules via co-regulation. The involvement of the industry will ensure that measures are future-proofed and that platform is built on what they are already doing on a voluntary basis. Some platforms are indeed already making great efforts to protect minors online and citizens from hate speech. Through the implementation via co-regulation, we are aiming to a building on the work already done. However, there are services that do not have such measures in place. Now all video-sharing platforms will be obliged to take measures. The Audiovisual Media Service Directive would provide regulators with a regulatory backstop in case there is no action from platforms. In addition, video-sharing platforms today apply their own standards when it comes to assessing what is harmful for minors or what constitutes hate speech. The Commission proposal aims that they have to comply with the Audiovisual Directive standards in this field.

The Commission believes that the proposed rules will ensure a better protection of viewers in online services. The Commission is also looking forward to the upcoming dialogues, and hopes to secure the adoption of the revised Audiovisual Media Service Directive as soon as possible, as this is a priority file and identified by the institutions.

Stanislav Polčák, za skupinu PPE. – Já bych chtěl pouze úvodem říci, že jsem se hlásil i na *catch-the-eye* k minulému bodu a byly uděleny slova pouze 2 kolegům z jiné frakce. Nestěžuji si, pouze se chci tímto přihlásit do *catch-the-eye* v tomto bodu, kde bych přednesl svůj projev a vyjádřil se i k této řešené otázce.

Já bych chtěl poděkovat kolegovi Maltesovi za to, že předložil tento bod. K tomu zraňujícímu příkladu, který přednesl on, bych přidal ještě jeden. V ČR byla skutečně policejně ověřena existence hry pro mladé děti, dospívající mládež – Modrá velryba, která je měla nutit k sebevraždě. Tento naprosto šokující příklad jen dokládá to, jak je nezbytné skutečně regulovat i obsah těchto informací, které jsou v digitálním věku šířeny naprosto nepřehledně a mají na svobodném internetu vlastně prostor k tomuto šíření.

Já vím, že je velmi složité zasahovat do svobody internetu. To je vždy kritický okamžik. Na druhou stranu v okamžiku, kdy máme na zřeteli takto zranitelné skupiny dětí a dospívající mládeže, si myslím, že bychom měli postupovat, jak naznačil pan komisař. To hledání té rovnováhy je velmi důležité.

Tibor Szanyi, az S&D képviselőcsoport nevében. – Elnök Asszony! Országunként eltérő súlyossággal és tartalommal, de Európa-szerte közös tapasztalatunk, hogy a fiatal generációk újfartózkodnak az emberi gyűlölet és az intolerancia különböző megjelenési formáival, a szélsőséges nacionalizmus, a rasszizmus, az antiszemitizmus, az idegenellenesség mérgével. A jelenséget különösen jól ismerjük Kelet- és Közép-Európában, ahol rendre az antiszemitizmus azon veszélyes válfaja üti fel a fejét, a legfiatalabb, szinte még gyermekkorú lakosság körében, amely még jóval születésük, sőt szüleik születése előtt vezetett milliók kiirtásához, egész népek, generációk felmérhetetlen szenvedéséhez és pótolhatatlan veszteségeihez.

E rémisztő tendencia okait kutatva elsőként a politikai szélsőség leggátlástalanabb képviselőire bukkanunk, akik a fiatalok szellemi mérgezésétől, vagy hatalmi pozícióból annak eltűnésétől sem riadnak vissza, obskurus politika céljaik elérése érdekében. Nem kerülhető meg az oktatásért felelős kormányzati, és egyéb tényezők felelőssége sem abban, hogy nem vétezik fel kellőképpen a fiatal generációkat történelmünk ordas eszméinek visszatérésével szemben, sőt arra is van példa, hogy magában a tananyagban, vagy éppen a hivatalos kormánypolitikában bukkannak föl ennek jelei.

Ez utóbbira sajnos immár globális dimenzióban jelentkező példa, a Putyin Oroszországa által folytatott kiberháború és szervezett hírhamisítás. Az eszközöket vizsgálva pedig ma azok adják a legnyilvánvalóbb, s talán legkevésbé átlátható és ellenőrizhető teret ennek a veszélyes jelenségnek, amelyekre a gyermek- és fiatalkorúak a legfogékonyabbak, köztük is elsőként a mai vitánk tárgyát képező videómegosztó platformok. Ezért olyan fontos a mai közös gondolkodásunk, amelynek szerintem a rövid időn belül közös és hatékony uniós akcióban kellene tárgyasulni.

Annak ellenére, hogy európai demokrataként magam is irtózom az információ- és szólásszabadság bármiféle korlátozásától, gyűlölöm a cenzúra minden nyílt vagy bújtatott formáját, gyermekeink és unokáink védelme, az embertelenség, a rasszizmus, az antiszemitizmus mindenkor terjesztése ellen, konkrétan a szolgáltatók felelősségének európai normák, és közösen kialakított, átlátható és ellenőrzött szabályok szerinti pontosabb és szigorúbb érvényesítése aligha tekinthető cenzúrának, még a leginkább szabadságszerető, akár a cenzúra átkát a valóságban is megtapasztalt európai polgár szemében sem.

Jozo Radoš, u ime kluba ALDE. – Poštovana predsjednice, najprije bih želio zahvaliti kolegi Maltezeu na otvaranju ovog važnog pitanja.

Prema današnjim pravilima, odnosno ovoj Direktivi o kojoj govorimo, davatelji usluga nisu dužni pratiti sadržaje koje objavljuju, a nisu odgovorni ako nemaju spoznaje o tome da je neki sadržaj protuzakonit. U isto vrijeme, države članice mogu dobiti informacije o pružateljima usluga, dakle identificirati tko je to, ali to posredno znači njihovu obvezu da one prate sadržaje, što zapravo govori o tome da postoji velika odgovornost država članica i vjerojatno nemogućnost praćenja tog cijelog procesa, a minimalna odgovornost pružatelja usluga.

To stanje svakako nije dobro i zato pozdravljam spremnost Komisije da prilikom promjene ove Direktive i ostalih sličnih direktiva, radi na zaštiti svih građana, a posebice onih koji su najslabiji, a to su djeca i starije osobe.

Isabella Adinolfi, a nome del gruppo EFDD. – Signora Presidente, onorevoli colleghi, signor Commissario, confesso che affrontare dei temi così complessi in un solo minuto è veramente difficile. Conosco sia il caso di Tiziana Cantone – io vengo dalla stessa regione – sia il caso della balena blu, che ha menzionato prima un collega. Però, in questo caso, stiamo parlando di reati e mi permetto di dissentire.

Nella direttiva sull'e-commerce non c'è scritto che le piattaforme non sono responsabili. Se poi vogliamo dire che l'articolo 14, comma 3, non sta funzionando, sono d'accordo e se siamo disposti a riaprire la direttiva per trovare un modo più stringente per proteggere i cittadini europei sono perfettamente d'accordo. Però, dall'altra parte, questi sono reati e dobbiamo anche pensare alla libertà di espressione. Davvero siamo convinti che la soluzione più semplice sia quella di dare ai privati un potere che invece spetta all'autorità giudiziaria? Spesso questi privati sono delle *big company*, sono spesso o quasi sempre non europei, e hanno una condizione di monopolio. E quindi mi chiedo dove inizia il limite e dove finisce la libertà di espressione.

Un altro discorso a parte riguarda la pubblicità. Io credo che l'ultima forma di tutela per i bambini sia veramente garantita dall'abolizione della pubblicità che a loro spetta. Le regole chiare e precise delle comunicazioni commerciali dovrebbero essere contenute invece in un atto legislativo ad hoc, che riguardi la pubblicità su tutti i mezzi. Infine, investiamo nell'educazione civica e nell'educazione digitale per i cittadini europei.

Die Präsidentin. – Ich weiß, dass eine Minute bei manchen Themen eine Zumutung ist. Aber Ihre Fraktion hat Ihnen leider nur eine Minute gegeben. Deswegen kann ich die Zeit auch nicht einfach laufen lassen. Tut mir leid.

Michaela Šojdrová (PPE). – Média, internet, ochrana dětí – to je téma, které považujeme za zásadní, a já se dívám, kde jsou kolegové, kteří volali po zásadní odpovědnosti rodičů. Jistě, odpovědnost rodičů za ochranu svých dětí, to je jejich prioritou, ale myslím si, že jestliže internet nezná hranic, musíme se také ptát, jaké jsou legislativní podmínky.

Já se domnívám, že povinné odstraňování ilegálního obsahu, to není cenzura. Myslím, že jde o zneužívání důvěry dětí, které jsou zranitelné. Internet, jak už jsem řekla, nemá hranic a patří to tedy na půdu EP a já děkuji panu komisaři, který zde zmínil audiovizuální směrnici, která je v legislativním procesu a zavádí odpovědnost poskytovatelů internetových platform za odstranění škodlivého nelegálního obsahu. Myslím, že to je zásadní opatření, které musíme přijmout.

Maria Grapini (S&D). – Doamnă președintă, domnule comisar, sigur, rezultă clar din puținele luări de cuvânt de aici, pentru că e păcat că suntem puțini, că trebuie făcut ceva. Trebuie să existe o responsabilitate a deținătorilor de platformă. Nu putem să avem știri false. Nu numai că distrug imaginea unei persoane sau chiar familia, dar avem probleme de viață aici. Sunt copii care, așa cum a fost arătat aici – și la noi, în țara mea, e acel joc stupid, cu balena albastră – mor copiii. Nu se poate. Sigur, suntem în era de digitalizare. Mă bucur că, doamnă președintă, sunteți o susținătoare a drepturilor consumatorului. Aici intervine și acest drept al consumatorului, să fim protejați, și trebuie urgent să intervenim cu o reglementare de responsabilitate: să răspundă fiecare pentru informația falsă. Asta nu înseamnă că nu vrem libertatea presei, dar vrem responsabilizarea celor care circulă informații pe platformele online. Până la urmă, noi am discutat și în Comisia IMCO foarte mult, doamnă președintă, acest comerț online și offline trebuie să aibă aceleași condiții, aceeași protecție pentru consumatori, aceleași condiții.

Stanislav Polčák (PPE). – Já bych chtěl doplnit k tomu, co řekla paní kolegyně Šojdrová. Skutečně je velmi zásadní role rodičů, to si musíme asi všichni uvědomit a v tomto smyslu bychom měli i rodinu a rodiče podporovat.

Tím se chci vyjádřit i k té předchozí závažné interpelaci. Bohužel, podle mého názoru platí nepřímá úměra. Čím více mluvíme o reálné podpoře rodin, tím méně se reálné podpory rodinám dostává. Já jsem si vědom toho, že toto téma je především odpovědností členských států. Samozřejmě musíme o tom hovořit. Jsem rád, že se na jednání tento týden dostaly témata, jako je rovná mzda za stejnou práci, ale i otázka důchodu, který podle mého názoru by měl být založen na zásadě zásluhovosti. Ten, kdo vychovává děti, kteří jsou potom plátcí do toho systému, z něhož se čerpají důchody, tak by měl být rovněž po zásluze odměněn tím, že se mu v rámci důchodu nebude dostávat méně důchodu.

(Ende des Catch-the-eye-Verfahrens)

Vytenis Povilas Andriukaitis, Member of the Commission. – Madam President, we have had a very interesting exchange of views, and, as the honourable Members have rightly mentioned, this is a very complex issue. We need not only to do something, but we need to take the concrete actions which the Commission presented and see how to move forward.

The Commission is fully committed to protecting minors and to ensuring freedom of speech. This debate will certainly help us in our internal work to prepare targeted measures to ensure that platforms take action against hate speech or content which is harmful to minors. I also welcome this debate in the context of the upcoming dialogue for the adoption of the Audiovisual Media Services Directive. We look forward to the rapid adoption of this directive and future work between the institutions to respond to the challenges of the platforms' economy. I would like to say once again that we need to have good collaboration and quick reactions and a good dialogue, and to see how to move forward in more concrete ways, keeping account of all the questions which have been raised.

Die Präsidentin. – Die Aussprache ist damit geschlossen.

12. Besluiten inzake bepaalde documenten: zie notulen

13. Ingekomen stukken: zie notulen

14. Verzoekschriften: zie notulen

15. Verzending van de tijdens deze vergadering aangenomen teksten: zie notulen

16. Rooster van de volgende vergaderingen: zie notulen

17. Onderbreking van de zitting

Die Präsidentin. – Ich erkläre die Sitzungsperiode des Europäischen Parlaments für unterbrochen.

(Die Sitzung wird um 15.55 Uhr geschlossen.)

Verklaring van de gebruikte tekens

*	Raadplegingsprocedure
***	Goedkeuringsprocedure
***I	Gewone wetgevingsprocedure (eerste lezing)
***II	Gewone wetgevingsprocedure (tweede lezing)
***III	Gewone wetgevingsprocedure (derde lezing)

(De aangeduide procedure is gebaseerd op de in de ontwerptekst voorgestelde rechtsgrond.)

Afkortingen van de commissies

AFET	Commissie buitenlandse zaken
DEVE	Commissie ontwikkelingssamenwerking
INTA	Commissie internationale handel
BUDG	Begrotingscommissie
CONT	Commissie begrotingscontrole
ECON	Commissie economische en monetaire zaken
EMPL	Commissie werkgelegenheid en sociale zaken
ENVI	Commissie milieubeheer, volksgezondheid en voedselveiligheid
ITRE	Commissie industrie, onderzoek en energie
IMCO	Commissie interne markt en consumentenbescherming
TRAN	Commissie vervoer en toerisme
REGI	Commissie regionale ontwikkeling
AGRI	Commissie landbouw en plattelandsontwikkeling
PECH	Commissie visserij
CULT	Commissie cultuur en onderwijs
JURI	Commissie juridische zaken
LIBE	Commissie burgerlijke vrijheden, justitie en binnenlandse zaken
AFCO	Commissie constitutionele zaken
FEMM	Commissie rechten van de vrouw en gendergelijkheid
PETI	Commissie verzoekschriften
DROI	Subcommissie mensenrechten
SEDE	Subcommissie veiligheid en defensie

Afkortingen van de diverse fracties

PPE	Fractie van de Europese Volkspartij (Christendemocraten)	Parlement
S&D	Fractie van de Progressieve Alliantie van Socialisten en Democraten in het Europees	
ECR	Fractie Europese Conservatieven en Hervormers	
ALDE	Fractie Alliantie van Liberalen en Democraten voor Europa	
GUE/NGL	Confederale Fractie Europees Unitair Links/Noords Groen Links	
Verts/ALE	Fractie De Groenen/Vrije Europese Alliantie	
EFDD	Fractie Europa van Vrijheid en Directe Democratie	
ENF	Fractie Europa van Naties en Vrijheid	
NI	Niet-fractiegebonden leden	