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| |  | | --- | | **14. Schengen Information System – access for vehicle registration services** |      |  |  |  |  |  | | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | | |  | | --- | | MPphoto | |  | **President.**The next item is the recommendation for second reading ([**A6-0084/2005**](https://www.europarl.europa.eu/doceo/document/A-6-2005-0084_EN.html)), on behalf of the Committee on Civil Liberties, Justice and Home Affairs, on the Council common position for adopting a regulation of the European Parliament and of the Council amending the Convention implementing the Schengen Agreement of 14 June 1985 on the gradual abolition of checks at common borders as regards access to the Schengen Information System by the services in the Member States responsible for issuing registration certificates for vehicles (14238/1/2004 – C6-0007/2005 – [**2003/0198(COD)**](https://oeil.secure.europarl.europa.eu/oeil/popups/ficheprocedure.do?lang=en&reference=2003/0198(COD))) (Rapporteur: Mr Coelho). |  | |  |  |  | |  | | --- | |  | |      |  |  |  |  |  | | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | | |  | | --- | | MPphoto | |  | **Carlos Coelho (PPE-DE),***rapporteur*. – *(PT)* Mr President, Mr Frattini, ladies and gentlemen, we all want to combat theft and the illegal trade in stolen cars. This is a growing form of crime, with more than 1 million cars stolen per year, of which fewer than 40% are recovered.  This is an alarming problem, not solely from an economic point of view, but more importantly because of its links with other forms of crime such as drug-trafficking, arms trafficking and the trafficking of human beings. It is also a highly lucrative activity, which has become very attractive to organised crime networks, as it does not entail too much risk. Fresh measures to combat crime of this nature must therefore be taken. In a Europe in which internal border checks have been scrapped, a response must be found that involves effective action at Community level. The purpose of this proposal is to provide the public vehicle registration authorities direct access to certain categories of data contained in the Schengen Information System (SIS) and, in turn, to restrict private vehicle registration services solely to the right to request indirect access through a public authority with access to the SIS. The aim is thus to enable the SIS to be an even more important instrument in the fight against crime. It is necessary to check quickly and efficiently whether vehicles presented to them for registration have been stolen, misappropriated or lost.  We have also improved the functioning of the internal market by strengthening the principle of free movement and, in so doing, we have fostered the gradual creation of the area of freedom, security and justice, along with the implementation of the common transport policy.  This direct access will ensure that cars stolen in one country cannot be registered – and thus made legal – in another, a process that sometimes takes less than 24 hours. There are two reasons for introducing this measure: firstly, efficiency – there are millions of vehicles registered in the EU and direct access will make it possible to check the legal status of a vehicle quickly and easily; and secondly, transparency – at the moment, the various Member States have different ways of checking whether a vehicle has been stolen, at the moment when it is being registered. All of these ways are, to a greater or lesser extent, opaque and complicated. The proposed solution, within the scope of the Schengen Convention, is transparent and offers more guarantees than the current situation.  We want to maintain data protection and our citizens’ privacy. We have therefore restricted the type of data that can be accessed and have proposed that access to data relating to identity documents and to blank official documents be removed, in line with the opinion of the joint supervisory authority. The range of data to which the competent vehicle registration authorities will have access is clearly laid down and limited in terms of what is necessary and appropriate.  I should also like to point out that Directive 95/46 on personal protection data is applicable here, along with the specific rules of the Schengen Convention on data protection. We should like to be sure that these rules are being effectively complied with and monitored. The authorities in charge of data protection must therefore have sufficient resources at their disposal to carry out their work and the Member States must be firmly committed to upholding the fundamental right to data protection.  My report, which tabled ten amendments to the Commission’s initial proposal, was approved at first reading in April 2004 and the Council common position was adopted in December 2004. I wholeheartedly welcome this common position, and I am delighted that, in accepting seven of the ten amendments put forward, it largely took on board Parliament’s recommendations. As for the three amendments not accepted, I shall first mention Amendment 4. I have dropped this amendment, because it is no longer relevant, given that on 24 February 2005, the Council finally adopted the initiative by the Kingdom of Spain with a view to adopting a Council Decision concerning the introduction of some new functions for the Schengen Information System, in particular in the fight against terrorism; secondly, Amendment 11, an attempt to amend the rules of data protection for the SIS, but I agree that this question should be addressed within the scope of the legal proposal on SIS II, the second generation of SIS; and thirdly, Amendment 10, which requested an annual report on the implementation of the proposed access for the authorities concerned.  I must stress that only if Parliament receives a report enabling it to assess the system will it be able to carry out its duties as a legislative body and a budgetary authority. I propose a slightly different wording, which I presume the Council would be in a position to accept, following an informal meeting with the Luxembourg Presidency.  The conditions are thus in place whereby this legal act can finally be adopted and this useful measure can enter into force. Accordingly, Mr President, we can help to fight crime and to make our citizens feel safer. |  | |  |  |  | |  | | --- | |  | |      |  |  |  |  |  | | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | | |  | | --- | | MPphoto | |  | **Franco Frattini,** *Vice-President of the Commission*. Mr President, first of all I would like to thank the rapporteur, Mr Coelho, for his report. Our aim is to prevent and combat the illegal trade in stolen vehicles and improve the functioning of the internal market. The proposal we are discussing today also offers a better use of the largest European database on stolen vehicles, the Schengen Information System.  The financial interests at stake are huge since annually millions of cars are registered and every 10 or 15 seconds a car is stolen, which has also been underlined by the rapporteur. Since vehicle theft is one of the foremost crimes to affect citizens directly, our working together to reduce it will have an immeasurable impact on their security.  We propose that under certain conditions national vehicle registration authorities should be allowed to consult the SIS data registers on stolen vehicles and stolen vehicle documents, prior to registering a vehicle that is already registered in another Schengen state. This information will make it more difficult to sell stolen vehicles in other Schengen states. At the same time, it will increase victims’ chances of reclaiming their lost property. This is an excellent way in which Europe can serve its citizens and promote concrete operational cooperation.  Our proposal will also make the law enforcement process more manageable by facilitating access to information. I agree with the rapporteur that the current situation is far from transparent. In view of the millions of cars that are presented for registration each year, authorities lack resources to check all cars in accordance with current requirements. Our proposal will grant this access on the basis of a transparent and common set of rules and data protection principles. Compliance with the rules will be monitored in a manner similar to other searches in the SIS. Data protection considerations made us differentiate between access arrangements for public and for private vehicle registration bodies.  Finally, the Commission welcomes the amendments proposed by the European Parliament, in particular Amendment 3, which allows for a reporting system with a view to collecting reliable data. Obviously when the SIS II is in place a systematic reporting system will be guaranteed by the Commission. |  | |  |  |  | |  | | --- | |  | |      |  |  |  |  | | --- | --- | --- | --- | |  |  | **IN THE CHAIR: MR COCILOVO** *Vice-President* |  | |  |  |  | |  | | --- | |  | |      |  |  |  |  |  | | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | | |  | | --- | | MPphoto | |  | **Martine Roure,***on behalf of the PSE Group*. **–** *(FR)*Mr President, I should first like to pay tribute to the productive working relationship we have in general with Mr Coelho. I was keen to point this out.  The proposal that we are examining today at second reading gives national vehicle registration authorities access to certain categories of the Schengen Information System. The clear objective of this ruling is the fight against organised vehicle crime, which we all fully agree is one of our priorities. We are, however, more reserved with regard to unlimited access to European databases. In actual fact, we must assure ourselves that personal data are stringently protected. In order to allow a balance between the fight against organised crime and the protection of the private lives of European citizens, every decision taken, moreover, must respect the principles of proportionality and finality. I believe that we are very much in agreement on this matter.  I regret that the Council has been unable to incorporate all of our amendments at first reading into its common position. In actual fact, registration of the people carrying out the research and people targeted by this research would, I believe, have allowed these abuses to be avoided. In the spirit of compromise, we support the rapporteur’s stand in bringing in only one amendment that was not adopted by the common position. An annual report from the Council to the European Parliament on the implementation of this regulation is an absolute prerequisite, in order to assure the representatives of European citizens that the principle of finality is genuinely observed.  I should finally like to point out that my group was opposed, at first reading, to direct access to the Schengen Information System by any authorities other than those responsible for law enforcement. I must add that we remain committed to this principle with the prospect of further discussions to come on the Schengen Information System II, which will therefore be a matter for codecision.  Whilst European databases can prove useful in the fight against organised crime, they must, in reality, be rigorously controlled. Our priority is the effective fight against organised crime in Europe, but in observing the rights and freedoms of European citizens, it is not always a pointless exercise to reaffirm it. |  | |  |  |  | |  | | --- | |  | |      |  |  |  |  |  | | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | | |  | | --- | | MPphoto | |  | **Ole Krarup,***on behalf of the GUE/NGL Group.* **–** *(DA)* I made some rather sarcastic remarks about this proposal at first reading and, as a lawyer, I have objections to its being defined as an aspect of transport policy when, in reality, what we have here is an arrangement that extends what, fundamentally, is dangerous access to very extensive information systems and the most comprehensive system of police supervision and control we have, namely the Schengen system. If it were a case of the supervisory authorities’ access to these systems helping to prevent crime in this area, it would be worth thinking about. Even if that were so, however, there are such major reasons for concern about extending the access in question that we in our group shall vote against the proposal, irrespective of the fact that we very much appreciate the rapporteur’s very commendable efforts to have an obligation imposed to report on whether the system is of any use. We have these reservations about the supervisory system because we see it as a further extension to a system of police supervision and control that, in all probability, will have no useful effect at all. |  | |  |  |  | |  | | --- | |  | |      |  |  |  |  | | --- | --- | --- | --- | | |  | | --- | | MPphoto | |  | **President.**The debate is closed.  The vote will take place tomorrow at 11 a.m. | |
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| |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | | **12. Breaches of Schengen rules (debate)** | |  |  |  | | --- | --- | --- | |  | [**Video of the speeches**](https://www.europarl.europa.eu/plenary/en/vod.html?mode=chapter&vodLanguage=EN&playerStartTime=20120704-16:13:31&playerEndTime=20120704-17:35:57) |  | | |  |  |  | | --- | --- | --- | |  | [**Minutes**](https://www.europarl.europa.eu/doceo/document/PV-7-2012-07-04-ITM-012_EN.html) |  | |      |  |  |  |  |  |  | | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | | |  | | --- | | MPphoto |  |  | | --- | |  | |  | **President. −** The next item is the Council and Commission statements on breaches of Schengen rules ([**2012/2700(RSP)**](https://oeil.secure.europarl.europa.eu/oeil/popups/ficheprocedure.do?lang=en&reference=2012/2700(RSP))). |  | |  |  |  | |  | | --- | |  | |      |  |  |  |  |  |  | | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | | |  | | --- | | MPphoto |  |  | | --- | |  | |  | **Andreas Mavroyiannis,***President-in-Office of the Council.***−**Mr President, honourable Members, let me start by saying that this is one of our toxic assets so I hope that you will bear with me and accept at least my commitment to do my utmost – to do together our utmost – to find a satisfactory way forward for all of us.  I am well aware that the issue of controls in and around internal borders in the Schengen area is a matter on which this Parliament has strong views and which Parliament is following very closely. I also know that many of you have questions and concerns. Specific cases concerning the reintroduction of border controls are a matter for the Commission which is responsible for overseeing the implementation of EU law. I would, however, like to make a number of points concerning recent developments in the Schengen area, including the issue of internal border controls.  At its meeting on 7 and 8 June, the Justice and Home Affairs Council discussed this matter on the basis of the Commission’s first biannual report on the functioning of the Schengen area. That discussion focused in particular on the issues of secondary movements by third country nationals within the Schengen area and of readmission and visa policy, but we also took note of the comments in the Commission report on the issue of ensuring the absence of internal border controls. I want to assure this Parliament that the Council took full account of the importance of the absence of internal border controls during its negotiation on the Schengen governance package.  In June 2011 the European Council underlined that the free movement of persons is one of the most tangible and successful achievements of European integration. The European Council called for improved cooperation within the Schengen area in order to enhance mutual trust between Member States. This is essential if we are to protect the principle of free movement.  The European Council specifically called for a strengthening of common rules through the Schengen evaluation mechanism and for the establishment of a mechanism to respond to exceptional circumstances which might put the overall functioning of Schengen cooperation at risk. In response the Commission submitted the legislative package last September which included both an amended proposal on the establishment of an evaluation and monetary mechanism and a proposal to amend the Schengen Borders Code.  As you will be aware, at its meeting on 7 and 8 June, the Council reached a political agreement on these two proposals. This followed difficult discussions within the Council as well as extensive contacts with the European Parliament. The texts as they now stand represent a clear improvement in the governance of the Schengen area. The Schengen evaluation mechanism is substantially improved, ensuring a stronger role for the Commission and a more efficient follow-up to evaluation reports and monitoring.  The Schengen Borders Code includes new provisions to address situations where Member States are not fully implementing the Schengen acquis. The proposal to amend the Schengen Borders Code is of course subject to ordinary legislative procedure. This Parliament will therefore be fully involved in deciding on the provisions which will govern the reintroduction of controls at internal borders.  As far as the Schengen evaluation mechanism proposal is concerned, the Council took the decision to change the legal basis from Article 77 to Article 70 of the Treaty on the Functioning of the European Union. I am of course well aware of the sensitivity of this decision for Parliament. I want to assure you that this decision was taken for legal reasons, even if its consequences may be felt by Members here to be political.  The Council was not in any way motivated by a wish to exclude Parliament from the process. On the contrary we want Parliament to be fully involved. That is why the Council agreed that when it consults Parliament your opinion, in all its aspects, will to the fullest extent possible be taken into consideration by the Council before the adoption of the final text.  I should also point out that the Council also agreed, again for legal reasons and as part of the overall agreement, to transfer several provisions in the Schengen evaluation mechanism proposal to the Schengen Borders Code proposal.  The Cyprus Presidency is ready to work constructively with the European Parliament on both the Schengen evaluation mechanism proposal and the Schengen Borders Code proposal. We therefore very much hope that a way can be found which will enable Parliament to reconsider its decision to suspend its work on the Schengen governance package. This would enable us to work together to reach agreement on this very important matter as soon as possible. |  | |  |  |  | |  | | --- | |  | |      |  |  |  |  |  |  | | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | | |  | | --- | | MPphoto |  |  | | --- | |  | |  | **Cecilia Malmström,***Member of the Commission.***−**Mr President, let me assure you that the Commission is willing to help ‘detox’ this file if you would so like.  The possibility to travel within Schengen without being subject to border control is of course one of the most valuable rights for European citizens. It is one of the most tangible effects of European integration for citizens and it is the role of the Commission, as guardian of the Treaties, to make sure that this will still be the case. We will not hesitate to initiate infringement procedures if appropriate.  My services are currently investigating a number of possible violations of the relevant EU legislation, including the Schengen Borders Code. These cases cover both obstacles to fluid traffic flow at internal land borders and police checks that might have an effect equivalent to border controls.  From last November to April, we investigated 11 different cases involving 10 different Member States. You have highlighted in your questions here two of these cases: the German authorities’ controls on passengers on Czech buses and mobile surveillance by the Dutch authorities at their borders with Belgium and Germany. The Commission is aware of both.  In the German-Czech case, the Commission has repeatedly requested information from the German authorities on the frequency of controls and their justification. However, the information we have received so far from the German and Czech authorities has not provided sufficient details to fully assess whether the controls were equivalent to border checks and whether they are in breach of the Schengen Borders Code.  We have not let the matter rest here. In May, we asked three major Czech bus companies to assist us with more information over a longer period. We hope to have additional facts by October, which would enable us to carry out a more thorough analysis of the situation at that border. I am of course ready to come back to you and report on these results.  Regarding the Dutch mobile surveillance, there have been several recent cases in various Dutch courts, questioning whether it is compatible with the Schengen Borders Code. In addition to the decision that you have highlighted, Dutch courts have referred two similar cases to the Court of Justice of the European Union for a preliminary ruling. The basic question is whether Dutch mobile surveillance contravenes the prohibition of border checks or their equivalent laid down in the Schengen Borders Code.  The Schengen Borders Code specifies that the abolition of border controls does not affect the use of police powers under national law, as long as they do not have an effect equivalent to border checks. This is valid in particular, but not only, if these police checks do not have border control as an objective – they are based on general police information and experience – and if they are carried out in a manner clearly distinct from border checks and on the basis of spot-checks.  In both of the cases referred to the Court of Justice, the Commission’s view is that the Dutch mobile surveillance has neither the same purpose nor the same modalities as a border check. The surveillance is targeted on the fight against illegal residence and is subject to limitations, for example on the frequency of checks.  The legal analysis conducted by the Commission led to the conclusion that the Dutch mobile surveillance does not contravene the Schengen Borders Code or the case law from the Melki case. We await of course the Court of Justice ruling in this matter.  On a broader note, as I have said repeatedly, the Commission will make use of our prerogatives to keep defending the rights of citizens to travel within the Schengen area without controls. That commitment is also reflected in our proposal for a new Schengen monitoring and evaluation mechanism which included the verification of absence of controls at internal borders.  I still believe that a truly effective mechanism implies a stronger role for the Commission based on Article 77 of the Treaty on the Functioning of the European Union. I am also convinced that the political legitimacy of that proposal would benefit from the European Parliament acting as co-legislator.  From the Commission’s side we naturally reserve the right to take whatever legal action we may deem necessary to safeguard the integrity of the roles that the Treaties have defined for each of the Union’s institutions, but at this moment let us not speculate on legal action.  No final decision has been taken so let us take some time for reflection and discussion and seize the opportunity to sit down to see if we can improve the text during the Cyprus Presidency and make sure that we have a balanced, good Schengen governance that all three institutions can support. The Commission is certainly willing to do everything it can to support such an outcome. |  | |  |  |  | |  | | --- | |  | |      |  |  |  |  |  |  | | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | | |  | | --- | | MPphoto |  |  | | --- | |  | |  | **Manfred Weber,***on behalf of the PPE Group*. – *(DE)*Mr President, Commissioner, President-in-Office of the Council, ladies and gentlemen, the discussion of Schengen has generated a lot of headlines in Europe in recent weeks. For that reason, it is good that we are discussing this matter in Parliament today. I would like to start by indicating the support of the Group of the European People’s Party (Christian Democrats) for the Commissioner in respect of the examination of the very specific detailed accusations in the European Union, and if it is found that offences have been committed at European internal borders, they should be properly investigated by the Commission, because the PPE Group wants a strong European authority that will monitor Schengen status in future.  That brings us to the real debate, which is one that, ultimately, concerns us all. With its decision on the Schengen rules, the Council was itself probably not altogether clear on what it was hoping to achieve, because it has not only set out on a path that we consider to be dubious in terms of content, it has also, by choosing a new legal basis, departed from the path of cooperation with Members of this House. The Council has also interfered in one of Europe’s most important achievements, namely the open borders.  For us, Schengen means freedom in place of borders, cooperation in place of egoism and working together instead of working against one another. The freedom to travel in Europe is the PPE Group’s top priority. The people, the economy and indeed the whole of Europe will benefit from this. We do not want the open borders, which are a visible feature of European cooperation, to be disproportionately restricted, particularly at a time when more European spirit is needed.  As the PPE Group, we want the Member States to stop doing secret deals with each other on how essential rights of their citizens are to be dealt with. This method has failed; we must focus on the Community method.  The PPE Group wants the decision making to come out of the diplomatic backrooms and the decisions on these new legal bases to be made by the elected bodies in which citizens are represented.  The PPE Group will fight to retain these rights in Europe. As far as the content is concerned, we do not see any insurmountable obstacles. The question is whether we will actually find a way forward in this process together. I have to say, Mr Mavroyiannis, that this is not the way for family members to treat each other. It destroys the spirit of European cooperation. We therefore ask the Council to return to the path of cooperation, and – as you said yourself today – more intensive contact is not enough for the European Parliament. We are legislators and we are involved in the decision, and for that reason I would ask you to withdraw your decision on the legal basis and involve Parliament as an equal legislator. |  | |  |  |  | |  | | --- | |  | |      |  |  |  |  |  |  | | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | | |  | | --- | | MPphoto |  |  | | --- | |  | |  | **Sylvie Guillaume,***on behalf of the S&D Group.* – *(FR)*Mr President, ladies and gentlemen, I personally am very pleased with this debate that we are having again today on this new Schengen governance in the broadest sense of the term. It means that we can reiterate our concerns about protecting the free movement of persons, a formidable EU body of legislation.  Cases of breaches of Schengen rules, alluded to by the Commission in its first Schengen bill of health, invite us, Commissioner, to request you to shed as much light as possible on these matters, as you indicated when you first spoke.  We first urge the Member States to adopt greater transparency. This transparency must be part of a mechanism to strengthen mutual trust between Member States, and to enable them to implement all the Schengen provisions effectively. However, we also need to be able to rely on a courageous European Commission which does not hesitate to draw on its powers, as guardian of the Treaties, to ensure that Community law is appropriately implemented, and all the more so in the case of the fundamental right, and I will come back to that, of the freedom of movement of our fellow citizens.  More than ever before, the examples that have been mentioned, whether Germany or the Netherlands, although we could think back to older examples such as Italy and France, and the border at Ventimiglia, are sufficient argument for us to make further calls for the introduction of a European Schengen evaluation mechanism, a Community-based one in which Parliament would have a full role to play.  The new Cypriot Presidency will have the onerous task of trying to find a positive outcome to the conflict that sets us apart on this issue. Furthermore, I must admit, President-in-Office of the Council, that I did not fully recognise in what you were saying either what had been said or the outcome of our previous discussions, although this is undoubtedly due to a misunderstanding on my part.  I would like to remind you that the system which had been applied in certain areas was an intergovernmental system. It is no longer suitable for the European Union as it is developing now, particularly if we want to put the support of the European people for our common project on a permanent footing.  In the absence of a shared view of these situations at the borders, it is highly likely that the same party-political arguments and their populist slant will remain the order of the day, and that, frankly, is toxic to our European democracy.  I shall conclude by reaffirming that the only weapon we can use to respond to the challenge posed by the structural fragility of certain borders, a fragility which clearly concerns us all, is that of European solidarity and a Community approach. |  | |  |  |  | |  | | --- | |  | |      |  |  |  |  |  |  | | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | | |  | | --- | | MPphoto |  |  | | --- | |  | |  | **Renate Weber,***on behalf of the ALDE Group.***–**Mr President, we have heard again and again from the Council, from the Member States, but also from you, Commissioner, that the implementation of the Schengen Agreement has been very good, almost perfect. Allow me please to at least partially disagree.  It is true that for several years no one has challenged how Member States implement the Schengen rules. Border controls have been reintroduced for limited periods of time, but no one complained. However, in the last 18 months there have been way too many attempts to apply Schengen rules in a much more personalised and dangerous manner. The joy of the Arab Spring was over-shadowed by Italy’s reaction and France’s decision to reintroduce border control.  Denmark considered that its domestic political problems could be solved by reintroducing border control as an alleged way of combating trans-border crime. For more than one year – one year – the Netherlands has had an initiative which was considered by a Dutch court as having the same effects as border controls. For several months another attempt to curtail free movement has taken place in Germany, where on a systematic basis more than 55% of Czech buses are checked. I cannot help wondering how long the Commission will keep pretending that things are OK within the Schengen governance. They are not. This is why the Commission in fact came up with a legislative package to improve it.  If the Commission continues with only half-measures, never daring to start infringement procedures, I am afraid we will wake up one morning realising that free movement no longer exists.  I am addressing you, Commissioner, because I have full confidence in your commitment to the defence of free movement. I am not addressing the Council at this stage, waiting for a better time to enlighten the Member States and make them understand what the real interests of European citizens are. |  | |  |  |  | |  | | --- | |  | |      |  |  |  |  | | --- | --- | --- | --- | |  |  | **IN THE CHAIR: OLDŘICH VLASÁK** *Vice-President* |  | |  |  |  | |  | | --- | |  | |      |  |  |  |  |  |  | | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | | |  | | --- | | MPphoto |  |  | | --- | |  | |  | **Judith Sargentini,***on behalf of the Verts/ALE Group*. – *(NL)*Mr President, do our national leaders have doubts about the benefits of the freedom of movement? Do they no longer see the freedom that it offers European citizens? Do they, similarly, no longer see the economic benefits of freedom of movement? Do our Heads of State or Government doubt their counterparts? Do they doubt the willingness of other Member States to properly control and protect our external borders? It looks very much like it.  I believe that those doubts – that distrust, even – of other Member States, is symptomatic of what is happening in the European Union. Together we are strong. Together we will get out of the crisis. Our Heads of State or Government are not giving the impression that they have confidence in cooperation. That mutual distrust between Member States has led Parliament to state that the control and delivery of the freedom of movement should be the responsibility of the Commission, as that is an institution that has European interests in mind.  For me, that freedom of movement is one of the greatest commodities that the European Union provides. It therefore amazes me to hear that the Commission, in the shape of Ms Malmström, is now saying that the Dutch Government’s so-called ‘mobile surveillance of aliens’ is permissible. My reaction would be that, if it looks like a duck and quacks like a duck, then it is a duck. If you proceed to permit this now, when various Dutch courts have already thrown it out, I am convinced that the same will happen within a short while at the Court of Justice of the European Union in Luxembourg. |  | |  |  |  | |  | | --- | |  | |      |  |  |  |  |  |  | | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | | |  | | --- | | MPphoto |  |  | | --- | |  | |  | **Timothy Kirkhope,***on behalf of the ECR Group.***–**Mr President, once again we find ourselves debating the Schengen system and its implementation – in this case by Germany and the Netherlands, but it is becoming increasingly impossible to have a discussion on Schengen separated from a discussion on the security of borders generally. The Schengen area is not just an area administered by the EU, it is the territories and borders of individual Member States, and yet Article 4(2) of the Treaty on European Union states that national security remains the sole responsibility of each Member State.  Increasingly this House wants Member States to have less control over their borders, and concerns about this are not reactionary or short-term but a belief by states that they themselves are best placed to deal with the unique security situation that they face. Instead this debate has so far been dominated by a rather petty squabbling with other institutions. Perhaps the European Council and Member States would feel less urgency to regain powers if this Parliament acted more responsibly and understood the security pressures which we all face.  In the fight against cross-border crime we need to join together to do that, but we should not be allowing ourselves to be held to ransom on topics such as my own EU PNR proposals, which were removed from our agenda at an important moment. It is important that we should conduct our business in future in a different, more considered and balanced way. |  | |  |  |  | |  | | --- | |  | |      |  |  |  |  |  |  | | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | | |  | | --- | | MPphoto |  |  | | --- | |  | |  | **Cornelia Ernst,***on behalf of the GUE/NGL Group*. – *(DE)*Mr President, we really ought to speak plainly and clearly today, and this plain-speaking includes the fact that we cannot turn the clock back, and nor do we want to. As Parliament, we have the right under the Treaty to be involved in decisions on all matters relating to Schengen and not just to be casually consulted. That is something that I would like to make clear at the start.  I would also like to say that this EU law simply must not be left to the arbitrariness of political freebooters – and that is how I would describe it. Politically motivated contravention – and that is also the term I would choose to use – using the Schengen agreement as a kind of muscle-flexing in election campaigns, is totally unacceptable, and also has nothing to do with EU law. These problems do not only include arbitrary border closures, which we had for a time and which, of course, violate EU law, they also include the installation of cameras at 15 border crossings between Germany and the Netherlands and Belgium. If these do not also constitute border controls, then what are they? Furthermore, all that nonsense from a German interior minister concerning the reintroduction of border controls is obviously dangerous. It is dangerous not just because of the problems with Schengen, but also because it represents the arguments of the extreme right, and not just in Germany. Equally unacceptable is the fact that, at the border between Germany and the Czech Republic, which is, incidentally, where I live, buses are constantly being checked. We must not tolerate this. It is not only buses from the Czech Republic that are being checked, but people who look a bit different in some way, for example those who have slightly darker skin, are also being checked. This is also part of the problem.  Let us make it very clear that this is not acceptable. We do not want this, because it contravenes the law and because, as Parliament, we do not want this sort of policy. We therefore also express our criticism of the Council’s action in the strongest possible terms. After all, this is not merely a contravention of the law; it is also undemocratic. I therefore suggest that the Council discusses four things with us:  Firstly, we ought to be in agreement that there must be no arbitrariness in the way that the Schengen Agreement is implemented. That is something I would like to discuss. Secondly, we want to increase free movement. We want to talk about this. Thirdly, in the event of contraventions of the Schengen Agreement, we want the Commission, with the involvement of the Council, to draw the necessary conclusions. Lastly, as Parliament, we want to be fully involved in all matters, and that includes decision making. |  | |  |  |  | |  | | --- | |  | |      |  |  |  |  |  |  | | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | | |  | | --- | | MPphoto |  |  | | --- | |  | |  | **Mara Bizzotto,***on behalf of the EFD Group.* – *(IT)*Mr President, ladies and gentlemen, on 7 June, the Council’s decision to give the Member States the option to reintroduce border controls created a new Europe, a courageous Europe that satisfied its citizens’ desire for greater safety, ultimately rooted in a more mature interpretation of the concept of solidarity based on the defence of its people’s rights above all else.  Even though he is not here, I would say to President Schulz that this historic decision does not constitute an interinstitutional incident; rather it represents the wishes of citizens being respected and not the wishes of Eurocrats, who for years have pretended not to understand what is really going on outside their glass palace. I am not talking about any imaginary influx of illegal immigrants, President Schulz, but a 35% increase in illegal immigrants in 2011, according to Frontex’s own data.  I only regret that the scenes of political hysteria in this House during the last plenary sitting took time away from a more useful and constructive activity, to ask ourselves why it was the Member States and not us that defended the interests of our fellow citizens. If Parliament cannot find the heart and the courage to oppose the political correctness and banal platitudes on which it has got by for too long, it will continue to be a follower and not a leader in the construction of the European project. |  | |  |  |  | |  | | --- | |  | |      |  |  |  |  |  |  | | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | | |  | | --- | | MPphoto |  |  | | --- | |  | |  | **Auke Zijlstra (NI).** – *(NL)*Mr President, the fact that there are problems that result from Schengen cannot be said here often enough. After all, the Europhiles in this House are blind when they can see, deaf when they can hear, and do not want to understand. Schengen is the cause of the massive relocation of crime and nuisance. Now that the Member States are finally recognising that these problems need to be tackled, this House is setting itself against the solution. However, the border controls need to be restored, and the Member States need to ensure security.  These border controls disappeared as a result of naive idealism. That idealism has not ensured that countries and peoples in Europe have got closer, as was hoped, but instead has actually led to them drifting apart. It is a divisive factor. The choices that Brussels makes do not offer any solutions. Brussels chooses to back the failed euro experiment at the expense of its citizens. Brussels chooses rising budgets at the expense of its taxpayers. When it comes to Schengen, Brussels chooses the free movement of criminals at the expense of security.  Mr President, the European Parliament backs these bad choices. I therefore now address Mr Van Rompuy, as President of the European Council, through the representative of the Council here today. He is not a fan of freedom, he is not a fan of participation or of national democracy. He likes centralisation, obsessive regulation and Japanese poetry. I therefore have a special haiku for him.  Schengen. Crime on tour. The border has been crossed. Winter in Brussels. |  | |  |  |  | |  | | --- | |  | |      |  |  |  |  |  |  | | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | | |  | | --- | | MPphoto |  |  | | --- | |  | |  | **Carlos Coelho (PPE).** – *(PT)*Mr President, ladies and gentlemen, listening to the speakers, we are all – with the exception of a couple from the far right – in agreement. We all agree that freedom of movement is one of the European Union’s greatest achievements. We all agree it needs to be strengthened. We all believe an area without border checks is essential to the internal market and that it brings benefits to the Member States and the public. We all agree with the need to improve governance of Schengen, and we even all agree that Schengen’s current evaluation system is inadequate and that we need a system guaranteeing a transparent, effective and consistent Schengen system.  Why, then, do we need to bring specific cases into the Chamber? Commissioner Malmström said that, as well as those mentioned by Parliament in the oral question, she is currently investigating some 11 cases. These 11 cases prove that there are systematic breaches of freedom of movement under Schengen. These 11 cases prove that the European institutions were unable to stop them. These 11 cases prove that Schengen’s current evaluation system is not working and that is the key issue.  The President-in-Office of the Council said the reasons were just legal, but that is not true. The Cypriot Presidency is getting off on the wrong foot by trying to pull the wool over Parliament’s eyes on this, because the reasons are political: the Council wants to continue covering up breaches of the Schengen Agreement, which is what it has systematically been doing with its peer-to-peer evaluation system. We need a genuine evaluation system; an EU-level system, led by the European Commission and subject to the codecision procedure, voted on by the Council and by Parliament. We think that is how we will defend Schengen, will defend freedom of movement, and will defend what is one of the best guarantees and the greatest successes of European integration. |  | |  |  |  | |  | | --- | |  | |      |  |  |  |  |  |  | | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | | |  | | --- | | MPphoto |  |  | | --- | |  | |  | **Ioan Enciu (S&D).** – *(RO)*Mr President, the recent debates on the Schengen Agreement have focused too much on the interinstitutional war between the Council and Parliament and too little on the real heart of the problem. This is why I believe that this debate provides a good opportunity to revisit arguments which justify the radical reform of the Schengen area.  Unfortunately, I must say that the current Schengen system has major problems, mainly due to a general trend towards renationalising the Schengen area. This trend has become evident in recent years through cases which are already well known of internal border controls being illegally reintroduced. However, what is less well known and publicised in the media are the hidden internal border controls which are in place in no fewer than 11 Member States, as the Commission highlighted in its biannual report in May, a situation also confirmed by the Commissioner responsible for the Schengen area and by Mr Coelho here before us. The refusal to admit Romania and Bulgaria is another example of the Schengen rules being misinterpreted. I hope that this autumn the accession of Romania and Bulgaria will mark the first step towards establishing a normal situation in terms of compliance with these rules.  In Romania, even at the moment, the national parliament and the Ponta government are making efforts to introduce the rule of law and get rid of the presidential dictatorship which has been imposed in recent years. Therefore, Romania is in the process of returning to normal after a long period of democratic abuses and violations. This will ensure that the problems relating to administration and justice which have delayed Romania’s admission to the Schengen area will disappear, never to occur again.  The European Union urgently needs to reform Schengen governance and have Parliament involved, while the Commission needs to adopt the role of an impartial arbitrator both in assessing the application of the Schengen *acquis* and in the measures adopted to resolve the problems which have occurred, if necessary. |  | |  |  |  | |  | | --- | |  | |      |  |  |  |  |  |  | | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | | |  | | --- | | MPphoto |  |  | | --- | |  | |  | **Sarah Ludford (ALDE). -**Mr President, I would say to my domestic coalition partner, Mr Kirkhope, if he were here, that internal border controls do not play a major role in catching major criminals, or even terrorists, and nor would PNR collection on internal EU flights do that. What is needed for that purpose is not populist moves designed to impress voters that irregular migration is being curbed, but strongly cooperative intelligence-led policing.  In addition we do need better managed external borders. I speak, of course, as a Brit who does not enjoy free movement travelling between London and Brussels or Strasbourg. Indeed, on a Brussels–London Eurostar journey I have my passport checked three times at present and my ticket twice. I acknowledge there is an issue on that route because people can buy a ticket to Lille but continue to London, but please be grateful that most of you do not have to endure these checks in Schengen and please preserve internal free movement so that even we Brits can join one day. |  | |  |  |  | |  | | --- | |  | |      |  |  |  |  |  |  | | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | | |  | | --- | | MPphoto |  |  | | --- | |  | |  | **Jan Zahradil (ECR).***– (CS)*Mr President, I would be happy to acknowledge the right of every Member State to control, in justified cases, its own external borders, for security reasons. I respect that, but it must be done in justified cases and it must never be done in order to harass.  It is simply not normal that every other coach coming from the Czech Republic is checked on the Czech-German border. There is no justification for this, because the Czech Republic presents no security risk for Germany, and nor does it present any risk in terms of illegal migration, and if ordinary tourist coaches are being checked then this is completely beyond me. I travel to Strasbourg from Prague by car and I well know that immediately after Rozvadov on the Czech-German border, the German or Bavarian police are lurking, and they deliberately go for cars with foreign number plates.  I think it is a kind of bureaucratic procedure, and that someone perhaps is ticking boxes in an office somewhere for the number of checks carried out, but it has to stop. The Treaty must have the final word here, and European law must be adhered to, just as in other cases. |  | |  |  |  | |  | | --- | |  | |      |  |  |  |  |  |  | | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | | |  | | --- | | MPphoto |  |  | | --- | |  | |  | **Ewald Stadler (NI).** – *(DE)*Mr President, in recent years, the Schengen rules have become a central dogma among EU apologists for this new, secular EU alternative religion. We are now witnessing another dogma collapsing before our eyes. Ministers who attacked Denmark’s imposition of extra checks two years ago are now forced to admit that they can no longer manage without additional border controls, particularly in relation to illegal migration at the border between Turkey and Greece.  For this reason, I welcome the decisions taken by the interior ministers. I also appeal to them not to back-track, but rather to consider whether they might need more stringent measures if the economic situation further deteriorates, as seems likely at present. To all those who currently crassly ignore the problems of the victims of crime I would like to say that this is a cynical way to deal with these wronged citizens.  Finally, I would like to make the following appeal: I would call on you not to relax visa requirements for Turkey as this would send out the wrong signal to this country. It is particularly important now that we should make it clear to Turkey that it is obliged to ensure that we do not have a massive wave of illegal migration into the Schengen area.  *(The speaker agreed to take a blue-card question under Rule 149(8))* |  | |  |  |  | |  | | --- | |  | |      |  |  |  |  |  |  | | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | | |  | | --- | | MPphoto |  |  | | --- | |  | |  | **Cornelia Ernst (GUE/NGL),***blue-card question.* – *(DE)*I should like you to explain what this has to do with Turkey. As far as I am aware, Turkey is not a Member of the EU. We are supposed to be discussing the EU’s internal borders. Are you aware of this? |  | |  |  |  | |  | | --- | |  | |      |  |  |  |  |  |  | | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | | |  | | --- | | MPphoto |  |  | | --- | |  | |  | **Ewald Stadler (NI),***blue-card answer.* – *(DE)* I am not sure if my colleague has noticed that there is a border between Turkey and Greece, that this border has been increasingly used for illegal migration in recent months, that, as a further consequence, there have been several migratory movements from Greece into the European Union, and that not all of those who come are genuine refugees but also include criminal elements. I am not sure whether she has noticed this. It has not, however, gone unnoticed by the many members of the public who have fallen foul of this criminality. |  | |  |  |  | |  | | --- | |  | |      |  |  |  |  |  |  | | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | | |  | | --- | | MPphoto |  |  | | --- | |  | |  | **Simon Busuttil (PPE). -***(MT)*Mr President, each time our external borders are placed under pressure a large number of Member States have got into the habit of reacting in the wrong way. Instead of trying to find ways of cooperating in order to strengthen the external borders, they are reintroducing internal ones between the European countries. What they fail to realise is that by putting up these internal borders they are leaving out European citizens whilst locking in their own citizens, and they are undermining freedom of movement, which is the European Union’s biggest achievement. In other words, they are placing all that we have built together under threat. We face two problems here. The first being that the Council is excluding the European Parliament when it comes to Schengen based decisions and, as a consequence, decisions related to freedom of movement.  Today, however, it is has emerged more clearly than ever that it is the European Parliament that is fully defending the freedom of movement of citizens. We want the European Commission to join us in this defence.  The second problem is that we are not simply talking about the risk of a potential threat to freedom of movement, but a real threat that is actually taking place. As we have heard, one country after another is now setting up internal borders between Schengen countries where they should not exist. The Parliament has appealed for this debate to reaffirm the importance of Schengen, to reiterate the importance of freedom of movement, and to send out a clear message to the Council that European citizens can still enjoy freedom of movement and that we are ready to defend this freedom. I would also like the European Commission to be on our side in our fight in favour of freedom of movement. |  | |  |  |  | |  | | --- | |  | |      |  |  |  |  |  |  | | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | | |  | | --- | | MPphoto |  |  | | --- | |  | |  | **Tanja Fajon (S&D). -***(SL)*Mr President, the Slovene press is full of headlines asking whether we might once more have to travel with passports. People are worried that we might lose our freedom of movement. The crisis has seriously shaken our citizens’ confidence.  For decades, we have worked to make the Union an area of free movement. The Council’s decision to exclude Parliament from decision making on the temporary introduction of controls within the Schengen area is unacceptable, regardless of any explanations. Any change to European border controls requires decision-making at a European level. A handful of people cannot decide on this behind closed doors without democratic control.  How do we ensure the governments of Member States do not bow to right-wing populism? Our record to date has not been good on that account.  Every year, more than a billion of us travel across the Union as tourists. We visit friends or relatives without needing a passport. Schengen is a symbol of Europe and I expect the Commission to firmly check any Schengen violations and the Cyprus Presidency to understand the sensitivity of the Schengen debate. We are at a very dangerous crossroads: truly, the confidence of our citizens is at stake. |  | |  |  |  | |  | | --- | |  | |      |  |  |  |  |  |  | | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | | |  | | --- | | MPphoto |  |  | | --- | |  | |  | **Sophia in 't Veld (ALDE).** – *(NL)*Mr President, I would just like to respond to my fellow Member from the Dutch Party for Freedom (PVV), who said, a little bit disdainfully that Schengen is something that was dreamt up by idealists. My late grandfather had a one-man business for the import of office supplies and travelled from the Netherlands to Brussels and Paris every fortnight, by bicycle at first, in order to collect his products. Recently, I discovered from his old passports the evidence of what Europe looked like before Schengen. His passports were full of stamps – evidence of long waiting times, the requirement to declare foreign currency and the need to change money. He would have embraced Schengen, as it would have made his life so much easier. Talk about idealism!  Commissioner, the Commission needs to supervise compliance with the Schengen Code, not only in terms of the letter of the law, but also in terms of the spirit, and if there are eleven problem situations in Europe, then it is clear that the spirit of Schengen is under pressure. It is the core of the European project. If you are telling us that the situation in the Netherlands is not problematic, then I am surprised, as the fight against crime is not something that we only do in border regions, Ms Malmström, it is something we do right across the Netherlands. So, to agree with my fellow Member from the Confederal Group of the European United Left – Nordic Green Left, if they look like border controls, that is probably what they are. |  | |  |  |  | |  | | --- | |  | |      |  |  |  |  |  |  | | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | | |  | | --- | | MPphoto |  |  | | --- | |  | |  | **Marian-Jean Marinescu (PPE).** – *(RO)*Mr President, the Council’s decision of 8 June to change the legal basis of the regulation on the evaluation of the Schengen area may have adverse consequences on the Schengen area’s operation. If we really want to have a higher degree of transparency and democratic and judicial accountability in the way in which the Schengen rules are implemented and applied by Member States, we need to return to the basic treaty, and the discussion with Parliament needs to start again. In addition, it is difficult to accept that Member States which have weak points in their external borders are refusing to adopt a coordinated approach to evaluating the Schengen mechanism, while also blocking access to the Schengen area to Member States which, after the efforts they have made, have managed to achieve an extremely high level of security at their external borders.  By refusing the codecision procedure for the Schengen dossier, the Council is intending to retain a Schengen evaluation system which has proved at the moment to be ineffective at identifying non-compliance with the Schengen rules. This means that the EU prefers to tolerate illegal controls at internal borders or irregularities at external borders. Some Member States think that introducing internal borders will contribute to citizens’ security and help control the influx of migrants. Unfortunately, they are on the wrong track. The EU needs to focus on consolidating Schengen governance and on harmonising the security level at the external borders of all Member States.  Parliament wants to avoid a decline in current external border standards which are stipulated by European legislation. The current Schengen rules need to be revised to establish uniform external border standards, and this must also be legislated by Parliament as colegislator. |  | |  |  |  | |  | | --- | |  | |      |  |  |  |  |  |  | | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | | |  | | --- | | MPphoto |  |  | | --- | |  | |  | **Birgit Sippel (S&D).** – *(DE)*Mr President, let me state quite plainly from the start that freedom of movement within the EU is not a national right and thus cannot be restricted solely on a national basis. As the only elected European institution, the European Parliament must be fully consulted and given a say on all questions, whether relating to changes in the Schengen area or violations of Schengen rules.  The reference to serious deficiencies at our external borders is dubious and factually incorrect. That is because the issue at stake is not just border controls, but also the excessive demands on some states immediately to investigate the legal status of every single refugee, thereby establishing clear perspectives for them. As Europeans, we must meet these challenges together, rather than sowing the seeds of uncertainty among our citizens with a crassly populist approach. This joint approach would be effective for our countries and our citizens, as well as for the refugees themselves. We should not regress to a parochial standpoint, because the fact is we need more Europe, not less. |  | |  |  |  | |  | | --- | |  | |      |  |  |  |  |  |  | | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | | |  | | --- | | MPphoto |  |  | | --- | |  | |  | **Zuzana Roithová (PPE).**–*(CS)*Mr President, we submitted another question to the Commission because, in the area of Schengen and visas, it has failed to fulfil its role sufficiently as guardian of the founding Treaties in recent years.  It is striking that it has tolerated systematic and frequent checks within Schengen for years, where more than half of Czech coaches are checked by the Bavarian police, without us knowing why. It also affects us MEPs, as we are checked on the way to Strasbourg. Despite all the warnings, including my own interventions, we have seen no strong reaction from the Commission. A year ago, the Netherlands constitutional court identified similar checks as a breach of Union law. Why does the Commission remain silent? Why does it not begin an investigation of countries that are in breach of community law?  The second problem is the non-functionality of Schengen’s external dimension, the joint visa policy. Many Member States today face unilateral visa obligations from third countries and cannot themselves respond reciprocally, since exclusive competence in this area rests with the Commission, which is again inactive. The unilateral imposition of Canadian visas for Czech citizens is now marking its dismal third anniversary, since the Commission is failing to fight for the rights of its citizens. On the contrary, the Commission is now fighting against the full involvement of the European Parliament in the regulation on visas granted by third countries and other regulations. This all undermines the trust of citizens in a European institution that is failing to protect one of the four key freedoms of the EU, the freedom of movement.  I must state in all seriousness that the Commission is entirely responsible for the current problems in this area, and so are you, Commissioner. You are reaping what you sowed. The seed you sowed may not trouble you, but it is indigestible for tens of millions of European citizens. |  | |  |  |  | |  | | --- | |  | |      |  |  |  |  |  |  | | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | | |  | | --- | | MPphoto |  |  | | --- | |  | |  | **Carmen Romero López (S&D).** – *(ES)*Mr President, despite what we have heard from some Members, internal mobility has been our great triumph. Now people want to portray external border control as a huge failure, which is in their interests. The anti-foreigner populism that is invading our countries is now becoming hostile to our own people.  Before they were criminals or self-seeking immigrants who were coming to Europe to steal the fruits of our labours, or asylum seekers who were fraudsters because they were abusing our asylum system or, in reality, they were people traffickers disguised as asylum seekers. Now this knock-on effect, this contagion of populism that is invading us, has reached our internal borders.  We are seen as self-seeking or fraudsters by each other. Now it will be the Greeks in the United Kingdom. Otherwise we are members of organised mafias when our buses are stopped at borders that do not exist and officers get on to enforce customs rules that do not exist in order to see whether we are trading in illicit goods or trafficking people. Everything is contagious. The cancer that is eating away at us and the genuine failure in the 17 years of application of the Schengen Agreement is the populism of the parties that are governing in the Member States and the cowardice of those who are not defending the founding texts.  We cannot stop worrying, Ms Malmström. How can we not worry? Internal mobility is not a threat, it is our opportunity, and mobility with our neighbouring countries will be our solution. Do we need to organise that solution? Yes we do. Will populism achieve that? No, it will not. Does the problem lie in mobility, in the desire for adventure? Fortunately, it does not. Does the problem lie among those who are fleeing wars? No, it does not. Our real failure is when we do not face up to populism and do not provide solutions. |  | |  |  |  | |  | | --- | |  | |      |  |  |  |  |  |  | | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | | |  | | --- | | MPphoto |  |  | | --- | |  | |  | **Georgios Papanikolaou (PPE).** – *(EL)*Mr President, we have recently given into an endless exchange of accusations on the question of the Schengen area. Sometimes we say that the state asking for internal border controls is to blame and sometimes we say that some other state is to blame, where the external borders of that state, which are also external borders of the Union, do not have adequate and secure border control as required for the Schengen area. I think that, whenever we give into such accusations, we lose direction. When the ‘fathers’ of the European Union founded our Union, they started from a basic assumption: that we are all to blame for failed policies. They said that we are all to blame and they arrived at a joint finding. Only if we all pull in the same direction can we resolve any problems that arise, because solidarity means taking joint responsibility. It does not just mean helping someone who may be in a weak position; it means jointly taking responsibility.  Within this framework, therefore, you will understand that it is very difficult for all of us, and for the public following us, to understand what happened last year between France and Italy or what is happening in terms of controls of Czech buses on the German borders or in similar cases on the Dutch borders. How, therefore, can we say that Greece is not acting as it should on its external borders, when Frontex itself admits that, without assistance from its partners and without assistance from Turkey, Greece cannot secure the borders on its own.  To close, please can we focus on that, Commissioner? I call on you, because we expect a great deal of the Commission. At this time, the Member States, with whose various representatives I have discussed the subject, are taking a fearful approach to the question of the assessment and changes that we have in the regulations and are taking the view that it is better for us to handle these matters and that we do not need anyone else. No, we want the Community method, we want Schengen to operate at a higher level, we want future generations to know that, at this time, we responded with more Europe, not less Europe and back-peddling on the subject. |  | |  |  |  | |  | | --- | |  | |      |  |  |  |  |  |  | | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | | |  | | --- | | MPphoto |  |  | | --- | |  | |  | **Wim van de Camp (PPE).** – *(NL)*Mr President, the principle of the free movement of people, goods, services and capital is one of the cornerstones of the European Union. Thanks to the Treaty of Lisbon, the Schengen Agreements are now a key element of the European Union.  In times of growing nationalism and even populism, but also of rising crime and illegality, we need to very carefully monitor the Schengen Agreements and really keep our finger on the pulse when it comes to the interpretation of the agreements.  Personally, I support a broad interpretation of Schengen border controls – the Commissioner is well aware of this – but also supervision at Union level. That is what we agreed among ourselves, and it is a key element of European constitutional law. In light of that, I, too, am shocked by the decision of the European Council of 7 and 8 June to abandon, or to restrict, that supervision at Union level, the Community method. I am also pleased with the undertaking on the part of the President of the European Council that he wants to remedy that situation. We will judge him by his actions, however. This House, and I agree in this respect with all those who spoke before me, cannot be sidelined here.  *(The speaker agreed to take a blue-card question under Rule 149(8)).* |  | |  |  |  | |  | | --- | |  | |      |  |  |  |  |  |  | | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | | |  | | --- | | MPphoto |  |  | | --- | |  | |  | **Judith Sargentini (Verts/ALE),***blue-card question***.** – *(NL)* I have here a letter from the Dutch Minister for Immigration, a member of Mr Van de Camp’s party, dated 3 July 2012, stating that, as of 1 August, he will be intensifying the mobile surveillance of aliens or mobile security supervision – they keep changing the name somewhat. Is that the kind of broad interpretation of Schengen that Mr Van de Camp would like to see? |  | |  |  |  | |  | | --- | |  | |      |  |  |  |  |  |  | | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | | |  | | --- | | MPphoto |  |  | | --- | |  | |  | **Wim van de Camp (PPE),***blue-card answer.* – *(NL)* Unless I misunderstood, the Commissioner said this afternoon that an initial assessment of the mobile surveillance of aliens by the Commission concluded that it is not in contravention of the Schengen Agreements. If that mobile surveillance of aliens were to be abused in order to impede free movement for European citizens, then we would be on the wrong track.  As the Dutch minister says, however, it is precisely because of these problems relating to illegal activity that I was able to justify the mobile surveillance of aliens despite being aware that there are Dutch judges who have difficulties with it, and it seems to me that the Dutch minister can go ahead, but, once again, under supervision at Union level. |  | |  |  |  | |  | | --- | |  | |      |  |  |  |  |  |  | | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | | |  | | --- | | MPphoto |  |  | | --- | |  | |  | **Hubert Pirker (PPE).** – *(DE)*Mr President, Commissioner, President-in-Office of the Council, unfortunately we must recognise the increasing frequency with which the Schengen Agreement is violated and we also know that not all external borders are monitored to the same high standards. We are aware that the Council clearly wants to decide for itself whether or not border controls are to be reintroduced for up to two years. This would be like the players in a football match deciding for themselves whether someone had committed a foul and whether or not there should be a penalty awarded. The majority in the European Parliament wants to avoid endangering our major achievement, namely freedom to travel without border controls, and we shall do all we can to ensure that this does not happen.  What does the European Parliament want? Naturally the European Parliament is in favour of introducing short-term border checks in emergency situations. If serious problems arise, we also require a decision to be taken about whether border controls are to be introduced and for how long. However, this must take place at European level following an objective examination by the Commission and, naturally, we also demand evaluation mechanisms, but also involving a subsequent decision at European level. The European Parliament and, I am sure, the majority of those here will vehemently support the continued assurance of security and freedom to travel – as guaranteed by the Schengen Agreement – so that actions with populist backing, such as those witnessed in Denmark, do not happen in the future.  Finally, I would call on the Council to do all it can to ensure that the interior ministers return to the path of common sense and cooperation. |  | |  |  |  | |  | | --- | |  | |      |  |  |  |  |  |  | | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | | |  | | --- | | MPphoto |  |  | | --- | |  | |  | **Salvatore Iacolino (PPE).** – *(IT)*Mr President, Commissioner, the new Cyprus Presidency – we wish you success in your work – ladies and gentlemen, what we have heard today has made it very clear that there is a vast gulf between the position of the Council, which considers the Schengen issue we are discussing today simply to be a legal issue, and, on the other hand, the clear and coherent position of the Commission, which suggests quickly returning to the codecision procedure. The Council deprived us of our say on 6 and 7 June and we are relying on the Council recalling its sense of joint responsibility in this particular case.  Schengen is a product of civilisation, a real and, we would say, inalienable achievement: 40 000 km of land borders, almost 800 km of maritime borders, 25 countries involved and 400 million citizens. Citing the supposed problem of public safety is not enough to call into question something that remains an extremely valuable achievement.  Schengen, like the single market, is among the few accomplishments of the European Union which we can now say is responsible for there being even partial European citizenship. What is needed is more cooperation, more cooperation in policing and judicial terms, responsibility and solidarity. Parliament wants an open and integrated Europe, where everyone fully plays their part and that is another challenge that we want to achieve with the decisive contribution of the Commission and with a Council that restores solidarity in its relations with Parliament. |  | |  |  |  | |  | | --- | |  | |      |  |  |  |  |  |  | | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | | |  | | --- | | MPphoto |  |  | | --- | |  | |  | **Jacek Protasiewicz (PPE). -***(PL)*Mr President, I come from a country that acceded to the European Union only recently, just in 2004. At that time, in a referendum, Poles spoke decisively in favour of European unity, in favour of membership of the European Union, just like the nations of all the other countries that were joining the European Union, as most of them took the decision by a general vote of this nature. In our countries and in particular in Poland there is still a high level of acceptance for the European Union, much higher than in the countries of the old Union. One of the principal reasons for this acceptance – and also the reason why the referendum decided in favour of joining the European Union – was the possibility of free movement throughout a Europe without borders, without passports, all of which became a reality through the Schengen Agreement.  Our role as representatives of our societies, as persons chosen in direct elections, is to protect those values that are dear to people, those issues regarding the European Union that are really important to them. The European Parliament must be involved in any decision concerning the future of Schengen and any return to internal frontiers. These are matters that are important to our electors and it is our responsibility to protect and defend those values that are dear to them. The role of governments is to ensure safety without affecting those basic values that are important for the citizens of Europe. |  | |  |  |  | |  | | --- | |  | |      |  |  |  |  |  |  | | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | | |  | | --- | | MPphoto |  |  | | --- | |  | |  | **Marco Scurria (PPE).** – *(IT)*Mr President, ladies and gentlemen, Schengen is an asset to Europe. Breaking down barriers between Member States was the first sign of something new that was starting to take shape: no more barriers but unity; no more controls but solidarity between states, which are no longer divided but united in a single great Union. That is why it is odd to hold this debate today. We seem to have taken a step backwards and it appears that we are abandoning the foundations of our fine Union.  If Schengen fails, the European Union fails, but if Schengen is so important it should be protected, as precious things are. It should be protected from a Council that thinks it can bypass Parliament’s prerogatives, but it should also be protected from anything that can call Schengen itself into question. External border control should therefore be strengthened with all the legislative and technological instruments we have because, if our borders are at risk of becoming porous, this automatically makes our Member States less flexible, and they could call for stricter control, even within our borders, to prevent the entry of illegal immigrants. We cannot allow that and for that I thank Commissioner Malmström for all her work and her future collaboration on this issue. |  | |  |  |  | |  | | --- | |  | |      |  |  |  |  |  |  | | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | | |  | | --- | | MPphoto |  |  | | --- | |  | |  | **Monika Hohlmeier (PPE).** – *(DE)*Mr President, ladies and gentlemen, I believe that Schengen is one of the greatest achievements in the European Union, however I am also aware that our Member States are sensitive of their borders and are likely to remain so. I am aware that the problems that exist between the Member States in relation to Schengen cannot simply be ignored. These problems are many and varied. Ignoring these problems does not make them any better or easier to resolve.  I live near the border with the Czech Republic and no one on our side would ever dream of simply closing the border again when problems are encountered. I would also call on the Commission to offer support in this area, rather than restrictions and rebukes. Dragnet controls were incorporated because we wish to ensure security while still allowing freedom to travel. If we are to be successful in implementing dragnet controls at locations that are frequent crossing points for drug dealers, such as the Czech border in particular, then I believe it is best for the German and Czech interior ministers to sit down together to find a joint solution to the problems that exist at the border. The Commission should not adopt a regulatory role here, but rather a positive supporting role.  We wish to rein in the populists, but also to resolve the real problems in a concerted approach. That is why I am also calling on the Council to seek a solution together with Parliament, so that we can successfully conclude the Schengen dossier, upholding freedom to travel while also ensuring the security of our citizens. |  | |  |  |  | |  | | --- | |  | |      |  |  |  |  |  | | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | | |  | | --- | |  | |  | *Catch-the-eye procedure* |  | |  |  |  | |  | | --- | |  | |      |  |  |  |  |  |  | | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | | |  | | --- | | MPphoto |  |  | | --- | |  | |  | **Pier Antonio Panzeri (S&D).** – *(IT)*Mr President, Commissioner, ladies and gentlemen, the choice made by the Council on 7 June does not just concern European internal policy; as you can imagine, it also has an impact outside Europe. Everyone here has said that the free movement of people is one of the greatest European achievements in a Europe that is defined by it. However, restricting that free movement actually implies and portrays a feeling of mistrust that the Council is trying to distil among European countries and into European public opinion, which risks destroying the European project.  For some time we have been calling for innovative and modern European governance on the migration issue. What you are doing, though, renationalises immigration policy. You are making rights and freedoms take a backward step, but these choices are likely to have a negative impact on another front, in that they reveal a certain schizophrenia in the action taken by Europe in its various policies.  Together we have decided that one of the pillars of the new neighbourhood policy is mobility, a core element of the new European approach, for example towards a changing area such as the Mediterranean. What message are we sending out to these countries, apart from a message of distrust and lack of credibility? |  | |  |  |  | |  | | --- | |  | |      |  |  |  |  |  |  | | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | | |  | | --- | | MPphoto |  |  | | --- | |  | |  | **Lena Kolarska-Bobińska (PPE). -***(PL)*Mr President, I would like to ask Ms Malmström to announce a ‘Zero tolerance for Schengen non-compliance’ programme. What we have been seeing over the past 18 months is a gradual undermining of the Schengen provisions, which represent the cornerstone of the European Union. Various countries, under various pretexts, are beginning to introduce temporary, transitional, hidden or open controls while we are focusing primarily on fiscal union, talking about the Euro, the crisis, a banking union and, in my opinion, we are not paying sufficient attention to these successive steps taken by various countries. I would therefore strongly encourage a ‘Zero tolerance for Schengen non-compliance’ programme, as it is only in this way that we can avoid further erosion of the Schengen system. |  | |  |  |  | |  | | --- | |  | |      |  |  |  |  |  |  | | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | | |  | | --- | | MPphoto |  |  | | --- | |  | |  | **Franziska Keller (Verts/ALE).** – *(DE)*Mr President, the cases of disproportionate border checks listed by Parliament in its question also show why the Council is seeking to exclude Parliament with regard to Schengen. The fact is that the Council wants to continue to undermine freedom to travel without involving Parliament in the decision-making process, without any form of parliamentary control or public debate. It is hardly surprising, then, that it would prefer to avoid awkward questions and withdraw to backrooms where its members can pat themselves on the back. We should not be surprised that the German Government wants to prevent an evaluation of the internal borders and is unwilling to consider just how much freedom to travel is restricted. However, Schengen does not belong to the governments, but rather to the people of Europe and therefore it also belongs in the European Parliament. |  | |  |  |  | |  | | --- | |  | |      |  |  |  |  |  |  | | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | | |  | | --- | | MPphoto |  |  | | --- | |  | |  | **Monika Flašíková-Beňová (S&D).** *– (SK)*Mr President, the establishment of the Schengen area is, according to the inhabitants of the EU Member States, one of our greatest successes. Up to 62% of EU Member State citizens stated in a survey that they considered it to be the greatest common European success and benefit.  Yet it is right now, at a time when we need to show our citizens that we are prepared to cooperate more closely, and that closer cooperation will strengthen the EU and move us further forward, right now that the Council comes up with a proposal that is absolutely unacceptable to us.  The controls that it will be possible to introduce for a period of six months and, moreover, that it will be possible to renew so that they potentially last for up to two years, are simply unacceptable to us. We cannot agree with this decision. Furthermore, we believe that it will be counterproductive since it is a direct attack on the guarantee of free travel and freedom of movement.  In conclusion, I would just like to add that, more and more, and ever more often, the Council takes decisions of this type without collaborating with the European Parliament, and without properly collaborating with the European Commission.  Commissioner, let us join forces – Parliament and the Commission – and hold the mirror up to the Council! |  | |  |  |  | |  | | --- | |  | |      |  |  |  |  |  |  | | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | | |  | | --- | | MPphoto |  |  | | --- | |  | |  | **Norica Nicolai (ALDE).** – *(RO)*Mr President, I welcome this debate and regard it as being useful for two reasons. This is because it is a debate about the institutional relations between the three European institutions and it is the first time that the Council is taking the liberty to ignore one of the institutions which has the legitimacy required to meet the aspirations and scrutiny of European citizens. The Council must realise that Parliament is the only European institution which has increased democratic legitimacy. We are elected here by popular vote and represent the interests of Europe’s citizens. Greater cohesion is in the interest of Europe’s citizens, and greater cohesion means more space and greater freedom of movement.  I do not believe that, if we have governments unable to provide suitable solutions to the crisis and resorting to populist measures, we need to return to feudalism which was not, not even during the feudal period, characteristic of Europe because the freedom of movement is taken for granted and was not created by the European Union. Europe’s citizens have understood very clearly that this is what unites them in terms of culture and civilisation. |  | |  |  |  | |  | | --- | |  | |      |  |  |  |  |  |  | | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | | |  | | --- | | MPphoto |  |  | | --- | |  | |  | **Franz Obermayr (NI).** – *(DE)*Mr President, we need to recognise that the removal of border controls has not just brought us advantages, such as convenient travel. These open borders have also naturally resulted in illegal immigration, while also making it child’s play for international criminal organisations to operate throughout Europe. You will all be aware of the undesirable side-effects: homes have been burgled, houses stripped bare, cars stolen, people trafficked, while we in this House seem almost oblivious. The situation has been worsened by the permeable Turkish-Greek border: in 2011 alone, 300 000 illegal aliens entered the European Union. Against this background, it was high time for the interior ministers to take action, which is why I find it impossible to understand the hysterical outcry in this House.  Let me turn to the Commissioner: Ms Malmström, when you claim that the waves of refugees entering Europe do not represent a threat to public security, despite 300 000 illegal immigrants from south-eastern Europe alone, then I do not know if you are living in the real world or ever talk to real people. Let me extend an invitation to you: come to the regions, for example my homeland, Austria. There you will meet with members of the public who are affected by this problem, who are anything but populists but who have justified concerns. |  | |  |  |  | |  | | --- | |  | |      |  |  |  |  |  | | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | | |  | | --- | |  | |  | *(End of the catch-the-eye procedure)* |  | |  |  |  | |  | | --- | |  | |      |  |  |  |  |  |  | | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | | |  | | --- | | MPphoto |  |  | | --- | |  | |  | **Andreas Mavroyiannis,***President-in-Office of the Council. −*Mr President, it is a difficult discussion. I hope that nobody really questions the intentions of the Cyprus Presidency.  The Council firmly believes that the new arrangements for Schengen governance, which are already in place, provide a solid basis for ensuring greater oversight of developments in the Schengen area, including by the European Parliament. Please allow me in this intervention to limit myself to the issue at hand and not comment on external borders, although we all know that the two questions are interlinked.  The Council very much wants Parliament to be involved in the ongoing process on the legislative aspects of the new Schengen governance arrangements. That includes not only the proposal for amending the Schengen Borders Code, which remains – as many of you very rightly mentioned – subject to the ordinary legislative procedure (codecision) but also the Schengen evaluation mechanism proposal. And in saying this I really weigh my words.  My plea to all of you is that we at least agree now to define, confine and circumscribe the disagreement that indeed exists between the European Parliament and the Council to one question, and that is the question of evaluation.  The honourable rapporteur, Mr Coelho, will allow me to say and to insist that there is also a fundamentally legal question and, please do not get me wrong, I am not doing away with the political sensitivities and political aspects of this. But when it comes to evaluation there is an issue on whether, under the Treaty, evaluation remains a peer review or whether it is a competence which has been transferred to the Community level. And somewhere there is agreement there. We should not have a very passionate debate on this – let us talk and let us find a way forward! But please do not consider that it is about lowering existing standards and guarantees.  The Council is already publicly committed to ensuring that the view of the European Parliament will, to the fullest extent possible, be taken into consideration in all its aspects before the adoption of the final text.  We have, of course, also taken very good note of all the comments and, I assure you, all the criticisms you addressed to the Council and be assured that we do not take it badly and we will convey the ‘heat’ we received to the Council and to the Member States.  Based on this, we will try our utmost to find a satisfactory way forward and we hope that we can come to a mutually satisfactory understanding as to how that can be given a practical expression, thus enabling work on these proposals to be brought to a successful conclusion in the very near future.  Let me conclude by saying that we remain as committed as all of you to preserving and strengthening the free movement of persons, as one of the most tangible and successful achievements of European integration.  We firmly believe in a European Union as a space of freedom, including the fundamental issue of freedom of movement, to which Schengen makes an outstanding contribution.  Of course we will fully respect the Treaty and the framework of the Treaty, but we of course stand ready to discuss, and see what improvements we can bring. |  | |  |  |  | |  | | --- | |  | |      |  |  |  |  |  |  | | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | | |  | | --- | | MPphoto |  |  | | --- | |  | |  | **Cecilia Malmström,***Member of the Commission. −*Mr President, as part of strengthening the Schengen governance, the Commission also proposed that we would have regular discussions on the state of play – the health check – of Schengen. This would be an opportunity to discuss among Ministers the shortcomings and challenges of Schengen on a regular basis. It would take place twice a year based on a report issued by the Commission. The first debate took place last June, and I immediately sent the report to the European Parliament as well, and I am of course willing to discuss with you how we can involve the European Parliament even more in those discussions.  In that report we identified 11 cases that we had been investigating for the last six months. Some of them could very well lead to infringement proceedings but, as I tried to explain on the two cases that you brought up in your oral questions, it is sometimes very difficult to get information and that is why we are now working very hard with Germany and the Czech Republic, including with the Czech bus companies, to see if we can get more information, so they have enough evidence to really bring the issue forward. Moreover, we are also issuing guidelines to the Member States, the first concerning travel documents, because of the background of the discussion between France and Italy on the travel documents of Tunisians, and we are also in regular contact with the Member States to see if there are other issues where we would need guidelines.  So, Ms Weber, everything is not shiny and rosy in Schengen. There are problems, and it is because of this that we proposed a strengthening of the evaluation mechanism, so that we would have the possibility of identifying possible shortcomings very early on and working with the member countries, using all the tools that we have at our disposal to hopefully remedy the shortcomings at our borders.  Mr President-in-Office, that is why we proposed to move from a peer-to-peer-based review to a Commission-led review. It is not because the Commission needs more powers *per se*, it is because we need an independent European-based system so that we can make sure that we have a compulsory action plan by the relevant Member States and that we can also avoid possible domestic pressures – populism, etc. – which could lead to a reinstallation of internal borders that is not in line with the acquis. That would imply a change of the legal base, also involving the European Parliament.  We maintain that view from the Commission side. Schengen is a European achievement, and that is why we need a European-based governance of Schengen. I hope that after the well-deserved summer break for everybody, we can sit together and see whether there is a way to find a good solution that all institutions can approve. |  | |  |  |  | |  | | --- | |  | |      |  |  |  |  |  |  | | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | | |  | | --- | | MPphoto |  |  | | --- | |  | |  | **President. -**The debate is closed.  ***Written statements (Rule 149)*** |  | |  |  |  | |  | | --- | |  | |      |  |  |  |  |  | | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | | |  | | --- | | MPphoto | |  | **Elena Băsescu (PPE),***in writing*. – *(RO)* European citizens regard the freedom of movement as part of the main practical benefits delivered by European integration. At the same time, it consolidates the formation of a single area of freedom, security and justice. Any decision intent on restricting this right must be well justified, be adopted after careful consideration, and be an exceptional measure with a strictly defined time limit. Clear criteria and conditions need to be established for situations where internal border controls can be applied, and Parliament is entitled to be closely involved in devising and monitoring them. The unjustified delay in Romania’s accession to Schengen is already a *de facto* act of discrimination against millions of European citizens. If internal border controls are going to be applied illegally on top of this, this will threaten one of the foundations of European integration. I appeal to all European leaders not to give in to populist temptations and to defend the freedom of movement. I also call on the Commission to monitor closely Member States’ compliance with the Schengen *acquis* and to take a prompt stance in the event of any abuse. Last but not least, I call for a clear decision to be adopted in September, along with a precise timetable for Romania’s accession to Schengen. |  | |  |  |  | |  | | --- | |  | |      |  |  |  |  |  | | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | | |  | | --- | | MPphoto | |  | **Sebastian Valentin Bodu (PPE),***in writing.* – *(RO)* Creating the Schengen area plays an important role in the process of consolidating and strengthening the European Union. This area has provided benefits for all Member States, both in economic terms as a result of the free movement of goods between internal borders, and for European citizens who can travel freely without being checked every time they cross an internal border.  Thanks to the actions of opportunist politicians, motivated by their desire to attract populist votes, the Schengen system has been repeatedly attacked, with it being used as a kind of scapegoat to increase their popularity at the ballot box. This can also be noticed in the case of Bulgaria and Romania where, although they have fulfilled all the criteria required to join the Schengen area, the final decision is still pending. |  | |  |  |  | |  | | --- | |  | |      |  |  |  |  |  | | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | | |  | | --- | | MPphoto | |  | **Kinga Gál (PPE),***in writing.* – *(HU)* Today’s debate is once again about the Community’s carefully guarded asset, which to European citizens is the most important of the EU acquis, not to mention young people, nearly 90% of whom agree with the importance of the freedom of movement according to a survey by the European Youth Parliament. Cracks have begun to form in this Community acquis as a result of a practice applied by the old Member States, namely the increasingly frequent controls of travellers and buses from new Member States. In the midst of the economic and financial crisis, where there is an increasingly urgent need for Community trust, some Member States are thereby reinforcing mistrust. This shakes the very foundations of the system. We could see a similar loss of trust when the Council adopted its decision in early July. I therefore request the Council to do everything within its power to enable us to move forward from the deadlock between Parliament and the Council as soon as possible and to develop Schengen governance together. I am also asking this so that in September we can welcome the two Member States awaiting accession, Romania and Bulgaria, with trust into the Schengen Area. |  | |  |  |  | |  | | --- | |  | |      |  |  |  |  |  | | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | | |  | | --- | | MPphoto | |  | **Nikolaos Salavrakos (EFD),***in writing.* – *(EL)*The Commission’s report on breaches of Schengen rules states that 75% of illegal immigrants entered the Schengen area via the Greek-Turkish border. The question of illegal immigration should be addressed overall at European level and particular measures need to be taken for the Member States that lie on the EU borders, as they are under the greatest pressure at this difficult time of economic crisis. I consider that the Dublin II Regulation needs to be revised and reviewed, because it places a disproportionate burden, in terms of managing illegal immigration, on the countries via which illegal immigrants enter. The restoration of controls on the external borders of the area proposed by the Commission and the EU Justice and Home Affairs Council does not address the problem on the ground and highlights the political isolation of individual Member States. |  | |  |  |  | |  | | --- | |  | |      |  |  |  |  |  | | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | | |  | | --- | | MPphoto | |  | **Joanna Katarzyna Skrzydlewska (PPE),** *in writing.***–***(PL)*The Schengen Agreement, which was concluded 27 years ago, is one of the key achievements of our Union and one that particularly affects EU citizens. Ease of travel is exceptionally important for the citizens of our continent and it is enormously appreciated. For this reason, under no circumstances should the right to free movement of persons be restricted, nor should there be any exceptions to compliance. Likewise the views of the European Parliament concerning the future of the Agreement should not be ignored since the European Parliament represents European citizens, 62% of whom consider the Schengen Agreement to be the greatest achievement of the European Union. We cannot destroy the soul of the Union, especially at a time when people are raising questions about European unity. Open frontiers are a symbol that we should defend. Instances of traffic controls at the border between the Netherlands and Belgium or Czech buses at the German border are the best argument in favour of furthering and deepening work to develop Schengen area regulations. These activities should be carried out with the cooperation of all European Union institutions. In this regard, the Council should return to the path of cooperation with MEPs and the European Commission concerning regulations regarding a new mechanism to evaluate Schengen. In my opinion this is the only way to ensure proper functioning of the Schengen area and to respect citizens’ rights in this regard. |  | |  |  |  | |  | | --- | |  | |      |  |  |  |  | | --- | --- | --- | --- | | |  | | --- | | MPphoto | |  | **Josef Weidenholzer (S&D),***in writing*. – *(DE)*Freedom to travel is one of the greatest achievements in Europe, alongside the common currency, the euro. Both of these are being sacrificed to short-term interests. Such policies will not achieve the successes hoped for by the populists, nor will they provide an answer to the problems of the world awaiting a solution. Nonetheless, the practice of pursuing symbolic policies is becoming increasingly prevalent, suggesting a willingness to take action, while actually avoiding a genuine solution to the problem. For many years, Europe’s interior ministers have been unable to agree on the fair distribution of refugees, Europe has failed in terms of neighbourhood policy and is pulling back from development cooperation. These elementary issues must be resolved as a priority, however, as otherwise even Schengen will not really work. Suspending the Schengen mechanism will not solve the problems. This must only be permitted in exceptional circumstances, if at all. Any decision reached in this regard must not be affected by populist influences. It must be taken at European level with the involvement of the European Parliament. | |
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| |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | | **17. Evaluation mechanism to verify application of the Schengen acquis - Temporary reintroduction of border control at internal borders (debate)** | |  |  |  | | --- | --- | --- | |  | [**Video of the speeches**](https://www.europarl.europa.eu/plenary/en/vod.html?mode=chapter&vodLanguage=EN&playerStartTime=20130611-17:22:48&playerEndTime=20130611-18:55:32) |  | | |  |  |  | | --- | --- | --- | |  | [**Minutes**](https://www.europarl.europa.eu/doceo/document/PV-7-2013-06-11-ITM-017_EN.html) |  | |      |  |  |  |  |  |  | | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | | |  | | --- | | MPphoto |  |  | | --- | |  | |  | **Elnök. −**A következő pont együttes vita a következő jelentésekről:  a Carlos Coelho által az Állampolgári Jogi, Bel- és Igazságügyi Bizottság nevében készített, a schengeni vívmányok alkalmazását ellenőrző értékelés mechanizmus létrehozásáról szóló jelentés (10273/2013 – C7-0160/2013 – 2010/0312/NLE)) - ([**A7-0226/2012**](https://www.europarl.europa.eu/doceo/document/A-7-2012-0226_EN.html)),  valamint  a Renate Weber által az Állampolgári Jogi, Bel- és Igazságügyi Bizottság nevében készített, a belső határokon történő határellenőrzés ideiglenes visszaállításáról szóló jelentés ([**COM(2011)0560**](https://eur-lex.europa.eu/smartapi/cgi/sga_doc?smartapi!celexplus!prod!DocNumber&lg=EN&type_doc=COMfinal&an_doc=2011&nu_doc=0560) - C7-0248/2011 - [**2011/0242(COD)**](https://oeil.secure.europarl.europa.eu/oeil/popups/ficheprocedure.do?lang=en&reference=2011/0242(COD))) - ([**A7-0200/2012**](https://www.europarl.europa.eu/doceo/document/A-7-2012-0200_EN.html)) |  | |  |  |  | |  | | --- | |  | |      |  |  |  |  |  |  | | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | | |  | | --- | | MPphoto |  |  | | --- | |  | |  | **Carlos Coelho,***relator***. −**Senhor Presidente, Senhora Comissária, Senhoras e Senhores Deputados, alcançamos um acordo em relação ao pacote da Governação de Schengen. Um acordo que não é exatamente o que o Parlamento Europeu desejou (porque nos foi negada a legítima codecisão), mas um acordo que representa um progresso substancial em relação às atuais regras reforçando a governança de Schengen. Um acordo que protege o direito dos cidadãos de circularem livremente e que reforça a segurança com que o fazem.  Permitam-me sublinhar seis pontos:  Primeiro, optámos por um sistema europeu. O mecanismo de avaliação deixará de ser puramente intergovernamental para passar a ter uma natureza europeia. A Comissão Europeia deixará de ter um papel de mero observador e passará a ser responsável pela coordenação geral no âmbito do processo de avaliação e de seguimento. Será responsável pela maioria das decisões no âmbito do processo de avaliação: em relação ao programa anual e plurianual, à preparação e realização de visitas *in loco* e à elaboração dos relatórios de avaliação e recomendações. Caber-lhe-á, na sequência de uma avaliação, aprovar o relatório e propor recomendações para ações corretivas, que deverão ser aprovadas pelo Conselho. Passarão ainda a estar envolvidas várias agências e instituições da União Europeia.  Em segundo lugar, não ignorámos as fronteiras internas. Está prevista explicitamente a possibilidade de avaliar se estão ou não a ser efetuados controlos ilegais nas fronteiras internas. Sabemos o quão atual isso é face às situações com que nos deparámos nos últimos anos nalguns Estados-Membros, muitas vezes inspiradas por agendas nacionais populistas impostas por partidos de extrema-direita.  Em terceiro lugar, eliminámos os *double standards.*Sempre discordámos dos *dois pesos, duas medidas* que atualmente existe. A partir de agora os países candidatos e os países já membros de Schengen deverão ser avaliados da mesma forma e de acordo com as mesmas regras. O acervo de Schengen deverá ser respeitado de forma rigorosa, não só no momento da adesão, mas também após essa adesão.  Em quarto lugar, acabaram as inspeções preparadas. A falta de rigor do atual mecanismo resultava também do facto de as visitas de inspeção serem anunciadas com exagerada antecedência. Uma das inovações mais úteis do novo sistema de avaliação consiste exatamente na possibilidade de serem feitas visitas *in loco*, sem qualquer aviso prévio, às fronteiras internas e às fronteiras externas apenas com 24 horas de antecedência.  Em quinto lugar, damos consequência e utilidade à avaliação. Ao contrário do atual sistema que não é juridicamente vinculativo e onde existe apenas uma mera avaliação entre pares, o novo sistema dispõe de mecanismos com maior eficácia e força dissuasora. Permitirá uma avaliação precisa em relação ao grau de cumprimento das regras de Schengen e permite uma reação imediata corretiva, de forma a dissipar qualquer sentimento de impunidade. Os Estados-Membros serão obrigados a resolver os problemas detetados.  Em sexto lugar, reforçámos o controlo democrático do Parlamento Europeu e garantimos o acesso aos documentos. O Parlamento será mantido informado durante todo o processo e terá acesso a todos os documentos relevantes, onde se inclui a análise de risco da FRONTEX, o programa de avaliação plurianual e anual, os relatórios de avaliação, as recomendações para ações corretivas e os planos de ação para fazer face às deficiências detetadas. Terá acesso às respostas dos Estados-Membros aos questionários. Trata-se de um enorme progresso em termos de transparência e do direito de informação do Parlamento Europeu, que não tinha acesso a quaisquer documentos no âmbito das avaliações de Schengen.  Senhor Presidente, o Parlamento assegurou o seu envolvimento quer no atual procedimento, quer no que diz respeito a futuras iniciativas nesta área. Este compromisso é assumido não só numa declaração conjunta entre as três instituições, mas também no texto de lei que vamos aprovar.  Agradeço à Comissária Malmström e à Presidência irlandesa todo o empenho e colaboração. Este compromisso representa um enorme passo em frente em relação ao presente *status quo*, ao criar um novo mecanismo de avaliação com um cariz mais europeu, mais transparente eficiente e rigoroso.  Por tudo isto solicito o vosso apoio para este compromisso que só foi possível graças à posição unida e forte que o Parlamento manteve ao longo das negociações. Agradeço a colaboração dos relatores-sombra e de todos os grupos políticos que nunca me negaram apoio, mesmo aos que, por diferentes razões, não consideram dar o seu voto favorável à versão final acordada. |  | |  |  |  | |  | | --- | |  | |      |  |  |  |  |  |  | | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | | |  | | --- | | MPphoto |  |  | | --- | |  | |  | **Renate Weber,***rapporteur***. −**Mr President, colleagues, each year a survey is carried out on how European citizens see the European Union. Each and every time, more than 50 % say that the biggest achievement of the EU is free movement. There are good reasons for this answer. In a Europe where for decades people, even families, were separated by borders and horrendous controls, finding ourselves all together in an area where movement is free gives us the feeling of living in one big house. It is also very easy to notice the economic benefits for our businesses.  Then why hesitate for more than a year and a half to reach an agreement on something so much wanted and appreciated by European citizens? The answer is as simple as it is complicated. A populist approach has taken over several EU Member States and the ongoing elections here and there have determined a switch in the approach of some governments – but here we are.  The text on the Schengen Border Code, for which I am the rapporteur, sets clear rules and checks and balances for last-resort situations involving the introduction of border controls at internal borders, to avoid any misuse or abuse. I admit I would have loved a 100 % Community decision on the reintroduction of border controls, but apparently that time has not yet come. However, it is fair to say that we succeeded in introducing a degree of Community dimension and additional guarantees to ensure that the mechanism would not be misused.  The current possibilities for reintroducing border controls have been clarified, and among the safeguards we should note a proportionality test of the impact of the measures and, where appropriate, consultations and meetings among the Member States affected by the reintroduction of border controls, and opinions by the Commission.  A new option of reintroducing border controls, which was in fact the request, or rather the demand, addressed by the Council to the Commission two years ago, will be used only as a last resort in exceptional circumstances, as a result of persistent, serious deficiencies related to external border controls. But, in that case, the proposal will come from the Commission after thorough evaluation.  Among other additional checks and balances, we should mention that a recital was introduced so as to keep our 2011 commitment. Migration and the crossing of external borders by a large number of third country nationals should not per se be considered to be a threat to public policy or to internal security. The total period during which border controls are reintroduced on the basis of a serious threat to public policy or internal security cannot exceed two months.  The Commission will present to the European Parliament and the Council, at least annually, a report on the functioning of the area without internal border controls. This report is to include a list of all decisions to reintroduce internal border controls taken during the relevant year.  I would like to say a few words also on Mr Coelho’s report, for which I am a shadow. The true achievement here is the role of the Commission. If today it is a mere observer and the mechanism is based on a peer-to-peer review, in future the Commission will be responsible for most decisions to be taken either in comitology, in cooperation with Member States, or acting alone. The Council can adopt recommendations only upon proposals from the Commission.  It is also interesting to note that in relation to the decision-making process, a joint statement from the three institutions has been adopted, and it provides that any future Commission proposal amending the evaluation mechanism should be submitted to Parliament for consultation.  If adopted – and I hope it will be adopted – it will set a precedent, as it interprets Article 70, whereby Parliament should only be informed in a creative way, namely a commitment to consult. |  | |  |  |  | |  | | --- | |  | |      |  |  |  |  |  |  | | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | | |  | | --- | | MPphoto |  |  | | --- | |  | |  | **Lucinda Creighton,***President-in-Office of the Council***. −**Mr President, on behalf of the Irish Presidency, I would like to say how pleased I am that we have been able to reach agreement on the Schengen governance legislative package.  The agreement responds fully to the request from the European Council in June 2011 for the existing evaluation mechanism to be improved and deepened, and for the introduction of a mechanism to respond to exceptional circumstances which could put the overall functioning of Schengen cooperation at risk.  The European Council was equally clear that this should not jeopardise the principle of free movement of persons. We have therefore been guided in our work on these two legislative proposals by the need to protect and strengthen free movement.  This is one of the most obvious and practical achievements of European integration over recent decades. Free movement is highly valued, and is a daily reality for the 500 million citizens within the European Union, as well as the nationals of third countries who are legally present in the Schengen area as residents or visitors.  Those citizens and visitors make more than a billon journeys within the EU every year and consider freedom to travel as amongst the most concrete and important benefits of the Union. That is why it is important that we have been able to strengthen arrangements for ensuring the proper functioning of the Schengen area.  The new reinforced Schengen evaluation mechanism, combined with an EU-based mechanism for responding to exceptional threats, will contribute significantly to that goal, as well as improve the transparency of its operation.  I am of course fully aware that the negotiations on these measures have not been easy. We started out with a fundamental difference of view on the issue of the legal base of the Schengen evaluation proposal. But this has now been successfully addressed.  I welcome the fact that we have been able to build on the work of earlier presidencies and find a way forward together. The difficulties have been overcome, and your views have been taken into account to the fullest extent possible on both measures.  The overall agreement also comprises a Joint Declaration by Parliament, the Council and the Commission which makes it clear that any future proposals from the Commission for amending the Schengen evaluation system will be submitted to Parliament for consultative purposes, so that your opinion can be taken into account to the fullest extent possible before the adoption of a final text, as was the case with the current proposal. I would like to thank this Parliament sincerely for the way in which it has cooperated and worked with us to reach agreement.  I understand that your opinion on the Schengen evaluation proposal was adopted yesterday in the Committee on Civil Liberties, Justice and Home Affairs (LIBE) and that this opens the way for Parliament to vote on the full Schengen governance package during tomorrow’s plenary session.  I would like to close by expressing my particular thanks to the rapporteurs for the two legislative proposals – Mrs Renate Weber and Mr Carlos Coelho – whose commitment and hard work on these legislative proposals has been absolutely crucial to ensuring that an agreement was possible, so your contribution is very much appreciated by our Presidency and by the Council, as I know it is by all Members in this Chamber.  I am very much looking forward to the debate and listening to the contributions from a range of Members of the European Parliament. I do have to beg your forgiveness, however, because I will have to depart early, unfortunately, on this occasion because we have a trialogue on the multiannual financial framework (MFF) this evening, which I have to participate in.  So thank you in advance for your indulgence and thank you again for the cooperation of Parliament, the Council and the Commission, throughout this process. |  | |  |  |  | |  | | --- | |  | |      |  |  |  |  |  |  | | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | | |  | | --- | | MPphoto |  |  | | --- | |  | |  | **Cecilia Malmström,***Member of the Commission***. −**Mr President, exactly a year ago, in this very Chamber, we found ourselves in a very difficult situation. There were strong, very emotional tensions between the three institutions. Today, a lot of time has passed. Thanks to intensive negotiations between Parliament – where you played a very strong and constructive role – the Cyprus Presidency and the Irish Presidency, we have reached a satisfactory agreement on the Schengen governance. We now have instruments at hand which will allow us to strengthen Schengen, and therefore the Commission can fully support the compromise reached.  I would like to thank the rapporteurs, Carlos Coelho and Renate Weber. I know how hard you worked with your different shadow rapporteurs and collaborators. You have been fantastic on this long road. The compromise reached will – as you have both said – bring a major improvement compared to the current system.  As you know, there is already a mechanism in place to evaluate Member States’ implementation of the Schengen *acquis*. It has, however, been clear that this is not the mechanism that we need. We need a new one that ensures that the area without internal border controls is better protected, a system that is better equipped to identify deficiencies at an early stage and that ensures that there are appropriate measures and follow-ups. The revised mechanism will serve this purpose, while at the same time allowing more transparency and openness.  In the new system, the Commission is given a central and coordinating role. Evaluation will be carried out by the Commission, together with experts from the Member States. If serious deficiencies emerge, the proposed new mechanism provides for specific measures that could be taken, for instance, the deployment of Frontex European border guard teams.  Although it is very unlikely that these will occur, the new system also provides for a system to respond to situations where recommendations for remedial action are not sufficient. To ensure that persistent, serious deficiencies in a Member State’s control of its external borders are adequately remedied, a new system allows for a coordinated decision to be taken on the temporary reintroduction of controls at internal borders. It is, however, clearly stated that this can only be an exceptional measure as a last resort in a truly critical situation. This would only be used to ensure that the problems can be resolved, while minimising the impact on free movement.  The new system brings many advantages for Parliament. Parliament will have increased possibilities to influence the functioning of the Schengen area. It will receive all relevant information, and both the Commission and the Council have expressed their political will to consult Parliament on the Schengen evaluation mechanism. The joint statement that will accompany the decision clearly states that any future proposal from the Commission to amend the evaluation system will be submitted to Parliament and that its opinion will be taken into consideration to the fullest extent possible before adopting the final text.  I think that, with this clarification and this strengthening of both tools, we can be proud of the compromise that we have achieved. Once again, as in the previous debate – I know many of you were there as well – it shows that, when we really sit together, the three institutions can cooperate for the benefit of the European citizens. |  | |  |  |  | |  | | --- | |  | |      |  |  |  |  |  |  | | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | | |  | | --- | | MPphoto |  |  | | --- | |  | |  | **Manfred Weber,***im Namen der PPE-Fraktion***. –**Herr Präsident, Frau Kommissarin, Frau Ministerin! Die irische Präsidentschaft hat diese Woche im Innenbereich zwei große Dossiers zum Abschluss gebracht. Die dürfen wir heute diskutieren: Asyl und Schengen. Insofern ist die irische Präsidentschaft in unserem Arbeitsbereich auch eine sehr erfolgreiche Präsidentschaft. Gratulation noch einmal dazu! Wir drücken Ihnen die Daumen, dass das beim MFF jetzt auch gelingt, dass dort auch große Erfolge zu erzielen sind, damit wir auch mit der Finanzausstattung vorankommen, Frau Ministerin.  Die Europäische Volkspartei hat den Schengen-Raum als einen der größten Erfolge Europas immer verteidigt, und wir wollten ihn stärken. Unsere Berichterstatter, Renate Weber und Carlos Coelho, haben hervorragende Arbeit geleistet. Herzlichen Dank!  Wir müssen Klartext reden, weil die Demagogen, die in Europa unterwegs sind – in Frankreich Le Pen, in den Niederlanden Wilders, in Ungarn Jobbik und in Bulgarien die Partei Ataka –, als Rechtspopulisten, die den Menschen weis machen wollen, dass wir diesen Schengen-Raum eigentlich nicht bräuchten, dass die Sicherheit in Gefahr sei. Denen müssen wir entschlossen entgegentreten! Diesen parteipolitischen Populisten dürfen wir nicht die politische Arena überlassen. Schengen bringt nicht weniger, sondern mehr Sicherheit. Das ist die zentrale Botschaft, und durch die heutige Veränderung des Rechts werden wir diese Entwicklung auch noch stärken. Diese Populisten würden Europa in eine dunkle Vergangenheit zurückführen.  Die Evaluation macht Fortschritte. Das wurde von unseren Berichterstattern beschrieben. Frau Kommissarin, ich freue mich schon auf die ersten Berichte, die von neutraler Seite vorgelegt werden. Ich hoffe, dass kritisch geprüft wird, damit wir dann auch neutrale Berichte auf dem Tisch haben, wo vielleicht mancher Innenminister nicht mehr so erfreut ist, dass er die Evaluation jetzt an FRONTEX und an die Kommission abgegeben hat. Das wird aber das System insgesamt stärken.  Zum Schluss möchte ich noch sagen: Negativ ist sicher, dass die Mitentscheidung des Europäischen Parlaments bei der Evaluation nicht anerkannt worden ist. Ich verstehe immer noch nicht, warum der Rat hier nach wie vor blockiert. Bei dem Prinzip, hier so verbissen die Kompetenzen des Rates zu verteidigen, entsteht eher der Eindruck, dass man im Hinterzimmer des Rates weiter alleine entscheiden will und keine Transparenz will. Ich kann das nicht nachvollziehen, und deswegen wird das Europäische Parlament auch in Zukunft verbissen für die Rechte der Parlamentarier kämpfen. Wir hoffen, dass wir in der Zukunft damit mehr Erfolg haben. |  | |  |  |  | |  | | --- | |  | |      |  |  |  |  |  |  | | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | | |  | | --- | | MPphoto |  |  | | --- | |  | |  | **Ioan Enciu,***în numele grupului S&D***. –**În primul rând, vreau să îi felicit pe cei doi raportori pentru munca şi tenacitatea de care au dat dovadă timp de doi ani pentru a ajunge la acest moment. Vreau să încep prin a spune că acest acord cu privire la guvernanţa Schengen este relativ departe de ceea ce Comisia Europeană a propus în urmă cu doi ani; cu toate acestea, eu cred că reprezintă un progres faţă de situaţia de până în prezent.  Vechiul model de guvernanţă interguvernamentală a dat naştere la abuzuri şi la limitări ale libertăţii de circulaţie în interiorul Schengen. Trebuie să avem în vedere că aceste abuzuri sunt probabil doar vârful aisbergului şi că multe alte probleme în gestionarea frontierelor au fost pur şi simplu ignorate, din cauza modului amical de evaluare.  Adaug faptul că, până în prezent, existau două sisteme de evaluare: unul foarte relaxat şi aplicabil tuturor statelor Schengen şi altul mai dur, pentru statele candidate. Acest dublu standard, dar şi modul de guvernanţă interguvernamental a dus la situaţii de-a dreptul absurde, în care unor state candidate, precum România şi Bulgaria, li se interzice accesul în Schengen, cu toate că este unanim acceptat că cele două ţări aplică cele mai înalte standarde de gestiune a frontierelor din întreaga Uniune Europeană. Noul acord duce la îmbunătăţiri considerabile, prin faptul că aceleaşi reguli se vor aplica tuturor, iar procesul de evaluare va fi europenizat şi mult mai eficient.  Comisia Europeană va avea rolul central în noua guvernanţă Schengen, întrucât va coordona întreg procesul de evaluare şi va avea un cuvânt de spus în ceea ce priveşte posibilele reintroduceri ale controalelor la frontierele interne. Noul mecanism de evaluare va fi bazat pe date obiective şi pe analize de risc FRONTEX şi prevede posibilitatea efectuării de vizite neanunţate, inclusiv la frontierele interne, lucruri care nu au existat până în prezent.  Începând de acum, va exista un plan de follow-up, coordonat de Comisia Europeană, de fiecare dată când se constată deficienţe în aplicarea acquis-ului. Acest lucru înseamnă, în primul rând, măsuri de sprijin şi de asistenţă, dar şi un sistem disuasiv, prin care Comisia poate propune reintroducerea temporară a controalelor la frontierele interne, în cazul existenţei unor deficienţe foarte grave şi persistente.  În acelaşi timp, Parlamentul European va juca un rol mult mai important, prin faptul că va avea acces la toate datele şi va supraveghea întreg procesul de evaluare şi va fi consultat în cazul modificării mecanismului.  În încheiere, vreau să subliniez că, pentru ţara mea şi pentru celelalte ţări membre din afara spaţiului Schengen, toate acestea nu vor fi suficiente, dacă europenizarea guvernanţei nu va fi aplicată şi modului de admitere de noi membri în spaţiul Schengen. Acest lucru este cu atât mai evident, cu cât aderarea României şi Bulgariei este blocată de mai mult de doi ani, din cauza unor considerente care nu au nimic de a face regulile şi cu spiritul european al bunei cooperări. De aceea, eu am în minte să propun Parlamentului spre dezbatere o nouă posibilă modalitate europeană de acceptare de noi membri Schengen şi sper că pot conta pe sprijinul dumneavoastră. |  | |  |  |  | |  | | --- | |  | |      |  |  |  |  |  |  | | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | | |  | | --- | | MPphoto |  |  | | --- | |  | |  | **Renate Weber (ALDE). -** Mr President, I will speak again at the end. But I can take advantage of this and thank the Irish Presidency very much, since the Minister will have to leave. Yes, Minister, I thank you deeply for all your efforts in coming to the conclusion of this report. |  | |  |  |  | |  | | --- | |  | |      |  |  |  |  |  |  | | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | | |  | | --- | | MPphoto |  |  | | --- | |  | |  | **Tatjana Ždanoka,***on behalf of the Verts/ALE Group***. –** Mr President, Minister, colleagues, first of all I would like to thank our rapporteurs, Mr Coelho and Mrs Weber for their long-lasting efforts to maintain Parliament’s position as it was approved by the vote in the LIBE committee one year ago, and it is very regrettable that these efforts were not crowned with success.  In the Greens/ALE Group from the very beginning we backed the proposed EU-based mechanism on the temporary reintroduction of border controls and on the evaluation of Schengen. We also strongly opposed the revision of the legal basis for the Schengen-related legislation, thus excluding Parliament from the decision-making process. Even if the Commission failed to defend the Union’s approach properly, Parliament had to proceed with this, and voluntary consultation is hardly a good compromise.  Last but not least, the reference to illegal immigration is not acceptable for us at all. Taking the above into account, we cannot support the deal of 29 May confirming the scaling-back of the EU’s border-free system at the whim of the European Union governments. This outcome is clearly at odds with the integrity of Schengen. |  | |  |  |  | |  | | --- | |  | |      |  |  |  |  |  |  | | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | | |  | | --- | | MPphoto |  |  | | --- | |  | |  | **Peter van Dalen,***namens de ECR-Fractie***. –**Voorzitter, het akkoord over de Schengenwetgeving laat enige ruimte voor grenscontroles. Maar de toon is eigenlijk dat grenscontroles niet meer thuis horen in de Europese Unie. Dat vrij verkeer van personen en goederen is heilig, zo klinkt het eigenlijk. Beperkingen in de vorm van grenscontroles mogen alleen worden toegestaan bij allerhoogste uitzondering, bijvoorbeeld bij terroristische dreiging.  Deze opstelling, Voorzitter, gaat mij te ver. Het afschaffen van grenscontroles heeft namelijk duidelijk een schaduwzijde. Mensenhandelaren hebben binnen het Schengengebied bijna vrij spel. Iedere dag worden er vrouwen door Europa vervoerd en ergens gedwongen tot prostitutie. Onze politiediensten zien het gebeuren, maar mogen niet ingrijpen, omdat het Europese Hof heeft bepaald dat de Nederlandse marechaussee niet meer dan negentig uur per maand gebruik mag maken van videobeelden bij grensposten. Ik vind dat echt absurd.  Vrij verkeer van goederen en personen is belangrijk. En het afschaffen van grenscontroles heeft bijgedragen aan dat vrije verkeer. Maar een lidstaat bepaalt uiteindelijk zelf hoe hij de openbare orde wil handhaven en de criminaliteit bestrijden. Vrij verkeer binnen Europa is mooi, maar laten we niet naïef zijn. Criminelen zijn dat ook niet. Die maken graag gebruik van elke opening die Europa ze geeft. Schengen OK, maar altijd Europese ópen grenzen, nee. |  | |  |  |  | |  | | --- | |  | |      |  |  |  |  |  |  | | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | | |  | | --- | | MPphoto |  |  | | --- | |  | |  | **Lorenzo Fontana,***a nome del gruppo EFD***. –**Signor Presidente, onorevoli colleghi, devo dire che abbiamo delle perplessità sull'accordo raggiunto per Schengen, perché ci troviamo veramente ad affrontare una situazione difficile nei nostri paesi e non riesco a capire perché non si possa ripristinare i controlli alle frontiere quando vi sono dei flussi migratori cospicui e sembra una situazione di emergenza anche questo. È sicuramente una situazione che talvolta si è anche realizzata.  Ho letto che in caso di emergenza si possono avere dei controlli alle frontiere, l'emergenza può quantificare in un certo periodo di mesi, se son due mesi, sei mesi e se magari è più lunga, cosa si fa? Si fa finta di nulla! Purtroppo teniamo conto che anche questa direttiva deve essere applicata per quei paesi che hanno un'uniformità economica e sociale, perché non sono rari i casi purtroppo di persone che magari vanno in altri paesi solo per tentare di sfruttare lo Stato sociale. Purtroppo l'Europa non è fatta solo da cittadini buoni, è fatta anche di persone che magari non hanno buone intenzioni e sulla criminalità, è molto più difficile contrastare la criminalità se non ci sono adeguati controlli alle frontiere.  E pensate solo che per esempio nel mio paese, in Veneto, talvolta si è tentato di rimpatriare delle persone, dei comunitari perché si comportavano male, perché magari commettevano dei reati, però queste dopo un po' tornavano tranquillamente. E riteniamo che quindi Schengen, la libera circolazione va bene, se però c’è anche un controbilancio, se si possono rimpatriare le persone e se si possono fare effettivamente dei controlli alle frontiere. |  | |  |  |  | |  | | --- | |  | |      |  |  |  |  |  |  | | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | | |  | | --- | | MPphoto |  |  | | --- | |  | |  | **Cornelia Ernst,***im Namen der GUE/NGL-Fraktion***. –**Herr Präsident! Die Abschaffung der Binnengrenzen, der Wegfall der Grenzkontrollen gehört zu den höchsten Werten der EU. Sie sind Gemeinschaftsgut der Union und dürfen nicht einfach der Willkür der Regierungen überlassen werden. Sie sind verbunden mit einem Grundrecht innerhalb der EU, nämlich der Freizügigkeit. Wenn jetzt sogenannte schwerwiegende Defizite vorliegen, – und das sollten wir doch einmal klar ansprechen – wenn jetzt die sogenannte neue Notfallklausel bei der Umsetzung von Schengen wirksam wird, weil die Mitgliedstaaten zu den Defiziten selbstverständlich auch die Migrationsströme zählen, wenn jetzt also eine solche Regelung einsetzt, dann bedeutet das, dass Migranten sehr wohl ein Grund dafür sind, Grenzkontrollen wieder einzuführen. Damit wird also die Wiedereinführung gewissermaßen gerechtfertigt. Insofern werden Migranten zu Sündenböcken europäischer Politik. Und das finden wir inakzeptabel.  Wenn man sich das Konstrukt anschaut, dann können nun auf Empfehlung des Rates die Grenzkontrollen bis zu zwei Jahren weiterbestehen. Die Kommission ist lediglich so eine Art Ausputzer, ein Kontrolleur bei dem Verfahren. Das Parlament hat nicht einmal am Katzentisch Platz nehmen können, ist also ganz aus der Gemeinschaftsaufgabe entlassen. Wir haben uns, wenn man so will, verabschiedet. Das sage ich, obwohl ich beiden Berichterstattern meinen großen Dank aussprechen möchte und Respekt zolle. Sie haben wirklich zwei Jahre lang kräftig gekämpft. Das ist richtig. Ich bin froh, dass wenigstens ein Evaluationsmechanismus zustande gekommen ist, der Gerechtigkeit zwischen Beitrittsländern und Mitgliedstaaten und mehr Transparenz schafft. Aber dennoch: Wir haben verloren! Ich hoffe nur, dass das kein Präzedenzfall wird für die freiwillige Ausbootung des Parlaments und die Aufgabe unserer eigenen Rechte.  Schengen darf nicht politisches Faustpfand von Regierungen oder politischen Kräften werden! Insofern ist das für uns leider kein Kompromiss. |  | |  |  |  | |  | | --- | |  | |      |  |  |  |  |  |  | | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | | |  | | --- | | MPphoto |  |  | | --- | |  | |  | **Auke Zijlstra (NI). -**Voorzitter, ik heb me al vaker verzet tegen Schengen. Het opheffen van de binnengrenzen was wellicht een aardig idee op papier, maar in de praktijk zien we dat de nadelen vele malen groter zijn dan de voordelen.  Schengen faciliteert criminelen en om dát dan weer te bestrijden komen we weer met nieuwe wetgeving uit Brussel, die Brussel sterker maakt en de lidstaten zwakker. Terwijl die criminaliteit zo gemakkelijk is te bestrijden, namelijk door de herintroductie van grenscontroles dáár waar de lidstaten dat van belang vinden. Welke goedwillende burger wil er niet even zijn paspoort laten zien, zodat het gastland niet wordt overlopen door criminelen en landlopers?  Ook tast paspoortcontrole het principe van vrij verkeer van personen totaal niet aan.  Waarom is iedereen heer zo allergisch voor controles aan de grens. Schengen is een typisch voorbeeld van een Europees beleid dat hopeloos ontspoord is. Ik roep de lidstaten dus opnieuw op om te kiezen vóór het belang van hun eigen burgers en te stoppen met Schengen. |  | |  |  |  | |  | | --- | |  | |      |  |  |  |  |  |  | | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | | |  | | --- | | MPphoto |  |  | | --- | |  | |  | **Véronique Mathieu Houillon (PPE). -**Monsieur le Président, Madame la Commissaire, chers collègues, grâce à l'implication de nos deux rapporteurs, M. Coelho et Mme Weber, qui ont fait un travail remarquable sur ce dossier, nous avons gagné à deux titres avec la présente réforme de la gouvernance Schengen.  Tout d'abord, la libre circulation des citoyens est préservée et cette libre circulation est une liberté fondamentale. Elle cimente les peuples européens et représente pour beaucoup une manifestation tangible de la citoyenneté européenne. L'espace Schengen et la libre circulation sont, à juste titre, cités par nombre de nos citoyens comme la plus belle réussite de la construction européenne. C'est une liberté essentielle que nos peurs ou querelles ne sauraient remettre en cause.  Tout rétablissement de contrôle aux frontières intérieures doit toujours être une mesure de dernier recours, limitée et proportionnée. Cette réforme nous permet également de renforcer la sécurité de l'espace Schengen et donc, des citoyens européens. Désormais, nous avons un mécanisme européen efficace d'évaluation de l'espace. Nous pouvons exercer de façon objective un contrôle à nos frontières grâce à des évaluations européennes menées par de petits groupes d'experts et des visites de terrain.  Nous nous sommes donné aussi les moyens de réagir et de renforcer le contrôle à nos frontières extérieures, si nécessaire, pour que les citoyens n'aient pas à assumer le prix de frontières poreuses. Si une défaillance de nos frontières est constatée, il y sera remédié. L'État membre concerné devra aussitôt agir et mettre en place un plan d'action pour renforcer le contrôle aux frontières en question. Si une telle défaillance perdurait et que les frontières cédaient, il serait alors possible de réintroduire temporairement les contrôles aux frontières intérieures, afin de protéger nos citoyens européens de flux incontrôlés. Mais il ne faut pas être naïfs, des situations bien particulières exigent un rétablissement temporaire et circonspect des frontières.  C'est pourquoi les États membres restent également libres de rétablir temporairement des frontières intérieures pour des raisons de sécurité et d'ordre public, car la sécurité des citoyens européens doit passer avant tout.  Ainsi, j'en suis persuadée, cette réforme de la gouvernance Schengen est un grand pas en avant et nous dote de mécanismes européens nécessaires pour mieux contrôler nos frontières. Grâce à cette réforme, nous assurons aux citoyens européens un espace Schengen dans lequel ils peuvent librement circuler et échanger, et cela en toute sécurité.  Ce paquet, nous l'avons gagné de haute lutte, grâce à la ténacité de nos rapporteurs et de la Commission européenne. Malheureusement, le Conseil, dans cette évolution, n'a pas eu, et je le déplore, une attitude très démocratique. |  | |  |  |  | |  | | --- | |  | |      |  |  |  |  | | --- | --- | --- | --- | |  |  | **PRESIDE: ALEJO VIDAL-QUADRAS** *Vicepresidente* |  | |  |  |  | |  | | --- | |  | |      |  |  |  |  |  |  | | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | | |  | | --- | | MPphoto |  |  | | --- | |  | |  | **Robert Goebbels (S&D). -**Monsieur le Président, en 1985, j'étais celui qui invitait à la signature du premier accord de Schengen, à l'origine de la suppression des contrôles aux frontières intérieures, tellement appréciée par les Européens et par les détenteurs d'un visa Schengen.  Pour de basses raisons de politique intérieure, certains États veulent des clauses de sauvegarde, arguant de la lutte contre l'immigration clandestine. S'il convient de renforcer la lutte contre la traite des êtres humains aux frontières extérieures de l'Europe, il ne faut cependant pas céder à cette logique de la peur, née du contentieux franco-italien sur les réfugiés tunisiens en 2011.  Le traité est clair. Selon l'article 77, l'Union développe une politique visant à assurer l'absence de tout contrôle des personnes, quelle que soit leur nationalité, lorsqu'elles franchissent les frontières intérieures. Les articles 78 et 79 en règlent les conditions. L'article 78, paragraphe 3, impose que, devant une situation d'urgence caractérisée par un afflux soudain de ressortissants de pays tiers, le Conseil, sur proposition de la Commission, peut adopter des mesures provisoires. Cela est plus que suffisant pour faire face à des situations exceptionnelles.  À travers l'accord dont nous discutons, certains États cherchent à imposer une renationalisation de Schengen en restant en dehors de la procédure législative ordinaire.  Certes, l'accord trouvé au sein du trilogue comporte quelques garde-fous appréciables. D'aucuns disent qu'en fait, ces dispositions permettraient à la Commission de bloquer toute dérive populiste contre les migrants, mais le fait que le Parlement européen ne soit pas informé dévoile les arrière-pensées de certains ministres de l'intérieur.  Je reste hostile à cette mascarade. 1,5 milliard de nos concitoyens traversent chaque année les frontières intérieures de l'espace Schengen. Qui peut les contrôler? Qui veut arrêter les dizaines de millions de touristes qui visiteront, par exemple, cet été la France ou l'Italie? Qui veut contrôler chaque jour le million de frontaliers qui travaillent dans un pays voisin? Je ne suis pas satisfait. Je dis qu'il faut dire "non" à la logique de la peur qui anime certains de nos gouvernements. |  | |  |  |  | |  | | --- | |  | |      |  |  |  |  |  |  | | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | | |  | | --- | | MPphoto |  |  | | --- | |  | |  | **Judith Sargentini (Verts/ALE). -**Voorzitter, na een jaar debatteren over het evaluatiemechanisme en de mogelijkheid om tijdelijk grenzen te sluiten, ligt er nu besluitvorming voor.  Maar wie maakt wie nu wat wijs? Wat is de uitkomst na een jaar? Lidstaten mogen het zelf weten en lidstaten durven niet te laten zien op welke gronden ze een besluit nemen om een grens tijdelijk te sluiten. Ze willen er in ieder geval niet dat de Europese Commissie of het Europees Parlement echt bij de besluitvorming betrokken zijn.  Dat laat zien dat het volgens mij vooral bedoeld is om je eigen burgers te vertellen 'oh, we hebben de grenzen nog in eigen handen', terwijl dat verder niet het geval is. De Nederlandse overheid doet een paar uur per maand checks op nummerborden van Oost-Europese busjes. Daarmee doen ze volgens hun zeggen aan criminaliteitsbestrijding. Met andere woorden, Oost-Europese nummerborden duiden op gevaarlijke mensen in gevaarlijke auto's, en dát is criminaliteitsbestrijding. Dames en heren, de lidstaten maken elkaar en hun mensen wat wijs. |  | |  |  |  | |  | | --- | |  | |      |  |  |  |  |  |  | | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | | |  | | --- | | MPphoto |  |  | | --- | |  | |  | **Oldřich Vlasák (ECR). -**Pane předsedající, o novele pravidel schengenského prostoru a systému se mezi Evropským parlamentem a Evropskou komisí a členskými státy hovoří déle než jeden rok.  Dosažený kompromis, podle kterého by mělo být znovuzavedení kontrol na vnitřních hranicích jen krajním řešením, a to v případě ohrožení vnitřní bezpečnosti daného státu a po vyčerpání všech ostatních prostředků, a hlavně po konzultacích s ostatními členskými státy a Evropskou komisí, je podle mého názoru vyvážený.  V souvislosti s novými pravidly také oceňuji možnost sledovat, zda se na vnitřních hranicích neprovádějí nepovolené kontroly. Čeští občané mají v tomto ohledu negativní zkušenosti, zejména s kontrolami na německé straně hranic a nově tak bude existovat praktický nástroj jak to kontrolovat a jak se bránit.  Schengenský prostor bez kontrol na vnitřních hranicích představuje podle mého názoru jeden z největších úspěchů evropské integrace. Naším společným zájmem proto musí být funkční schengenská spolupráce založená na odpovědném dodržování stanovených pravidel. |  | |  |  |  | |  | | --- | |  | |      |  |  |  |  |  |  | | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | | |  | | --- | | MPphoto |  |  | | --- | |  | |  | **Gerard Batten (EFD). -**Mr President, last year we saw the Schengen system buckle under the strain of mass migration, and some Member States sought to introduce unilateral controls. The revision of the rules is an attempt to keep the lid on a boiling pot, but it is too little and too late. It only allows some controls in very exceptional circumstances for a limited period of time. It is too little, too late.  An open-borders policy could only work between countries with very similar and stable economic and cultural natures. The EU’s open-borders policy is a disaster for ordinary people, and has created enormous social problems. This has all been done in pursuit of a political ideology not shared by the people of Europe. That ideology is that the continent of Europe is a single country, a United States of Europe, which obviously it is not.  The EU is out of touch with reality and in a contest between reality and ideology, reality always wins in the end.  *(The speaker agreed to reply to two blue-card questions from Robert Goebbels and Krisztina Morvai under Rule 149(8))* |  | |  |  |  | |  | | --- | |  | |      |  |  |  |  |  |  | | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | | |  | | --- | | MPphoto |  |  | | --- | |  | |  | **Robert Goebbels (S&D),***question "carton bleu"***. –**Monsieur Batten, vous venez de nous dire que la politique européenne en matière de contrôle des frontières est une grande catastrophe. Nous savons que la Grande-Bretagne ne fait pas partie de l'espace Schengen. Pourriez-vous m'expliquer, Monsieur Batten, pourquoi il y a tant d'immigrés clandestins en Grande-Bretagne et pourquoi votre pays, qui ne fait pas partie de ce damné Schengen, a tant de problèmes avec l'immigration? |  | |  |  |  | |  | | --- | |  | |      |  |  |  |  |  |  | | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | | |  | | --- | | MPphoto |  |  | | --- | |  | |  | **Krisztina Morvai (NI),***blue-card question***. –**With all due respect to Mr Batten and our other Western European friends, as an East European let me ask you if you want to reconsider basically the whole idea of the free movement of workers and free movement of people within the European Union?  Would you kindly reconsider the free movement of capital as well? In that case, we East Europeans are more than happy to close our borders to Western capital and get our own economy back. |  | |  |  |  | |  | | --- | |  | |      |  |  |  |  |  |  | | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | | |  | | --- | | MPphoto |  |  | | --- | |  | |  | **Gerard Batten (EFD),***blue-card answers***. –**Mr Goebbels, you asked about border controls. Yes, Britain is not in the Schengen system, but we still suffer from the effects of it because it is very much easier for people to get to Calais and make that final hop over to Britain.  You are quite right: even though we are supposed to have border controls, immigration policy is a disaster in my country. This is not just because of the European Union, it is because of the complete inability and lack of will on the part of British governments to actually put in proper immigration controls and carry them out. So I agree with you that this is a disaster in my country that is not entirely of the making of the EU.  In answer to Ms Morvai’s question regarding the free movement of people: no, we do not believe in the free movement of peoples in my party. We believe in controlled immigration and controlled border policy. We do not want to stop immigrants; we do not want to stop people coming. But we want this to be controlled by our government in the interests of the British people, and not in the interests of a political ideology which they do not share.  If you are going to control people, it is a lot easier to do that than capital, which is often numbers on a computer, so I understand the problems there. We want to see policies in a whole range of areas that are in the interests of the British people, and then ultimately in the interests of everybody else. |  | |  |  |  | |  | | --- | |  | |      |  |  |  |  |  |  | | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | | |  | | --- | | MPphoto |  |  | | --- | |  | |  | **Franz Obermayr (NI). -**Herr Präsident! Ich kann dem Jubel zum vorliegenden Schengen-Bericht nicht zustimmen. Zwar bringt die Kommission teilweise Positives, wie den Vorschlag, die EU-Außengrenze, die mit ihren Schlupflöchern ohnedies eher an einen Schweizer Käse erinnert als an eine sichere Grenze, besser zu sichern. Das ist ein Positivum. Doch absolut falsch finde ich, dass die Entscheidung zur Wiedereinführung von Kontrollen an den Binnengrenzen nun total bürokratisiert werden soll und das Recht zur Einführung dieser Kontrollen den Mitgliedstaaten weitgehend entzogen wird. Das ist ein Anschlag auf die Souveränität der Mitgliedstaaten. Im Rahmen eines bürokratischen Verfahrens muss nun bei der Kommission angesucht werden, man muss mit den Nachbarstaaten in den sogenannten Dialog eintreten etc.. Das wird entweder zu gar nichts führen, oder es wird zu spät sein, denn illegale Einwanderer warten sicherlich nicht geduldig an der Grenze, bis sich Brüssel zum Handeln entscheidet. |  | |  |  |  | |  | | --- | |  | |      |  |  |  |  |  |  | | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | | |  | | --- | | MPphoto |  |  | | --- | |  | |  | **Γεώργιος Παπανικολάου (PPE). -**Κύριε Πρόεδρε, δεν υπάρχει καμία αμφιβολία ότι η τελική συμφωνία για το πακέτο Σένγκεν, συνιστά μια πολύ σημαντική εξέλιξη. Θέλω να συγχαρώ τον κ. Coelho και την κ. Weber για την προσπάθειά τους και να σας πω αγαπητοί συνάδελφοι, ότι παρακολούθησα από κοντά και εγώ την όλη προσπάθεια ως εισηγητής για μια τρίτη έκθεση για την τροποποίηση και αναθεώρηση του κώδικα και της Συνθήκης Σένγκεν σε άλλα σημεία, τα οποία ολοκληρώσαμε με τους συναδέλφους σε πρώτη ανάγνωση χωρίς κανέναν πρόβλημα και την οποία ψηφίζουμε αύριο.  Ο χώρος Σένγκεν και η ελεύθερη κυκλοφορία εντός του χώρου, παραμένει μια από τις πλέον προωθημένες μορφές συνεργασίας στην Ευρωπαϊκή Ένωση, διέπεται από πολύ συγκεκριμένους κανόνες λειτουργίας, πολύ δε περισσότερο απαιτεί τον σεβασμό του απ' όλα τα κράτη μέλη. Με δυο λόγια: η ορθή διακυβέρνησή του, η επιτυχία του εξαρτάται από την προσήλωση όλων των κρατών μελών. Και είναι προφανές πως μονομερείς ενέργειες υπονομεύουν τη συνολική προσπάθεια, τραυματίζουν το αίσθημα αλληλεγγύης ανάμεσα στα κράτη που απαρτίζουν συνολικά τον χώρο Σένγκεν.  Επομένως, ανεύθυνες δηλώσεις ή ακόμη και πολιτικές διακηρύξεις φανερώνουν απλώς άγνοια της λειτουργίας της Ευρωπαϊκής Ένωσης. Άγνοια των δικαιωμάτων και των υποχρεώσεων όσων συμμετέχουν στις πιο προωθημένες ευρωπαϊκές πολιτικές. Και αναφέρομαι συγκεκριμένα: εκείνοι που για παράδειγμα πιστεύουν, ότι δίνοντας ταξιδιωτικά έγγραφα σε παράνομους μετανάστες, λύνουν το πρόβλημα του μεγάλου αριθμού παράνομων μεταναστών σε μια χώρα, δεν γνωρίζω αν έχουν αντίληψη της πραγματικότητας, σίγουρα πάντως δεν έχουν καμία απολύτως γνώση και αντίληψη του πνεύματος και του τρόπου λειτουργίας του χώρου Σένγκεν. Δεν έχουν προφανώς καμία αντίληψη σε σχέση με τα αποτελέσματα σ' αυτόν τους τον λόγο.  Κυρία Επίτροπε θα ήθελα παρακαλώ -εάν είναι εφικτό - να έχω μια απάντηση σε σχέση με το σημείο αυτό από την πλευρά σας. |  | |  |  |  | |  | | --- | |  | |      |  |  |  |  |  |  | | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | | |  | | --- | | MPphoto |  |  | | --- | |  | |  | **Juan Fernando López Aguilar (S&D). -**Señor Presidente, este Pleno del Parlamento Europeo está presenciando el desbloqueo del paquete de asilo, pero también del paquete Schengen, en sus dos piezas principales: la evaluación del sistema Schengen y el marco legal para la reinstauración de fronteras en la Unión Europea.  Por tanto, hay que felicitar a los ponentes que han conducido estos expedientes, pero también hay razones para poner en valor el refuerzo que esto supone para los Estados miembros en su confianza mutua; para la Comisión y el Parlamento Europeo, que ven reforzados los poderes de información y de evaluación de este paquete tan importante para el acervo de la libre circulación de personas; y, sobre todo, para los propios ciudadanos europeos, porque este paquete ha conocido un año y medio de negociaciones precisamente como consecuencia de las pulsiones populistas que propenden a la renacionalización de una política que el Tratado de Lisboa quiere definitivamente europea: la política de libre circulación de personas.  El cambio operado unilateralmente por el Consejo ha estado en el origen de este año y medio de negociaciones que ahora conocen un desbloqueo. Se trata, por tanto, de transmitir a los ciudadanos el mensaje de que el Parlamento Europeo va a ocuparse de que cualquier eventual modificación, en el futuro, de esta importante pieza de legislación asegure la representación de la ciudadanía europea, que aprecia en la libre circulación de personas uno de los mejores tesoros, uno de los mejores componentes del acervo europeo, de lo que Europa representa para 500 millones de ciudadanos. |  | |  |  |  | |  | | --- | |  | |      |  |  |  |  |  |  | | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | | |  | | --- | | MPphoto |  |  | | --- | |  | |  | **Franziska Keller (Verts/ALE). -**Herr Präsident! Ich kann leider nicht sehen, dass diese Schengen-Reform Vorteile für die Menschen in Europa bringt. Die Reform etabliert einen weiteren Grund, warum Binnengrenzen geschlossen werden können. Defizite an den Außengrenzen, das kann alles heißen oder auch nichts. Auch, dass ein Land viele Migrantinnen oder Migranten hereinlässt: Ist das ein Grund, die Binnengrenzen zu schließen? Ich denke, damit wird die Reisefreiheit in Europa weiter unterhöhlt. Die Entscheidung darüber bleibt letztendlich in nationaler Hand, obwohl die Freiheit der Binnengrenzen alle Europäerinnen und Europäer betrifft. Auch das Parlament bekommt bei der Schengen-Evaluierung nicht die Rolle, die ihm eigentlich zusteht.  Ich danke den Berichterstattenden ausdrücklich für ihren Einsatz. Aber letztendlich muss ich feststellen, dass eine europäische und demokratische Reform von Schengen nicht gelungen ist. Das ist sehr schade, denn Schengen ist schließlich ein Grundpfeiler der Europäischen Union. |  | |  |  |  | |  | | --- | |  | |      |  |  |  |  |  |  | | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | | |  | | --- | | MPphoto |  |  | | --- | |  | |  | **Adam Bielan (ECR). -** Panie Przewodniczący! Nie ulega chyba wątpliwości, że swobodny przepływ osób jest jedną z największych zdobyczy Unii Europejskiej. Nabyte uprawnienia pozwalają obywatelom w sposób nieskrępowany przemieszczać się, osiedlać się i podejmować pracę w dowolnym kraju.  Czasowe ograniczenia nie wzbudzają zastrzeżeń w sytuacjach zagrożenia bezpieczeństwa np. atakiem terrorystycznym. Decyzja odnośnie ich wprowadzania powinna jednak pozostać w gestii państw członkowskich.  Niestety pojawiają się również postulaty zaostrzenia przepisów dotyczących kontroli wewnętrznej wynikające z pobudek ekonomicznych. Wyrażają konieczność powstrzymania wewnętrznej migracji zarobkowej.  Propozycje te wydają się bezpodstawne i pozostają w wyraźnej sprzeczności z zasadami funkcjonowania Wspólnoty. Oceniam je jako ewidentnie rozmijające się z interesem europejskich obywateli. Jest to tym bardziej niezrozumiałe, że pracownicy napływowi nierzadko wydatnie przyczynili się do poprawy sytuacji gospodarczej danego państwa.  Na poparcie zasługuje natomiast propozycja wzmocnienia ochrony nieszczelnych granic zewnętrznych. Regularnie odnotowujemy bowiem przypadki nielegalnej imigracji, często z wykorzystaniem metod wręcz zagrażających życiu. |  | |  |  |  | |  | | --- | |  | |      |  |  |  |  |  |  | | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | | |  | | --- | | MPphoto |  |  | | --- | |  | |  | **Νικόλαος Σαλαβράκος (EFD). -**Κύριε Πρόεδρε, αποτελεί σίγουρα κατάκτηση το σύστημα Σένγκεν για την ελεύθερη διακίνηση των πολιτών στην Ευρώπη, έχει όμως και παρενέργειες. Είμαι από εκείνους που πιστεύουν στην αναγκαιότητα ασφάλειας των συνόρων των κρατών μελών που διασφαλίζεται, βέβαια, αποκλειστικά από την τήρηση και εφαρμογή των εσωτερικών κανόνων χωρίς την παρέμβαση της Ευρωπαϊκής Ένωσης.  Υποτίθεται ότι επιχειρούμε να εξασφαλίσουμε την δίκαιη κατανομή του βάρους που ασκούν στις εθνικές κοινωνίες τα προσφυγικά ρεύματα. Πως όμως εξασφαλίζεται αυτό κύριε Πρόεδρε και κύριοι συνάδελφοι; Από τα 26 ευρωπαϊκά κράτη της περιοχής Σένγκεν, μόλις τα 6 δέχονται όλη την μεταναστευτική πίεση, ως χώρες των εξωτερικών συνόρων της Ευρωπαϊκής Ένωσης. Οι βόρειες χώρες, οι χώρες που δεν έχουν θαλάσσια σύνορα στη Μεσόγειο, δεν αντιλαμβάνονται το πρόβλημα που υφίσταται η Ελλάδα, πολύ περισσότερο από οποιαδήποτε άλλη χώρα, σε σχέση με τον πληθυσμό της. Η οικονομία της χώρας μας και οι κοινωνικές δομές της έχουν κατακρεουργηθεί και η ανεργία καλπάζει.  Δυστυχώς, στην ευρωπαϊκή πολιτική για την μετανάστευση δεν εμπεριέχεται καλόπιστος διαμερισμός ευθυνών ανάμεσα στα κράτη μέλη. Αρκεί να σημειώσω το εξής: για την περίοδο 2007 έως 2011 διατέθηκαν σχεδόν 1 δις ευρώ, μόνο στα έξι αυτά κράτη, για την αντιμετώπιση των μεταναστευτικών ροών. Το κόστος για την Ελλάδα ανέρχεται σε περισσότερο από 30 δις. |  | |  |  |  | |  | | --- | |  | |      |  |  |  |  |  |  | | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | | |  | | --- | | MPphoto |  |  | | --- | |  | |  | **Kinga Gál (PPE). -**Az előző hetekben körvonalazódott egyezség legfontosabb üzenete az, hogy sikerült megőrizni és megerősíteni az Unió legkézzelfoghatóbb vívmányát, a személyek akadálytalan mozgását biztosító schengeni rendszert, miközben reményeink szerint átláthatóbbá és hatékonyabbá is tettük e rendszert.  Szeretnék gratulálni Carlos Coelho kollégámnak és Weber asszonynak kiemelkedő munkájukhoz ebben a csöppet sem egyszerű tárgyalási folyamatban, melynek végére mindhárom uniós intézmény eredménynek tartja a kialakult kompromisszumot. A schengeni értékelési mechanizmus hatékonyságának javítása, illetve a schengeni kormányzás további erősítése pozitív, és mindenképpen támogatandó.  A polgárok számára egyértelmű előnyöket jelentő vívmány megerősödött szerintem, hiszen csakis rendkívüli helyzetben, komoly indok esetében vezetheti be egy adott tagállam ideiglenesen a határellenőrzést, de bevezetheti, ha polgárainak biztonsága ezt megkívánja. Ugyanakkor lehetővé válik, hogy végső esetben a Bizottság aktívan lépjen fel alapos vizsgálódás után, ha adott külső határokon egy tagállam nem tudja teljesíteni az elvárt feltételeket.  Üdvözlöm továbbá a kettős mérce megszüntetése érdekében elért eredményt is, amely a jövőben egyenlő bánásmódot ír elő az értékelési mechanizmus alkalmazásának összefüggésében a tagállamok között. Ez azért is kiemelendő, mert ez hozzájárul a tagállamok közötti bizalom további növeléséhez, amelyre úgy érzem, nagy szükségünk van. |  | |  |  |  | |  | | --- | |  | |      |  |  |  |  |  |  | | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | | |  | | --- | | MPphoto |  |  | | --- | |  | |  | **Sylvie Guillaume (S&D). -**Monsieur le Président, Madame la Commissaire, chers collègues, la solidarité et la confiance mutuelle incarnées par l'acquis Schengen ont sérieusement été mises à mal ces dernières années. La liberté de circulation a encore été récemment mise en cause par plusieurs États membres qui, pourtant, ne savent toujours pas apporter les preuves qui justifient leurs accusations de fraude aux prestations sociales.  Face à des réflexes purement nationalistes, nous avons pu enfin aboutir à un compromis qui renforce l'approche communautaire et préserve cet acquis fondamental de la construction européenne. Certes, sur ce sujet aussi, nous aurions souhaité aller plus loin encore et surtout préserver les prérogatives du Parlement européen dans une matière qui touche directement les droits des citoyens, c'est-à-dire ceux qu'il représente.  L'enjeu, désormais, est de mettre fin à cette méfiance mutuelle qui habite les esprits afin de retrouver la confiance mutuelle initiale qui présidait au tout début de l'espace Schengen. Il nous faut également un espace où on arrête de croire que tous les problèmes sont de la faute de l'État membre voisin, forcément incompétent d'ailleurs, et un espace où les questions de migration irrégulière peuvent être mieux gérées au niveau européen et non plus au regard des agendas politiques nationaux. |  | |  |  |  | |  | | --- | |  | |      |  |  |  |  |  |  | | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | | |  | | --- | | MPphoto |  |  | | --- | |  | |  | **Vicky Ford (ECR). -** Mr President, the ability to control one’s own borders is fundamental to national sovereignty, and whilst the UK is not part of the Schengen area, I do still support the Council’s view that ultimate decision-making on border control should lie with national governments. However, all of our authorities must be able to identify those who pose a risk to our citizens and there have been some shocking cases of individuals who have been known to pose a risk in one Member State then being able to commit crimes because they relocated to another country where they were less well known.  The freedom of movement of people is a very valued freedom, but we also need to protect citizens, so it must be coupled with full and accurate exchange of information. Tackling risks posed by potentially dangerous individuals is critically important and stricter border controls can help to achieve this. |  | |  |  |  | |  | | --- | |  | |      |  |  |  |  |  |  | | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | | |  | | --- | | MPphoto |  |  | | --- | |  | |  | **Monica Luisa Macovei (PPE). -**Susţin cele trei rapoarte din pachetul Schengen, pentru că apără dreptul la liberă circulaţie în Uniunea Europeană, unul din bunurile cele mai de preţ pe care le are Uniunea. Aş vrea să mă refer la câteva îmbunătăţiri aduse de aceste rapoarte.  1 - Standardele pentru statele membre Schengen sunt mai relaxate decât pentru statele candidate, cum ar fi România şi Bulgaria. Prin aceste rapoarte, standardele devin egale pentru toată lumea: şi pentru statele candidate, şi pentru statele membre, adică se vor ridica standardele şi în statele deja membre Schengen.  În al doilea rând, monitorizarea controalelor interne la frontiere, monitorizarea controalelor ilegale la frontierele interne va fi posibile, ceea ce astăzi nu se poate face. De pildă, echipe de experţi se pot sui în autocare care pleacă cu turişti din diverse ţări în alte state ale Uniunii, să vadă, să constate cu ochii lor dacă sunt sau nu aceşti oameni supuşi unor controale ilegale.  O a treia îmbunătăţire se referă la faptul că posibilitatea de a reintroduce controalele la frontiere se poate face mult mai restrictiv decât până acum, şi anume numai cu acordul Comisiei Europene, iar decizia se ia de către Consiliul Uniunii, cu aprobarea Comisiei Europene. Şi iarăşi, pe baza unor criterii bine stabilite dinainte şi numai pentru a proteja ordinea publică.  Deci toate acestea vor duce la un transport, la o călătorie, la o liberă circulaţie în Uniunea Europeană în mod egal pentru toţi cetăţenii. |  | |  |  |  | |  | | --- | |  | |      |  |  |  |  |  |  | | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | | |  | | --- | | MPphoto |  |  | | --- | |  | |  | **Claude Moraes (S&D). -**Mr President, coming from a Member State which is not in Schengen, and having a perspective which values the free movement within the Schengen area, if we cast our minds back to the opportunism which caused this situation, we can really appreciate the progress which has been made by the two rapporteurs, Ms Weber and Mr Coelho.  We understand the objections in respect of Parliament’s role, the lack of codecision and the difficulties, but we have to make an assessment about what the rapporteurs have achieved and the jump that we have made from those opportunistic situations to where we are now. I could make an assessment as a citizen who does not enjoy that free movement from Schengen, from the United Kingdom: this is something that created progress, democratic accountability and transparency. It is not a perfect situation but it is real progress and that is why my Group values the agreement. |  | |  |  |  | |  | | --- | |  | |      |  |  |  |  |  |  | | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | | |  | | --- | | MPphoto |  |  | | --- | |  | |  | **Marco Scurria (PPE). -**Signor Presidente, onorevoli colleghi, mi permetta prima di tutto di ringraziare i nostri relatori, i colleghi Coelho e Weber, che hanno lavorato assiduamente per raggiungere il risultato di cui oggi parliamo. Plaudiamo prima di tutto al meccanismo di valutazione e monitoraggio di cui la Commissione europea, insieme agli Stati membri e alle agenzie, diventa protagonista, ma anche alla capacità di capire che qualcosa doveva essere cambiato: parlo della reintroduzione dei controlli alle frontiere interne in casi di eccezionali circostanze.  Non si aliena certo il principio della libera circolazione delle persone che è una delle basi su cui si fonda la nostra Unione, ma la si adegua ad una serie di necessità che nel corso del tempo si sono manifestate. Abbiamo vissuto anche momenti di tensione tra alcuni dei nostri Stati membri – momenti difficili come quelli per esempio conseguenti alla cosiddetta primavera araba – ed era opportuno intervenire e regolare perché troppe differenze ci sono ancora tra le nostre società e dove scelte unilaterali ed improvvise possono mettere davvero in crisi le ragioni stesse del nostro stare insieme.  Ma vedere oggi che tutti i nostri cittadini possono tranquillamente circolare tra i nostri Stati, senza polizia, senza esibire documenti, è senza dubbio motivo di orgoglio e dimostrazione che la nostra Unione vive e cresce con il passare degli anni. Perché alcuni, magari dei visitatori che stanno ascoltando questo dibattito dalle tribune, si stanno chiedendo se davvero vogliamo inspiegabilmente tornare indietro a un mondo che non esiste più e noi questo non lo vogliamo. |  | |  |  |  | |  | | --- | |  | |      |  |  |  |  |  |  | | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | | |  | | --- | | MPphoto |  |  | | --- | |  | |  | **Jacek Protasiewicz (PPE). -**Panie Przewodniczący! Pani Komisarz! Możliwość poruszania się bez paszportu po Europie bez granic jest jednym z najważniejszych dla obywateli Unii dowodów na sens budowy zjednoczonej Europy. Nie mam co do tego najmniejszych wątpliwości. W dzisiejszej debacie omawiamy dwa rozporządzenia, z których jedno wprowadza nowy tryb określonego przywracania kontroli na granicach wewnętrznych między państwami Schengen. Oba rozporządzenia dotyczą zatem tej ważnej swobody, jaką jest przepływ ludzi w ramach Unii Europejskiej.  Chcę z tego miejsca uczciwie powiedzieć, że ten kierunek zmian, który jest wprowadzany w prawie do swobodnego przepływu osób wewnątrz Unii, uważam za ryzykowny, jednak rozumiem powody, dla których został on zaproponowany. I dlatego mimo swojej sceptycznej oceny będę głosował za przyjęciem sprawozdania zarówno pani poseł Weber, jak i sprawozdania pana posła Coelho. Uczynię tak również dlatego, że w sprawach, jakimi są przywracanie granic wewnętrznych w ramach strefy Schengen, oraz oceny, czy państwo członkowskie spełnia wymogi i zobowiązania wynikające ze wspólnej odpowiedzialności za bezpieczeństwo, a także za ochronę granic zewnętrznych Unii, decyzje będą podejmowane wspólnie i pod nadzorem Komisji Europejskiej. Wierzę, że ta kluczowa rola Komisji jako strażnika traktatów i płynących z nich praw obywatelskich zapewni, że te nowe możliwości przywracania granic nie będą nadużywane, a ich stosowanie ograniczy się tylko do najbardziej wyjątkowych sytuacji.  Chcę dobitnie podkreślić, że przepływy migracyjne nie mogą być bowiem pretekstem do przywracania granic w Europie. Reakcja Komisji na list czterech ministrów spraw wewnętrznych w sprawie zapobieżenia nadużyciom narodowych systemów opieki społecznej dowodzi, że zasługuje ona na kredyt zaufania. |  | |  |  |  | |  | | --- | |  | |      |  |  |  |  |  |  | | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | | |  | | --- | | MPphoto |  |  | | --- | |  | |  | **Monika Flašíková Beňová (S&D). -**Zavedenie schengenského priestoru patrí medzi najväčšie úspechy Európskej únie. Podľa prieskumu považuje Schengen za najpozitívnejší výsledok európskej integrácie až 62 % našich obyvateľov. Voľný pohyb je základnou slobodou Európskej únie a my ju musíme dodržiavať. Je preto nevyhnutné nájsť primeranú rovnováhu medzi právom na voľný pohyb a právom na bezpečnosť, ktoré by mal každý jeden členský štát svojim obyvateľom garantovať.  Minulý rok nastali udalosti, ktoré garancie voľného cestovania a slobody pohybu výrazne ohrozili. Všetky členské štáty sú však povinné riadiť hranice takým spôsobom, ktorý nebude narúšať voľný pohyb osôb v rámci schengenského priestoru. Znovuzavedenie hraničných kontrol by malo byť prípustné iba za skutočne mimoriadnych okolností. Každé jedno opatrenie súvisiace s obnovením kontrol na vnútorných hraniciach musí byť dôsledne zvážené, primerané a zavedené iba ako skutočne krajné riešenie. Takéto rozhodnutie nemôže byť však v žiadnom prípade individuálnym rozhodnutím jedného členského štátu. Rozhodnúť o ňom je kompetentná jedine Európska únia ako celok. Európsky parlament nemôže byť z tohto procesu v žiadnom prípade vylúčený. |  | |  |  |  | |  | | --- | |  | |      |  |  |  |  |  |  | | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | | |  | | --- | | MPphoto |  |  | | --- | |  | |  | **Alajos Mészáros (PPE). -**Úgy politikai, mint állampolgári szempontból is a schengeni dokumentumok az uniós vívmányok egyik legfontosabbikai. Éppen ezért ezt az eddig elért és kimunkált európai rendszert fenn kell tartani, és tovább finomítani. Úgy gondolom, a parlamenti álláspont a közös bizalom és együttműködés elveit próbálja megőrizni a schengeni csomagban.  A belső határellenőrzések rendszeresebbé válásának gondolata azonban az európai együttműködést és együttélést gátló elképzelés. Nem kell a múltban messzire mennünk, sokunkban él még az élmény a határátkelőkön történő állandó ellenőrzésekről. A belső határellenőrzéseknek a jövőben is csak kivételes és indokolt esetekben szabad megvalósulniuk. Ez az eljárás nem válhat rendszeressé. A bevándorlás és elvándorlás természetes folyamatok, a gazdasági és globális változások következményei. Ezért ezekre nem adhat választ egy újabb vasfüggöny. A tagállamoknak máshogy, megerősített uniós eszközökkel kell elérniük a hatékony problémakezelést.  A személyek szabad mozgása azon alapelvek egyike, amelyekre közösségünk épül, és ez egyedülálló a világon. Ennek további javítására, és a jogok szilárdítására van szükség, nem visszalépésre a múltba. Schengen sok régiót, népet összeköt, ugyanakkor a külső határok megszilárdítása több olyan országot távolabb vitt az EU-tól, amelyek az európai vérkeringés részei lehetnének.  A szilárd, bizalmi alapokon fekvő belső rendszer fejlesztése mellett megfelelő garanciákat kell biztosítani a Schengenen kívüli országokkal történő együttműködéshez is. A parlament fő feladata ebben a folyamatban véleményem szerint a biztonság szavatolása mellett az európaiság, az átláthatóság és az uniós polgárok szabadságérzetének megerősítése. |  | |  |  |  | |  | | --- | |  | |      |  |  |  |  |  |  | | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | | |  | | --- | | MPphoto |  |  | | --- | |  | |  | **Seán Kelly (PPE). -**Mr President, first may I thank the Commissioner for her statement that she wants to have Parliament involved more in this area; that is important. I would also compliment her and other speakers on the role the Irish Presidency has played in moving this dossier forward and also the one on asylum.  That is something I greatly appreciate because our minister, who has had to leave, told me at the beginning of the Presidency that she was going to be in attendance at every single part-session that she was invited to attend. I just want to put it on the record that once or twice it has been mentioned here that the Council was not present. The reason they were not present was that they were not invited. Minister Creighton has been present on all occasions.  Now, regarding this measure, I think a lot of practical, sensible measures are here which I would support. Schengen is a great part of the European Union. We talk about the freedom of movement, of goods, capital, etc., but freedom does not mean uncontrolled. There have to be controls in everything and particularly at times of exceptional circumstances, The measures proposed here, measures of last resort, for limited periods, do make sense and I think unilateral action for a maximum of five days is a sensible approach as well.  So by and large, I think that this is a step in the right direction which will give a lot of consolation to citizens and also to Member States, and so I welcome these measures. |  | |  |  |  | |  | | --- | |  | |      |  |  |  |  |  |  | | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | | |  | | --- | | MPphoto |  |  | | --- | |  | |  | **Frank Engel (PPE). -**Monsieur le Président, je trouve que nous sommes devant une contradiction fort intéressante. L'intérêt et l'engouement pour Schengen sont énormes, tant à l'intérieur qu'à l'extérieur de l'Union et, en même temps, nous assistons à une remise en question constante de son essence, qui est simplement l'absence de frontières intérieures au sein de l'Union européenne et de l'espace plus vaste.  La raison se trouve dans une imperfection majeure de la construction européenne qui est simple à formuler. Nous n'avons pas intériorisé, surtout au niveau du Conseil et des États membres, le fait que nous ne constituons plus qu'un seul espace et que nous ne devrions constituer plus qu'un seul espace. Voilà la raison pour laquelle nous ne fournissons pas assez de soutien à tous ceux qui gardent nos frontières extérieures. Que l'on aille se promener en Grèce ou à Malte pour voir la réalité de ces propos. Voilà, également, pourquoi les États préfèrent verrouiller leur territoire au lieu de protéger et de gérer l'espace de libre circulation qui doit être celui de toute l'Union.  Si le Parlement a eu raison de s'opposer à ce qui était proposé, ce que nous avons obtenu est loin de ce que nous souhaiterions. Le collègue Goebbels et d'autres l'ont mentionné de façon éloquente. Nous en sommes très loin. Parce que nous croyons toujours que nos policiers sont les meilleurs, que nos forces de sécurité sont les meilleures et que le voisin n'est pas capable de fournir le même degré de sécurité que celui qu'un autre État membre serait en droit d'exiger.  Arrêtons cela. Venons-en à une conscience européenne de la gestion de cet espace. Sans cela Schengen restera ce qu'il est actuellement, à savoir un terrain de bataille entre des États qui restent nationaux et un Parlement européen qui voudrait un espace continental.  *(Applaudissements)* |  | |  |  |  | |  | | --- | |  | |      |  |  |  |  |  |  | | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | | |  | | --- | | MPphoto |  |  | | --- | |  | |  | **Моника Панайотова (PPE). -**Бих искала да поздравя докладчика г-н Коелю за постигнатото споразумение със Съвета и Комисията по правилата за управление на механизма за Шенген, както и за това, че успя да защити позицията на Европейския парламент в тези дълги и трудни преговори. Приветствам, че механизмът за оценка и наблюдение на прилагането на правото от Шенген вече ще бъде европейски, а не само междуправителствен инструмент. Фактът, че Европейската комисия ще има централна роля и че Парламентът ще бъде консултиран за всяка евентуална промяна ще допринесе за по-ясни и прозрачни правила и по-ефективна система.  Вярвам, че новите разпоредби ще засилят координацията и сигурността между държавите членки, защото Шенген е зона преди всичко на доверие. Винаги колективният отговор на външни предизвикателства е по-ефективен.  Вярвам, че това споразумение ще сложи край на появата на допълнителни критерии и двойни стандарти, които в момента се прилагат към България и Румъния и ще бъде крачка напред към присъединяването им към Шенген. Убедена съм, че това ще придаде геополитическа добавена стойност към сигурността в региона.  И в момента България прилага високи стандарти за сигурността на границите си. Като част от Шенген, България ще бъде гарант за сигурността и надеждността на външната граница на Европейския съюз и респективно за сигурността на европейските граждани**.**Надявам се, че решението за разширяването на Шенген няма да се отлага продължително, защото това може да предизвика съмнения в способността на Европейския съюз да спазва собствените си правила и решения. Може, също така, да подхрани евроскептицизма в момент, когато повече от всякога се нуждаем от повече Европа. |  | |  |  |  | |  | | --- | |  | |      |  |  |  |  |  | | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | | |  | | --- | |  | |  | *Intervenciones con arreglo al procedimiento de solicitud incidental de uso de la palabra («catch the eye»)* |  | |  |  |  | |  | | --- | |  | |      |  |  |  |  |  |  | | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | | |  | | --- | | MPphoto |  |  | | --- | |  | |  | **Agustín Díaz de Mera García Consuegra (PPE). -**Señor Presidente, gracias a Carlos y a Renate hoy avanzamos considerablemente en la dimensión comunitaria de Schengen y en la libertad de tránsito de los ciudadanos. Voy a ser telegráfico: ustedes han hecho un trabajo meritorio, intenso y constante. Se lo agradecemos.  Resumidamente: el Parlamento, bien, y el Consejo, mal. El Consejo ha estado inflexible y miope en el proceso. El Parlamento, gracias a ustedes, va a tener acceso a información relevante en procesos de evaluación y seguimiento, pero ¿realmente tenemos que creernos que vamos a ser consultados sobre cualquier reforma que afecte de manera sustantiva al espacio Schengen? Me fío de la señora Malmström, me callo con referencia a lo que espero del Consejo; el Parlamento estará vigilante. |  | |  |  |  | |  | | --- | |  | |      |  |  |  |  |  |  | | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | | |  | | --- | | MPphoto |  |  | | --- | |  | |  | **Petru Constantin Luhan (PPE). -**Este îmbucurător faptul că, prin aceste două regulamente, se urmăreşte îmbunătăţirea mecanismului de evaluare Schengen vizând abordarea situaţiilor de criză în regiunile comune, mai ales la graniţele ţărilor din Uniunea Europeană.  Cu toate acestea, este îngrijorător faptul că nu se face nimic la nivel european pentru soluţionarea problemei referitoare la aderarea Bulgariei şi a României la spaţiul Schengen. Menţinerea opoziţiei manifestate de către anumite state membre este un abuz ce contravine principiilor şi obiectivelor pe termen lung ale Uniunii Europene. Poziţia acestor state a arătat, încă o dată, faptul că, deşi toate statele membre se bucură de responsabilităţi comune, totuşi, din nefericire, unele state nu se bucură de aceleaşi beneficii.  Stimaţi colegi, aceste ambiţii populiste nu vor face decât să slăbească puterea Uniunii Europene şi să reducă credibilitatea noastră pe plan global. Având în vedere că au fost îndeplinite toate condiţiile pentru aderare, solicit pe această cale tuturor instituţiilor responsabile să identifice şi să propună pentru a pune în aplicare toate măsurile necesare care să contribuie la extinderea cu succes a spaţiului Schengen şi la eliminarea acestei nedreptăţi. |  | |  |  |  | |  | | --- | |  | |      |  |  |  |  |  |  | | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | | |  | | --- | | MPphoto |  |  | | --- | |  | |  | **Janusz Władysław Zemke (S&D). -**Panie Przewodniczący! Chciałbym podkreślić z całą mocą, że działalność strefy Schengen jest dzisiaj jednym z najmocniejszych argumentów na rzecz integracji europejskiej, co ma znaczenie szczególne w czasach, gdy narastają nastroje antyunijne. Obywatele Unii cenią i doceniają swobodę przemieszczania się i fakt, że kontrole mają charakter wyjątkowy, przede wszystkim na zewnętrznych granicach Unii. Dlatego też myślę, że dzisiaj najważniejsze znaczenie ma właśnie ta skuteczność kontroli dokonywanych przez państwa graniczne. Państwa te czynią to bowiem nie tylko w interesie swoim, lecz i w imieniu i na rzecz wszystkich członków Unii. Chciałbym poprzeć w związku z tym w szczególności wszystkie te rozwiązania, które powinny poprawić efektywność tej kontroli na zewnątrz, bo jeśli chodzi o wewnętrzne rozwiązania, to jest tu niestety sporo wątpliwości. |  | |  |  |  | |  | | --- | |  | |      |  |  |  |  |  |  | | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | | |  | | --- | | MPphoto |  |  | | --- | |  | |  | **Danuta Jazłowiecka (PPE). -**Panie Przewodniczący! Przygotowany przez Komisję Europejską wniosek legislacyjny wyraźnie pokazuje, że ugięła się ona pod żądaniami niektórych państw członkowskich. Zaproponowane rozwiązania nie tylko bardzo wpłynęłyby na funkcjonowanie strefy Schengen, ale przede wszystkim podważyłyby jeden z fundamentów Unii – swobodę przepływu osób.  Ostatnie lata pokazały, że państwa członkowskie dla wewnętrznych celów politycznych są w stanie naruszać wspólne dla Unii wartości, w tym wprowadzać nieuzasadnione kontrole na granicach wewnętrznych. Jeżeli zaakceptujemy taką praktykę, z czasem rozprzestrzeni się ona na całą Wspólnotę. W pełni zatem zgadzam się ze sprawozdawczynią, że należy umożliwić Komisji i Parlamentowi monitorowanie przypadków przywracania kontroli na granicach wewnętrznych. Nie można dopuścić, aby państwa członkowskie dokonywały tego w pełni swobodnie i uznaniowo.  Popieram więc wniosek o to, aby Komisja przygotowała wytyczne dotyczące przywracania kontroli, tak aby zapewnić spójną interpretację istniejących przepisów. Powinna również przygotowywać coroczne raporty z funkcjonowania strefy Schengen dla Parlamentu i Rady. Nie mam bowiem wątpliwości, że w tym przypadku jedynie instytucje unijne gwarantują racjonalne i uzasadnione stosowanie wyjątków pozwalających na tymczasowe przywracanie kontroli na granicach wewnętrznych. |  | |  |  |  | |  | | --- | |  | |      |  |  |  |  |  |  | | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | | |  | | --- | | MPphoto |  |  | | --- | |  | |  | **Andreas Mölzer (NI). -**Herr Präsident! Es mag sich ja um ein Missverständnis oder um eine großzügige Interpretation der Visa für touristische Zwecke oder auch um eine bewusste Provokation handeln, die regelwidrige Ausstellung von Aufenthaltstiteln, welche Italien ja nicht zum ersten Mal einsetzt, muss jedoch endlich ein Ende haben. Denn Massenamnestien von illegalen Migranten oder der Bruch des Schengen-Vertrags mittels Touristenvisa ziehen unweigerlich weiter Zehntausende Flüchtlinge nach sich. Damit droht auch das Scheitern des Schengen-Systems insgesamt.  Nach wie vor gelingt es Griechenland, Italien und Malta offenbar nicht, eine ausreichende Sicherung der EU-Außengrenzen herzustellen. Und die EU will sich hinsichtlich des Sozialtourismus eben auch nicht die Hände schmutzig machen. Kein Wunder also, dass Schengen-Neulinge nach ihrer Aufnahme häufig in ihren Bemühungen nachlassen oder erlahmen.  Aber auch im Inneren haben wir in vielen Regionen Europas gerade angesichts der im Rahmen der Eurokrise verstärkten sozialen Ungleichgewichte mit steigender Kriminalität zu kämpfen. Insofern könnten also temporäre Kontrollen an den Binnengrenzen meines Erachtens durchaus hilfreich sein. |  | |  |  |  | |  | | --- | |  | |      |  |  |  |  |  |  | | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | | |  | | --- | | MPphoto |  |  | | --- | |  | |  | **Lena Kolarska-Bobińska (PPE). -**Panie Przewodniczący! Jest mi przykro, że dzisiaj, zamiast mówić o przystąpieniu Bułgarii i Rumunii do strefy Schengen, staramy się uzasadnić i wytłumaczyć i rozmawiać o kontrolach, które chciało wprowadzić kilka krajów, bo idziemy w Unii Europejskiej dwa kroki do przodu, a potem cofamy się. Wydaje mi się, że w tej chwili jest najwyższy czas, żeby właśnie zacząć mówić jak najszybciej o otwarciu strefy Schengen, a nie o jej zamykaniu. Jest mi też przykro, że w całej tej procedurze Parlament został odsunięty, jego rola nie została doceniona, i obawiam się, że później przy tego typu ustaleniach, jakie osiągnięto, tak samo nie będzie dostatecznie brana pod uwagę opinia Parlamentu. Będę więc popierała to sprawozdanie, ale z bardzo dużą rezerwą. |  | |  |  |  | |  | | --- | |  | |      |  |  |  |  |  |  | | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | | |  | | --- | | MPphoto |  |  | | --- | |  | |  | **Krisztina Morvai (NI). -**Úgy tűnik, hogy kivételes körülmények között felfüggeszthető az Európai Unió egyik fő, úgymond vívmánya, szabadsága: a munkaerő, illetőleg a polgárok szabad áramlásának szabadsága, hiszen a schengeni területen belül is – holnap megszavazza a Parlament minden valószínűség szerint – visszaállítható lesz a határok ellenőrzése. Nem is titkolták itt nyugat-európai barátaink, hogy erre azért van szükség szerintük, mert mi kelet-európaiak veszélyesek vagyunk.  Kérdésem: hogyha kivételes körülmények között a polgárok szabad áramlása és a munkaerő szabad áramlása felfüggeszthető, akkor lehet-e esélyünk arra – és kérjük is, hogy így legyen –, hogy a tőke szabad áramlása is felfüggeszthető legyen kivételes körülmények között? Ezek a kivételes körülmények például az én hazámban, Magyarországon adottak, hiszen óriási a szegénység, sorra mennek tönkre a magyar kis- és középvállalkozók, tekintettel arra, hogy nem tudnak versenyt tartani a beáramló nyugati tőkével.  Lehetséges-e tehát felfüggeszteni azt, hogy egyenlő elbánásban kell őket részesítsük, és lehet-e, hogy preferenciális, tehát kedvezőbb megítélést kapjanak a hazai vállalkozók mostantól, hiszen kivételes körülmények állnak fent? |  | |  |  |  | |  | | --- | |  | |      |  |  |  |  |  | | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | | |  | | --- | |  | |  | *(Fin de las intervenciones con arreglo al procedimiento de solicitud incidental de uso de la palabra («catch the eye»))* |  | |  |  |  | |  | | --- | |  | |      |  |  |  |  |  |  | | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | | |  | | --- | | MPphoto |  |  | | --- | |  | |  | **Cecilia Malmström,***Member of the Commission***. −**Mr President, first on Romania and Bulgaria: this is not the subject of today’s debate but, as you know – I do not have to repeat it – the Commission has said on several occasions that we do think that Romania and Bulgaria are ready to join Schengen and do fulfil all the technical criteria, which have to be the same for all countries. However, the Council has still not yet been in a position to make that decision. I hope they will do so very soon.  The creation of Schengen – as many of you have said – is the most tangible and valued achievement of the European Union. Four hundred and twenty million people residing in the area move freely across the internal borders, making some 1.25 billion journeys within the EU every year, and that is rising. The fact that they can travel from Lapland in northern Finland to Malta without a passport is truly something very tangible and good for the citizen. It has of course had a huge impact on the internal market.  On the negotiations, I am aware that some of you would have liked to take a little longer. It is also not 100% what I wanted, but I think that this compromise is the only one possible today. We can be proud of it. It will give us better possibilities to remedy deficiencies at the external borders.  The Commission will also have greater possibilities to make sure that Member States do not have unauthorised border controls at the internal borders. Through these regular evaluation dialogues and reports we will hopefully build trust, because trust was what was lacking when we had this huge political debate a year and a half ago.  With this agreement, the freedom to travel around Europe without border controls should continue to be granted for many years to come. Therefore I very much encourage you to vote for the proposals that have been prepared by your two rapporteurs, Mrs Weber and Mr Coelho. I would once again like to thank them very much for their hard work in concluding this file, together of course with the Irish Presidency. |  | |  |  |  | |  | | --- | |  | |      |  |  |  |  |  |  | | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | | |  | | --- | | MPphoto |  |  | | --- | |  | |  | **Carlos Coelho,***relator***. −**Felicito Cecilia Malmström. Quem ganha sobretudo neste processo é a Comissão e isso é o sinal de que passamos a ter um mecanismo comunitário como o Parlamento sempre defendeu.  Senhor Presidente, quatro correções a coisas que foram ditas no plenário, agradecendo todas as palavras simpáticas que me foram dirigidas.  Primeiro, não é verdade que haja um exagero na reintrodução de fronteiras. A reintrodução de controlos nas fronteiras será a título excecional, será proposto pela Comissão Europeia caso seja mesmo necessário, será decidida pelo Conselho, com o envolvimento dos Estados-Membros. Não há aqui nenhum perigo.  Segundo, não é verdade que se vá enfraquecer a livre circulação dos cidadãos. Pelo contrário, vamos reforçar a livre circulação porque a partir deste momento tudo o que sejam tentativas de reintrodução ilegal dos controlos nas fronteiras internas serão objeto de fiscalização por este mecanismo.  Terceiro lugar, não é verdade que a imigração possa ser causa para a reintrodução de fronteiras. Explicitamente, recusamos essa previsão na lei que vamos aprovar.  Como a Senhora Comissária já disse, este debate não é sobre a Bulgária e sobre a Roménia, que já deveriam ser membros integrantes do Espaço Schengen. Mas, é uma forma de responder àqueles que têm medo da Bulgária e da Roménia, dizendo que eles podem preencher as condições no momento da adesão e não preencher as condições depois. A partir do momento que temos este mecanismo de avaliação, todos os Estados-Membros têm de, permanentemente, responder a todas as condições, o que significa que esse pretexto deixa de existir contra a Bulgária e contra a Roménia.  Finalmente, Senhor Presidente, uma vez mais agradecer toda a colaboração dos relatores sombra, mesmo daqueles que vão votar contra mas que nos deram toda a força durante o processo negocial. Recordar, sobretudo, a colaboração do colega Enciu que deu muitas sugestões, e, particularmente, a colaboração sempre estreita com a colega Renate Weber, a quem agradeço muito. |  | |  |  |  | |  | | --- | |  | |      |  |  |  |  |  |  | | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | | |  | | --- | | MPphoto |  |  | | --- | |  | |  | **Renate Weber,***Raportoare***. −**Voi folosi aceste ultime minute ca să transmit doar două mesaje. Primul este acela de a mulţumi, realmente din tot sufletul, prietenului şi colegului meu, Carlos Coelho, dar şi celorlalţi colegi care au fost *shadow* în aceste rapoarte, precum şi asitenţilor noştri şi staffului Parlamentului, care ne-a ajutat atât de mult.  Cel de-al doilea mesaj pe care vreau să îl transmit este că pentru mine, o proeuropeană convinsă, nu este o supriză că un deputat care provine dintr-o ţară din afara spaţiului Schengen, a putut să lucreze, se pare foarte bine, dar, în orice caz, cu multă hotărâre, pentru ceva care aparţine tuturor cetăţenilor europeni.  Mărturisesc, însă, că, în acelaşi timp, am făcut-o gândindu-mă şi la ţara pe care o reprezint aici, la România, gândindu-mă că această nouă guvernanţă Schengen va netezi calea aderării României la spaţiul Schengen, o ţară care este pregătită şi tehnic şi care îşi doreşte foarte mult să facă parte din acest spaţiu. Suntem cetăţeni europeni şi, evident, dorim să ne bucurăm cu toţii de aceleaşi drepturi, aşa cum este şi firesc. |  | |  |  |  | |  | | --- | |  | |      |  |  |  |  |  |  | | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | | |  | | --- | | MPphoto |  |  | | --- | |  | |  | **El Presidente. −**Se cierra el debate.  La votación tendrá lugar mañana a las 11.30 horas.  ***Declaraciones por escrito (artículo 149 del Reglamento)*** |  | |  |  |  | |  | | --- | |  | |      |  |  |  |  |  | | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | | |  | | --- | | MPphoto | |  | **George Sabin Cutaş (S&D),***în scris***. –**Libera circulaţie a persoanelor este una dintre realizările cele mai concrete ale Europei unite, fiind totodată şi dreptul cel mai apreciat de cetăţenii Uniunii, aşa cum se arată într-un studiu al Comisiei Europene. Cu toate acestea, am constatat cu stupoare că anumite guverne au reuşit, timp de mai bine de doi ani, să impună standarde duble şi să ridice bariere în calea aplicării unui drept fundamental. Astfel, România şi Bulgaria s-au confruntat în repetate rânduri cu schimbarea regulilor în timpul jocului. Vreau să mulţumesc Comisiei şi colegilor din Parlament pentru eforturile depuse în vederea impunerii unor criterii uniforme în privinţa acquis-ului Schengen. Acestea vor fi valabile atât pentru statele care se bucură deja de apartenenţa la spaţiul de liberă circulaţie, cât şi pentru cele care nu au aderat încă şi vor face referire la principii tehnice şi nu la sistemul de justiţie, punând capăt discriminării şi consolidând încrederea reciprocă între membrii UE. Salut acest mecanism de evaluare Schengen care va fi bazat pe reguli clare şi transparente şi va fi mai riguros şi, în acelaşi timp, mai corect decât sistemul în vigoare până în prezent. |  | |  |  |  | |  | | --- | |  | |      |  |  |  |  |  | | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | | |  | | --- | | MPphoto | |  | **Marian-Jean Marinescu (PPE),***în scris***. –**Noul Mecanism de Evaluare Schengen, aşa cum a fost modificat acesta prin amendamentele Parlamentului, va duce la consolidarea spaţiului Schengen. Prin acest mecanism, introducerea controalelor la frontieră nu va mai fi o decizie pe care un stat membru să o poată lua fără a cere aprobare la nivelul UE. Reintroducerea controalelor la frontieră trebuie să se întâmple doar în ultimă instanţă şi dacă, în urma evaluării pe teren şi a ajutorului acordat de Frontex, Statul Membru nu poate să remedieze deficienţa în termen de şase luni. Subliniez importanţa consolidării rolului Frontex şi a operabilităţii recent propusului Corp European de Poliţişti de Frontieră. Comisia trebuie să asigure coordonarea programelor de evaluare. Procesul de evaluare Schengen trebuie să fie realizat în cooperare cu experţii statelor membre şi cu reprezentanţi ai Parlamentului European. Este important să se stabilească măsuri financiare compensatorii, pentru a sprijini statele membre afectate de reintroducerea controalelor la frontierele interne. Schimbarea abordării interguvernamentale a evaluării Schengen într-un mecanism coordonat la nivelul UE sub controlul Comisiei este un lucru foarte bun. Subliniez că România şi Bulgaria au îndeplinit toate criteriile de evaluare Schengen şi acest nou mecanism va reconfirma acest lucru în momentul în care va intra în vigoare. |  | |  |  |  | |  | | --- | |  | |      |  |  |  |  |  | | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | | |  | | --- | | MPphoto | |  | **Jarosław Leszek Wałęsa (PPE),***na piśmie***. –** Osiągnięcie płynności przepływu obywateli UE w obrębie strefy Schengen jest jednym z fundamentalnych osiągnięć UE. Sprawdzanie pasażerów na granicach powinno odbywać się jedynie w sytuacji, gdy istnieją jakiekolwiek podejrzenia wobec podróżującego. Miałoby się to odbywać w celu zapewnienia obywatelom bezpieczeństwa. Ponowne wprowadzenie kontroli granicznych i utrudnienie obywatelom przemieszczania się w granicach strefy Schengen w moim przekonaniu podyktowane jest obecnie bardziej względami gospodarczymi i ekonomicznymi niż bezpieczeństwem.  Podobnie jak część posłów, jestem za podtrzymaniem płynności przemieszczania się między krajami UE oraz za wzmocnieniem granic zewnętrznych w celu uniknięcia napływu ludności krajów niezrzeszonych. Pozbawienie obywateli UE prawa do swobodnego przemieszczania się między krajami członkowskimi mogłoby podważyć autorytet, wiarygodność i sens istnienia Unii wśród obywateli.  Ponadto takie podejście wspiera myślenie lokalne, a nie globalne będące sensem istnienia UE. Każdy kraj członkowski ma swój własny pogląd na kwestię strefy Schengen, lecz nie możemy zapomnieć o tym, że jako państwa członkowskie tworzymy Unię i dążymy do wspólnego dla nas wszystkich dobra i korzyści. Powinniśmy wspierać podejście, którego podstawą jest jedna wspólna przestrzeń i wspierać ludzi, którzy chcą z tego korzystać.  Uważam, że ponowne ograniczenie obecnych przywilejów obywateli UE będzie dużym krokiem wstecz, a przecież podstawą funkcjonowania Unii jest ciągły rozwój w celu usprawniania współpracy międzynarodowej. |  | |
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| |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | | **15. Migration flows and asylum and their impact on Schengen (debate)** | |  |  |  | | --- | --- | --- | |  | [**Video of the speeches**](https://www.europarl.europa.eu/plenary/en/vod.html?mode=chapter&vodLanguage=EN&playerStartTime=20110510-15:04:45&playerEndTime=20110510-17:02:45) |  | | |  |  |  | | --- | --- | --- | |  | [**Minutes**](https://www.europarl.europa.eu/doceo/document/PV-7-2011-05-10-ITM-015_EN.html) |  | |      |  |  |  |  |  |  | | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | | |  | | --- | | MPphoto |  |  | | --- | |  | |  | **President.**− The next item is the Council and Commission statements on migration flows and asylum and their impact on Schengen ([**2011/2689(RSP)**](https://oeil.secure.europarl.europa.eu/oeil/popups/ficheprocedure.do?lang=en&reference=2011/2689(RSP))). |  | |  |  |  | |  | | --- | |  | |      |  |  |  |  |  |  | | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | | |  | | --- | | MPphoto |  |  | | --- | |  | |  | **Enikő Győri,***President-in-Office of the Council.***−** Mr President, the developments in the Southern Neighbourhood and the ensuing migration flows are posing a serious challenge for the European Union. They have served to underscore the importance of looking at the whole issue of how we manage migration and refugee flows.  Therefore the European Council in March called upon the Council and the Commission to submit before the June European Council a plan for the development of capacities to manage migration and refugee flows as a response. The conclusions adopted by the Justice and Home Affairs Council on 11 and 12 April 2011 and the communication issued by the Commission last week are important steps in this direction. The Presidency has convened an extraordinary meeting of the Council on Justice and Home Affairs for 12 May in order to discuss the issue of the management of migration and refugee flows. These discussions will help to prepare for the meeting of the European Council on 21 June which will address the same issues.  We cannot of course stand idle in the face of events on the other side of the Mediterranean. The EU and the Member States are ready to assist both those displaced as a result of the latest developments in North Africa and those Member States most directly concerned. Over the past few months the EU and the Member States have made available approximately EUR 96 million of emergency humanitarian aid and we are committed to continue to provide further support as and when the situation requires.  The Council has also invited all Member States to continue their support for UNHCR, the International Organisation for Migration, the Red Cross and all relevant actors, the efforts of which are paramount in helping those displaced as a consequence of protracted violence in Libya. Those Member States more directly affected by these developments are receiving contributions of funding, equipment and technical expertise; for example the Commission announced earlier that approximately EUR 25 million from emergency funds could be made available for Member States such as Italy and Malta. Furthermore, the newly-created European Asylum Support Office, although still in the process of becoming fully operational, is also available to help. Some Member States, including Hungary, have already said that they are ready to reallocate refugees from Malta in order to alleviate pressure on the authorities there.  Apart from the specific measures intended to address this particular situation, the Council remains fully committed to the further development of the common European asylum system. Work is under way in the Council and Parliament and some progress has been already achieved, despite the technical difficulty and the politically sensitive nature of this subject.  In general the management of migratory flows in the EU and in individual Member States requires the effective management of borders. As far as the management of external borders is concerned, Frontex has an important role to play in a number of ways, including the monitoring of the EU’s external borders and providing operational support.  In the light of the latest developments in North Africa, joint operation Hermes was launched on 20 February 2011 following a request from the Italian Government. This is aimed at preventing and detecting illegal border crossings to Lampedusa, Sicily, Sardinia and the Italian mainland. Frontex is also supporting the Italian authorities in second-line border control activities by the briefing and screening of migrants.  The Council also welcomes the Commission’s decision to mobilise supplementary funds needed by Frontex to continue its planned joint operations. We have urged Member States to provide further human and technical resources as required in support of the agency’s operations, including Hermes.  As you know, the new proposal concerning Frontex is in this House and we have been negotiating it. I very much count on the support of Parliament in bringing this legislative proposal to a conclusion and ensuring the success of the negotiations.  Against the background of the recent migratory pressure from North Africa, the strengthening of Frontex has become a high priority for the Council. I would like to express my thanks to Mr Busuttil and the shadow rapporteurs for their good cooperation and I very much hope, as I have just emphasised, that a first-reading agreement can be achieved by June 2011, as was called for by the European Council in March.  Developments in the southern Mediterranean, in particular in relation to the Tunisian migrants arriving in Lampedusa, have also raised questions about controls at internal borders. This in turn touches on the issue of freedom of movement within the European Union. The Council fully agrees with the view held by almost everyone here that the free movement of persons within the Schengen area is a major achievement. Those Member States that have asked for the revision of the Schengen system have also underlined that they were proposing this with the intention of preserving the free movement of our citizens, which is one of the cornerstones of the Union.  Improving the security and governance of the Schengen area in a time of increased pressure is a means to this end. That said, in the light of the increased pressure on some external borders and the calls from Member States to strengthen the system of the Schengen rules, the Council needs to look into how we can further guarantee the principle of free movement and, at the same time, citizens’ need for maintenance of a high level of internal security.  At the Council meeting on 12 May 2011 the Presidency plans to initiate discussions on the various ideas on the Schengen acquis which have been put forward by the Commission in its communication on migration of 4 May. The Council looks forward in particular to examining the Commission’s suggestions for a mechanism concerning the coordinated and temporary reintroduction of controls as a measure of last resort, based on objective criteria and respecting the Community method. The Council will also have a chance to discuss how to continue work on the revision of the Schengen evaluation mechanism to ensure more efficient and uniform implementation of the aquis.  Of course our immediate priority is to deal with the effects of the dramatic events in the southern Mediterranean, but we also have to draw lessons for the future. In short we need to put in place a strategy for the longer term. Some of the issues which I have set out will help in creating such a strategy, but I look forward to discussions which can lead to a comprehensive approach to migration, fully in line with our global approach to migration.  Along these lines Prime Minister Orbán has recently said that we should clearly differentiate between economic migrants and political refugees. Europe must welcome the latter if she wants to be true to herself. Europe must help, through means similar to a Marshall Plan, the countries of North Africa so as to create liveable conditions there, thus tackling the root causes of migration. That will require not only agreement amongst ourselves, but also consultations with our neighbours and in particular in partnership with the countries of Northern Africa, and it will need to take into account a wide range of factors such as international protection, migration, mobility and security.  To conclude, from a wider perspective, our southern neighbours will be assisted by all available means in their transition to open, democratic and prosperous societies. This is the best possible way of addressing the push factors driving irregular immigrants towards our shores. |  | |  |  |  | |  | | --- | |  | |      |  |  |  |  |  |  | | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | | |  | | --- | | MPphoto |  |  | | --- | |  | |  | **José Manuel Barroso,***President of the Commission.***−** Mr President, today we are here to debate migration and cross-border movement of European citizens, but let me start by reminding all of us that yesterday was the 61st anniversary of the Schuman Declaration, which laid the foundations of the European Union, and from that day began a process in which European people have been willing to come together and put aside their differences, to build a European continent without borders, where our citizens can move freely between countries.  For regions like the one where we are now, here in Strasbourg and in Alsace generally, living on a frontier no longer equates with being restricted by borders, and the benefits extend far beyond these border regions. For the vast majority of European citizens, the right to move freely is the embodiment of the European project and one of the most tangible results of the European Union, and I am pleased to say that most Europeans use their right to the full – people make around 1.25 billion journeys as tourists within the European Union countries every year.  That would be completely impossible without the European Union. I still remember when we had to overcome many difficulties in order to travel from my country, Portugal, to Spain. So it is indeed a great mark of the progress of civilisation that countries are able to lower barriers at their borders and let citizens move freely.  Moreover, in terms of the economy too, free movement is central to the success of the Single Market and Europe’s continued efforts to boost growth and jobs. To put it plainly, free movement is to Europe what foundations are to buildings. Remove it and the whole structure is undermined.  Last week, the Commission presented a communication on a more structured approach to migration, referring, inter alia, to a proposal on a reinforced Schengen governance system. Other proposals will follow in the coming weeks, and here I want to praise the work of Commissioner Malmström who, with great intelligence and sensitivity, is doing her best to find the right approach to this complex matter.  Let me concentrate on the governance of Schengen because I understand that this is the most important concern here in Parliament. Of course there are many other proposals, on the reinforcement of Frontex and on a common European asylum system, for example, but I hope we will have other occasions to discuss such issues in greater depth.  Last year, the Commission put forward proposals to preserve and strengthen the Schengen evaluation mechanism as a central element in the acquis of our common project, and I want to emphasise that last year – i.e. well before the recent developments – the Commission had already identified some problems in the governance of Schengen. We will now update and complete these proposals and we will do all we can to achieve swift results.  The current migration situation in the Mediterranean and the resulting pressures have highlighted some weaknesses and uncoordinated reactions by Member States in the management of Schengen. In the wake of these exceptional circumstances, we urgently need to reinforce the governance of Schengen and of the external borders. We need better coordination between the Commission and Member States and, above all, between Member States themselves.  While recent events have provided a spark of urgency in bringing this matter to the table, the Commission is taking this opportunity, through the communication, to address the long-standing underlying inconsistencies and unresolved issues that have provided scope for some Member States to act unilaterally and not necessarily with a European Union perspective. It is time to nip this tendency in the bud: to stop it *ab ovo*.  The Commission has already taken short-term measures to deal with the situation in the Mediterranean. In addition, the package we put forward last week urges rational reflection, taking into account short-term needs for strengthened external borders as well as a broader approach to asylum and migration. These issues must also be considered in the light of our neighbourhood policy, trade with North Africa and support for democratisation, as well as Europe’s own long-term labour shortages and efforts to boost European competitiveness.  This is not a knee-jerk reaction. This is not improvisation. This is and must be a broad range of measures built on the foundations of a strong and successful European policy, defining the best interests of the European Union and its citizens now and into the future.  At the same time, the aim is to give relief to those Member States who are trying to cope with an unfair share of the migration burden. When thousands of people arrive on the shores of one country, it is not because they dream of living in Malta or Lampedusa; it is because they are seeking a better life in Europe. Countries that are more directly exposed to massive migrant inflows cannot be expected to deal with them alone. The rules on free movement of citizens benefit all countries in the European Union. It is the duty of all countries to support those countries that come under particular pressure at one time or another. This means that burdens have to be shared equitably. It also means that all Member States need to take their responsibilities seriously.  When looking at burden sharing, all the pressures and all the contributions need to be taken into account, and this is the very spirit of the European Union: the management of crisis by solidarity and responsibility. Solidarity and responsibility are the key words in our response. Immigration is a European challenge. Immigration requires a European response.  That is why the Commission’s proposal aims to take Union governance of the Schengen system a step further, showing that there can be solidarity between Member States. This is about common governance, not unilateral moves. I emphasise once again that this is part of an overall approach. The strengthening of Frontex and the move to a common European asylum system are also aspects of such an approach.  Allow me to make one point crystal clear: this is not about finding ways for Member States to reintroduce border controls. I firmly believe that to do so would not only catastrophically undermine what Europe has constructed over the past 61 years, but also sabotage the viability of our efforts to build a prosperous and integrated Europe for the future.  Moreover, Member States already have the right to exercise this option unilaterally under the existing Schengen system. That right has been exercised in the past to help Member States cope with specific short-term exceptional circumstances, for example in the wake of terrorist attacks or in relation to the movement of drugs.  These exceptions should remain exceptions, for I cannot emphasise strongly enough that reintroducing border controls is not a desirable development for Europe, neither in the current circumstances nor in relation to the future challenges that we will face sooner or later. They should be an absolute last resort.  Moreover, we all know that internal controls can be sporadically useful but they are not part of a constructive approach to European integration, nor do they represent a cost-efficient long-term solution to monitoring movement and coping with immigration pressure. This has always been the case. The fact is that when faced with a massive arrival of migrants no Member State will ultimately be in a better position if it tries to deal with them alone. Only if Member States face the situation together, can a lasting solution be found.  The proposals we put forward one year ago to strengthen Schengen, through an evaluation mechanism and intensified coordination of border surveillance, will help create a sense of Union-wide discipline and shared guidance in the system. They will ensure that, in the future, countries will not feel pressured to take decisions alone that affect all Schengen signatories.  This is not, I emphasise, a new policy that undermines the Union. It is a chance to strengthen it – a step forward for joint European governance, not a step back. It is the intention to reinforce the Schengen acquis, not to depart from the Schengen acquis. We cannot be blind to the fact that recent events have revealed a problem in Schengen governance which we have to solve. If we do not reinforce existing mechanisms, Member States will continue to act alone. They will, in fact, be encouraged to act alone. We will be giving arguments to the populists, the extremists and, in some cases, the xenophobes who want to call into question the great acquis communautaire in this area. This is why we think the best way to avoid putting Schengen at risk is precisely to reinforce the rules of governance of Schengen and clarify some of its aspects.  This is not, I insist, about caving in to pressure from any part of Europe. By enhancing our capacity to deal with crisis situations, it will put a more robust governance system in place that will equip decision-makers with better tools to resist populist or extremist pressure in the future.  It is not a proposal intended simply to deal with short-term events, but there can only be real confidence in long-term solutions if we show that we can effectively address the short-term issues as well. It is not about turning back time: it is about getting the governance right today for the challenges Europe will surely face tomorrow. It is not about abandoning citizens’ rights of free movement. It is about valuing their integrity by strengthening the rules.  I am confident that this House will support our approach and our efforts. We are united in our determination to uphold the principles on which our Union is founded, against any populist temptation. We know that it is now fashionable in some quarters to be extremist or populist, or indeed sometimes to wave the flags of xenophobia. This is not what we are going to do. We will resist all these kinds of pressure, but to succeed in this we need to give citizens the confidence that we stand firm on two things: first on correcting the shortcomings of the existing system so that effective relief can be brought to situations of pressure and crisis; and, second, on ensuring, on this basis, full respect for human rights and the humanitarian principles on which our Union is founded. The people are ready to exercise solidarity, internally and externally, if they are confident that their security concerns are addressed decisively and comprehensively.  I count on the support of this House in calling on the Member States to take the necessary decisions quickly. Our proposals are on the table. Now is not a time to wait: it is a time to act, so that an open European Union comes out of this challenge, united and stronger. |  | |  |  |  | |  | | --- | |  | |      |  |  |  |  |  |  | | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | | |  | | --- | | MPphoto |  |  | | --- | |  | |  | **Manfred Weber,***on behalf of the PPE Group*. – *(DE)* Mr President, President-in-Office of the Council, President of the Commission, as has already been emphasised, Schengen is one of the great achievements of our common European project. Citizens notice it on a daily basis when travelling around Europe. It is the realisation of the dream of Europe – a Europe without border controls. It must therefore first be made clear in this debate – particularly in view of the debate that has taken place in recent weeks – that we in this House will jointly ensure that this principle and the idea behind it are not derailed by any initiative or any debate. We will defend this principle in the European Parliament.  In recent weeks there have been discussions concerning more than 25 000 refugees from Tunisia who have arrived in the Italian territory of Lampedusa. Yet a country such as Sweden has been accepting more than 25 000 people a year for years on end. There have been states that have accommodated much greater numbers of people relative to their own population that is currently happening on the southern border of Europe, yet nobody has ever thought of questioning Schengen because of the burden. I would therefore like to clearly stress at this stage that it is a pity that we seriously need to have a debate in Europe, of all places, on Schengen status as a result of this challenge that we must deal with together.  Secondly, I should like to make it clear that we practise solidarity. When it comes to countries such as Malta – a small country that is massively affected and which has no hinterland – then we are currently practising solidarity. In addition to this solidarity, however, I should like to stress that the second basic principle is the responsibility that the countries themselves have. I must therefore also ask the Commission to look more into this. If courts in the European Union are now ruling that Dublin II is to be ineffective – in other words, that refugees are not to be deported to their states of first arrival – then we must ask the Commission how committed it will be to taking action against those states that are obviously not currently implementing the existing law. We are talking here about minimum standards in the European Union. I am therefore calling on the Commission to take action here, too.  As regards the preparation for the Council, I have just three points to make. The first is that when it comes to migration then naturally we must expect more migration in the long term as a result of demographic change, but here in the European Union we currently have 24 million people without work and in Spain the youth unemployment rate is 30%. We should therefore proceed cautiously – very cautiously – when it comes to the issue of migration. My second point concerns strengthening Frontex, as has already been mentioned.  My third point is that I would ask us all to ensure that those states that were about to join Schengen, namely Bulgaria and Rumania, are not left behind because of the current debate. They have done the work; they have made efforts. We are not asking for lower standards for joining, but if they meet the standards then it is only fair that Bulgaria and Rumania also have the right to become members of the Schengen area. |  | |  |  |  | |  | | --- | |  | |      |  |  |  |  |  |  | | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | | |  | | --- | | MPphoto |  |  | | --- | |  | |  | **Martin Schulz,***on behalf of the S&D Group*. – *(DE)* Mr President, I do not share the opinion that the Commission’s communication is a good one. I am very sorry, but I do not think it is. I think it is over the top and misguided.  We are not dealing here with a crisis in the European Union. When 400 000 people travel from Libya to Tunisia, that is a crisis for Tunisia. When 20 000 people cross the Mediterranean to Europe, that is not a crisis for Europe.  *(Applause)*  If the burden were sensibly spread across Europe then there would not be a problem at all. You gave the figures, Mr Weber. Nobody has got worked up over figures of such magnitude.  I therefore do not believe that what you have presented is good, Mrs Malmström, because you have failed to quote Article 78(3) of the Treaty on the Functioning of the European Union (TFEU). I do not know whether you are familiar with it. Article 78(3) of TFEU states that in the event of one or more Member States being confronted by a sudden inflow of nationals of third countries, the Council, on a proposal from the Commission, may adopt provisional measures for the benefit of the Member State(s) concerned – after consulting the European Parliament, by the way. That is what Article 78(3) of the current Treaty says.  By the way, temporary border controls were introduced on the basis of the Schengen regime of 2006 for the European Football Championship and for the football World Cup as a defence against hooliganism. There is no need whatsoever to give support to a populist initiative by two heads of government – who have their backs against the wall in their countries and are looking for an escape route by populist means – by tabling such a communication.  *(Applause)*  Then what happened, President of the Commission? A Northern League interior minister in Italy says: Tunisians all speak French; that is good – it means we can give them Schengen residence permits and they can all head off to France. The French President then naturally asks whether they have a screw loose. All the Tunisians coming to Italy now want to go to France? You want to shove them onto us? In that case, we will close the border. At that, Prime Minister Berlusconi and the French President join forces to say that now we need border controls again because of the situation that we ourselves have brought about. What does the Commission then do? It tables a communication, instead of saying: ‘People, that is absolutely the wrong road to go down. You cannot deprive the citizens of Europe of one of their fundamental freedoms in such a way.’ That is what I would have expected of you.  *(Applause)*  We are losing the European spirit. How can it in fact be the case that in this Union – in which one of our greatest achievements as regards fundamental freedoms is the freedom of movement of our citizens – suddenly two heads of government can simply arbitrarily render ineffective one of our really great achievements – that was an excellent phrase you used in your speech – because of a marginal problem that can easily be managed? How can that be possible? All that is needed for these people to win is for us not to fight sufficiently against it. I would therefore have liked to see you fight it.  *(The President interrupted the speaker)*  I would just like to say one thing to you: I live on a border, in my case the German-Dutch-Belgian border between Aachen, Maastricht and Lüttich. If you can explain to me, Mrs Malmström, how the migration problem in the Mediterranean is going to be managed by my having to show my passport the next time I travel from Aachen to Maastricht – if you can explain that to me, please – then I would be very grateful. |  | |  |  |  | |  | | --- | |  | |      |  |  |  |  |  |  | | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | | |  | | --- | | MPphoto |  |  | | --- | |  | |  | **Guy Verhofstadt,***on behalf of the ALDE Group.***–** Mr President, let us be very open and blunt about this: what we have seen in recent weeks on this issue has been shameful – Italy issuing temporary residence permits to refugees from Tunisia, then France reacting by reintroducing internal border checks, as if the European Union had suddenly ceased to exist.  Let us be very open and call this by its name: it was a ping-pong game by two governments, and by Berlusconi and Sarkozy, on the back of refugees who are, in fact, in trouble. That is what has been happening and, in my opinion, it has been disastrous not only for Schengen but also for the European Union and its image because the reintroduction of internal border checks contradicts the whole essence of the Union and the basic principles of the Treaty. That point has been made several times here and Mr Barroso has also made it.  Moreover, what occurred was absolutely out of proportion. I would not go so far as to echo Mr Schulz in calling this a marginal problem – 27 000 Tunisians do not constitute a marginal problem – but he is right to say that, by comparison with, for example, the 350 000 people who fled from Kosovo during the Kosovo war, we are clearly not talking about a migration tsunami.  And so we come to the problem: the communication from the Commission. In my opinion, it was not very clear. The communication states that, as a last resort in truly critical situations, a mechanism may need to be introduced – and, as I read it, that means a new mechanism – allowing for a coordinated and temporary reintroduction of controls.  That is the problem with the whole communication because, if this means that the Commission is proposing an additional possibility for the reintroduction of border controls, not provided for in the existing Schengen acquis, I can tell you that our Group will fight such a proposal with all available means, and I hope the entire Parliament will do likewise.  If, on the contrary, the sentence in question means that the Commission wants to restrict the current provision, then that has been foreseen: national security and public order are the two elements covered by the existing Schengen acquis.  If the intended meaning is that the Commission wants to restrict the current provision allowing Member States to reintroduce border controls, then, Mr Barroso, you can have 100% support from our Group.  So, what I am asking of Ms Malmström and Mr Barroso is a rewriting of the communication and specifically of the sentence which states that a new mechanism shall be introduced for the reintroduction of border checks. All they need to do is to state that they will strengthen the existing provision in the Schengen acquis. |  | |  |  |  | |  | | --- | |  | |      |  |  |  |  |  |  | | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | | |  | | --- | | MPphoto |  |  | | --- | |  | |  | **Timothy Kirkhope,***on behalf of the ECR Group.***–** Mr President, my Group and I welcome this opportunity to debate the issues and problems which Europe faces in the area of migration and the Schengen system. The debate is long overdue. Now is the time to focus not only on providing free movement, but also on better guarding the borders of Member States and the EU itself. Rather than pushing for more legislation in the area of immigration and migration, we should be making the legislation that we already have work better and harder for all the citizens of the Union. However, current concerns from Member States are not reactionary, but instead the inevitable consequence of over 20 years of ever-changing circumstances in Europe and around the world.  There is no doubt that Schengen has been a success in many ways, but Europe is facing challenges which simply did not exist to the current extent when the system was first created. Large-scale unemployment, migration from North Africa, terrorism, organised crime and people-trafficking have provided us with problems far more complex than those envisaged in the policies for free movement of European citizens. It is not an unfair assessment to say that the current system is now shown to be flawed and ill-equipped for the new circumstances we find ourselves in. We need to create an effective tool representative of the modern needs of Europe’s Member States and able to improve the situation for all.  This needs to be complemented by renewed strength in making sure the other agencies of the EU, like Frontex, are there to support states in securing their own EU external borders, and that the problems are not exacerbated by further countries which may join the EU and therefore the Schengen area that are both ill-prepared to face the challenges and also to assume the burdens that accompany the obvious benefits.  This is a problem best solved through communication and cooperation, but Europe’s immigration and Schengen policies urgently require review, reflection and then sensible reform. |  | |  |  |  | |  | | --- | |  | |      |  |  |  |  |  |  | | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | | |  | | --- | | MPphoto |  |  | | --- | |  | |  | **Daniel Cohn-Bendit,***on behalf of the Verts/ALE Group.* – *(FR*) Mr President, Commissioners, ladies and gentlemen, there is something I do not understand. We are told that 25 000 Tunisians are arriving in Europe and people are talking about a lack of security. What lack of security? Let us not forget that extraordinary events have been taking place in Tunisia and Egypt, and that a war is going on in Libya. May I remind you that during the war in Bosnia temporary residency permits were issued while the war lasted. Germany took in several hundreds of thousands of people. This happened and Germany is still standing. It has not gone under as yet. All this talk of a sinking ship is just propaganda.  Added to this, we are now hearing talk of criminals and mafia. As if criminals and mafia were landing in Lampedusa! Criminals do not need to come through Lampedusa. They come in the usual way. We do not see them, but they are here in our countries. So stop making such a fuss.  The problem is quite straightforward: people are fleeing from North Africa. So let us share out the support for them in Europe. Surely you are not going to tell me that 25 000 people among 400 million is a big problem? Let me tell you something. This is close to me, because how many Jews did we turn away? The English did it, the Americans did, all the countries did it when the Jews were leaving, because people said there were too many Jews. This was in 1939–1940. It was Europe that was like this. England was like this: it turned Jews away. The United States turned them away. The ship was called the *Saint Louis*. It sickens me that every time people are in difficulty, it is seen that they are the problem. They are not the problem: it is us and our inability to show solidarity and our inability to be open.  *(Applause)*  Commissioners, President-in-Office of the Council, are you aware of what happened in Paris? In Paris, some young Tunisians who had an Italian residency permit heard the French police say to them: ‘This is what we are going to do with your permits’, before tearing them up in front of them. This is European law today: a national police force that tells people who have a residency permit issued by Italy: ‘Mr Sarkozy has decided they do not count’. If this is the state of the law in Europe, I say something has gone wrong, and that is why I am asking you now to stop telling us that the problems in North Africa represent a security problem. The problem in North Africa and the problem of the war in Libya are causing a problem of insecurity for the people living there.  So let us distribute the refugees between us. Let us empower them by giving them temporary permits until things have calmed down, and let these permits be Europe-wide. I think that by accepting this debate on Schengen today and by accepting populist pressure and racism, any border controls will be based on people’s faces. Mr Schulz, did anyone stop you? No. Mr Verhofstadt, did anyone stop you? No. They did not stop me either. But anyone who is brown-skinned, anyone who is different will be stopped and checked. We will create an *à la carte* Europe. Whites are allowed in, brown-skinned people are not! That is the kind of Europe we want to fight against.  *(Applause)* |  | |  |  |  | |  | | --- | |  | |      |  |  |  |  |  |  | | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | | |  | | --- | | MPphoto |  |  | | --- | |  | |  | **Rui Tavares,** *on behalf of the GUE/NGL Group*. – *(PT)*Mr President, exactly one year ago, we voted in this Parliament on our part of the codecision on resettling refugees, and in that codecision we had an emergency mechanism to be used in the case of any refugees who found themselves under armed attack or were the victims of natural disasters.  One year on, this codecision has not been concluded by the Council and my work as rapporteur on the resettlement of refugees has now become the job of finding support for this co-decision. We had 600 votes in favour, only for it to become a task that was at first frustrating and depressing, and is now desperate.  My job as rapporteur on the resettlement of refugees cannot be to report, like last month, that have 150 people died off the coat of Lampedusa and now to learn of 600 who have disappeared and more than 60 who died in view of ships from the North Atlantic Treaty Organisation (NATO) ships and European navies. That cannot be what my job is about.  The Council has to conclude this codecision, because there is a great deal to do to resettle refugees. Right now, we can call on Baroness Ashton to say that we need to open a humanitarian corridor to bring out 8 000 who are still in Tripoli. There are 8 000 who have United Nations High Commission for Refugees (UNHCR) identity cards; not very many.  NATO ships need to be told to apply the 1973 Resolution, which says to protect civilians. That means the same in Benghazi, Misrata and the Mediterranean: it means saving those who are shipwrecked.  In relation to Schengen, I want to say one thing. The response to *ad hoc*, unilateral suspensions of Schengen can never be a systemic suspension of Schengen by the Union. This is not a case of completely killing off the idea. It is a case of sticking to the idea and applying it universally. It cannot be. For a start, it has to be a case of applying resources to resettling refugees. Do you know how much money the Member States of the European Union made, just from the sale of arms to Libya in 2009? EUR 343 million. Do you know how much we have in the European Refugee Fund (ERF)? EUR 100 million. We would be delighted if the ERF contained as much as we earned in just one year from the sale of arms.  Hungary, which was the first country in the world to be the subject of a coordinated action to resettle its refugees in 1956, has very particular responsibilities – historical responsibilities – to act on this refugee crisis as well. We cannot complain of a lack of funds in this area. |  | |  |  |  | |  | | --- | |  | |      |  |  |  |  |  |  | | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | | |  | | --- | | MPphoto |  |  | | --- | |  | |  | **Nigel Farage,***on behalf of the EFD Group.***–** Mr President, yesterday indeed was Europe Day and in the courtyard here we had armed soldiers, we had the Luftwaffe band and imperial eagles, we had the flag being paraded, being raised, the European anthem; it was the display of militarism and EU nationalism.  I thought and hoped it was all just a bad dream, but today we have got you, Mr Barroso. You begin of course by reiterating the fact that the free movement of peoples is the embodiment of the European project. You then go on to say that it is the duty of Member States to share the burdens of migratory flows into Europe. You advocate a common EU immigration policy, but of course you know that you are losing because the row that has blown up between Italy and France shows that when there is a crisis, between the theory of European integration and the practicality of nation state, it is the nation state that wins.  So you are worried that you are losing and, in your defence of your position, in your defence of your beloved acquis communautaire, your body of law, you resort to intolerance, you resort to nationalism, you make me realise that what I saw yesterday was actually for real.  You attack those who want to control their own border policies. You attack them today as xenophobes. You attack them as extremists, but worst of all, oh worst of all, you attack them three times for being populists. Is that not a dreadful thing? The power of the ballot box. When people dare to vote no in referendums, they are populists; when they want to control their own borders, they are populists. I put it to you that populists are actually democrats and you abuse those who want to fly the flag of populism.  Well, here it is, Mr Barroso. Here it is.  *(Mr Farage, Mr Agnew and Mr Bloom held up small Union Jacks)*  That flag has represented liberal democracy far more than any other Member State of this European Union and it will go on long after your star-spangled banner has disappeared. |  | |  |  |  | |  | | --- | |  | |      |  |  |  |  |  |  | | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | | |  | | --- | | MPphoto |  |  | | --- | |  | |  | **Philip Claeys (NI). -***(NL)* Mr President, although Schengen stipulates that checks on the EU’s internal borders must be removed, it also stipulates that we have to monitor our external borders. The problem is that this Treaty is not being complied with, because our external borders are not being effectively monitored. Therefore, 16 years after the introduction of Schengen, we should have the courage to recognise that the Treaty has not worked. We should also have the courage to admit that the EU has not provided a solution and that, instead, it has itself become part of the problem. Member States must therefore once again be given the possibility of protecting their borders without EU interference.  We urgently need more measures. Frontex, for example, should send back ships carrying bogus refugees to their countries of origin instead of playing the role of a sort of benevolent welcome committee. We must crack down on human trafficking networks. Member States should stop rewarding illegal foreigners with residence permits. Active steps should be taken to repatriate illegal refugees and political refugees whose applications have been rejected. If none of that happens, I guarantee you that that will be the end of Schengen, which would, actually, not be such a bad thing.  Mr President, I would also like to protest against the language being used here, against terms of abuse such as ‘populists’, ‘extremists’ and the like, for people who simply want to protect the borders of their country. We need to put a stop to that. It is not right. We must also admit that the rules need to be applied; is it not strange that, while we are refusing to discuss the application of the rules, we *are* allowing some people to call others names? |  | |  |  |  | |  | | --- | |  | |      |  |  |  |  |  |  | | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | | |  | | --- | | MPphoto |  |  | | --- | |  | |  | **Simon Busuttil (PPE). -** Mr President, the Schengen zone is indeed a very important and visible achievement for European citizens and the message is coming out clearly from this Chamber today that we need to fight together not just to preserve it, but to strengthen it further. We rely on the European Commission to achieve that and the European Parliament will be behind the Commission in strengthening Schengen, but if there are two lessons that we have learnt in respect of what happened in recent weeks they are these.  First of all, the internal borders within Schengen depend on a common strategy, a common concern about our external borders. If our external borders are weak then we will have problems on our internal borders and we need to look at that. Italy felt under pressure with 25 000 people; it gave them a temporary permit, they moved to France. France felt under pressure and it re-erected national borders. So the pressure went onto the internal borders and therefore the external borders are a common concern.  Secondly, Schengen needs solidarity and solidarity is also about sharing the responsibility – burden-sharing – and sharing responsibility is also relative to the size of the Member State. On the current system, people who arrive in one country remain in the country where they arrive because our laws, including the Dublin Regulation, ensure that they have to remain in the first country of arrival. This clearly needs to change because it is no longer tenable. One thousand people arriving in the smallest Member State, my country Malta, are equivalent, population-wise, to over one million people arriving in the entire European Union. So yes, 25 000 people are nothing, they are a drop in the ocean for the entire Union but 1000 people arriving in the southernmost Member State are a lot. We need therefore to link Schengen with solidarity; Schengen needs solidarity.  *(The speaker agreed to take a blue-card question under Rule 149(8))* |  | |  |  |  | |  | | --- | |  | |      |  |  |  |  |  |  | | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | | |  | | --- | | MPphoto |  |  | | --- | |  | |  | **William (The Earl of) Dartmouth (EFD). -** Mr President, the speaker talked of strengthening Schengen. Does that include strengthening Schengen’s borders and, in particular, the borders between Greece and Turkey? |  | |  |  |  | |  | | --- | |  | |      |  |  |  |  |  |  | | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | | |  | | --- | | MPphoto |  |  | | --- | |  | |  | **Simon Busuttil (PPE). -** Mr President, I thank the Member for his question.  One of the conditions for joining the Schengen zone is, indeed, strengthening external borders. Precisely because they are a common concern, it is the responsibility of all the Member States to ensure that the external borders are strong.  Once you fulfil those conditions, then you can join Schengen. This is precisely what countries such as Bulgaria and Romania have done, and it is precisely why we have helped Greece, by means of a Frontex mission there on the Turkish-Greek border.  So, yes, this goes to show that strengthening external borders is also a common concern. |  | |  |  |  | |  | | --- | |  | |      |  |  |  |  |  |  | | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | | |  | | --- | | MPphoto |  |  | | --- | |  | |  | **Juan Fernando López Aguilar (S&D).** – *(ES)* Mr President, it is true that yesterday, 9 May, we commemorated the moment that the European Union was founded, which showed us that Europe would be built with small steps and not once and for all, or for evermore: in other words, that Europe is not built definitively or irreversibly, and that our day-to-day work must be to preserve each of its achievements.  Schengen is an area of free movement of people, but it is also a symbol of the best that Europe has done in the last 20 years and, therefore, of the best Europe.  Presenting the 25 000 immigrants who have arrived on this side of the Mediterranean as an unbearable burden sends the wrong sort of message: Germany has demonstrated that they are not; the Canary Islands and Spain have demonstrated that 30 000 arrivals per year from the African coasts were not an unbearable burden for the European Union.  The response cannot, therefore, be to use this migration flow to question Schengen. Quite the contrary: instead it must be used to demonstrate that what still remains to be done is not correcting weaknesses caused by Schengen’s excesses, but rather strengthening Schengen. Schengen can be strengthened by completing the solidarity clause provided for in the area of freedom, security and justice, pursuant to the Treaty of Lisbon; by completing the asylum package, whose processing still remains outstanding; and by permanently establishing the second-generation Schengen Information System (SIS II) and the verification mechanism, as stipulated in the conditions of entry to the area of free movement and as Parliament has voted in favour of Romania and Bulgaria doing. These countries have the right to become part of the area of free movement.  However, what needs to be done above all is for the European Parliament to stake its claim to competence to decide on the issue alongside the Council. I would therefore remind you that the proposal that the procedure invoke the legal basis of Article 70, which excludes Parliament, is unacceptable: we demand Article 77.  A final thought, Mr President: populism is being mentioned, because populism is not combated by imitating its half-hearted solutions but, quite the contrary, by confronting it with solutions for the future and not the past. |  | |  |  |  | |  | | --- | |  | |      |  |  |  |  |  |  | | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | | |  | | --- | | MPphoto |  |  | | --- | |  | |  | **Renate Weber (ALDE). -** Mr President, Mr Verhofstadt asked the Commission to rewrite the communication but I wonder if, before it is rewritten, we could get a clear answer today as to whether or not you are aiming to improve the current existing system, to temporarily close borders, or to add something to the existing system. That would be a good way of solving at least one of our questions.  Having said this, it is fair to say that we concur with the Commission’s aim of improving Schengen governance by reviewing the evaluation mechanism on the basis of a Community approach. Parliament shares this view and, in this context, I have to say that we are deeply disappointed by the Council’s approach.  In fact what the Council wants to do is simply to isolate the Parliament. I really wonder why the Council almost constantly seeks to undermine the great achievement that is the codecision role of the European Parliament. We represent European citizens, and we should all work to serve European citizens. Perhaps the Council should also understand its role as an EU institution rather than a mere gathering of 27 Member States.  The truth is that the answer to this migration flow, whether or not it is due to what has happened in North Africa and the Southern Mediterranean, is to come up with legislation involving a common policy on asylum and migration, which Parliament has worked on and which is being blocked in the Council. |  | |  |  |  | |  | | --- | |  | |      |  |  |  |  |  |  | | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | | |  | | --- | | MPphoto |  |  | | --- | |  | |  | **Konrad Szymański (ECR).** – *(PL)* Mr President, in spite of the fact that I live a relatively long way away, in Poland, I feel that I understand entirely the concerns provoked by uncontrolled immigration into France or Italy. Immigration from North Africa quite naturally exacerbates cultural and social tensions, and intensifies pressure on the social budgets of the Member States. We therefore have a lot to discuss, and we should not try to ignore the matter. French, Italian and Maltese citizens are today faced with the highest bills on account of the fact that controls along the European Union’s external borders are simply not working. The European nations are also footing the bill for our failed efforts to halt immigration into Europe.  I have only one request. I would like the changes to the Schengen Code not to be used as a pretext for limiting the freedom of movement of citizens of the European Union’s Member States. Such proposals have been made for many years in respect of the Polish-German border, to the disadvantage of Polish citizens. It will be easier to reach an agreement if we have a full guarantee that changes to the Schengen Code will not affect the citizens of the Member States. |  | |  |  |  | |  | | --- | |  | |      |  |  |  |  |  |  | | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | | |  | | --- | | MPphoto |  |  | | --- | |  | |  | **Marie-Christine Vergiat (GUE/NGL).** – *(FR)* Mr President, this debate beggars belief. We are being asked to review the freedom of movement of people in Europe and to reinstate national borders in order to cope with the influx of migrants that has supposedly been overwhelming Europe since the revolution in Tunisia.  If the consequences of this posturing were not so drastic and far-removed from reality, they would be laughable. Since the beginning of 2011, over 1 150 people have died in the Mediterranean and 23 000 people have arrived in Italy. Meanwhile, more than 700 000 people have fled Libya and sought refuge in neighbouring countries and have found a different kind of welcome there than the kind they would have received in Europe.  Mr Sarkozy and Mr Berlusconi are putting short-term electoral interests first, by fearmongering and making people believe there is an invasion going on. What nonsense! When will Europe stop saying one thing and doing another? What suggestions are people putting forward today, apart from just words, giving in to populist pressure, reinforcing Frontex yet again and turning Europe into a fortress? Borders have never stopped anyone, either during the darker days of our history or today. Do we not have any other message to pass on to the emerging democracies on the other side of the Mediterranean?  The Union reached out to the dictators for years, in contempt of its own values. Is it not time that it opened its eyes? I for one think it is.  *(Applause)* |  | |  |  |  | |  | | --- | |  | |      |  |  |  |  |  |  | | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | | |  | | --- | | MPphoto |  |  | | --- | |  | |  | **Daniël van der Stoep (NI). -***(NL)* Mr President, I believe that Mr Borghezio, of the Europe of Freedom and Democracy Group, is next in line to speak. |  | |  |  |  | |  | | --- | |  | |      |  |  |  |  |  |  | | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | | |  | | --- | | MPphoto |  |  | | --- | |  | |  | **Mario Borghezio (EFD).** – *(IT)* Mr President, ladies and gentlemen, this issue has the merit of having brought great hypocrisy to light.  The only government within the European Union that has an interior minister from a party which you define as populist is the one that has had the courage to implement the most humanitarian measure: giving 25 000 Tunisian people permission to move freely. This is because we saw in the flesh that they were not 25 000 criminals, but people who had fled Tunisia. It was an emergency, we had to face it with common sense and we have tried to help.  This shows a truth, namely that in many situations the real ‘goodies’ are us, the ‘baddies’. We who affirm the need to control immigration and external borders, continue to beg Europe – as Mr Cohn-Bendit has rightly done – to spread what might become 50 000 or 100 000 refugees across its territory, because the people who flee Libya are not criminals.  These are the clear words of a movement which defends territory and identity, which is against immigration because it does not want people to be uprooted, and which condemns racism and xenophobia but also hypocrisy. |  | |  |  |  | |  | | --- | |  | |      |  |  |  |  |  |  | | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | | |  | | --- | | MPphoto |  |  | | --- | |  | |  | **Daniël van der Stoep (NI). -***(NL)* Mr President, we have a single European asylum and migration policy, one and the same awful policy for the whole of the EU. The recent disastrous stream of migrants from North Africa and the trouble we have been having with the failing Schengen Treaty indicate that asylum and migration policy should be handed back to Member States. One Member State is not the same as another, it is as simple as that. That is why a single, common European policy will not work.  Mr President, Commissioner Malmström’s proposal concerning Schengen is a downright pathetic move. It is bonkers of her to decide that Member States should not be allowed to make up their own minds on whether or not to introduce border checks and, if necessary, close their borders. Member States are having trouble with tens of thousands of underprivileged migrants from North Africa, but Commissioner Malmström is preventing them from doing anything about it. We still have boatloads of fortune-seeking migrants reaching Lampedusa. The evil of migration continues its insidious spread. But no, if you ask Commissioner Malmström, she will tell you that Member States are not allowed to fight back. Instead, she gives us some claptrap about solidarity.  Mr President, Member States are unfortunately no longer the masters in their own homes. Europe is the master. Member States want those powers back. Member States must, once again, be able to set their own asylum and immigration policies. What is the Commission going to do about this? |  | |  |  |  | |  | | --- | |  | |      |  |  |  |  |  |  | | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | | |  | | --- | | MPphoto |  |  | | --- | |  | |  | **Carlos Coelho (PPE).** – *(PT)*Mr President, ladies and gentlemen, I would like to start by telling Commissioner Malmström that I agree with the deserved praise given to her by President Barroso for the work that she is doing in this area.  The fact that we are experiencing a difficult period with regard to migration pressures cannot be an excuse for weakening one of the major achievements of European integration: namely, the Schengen area.  Schengen is synonymous with freedom of movement, and this reality cannot and must not be reversed, but must be protected, strengthened and developed. I also agree that proper control of external borders is essential. If this does not happen, the security of the Schengen area is weakened, the credibility of the European Union is undermined and mutual trust is destroyed.  Therefore, I welcome the recognition made by the European Commission, in its communication of last week, of the importance of the Schengen area, and of the challenge of strengthening and developing it. I also agree with President Barroso that there is a need for greater solidarity and sharing of responsibilities between the Member States. The problem does not lie in the Schengen rules, but in the way in which the Member States apply the rules without responsibility or solidarity.  Therefore, we require a real mechanism for evaluating Schengen. This Parliament is prepared to work in good faith to create this mechanism: a mechanism that does not apply double standards; in other words, that is not more demanding of candidate countries than of those that are already members of the club.  However, I am concerned, Commissioner. I am concerned about the silence of the Presidency of the Council at the start of this debate concerning this mechanism, and I am also concerned about the Council’s year-long silence concerning the mechanism for resettling refugees, as already mentioned by Mr Tavares. Of the three institutions, the one that is not making good progress in this area is the Council, and it should get back on track as quickly as possible. |  | |  |  |  | |  | | --- | |  | |      |  |  |  |  |  |  | | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | | |  | | --- | | MPphoto |  |  | | --- | |  | |  | **Judith Sargentini (Verts/ALE),***a blue-card question for Mr van der Stoep*. **–***(NL)* Mr President, I would like to ask Mr van der Stoep the following question: if border checks were to be reintroduced, what would Mr van der Stoep say to the Dutch holidaymakers returning from a fortnight’s holiday in France who want to cross the border between Antwerp and Hazeldonk and who, on their way home, end up in a mile-long tailback, the same tailback as the lorry drivers on their way to the Port of Rotterdam to unload their cargo? |  | |  |  |  | |  | | --- | |  | |      |  |  |  |  |  |  | | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | | |  | | --- | | MPphoto |  |  | | --- | |  | |  | **Daniël van der Stoep (NI). -***(NL)* Mr President, Mrs Sargentini knows very well that we are absolutely against new customs gates being set up; from 1992, when our borders were opened, to last year’s common asylum and migration policy, everything worked absolutely fine. However, at a certain moment, we crossed a line ourselves and what you seem to have overlooked is the fact that there are now 25,000 economic refugees in Italy who are going to be given visas. These are economic refugees and they should be sent back to their countries as soon as possible. They should not even have been permitted to apply for a visa. The Dutch Party for Freedom (PVV) has always been clear on this: we do not want those gates back, but what we do want is merely the possibility of determining our own asylum and migration policy ourselves, and you are well aware of that. |  | |  |  |  | |  | | --- | |  | |      |  |  |  |  | | --- | --- | --- | --- | |  |  | **IN THE CHAIR: DIANA WALLIS** *Vice-President* |  | |  |  |  | |  | | --- | |  | |      |  |  |  |  |  |  | | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | | |  | | --- | | MPphoto |  |  | | --- | |  | |  | **Claude Moraes (S&D). -** Madam President, the position of the S&D Group is very clear. We have heard all the background as to why Schengen is being breached and we have waited since 1999 for any kind of common migration or asylum policy.  So we are very clear in our messages. First to the Commission: on Schengen, you want a Community mechanism for collective decision-making, you want to move away from intergovernmentalism, you want a lock on the political opportunism that we have seen from Italy and from France. So please do not make the message ambiguous in the statement. Make it clear that you will have a lock and you will prevent that type of opportunism which will in the end break Schengen.  To the Council: you have waited since 1999 for a common European asylum system, you have created a situation where solidarity and burden-sharing are often spoken of in this place, but we are nowhere near the formal mechanism for burden-sharing in the European Community. You are blocking much of the work we are doing here in Parliament. Unblock it. Work with us and the Commission to ensure that solidarity means solidarity, burden-sharing means burden-sharing.  And finally, the Commission is looking ahead to a migration policy. Work with us. Do not be timid, be courageous and ensure that when we fix Schengen, we also fix our common migration policy and we have something to be proud of. |  | |  |  |  | |  | | --- | |  | |      |  |  |  |  |  |  | | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | | |  | | --- | | MPphoto |  |  | | --- | |  | |  | **Sarah Ludford (ALDE). -** Madam President, like others I think that Commissioner Malmström is doing a very good job, but I also feel, in view of President Barroso’s robust defence of Schengen free movement today, that I do not really understand how the notion could possibly have taken hold that the Commission’s proposed EU-level mechanism is going to make it easier to reintroduce internal border controls. Yet that notion has taken hold. It could not possibly be, could it, that different messages are being sent to different audiences, one to MEPs, maybe one to Paris and Rome? The EU’s migration and asylum pressures ought to be capable of effective management by competent governments.  Unfortunately we have too many governments now which are playing to the extremist right-wing gallery. The European Commission must indeed defend EU internal free movement and not throw gestures to the likes of President Sarkozy and Prime Minister Berlusconi for electioneering purposes. It should highlight the failure of Member States to implement EU migration rules. Lastly, the Commission must investigate allegations about 61 migrants being left to die, despite their making contact with Italian coastguards, a NATO warship and a military helicopter. Any authorities that breached international maritime and humanitarian law must be brought to book. |  | |  |  |  | |  | | --- | |  | |      |  |  |  |  |  |  | | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | | |  | | --- | | MPphoto |  |  | | --- | |  | |  | **Cornelia Ernst (GUE/NGL).** – *(DE)* Madam President, ladies and gentlemen, I think we need to get to the point here. We do not need a new rule on the temporary or any other reintroduction of border controls, either now or in the future. We need to grasp that freedom of movement – and that is, after all, the message of the European Union – is something that you cannot simply displace or circumvent at will. It is a citizens’ right that you cannot simply relativise.  Do you want to know what honestly annoys me? We hear a lot said about solidarity. Who is talking about solidarity with the countries of Africa who are currently having to accommodate hundreds of thousands of refugees and will continue to do so – without great debate? Is anyone talking about solidarity with the people who are fleeing war and coming here to Europe? We need to show these people a bit of respect.  To be frank, I do not want to discuss any changes to Schengen or any rules whatsoever; I simply want us to deal sensibly with migration once and for all. We will not achieve this by using Frontex as a means of deporting people; we will achieve it by having a democratic and humanitarian asylum law. That is what we should be talking about in Europe and it must apply throughout Europe. That is what we should fight for. That is our real task. |  | |  |  |  | |  | | --- | |  | |      |  |  |  |  |  |  | | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | | |  | | --- | | MPphoto |  |  | | --- | |  | |  | **Véronique Mathieu (PPE).** – *(FR)* Madam President, my speech is addressed to the Commission and to my fellow Members, and I would also like to welcome the Council. The issue we are facing today stems from the management of the Schengen area in 2011. That area is no longer restricted to five Member States, as it was in the 1980s. Rather, it is an area which has continually expanded over the last few years and which today comprises 25 countries, three of which are not members of the European Union.  Therefore, like all European policies, cooperation in the Schengen area should reflect the real situation to which it applies today, which is different from that of 10 years ago. This is the context in which the Italian and French Governments’ proposals, and the pragmatic and necessary steps outlined by the Commission today in its communication on immigration, should be understood. Mutual trust between the Member States party to the Schengen area is indeed the cornerstone of Schengen cooperation. However, this trust is based on reciprocal obligations. If one of the parties fails to respect its obligations and generates an influx, the whole system breaks down. The other Member States must therefore be allowed to respond to this breakdown by restoring temporary and strictly regulated border controls. Such action would be a clear request to the Member States that are responsible for the breakdown to control their external borders better.  Furthermore, the Commission’s proposed measures would be very much in the spirit of Schengen, since controls would be reinstated as a last resort and the decision would be taken at European level rather than at intergovernmental level. These measures will be intrinsically linked to all of the other proposed long-term measures, in preparation for a common migration policy. Strengthening Frontex and showing greater solidarity are particularly crucial – and I will conclude on this point – in order to support the Member States situated at our external borders. The situation in the Mediterranean in recent years only serves to highlight shortcomings in the Schengen *acquis*.  In the space of a few weeks, migrants from neighbouring Mediterranean countries have come to account for a significant percentage of France’s annual immigration. This *acquis* is not static, but must instead be developed. I hope that this proposal will be adopted quickly in order to guarantee better management of our Schengen area as soon as possible, and thus to ensure the security of our common external borders. |  | |  |  |  | |  | | --- | |  | |      |  |  |  |  |  |  | | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | | |  | | --- | | MPphoto |  |  | | --- | |  | |  | **Ioan Enciu (S&D).** – *(RO)* Madam President, the exceptional migration flows, such as those from the southern Mediterranean, must not pose a threat to the Schengen area. The European Commission must not promote the ideas of certain Member States which cast doubt over it. The role of the Commission is to protect the Schengen area by promoting European solutions mentioned in the Schengen acquis. Member States must demonstrate solidarity in managing the Schengen area. The Council must also help strengthen the Schengen area by giving its immediate approval allowing Romania and Bulgaria to access this area. The so-called problems with the Schengen area are bogus and have nothing to do with the freedom of movement inside the Union, but with the inability or bad faith on the part of some states to face up to immigration-related problems outside the European Union. The solution for the future lies in improving Europe’s migration management system, completing the process of setting up the European Common Asylum System, the legal framework for illegal and legal migration, and enhancing the role of Frontex. |  | |  |  |  | |  | | --- | |  | |      |  |  |  |  |  |  | | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | | |  | | --- | | MPphoto |  |  | | --- | |  | |  | **Salvatore Iacolino (PPE).** – *(IT)* Madam President, in recent weeks massive migration flows have provoked anxiety and reactions among European citizens.  Some Member States have set out positions that mean that the question of migration flows should be held in high estimation.  Schengen is now an established asset of European civilization and as such should be protected and preserved. This does not mean that the temporary reintroduction of border controls, under certain conditions, is not an option. We therefore welcome compensation mechanisms based on an EU approach, to ensure, in each case, the application of the Schengen area in compliance with the expectations of the people concerned.  The Commission’s valuable proposal of 4 May 2011, by which the Schengen area is made more flexible and concerted in order to allow a more regular management of internal migration flows, heads in this direction. The proposal aims at stronger governance, which must certainly be held in due consideration during moments of particular crisis.  I listened with particular interest to Mr Barroso both here in Brussels and in Palermo on the regional policies for the protection of Sicily and Lampedusa, which continues to see the arrival of boats which would otherwise be at the mercy of raging seas where more lives would be lost. Madam President, we must continue to take this into account. |  | |  |  |  | |  | | --- | |  | |      |  |  |  |  |  |  | | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | | |  | | --- | | MPphoto |  |  | | --- | |  | |  | **Sylvie Guillaume (S&D).** – *(FR)* Madam President, in these important debates on migration issues, we must avoid at all costs falling into the trap of Mr Sarkozy’s and Mr Berlusconi’s opportunistic statements on the Schengen Agreements. Using Europe and migration flows as punchbags while citing the populist arguments of the extreme right is a very convenient way for some European governments to conceal their national economic and social failings.  To challenge free movement, a tangible achievement of European integration, today, is manipulative and dangerous. On the one hand commentators are saying that the Commission has sided with France and Italy, while on the other President Barroso is today telling us that he does not intend to side with populist Member States. Which of these is it?  The Communication of 4 May not only mentions the reinstatement of internal border controls, it also addresses many other topics, such as the fight against human trafficking, legal immigration, resettlement of refugees, asylum and so on. Those are the real issues! The problem is that this communication only goes halfway.  Commissioner Malmström, it seems that you want to reintroduce a Community approach, which is vital. Go on then, I dare you! We need more Europe and more integration where Member States are tempted to protect only their individual interests.  *(Applause)* |  | |  |  |  | |  | | --- | |  | |      |  |  |  |  |  |  | | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | | |  | | --- | | MPphoto |  |  | | --- | |  | |  | **Georgios Papanikolaou (PPE).** – *(EL)*Madam President, on 2 July 1990, just a few days after the Convention implementing the Schengen Agreement was signed, Time Magazine published an article which started as follows: ‘The dream of a border-free Europe took a step toward reality’ and ended as follows: ‘to combat a possible increase in illicit drug trafficking, terrorist activities and illegal immigration, controls on the external borders of Schengenland will be tightened’.  That was written 21 years ago and, as the President of the Commission said, that is precisely what we are being called on to do today: to keep the dream alive and to tighten controls on the Italian, Greek and southern European borders as a whole, because the southern borders of united Europe are the borders of the other states – of Germany, France and Belgium, for example. In keeping with the principles of solidarity and reciprocity that keep this Europe alive, we need to review everything which does not appear to be paying off, to review the Dublin II agreement, as already debated in Parliament, and to share the burdens which each Member State must bear fairly, so that we can all help to keep the dream alive. |  | |  |  |  | |  | | --- | |  | |      |  |  |  |  |  |  | | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | | |  | | --- | | MPphoto |  |  | | --- | |  | |  | **David-Maria Sassoli (S&D).** – *(IT)* Madam President, to question Schengen is, in our view, to question Europe. If Europe is going to be even weaker, as right-wing governments desire, it will be increasingly tempting to ask ourselves whether remaining in Europe still makes sense, as the Italian Interior Minister, Mr Maroni, has done.  The answer, however, is greater involvement of EU mechanisms. In essence, we need more Europe, not less Europe, and the Commission needs to say so more forcefully. The best of Europe was shown on Sunday night when, in an extraordinary chain of human solidarity, the people of Lampedusa saved 500 shipwrecked people who were heading towards certain death. The worst of Europe, if the news carried by *The Guardian* is confirmed, would be NATO military forces who do not intervene to save men, women and children adrift.  If we are sure about which of these we prefer, Mrs Malmström, then during the European Council in June the Commission will have to convince Member States to formulate a European policy on immigration, because Europe *à la carte* would be tantamount to the collapse of the European dream. |  | |  |  |  | |  | | --- | |  | |      |  |  |  |  |  |  | | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | | |  | | --- | | MPphoto |  |  | | --- | |  | |  | **Wim van de Camp (PPE). -***(NL)* Madam President, in June 2009 I was elected to the European Parliament by European citizens. I was not elected to a parliament of institutions, nor was I elected to a parliament of individual Member States. I am pointing that out because European citizens have many questions about Schengen. This is nothing to do with populism, nor is it to do with fear. This is to do with the questions which are worrying European citizens: how are we dealing with Schengen? Many questions are being asked about this at the moment, and I therefore call your attention to this.  Obviously, if the President of the Commission says that we have to uphold the principle of free movement of persons, then I will support that. 25,000 Tunisians cannot be allowed to take 502 million Europeans hostage, but these questions will not go away and public support for Schengen in Europe will be jeopardised. That is why I can also agree to temporary border check arrangements, as my fellow member Mr Iacolino suggested. I am very well aware that we cannot get burden-sharing up and running at the first attempt.  Finally, Madam President, one more question: what is the state of play when it comes to the launch of the European Asylum Support Office in Malta? I have heard that there is still a possibility of it getting off the ground. Perhaps, the Commissioner could explain once again when the Office will actually be up and running. |  | |  |  |  | |  | | --- | |  | |      |  |  |  |  |  |  | | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | | |  | | --- | | MPphoto |  |  | | --- | |  | |  | **Carmen Romero López (S&D).** – *(ES)* Madam President, Mrs Malmström, the problem with the communication tabled by the Commission is that it is a communication that is not credible at the present time, in relation to the long-term problems that the issue raised here involves, or even to the emergency solutions that the European Union should have implemented at this time.  Unfortunately, what the Commission has shown is that it is very weak, because you cannot keep everyone happy. It is not possible to keep Mr Sarkozy and Mr Berlusconi happy, on the one hand, and have a common asylum and immigration policy for the long term, on the other. It is impossible to introduce ambiguities that go nowhere into a communication like this, and what they demonstrate is that this is a policy that does not resolutely face up to the situation we are experiencing.  Mr Barroso is not doing you much of a favour when he says that you have done the best you could to find a balance, because this is not about finding a balance. This is about dealing with an emergency situation like the one before us. It is about having financing and reaching a proper agreement between the Member States on a common asylum policy, on the European Asylum Office and on all the challenges we are facing. There is none of that here.  How can you talk about regional cooperation programmes with third countries when the democrats of Tunisia and Libya are seeing us closing our countries’ borders? Is it possible to talk about that? We cannot say ambiguous things. We are dealing with issues serious enough that you should take this seriously too, Mrs Malmström. |  | |  |  |  | |  | | --- | |  | |      |  |  |  |  |  |  | | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | | |  | | --- | | MPphoto |  |  | | --- | |  | |  | **Hubert Pirker (PPE).** – *(DE)*Madam President, I consider the debate on the reintroduction of border controls and the modification of the Schengen mechanism to be absolutely excessive and superfluous. Moreover, we are only having this debate because Mr Berlusconi and Mr Sarkozy were thinking only of their national interests and acting in a populist way when they threatened to reintroduce controls at the borders between individual Member States on account of the migrants from North Africa.  I was also astounded – I must make that clear – at how quickly Mr Barroso, the President of the Commission, took up the debate rather than taking a corrective European approach. Schengen is a huge achievement. Schengen is a European symbol and is the perfect combination of freedom to travel, open borders and security. Schengen must never be brought into question. In special cases we already have the possibility of reintroducing controls for a limited period and in a limited region where there is a serious threat to internal security.  What we do not need, then, is a debate on Schengen. What we instead need is a debate on measures to enhance Frontex so as to provide maximum security at the external borders of the European Union – thereby ensuring freedom of movement – and a debate on speedy asylum proceedings and managed migration, on cooperation to deal with the causes of migration and on readmission agreements.  I am happy to go along with Commissioner Malmström’s proposals on this – her proposals are very broad – and I invite the Commission to follow Parliament’s lead, rather than the lead set by certain representatives of the Council. |  | |  |  |  | |  | | --- | |  | |      |  |  |  |  |  |  | | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | | |  | | --- | | MPphoto |  |  | | --- | |  | |  | **Stavros Lambrinidis (S&D).** – *(EL)*Madam President, Commissioner, at a time when, politically, the fundamental principles of cohesion and solidarity in the EU are under attack on all sides, especially from neo-nationalist movements, and we all know who they are, the Commission should, in my opinion, make it its daily task to crush anyone who attacks the symbols of European political unification.  Yet, we are here today, precisely because it has not done so. It has allowed a debate to be instigated under pressure from certain Member States on the cornerstone of the European identity: Schengen. However, legally also, the Commission’s proposal conflicts with Articles 78 and 80 of the Convention. Where a Member State is under severe pressure from immigration, the Convention expressly states that Europe must provide support and solidarity. Restoring internal border controls is not solidarity, it is punishment. It does not fairly distribute the burden of the pressure on the external borders, for example, by strengthening Frontex; it puts an even greater burden on the Member State. In other words, Commission, this is not ‘burden sharing’; it is a blatant form of ‘burden dumping’. You, the Commission, have allowed this debate to happen and you must stop it, right here, right now. |  | |  |  |  | |  | | --- | |  | |      |  |  |  |  |  |  | | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | | |  | | --- | | MPphoto |  |  | | --- | |  | |  | **Kinga Gál (PPE).** – *(HU)* Madam President, Mr Barroso, Commissioner, Minister of State Győri, the Schengen system is one of the most tangible acquis of the European Union. If European citizens were asked, they would mention free movement without border controls as something important for them in the European Union. That is why it is important to preserve this system and to do everything to preserve the free movement of our citizens and a Europe without borders. This must remain our primary goal.  The values, our acquis have to be protected especially when they are challenged. This challenge today is the surge of migration and refugees. However, in order to address these challenges we need concrete proposals and solutions.  This begins with separation and clarification of the issue, which means that we separate the refugee issue from illegal immigration, we use our existing principles that we can build on, such as solidarity and cooperation, and we use our existing institutions such as FRONTEX, or our existing rules.  I welcome the Hungarian position and the position of Minister of State Győri, and also the words of Mr Barroso, who said that the aim is to reinforce the Schengen acquis and operate it well, not to depart from it. |  | |  |  |  | |  | | --- | |  | |      |  |  |  |  |  |  | | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | | |  | | --- | | MPphoto |  |  | | --- | |  | |  | **Vilija Blinkevičiūtė (S&D). -***(LT)* Madam President, first of all I would like to stress that the solution to the migration problems that have come about should remain within the scope of the Schengen Agreement. The Schengen acquis currently provides for possibilities to temporarily restore the protection of internal borders when there is a threat to public order and security and these provisions really are wholly sufficient. Therefore, perhaps the Commission might elaborate on the additional cases provided for in its Communication on migration, enabling border protection to be extended temporarily, which the Communication describes in very abstract terms, and whose subject area is too poorly defined? Does this mean that the European Commission is pandering to the leaders of the two largest European Union Member States and aims to destroy one of the greatest EU values – the area of freedom and free movement? I would also like to comment on the Communication’s content, because it seems as if the Communication was written purely with this case in mind, where there are increased migration flows from the countries of North Africa. Doesn’t the Commission feel that a document called a Communication on migration should be much broader in terms of its content and substance? |  | |  |  |  | |  | | --- | |  | |      |  |  |  |  |  |  | | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | | |  | | --- | | MPphoto |  |  | | --- | |  | |  | **Nadja Hirsch (ALDE).** – *(DE)*Madam President, the borders have been removed for the first time in Germany and Austria and we finally have free movement for workers from the countries of Eastern Europe. On the one hand, borders are being torn down, while on the other you are trying to build barriers yet again.  I find it impossible to accept that two Member States and two gentlemen looking to make a name for themselves have managed to bring the issue of the reintroduction of border controls back to the debating chamber. There is no going back on this matter and we cannot allow ourselves to be put under pressure by this single-issue discussion. The refugee problem cannot be automatically resolved by returning to a regime of border controls. Pardon me. These people have risked their lives in making their way to Europe and they will also succeed in bypassing border crossings. The only ones who stand to gain from the reintroduction of border controls would be the human traffickers because the refugees would have to find new ways to cross the borders, providing the human traffickers with a new source of income.  I cannot accept the fact that we are seriously contemplating this matter and I would call on the Commission not to compromise here. |  | |  |  |  | |  | | --- | |  | |      |  |  |  |  |  |  | | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | | |  | | --- | | MPphoto |  |  | | --- | |  | |  | **Ulrike Lunacek (Verts/ALE).** – *(DE)*Madam President, I am pleased that all sides of the House, including the Group of the European People’s Party (Christian Democrats), which includes Mr Sarkozy and Mr Berlusconi, have made it clear that new rules are not required and that it is not necessary to alter the Schengen Agreement, but that something else is needed, namely a common asylum and migration policy that is worthy of the name. Furthermore, Mrs Malmström, I am calling on you to take action and to make it clear that the Dublin II Agreement must be changed in order to facilitate genuine European solidarity in relation to asylum issues and to show that this continent is a cohesive entity and that countries with external borders cannot be left to fend for themselves.  However, caution is advised. Italy itself can certainly assume responsibility for this and must do so. An interior minister like Mr Maroni, who himself belongs to Lega Nord party, must make it clear that these people are refugees whose rights must be respected and that the correct course of action must be taken here. We in Europe need to protect not just money and banks, but also refugees, which is why we do not need a new Schengen regulation, but rather a policy on asylum and migration that truly respects human dignity. |  | |  |  |  | |  | | --- | |  | |      |  |  |  |  |  |  | | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | | |  | | --- | | MPphoto |  |  | | --- | |  | |  | **Kyriacos Triantaphyllides (GUE/NGL). -** Madam President, in the past couple of months, the Commission has moved rather fast in publishing two important communications aimed at addressing the challenges at hand since the outbreak of the Jasmine Revolution in Tunisia.  A number of policy options have been put forward and Parliament has already expressed itself on them in order to guide the Commission in drafting concrete legislative proposals.  In the communication on migration, the Commission addresses the issues of external border controls, Schengen governance and organised mobility. Why is there nothing more explicit here on burden-sharing? The communication mentions the pilot project for the resettlement of refugees in Malta, but it does not introduce the notion of a pilot project concerning relocation of unauthorised migrants or asylum seekers – and this despite the repeated calls for such a burden-sharing system from various Member States and Members of Parliament.  Why is the Commission not coming up with a concrete proposal on this? We are talking about a European area of freedom of movement; we are talking about a common European asylum system. When are you going to back up the notion of European solidarity with deeds? |  | |  |  |  | |  | | --- | |  | |      |  |  |  |  |  |  | | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | | |  | | --- | | MPphoto |  |  | | --- | |  | |  | **Morten Messerschmidt (EFD).** – *(DA)* Madam President, I would like to address the proposal that the Commission has tabled concerning the strengthening of external border control. Unfortunately, it is not very satisfactory because, at a time when we are witnessing several Member States pursuing a rash immigration policy that grants large numbers of foreigners lawful residence in the EU, and when the lack of border control allows people to move freely across borders, there is a need for stronger border control between the EU’s Member States on a permanent basis. With regard to the constant talk of solidarity, I would also like to express my surprise at the fact that Member States like Denmark, for example, that have been good at tightening up their immigration policy, are supposed to show a large degree of solidarity with countries that have not managed to do the same. It would make sense to allow countries expressing their national sovereignty by determining their own immigration policy to also reap the fruits of their labours. |  | |  |  |  | |  | | --- | |  | |      |  |  |  |  |  |  | | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | | |  | | --- | | MPphoto |  |  | | --- | |  | |  | **Andreas Mölzer (NI).** – *(DE)*Madam President, apparently only about 3 000 of the Tunisian refugees apprehended in Lampedusa are genuine asylum-seekers, while 20 000 or more are economic migrants. As long as the European Union refuses to admit that it cannot accommodate all economic migrants from every conceivable quarter, hundreds of thousands more will make their way here. If steps are taken such as mass amnesties for illegal immigrants or if the Schengen Agreement is violated through the use of tourist visas, as was recently the case, then this will inevitably result in many thousands more refugees. This puts the entire Schengen system at risk.  Greece, Italy and Malta are obviously not in a position to secure their external borders and newcomers to the Schengen Group often relax their efforts after accession. The EU’s external borders are riddled with more holes than a Swiss cheese and are also being undermined internally. Temporary controls are not enough. The EU must develop Frontex into a genuine border protection agency. If none of these measures produce results, then inevitably one or other country will come up with the idea of withdrawing from the Schengen Agreement. |  | |  |  |  | |  | | --- | |  | |      |  |  |  |  |  |  | | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | | |  | | --- | | MPphoto |  |  | | --- | |  | |  | **Andrey Kovatchev (PPE).** – *(BG)* Madam President, today we need to answer the question about how to preserve and strike a balance between our basic values: freedom, solidarity, justice and, on the other hand, security. The point was mentioned on numerous occasions that external borders are a joint responsibility for all Member States. Let us refrain from creating unnecessary obstacles between us. Let us also prevent the current situation from going down in the history books as a bad example of European integration. I naturally welcome the greater role given to Frontex and the additional human and material resources for the agency, along with the reinforcement of the Schengen evaluation mechanism, but not the new requirements imposed on Bulgaria and Romania and the obstruction of their membership.  Mrs Győri, after Bulgaria and Romania met all the technical criteria for membership, which was assessed by the Council’s experts, please tell us what the Council’s position is on the timeframe for admitting Bulgaria and Romania, and whether such a discussion is going on in the Council. If new rules apply, they must be valid for everyone and not be used to achieve political objectives, but to build on the current system for protecting our borders. From a foreign policy perspective, I think that our good neighbourhood policy must be linked to the relevant governments fulfilling readmission commitments to their citizens. |  | |  |  |  | |  | | --- | |  | |      |  |  |  |  |  |  | | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | | |  | | --- | | MPphoto |  |  | | --- | |  | |  | **Ulrike Rodust (S&D).** – *(DE)*Madam President, open borders are an important symbol for Europe. I would like to draw your attention to another problem. I come from Northern Germany, which is why the German-Danish border is of particular importance for me. The right-wing populist Danish People’s Party is trying to force the Danish Government to reintroduce border controls. What is the reason for this? It is a fear of people from Romania and Bulgaria. This is scandalous. The right-wing populists are rapidly growing in numbers and represent a real danger for Europe. Of course we must have protections against untrammelled criminality and our security authorities have already found effective alternatives to passport controls.  It makes me very sad that one of our major European achievements is to be put at risk. The EU success in promoting peace and freedom is without historical parallel but is now under high-level attack. I would call on the Danish Government not to allow itself to be dictated to by the right-wing populists. |  | |  |  |  | |  | | --- | |  | |      |  |  |  |  |  |  | | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | | |  | | --- | | MPphoto |  |  | | --- | |  | |  | **Anna Maria Corazza Bildt (PPE). -** Madam President, freedom of movement is a cornerstone of European integration. Let us not open a Pandora’s Box by revising Schengen. Let us not go back on our principles. The possibility of introducing border controls already exists. It should be temporary, exceptional and a last resort. What is needed is a common approach, a long-term vision as called for by the Commission, to respond to citizens’ concerns on security. We need to move forward to a common asylum policy by 2012, to have a common migration policy and to facilitate legal immigration for work while combating irregular immigration.  Short-term procedures that hinder resettlement have to be removed. Yes, we have to express solidarity with the Member States that are most exposed to an influx of people, but first of all our solidarity should be with the people who are fleeing tragedy. The dignity of immigrants, of people fleeing the country, has to be put back at the centre of the European debate. |  | |  |  |  | |  | | --- | |  | |      |  |  |  |  |  |  | | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | | |  | | --- | | MPphoto |  |  | | --- | |  | |  | **Robert Goebbels (S&D).** – *(FR)* Madam President, I wonder if the demagogues of Rome and Paris and their cohorts here in the European Parliament realise what their request to reinstate internal border controls actually implies. More than one million European citizens work in countries other than their own. One hundred and fifty thousand people cross the border every day into Luxembourg. Do you want to subject them to border checks? Tens of millions of Europeans will travel this summer. Do Mr Berlusconi and Mr Sarkozy want to subject them to border checks? President Barroso said it himself: every year there are over 1.25 billion movements of persons within the Schengen area. Do you want to subject them to border checks?  Commissioner Malmström, leave Schengen as it is. Re-read the Treaties, re-read Articles 67 and 78. Everything is there. There is no need to devise something new; let us stick with Schengen and the free movement of citizens, otherwise we will have a citizens’ revolt on our hands. |  | |  |  |  | |  | | --- | |  | |      |  |  |  |  |  |  | | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | | |  | | --- | | MPphoto |  |  | | --- | |  | |  | **Jens Rohde (ALDE).** – *(DE)*Madam President, Mr Schulz has left us, but I am pleased that he and Mrs Rodust have made it clear that it was not Social Democrat policy that border controls should be reintroduced. However, two years ago, during the election campaign for the European Parliament, the key demand of the Danish Social Democrats was that the borders should be closed again. I am not talking about the right-wing populists. Mr Jørgensen and party leader Mrs Thorning-Schmidt both argued for this. You are absolutely right, this is populism. An important question for the Commission is therefore as follows: Can a country reintroduce border controls and still remain in the Schengen Union with access to the information system, etc., or is this an either-or situation? The question is important for the Danish debate, which is why I ask that a clear answer be given. |  | |  |  |  | |  | | --- | |  | |      |  |  |  |  |  |  | | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | | |  | | --- | | MPphoto |  |  | | --- | |  | |  | **Mario Mauro (PPE).** – *(IT)* Madam President, ladies and gentlemen, I note that, in order to save Schengen, many would like to offer as a solution the expulsion from Europe of Mr Berlusconi and Mr Sarkozy.  More simply, I think it would be enough to strengthen Frontex, which means tightening security along the EU external borders. I would like to remind everyone that right now many governments shun their duty of solidarity by not taking part in Frontex.  Besides that, I feel compelled to make another crucial point: behind the humanitarian emergency and the immigration problem lurks a political problem. Indeed, while Europe has a strong humanitarian presence on immigration, I agree with Mrs Malmström that it is absent, at a political level, with regard to the tragedy behind it. More Mrs Malmström and less Baroness Ashton is what we need, and we will see that somehow we can improve the difficult conditions in which we find ourselves and will be able to ensure that the future is given a chance. |  | |  |  |  | |  | | --- | |  | |      |  |  |  |  |  |  | | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | | |  | | --- | | MPphoto |  |  | | --- | |  | |  | **Cecilia Malmström,***Member of the Commission.***−** Madam President, this has been a very interesting and good debate on a very important subject. There was talk earlier about a ping-pong game going on. That ping-pong game is probably between the European Parliament and two Member States, so please do not use the Commission as a ball.  We are trying to have a coordinated, responsible and coherent response to everything relating to migration and borders because it all goes together. We cannot have a visa policy if we do not have border control. We cannot have credible protection of people who ask for asylum if we do not have a common asylum policy in the European Union. We cannot have legal migration that works if we do not also work with integration and we cannot fight irregular migration if we do not have a proper and decent return and readmission policy. So, in order to have all this together, we need a clear framework and we need a European framework.  The Commission has therefore presented this communication. With all respect to the hard-working people in the Commission, I will reveal a secret to you. We cannot produce a communication like this in two days. It is not possible. It has been planned for a long time. This is not a response to one or two Presidents or Prime Ministers – this is something that we have been planning for a long time, and it is all there.  Those with whom we have been working together on a daily basis will know that since day one I have been working with them and the Council to achieve a joint common European asylum system. It is hard work, it is difficult and we are working very slowly, but we are making some progress. We are working together on legal migration, we are trying to reinforce Frontex, and I have been promising you a paper on integration since my hearing last February and, already last year, we proposed better governance of Schengen. This is not a response to one or two Prime Ministers calling for something. It is something well thought out and it is something that will lead to further legislation and proposals in the light of the European Council meeting in June, which will have as a theme – also planned for a long time – migration issues.  Of course, the situation in Northern Africa and in the Mediterranean accelerates the need for us in Europe to have our house in order. Is that a reason to reinstall internal border control? No, of course not. Is there a reason for European action? Yes, there is. We have about 25 000 Tunisians coming to Europe. We have discussed this on many occasions here in the plenary. Of course, every individual comes for a reason, namely that he – because it is very often a he – has no work in Tunisia. I feel very strongly about every individual’s fate here, but not all of them can come to Europe. It is much better – and that is why we are working with the Tunisian authorities and Italy in order to see how we can support Italy to create jobs and growth – for these people to find a future in Tunisia, because they are not refugees.  However, there are refugees coming, and increasingly more so now. This week a lot of people have come from Libya – third country nationals, even Libyans – and that might increase. These people are clearly a reason for European action and solidarity. The Commission has invited all Member States to a conference on 12 May in order to discuss relocation and a prolongation of the Malta project in order to assist Malta with the thousands of people who have been going there. But we will also have the UNHCR there, so we will try to ask Member States to take increased responsibility for the refugees running away from the increasing violence in Libya who are stranded in Tunisia and at the border.  Turning to Schengen, I agree with you – or most of you – who have said that Schengen is a fantastic achievement. The fact that we can travel from Finland to Malta, from Portugal to Estonia, without ever showing a passport is a wonderful symbol of European integration. I want to protect this and further promote it. I am happy that I can count on your support in this.  However, the system is not perfect. We knew long before all this started that there were some weaknesses in the systems. Evaluation has not worked, because Member States are evaluating each other and that is not a good thing. We need a European mechanism with the involvement of the European Parliament. I presented this in November last year and I remember that I got quite a lot of support from this plenary to do this.  We need to have tools to help the Member States perform better in protecting EU external borders. We need to strengthen monitoring and we need more – not less – Europe. So, in order to assess this situation and to decide on the necessary means, we really need a European approach. The events of last week have confirmed this. The shortcomings should never automatically lead to the reintroduction of border control. There has to be an assessment of the shortcomings in all other ways possible, such as providing financial and operational support. Member States can also help each other. We are also working together with you on strengthening Frontex.  The point of departure is strengthening current legislation. I am convinced that the current rules can cater for most situations. Where there are differences in interpretation, the Commission should consult with Member States in order to clarify the rules. This can be done by issuing guidelines or recommendations.  There are particular circumstances where there might be a need to reintroduce border controls. That is already provided for today and it has been the case in a few situations – for example a major event such as a terrorist threat. There could be a major event where Member States, under very clear circumstances, need to do this. But we need to strengthen the European dimension of this and to prevent Member States from unilaterally taking action. That is what we are talking about.  We live in turbulent times. Many of the things that are happening are a reason for joy – in Egypt and Tunisia – but there are also a lot of concerns. We need to be calm in this situation. We need to try to handle it in the short term, but also in the long term. We need to strengthen our rules, not to undermine them. We need to strengthen the rules based on European law, on our values and on international commitments. We need a European leadership to stand up against simplistic solutions – and I have heard some of them here today – and populism. We need more Europe, not less.  *(Applause)* |  | |  |  |  | |  | | --- | |  | |      |  |  |  |  |  |  | | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | | |  | | --- | | MPphoto |  |  | | --- | |  | |  | **Enikő Győri,***President-in-Office of the Council. −* Madam President, I would also like to thank you very much for this debate and the contributions I had from the honourable Members of this House.  First let me start with our clarification concerning the asylum package, as I received very concrete questions on that. As to the specific proposals on the table, the Council welcomes the start of the trilogues between the Parliament and the Council concerning the Qualification Directive. As to the Dublin Regulation and the Eurodac Regulation, important progress has been made at technical level.  Two main issues, however, remain outstanding which are inextricably linked to the political discussions. The first is the suspension of transfers under the Dublin Regulation and the second is access for law enforcement under the Eurodac Regulation. Many delegations in Council are of the opinion that suspending Dublin transfers to Member States that are subject to practical pressures would create a poor precedent and would undermine the Dublin Regulation. A large number of delegations have also expressed a strong wish to give law enforcement agencies access to the Eurodac database. Given these views in Council and considering our shared commitment to establishing a common European asylum system, a constructive debate is needed between all the institutions involved: the Council, Parliament and the Commission.  Finally, the Council awaits with interest the revised proposals of the Commission concerning the procedural directives and the Reception Conditions Directive, which are expected, if I am not mistaken, in early June. So, Ms Weber, since you suggested, with reference to the work of the Council, that we are questioning and undermining codecision and are trying to isolate Parliament, I hope that my clarification was enough for you. Of course we are very pleased to share all the information with you and we are very committed to making progress on these dossiers, which are, I think, of vital importance for all of us.  Let me continue in my mother tongue for some horizontal general concluding remarks.  *(HU)*As emphasised in my introduction, the great debate in the Council is yet to come. The proposal of the Commission was published six days ago. We convened a special meeting of the Justice and Home Affairs Council for 12 May, where we will be able to have an orientation debate. We hope that this work and the working group debate can make the situation easier for the heads of states and heads of governments, and they will be able to take the most important political decisions in the European Council in June.  So at this moment I can share with you the opinion of the Hungarian Presidency. And let me reiterate, not for the first time in this House, that our basic philosophy is a strong Europe; a strong Europe that places people at the centre of its thinking.  This is our basic principle; it determines every policy we make and each step we take. It is on this basis that I can tell you what our starting point will be in this politically highly sensitive issue. We will not be partners with anyone attempting to dismantle the Schengen system and free movement.  The overwhelming majority of the comments made in this House have argued for the preservation of this common acquis. Let me quote the honourable Italian Member Mr Iacolino, who called it ‘patrimonia della civilta europea,’ ‘our common European heritage’, or Mrs Kinga Gál, who said that free movement is the most tangible result of the unity of the EU.  The Hungarian Presidency will withstand every effort to the contrary. But this does not mean, and here I agree with Commissioner Malmström, that the system should not be perfected. For months, for years we have been aware that the system should be adjusted to the challenges of 2011, and this can indeed be done. Nobody wants the system that we have established together, with many years of work, to fall into pieces.  So, as regards restoring internal borders, we think that it can be done only in an exceptional situation, in case of an extraordinary challenge, for a defined period and by the decision of the Community. I have said this in my introduction, Mrs Malmström and Mr Barroso have said this as well. I repeat once again that this is our starting point.  What are the issues in which we can still be partners, and which are the ones in which we cannot be partners? We would like to distinguish refugees who are genuine asylum seekers under international law. We must help them so that we can be loyal to ourselves and to our common values.  At the same time we also have to combat illegal migration. I do not need to mention that the protection of the common borders, our external borders, is a common issue. FRONTEX has to be strengthened, and the means necessary for this must be provided. This is what we are working on with your cooperation, hoping that we can make a decision as soon as possible.  The issue of Schengen does not only mean what the Commission communication now contains; the expansion of the Schengen zone is on the agenda. The Hungarian Presidency clearly separates these two issues. Nobody should want to ignore the two countries which have put enormous work, energy and money into preparing properly and meeting the rigorous requirements that accession to the Schengen zone involves, and destroy it by saying that the atmosphere is not right at the moment.  We already acknowledged in February during the Hungarian Presidency that as far as the technical standards were concerned, Romania was ready, while Bulgaria still had some homework to do. I am happy to announce that Sch-eval, the Schengen Evaluation Group has now found that Bulgaria has done that work.  I hope that we can state in the Council before the Hungarian Presidency comes to an end that technical preparation has been completed. The two countries fulfil the technical criteria of Schengen. The political decision will have to be made when the Member States are ready for it. We have had ongoing consultations with all parties concerned, and are trying to find a solution that is acceptable for all stakeholders, Romania, Bulgaria, and the Member States concerned about the Schengen mechanism.  And finally, a comment: I think it was Mr Weber of the Group of the European People’s Party (Christian Democrats) who said that we had to be very careful about the policy we implement concerning migrants, European problems and labour supply. I deeply agree with that. We should not forget that we have our own unemployed, but we should equally remember that we are an aging society in Europe and we will have labour supply problems as well.  That is why the Hungarian Presidency has been committed to put demographic issues on the agenda, to help each other see which Member States have been very successful in the field of demographic policy, in the field of family policy. We would like to improve the situation of families in the European Union. We would like more children to be born in Europe, because every Member State promotes this with their own means, and this is the solution for the problem of an aging society, and it would be good if we did not have to solve it through migration. |  | |  |  |  | |  | | --- | |  | |      |  |  |  |  |  |  | | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | | |  | | --- | | MPphoto |  |  | | --- | |  | |  | **President. −** The debate is closed.  ***Written statements (Rule 149)*** |  | |  |  |  | |  | | --- | |  | |      |  |  |  |  |  | | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | | |  | | --- | | MPphoto | |  | **Ivo Belet (PPE)** *, in writing. – (NL)* Together with the euro, free movement of persons in the EU is one of the fundamental pillars of the European project. There is no reason whatsoever why we should now question this. The reaction to the thousands of refugees who are literally being washed ashore in the south of Europe cannot possibly be considered a valid reason for us to start closing our internal borders, even temporarily. The only sensible way to react to this is to do something, in the short term, about a common European asylum and migration policy. We cannot and should not sit back and allow the arrival of 30 000 refugees on the shores of Italy or Greece to undermine the pillars of the EU. Obviously, Italy is right to have requested European solidarity in tackling this problem. Solidarity is the solution. Shutting our borders, even temporarily, is a panic reaction, unbefitting of EU leaders. |  | |  |  |  | |  | | --- | |  | |      |  |  |  |  |  | | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | | |  | | --- | | MPphoto | |  | **John Bufton (EFD)** *, in writing.***–** The Commission’s response to any perceived challenge to the EU is to reach for more centralised powers. In the same way the financial crisis played perfectly into their hands and they leapt at the chance to justify economic governance rather than admit the euro’s failure, concerns about the sudden influx of migrants and the stresses it puts on countries is being used to call for the reinforcement of Schengen with increased centralised governance. MEPs are elected by the people, as the voice of the people. They represent the countries they are from. Yet when they reflect national interests here, it’s labelled ‘Populist’. Mr Barroso said it’s becoming fashionable to be Populist and wave the flag of xenophobia. Does he believe the very essence of being a country – having a domestic government, an independent economy and national borders – is inherently wrong? Why not have the guts to just scrap Parliament and take over Europe by force? Name calling, scaremongering and creeping bureaucracy is calculated and megalomaniac. But don’t think we are unaware. If we were, the so called ‘fashion’ for populism would not be developing. People are waking up to your intentions and the time will come that you are exposed. |  | |  |  |  | |  | | --- | |  | |      |  |  |  |  |  | | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | | |  | | --- | | MPphoto | |  | **Giovanni Collino (PPE),***in writing.* – *(IT)* The migration problem that we are facing in Italy and throughout Europe absolutely cannot be reduced to just the humanitarian emergency, even though that is the most urgent situation to deal with. We MEPs – who are known to be responsible for expressing the political will of our citizens, and for implementing and assessing the long-term sustainability of their requests – must have an overall vision, and we must know how to defend it against the other institutions. In the case of immigration policy, the overall vision starts with the analysis of a European population which is aging, although this is happening rather unevenly among the States of the Union. A serious imbalance is being created between birth rates and death rates and our growth is also linked to the distribution of the workforce to ensure that the market has the necessary resources to continuously produce everything that is needed. This is why Parliament should advocate a holistic management of the immigration problem to the other institutions, including the governments of Member States, with people at the centre of a recovery strategy – by which I do not mean solely an economic recovery – which needs plumbers, engineers and builders, as well as banking. |  | |  |  |  | |  | | --- | |  | |      |  |  |  |  |  | | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | | |  | | --- | | MPphoto | |  | **Anne Delvaux (PPE),***in writing.* – *(FR)* Italy’s decision to issue temporary residence permits to thousands of Tunisian immigrants arriving on its soil, followed by France’s request to temporarily restore border controls, has brought the Schengen area, one of the most tangible aspects of European integration, into question.  The proposals outlined in the Commission Communication of 4 May, including, in particular, a planned extension of the ‘exceptional circumstances’ under which internal border controls may be restored, leave me somewhat perplexed. Surely we are not going to allow the will of two Heads of State to jeopardise one of Europe’s greatest achievements.  Immigration is a challenge requiring a Europe-wide response, and therefore I call for a common migration policy. It is time to tackle this issue head-on. I hope that the atmosphere of the European Summit in June, at which this topic will be addressed, will not be contaminated by populist sentiments. |  | |  |  |  | |  | | --- | |  | |      |  |  |  |  |  | | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | | |  | | --- | | MPphoto | |  | **Monika Flašíková Beňová (S&D),***in writing. – (SK)* I would like to voice my disappointment over the fact that the Commission is narrowing down the entire issue of migration to the problems in the Mediterranean and the Schengen area. The situation is critical. An ambitious strategy has long been expected from the Commission. Not an anti-European plan for restoring national boundaries. Commissioner Malmström correctly emphasises the fact that the free movement of people across European borders is an enormous success and we must not lose it. From this perspective, the Commission proposal for managed immigration flows seems incomprehensible. Particularly the part allowing the introduction of border controls in the EU, even if they are only emergency ones and on a temporary basis. The fact that a state cannot decide on such a measure, but only the Union, is a plus. Despite this, I consider the clause to be backward and needlessly submissive to the populist pressure of the French and Italian premiers. We are not talking about something insignificant, but about one of the fundamental principles of the EU; freedom of movement. I am not convinced that we should sacrifice this to the current problems with controlling migration pressures from Africa. In my opinion, the role of the Union should be to plan the sharing out of migration pressures from the Mediterranean between the Member States, and to manage the integration of immigrants effectively. The Commission is recommending the adoption of many documents relating to migration in May and June. I would like to express the hope that, in formulating these documents, the Commission will maintain a measure of detachment and a cool head. |  | |  |  |  | |  | | --- | |  | |      |  |  |  |  |  | | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | | |  | | --- | | MPphoto | |  | **Elisabetta Gardini (PPE),***in writing.* – *(IT)* The current political crisis in North Africa and the resulting migration confirm the need for a strong European approach to immigration and asylum. Immigration is a European challenge that requires not only a rapid and effective solution but also a shared long-term strategy. Perhaps we are forgetting that according to the latest United Nations estimates, 12 360 migrants have left Libya and arrived in Italy and Malta since last March, but already 700 000 people have fled Libya and Tunisia with the aim of crossing the Mediterranean. Without a joint plan for immigrant reception and border control we risk uncontrollable, chaotic immigration with serious consequences for the whole of Europe. In this regard, it is important to strengthen Frontex, establish greater solidarity among the Member States, set up agreements for increased border control and also to repatriate illegal immigrants. Finally, as regards any changes in the Schengen system, such a decision should be taken at a European level and not left in the hands of any single country. We should not allow the states most exposed to migratory pressure to run the risk of finding themselves even more isolated. |  | |  |  |  | |  | | --- | |  | |      |  |  |  |  |  | | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | | |  | | --- | | MPphoto | |  | **Kinga Göncz (S&D)** *, in writing. – (HU)*One of the most important challenges for Europe today is how to react to the revolutions developed on its southern borders. The democratisation of this region is an essential interest for the EU; the EU must find a solution for the flow of refugees coming from this region which complies with humanitarian principles and human rights. Solidarity is necessary between Member States, but especially with the refugees coming to Europe. We Hungarians can really understand the importance of this, since hundreds of thousands of our compatriots were taken in by many countries of the world after the 1956 uprising.  The answer to the pressure of migration is not the reintroduction of internal border control, but the acceleration of the ongoing negotiations for the purpose of adopting the refugee package, the common European migration policy and the Schengen evaluation system as soon as possible.  Reintroduction of border controls, albeit temporarily, would undermine one of the symbolic acquis of the EU, hindering the free movement of citizens. This is an acquis which European citizens much appreciate, and which is also a guarantee for the implementation and success of the common economic area. We must find solutions to the emerging problems together, we should not give grounds to populist and individual voices merely offering pseudo-solutions. |  | |  |  |  | |  | | --- | |  | |      |  |  |  |  |  | | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | | |  | | --- | | MPphoto | |  | **Lena Kolarska-Bobińska (PPE)** *, in writing.* – *(PL)* During our debates on strengthening and improving management of the Schengen area, we must at the same time consider the European Union’s new migration policy, not only in the context of the situation in North Africa, but also with regard to possible events in the countries neighbouring us to the east. It is hard to predict what might happen in the post-Soviet states in future. We must also bear in mind the challenges facing Europe. The EU is an ageing society, and therefore the influx of migrants should not be regarded only as a threat to European labour markets. Migrants often contribute to the economic growth of their country of destination.  This was the case after the new Member States were accepted into the EU. Germany, which feared an influx of migrants, applied transitional periods and is only now opening up its borders to workers from Poland. The UK decided to open up its labour market straight away, and is now enjoying the benefits of having employed around two million young, efficient and energetic Poles. It is also frequently said that we should accept political migrants, but close Europe’s doors to economic migrants. In my opinion, this division does not make much sense, since it is often difficult to distinguish between these two types of migration. How should we classify the middle-class protests in the Arab countries? The underlying causes are both political and economic. Let us not therefore fall prey to imagined fears, but let us think about the opportunities for our development. |  | |  |  |  | |  | | --- | |  | |      |  |  |  |  |  | | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | | |  | | --- | | MPphoto | |  | **Edward Scicluna (S&D)** *, in writing.***–** The aggressive positions taken by the French and Italian political leaders with regard to the Ventimiglia incident have nothing to do with the Schengen agreement, but are rather an exercise to impress their own citizens. The 20 000 or so migrants were, in the main, economic migrants seeking jobs and better economic opportunities. Rather than suffer a brain-drain as its best and brightest people seek economic migration, what Tunisia requires is EU financial assistance for economic development programmes promoting work for the young and the unemployed. However, this should not distract us from dealing with the real problem of how best to cope with the migration of genuine asylum seekers from North Africa, who are or will be fleeing from war-torn countries. For this we do not need the return of national border controls. The principles of the EU include freedom of movement and solidarity between Member States, and we should not take retrograde steps in that regard. We have provision in the treaties for establishing a single EU asylum system and proper burden-sharing between Member States. Instead of stoking up right-wing populism, we should be working as Europeans to put the necessary legislation in place. |  | |  |  |  | |  | | --- | |  | |      |  |  |  |  |  | | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | | |  | | --- | | MPphoto | |  | **Debora Serracchiani (S&D),***in writing.* – *(IT)* The arrival of streams of immigrants to Lampedusa in recent days shows that the immigration crisis is an ongoing issue that requires immediate action. We clearly need improved governance within the Schengen area, as established by the Commission Communication of 4 May.  To this end, the solidarity mechanims must be strengthened in terms of redistribution of asylum seekers, organised mobility and new partnerships with third countries. Revising the mechanisms for applying the Schengen *acquis* must not be seen as an excuse to limit at will the right to free movement, but rather as a stimulus for new opportunities.  I hope that concrete proposals will be made very soon to combat prejudice and discrimination, to combat lawlessness and to promote human rights, human dignity and peace. Governing immigration effectively and encouraging peaceful coexistence must be the daily commitment of a good policy that aims to promote development and security. Returning the massive flows of people to their countries of origin does not help maintain the distance between Europeans and immigrants. If anything, it risks increasing illegality, insecurity and economic costs. |  | |  |  |  | |  | | --- | |  | |      |  |  |  |  |  | | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | | |  | | --- | | MPphoto | |  | **Monika Smolková (S&D),***in writing.*– *(SK)* The mass migration of people from North Africa was foreseeable some months ago, and France and Italy should have reacted immediately, together with the Commission. Their statements and actions today, with the police of one state refusing to accept the documents of another state, are provoking more than just astonishment. The demands for the protection of interests on internal borders on account of 25 000 refugees are unprecedented and populistic, and are against everything Schengen stands for. On 22 December 2007, I helped to chop down the border gate on the Slovak-Hungarian border. Compared to people’s enthusiasm at that time, today’s strengthening of internal borders looks like a complete negation of the Schengen ideal. Freedom, the free movement of people and goods, and solidarity with everyone who is in need of solidarity, must remain priorities of the EU. I am opposed to internal borders, and I therefore expect a strengthening of the Schengen control mechanisms, so as to prevent the populist tendencies of some states, to prevent radicalisation and intolerance, and to consolidate the Schengen system, which is one of the greatest achievements of today’s Europe. |  | |  |  |  | |  | | --- | |  | |      |  |  |  |  |  | | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | | |  | | --- | | MPphoto | |  | **Nuno Teixeira (PPE)** *, in writing.* – *(PT)*The events that are devastating the island of Lampedusa, as the result of the popular revolutions in North Africa, have created a humanitarian crisis, with more than 20 000 Tunisian immigrants arriving between January and April. The Italian Government has not been successfully responding to the innumerable requests for asylum and the sudden arrival of thousands of illegal immigrants. The Schengen Agreement, concluded in 1985, and incorporated in the Treaty on European Union, is regarded as one of the greatest expressions of European integration. Therefore, it is important not to forget its basic principles, which, if corrupted, will compromise the effectiveness of the Schengen area. It is becoming imperative to properly apply the Schengen agreements through the spirit of solidarity, reciprocal information and coordination. The humanitarian crisis we are experiencing today must be resolved, but through the legal means established by the Schengen rules. The differentiation between people who are entitled to international protection, such as refugees, and economic migrants is extremely important, in order to protect those who really need to be protected. On the other hand, unilateral violation of the agreement must be prevented at all costs, since this threatens the construction of a European area without borders, which started in 1985. |  | |  |  |  | |  | | --- | |  | |      |  |  |  |  |  | | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | | |  | | --- | | MPphoto | |  | **Kathleen Van Brempt (S&D)** *, in writing. – (NL)* The proposals which the Commission announced on Wednesday to tighten the asylum and migration policy contain one piece of poppycock and some good initiatives. The reference to border checks on our internal borders is evidence more of political expediency than of leadership and insight. But, all right, this concession to France and Italy is fortunately merely symbolic. I am also pleased that, in its proposals, the Commission has shown that it, too, is aware that it does not have to look for solid solutions to a more efficient asylum and migration policy under church towers, and that this requires another, more European, form of cooperation.  There are enormous differences between Member States in terms of how they deal with asylum applications and the outcome of these procedures. A single European asylum system is therefore necessary, so that asylum seekers can see that Europe can provide help where it is necessary, but that it does not give free tickets to adventurers. We need to link this to the development of meaningful partnerships between Europe and its neighbouring countries, so that we can support growth and development. I hope that the Commission will no longer allow itself to be used as a plaything by some politicians who want to score points at home. What we need are solid European solutions to a European problem. These proposals are a good starting point, but I need a few more things on top of that. |  | |  |  |  | |  | | --- | |  | |      |  |  |  |  |  | | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | | |  | | --- | | MPphoto | |  | **Iuliu Winkler (PPE),***in writing.* – *(RO)* With the severe impact from the economic and financial crisis and from the repercussions of the Arab Spring with its far-reaching implications in terms of the requirements for controlling the flows of emigrants and access to oil resources, the EU is looking increasingly divided and likely to abandon one of its most valuable achievements – free movement in the Schengen area. Limiting European citizens’ freedom of movement by introducing some new restrictions, albeit temporary, and imposing on Romania and Bulgaria additional criteria to those in the Schengen Agreement will result in undermining European unity. I believe in a powerful Europe that shows solidarity and I am one of the supporters of the vision promoted by the EU Hungarian Presidency, expressed by the slogan ‘Strong Europe’. However, looking at the recent developments concerning the future of the Schengen area, I must say that we are on the wrong track. During critical moments, like those we are going through, the EU leadership should demonstrate greater vision and solidarity and be concerned about blocking the resurgence of crass populism and internal protectionism in Europe. These problems will have dramatic consequences, which are easy to predict. It is certainly not restrictions and bans that will help strengthen the Schengen area and establish stability in it. |  | |  |  |  | |  | | --- | |  | |      |  |  |  |  |  | | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | | |  | | --- | | MPphoto | |  | **Anna Záborská (PPE),** *in writing. – (SK)*It also emerged from the debate in the plenary of the European Parliament that the freedom of movement made possible by the Schengen Agreement is one of the key pillars of European cooperation, and we must do everything to preserve it. At the same time, however, we see that Europe was not ready for the growing number of immigrants from Tunisia and Libya. The fact that Italy has given these immigrants travel documents allows them free movement within the Schengen area. It has thus also forced other states, particularly France and Germany, to begin searching intensively for a solution. Schengen allows states to introduce random border controls over travellers in exceptional circumstances, and Denmark, for example, has already made use of this option. In my opinion, a single European migration and asylum policy is not the solution, as this matter is within the competence of Member States. At this moment, the boundary states of the Schengen area should accept their responsibility for protecting the common boundary, and take measures for the rapid return of economic migrants to their country of origin. |  | |
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| |  |  |  |  |  | | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | | **9.13. Establishment of an evaluation mechanism to verify application of the Schengen acquis (**[**A7-0215/2013**](https://www.europarl.europa.eu/doceo/document/A-7-2013-0215_EN.html)**- Carlos Coelho)** | |  |  |  | | --- | --- | --- | |  | [**Video of the speeches**](https://www.europarl.europa.eu/plenary/en/vod.html?mode=chapter&vodLanguage=EN&playerStartTime=20130612-14:27:04&playerEndTime=20130612-14:31:10) |  | |      |  |  |  |  |  | | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | | |  | | --- | |  | |  | **Ustne wyjaśnienia dotyczące głosowania** |  | |  |  |  | |  | | --- | |  | |      |  |  |  |  |  |  | | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | | |  | | --- | | MPphoto |  |  | | --- | |  | |  | **Guido Milana (S&D). -**Signor Presidente, onorevoli colleghi, io ho votato a favore perché con questo voto oggi si rafforza il coordinamento e la cooperazione a livello dell'Unione europea e si definiscono criteri attraverso i quali si possono ripristinare controlli di frontiera da parte degli Stati. Prima dell'adozione del testo definitivo, occorrerà tener conto del dibattito nel Parlamento, poiché oggi il testo presentato non è esattamente conforme alla volontà espressa dal Parlamento stesso.  Il meccanismo che si propone è certamente più efficiente e rigoroso, consegna agli Stati membri la risoluzione di molti problemi che si riscontrano nella gestione, ma l'attualità ci consegna anche un'Europa dove troppo spesso vengono messi in discussione i principi – e tra questi la libera circolazione delle persone è minata da sentimenti che a volte assumono le caratteristiche della xenofobia. Ë evidente che oggi con questo voto il Parlamento si è ritagliato, in questo nuovo contesto, una funzione utile a prestito della democrazia. |  | |  |  |  | |  | | --- | |  | |      |  |  |  |  |  |  | | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | | |  | | --- | | MPphoto |  |  | | --- | |  | |  | **Philip Claeys (NI). -**Voorzitter, ik heb tegen het verslag Coelho gestemd omdat dit verslag getuigt van een verregaande wereldvreemdheid.  Wanneer bijvoorbeeld in amendement 3 gesteld wordt, en ik citeer, "het Schengengebied is één van de grootste prestaties van de Unie en wordt door de burgers het meest gewaardeerd, omdat het het vrije verkeer garandeert".  We zouden ons kunnen afvragen of het hier gaat om een passage uit een satirische tekst. We kunnen ons afvragen of het sarcastisch bedoeld is. Want als Schengen inderdaad één van de grootste verwezenlijkingen van de Unie is, dan moet die Unie dringend fundamenteel ter discussie gesteld. De controles aan de binnengrenzen zijn weggevallen, maar de buitengrenzen zijn zo lek als een zeef. Dat leidt allemaal tot nog meer immigratieoverlast en daar zal een pleister op een houten been, zoals het instellen van een evaluatiemechanisme, absoluut niets aan veranderen. |  | |  |  |  | |  | | --- | |  | |      |  |  |  |  |  |  | | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | | |  | | --- | | MPphoto |  |  | | --- | |  | |  | **Elena Băsescu (PPE). -**Salut introducerea noului mecanism pentru că, în felul acesta, se rezolvă una dintre nemulţumirile exprimate public de către ţara mea: aplicarea unui standard dublu în ceea ce priveşte implementarea acquis-ului Schengen. Subliniez că, la momentul evaluării tehnice, România era mai bine pregătită să intre în spaţiul Schengen decât unele state deja membre, lucru pe care îl putem foarte uşor interpreta şi din raportul prezentat de Comisie săptămâna trecută.  Totuşi, semnalul primit de premierul Ponta la Berlin, de la cancelarul Merkel arată foarte clar că, în ochii partenerilor externi, mai sunt paşi importanţi de făcut, cum ar fi respectarea statului de drept, combaterea corupţiei, transparenţă decizională şi stabilitate juridică. Cu toţii ne dorim ca guvernul socialist să se ridice la nivelul acestor aşteptări, iar România să facă parte din marea familie Schengen până la sfârşitul anului. |  | |  |  |  | |  | | --- | |  | |      |  |  |  |  |  | | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | | |  | | --- | |  | |  | **Pisemne wyjaśnienia dotyczące głosowania** |  | |  |  |  | |  | | --- | |  | |      |  |  |  |  |  | | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | | |  | | --- | | MPphoto | |  | **Luís Paulo Alves (S&D),***por escrito*. **−** Aprovo o presente relatório, considerando que este novo mecanismo – com um cariz mais Europeu, mais transparente, eficiente e rigoroso – constitui um enorme passo em frente em relação ao presente *status quo*. Reforça as ferramentas necessárias para identificar e sanar, logo de início, eventuais deficiências existentes nos Estados-Membros no que diz respeito à implementação e aplicação das regras de Schengen, contribuindo, assim, para preservar a área de Schengen como um espaço sem fronteiras internas e para proteger a liberdade de circulação dos cidadãos. Por todas estas razões e tendo sido acordadas garantias satisfatórias para salvaguardar o papel institucional do Parlamento Europeu, recomendo a aprovação deste acordo. |  | |  |  |  | |  | | --- | |  | |      |  |  |  |  |  | | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | | |  | | --- | | MPphoto | |  | **Martina Anderson (GUE/NGL),***in writing***. −** I have abstained on all votes related to the Schengen area as my Member State is not part of the Schengen area, having opted out at its creation. However, I would like to have on record the fact that I do object on principle to the way the EU internal border policy is being manipulated to create obstacles for certain minorities and groups. Disallowing the principle of free movement to minorities such as the Roma people and those seeking asylum after the Arab Spring is a reactionary policy fuelled by racism and I condemn this. |  | |  |  |  | |  | | --- | |  | |      |  |  |  |  |  | | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | | |  | | --- | | MPphoto | |  | **Laima Liucija Andrikienė (PPE),***raštu***. −** Balsavau už šią rezoliuciją dėl vertinimo mechanizmo Šengeno *acquis* taikymui tikrinti sukūrimo projekto. Šis susitarimas leis specialioms inspektorių komandoms be iš ankstinio pranešimo lankytis skirtingose ES vidinių sienų vietose ir tikrinti, ar nevykdoma neteisėta sienų patikra. Šios komandos bus sudarytos iš Europos Komisijos, ES agentūrų ir ES valstybių ekspertų. Be to, bus sugriežtina galimybė ES valstybėms grąžinti vidinių ES sienų patikrą. Ji bus galima tik kaip kraštutinė griežtai ribotos apimties ir trukmės priemonė bei prižiūrima ES lygiu. Svarbu pažymėti, kad Eurobarometro atlikti tyrimai rodo, kad 62 proc. respondentų mano, kad laisvas judėjimas yra geriausia, ką ES sugebėjo pasiekti per 50 metų. Naujasis vertinimo mechanizmas panaikina šiuo metu galiojančius dvigubus standartus ir tiek šalys narės, tiek šalys kandidatės turi būti vertinamos vienodai ir pagal tas pačias taisykles. Pritariu pranešėjo pozicijai, kad šis naujas mechanizmas – europietiškesnis, skaidresnis, veiksmingesnis ir griežtesnis – tai ženkli pažanga, palyginti su esama padėtimi. |  | |  |  |  | |  | | --- | |  | |      |  |  |  |  |  | | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | | |  | | --- | | MPphoto | |  | **Sophie Auconie (PPE),***par écrit***. –** Sous l'impulsion de l'ancien Président de la République Nicolas Sarkozy, la Commission européenne avait présenté en 2011 deux textes visant à améliorer le fonctionnement de cet espace. Le texte en question met en place un mécanisme plus transparent et des règles d'évaluation plus objectives de la gestion des frontières au sein de l'espace Schengen. Il prévoit notamment des visites inopinées par des experts nationaux afin d'inspecter la gestion des frontières intérieures. Je me suis prononcée en faveur de ce rapport qui permettra d'améliorer le fonctionnement de l'espace Schengen et donc de favoriser la libre circulation des citoyens européens. Soyons clairs: il ne s'agit pas ici de transformer l'Europe en une forteresse renfermée sur elle-même. Cependant, je considère que les dysfonctionnements qui se sont produits en 2011 suite aux révoltes populaires en Tunisie et en Libye ont démontré qu'une refonte du système de Schengen était incontournable. |  | |  |  |  | |  | | --- | |  | |      |  |  |  |  |  | | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | | |  | | --- | | MPphoto | |  | **Zigmantas Balčytis (S&D),***raštu***. −** Laisvas judėjimas yra išskirtinis Europos Sąjungos principas ir galimybė judėti Europos Sąjungos teritorijoje netaikant patikrinimų prie vidaus sienų yra vienas didžiausių jos laimėjimų. Vidaus sienų kontrolė visoje Europos Sąjungoje pradėta naikinti 1985 m. Įsigaliojus Šengeno susitarimui keliauti be pasų kontrolės įgijo teisę daugiau kaip 400 milijonų europiečių. Laisvas judėjimas labai svarbus ir ekonomikai, nes tai – svarbiausia ES bendrosios rinkos sėkmės sąlyga ir svarbus Europos ekonomikos augimo veiksnys. Priklausymas erdvei be vidaus sienų kontrolės reiškia, kad šios šalys nebeatlieka tikrinimo prie vidaus sienų bei yra sustiprinusios išorės sienų kontrolę. 2010 m. lapkričio mėn. Komisija pateikė pasiūlymą, kuriuo siekiama nustatyti vertinimo, ar Šengeno *acquis* tinkamai taikomas, teisinę sistemą. Šis vertinimo mechanizmas padės išlaikyti valstybių narių tarpusavio pasitikėjimą viena kitos gebėjimais veiksmingai taikyti papildomas priemones, leidžiančias išlaikyti erdvę be vidaus sienų. Šiuo pasiūlymu taip pat siekiama veiksmingesnio Šengeno *acquis* vertinimo mechanizmo, užtikrinant skaidrų, veiksmingą ir nuoseklų Šengeno *acquis* įgyvendinimą. |  | |  |  |  | |  | | --- | |  | |      |  |  |  |  |  | | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | | |  | | --- | | MPphoto | |  | **Regina Bastos (PPE),***por escrito*. **−** A criação do Espaço Schengen no final dos anos oitenta e início dos anos noventa, foi um dos maiores sucessos da história europeia. Schengen caracteriza-se pela ausência de controlos nas fronteiras comuns entre os países participantes e a introdução da liberdade de circulação no interior desse Espaço. Em novembro de 2010 a Comissão apresentou uma proposta com o objetivo de estabelecer um regime jurídico de avaliação da correta aplicação do Acervo de Schengen. Nesse sentido, defende-se um novo mecanismo de avaliação de Schengen que seja mais comunitário, mais transparente, mais eficaz, com mais cooperação, que aproveite melhor os recursos. Mecanismo esse que permita avaliar com rigor o grau de cumprimento das regras de Schengen e prever mecanismos para a sua tempestiva correção e pondo, desse modo, cobro a um certo sentimento de impunidade. Pelo exposto, apoiei o presente relatório. |  | |  |  |  | |  | | --- | |  | |      |  |  |  |  |  | | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | | |  | | --- | | MPphoto | |  | **Nora Berra (PPE),***par écrit***. –** L'espace Schengen permet la libre circulation des citoyens européens au sein de cet espace sans qu'ils ne fassent l'objet de contrôle aux frontières. Ce système ne peut fonctionner que sur la base d'une confiance commune et le respect et l'application des règles définis dans le code frontières de Schengen. Seul un mécanisme de contrôle efficace, c'est-à-dire, plus transparent, basé sur une coopération communautaire, permettra de s'assurer que l'acquis de Schengen est mis en œuvre par les Etats, et dans le cas contraire, de formuler des recommandations. L'objectif visé par le mécanisme est de garantir et de renforcer la libre circulation des citoyens européens au sein de l'espace Schengen. Au regard de ces éléments, j'ai voté pour la résolution législative. |  | |  |  |  | |  | | --- | |  | |      |  |  |  |  |  | | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | | |  | | --- | | MPphoto | |  | **Sebastian Valentin Bodu (PPE),***în scris***. −** Spre deosebire de sistemul actual, care nu este obligatoriu din punct de vedere juridic şi care prevede numai o evaluare inter pares, noul sistem are mecanisme mai eficiente şi mai descurajante. Acesta va permite realizarea unei evaluări mai exacte a nivelului de respectare a normelor Schengen şi adoptarea unor măsuri de remediere imediate, ceea ce va elimina orice impresie legată de existenţa unei impunităţi. Statele membre vor avea obligaţia să rezolve toate problemele pe care le întâmpină. Noul sistem prevede şi posibilitatea efectuării unor vizite neanunţate pe teren la frontierele interne, ceea ce va contribui la păstrarea uneia dintre principalele realizări ale integrării europene, şi anume libera circulaţie a cetăţenilor într-un spaţiu fără frontiere interne. |  | |  |  |  | |  | | --- | |  | |      |  |  |  |  |  | | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | | |  | | --- | | MPphoto | |  | **Philippe Boulland (PPE),***par écrit***. –** J'ai voté en faveur du mécanisme d'évaluation Schengen, dans le cadre de la refonte du paquet gouvernance Schengen. Le nouveau mécanisme d'évaluation vise à renforcer la libre circulation des citoyens, diminuer les procédures intergouvernementales pour plus de participation européenne et renforcer la coopération entre la Commission et les Etats membres. La libre circulation est l'un des aboutissements les plus retentissants de l'UE. 62% de la population européenne estime que c'est le résultat le plus positif des 50 ans d'intégration européenne. |  | |  |  |  | |  | | --- | |  | |      |  |  |  |  |  | | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | | |  | | --- | | MPphoto | |  | **John Bufton (EFD),***in writing***. −** This report is on the adoption of the regulation to amend the Schengen Borders Code in order to provide common rules on the temporary reintroduction of border control at internal borders in exceptional circumstances; and of the regulation on the establishment of an evaluation and monitoring mechanism to verify the application of the Schengen acquis. I voted against this report because the rapporteur takes the view that this new mechanism, which is supposedly more European, more transparent, more efficient and more rigorous, represents a huge step forward in comparison to the status quo – I do not believe this to be the case. |  | |  |  |  | |  | | --- | |  | |      |  |  |  |  |  | | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | | |  | | --- | | MPphoto | |  | **Alain Cadec (PPE),***par écrit***. –** Je me réjouis de l'adoption de ce rapport, qui vise à remédier aux faiblesses du système intergouvernemental actuel d'évaluation des règles de Schengen. Une application cohérente des règles de Schengen par les Etats membres n'est ainsi pas garantie. Ce rapport va dans la bonne direction: la libre circulation des citoyens devrait être renforcée par le nouveau mécanisme d'évaluation proposé, avec davantage de participation communautaire. Le rapport inclut également une exigence de transparence, avec un meilleur accès à l'information pour le Parlement. |  | |  |  |  | |  | | --- | |  | |      |  |  |  |  |  | | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | | |  | | --- | | MPphoto | |  | **Lara Comi (PPE),***per iscritto***. −** Ho votato su questa relazione pensando al lungo lavoro che ha permesso di giungere a questo testo, e all'importanza per il mio Paese. L'Italia, destinazione di ampi flussi migratori, ha già visto in passato la chiusura delle proprie frontiere da parte di altri Paesi dell'Area Schengen agli immigrati irregolari in uscita, e ha tutto l'interesse ad un funzionamento adeguato delle frontiere. Le misure previste in questo testo fanno in modo che gli Stati abbiano il controllo della situazione, trattando fra pari, invece di doversi sempre rivolgere alla Commissione europea. Tale soluzione non è banale perché, in questo caso, centralizzare le decisioni potrebbe portare a non prendere completamente in considerazione le problematiche affrontate dallo Stato in circostanze speciali. E' per questo motivo che ho votato favorevolmente. |  | |  |  |  | |  | | --- | |  | |      |  |  |  |  |  | | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | | |  | | --- | | MPphoto | |  | **Corina Creţu (S&D),***în scris***. −** Prin regulamentul propus, preconizăm eliminarea unei lungi serii de neînţelegeri şi măsuri discriminatorii din partea unor state, care au condus la întârzierea aderării României la spaţiul Schengen. Mai mult, au reuşit să lege aderarea de Mecanismul de Cooperare şi Verificare în justiţie, lucru total nejustificat. De aceea, respingem un sistem bazat pe standarde duble. Este important ca normele să fie aceleaşi pentru toţi, pentru că este injust să avem criterii şi sisteme de evaluare diferite pentru ţările membre şi cele candidate. Sper ca modificările propuse de Parlament să nu lase vreo portiţă deschisă spre limitarea libertăţii de circulaţie pentru unii dintre cetăţenii ţărilor membre, folosindu-se criterii arbitrare. Este cât se poate de evident că acest mecanism nu poate funcţiona fără încrederea reciprocă deplină între ţările membre. Iar aceasta se obţine prin criterii clare, obiective de evaluare şi, la nevoie, prin gestiunea comună a problemelor. Sper că adoptarea acestei rezoluţii va grăbi procesul de aderare la Schengen a statelor candidate. |  | |  |  |  | |  | | --- | |  | |      |  |  |  |  |  | | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | | |  | | --- | | MPphoto | |  | **Rachida Dati (PPE),***par écrit***. –** Je soutiens l'ambition selon laquelle il nous faut développer un mécanisme destiné à garantir une plus grande efficacité de la mise en œuvre de l'espace Schengen. Une plus grande efficacité, cela veut dire non seulement des déplacements sans entraves pour les Européens, mais cela veut aussi dire un réel contrôle de l'immigration, et des résultats concrets sur la lutte contre l'immigration clandestine. Il faut absolument rendre plus visibles ces résultats, pour renforcer la confiance des citoyens dans l'Union européenne. |  | |  |  |  | |  | | --- | |  | |      |  |  |  |  |  | | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | | |  | | --- | | MPphoto | |  | **Marielle de Sarnez (ALDE),***par écrit***. –** Le manque de solidarité dont ont fait preuve certains pays européens en avril 2011, en considérant que la gestion des réfugiés tunisiens sur l'île de Lampedusa relevait de la responsabilité unique de l'Italie, a fortement remis en cause l'acquis Schengen, l'une des réalisations majeures de l'UE. Plus récemment, le drame syrien et ses conséquences en termes de réfugiés ont également a une nouvelle fois démontré que la sécurisation des frontières extérieures doit être l'affaire de tous. Il est grand temps de renouer avec l'esprit de solidarité européen. L'Europe doit se doter d'une stratégie commune d'immigration, qui soit humaine et raisonnable. Un Etat ne peut décider unilatéralement de fermer ses frontières même de façon exceptionnelle comme le fit le Danemark en 2011. Cela n'est acceptable ni juridiquement ni politiquement. La mise en place d’un mécanisme européen de réintroduction d'un contrôle temporaire s’appuyant sur l’analyse de l'acquis de Schengen constitue donc une solution plus appropriée. Ce nouveau mécanisme contribuera ainsi à préserver la zone Schengen en tant qu'espace sans frontières intérieures. Soumis au contrôle démocratique du Parlement européen, sa mise en œuvre aura toute sa légitimité démocratique, prérequis indispensable. |  | |  |  |  | |  | | --- | |  | |      |  |  |  |  |  | | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | | |  | | --- | | MPphoto | |  | **Christine De Veyrac (PPE),***par écrit***. –** J'ai voté en faveur de ce texte qui préconise une amélioration du mécanisme d'évaluation et de contrôle de l'application de Schengen et ainsi une amélioration de la gouvernance de l'espace Schengen. Les acquis de Schengen tel que la libre circulation, auxquels les citoyens européens tiennent tant, sont essentiels au fonctionnement du marché intérieur ainsi qu'à la mobilité européenne. La liberté de circulation est un élément essentiel de la citoyenneté européenne. Afin de garantir l'efficacité du système et la sécurité des citoyens, la Commission devra désormais s'assurer du respect par les Etats membres du principe de liberté de circulation. |  | |  |  |  | |  | | --- | |  | |      |  |  |  |  |  | | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | | |  | | --- | | MPphoto | |  | **Anne Delvaux (PPE),***par écrit***. –** Je me félicite de l'adoption de ce rapport qui instaure une véritable méthode communautaire à l'évaluation de l'application des règles dictées par Schengen. La méthode était avant purement intergouvernementale et la Commission européenne sera dorénavant bien plus impliquée dans le processus d'évaluation. Il y aura plus de possibilités pour obliger les Etats membres réfractaires au respect de tous les accords à incorporer des processus correctifs dans leurs politiques nationales. L'action d'évaluation de la Commission sera également contrôlée par le Parlement, ce qui implique un meilleur contrôle démocratique et une meilleure transparence. |  | |  |  |  | |  | | --- | |  | |      |  |  |  |  |  | | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | | |  | | --- | | MPphoto | |  | **Mark Demesmaeker (Verts/ALE),***schriftelijk***. −**De vandaag goedgekeurde hervorming dient bij uitstek de versterking van de mobiliteit van de Europese burger. Dat de Europese Commissie, als hoedster van de Europese verdragen, nu de mogelijkheid krijgt om ernstige gebreken in de toepassing van de Schengenregels vast te stellen en oplossingen voor te stellen, met inspraak van Raad en Europees Parlement, stemt mij tevreden. Dit moet het gemarchandeer tussen de lidstaten over grenscontroles tegengaan en meer houvast bieden in situaties die grote druk zetten op landen. De omstandigheden waarin naar invoering van grenscontroles als laatste redmiddel kan worden teruggegrepen, worden nu duidelijker afgebakend. Daarnaast moet de EU nog meer doen. Een versterking van het toezicht aan de buitengrenzen via een versterking van Frontex en een gemeenschappelijk Europees asiel- en migratiebeleid zijn beide noodzakelijk om het vrij verkeer zonder binnengrenscontroles te behouden. Gelukkig heeft de communautaire methode het in dit dossier gehaald. Een grondige Europese democratische controle is immers absoluut nodig. Uiteindelijk zijn we er in geslaagd een evenwichtige Europese aanpak te vinden zonder de prerogatieven van de lidstaten buitenspel te zetten om in uitzonderlijke omstandigheden te kunnen doen wat nodig is voor het garanderen van de openbare orde of de binnenlandse veiligheid. |  | |  |  |  | |  | | --- | |  | |      |  |  |  |  |  | | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | | |  | | --- | | MPphoto | |  | **Ioan Enciu (S&D),***în scris***. −**În calitate de raportor din umbră pentru pachetul de guvernanţă Schengen, am votat în favoarea acestui raport, întrucât spaţiul Schengen trece de la o abordare interguvernamentală la una europeană a evaluării Schengen cu Comisia care va avea rolul de coordonare a întregului mecanism de evaluare şi nu va fi ca până acum un simplu observator. Comisia va adopta programele anuale şi multianuale de evaluare, va conduce echipele de evaluare împreună cu un reprezentant al unui stat membru, va coordona procesul de follow-up în cazul în care se identifică potenţiale deficienţe. Se va întări şi libertatea de circulaţie în interiorul Schengen, întrucât, de acum înainte, Comisia va putea face vizite neanunţate la frontierele interne, pentru a se asigura că nu există abuzuri. De asemenea, Parlamentul European va avea un rol de supervizare a procesului de evaluare şi va avea dreptul să fie informat şi să primească documentele relevante la fiecare pas al evaluării. Acest lucru reprezintă o schimbare majoră faţă de situaţia actuală în care Parlamentul nu este în niciun fel informat şi nu are acces nici măcar la rapoartele de evaluare. |  | |  |  |  | |  | | --- | |  | |      |  |  |  |  |  | | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | | |  | | --- | | MPphoto | |  | **Diogo Feio (PPE),***por escrito*. **−** A criação, com o Acordo Schengen, de um espaço europeu sem controlos nas fronteiras foi um passo importante na construção de um mercado interno aberto fundado na essencial liberdade de circulação de pessoas. Pese embora este espaço constitua uma inestimável conquista, a verdade é que recentemente tem sido tema recorrente o equilíbrio entre a necessária segurança dentro das nossas fronteiras e a fundamental liberdade de circulação. Voto favoravelmente as alterações agora propostas no sentido de alterar o Código das Fronteiras Schengen e ser encontrado um equilíbrio correto que deixe aos Estados-Membros margem de manobra suficiente, tanto em situações imprevisíveis como previsíveis para a reposição das suas fronteiras, ao mesmo tempo que se assegura um processo de tomada de decisão mais coletivo. |  | |  |  |  | |  | | --- | |  | |      |  |  |  |  |  | | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | | |  | | --- | | MPphoto | |  | **Lorenzo Fontana (EFD),***per iscritto***. −** Il regolamento istituisce un meccanismo di valutazione e monitoraggio sugli accordi di Schengen, per capire se siano stati applicati integralmente, se il loro acquis sia stato recepito ecc.... Si evidenzia l'importanza di attuare un nuovo meccanismo di adesione e di non discriminare gli Stati già rientranti in Schengen dai Paesi candidati all'accesso. Tutto ciò si basa sulla compilazione di appostiti questionari e su visite in loco con o senza preavviso. Esprimo voto negativo riguardo a questa proposta. |  | |  |  |  | |  | | --- | |  | |      |  |  |  |  |  | | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | | |  | | --- | | MPphoto | |  | **Robert Goebbels (S&D),***par écrit***. –** Je n'ai pas pu donner mon accord sur le paquet Schengen. Même si la Commission voit ses pouvoirs un peu améliorés face à des décisions unilatérales d'un État membre, le Parlement européen, pourtant colégislateur selon le traité de Lisbonne en matière de contrôle aux frontières, d'asile etc., reste confiné dans un rôle d'observateur qui reçoit uniquement des "informations". Le fait que certains États continuent à refuser au Parlement européen la procédure législative ordinaire dans ces matières démontre que les velléités de renationalisation de Schengen sont très fortes. Mon "Non" est une protestation à l'adresse des ministres de l'intérieur qui jouent sur les "peurs" de leurs concitoyens. |  | |  |  |  | |  | | --- | |  | |      |  |  |  |  |  | | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | | |  | | --- | | MPphoto | |  | **Mikael Gustafsson (GUE/NGL),***skriftlig***. −** Vänsterpartiet har motsatt sig Schengenavtalet från första stund både utifrån vår antifederalistiska hållning och utifrån vårt konsekventa försvar av de mänskliga rättigheterna. Schengensystemet har kraftigt bidragit till att bygga murar runt EU och skapandet av en Fästning Europa. Konsekvensen har blivit att tusentals flyktingar omkommit i sina försök att fly till EU. Flyktingströmmarna är orsakade av krig och djupa ekonomiska orättvisor i världen, som också EU bidrar till att skapa. I konsekvens med detta principiella resonemang röstar jag nej till detta betänkande. |  | |  |  |  | |  | | --- | |  | |      |  |  |  |  |  | | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | | |  | | --- | | MPphoto | |  | **Philippe Juvin (PPE),***par écrit***. –** J'ai soutenu le rapport de mon collègue Carlos Caelho lors de la séance plénière du 12 juin. Ce rapport visait à créer un mécanisme d'évaluation afin de garantir que les règles de Schengen soient appliquées de manière cohérente par chaque Etat membre et ce notamment afin de renforcer la libre circulation des citoyens. Ce rapport a été adopté par 526 voix pour, 101 contre et 55 abstentions. Je m'en félicite. |  | |  |  |  | |  | | --- | |  | |      |  |  |  |  |  | | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | | |  | | --- | | MPphoto | |  | **Filip Kaczmarek (PPE),***na piśmie***. −** Głosowałem za przyjęciem rezolucji w sprawie projektu rozporządzenia Rady w sprawie ustanowienia mechanizmu oceny w celu weryfikacji stosowania dorobku Schengen. Mam jednak mieszane uczucia w tej sprawie. Rozumiem, że celem jest „skuteczny i niezawodny system monitorowania i oceny pozwalający egzekwować wspólne zasady oraz ulepszać, dostosowywać i rozszerzać kryteria oparte na dorobku UE, któremu to apelowi towarzyszyło przypomnienie, że należy skutecznie i spójnie zarządzać zewnętrznymi granicami UE, wspólnie ponosząc za to odpowiedzialność, działając solidarnie oraz praktycznie współpracując”. Cieszę się, że nowy system oceny jest mechanizmem unijnym. Z drugiej strony mam wrażenie, że mechanizm oceny może być w przyszłości wykorzystywany do uzasadniania praktycznego ograniczania dorobku Schengen. Mam nadzieję, że tak się nie stanie. |  | |  |  |  | |  | | --- | |  | |      |  |  |  |  |  | | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | | |  | | --- | | MPphoto | |  | **Agnès Le Brun (PPE),***par écrit***. –** Depuis près de 20 ans, l'Union européenne a créé l'espace Schengen qui permet aux citoyens européens de circuler d'un Etat à l'autre sans qu'il n'y ait de contrôles aux frontières intérieures. Cependant, lorsqu'un Etat ne contrôle pas suffisamment ses frontières extérieures, la question de l'immigration illégale se pose. J'ai alors voté ce texte car il crée un nouveau mécanisme qui permet de vérifier que les Etats gèrent correctement le contrôle des frontières extérieures, par le biais de visites, annoncées ou non. L'obligation pour l'Etat de présenter un plan d'action en cas de défaillance constatée m'a convaincue de l'efficacité d'un tel mécanisme. |  | |  |  |  | |  | | --- | |  | |      |  |  |  |  |  | | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | | |  | | --- | | MPphoto | |  | **Светослав Христов Малинов (PPE),***в писмена форма***. −** Четирите фундаментални свободи - свободното движение на хора, стоки, услуги и капитал - представляват най-отличителната черта на Европейския съюз. Безспорно, най-осезаемо за гражданите е правото им на свободно движение в рамките на Съюза. То е изградено въз основа на взаимно доверие между страните членки, но те имат и определени задължения. Чрез различни инструменти Европейският съюз подпомага всяка страна да изпълнява поетите ангажименти към Шенген. Въпреки това, тези лостове не гарантират, че шенгенските правила са константно спазвани в рамките на цялото пространство. Именно затова съществува Шенгенският механизъм за оценка, който съблюдава за спазването на правилата и издава препоръки. Текущото предложение цели да преразгледа и осъвремени начина на функциониране на механизма, като следва да се засили контролът върху членовете и по този начин да се утвърди принципът на равнопоставеност между страните кандидатки за Шенген и тези, които вече са част от пространството. Аз подкрепям предложението, защото вярвам, че високите стандарти за сигурност, наложени като условие за влизането на страни като България в Шенген, следва да останат валидни и за приетите страни. Приветствам и техническите изменения, предвиждащи засилване на правомощията на наднационалните агенции, както и повече прозрачност и оптимизация на дейността и на изразходваните ресурси. Подкрепям и правото на Комисията да извършва необявени инспекции. |  | |  |  |  | |  | | --- | |  | |      |  |  |  |  |  | | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | | |  | | --- | | MPphoto | |  | **David Martin (S&D),***in writing***. −** I take the view that this new mechanism – which is more European, more transparent, efficient and rigorous – represents a huge step forward by comparison with the status quo. It strengthens the tools needed to identify and swiftly remedy any shortcomings found in the Member States with regard to the implementation and application of the Schengen rules, thereby helping to preserve the Schengen area as an area without internal borders and protect citizens’ freedom of movement. For all these reasons, and with satisfactory guarantees having been agreed to safeguard Parliament’s institutional role, I support the rapporteur’s recommendation that this agreement be approved. |  | |  |  |  | |  | | --- | |  | |      |  |  |  |  |  | | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | | |  | | --- | | MPphoto | |  | **Clemente Mastella (PPE),***per iscritto***. −** Quanto al meccanismo di valutazione oggi approvato, riteniamo che il diritto alla libera circolazione all'interno dello spazio Schengen sarà meglio garantito grazie alla riforma della sua stessa governance. In futuro, infatti, gli ispettori che garantiscono il rispetto di tali regole, saranno abilitati ad effettuare visite senza preavviso per evitare controlli di frontiera illegali da parte delle autorità nazionali delle frontiere interne. Nel caso di ispezione alle frontiere esterne, invece, lo Stato Membro interessato dovrà essere informato con almeno 24 ore di anticipo. Le squadre, inoltre, saranno composte da esperti degli Stati Membri, della Commissione e delle agenzie dell'Unione Europea. Lo *Schengen Borders Code* (SBC), così come modificato dal nostro voto odierno, chiarisce che qualunque reintroduzione di controlli alle frontiere interne costituisce un'eccezione e può avvenire solo come misura di ultima istanza, per un periodo di tempo limitato, in base a specifici criteri oggettivi ed una valutazione monitorata a livello di Unione Europea. Abbiamo stabilito, infine, che in caso di minaccia grave per l'ordine pubblico o la sicurezza interna, i controlli possano essere ristabiliti per 30 giorni, termine che può essere prolungato per un massimo di sei mesi. |  | |  |  |  | |  | | --- | |  | |      |  |  |  |  |  | | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | | |  | | --- | | MPphoto | |  | **Véronique Mathieu Houillon (PPE),***par écrit***. –** Nous avons gagné à deux titres avec la présente réforme de la gouvernance Schengen: la liberté fondamentale que représente la libre circulation des citoyens européens est préservée et la sécurité de l'espace Schengen est renforcée. La libre circulation cimente les peuples européens, et représente pour beaucoup une manifestation tangible de la citoyenneté européenne. C'est une liberté essentielle que nos peurs ou querelles ne sauraient remettre en cause. Mais cette réforme nous permet également de renforcer la sécurité de l'espace Schengen. Désormais nous avons un mécanisme européen efficace d'évaluation de l'espace Schengen. Nous pouvons contrôler de façon objective le contrôle de nos frontières, de par des évaluations européennes menées par de petits groupes d'experts et des visites de terrains. Cela nous assure un meilleur contrôle de nos frontières extérieures. |  | |  |  |  | |  | | --- | |  | |      |  |  |  |  |  | | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | | |  | | --- | | MPphoto | |  | **Iosif Matula (PPE),***în scris***. −** După cum o evidenţiază şi Eurobarometrele, libertatea de circulaţie în cadrul UE reprezintă unul dintre beneficiile cele mai importante pentru cetăţeni, ca urmare a apartenenţei la UE. Din păcate, este încă un deziderat îndepărtat pentru o parte din populaţie, deşi statele în cauză îndeplinesc toate criteriile de aderare la spaţiul Schengen. Pachetul de guvernanţă, cu cele două regulamente - unul care stabileşte un nou mecanism de evaluare pentru situaţiile de urgenţă şi un altul care amendează Codul frontierelor Schengen - va adăuga o dimensiune comunitară mai mare liberei circulaţii. Mai exact, va evita posibilitatea unor abuzuri la reintroducerea controalelor la frontieră, decizie care va fi supusă unor criterii riguroase de evaluare. La modul concret, va garanta libertatea de mişcare a cetăţenilor şi va elimina standardele duble care afectează anumite state din estul Europei. În ciuda pierderii competenţei de codecizie, va asigura o mai bună informare a Parlamentului European în eventualitatea apariţiei unor situaţii critice. Pe baza noului mecanism, îmi exprim încrederea că se va putea recunoaşte faptul că România şi Bulgaria sunt pregătite să adere la spaţiul de liberă circulaţie, în cazul celor două ţări realizându-se deja evaluarea Schengen, cu rezultate pozitive. |  | |  |  |  | |  | | --- | |  | |      |  |  |  |  |  | | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | | |  | | --- | | MPphoto | |  | **Jean-Luc Mélenchon (GUE/NGL),***par écrit***. –** Je refuse l'extension du pouvoir de la Commission européenne dans la procédure de réintroduction des contrôles temporaires aux frontières intérieures. Je ne peux donc pas approuver ce rapport qui avalise cette procédure et consacre la toute-puissance de la Commission dans les inspections. |  | |  |  |  | |  | | --- | |  | |      |  |  |  |  |  | | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | | |  | | --- | | MPphoto | |  | **Nuno Melo (PPE),***por escrito*. **−** Apesar deste acordo não ser exatamente o que o Parlamento Europeu teria desejado, dá resposta à maior parte das preocupações das nossas preocupações e representa um progresso substancial em relação às atuais regras de Schengen, reforçando a sua governança. Além disso, reforça o direito dos cidadãos de circularem livremente no âmbito do espaço Schengen, prevendo explicitamente a possibilidade de avaliar se estão ou não a ser efetuados controlos ilegais nas fronteiras internas. |  | |  |  |  | |  | | --- | |  | |      |  |  |  |  |  | | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | | |  | | --- | | MPphoto | |  | **Alexander Mirsky (S&D),***in writing***. −** The Evaluation Mechanism will be based on a European approach. It provides for the involvement of the European institutions, as opposed to a purely intergovernmental approach. I voted in favour. |  | |  |  |  | |  | | --- | |  | |      |  |  |  |  |  | | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | | |  | | --- | | MPphoto | |  | **Elisabeth Morin-Chartier (PPE),***par écrit***. –** Le rapport Coelho correspond à ce que je conçois de l’Union européenne et ce en quoi je crois. Ce rapport issu d’une négociation entre le Conseil européen, la Commission européenne et le Parlement européen propose de ne plus recourir à des systèmes de contrôle uniquement intergouvernementaux mais à un mécanisme plus centralisé de contrôle et d’évaluation des politiques en lien avec les accords de Schengen. Ceci est un avantage et une avancée pour les citoyens de l’Union européenne car ceux-ci sont protégés de toute partialité provenant d’un État membre, qui ne respecterait pas les règles en vigueur. Ses raisons et ses nouvelles garanties pour les États membres et les citoyens de l’Union européenne me conduisent à voter en faveur de ce texte. |  | |  |  |  | |  | | --- | |  | |      |  |  |  |  |  | | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | | |  | | --- | | MPphoto | |  | **Sławomir Nitras (PPE),***na piśmie***. −** Umowa z Schengen i wiążące się z nią przywileje są jednymi z największych osiągnięć Unii Europejskiej. Swobodny przepływ ma jednak niekiedy niepożądane konsekwencje, szczególnie wtedy, gdy przepływ ludzi negatywnie wpływa na bezpieczeństwo wewnętrzne Unii i jej poszczególnych członków. Projekt normujący mechanizmy okresowego przywracania kontroli na granicach wewnętrznych jest krokiem do właściwego uregulowania tej kwestii. Takie mechanizmy muszą jednak być stosowane tylko w sytuacjach wyjątkowych, przy zachowaniu proporcjonalności używanych środków zapobiegawczych do danej sytuacji. Kodeks graniczny Schengen przewiduje już możliwość przywrócenia kontroli na granicach wewnętrznych przez państwo członkowskie w przypadku poważnego zagrożenia porządku publicznego i bezpieczeństwa wewnętrznego lub w czasie dużych wydarzeń kulturalno-sportowych. Aktualnie państwo członkowskie może wznowić kontrolę na swojej granicy na okres od 10 dni do maksymalnie 2 miesięcy. Taka decyzja jest podejmowana wyłącznie na szczeblu krajowym. Nowe przepisy będą wymagały od państwa członkowskiego zwrócenia się do KE o przywrócenie kontroli granicznej na okres do 6 miesięcy, który mógłby być osobną decyzją przedłużony maksymalnie do 2 lat. Taki wniosek będzie oceniany przez KE, a następnie zatwierdzany przez Radę. Kontrola Komisji zapewni, by te nowe możliwości przywracania granic były ograniczone tylko do sytuacji naprawdę wyjątkowych. Z uwagi na racjonalny charakter reformy strefy Schengen zdecydowałem się ją poprzeć. |  | |  |  |  | |  | | --- | |  | |      |  |  |  |  |  | | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | | |  | | --- | | MPphoto | |  | **Younous Omarjee (GUE/NGL),***par écrit***. –** Le mécanisme d'évaluation destiné à contrôler l'application de l'acquis de Schengen, jusqu'ici de la compétence des États, fait l'objet dans ce texte d'un transfert de compétence aux institutions européennes. La Commission européenne jouerait ainsi désormais un rôle majeur dans l'élaboration des programmes d'évaluation et bénéficierait de nouvelles prérogatives. En outre, les multiples références du rapport au programme Frontex témoignent du consentement donné à l'usage de la force aux frontières dans la guerre inégale menée contre les personnes migrantes.  Je ne peux donc que me prononcer contre ce rapport. |  | |  |  |  | |  | | --- | |  | |      |  |  |  |  |  | | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | | |  | | --- | | MPphoto | |  | **Rolandas Paksas (EFD),***raštu***. −** Pasiūlymas dėl Šengeno vertinimo mechanizmo neabejotinai yra svarbus instrumentas, stiprinant Šengeno erdvės valdymo sistemą. Vertinimų sistema padės užtikrinti, kad valstybės narės laikytųsi Šengeno *acquis* nuostatų. Griežtas ir veiksmingas vertinimo mechanizmas panaikins dvigubus standartus ir padės veiksmingiau spręsti ES išorės sienos apsaugos klausimus. Patikrinimai, apie kuriuos nepranešta, ir didesnis Frontex bei Komisijos vaidmuo vertinimų procese užkirs kelią neteisėtai kontrolei, vykdomai prie vidaus sienų. Tačiau kyla abejonių, ar naujas teisinis reglamentavimas išlaikys tinkamą valstybių narių tarpusavio pasitikėjimą bei svarbų jų vaidmenį vertinimo procese. Manau, kad turėtume siekti aktyvaus pačių valstybių narių vaidmens Šengeno *acquis* vertinimų procese. Be to, turėtų būti numatyti tam tikri saugikliai dėl tinkamo išimtinių priemonių, atstatant kontrolę prie valstybės narės vidaus sienų, taikymo. |  | |  |  |  | |  | | --- | |  | |      |  |  |  |  |  | | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | | |  | | --- | | MPphoto | |  | **Justas Vincas Paleckis (S&D),***in writing***. −** The ability to travel within the Schengen area is considered one of the top benefits brought by the EU by many people; this right is not being challenged. However, recent events have shown that the internal regulations of the system are not as strong as they should be and challenge the delicate balance between security and free movement. The temporary reintroduction of internal borders is not to prevent migrants from coming to the EU but rather to be sure that no one Member State acts unilaterally. I support the EU working together as a whole to acknowledge each Member State’s interests while making sure the Schengen area is secure. These new standards of internal movement will apply to both Schengen states and Schengen candidates, making the system far more unified. A balance can be found between Member State’s need to react to unpredictable circumstances and collective-decision making. I voted in favour of this report because it will transform the Schengen area from one based on agreements between governments to an area where all follow the same European standards. |  | |  |  |  | |  | | --- | |  | |      |  |  |  |  |  | | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | | |  | | --- | | MPphoto | |  | **Maria do Céu Patrão Neves (PPE),***por escrito*. **−** Felicito o relator e acompanho a sua posição favorável à aprovação do acordo alcançado, uma vez que, ainda que não cumpridas todas as expectativas do Parlamento Europeu, o acordo dá resposta à maior parte das preocupações do Parlamento e representa um progresso substancial em relação às atuais regras de Schengen, reforçando a governança de Schengen. Além disso, e ainda de acordo com o relator, reforça-se o direito dos cidadãos de circularem livremente no âmbito do espaço Schengen, prevendo explicitamente a possibilidade de avaliar se estão ou não a ser efetuados controlos ilegais nas fronteiras internas, nomeadamente, através da possibilidade de fazer visitas sem qualquer aviso prévio. |  | |  |  |  | |  | | --- | |  | |      |  |  |  |  |  | | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | | |  | | --- | | MPphoto | |  | **Aldo Patriciello (PPE),***per iscritto***. −** Considerando che l'accordo dà risposta alla maggior parte delle preoccupazioni del Parlamento europeo e che rappresenta un progresso sostanziale rispetto alle attuali norme di Schengen, rafforzandone la governance e concordando con il relatore, ho espresso il mio voto in favore alla proposta. |  | |  |  |  | |  | | --- | |  | |      |  |  |  |  |  | | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | | |  | | --- | | MPphoto | |  | **Franck Proust (PPE),***par écrit***. –** Depuis 1993, les citoyens de l’espace Schengen peuvent circuler librement. C'est un droit inaliénable que nous ne pouvons remettre en cause. Mais ce système était quasiment obsolète. La solidarité de fait entre tous les Etats membres n'était pas bien réelle. Il nous fallait compléter le dispositif, afin de ne pas le laisser en pâture aux Eurosceptiques. Avec ce vote, nous avons remporté une bataille. D'un coté, nous préservons notre modèle de libre circulation, mais de l'autre nous renforçons la sécurité de nos frontières. C'est ce que demandaient les peuples. A partir de maintenant, le contrôle effectif de frontières pourra être examiné au niveau européen. En contrepartie, les Etats membres pourront imposer la fermeture d'une frontière avec un autre Etat un peu trop laxiste sur ses propres frontières. Et chaque Etat membre reste maître chez lui si une situation d'extrême urgence l'amène à devoir temporairement rétablir les contrôles à ses frontières. La chose essentielle que nous devons toujours garder en mémoire: c'est jouer l'équilibre entre libre circulation et sécurité de nos concitoyens. |  | |  |  |  | |  | | --- | |  | |      |  |  |  |  |  | | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | | |  | | --- | | MPphoto | |  | **Paulo Rangel (PPE),***por escrito*. **−** A livre circulação de cidadãos num espaço sem fronteiras internas estriba-se num contexto de confiança mútua, em que cada Estado participante se acha pronto e apto a implementar os diversos instrumentos legislativos que compõem o acervo de Schengen. Contudo, o Acordo de Schengen, sendo uma das principais conquistas da integração europeísta, merece dispor de ferramentas para apoiar os Estados-Membros a cumprir as suas obrigações e a reagir a circunstâncias críticas que possam colocar em risco Schengen. Estas ferramentas não podem, contudo, por si só, garantir que as regras de Schengen sejam aplicadas de modo consistente por cada Estado-Membro. Logo, neste caso, o único garante do cumprimento do Acordo será um mecanismo de avaliação de Schengen, usado para monitorizar a aplicação do acervo e para emitir recomendações sobre quaisquer deficiências identificadas. O mecanismo atual, dependente do sistema intergovernamental de revisão por pares, não é forte o suficiente para solucionar todas as lacunas. Neste sentido, o relator envidou todos os esforços possíveis, conquistando efetivamente um progresso em relação às atuais regras, consumado neste ato juridicamente vinculativo, cujo rigor e alcance merecem todo o meu apoio. |  | |  |  |  | |  | | --- | |  | |      |  |  |  |  |  | | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | | |  | | --- | | MPphoto | |  | **Mitro Repo (S&D),***kirjallinen***. −** Vapaan liikkumisen periaatteesta on väännetty jäsenvaltioiden keskuudessa kättä jo usean vuoden ajan. Lyhykäisyydessään kiistan juuret ovat siinä, että jotkin maat (Ranska sekä Tanska) ovat vaatineet nykyisen Schengen-sopimuksen löyhentämistä niin, että EU-maiden sisärajoillakin voitaisiin tietyissä tapauksissa suorittaa rajatarkastuksia. Verukkeena on käytetty milloin kuviteltua pakolaisaaltoa, milloin rikollisten tai romanien liikkumisen estämistä. Edustajakollegoideni reaktio tälle jäsenvaltioiden hankkeelle on ymmärrettävän tiukkasävyinen: vapaan liikkumisen periaate on pyhä!  Tällä päätöslauselmalla äänestettiin ennen kaikkea siitä, pitäisikö Schengen-tarkastajilla olla oikeus tehdä ennalta ilmoittamattomia tarkastuskäyntejä myös EU:n sisäisille raja-asemille, jotta estettäisiin kansallisia viranomaisia tekemästä laittomia sisärajatarkastuksia. Pitäisi. Ennalta ilmoittamattomien tarkastuskäyntien tarkoitus on estää laittomat tarkastukset sisärajoilla. Vapaa liikkuvuus kuuluu Euroopan unionin perusperiaatteisiin, ja mahdollisuus liikkua EU:n alueella ilman sisärajoilla tehtäviä rajatarkastuksia on myös kansalaisten mielestä yksi EU:n parhaista saavutuksista. |  | |  |  |  | |  | | --- | |  | |      |  |  |  |  |  | | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | | |  | | --- | | MPphoto | |  | **Raül Romeva i Rueda (Verts/ALE),***in writing***. −** Against. If the matter were purely substantial, we could agree that significant improvements are in place, and support the report. Nevertheless, we still believe that Article 77(2)(e) TFEU would be a more appropriate legal basis, and voluntarily consultation is hardly a good compromise, where co-decision could be used. Also a reference to ‘illegal’ immigration is not acceptable for us. For these reasons we cannot support the compromise. |  | |  |  |  | |  | | --- | |  | |      |  |  |  |  |  | | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | | |  | | --- | | MPphoto | |  | **Czesław Adam Siekierski (PPE),***na piśmie***. −** Korzyści płynące z istnienia strefy Schengen są łatwe do zauważenia przez większość mieszkańców Unii. Wprowadzanie strefy przyspiesza także transport dóbr i wymianę usług, ułatwiając w ten sposób rozwój wspólnego rynku. Istnienie strefy Schengen oparte jest na zaufaniu; każde z państw ufa, że inne państwa właściwie chronią swoje granice. Jednak strefa jest tworem niejednorodnym. A że ochrona granic w każdym z państw ma wpływ na wszystkie pozostałe, potrzebne są rozwiązania na szczeblu unijnym, a nie tylko międzypaństwowym, i wprowadzenie nowego mechanizmu oceny Schengen. Jednym z ważnych środków, jaki otrzymała Komisja, jest możliwość złożenia wniosku do zatwierdzenia przez Radę, dotyczącego przywrócenia granic w przypadku istotnych długotrwałych zaniedbań ze strony państwa członkowskiego w kwestii ochrony granic. Przywrócenie granic nawet na krótki czas byłoby zabiegiem trudnym dla mieszkańców, jednak należy podkreślić, że przepisy te dają Unii większą elastyczność działania na wypadek trudności. W dłuższej perspektywie będzie to korzystne dla stabilności strefy Schengen. Przywrócenie kontroli na granicach, jest posunięciem drastycznym, ale już samo istnienie takiej możliwości będzie dyscyplinować państwa do lepszego przestrzegania ochrony granic. |  | |  |  |  | |  | | --- | |  | |      |  |  |  |  |  | | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | | |  | | --- | | MPphoto | |  | **Catherine Stihler (S&D),***in writing***. −** I voted in favour as it calls for the strengthening of Schengen governance by putting an end to a purely intergovernmental system and creating a more EU-based Schengen Evaluation Mechanism. |  | |  |  |  | |  | | --- | |  | |      |  |  |  |  |  | | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | | |  | | --- | | MPphoto | |  | **Marc Tarabella (S&D),***par écrit***. –** Je considère que ce nouveau mécanisme – plus européen, plus transparent, plus efficace et plus rigoureux – constitue un énorme pas en avant par rapport à la situation actuelle. Il fournit les outils nécessaires pour identifier et corriger, dès le début, d'éventuels manquements des États membres dans l'application des règles de Schengen, contribuant ainsi à préserver la zone Schengen en tant qu'espace sans frontières intérieures et à protéger la libre circulation des citoyens. Pour toutes ces raisons, et compte tenu des garanties satisfaisantes qui ont été données quant au rôle institutionnel du Parlement européen, j'approuve malgré tout ce compromis. |  | |  |  |  | |  | | --- | |  | |      |  |  |  |  |  | | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | | |  | | --- | | MPphoto | |  | **Nuno Teixeira (PPE),***por escrito*. **−** O espaço de liberdade, segurança e justiça que hoje vivem os 500 milhões de cidadãos europeus permite a livre circulação de pessoas, uma das principais conquistas do projeto Europeu. O espaço Schengen e o seu *acquis* estão baseados no princípio da confiança mútua entre os Estados participantes. Nos últimos tempos, vários governos europeus puseram em causa esta conquista, como resposta ao afluxo imprevisto de migrantes. Os instrumentos e o mecanismo de avaliação de Schengen demonstram debilidades, que poderão vir do sistema ser em si intergovernamental. Por isso, o que este relatório assume é mais método comunitário, mais transparência nas informações entre as instâncias europeias, sobre as inspeções e recomendações da Comissão Europeia (CE), e uma maior cooperação entre a CE e os Estados-Membros. Por outro lado, os especialistas nacionais devem ter mais formação e a FRONTEX deve ver o seu poder reforçado e usar mais eficientemente os seus recursos. Sou favorável a este relatório. |  | |  |  |  | |  | | --- | |  | |      |  |  |  |  | | --- | --- | --- | --- | | |  | | --- | | MPphoto | |  | **Inês Cristina Zuber (GUE/NGL),***por escrito*. **−** O acervo de Schengen, que inclui o seu sistema de informação (SIS) e o sistema de informação sobre vistos (VIS), tem vindo a ser cada vez mais desenvolvido, alargado e com novas características, desde há vários anos. São políticas que desde sempre considerámos comportarem elevados riscos para os direitos, as liberdades e as garantias dos cidadãos e têm sido constantemente adequadas aos inaceitáveis e mesmo perigosos objetivos da atual ofensiva securitária, ao alargamento e à crescente comunitarização dos assuntos internos na UE, aspetos com os quais não concordamos. A nova proposta pretende estabelecer um regime de avaliação da correta aplicação do acervo de Schengen para *preservar a confiança mútua entre os Estados-Membros quanto à sua capacidade para aplicar de forma eficaz e efetiva as medidas de acompanhamento que permitem manter um espaço sem fronteiras internas*. O relatório propõe a realização de questionários e visitas ao terreno, como base da avaliação numa frequência obrigatória de pelo menos uma vez a cada cinco anos para cada Estado-Membro. Propõe ainda o mesmo procedimento para o programa anual que deve basear-se na análise de risco efetuada pela Frontex, prevendo as avaliações a realizar em cada país, com ou sem aviso prévio. Desde sempre, rejeitámos Schengen e este relatório visa a sua manutenção e aprofundamento. | |
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