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| |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | | **18. Establishment, operation and use of the Schengen Information System in the field of border checks - Establishment, operation and use of the Schengen Information System in the field of police cooperation and judicial cooperation in criminal matters - Use of the Schengen Information System for the return of illegally staying third-country nationals (debate)** | |  |  |  | | --- | --- | --- | |  | [**Video of the speeches**](https://www.europarl.europa.eu/plenary/en/vod.html?mode=chapter&vodLanguage=EN&playerStartTime=20181023-20:43:24&playerEndTime=20181023-22:03:47) |  | | |  |  |  | | --- | --- | --- | |  | [**Minutes**](https://www.europarl.europa.eu/doceo/document/PV-8-2018-10-23-ITM-018_EN.html) |  | |      |  |  |  |  |  |  | | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | | |  | | --- | | MPphoto |  |  | | --- | |  | |  | **Presidente. –** L'ordine del giorno reca, in discussione congiunta,  - la relazione di Carlos Coelho, a nome della commissione per le libertà civili, la giustizia e gli affari interni, sull'istituzione, l'esercizio e l'uso del sistema d'informazione Schengen nel settore delle verifiche di frontiera ([**COM(2016)0882**](https://eur-lex.europa.eu/smartapi/cgi/sga_doc?smartapi!celexplus!prod!DocNumber&lg=EN&type_doc=COMfinal&an_doc=2016&nu_doc=0882) - C8-0533/2016 - [**2016/0408(COD)**](https://oeil.secure.europarl.europa.eu/oeil/popups/ficheprocedure.do?lang=en&reference=2016/0408(COD))) ([**A8-0347/2017**](https://www.europarl.europa.eu/doceo/document/A-8-2017-0347_EN.html)),  - la relazione di Carlos Coelho, a nome della commissione per le libertà civili, la giustizia e gli affari interni, sull'istituzione, l'esercizio e l'uso del sistema d'informazione Schengen nel settore della cooperazione di polizia e della cooperazione giudiziaria in materia penale ([**COM(2016)0883**](https://eur-lex.europa.eu/smartapi/cgi/sga_doc?smartapi!celexplus!prod!DocNumber&lg=EN&type_doc=COMfinal&an_doc=2016&nu_doc=0883) - C8-0530/2016 - [**2016/0409(COD)**](https://oeil.secure.europarl.europa.eu/oeil/popups/ficheprocedure.do?lang=en&reference=2016/0409(COD))) ([**A8-0349/2017**](https://www.europarl.europa.eu/doceo/document/A-8-2017-0349_EN.html)), e  - la relazione di Jeroen Lenaers, a nome della commissione per le libertà civili, la giustizia e gli affari interni, sull'uso del sistema d'informazione Schengen per il rimpatrio di cittadini di paesi terzi il cui soggiorno è irregolare ([**COM(2016)0881**](https://eur-lex.europa.eu/smartapi/cgi/sga_doc?smartapi!celexplus!prod!DocNumber&lg=EN&type_doc=COMfinal&an_doc=2016&nu_doc=0881) - C8-0532/2016 - [**2016/0407(COD)**](https://oeil.secure.europarl.europa.eu/oeil/popups/ficheprocedure.do?lang=en&reference=2016/0407(COD))) ([**A8-0348/2017**](https://www.europarl.europa.eu/doceo/document/A-8-2017-0348_EN.html)). |  | |  |  |  | |  | | --- | |  | |      |  |  |  |  |  |  | | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | | |  | | --- | | MPphoto |  |  | | --- | |  | |  | **Carlos Coelho,***Relator***.** – Senhor Presidente, Senhor Comissário Avramopoulos e Senhor Comissário King, Senhor Ministro, Caros Colegas, todos nós queremos reforçar a segurança das nossas fronteiras, proteger melhor os nossos cidadãos e defender a livre circulação. Para tudo isto, precisamos de melhorar o Sistema de Informação de Schengen.  Demorámos cerca de seis meses nas negociações interinstitucionais sobre o SIS, metade do que tínhamos demorado na reforma anterior. Neste meio ano, lutámos por mais segurança, por mais liberdade, por mais Schengen em prol dos cidadãos europeus.  Com efeito, esta reforma do Sistema de Informação de Schengen adapta o sistema aos desafios colocados pela migração, responde às novas ameaças do terrorismo e da criminalidade organizada, tira proveito dos desenvolvimentos tecnológicos e reforça o respeito pelos direitos fundamentais, em particular a proteção de dados.  No momento em que a União Europeia é acusada de não responder atempadamente às necessidades dos cidadãos, a implementação desta reforma inicia-se já no início do próximo ano. Pela primeira vez, aliás, temos uma data limite para que esta reforma entre em funcionamento, assim como mecanismos que asseguram maior controlo e transparência sobre os custos. Medidas do mais elementar bom senso, dir-se-á, mas que encontraram desde sempre muita resistência, mas desta vez vai ser diferente. Estados—Membros e Comissão têm de cumprir prazos e orçamento. Dentro do calendário dos custos previstos, o novo SIS tem de estar em pleno funcionamento.  O impacto desta reforma é profundo. O novo Sistema de Informação de Schengen vai mudar a forma como as autoridades de polícia de fronteira partilham informação na Europa. Não precisamos de mais informação, precisamos de melhor informação. Vamos proteger melhor as nossas crianças, não apenas quando o pior já aconteceu e não sabemos o seu paradeiro, pelo contrário, através de novos alertas para crianças em risco. Vamos poder prevenir estes raptos ou realidades tão dramáticas como a mutilação genital, mas também vamos melhorar a segurança de todos através de uma monitorização mais estreita dos chamados *foreign fighters* e outros criminosos, através de novos meios de obtenção de informação, os *inquiry checks*, através de melhores dados biomédicos, como impressões digitais e imagens faciais. Será possível não apenas efetuar pesquisas com estes elementos, como procurar em toda a Europa autores de crimes desconhecidos, mas cuja impressão digital foi encontrada no local do crime.  Vamos melhorar os controlos nas nossas fronteiras externas. Levamos a cabo a maior revisão de sempre às proibições de entrada em Schengen. Será virtualmente impossível que alguém recusado por Portugal consiga entrar pela Alemanha, mas certos requisitos terão de ser cumpridos.  Melhoramos a capacidade de resposta do sistema, aumentamos a sua capacidade de processamento e reforçamos as suas defesas contra potenciais ataques, problemas de segurança ou simples falhas. E pedimos mais eficácia aos Estados—Membros. Os prazos de resposta dos Gabinetes Sirene foram encurtados e os pedidos de informação em casos relativos a crianças ou terrorismo requerem resposta imediata.  Por fim, mas nem por isso menos importante, colocamos o SIS no centro da ação europeia, providenciando o acesso à Frontex e à Europol, aumentando ainda mais o valor da sua ação.  Estou confiante, Sr. Presidente, em que, amanhã, esta Câmara irá aprovar sem reservas a terceira reforma do Sistema de Informação de Schengen. Acredito que mais Europa, que mais SIS permite melhor informação e melhor coordenação, permite mais segurança e mais liberdade. |  | |  |  |  | |  | | --- | |  | |      |  |  |  |  |  |  | | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | | |  | | --- | | MPphoto |  |  | | --- | |  | |  | **Jeroen Lenaers,***Rapporteur***.** – Voorzitter, laat me ook allereerst collega Carlos Coelho, commissarissen King en Avromopoulos en alle schaduwrapporteurs bedanken, die samen met ons aan dit resultaat gewerkt hebben, en natuurlijk de Raad, met name het Estse en het Bulgaarse Voorzitterschap. Ik denk dat we een heel goed resultaat bereikt hebben.  Het Schengeninformatiesysteem is een cruciaal onderdeel van ons veiligheidsbeleid. Het is een onderdeel dat eigenlijk heel goed functioneert, maar waarover we toch vaak weinig horen. Het is cruciaal dat nationale autoriteiten, politie, justitie via dit systeem toegang kunnen krijgen tot informatie over bijvoorbeeld gezochte personen, personen die discreet gevolgd moeten worden, die aangehouden moeten worden, vermiste personen en vermiste kinderen, maar ook bijvoorbeeld gestolen voorwerpen als auto's, paspoorten of wapens.  Laat me toch een aantal cijfers noemen om te vertellen wat er met dat systeem gebeurt. Het wordt vijf miljard keer per jaar geraadpleegd. We hebben meer dan 70 miljoen van dit soort signaleringen in dat systeem opgenomen. 450 keer per dag in de EU hebben we een hit op basis van dit systeem. We hebben 40 000 verdachten gearresteerd op basis van dit systeem, 150 000 mensen geweigerd aan de grens, 28 000 vermiste personen gevonden, 200 000 objecten teruggevonden. Dat zijn stuk voor stuk hele indrukwekkende cijfers, maar het kan altijd beter en het moet altijd beter, en daarom deze hervorming van het Schengeninformatiesysteem.  Carlos Coelho heeft al een aantal dingen gezegd, dus laat mij op één specifiek onderdeel wat dieper ingaan en dat is het opnemen van terugkeerbesluiten in het Schengeninformatiesysteem. Een belangrijke stap, want we weten allemaal dat we er tegenwoordig maar heel moeizaam in slagen om mensen die geen asiel hebben gekregen in Europa en die eigenlijk moeten terugkeren naar het land van herkomst, ook daadwerkelijk te laten terugkeren. Op dit moment lukt dat maar in 37 % van de gevallen. Dat betekent dat in bijna twee derde van de gevallen mensen die hier gekomen zijn, die geen asiel gekregen hebben, toch gewoon blijven. Dat getal, dat percentage moet absoluut omhoog, als wij het draagvlak onder het gemeenschappelijk asielbeleid willen behouden. Dat moet beter en het Schengeninformatiesysteem kan daarbij helpen.  Nu is het zo dat, wanneer een lidstaat besloten heeft om geen asiel te verlenen en dat een persoon terug moet naar het land van herkomst, we bij wijze van spreken een vrijwillige terugkeer aanbieden, een vinkje erachter zetten en maar geloven dat het goed is. Hier doen zich twee problemen voor. In de eerste plaats, weten we niet of die persoon daadwerkelijk vertrokken is. In de tweede plaats, mocht die persoon in een andere lidstaat opduiken, dan weten de autoriteiten daar vaak niet dat er in een ander land al een terugkeerbesluit genomen is en beginnen we weer van voren af aan.  Die twee problemen lossen wij vandaag op. Op het moment dat iemand ook daadwerkelijk de buitengrens van de EU overschreden heeft, wordt de originele lidstaat geïnformeerd en wordt dat gecorrigeerd, zodat we onze energie kunnen richten op de mensen die hier nog steeds zijn. Politiediensten kunnen voortaan in het systeem zien of iemand al gesignaleerd staat als persoon die terug moet naar het land van herkomst, zodat de samenwerking veel gemakkelijker is om dat ook op een efficiënte manier te laten gebeuren. Dit is een belangrijke stap om het terugkeerbeleid efficiënter te maken.  Tegelijkertijd moeten we daarom voorzichtig zijn. Het is juist daarom dat we vanuit het Europees Parlement ervoor gezorgd hebben dat de waarborgen dienaangaande, ook ernstig versterkt worden. Wanneer een terugkeerbesluit opgeschort wordt of uitgesteld, wordt het *alert* verwijderd. Het principe van non—refoulement en het Verdrag van Genève worden expliciet opgenomen. De waarborgen op het gebied van databescherming worden sterk verbeterd, zowel ten aanzien van het bewaren van data als van de samenwerking met derde landen op dat gebied.  Dus samengevat, Voorzitter, we zijn erin geslaagd om het terugkeerbeleid een stap dichter bij echte efficiëntie te brengen, terwijl we tegelijkertijd ervoor zorgen dat de waarborgen en de rechten van personen te allen tijde gerespecteerd worden. Dat is een heel mooi resultaat en daar mogen we trots op zijn. |  | |  |  |  | |  | | --- | |  | |      |  |  |  |  |  |  | | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | | |  | | --- | | MPphoto |  |  | | --- | |  | |  | **Dimitris Avramopoulos,** *Member of the Commission***.** – Mr President, I am very pleased to be here with you tonight for the final debate on our three proposals for a reinforced Schengen Information System. I would like to thank wholeheartedly the rapporteurs, Mr Coelho and Mr Lenaers; the shadow rapporteurs, their teams and all those involved on this file for enabling us to have this debate tonight. This agreement was the result of intense work and I would like to congratulate them for it.  At the core, the Schengen Information System is about one thing: trust. The trust to share sensitive information with EU partners. The trust to follow up on alerts shared by EU partners. The trust to rely on the Schengen Information System when the security of our citizens is at stake.  The SIS today contains over 80 million alerts on wanted and missing persons and objects. Just last year it was accessed 5.2 billion times. Since 2013, when we first had SIS in its current form, it has led to 50 000 arrests and the tracking of 200 000 serious criminals. These numbers are clear testament to its value for our Member States. It is no exaggeration to say that it is the centrepiece of our security cooperation in Europe and our most important instrument for information exchange in the European Union.  It was against this background that we proposed – in December 2016, as you will remember – to further strengthen the system. But the question is: why change a system that performed so well? Because with the dramatic improvements in information-sharing during the past three years, a stronger SIS can open a new chapter in our cooperation on internal security and can contribute to the coherent application of the rules and principles governing the Schengen area.  The new rules will help with the effective enforcement of entry bans for third-country nationals at the external borders by making the entry of their data into the SIS compulsory. With the introduction of a new alert category for return decisions, the SIS will also provide an efficient tool for the implementation of EU policies on return. Member States will now be obliged to enter alerts where a person or an object is sought for a terrorist offence.  The role of Europol will be strengthened, as it will now have access to all alerts and supplementary information exchanges, while Member States will be obliged to inform Europol of any alerts related to terrorist offences. The operational teams of the European Border and Coast Guard Agency will also have their own access to SIS in order to carry out checks at the hotspots. The new SIS will make better use of biometric data, with the possibilities of using palm prints, facial images and DNA profiles in specific cases, when safeguards are met. This will build on the Automated Fingerprint Identification System we introduced to SIS earlier this year, which has already led to a 25% increase in the number of alerts containing fingerprints.  In parallel, the reinforcement of SIS will strengthen the protection of personal data by aligning the SIS provisions with the new data protection framework. There will also be important improvements for the work of law enforcement authorities and strong links to our work on interoperability, which Julian will tell you more about in a minute.  Interoperability, like our security initiatives on electronic evidence, explosives and terrorist content online, is vital for the security of our citizens, and it is essential that they advance rapidly to adoption before the May elections.  What I would like to leave you with is that, with this debate tonight and tomorrow’s vote, Europe’s most widely-used secure database will become even stronger. A strengthened SIS will provide police and border guards with the information they need to do their jobs and help keep Europeans safe. It is the most concrete example of all our work to change the culture on how we cooperate on security in the European Union: a Europe that protects; a genuine and effective Security Union to ensure the security of our citizens. With this in mind, I encourage you to support this important initiative when you vote tomorrow. |  | |  |  |  | |  | | --- | |  | |      |  |  |  |  |  |  | | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | | |  | | --- | | MPphoto |  |  | | --- | |  | |  | **Julian King,** *Member of the Commission***.** – Mr President, the Schengen Information System (SIS) is the centrepiece of our network of information exchange and the main law enforcement database that we have. But its real strength lies in the fact that it is used. It is used every day. It has been integrated into the everyday work of over two million police officers and border guards across Europe, whose job it is to try and keep us safe. It is an undoubted success.  In addition to some of the figures that we’ve already heard, between 2013 and 2017 the SIS also contributed to over 28 000 missing persons being found; to the tracing of more than 180 000 persons needed to assist with a criminal judicial procedure; and to almost 200 000 cases concerning stolen objects – vehicles, identity, travel documents and firearms – being solved, all using the SIS.  I would like to join the speakers who have already thanked Mr Coelho, Mr Lenaers and all those who worked on reaching agreement on these proposals for improving the system. The improvements that we’ve agreed – that you’ve agreed – will make a real, positive contribution to the fight against terrorism and serious and organised crime. As we have heard, they will make the exchange of information more efficient. The new obligation to enter an alert in relation to a terrorist offence will be applicable immediately. Together with the provisions on information sharing in the directive on countering terrorism, this is an important step towards information sharing by default, which many of you in this House have argued for.  New alert categories, like the new inquiry check, will provide key investigative tools for law enforcement authorities. The proposed changes will also allow the SIS alerts to be used for unknown persons wanted in connection with a crime on the basis of fingerprints or palm prints discovered at the scene of the crime – for instance, when fingerprints are found on a weapon that has been used – all subject to certain safeguards. The new SIS will strengthen support for the prevention and investigation of theft and counterfeiting by providing for alerts to be issued on a wider range of stolen and falsified goods and documents. In parallel to these measures, we’ve also been working with the Member States to make the system more user friendly for frontline officers, and we have thus seen the number of checks made against the SIS increase by 40% in 2016, compared with the year before, and by a further 30% year-on-year in 2017.  Dimitris Avramopoulos has already mentioned the Automated Fingerprint Identification System (AFIS). To date, 12 Member States are using AFIS to identify people at the external borders or on their territory. This has already led to a number of hits on people who would not have been identified otherwise, such as, to give one example, the man who claimed asylum on arrival at Schiphol without identity documents. After a fingerprint check on AFIS, it was found that there was a warrant out for his arrest in Germany. That’s the kind of practical result that these new systems, incorporating biometrics, can deliver. We are now working with the other Member States to ensure that they too implement biometrics. Under the new proposals, the use of AFIS will be mandatory for all Member States by the end of 2020, which in itself will mark an important milestone in the fight against multiple or fraudulent identities. But, as Dimitris Avramopoulos underlined, there’s still more to do on this.  So, finally, let me briefly link the strengthening of the SIS with our wider work towards the interoperability of EU information systems for security, border and migration management. The reinforced SIS sits at the core of our proposals on interoperability, i.e. our work to ensure that national authorities have the information they need, when and where they need it, with all the safeguards offered by our fundamental rights framework. By closing down the gaps that terrorists and criminals can exploit, we can cut down on identity fraud and strengthen our external border security and our internal security.  I very much welcomed the Committee on Civil Liberties, Justice and Home Affairs (LIBE) Committee adopting its negotiating mandate on interoperability last week, and I look forward to the start of trilogues soon on this important subject. Thank you for your support. |  | |  |  |  | |  | | --- | |  | |      |  |  |  |  | | --- | --- | --- | --- | |  |  | **PRESIDE: RAMÓN LUIS VALCÁRCEL SISO** *Vicepresidente* |  | |  |  |  | |  | | --- | |  | |      |  |  |  |  |  |  | | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | | |  | | --- | | MPphoto |  |  | | --- | |  | |  | **Hilde Vautmans,***Rapporteur voor advies van de Commissie buitenlandse zaken***.** – Meneer de Voorzitter, commissaris, we hebben het al gehoord, het Schengeninformatiesysteem vormt de kern van de veiligheidssamenwerking binnen de Europese Unie. De aanpassingen die we vandaag gaan voorstellen zijn eigenlijk broodnodig om onze veiligheid te vergroten in de strijd tegen terreur. Vandaar ook de gezichtsherkenning en het gebruik van vingerafdrukken. Het zijn allemaal noodzakelijke aanpassingen.  Maar vandaag ben ik vooral heel blij met hetgeen mijn collega Gérard Deprez mee heeft bewerkstelligd. De preventieve waarschuwingen voor kinderen die het gevaar lopen slachtoffer te worden van een ouderontvoering, van een kindhuwelijk of van genitale verminking. Die hervorming was broodnodig. Net zoals de hervorming die we doorvoeren voor de kinderen in migratie, voor de kinderen op de vlucht. Eindelijk zal het mogelijk zijn om DNA-profielen te gebruiken om hen sneller te identificeren en op te sporen. Collega's, deze derde hervorming van het Schengeninformatiesysteem zal onze veiligheid in Europa ongetwijfeld vergroten. |  | |  |  |  | |  | | --- | |  | |      |  |  |  |  |  |  | | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | | |  | | --- | | MPphoto |  |  | | --- | |  | |  | **Kinga Gál,***a PPE képviselőcsoport nevében***.** – Tisztelt Elnök Úr! A Schengeni Információs Rendszer, akárcsak a schengeni térség, maga az európai sikertörténet. Az európai polgároknak a legkézzelfoghatóbb vívmányát jelenti, a belső határnélküliséget, ugyanakkor nem veszélyeztetve biztonságukat. Hiszen csak 2015-ben az illetékes nemzeti hatóságok közel 2,9 milliárd alkalommal ellenőriztek személyeket és tárgyakat biztonsági célzattal a SIS-ben tárolt adatok alapján. A holnap szavazásra kerülő új javaslat ezt a biztonsági elemét a schengeni rendszernek erősíti tovább, hogy az megfelelő választ tudjon adni az új migrációs és terrorizmus általi kihívásokra is. Üdvözlendő, hogy végre nagyobb figyelmet kap, gyorsabb és hatékonyabb lesz az eljárás az eltűnt gyermekek felkutatásában, amelynek sikere sokszor az első huszonnégy órán múlhat. Hatékonyabbá válik a kitoloncolásra váró vagy a beutazási tilalom alá eső illegális migránsok elleni eljárás. Az arcképek tárolásával könnyebben beazonosíthatóvá válnak bűnözők és terroristák. Az Európai Néppárt törekvéseivel egyezik a megújított rendszer, hiszen tükrözi valamennyi meggyőződését, hogy nincs szabadság biztonság nélkül. Ezen új generációs információs rendszer pedig épp biztonságunkat növeli majd. Ugyanakkor nem szabad felednünk, hogy belső határnélküliségünk csak addig fenntartható, ameddig külső határaink biztonságát garantálni tudjuk. |  | |  |  |  | |  | | --- | |  | |      |  |  |  |  |  |  | | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | | |  | | --- | | MPphoto |  |  | | --- | |  | |  | **Miriam Dalli,***on behalf of the S&D Group***.** – Mr President, let me first of all thank the rapporteurs, Mr Coelho and Mr Lenaers, with whom we worked closely and had a good working relationship. I can say that the Schengen Information System that we negotiated together is a valuable tool which can help build resilience against terrorist threats and can help keep our citizens secure and safe. The effectiveness and efficiency of the system can always be further strengthened, but I believe that what we have achieved is a good balance to ensure the safety of our citizens across the European Union.  As the S&D Group we have welcomed the revision of SIS. However, we wanted to strike the right balance between gathering data and the fundamental rights of our citizens. This is a system primarily designed for the purpose of police and border control, and with this in mind, it is crucial to establish a system that will not jeopardise the right to privacy, the right to the protection of personal data, and procedural rights in criminal cases.  On behalf of my Group, I have pushed for proper safeguards for the biometric data stored in the system. Our focus was to establish uniform rules for securely addressing and processing Schengen Information System data. We have given special attention to the safety of all civilians and included preventive alerts for vulnerable third-country nationals and victims of human trafficking, but also for missing children or children at high risk of parental abduction. For me, it was pivotal not only to address the fight against human trafficking and child abduction but also to ensure that their fundamental rights with regard to their personal data are protected.  Information exchange in the field of police and judicial cooperation in criminal matters and in the field of border checks is essential, particularly since the great majority of individuals involved in perpetrating terrorist attacks in Europe within the last decade have been EU citizens. Many were foreign fighters; most were already known to the European authorities.  Let me emphasise a final point about SIS II. SIS II is based on the principle of mutual trust and requires Schengen states to enforce each other’s SIS alerts. It means that states have a duty to check an alert’s lawfulness and proportionality, particularly if its enforcement would violate the fundamental rights of the person involved. Based on this principle, the relevant authorities should check first whether any action would violate the person’s fundamental rights, because the improvement of the system should never come at the expense of the protection of the individual’s fundamental rights. We have the tools to guarantee the safety of our citizens; now we need to make sure that Member States implement properly this regulation. Thanks a lot, and once again thank you to the rapporteurs. |  | |  |  |  | |  | | --- | |  | |      |  |  |  |  |  |  | | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | | |  | | --- | | MPphoto |  |  | | --- | |  | |  | **Helga Stevens,***namens de ECR-Fractie***.** – Voorzitter, collega's, ik ben zeer tevreden met het wetgevingspakket over het Schengeninformatiesysteem. Hiermee verhogen we de efficiëntie van de SIS-databank op het vlak van grensbewaking, het opvolgen van de terugkeer van illegalen en de politiesamenwerking. Deze databank is trouwens cruciaal voor onze veiligheid in het licht van het vrij verkeer van personen binnen het Schengengebied.  Een evaluatie bracht echter gebreken aan het licht, gaande van kwaliteitsproblemen, een gebrek aan opleiding bij politiemensen tot onvoldoende informatie over signalisering en vertragingen bij de opvolging van treffers. Deze voorstellen werken deze gebreken nu weg, maar het gaat verder dan puur cosmetische aanpassingen of technische verbeteringen. Nu kunnen personen enkel aan de hand van bijvoorbeeld hun naam of geboortedatum in de databank worden opgezocht. Maar in de toekomst kunnen criminelen worden opgespoord aan de hand van hun vingerafdrukken. Gedaan dus met identiteitsfraude. Ook van belang is dat vingerafdrukken, gevonden op de plaats van de misdaad, kunnen worden ingevoerd in het systeem. Hiermee verhogen we de pakkans van misdadigers die op de vlucht zijn.  Een efficiëntere en gebruiksvriendelijkere databank is absoluut nodig, zodat onze politiediensten en grenswachters hun werk naar behoren kunnen doen. Samen met de interoperabiliteit van databanken door allerlei gegevensbanken aan elkaar te koppelen, zetten we een nieuwe stap vooruit in de strijd tegen criminaliteit, mensensmokkel en terreur. Ik roep alle fracties dan ook op om voor deze zeer nodige aanpassingen te stemmen. Veiligheid is immers een zaak van ons allen. |  | |  |  |  | |  | | --- | |  | |      |  |  |  |  |  |  | | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | | |  | | --- | | MPphoto |  |  | | --- | |  | |  | **Gérard Deprez,***au nom du groupe ALDE***.** – Monsieur le Président, Messieurs les Commissaires, chers collègues, ils sont nombreux les citoyens européens – et j’en suis – à se réjouir et à profiter de la liberté de circulation dans l’espace européen.  Mais ce que les citoyens savent moins et que nos deux excellents rapporteurs Carlos Coelho et Jeroen Lenaers connaissent à la perfection – je tiens à les féliciter – c’est le rôle central que joue le système d’information Schengen (SIS) pour garantir cette liberté. Car le corollaire obligé de la liberté de circulation, c’est le contrôle efficace des frontières extérieures et une coopération accrue entre les forces de police à l’intérieur de l’espace commun européen.  Les commissaires Avramopoulos et King, ainsi que Jeroen Lenaers, ont rappelé des chiffres indiscutables sur l’efficacité actuelle du système d’information Schengen. Mais cette efficacité, pour grande qu’elle soit déjà, comportait encore trop de lacunes que nous avions dénoncées. Il était donc nécessaire de l’améliorer. C’est ce qui est proposé à notre assemblée dans ces trois rapports.  Premièrement, dorénavant les États membres devront introduire un signalement dans le SIS pour toute personne impliquée dans des infractions ou des crimes terroristes. Europol en sera instantanément averti, ce qui permettra le déclenchement rapide de la coopération entre les polices européennes.  Deuxièmement, dorénavant, les États membres devront introduire dans le SIS, un signalement pour toute personne frappée d’une interdiction de séjour sur le territoire européen. Ce n’est pas le cas actuellement et cela entrave considérablement l’exécution des décisions de quitter le territoire.  Troisièmement, dorénavant, les États membres pourront introduire dans le SIS un signalement pour les enfants disparus, les enfants menacés d’enlèvement, les jeunes filles menacées de mariage forcé ou de mutilations génitales.  Avec ces changements, chers collègues, le SIS ne sera plus seulement un outil répressif, ce qui reste nécessaire, mais deviendra aussi un moyen efficace de protection des personnes les plus fragiles, ce qui doit nous réjouir tous.  *(L’orateur accepte de répondre à une question «carton bleu» (article 162, paragraphe 8, du règlement)* |  | |  |  |  | |  | | --- | |  | |      |  |  |  |  |  |  | | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | | |  | | --- | | MPphoto |  |  | | --- | |  | |  | **Dobromir Sośnierz (NI),***pytanie zadane przez podniesienie niebieskiej kartki***.** – Chciałem spytać, skoro Pan martwi się o usprawnienie systemu informacji Schengen, to może zwróci się Pan do przewodniczącego Pana ugrupowania, pana Verhofstadta, który zaprosił do tego Parlamentu Ludmiłę Kozłowską, która dostała zakaz wjazdu na teren Unii Europejskiej od polskich służb specjalnych, co potem potwierdziły służby ukraińskie – potwierdziły, że jest to osoba niebezpieczna. Przewodniczący Pana ugrupowania obwozi ją jako jakiegoś rzekomego polskiego dysydenta i pokazuje w tym Parlamencie wbrew zakazowi wydanemu przez władze polskie. Jak Pan to skomentuje? |  | |  |  |  | |  | | --- | |  | |      |  |  |  |  |  |  | | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | | |  | | --- | | MPphoto |  |  | | --- | |  | |  | **Gérard Deprez (ALDE),***réponse «carton bleu»***.** – M. Verhofstadt a eu parfaitement raison de faire ce qu’il a fait, parce que dans le cas que vous avez mentionné, le signalement dans le système d’information Schengen par les autorités polonaises était un véritable détournement et c’est la raison pour laquelle nous ne l’avons pas accepté et que nous avons accordé un droit d’accès à cette personne. |  | |  |  |  | |  | | --- | |  | |      |  |  |  |  |  |  | | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | | |  | | --- | | MPphoto |  |  | | --- | |  | |  | **Eva Joly,***au nom du groupe Verts/ALE***.** – Monsieur le Président, le système d’information Schengen est un outil indispensable pour garantir la liberté de circulation dans l’espace Schengen et la sécurité des citoyens.  Mon groupe soutient les propositions qui améliorent l’échange d’informations pertinentes entre États membres, un élément essentiel pour lutter efficacement contre le terrorisme, le crime organisé et l’enlèvement d’enfants. Mais l’extension de l’utilisation de ce fichier pour les décisions de retour contribuera à accroître la criminalisation de la migration.  Par ailleurs, les menaces à l’ordre public sont des notions trop vagues qui permettent à certains États membres d’en abuser en entrant des alertes dans le système sur des bases strictement politiques. C’est notamment le cas de la Pologne, qui interdit l’entrée dans l’espace Schengen à la défenseuse des droits humains ukrainienne, Lyudmyla Kozlovska via ce type d’alerte.  Des garanties sont donc indispensables pour que ces fichiers ne deviennent ni un instrument politique entre les mains d’États peu scrupuleux, ni un *Big Brother* avec toutes nos données biométriques. |  | |  |  |  | |  | | --- | |  | |      |  |  |  |  |  |  | | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | | |  | | --- | | MPphoto |  |  | | --- | |  | |  | **Marie-Christine Vergiat,***au nom du groupe GUE/NGL***.** – Monsieur le Président, le SIS II sera-t-il le nouveau *Big Brother* européen?  Le système d’information Schengen créé en 1990 était le pendant de la suppression des contrôles aux frontières. Il concernait essentiellement les véhicules volés, les personnes disparues et les ressortissants de pays tiers interdits de séjour. Un simple outil de coopération policière.  Sa portée n’a cessé de s’élargir au regard des signalements inclus, des données collectées et du nombre de personnes y ayant accès. Plus de 5 milliards de consultations, 76 millions de signalements et plus de 2 millions d’utilisateurs. Moi, cela m’inquiète pour le droit des personnes signalées et qui n’avaient rien à se reprocher.  Le ratio n’est pas beau et on va encore en élargir le champ, en y intégrant notamment des personnes soupçonnées d’avoir l’intention de commettre une infraction. Le soupçon d’intention: voilà une nouvelle norme pénale qui est assez loin de la présomption d’innocence. On pourra intégrer dans un fichier de criminalité un peu n’importe qui – nous venons de l’entendre – sans que les intéressés même ne le sachent vraiment.  On va aussi ficher tous les ressortissants de pays tiers faisant l’objet d’une mesure de retour ou d’un refus d’entrée sur le territoire. C’est un cran supplémentaire dans la criminalisation des migrants en situation dite «irrégulière» qui sont, rappelons-le, dans leur immense majorité, des personnes en situation de détresse.  On augmente aussi les collectes de données alphanumériques, images faciales, données digitales ou palmaires, voire ADN dans certains cas.  Oui! nos citoyens ont droit à la sécurité, les nouvelles technologies peuvent y aider mais pas à n’importe quel prix, pas en développant un climat de suspicion généralisée au détriment des droits fondamentaux, surtout entre de mauvaises mains. Pour nous, c’est non! |  | |  |  |  | |  | | --- | |  | |      |  |  |  |  |  |  | | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | | |  | | --- | | MPphoto |  |  | | --- | |  | |  | **Giancarlo Scottà,***a nome del gruppo ENF***.** – Signor Presidente, onorevoli colleghi, perché continuare a voler mettere in secondo piano i cittadini europei?  La proposta della Commissione europea, seppur migliorabile, era già condivisibile. A fronte di ciò, invece, l'azione del Parlamento ha indebolito un testo che avrebbe potuto, date le ampie differenze tra Stati membri soprattutto in tema di magistratura, rafforzare la cooperazione tra le autorità competenti degli Stati per affrontare compatti l'immigrazione irregolare.  Ancora una volta, quindi, abbiamo perso un'opportunità. Il diritto alla richiesta d'asilo non è mai stato messo in discussione ma noi, come espressione diretta dei nostri cittadini, abbiamo il compito di garantire la sicurezza dei nostri territori.  Seppur in un quadro, quindi, di piena garanzia per ciò che riguarda la tutela dei diritti fondamentali delle persone e i principi sanciti dalla Carta dei diritti fondamentali dell'Unione europea, dobbiamo lavorare a una revisione e a un riordino della disciplina legata al tema dell'immigrazione irregolare guardando alla realtà dei fatti in modo più franco. |  | |  |  |  | |  | | --- | |  | |      |  |  |  |  |  |  | | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | | |  | | --- | | MPphoto |  |  | | --- | |  | |  | **Steven Woolfe (NI).** – Mr President, nothing illustrates the long-term aim of the European Union more clearly than the increasing weakening of the national borders by Schengen. The Commission brags that the Schengen Information System is the most important information exchange system in Europe. No doubt it is. The vast body of information kept on you, me and everyone else who has ever crossed a European border makes George Orwell’s 1984 nightmare look kind, generous and liberal.  Schengen is supposed to keep those inside safe and control who comes in from outside. It does neither. Terrorist slaughter has taken place inside the Schengen Area, committed by evil men who go between Europe and the Middle East at ease and at will. Schengen stops none of it. Still, the Commission wants to hold more information on all of us. It is further to weaken powers of the nation states. Without control, borders dissolve. Without borders, nations dissolve. That is the long-term aim of the European Union. |  | |  |  |  | |  | | --- | |  | |      |  |  |  |  |  |  | | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | | |  | | --- | | MPphoto |  |  | | --- | |  | |  | **Agustín Díaz de Mera García Consuegra (PPE).** – Señor presidente, apoyo estas propuestas, naturalmente. Todo un universo en materia de seguridad resumido en un minuto. Esto demuestra la baja calidad de nuestro sistema parlamentario: tres informes, dos comisarios. Así es que, haciendo un esfuerzo de síntesis, diré cuatro palabras.  Felicidades a Carlos y a Jeroen y me quedo con estos cuatro *inputs*: entrevistas, huellas, imágenes faciales y perfiles ADN. Son determinantes para mejorar la seguridad de los europeos, son necesarios para utilizar adecuadamente la revisión del sistema y así se facilitará, comisario King, su empeño —que comparto— de la interoperabilidad en el ámbito del año 2020. |  | |  |  |  | |  | | --- | |  | |      |  |  |  |  |  |  | | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | | |  | | --- | | MPphoto |  |  | | --- | |  | |  | **Juan Fernando López Aguilar (S&D).** – Señor presidente, comisarios, desde que se puso en marcha en 1995, Schengen equivale para los europeos a libre circulación de personas y, por tanto, es uno de los activos más preciados del acervo y de la construcción europea y hay que protegerlo. Y estamos dando un paso en esa dirección con estos tres Reglamentos en un debate conjunto: fronteras exteriores, cooperación policial y judicial, y también retorno.  Tres Reglamentos que se incardinan en el refuerzo de la seguridad en la gestión de las fronteras exteriores, también para controlar mejor los flujos migratorios, lo que se conecta con el sistema de entradas y salidas, con el sistema de información de visados, e incluso con Eurodac —registros biométricos, con todas las nuevas tecnologías—.  Pero hemos puesto el acento también en algunos elementos que son muy relevantes. El primero, que estamos poniendo a disposición de la interoperabilidad de las bases de datos elementos que afectan a los derechos fundamentales de las personas, y el objetivo garantista es irrenunciable para este Parlamento y no puede ser ignorado ni olvidado.  En segundo lugar, que Schengen está cuestionado porque las amenazas contra la seguridad han dado lugar a suspensiones temporales en un buen número de Estados miembros y es imprescindible que el objetivo irrenunciable sea la plena restauración de la libre circulación de personas y, por tanto, la preservación del activo Schengen.  En tercer lugar, que esta interoperabilidad de datos puede servir también para proteger mejor a las personas, particularmente a las más vulnerables, por ejemplo, a los niños, a los menores que atraviesan las fronteras de la Unión y no pueden desaparecer después, como ha puesto de manifiesto el terrible informe de Europol —nada menos que diez mil niños desaparecidos—.  Y, finalmente, que no se puede vincular enteramente el sistema de Schengen al retorno de los inmigrantes irregulares, porque, si es cierto que debemos reforzar la seguridad, también es cierto que no podemos renunciar a la visión que llamamos holística, comprensiva, general del fenómeno migratorio, del hecho migratorio, para darle el tratamiento adecuado que tantas veces ha reclamado en sus resoluciones este Parlamento Europeo. |  | |  |  |  | |  | | --- | |  | |      |  |  |  |  |  |  | | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | | |  | | --- | | MPphoto |  |  | | --- | |  | |  | **Kristina Winberg (ECR).** – Herr talman! Informationsutbyten är i grunden bra, särskilt när det gäller tredjelandsmedborgare. Vi behöver ha kontroll på vilka som rör sig inom EU:s gränser. Därför kommer jag att rösta ja på detta förslag. Men glöm inte bort de havererande inre gränskontrollerna. Sverige har i veckan fått kraftig kritik för sina bristande gränskontroller i en hemligstämplad rapport. Underkänd av EU på 95 punkter. Men exakt vad det gäller vet vi inte, och får inte veta det heller.  Men även fungerande gränskontroller löser inte alla problem. En asylprocess i Sverige ligger tidsmässigt på cirka 500 dagar. Många av dem som får avslag vägrar att acceptera beslutet. EU borde uppmana medlemsstater som Sverige att effektivisera återvändandet med kortare handlingstider och fler förvarsplatser, vilket tyvärr behövs. |  | |  |  |  | |  | | --- | |  | |      |  |  |  |  |  |  | | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | | |  | | --- | | MPphoto |  |  | | --- | |  | |  | **Γεώργιος Επιτήδειος (NI).** – Κύριε Πρόεδρε, η ανεξέλεγκτη παράνομη μετανάστευση και η ανάγκη να καταπολεμηθεί η τρομοκρατία υποχρεώνει τα κράτη να αυξήσουν τους ελέγχους στα σύνορά τους. Αυτό είναι πολύ φυσιολογικό να συμβαίνει. Παράλληλα όμως, επιδιώκουν να βελτιώσουν και το Σύστημα Πληροφοριών Σένγκεν. Μία από τις βελτιώσεις είναι και η προσθήκη σε αυτό πληροφοριών που αναφέρονται σε βιομετρικά χαρακτηριστικά. Αυτά τα δεδομένα είναι ιδιαίτερα ευαίσθητα και δεν πρέπει να καταχωρίζονται στο σύστημα, εάν προηγουμένως δεν έχουν εξετασθεί και αναλυθεί με προσοχή.  Ιδιαίτερη προσοχή πρέπει να δίδεται στα βιομετρικά δεδομένα ευάλωτων ομάδων, όπως είναι τα μικρά παιδιά. Από την άλλη πλευρά, επιβάλλεται να υπάρξει και η ασφάλεια αυτών των δεδομένων, ούτως ώστε να μη χρησιμοποιούνται κατά τρόπο που προσβάλλει τα θεμελιώδη δικαιώματα. Επιπλέον, θα πρέπει να έχουμε υπόψη ότι ο σκοπός αυτού του συστήματος είναι η προστασία μας από την τρομοκρατία και το οργανωμένο έγκλημα και όχι η δημιουργία ενός «μεγάλου αδελφού». |  | |  |  |  | |  | | --- | |  | |      |  |  |  |  |  |  | | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | | |  | | --- | | MPphoto |  |  | | --- | |  | |  | **Innocenzo Leontini (PPE).** – Signor Presidente, onorevoli colleghi, migliorare l'efficacia dei rimpatri è fondamentale per mantenere la fiducia dei cittadini nei confronti delle politiche dell'Unione europea in materia di immigrazione e asilo.  Grazie alla revisione del sistema d'informazione Schengen sarà possibile istituire per la prima volta un sistema per lo scambio di informazioni tra gli Stati membri relativo alle decisioni di rimpatrio. Tale sistema consentirà di verificare se i cittadini di paesi terzi abbiano effettivamente lasciato il territorio degli Stati membri.  Inoltre il nuovo SIS permetterà di contrastare più efficacemente anche il terrorismo e la criminalità organizzata, attraverso le segnalazioni obbligatorie delle persone legate ad attività terroristiche, la condivisione del DNA dei criminali ricercati e la maggiore collaborazione con Europol.  Per tutte queste ragioni sostengo pienamente l'eccellente lavoro svolto dai colleghi Lenaers e Coelho, volto a potenziare ulteriormente il SIS in ambito europeo e a colmare alcune lacune presenti fino a oggi a livello nazionale. Auspico, al fine di fornire alle forze di polizia e alla guardia costiera gli strumenti più adatti, che il nuovo quadro giuridico diventi applicabile il prima possibile. |  | |  |  |  | |  | | --- | |  | |      |  |  |  |  |  |  | | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | | |  | | --- | | MPphoto |  |  | | --- | |  | |  | **Maria Grapini (S&D).** – Domnule președinte, domnule comisar, stimați colegi, cred că eforturile din ultimii ani ai Uniunii Europene - pentru că au fost eforturi - ne-am confruntat de fapt cu lucruri noi, cu gestionarea migrației, cu gestionarea integrată a frontierelor, cu criminalitate transfrontalieră. Aveam un sistem SIS, modificarea pe care vrem acum să o facem dacă se va vota - și sper să se voteze acest nou regulament - este absolut pornită de la o constatare.  În 2016, Comisia a făcut o evaluare - și eu cred că trebuie să facem asemenea evaluări, pentru că lucrurile sunt în schimbare - și concluzia Comisiei a fost că trebuie să facem și a venit cu o propunere în fața Parlamentului de modificare a regulamentului SIS. Raportorii și noi toți am încercat să găsim o situație, au fost colegi care au criticat. Nu avem situații ideale - sigur că putem să ne gândim că vor fi persoane care vor fi suspectate fără să fie de vină sau se ia amprenta și nu convine unor persoane - dar important este să crească siguranța și securitatea cetățenilor în spațiul Uniunii Europene - vorbesc „spațiul”, nu numai în zona Schengen - și cred că raportul, prin propunerea Comisiei și amendamentele aduse, își atinge scopul. Evident că la un anumit interval putem să îmbunătățim, după o analiză, dar acum cred că scopul este de creștere a siguranței - și aici s-a spus în ce direcție merge raportul - și sper să fie votat, pentru că avem nevoie de creșterea siguranței. Criminalitatea transfrontalieră a crescut și avem nevoie de un sistem mai sigur. |  | |  |  |  | |  | | --- | |  | |      |  |  |  |  |  |  | | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | | |  | | --- | | MPphoto |  |  | | --- | |  | |  | **Heinz K. Becker (PPE).** – Herr Präsident, Herr Kommissar King! Die Neuregelung des Schengener Informationssystems ist ein großer Schritt zur europäischen Sicherheitsunion, um an den Außengrenzen der EU sowie bei der täglichen Arbeit in Polizei und Justiz, Europol, Frontex und Eurojust die Schlagkraft gegen Terrorismus, Schwerstverbrechen, organisierte Kriminalität, illegale Migration – jawohl – und Asylmissbrauch massiv zu stärken. Der Einsatz von Gesichtserkennung, Biometrie, Finger- und Handabdrücken und DNA wird schon ab 2019 bis 2020 selbstverständlich werden. Das ist ein Erfolg Europas. Der nächste Schritt wird die Vollvernetzung aller EU-Datenbanken sein. Denn das ist unser Ziel: Jede Beamtin, jeder Beamte muss zu jeder Zeit augenblicklich gefährliche Personen erkennen und sofort amtshandeln können. Und das ist dann die verwirklichte Interoperabilität.  Gratulation an Kommission und an die Berichterstatter. Setzen wir diese effektive Arbeit konsequent fort, das sind wir den Menschen Europas schuldig! |  | |  |  |  | |  | | --- | |  | |      |  |  |  |  |  |  | | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | | |  | | --- | | MPphoto |  |  | | --- | |  | |  | **Francisco Assis (S&D).** – Senhor Presidente, queria começar por saudar os relatores e muito em particular o Senhor Deputado Carlos Coelho que, ao longo dos últimos anos aqui no Parlamento Europeu, tem contribuído de uma forma extraordinária para que se encontrem soluções equilibradas e justas num sector tão difícil como este.  Aqueles que pensam que é possível garantir a liberdade num contexto de insegurança estão rotundamente enganados. Não há melhor caldo de cultura para favorecer a emergência de soluções tirânicas do que um quadro de insegurança.  A insegurança é que gera muitas vezes o desejo de uma proteção excessiva que leva imediatamente à valorização das tiranias e, portanto, temos de ter a noção de que uma sociedade livre também tem de ser uma sociedade segura e temos de alcançar o equilíbrio entre estas duas dimensões, entre a dimensão da proteção da segurança dos cidadãos e a dimensão, naturalmente, do respeito pelos direitos fundamentais desses mesmos cidadãos.  Ora, o trabalho que aqui foi desenvolvido vai justamente neste sentido: a modernização de um instrumento essencial, o sistema SIS que é o instrumento fundamental para garantir o reforço da segurança, nomeadamente nas fronteiras externas, e, ao mesmo tempo, a salvaguarda dos direitos fundamentais dos cidadãos europeus.  Só temos razões para estar satisfeitos com este trabalho. |  | |  |  |  | |  | | --- | |  | |      |  |  |  |  |  |  | | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | | |  | | --- | | MPphoto |  |  | | --- | |  | |  | **Dubravka Šuica (PPE).** – Gospodine predsjedavajući, znamo da je Schengen jedna od velikih uspješnih europskih priča, ali, svakako, i ta priča treba doživjeti nadogradnju da bi naši građani bili mirni i mogli živjeti u potpunoj slobodi i koristiti tu slobodu kretanja.  Fascinantne su brojke koje ste spomenuli ovdje, i jedan i drugi povjerenik, o broju ulazaka u SIS1, u SIS 2, o broju otkrivenih slučajeva. Dakle, brojke su zaista fascinantne i taj SIS 1 i SIS 2 su sigurno dobri, međutim, definitivno ih treba nadograditi kako bismo spriječili sve moguće situacije koje se događaju na granicama. Međutim, želim napomenuti da unutarnja sigurnost građana Europske unije ne može biti dobra ukoliko nije osigurana vanjska granica.  Ja ne bih bila dosljedna ako i danas ne bih iskoristila prigodu u ovoj raspravi spomenuti Hrvatsku, koja ima najdužu vanjsku granicu u Europskoj uniji, od 1350 km, i koja još uvijek nije schengenska granica. Stoga još jedanput, znam da radimo na tome, znam da ispunjavamo kriterije, ali svakako očekujemo da, iako koristimo već i SIS 1 i SIS 2, konačno pristupimo toj slobodnoj schengenskoj zoni kako bismo i mi pomogli da Europska unije ne bude tvrđava, ali da znamo tko se nalazi na našem teritoriju, tko ulazi preko naših granica. Vjerujem da je to u interesu i svima vama iz ostalih zemalja Europske unije. |  | |  |  |  | |  | | --- | |  | |      |  |  |  |  |  |  | | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | | |  | | --- | | MPphoto |  |  | | --- | |  | |  | **Michał Boni (PPE).** – Mr President, firstly I would like to thank Carlos Coelho and Jeroen Lenaers, the rapporteurs, for the great job and balanced solution. These three regulations establish not only significant improvements for the Schengen Information System but create the new order. They open up the possibility to exchange more information among Member States’ agencies and to improve the security of our borders against terrorists by real time checks and the sharing of information. They support the effectiveness of the prevention, detection and investigation of criminal offences. On the other hand, they also make it possible to speed up searches, with the help of an adequate alert system, for missing children.  These improvements strengthen trust and boost cooperation between Member States. Also, thanks to common technical standards, rules and semantic interoperability, they guarantee the efficiency of using the digital tools to collect the data – not more but better data – for a legitimate purpose and in an adequate way.  *(The speaker agreed to take a blue-card question under Rule 162(8))* |  | |  |  |  | |  | | --- | |  | |      |  |  |  |  |  |  | | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | | |  | | --- | | MPphoto |  |  | | --- | |  | |  | **Róża Gräfin von Thun und Hohenstein (PPE),***pytanie zadane przez podniesienie niebieskiej kartki***.** – Panie Pośle! Pan mówił o *efficiency*, o sprawnym systemie. Ja chciałam zapytać, czy Pan, znający casus Ludmiły Kozłowskiej wydalonej z Polski, nie uważa, że jest pewna luka, że trzeba by dodać do SIS jakieś zabezpieczenia przed politycznym wykorzystaniem? Czy nie powinniśmy osobom wpisanym do systemu Schengen, na tę listę osób, które nie mogą wjeżdżać do krajów Schengen, stworzyć możliwości ewentualnego odwołania, żądania wyjaśnienia? Co Pan Poseł o tym sądzi? |  | |  |  |  | |  | | --- | |  | |      |  |  |  |  |  |  | | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | | |  | | --- | | MPphoto |  |  | | --- | |  | |  | **Michał Boni (PPE),***odpowiedź na pytanie zadane przez podniesienie niebieskiej kartki***.** – Dziękuję za pytanie. Systemu informacyjnego Schengen nie powinno używać się pod żadną presją polityczną ani wykorzystywać do celów politycznych. Tak jak powiedziałem na końcu swojego wystąpienia, musi być uzasadniony interes. Wtedy, kiedy używa się – tak jak w przypadku władz polskich – bezpieczeństwa kraju jako rzekomego powodu wstrzymania możliwości poruszania się Ludmiły Kozłowskiej, to uważam, że jest to naruszenie zasad Schengen, i zgadzam się, że możliwości odwoławcze istnieją – być może powinniśmy jeszcze o nich podyskutować.  Przy okazji tylko chcę powiedzieć koledze, który wcześniej już mówił o sprawie Ludmiły Kozłowskiej, że – po pierwsze – była zaproszona nie tylko przez pana Verhofstadta, ale także przez Zgromadzenie Narodowe Niemiec, przez wiele instytucji. A oprócz tego nawet na dzisiejszej konferencji prasowej pytany o tę sprawę minister spraw zagranicznych Ukrainy nie dał odpowiedzi mówiącej, że jest ona jakimkolwiek dla Ukrainy zagrożeniem i nigdy władze ukraińskie oficjalnie jasno tego nie powiedziały, a o sprawach związanych z Ludmiłą Kozłowską rozmawialiśmy w oficjalnej delegacji ukraińskiej w Kijowie miesiąc temu. |  | |  |  |  | |  | | --- | |  | |      |  |  |  |  |  |  | | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | | |  | | --- | | MPphoto |  |  | | --- | |  | |  | **El presidente. –**Señorías, ruego que se vayan ajustando a los tiempos, por favor. Señor, Sośnierz, usted antes ya tomó la palabra levantando una tarjeta azul, veo ahora que en el turno de «catch de eye» va a intervenir otra vez. Habida cuenta de que este turno tiene numerosas peticiones, le pido que renuncie a la tarjeta azul y tome la palabra en su momento, en el turno que ahora, dentro de nada, va a comenzar. |  | |  |  |  | |  | | --- | |  | |      |  |  |  |  |  |  | | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | | |  | | --- | | MPphoto |  |  | | --- | |  | |  | **Mihai Ţurcanu (PPE).** – Domnule președinte, securitatea frontierelor externe ale Uniunii Europene este fundamentală și statele membre au responsabilitatea de a-și proteja cetățenii. Pentru a îmbunătăți sistemele de informații Schengen, statele membre și Europol trebuie să aibă o colaborare mai strânsă și un schimb de informații consistent, iar acest sistem este soluția.  Sistemul comun de informații este în vigoare în toate cele 28 de state membre, inclusiv în România. Uniunea Europeană se poate bucura de rolul activ pe care îl are România, o țară care împărtășește informații prin aceste sisteme comune. România a căpătat dreptul de aderare la spațiul Schengen când a semnat Tratatul de aderare la Uniunea Europeană, iar acest lucru nu mai trebuie întârziat prin inventarea unor varii motive de alte state membre. Inclusiv în discursul său de astăzi, președintele Juncker a susținut că, până la finele mandatului său, România va face parte din spațiul Schengen. Și vreau să subliniez, domnule președinte Juncker, că mai aveți doar șase luni la dispoziție. |  | |  |  |  | |  | | --- | |  | |      |  |  |  |  |  |  | | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | | |  | | --- | | MPphoto |  |  | | --- | |  | |  | **Željana Zovko (PPE).** – Gospodine predsjedavajući, koncept Europe kao otvorenog prostora bez granica jedna je od temeljnih vrijednosti koja je spojila tisuće građana i potakla daljnju međusobnu integraciju. Od izazova migrantske krize 2015. godine do terorističkih prijetnji schengenski prostor postao je primarno sigurnosno političko pitanje. Gubitak povjerenja u sustav podigao je zidove tamo gdje su oni već desetljećima bili srušeni.  Republika Hrvatska ima za cilj ulazak u schengenski prostor do 2019. godine i brine o vanjskim granicama Europe prema zapadnom Balkanu te odgovorno ispunjava svoje zadaće na tom putu. Zato dobro razumijemo značaj kontinuiranog unaprjeđenja sustava između država članica, kako bi izbjegli propuste nastale za vrijeme i nakon migrantske krize.  Schengen će najbolje funkcionirati ako zajedno branimo europske granice, kako se ne bismo zatvarali u unutarnje. Hrvatska strana sigurno napreduje u tom smjeru uspješno implementirajući Schengenski informacijski sustav te ostale schengenske instrumente. Ohrabrena ovim napretkom, vjerujem kako će Hrvatska ostvariti svoj strateški cilj i pristupiti zajedničkom prostoru do 2019. godine te nastaviti štititi Europu od budućih ugroza. |  | |  |  |  | |  | | --- | |  | |      |  |  |  |  |  | | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | | |  | | --- | |  | |  | *Intervenciones con arreglo al procedimiento de solicitud incidental de uso de la palabra («catch the eye»)* |  | |  |  |  | |  | | --- | |  | |      |  |  |  |  |  |  | | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | | |  | | --- | | MPphoto |  |  | | --- | |  | |  | **Cristian-Silviu Buşoi (PPE).** – Domnule președinte, felicitări domnului Coelho. Schengen este, fără îndoială, un sistem eficient în a apăra Uniunea Europeană, în a proteja frontierele împotriva terorismului și a crimei organizate. Este însă foarte important ca el să fie permanent îmbunătățit și toate statele participante să coopereze cât mai strâns. România este parte a SIS încă din anul 2010 și instituții ca Inspectoratul General al Poliției Române sau Inspectoratul Poliției de Frontieră se bucură de un deosebit respect colaborând într-o manieră eficientă în combaterea criminalității transfrontaliere.  România joacă, de altfel, un rol decisiv în securitatea întregii Uniuni Europene și acționează ca un stat Schengen *de facto* apărând cu profesionalism peste 2 000 de kilometri de frontieră. Din păcate, accesul României este restricționat la spațiul Schengen de 7 ani de o decizie politică cu dedesubturi economico-maritimo-protecționiste, mai ales din partea Olandei, și această opoziție alimentează cu succes fenomenul sceptic din România. Sper ca, în viitorul foarte apropiat, România să devină parte a spațiului Schengen, așa cum este drept și corect. |  | |  |  |  | |  | | --- | |  | |      |  |  |  |  |  |  | | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | | |  | | --- | | MPphoto |  |  | | --- | |  | |  | **Maria Gabriela Zoană (S&D).** – Domnule președinte, deși România și Bulgaria îndeplinesc criteriile de aderare la spațiul Schengen - România încă din 2011 - și, deși în plenul Parlamentului European a fost adoptată o rezoluție încă din luna mai pentru sprijinul aderării acestor două țări în spațiul Schengen, suntem în luna octombrie, iar perspectiva aderării nu pare să fie una apropiată.  Țin doar să atrag atenția, domnule președinte, asupra unei realități pe care, uneori, o ascundem sau o negăm. Lipsa încrederii europenilor în instituțiile europene provine și din astfel de situații, în care cetățenii Uniunii constată că, la acest nivel, încă mai vorbim despre birocrație și interese politice care primează, se pare, în fața intereselor individului.  Aproape douăzeci de milioane de români sunt privați de un drept care le aparține, întrucât țara noastră a îndeplinit exigențele cerute. Pe lângă aceștia, discutăm de miile de operatori români care efectuează schimburi comerciale și care se văd nevoiți să aștepte zeci de ore la intrarea în spațiul Schengen în autovehicule pentru a fi controlați și verificați. Doresc să mulțumesc pentru rezoluția adoptată în acest plen în luna mai. Nu pot totuși să nu observ o lipsă de operativitate a celorlalte instituții europene în ceea ce privește transpunerea în practică a rezoluțiilor adoptate în plenul Parlamentului European, consecințele de imagine în ceea ce privește Uniunea Europeană în ansamblul ei fiind dintre cele mai serioase. |  | |  |  |  | |  | | --- | |  | |      |  |  |  |  |  |  | | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | | |  | | --- | | MPphoto |  |  | | --- | |  | |  | **Νότης Μαριάς (ECR).** – Κύριε Πρόεδρε, κύριε King, σας άκουσα πριν, και εσάς και τον κύριο Αβραμόπουλο, και σκέφτηκα πραγματικά τι θα έλεγαν οι κάτοικοι των νησιών του Αιγαίου ακούγοντάς σας. Διότι αναφερθήκατε στο ότι θα περιορίσετε την παράνομη είσοδο στην Ευρωπαϊκή Ένωση, θα γίνεται έλεγχος, θα λαμβάνονται δακτυλικά αποτυπώματα. Πού; Στη Μόρια; Στο hotspot της Μόριας όπου υπάρχουν 10.000 άτομα; Τολμάει η αστυνομία να μπει μέσα να κάνει έλεγχο; Έχετε πάει να δείτε τι υπάρχει στη Μόρια; Δεν τολμάει άνθρωπος να περάσει. Οι καταστάσεις είναι ανεξέλεγκτες. Θα κάνετε έλεγχο στη Σούδα, δηλαδή στη Χίο, που δεν τολμά να μπει ούτε η ελληνική αστυνομία; Θα κάνετε έλεγχο στη Σάμο;  Ακούστε, για ποιο λόγο δεν έχουν επαναπροωθηθεί χιλιάδες παράνομοι μετανάστες που είναι αυτή τη στιγμή στα νησιά του Αιγαίου; Έτσι θα σας ρωτούσαν οι κάτοικοι των νησιών του Αιγαίου, αν είχαν τη δυνατότητα να παρακολουθήσουν τη συζήτηση. Θα σας ρωτούσαν οι κάτοικοι του Έβρου, γιατί τώρα οι παράνομοι μετανάστες περνάνε από Τουρκία σε Βουλγαρία και μετά στην Ελλάδα. Αυτούς θα σταματήσετε; Θα τους πάρετε δακτυλικά αποτυπώματα; Πρέπει να υπάρχει σοβαρότητα στη λειτουργία της Frontex. Δεν υπάρχει φύλαξη των συνόρων και εντάξει τα θαλάσσια σύνορα. Δεν υπάρχει φύλαξη της Frontex στον Έβρο, που είναι χερσαία τα σύνορα. Δεν υπάρχουν απαντήσεις σε αυτά τα θέματα. |  | |  |  |  | |  | | --- | |  | |      |  |  |  |  |  |  | | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | | |  | | --- | | MPphoto |  |  | | --- | |  | |  | **Izaskun Bilbao Barandica (ALDE).** – Señor presidente, aprovecho este debate sobre el funcionamiento del Sistema de Información Schengen para insistir en que un servicio europeo de seguridad eficiente obliga a acabar con los filtros que tienen su origen en el nacionalismo de los Estados que frena tantos proyectos europeos.  La Ertzaintza es la Policía integral responsable de la seguridad pública de Euskadi. Atesora un enorme conocimiento sobre delincuencia organizada y terrorismo. Actúa en un enclave geográfico estratégico para el tránsito de personas y bienes entre el norte y el sur de la Europa más occidental.  Por eso, una participación operativa directa en el SIS, sin intermediaciones ni dependencias ineficaces e ineficientes, es clave para aportar los recursos y el conocimiento de esta Policía en las políticas de seguridad de la Unión.  Atendiendo a la legislación del propio Estado miembro y la comunitaria, y desde la lógica operativa, la Ertzaintza debe tener representación propia en todos los foros y comisiones internacionales donde se deciden y coordinan las estrategias de seguridad; donde se establecen puntos de conexión directos entre Policías europeas y se propicia la continuidad de muchas investigaciones. Por eso, señor comisario, me gustaría conocer su opinión al respecto. |  | |  |  |  | |  | | --- | |  | |      |  |  |  |  |  |  | | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | | |  | | --- | | MPphoto |  |  | | --- | |  | |  | **Florent Marcellesi (Verts/ALE).** – Señor presidente, el muro de Trump está aquí, está con nosotros en Europa, en la frontera sur del espacio Schengen. Es una gran valla con cuchillas en Ceuta y Melilla. Es una valla que mata. Este mismo domingo dos personas han muerto al intentar cruzarla. Otras, sí, llegan, pero ¿cuál es a menudo la respuesta?: las devoluciones en caliente. Es decir, incumplir la legislación internacional y las sentencias del Tribunal Europeo de Derechos Humanos, sin importar que sean menores, demandantes de asilo o personas heridas que necesitan atención sanitaria.  España y la Unión Europea no pueden seguir pisoteando los derechos humanos ni seguir externalizando nuestras fronteras a países terceros no seguros. Porque la cuestión migratoria es clave para el futuro de Europa. Así que seamos responsables, terminemos con las devoluciones en caliente, respetemos los derechos humanos y abramos vías de entrada seguras y legales al espacio Schengen. Que nadie más tenga que morir por tener que migrar a Europa. |  | |  |  |  | |  | | --- | |  | |      |  |  |  |  |  |  | | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | | |  | | --- | | MPphoto |  |  | | --- | |  | |  | **Dobromir Sośnierz (NI).** – Panie Przewodniczący! Ja pytam, po co jest ten system, skoro każdy poseł do tego Parlamentu może podważać decyzje stosownych władz, stosownych służb i zapraszać wykluczone osoby, w blasku reflektorów obnosić się z nimi. Panie Pośle Boni! To jest Pana obrona praworządności? I na jakiej podstawie kwestionujecie decyzję władz polskich? Skoro wiecie lepiej od nich, to możemy sporo zaoszczędzić. Zamiast tych wszystkich służb granicznych, władz i służb specjalnych zatrudnijmy posła Boniego, posła Verhofstadta, posłankę Różę Thun, niech siądą przy stoliku i decydują za nas, to nie będziemy musieli wydawać na te wszystkie służby tych milionów euro.  Rozszczelniacie system w imię walki politycznej. Mówicie, że to jest decyzja polityczna? A w jakiej sprawie pan Verhofstadt zaprosił tutaj Ludmiłę Kozłowską? W imię interesów politycznych. W imię politycznej walki z polskim rządem wysadzacie w powietrze system, który ma nas chronić przed terrorystami i niebezpiecznymi osobami. Służby ukraińskie wydały – to Pan przegapił – oświadczenie na temat Kozłowskiej, że uważają ją za osobę niebezpieczną, która dążyła do zmiany granic Ukrainy. Jest to najprawdopodobniej osoba powiązana z rosyjskimi służbami specjalnymi. I w ten sposób Rosjanie jeszcze raz Wami tutaj sterowali. |  | |  |  |  | |  | | --- | |  | |      |  |  |  |  |  |  | | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | | |  | | --- | | MPphoto |  |  | | --- | |  | |  | **Róża Gräfin von Thun und Hohenstein (PPE).** – Panie Przewodniczący! Dziękuję bardzo, to się dobrze składa, bo skorzystam z okazji i odpowiem na te pomówienia, które przed chwileczką słyszeliśmy. To rzeczywiście jest pewna luka w systemie SIS, bo to jest rzeczywiście głośna sprawa z obywatelką Ukrainy, która mieszkała w Polsce, jest zamężna z Polakiem i – dla wyjaśnienia – obydwoje angażują się w fundacji Otwarty Dialog, która piętnuje łamanie praw człowieka w Europie Wschodniej.  Fundacja Otwarty Dialog ostatnio wzięła pod lupę również stan praworządności w Polsce. Za to Ludmiła Kozłowska natychmiast została wydalona z Polski i wpisana na listę SIS osób, którym nie wolno wjeżdżać do Schengen. Od razu pojawiły się też informacje – te które słyszymy też tutaj – że służby bezpieczeństwa Ukrainy uznały ją za osobę niebezpieczną. Ale służby bezpieczeństwa Ukrainy skierowały natychmiast do portalu, który to rozprzestrzenia, dementi, że nie ma w ogóle takiej procedury w sprawie pani Kozłowskiej. Te plotki powtarzają tylko ci, którzy czerpią informacje z putinowskich *fake news*.  Mam króciutkie pytanie do pana komisarza. Co Pan na to, Panie Komisarzu? Czy nie powinniśmy natychmiast stworzyć jakiegoś systemu zabezpieczenia dla takich osób? Gdzie one mogą się w szybkim tempie odwołać? Ta sprawa jest rzeczywiście bardzo paląca. |  | |  |  |  | |  | | --- | |  | |      |  |  |  |  |  |  | | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | | |  | | --- | | MPphoto |  |  | | --- | |  | |  | **Julie Ward (S&D).** – Mr President, when we discuss the Schengen Information System it is important to bear in mind that some Member States are ready to abuse it for their own anti-democratic agenda. Last month, Open Dialogue Foundation President Lyudmyla Kozlovska was deported out of Poland through the Schengen Information System because of her peaceful human rights activities. Although I knew that this excellent human rights organisation had been the target of intimidation and smear campaigns by several governments, I was shocked to learn about what happened to Lyudmyla.  The backlash against freedom of expression and rule of law in several Member States should be very concerning for all of us. I believe we should deeply question the way this system works and how it can be used by Member States that deliberately choose to overlook their human rights obligations and act like authoritarian regimes.  The case also says much about the way we approach our migration policies. Locking our borders at all costs has terrible consequences for human rights. I call on the EU to wake up and rethink its migration policy and come up with a more humane approach. |  | |  |  |  | |  | | --- | |  | |      |  |  |  |  |  |  | | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | | |  | | --- | | MPphoto |  |  | | --- | |  | |  | **Ruža Tomašić (ECR).** – Gospodine predsjedavajući, dorada i jačanje Schengenskog informacijskog sustava prijeko su potrebni budući da pritisak na vanjske granice Unije ne jenjava, a s njime ni sigurnosne prijetnje za naše građane.    Rješenja predstavljena u izvješćima predstavljaju napredak u odnosu na dosadašnju praksu. Doista je zapanjujuće to da je Komisija učinila toliko malo da se usklade kriteriji za upozorenja u svrhu odbijanja ulaska u schengenski prostor. Predložene izmjene konačno ispravljaju očite pogreške, a posebno mi je drago što se i osobe osuđene za terorizam uvrštavaju među nepoželjne. Glavno je pitanje zašto to dosad nije učinjeno.    Hrvatska je napokon dobila pristup Schengenskom informacijskom sustavu, što će joj olakšati put prema članstvu u Schengenu. Ovim putem pozivam sve nadležne da se to dogodi što prije. |  | |  |  |  | |  | | --- | |  | |      |  |  |  |  |  |  | | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | | |  | | --- | | MPphoto |  |  | | --- | |  | |  | **Rory Palmer (S&D).** – Mr President, forgive me, Members, for looking at these reports through the context of what might happen next March and Brexit, but the UK is the third-heaviest user of data on a daily basis through the SIS systems. Having recently joined Lord Willy Bach, the Police Commissioner for Leicestershire, in a series of meetings in Brussels, including with the Commissioner (who was very generous with his time), with parliamentarians and other agencies concerned with law enforcement, it is clear to me that that data and those tools are as important to modern policing as handcuffs. So it is critical over these next few months that we ensure – the UK government and the negotiators here – that that close cooperation through these systems between the UK and our partners here in the EU can continue, to ensure that our citizens on both sides of the Channel can be kept safe long into the future. |  | |  |  |  | |  | | --- | |  | |      |  |  |  |  |  | | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | | |  | | --- | |  | |  | *(Fin de las intervenciones con arreglo al procedimiento de solicitud incidental de uso de la palabra («catch the eye»))* |  | |  |  |  | |  | | --- | |  | |      |  |  |  |  |  |  | | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | | |  | | --- | | MPphoto |  |  | | --- | |  | |  | **Julian King,** *Member of the Commission***.** – Mr President, I would like to thank honourable Members for this debate. Speaking for myself, I think we can rightly be proud of what we have achieved with Schengen and with the Schengen Information System (SIS). Today’s debate and the vote tomorrow will further reinforce that information system, making Europe’s most widely used security database even more effective and, at the same time, reinforcing data protection safeguards. That is what modernising the SIS means.  After the legislation enters into force and the necessary technical changes have been implemented, Member States’ authorities, together with Europol, eu—LISA and the European Border and Coast Guard Agency, will be able to make better use of the system in the fight against terrorism and serious and organised crime. We will work with all Member States and all Member States’ authorities and encourage them to use that system and to use it for the purposes it is intended for, in the full respect of our fundamental rights, the fundamental rights that underpin all our work in this area, the values that we are protecting. A strengthened SIS will provide the police, the border guards, those on the front line whose job it is to keep us safe, with the information they need to do their jobs.  Thanks again to the rapporteurs and to all who have been involved on these proposals. I encourage you to support this key file when you vote tomorrow. |  | |  |  |  | |  | | --- | |  | |      |  |  |  |  |  |  | | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | | |  | | --- | | MPphoto |  |  | | --- | |  | |  | **Carlos Coelho,***Relator***.** – Senhor Presidente, agradeço as referências simpáticas de várias colegas. Creio que no final deste debate é evidente que a grande maioria daqueles que usaram da palavra foi para defender a importância do Sistema de Informação de Schengen, para assegurar as liberdades de Schengen, para sublinhar que necessitamos de uma livre circulação com segurança e para recordar que os direitos dos cidadãos também se fazem reforçando a proteção de dados, e nós fazemos isto neste regulamento.  Estou confiante, como disse o Sr. Comissário King, que amanhã vamos aprovar a reforma do Sistema de Informação de Schengen. Quero sublinhar que este é o resultado do trabalho de uma equipa constituída por elementos de todas as instituições, que trabalharam de forma muito empenhada e muito célere para este resultado.  Quero agradecer a toda a equipa do nosso Parlamento, ao nosso secretariado em especial, pelo imenso esforço e dedicação que colocaram neste dossiê.  Agradeço ao Secretariado do Conselho, às equipas das Presidências da Estónia e da Bulgária, com que trabalhámos de forma leal e dedicada na busca do melhor resultado, e quero lamentar a ausência austríaca durante este debate sobre o SIS.  Um agradecimento à equipa negocial da Comissão Europeia, naturalmente aos Srs. Comissários King e Avramopoulos, que foram cruciais na elaboração dos compromissos que garantem o sucesso do Sistema de Informação de Schengen, aos meus colegas relatores—sombra agradeço naturalmente a colaboração e a abordagem muito construtivas em todo este processo, e termino com o meu colega Jeroen, meu parceiro neste desafio, de quem não poderia ter tido melhor cooperação, fomos uma boa equipa, a todos muito obrigado. |  | |  |  |  | |  | | --- | |  | |      |  |  |  |  |  |  | | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | | |  | | --- | | MPphoto |  |  | | --- | |  | |  | **Jeroen Lenaers,***Rapporteur***.** – Mr President, I would like to thank Carlos Coelho once again. I’m not sure that the term ‘partners in crime’ is the most appropriate when it comes to the Schengen Information System (SIS), but I do very much appreciate the sympathy. I would like to thank all my colleagues who have worked so hard in a good spirit and a very constructive way. It almost makes me sad to think that, after tomorrow, this work will actually be finished. I don’t want to scare Commissioner King but, on the basis of this experience, I am already looking forward to the next SIS reform.  We have worked on this legislation in a diligent and efficient way. We have a result that we can be proud of, as Commissioner King said. SIS is crucial for the security of our citizens. It already works well and it will work even better in the future thanks to this reform, not only in the area of security but also in that of migration management. These are two issues that are very important for many European citizens, and the fact that we have this result also shows that the European Union can deliver on these key issues. I think that is very important.  I am very happy with the result and I hope we can get widespread support when the House votes on this tomorrow. Thank you very much to everybody concerned, especially my dear friend Carlos. We look forward to tomorrow’s vote. |  | |  |  |  | |  | | --- | |  | |      |  |  |  |  |  |  | | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | | |  | | --- | | MPphoto |  |  | | --- | |  | |  | **El presidente. –**Se cierra el debate conjunto.  La votación tendrá lugar mañana.  ***Declaraciones por escrito (artículo 162 del Reglamento interno)*** |  | |  |  |  | |  | | --- | |  | |      |  |  |  |  |  | | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | | |  | | --- | | MPphoto | |  | **Barbara Kudrycka (PPE),***na piśmie***.** – Panie Przewodniczący! Wszyscy wiemy, jak ważne jest sprawne funkcjonowanie strefy Schengen. To jeden z symboli wspólnej Europy i wielki sukces integracji – nasz sukces. Nie możemy tego zaprzepaścić i musimy pamiętać o ciągłym ulepszaniu tego systemu – przy jednoczesnym zapewnieniu nam bezpieczeństwa. Dlatego dzisiaj gratuluję posłom Coelho i Leanarsowi sprawozdań, które mają za zadanie wprowadzenie nowych systemów i zabezpieczeń do funkcjonującego już Systemu Informacyjnego Schengen. Dotychczasowe rozporządzenie SIS II jedynie zezwalało krajowym organom egzekwowania prawa, aby wprowadzały ostrzeżenia o odmowie wjazdu i pobytu do systemu. Nie był to jednak obowiązek, co stanowiło lukę w całym systemie, którą sprawozdanie posła Coelho eliminuje. Należy także zwrócić uwagę na zapewnienie możliwości wykorzystywania obrazów twarzy czy profilu DNA do łatwiejszej identyfikacji osób zaginionych – szczególnie w przypadkach, w których dane daktyloskopijne czy zdjęcia nie są dostępne bądź nie nadają się do identyfikacji. Zwiększa to nie tylko szanse na właściwą identyfikację, ale także nasze bezpieczeństwo. Z mojej perspektywy ogromnie ważne jest, by nowe rozwiązania usprawniały Schengen i zwiększały bezpieczeństwo Europejczyków, lecz nie zmuszały nas do rezygnacji z wartości i swobód, które stanowią istotę Unii, istotę bezpiecznej Europy, Europy bez granic. To udało się osiągnąć. |  | |  |  |  | |  | | --- | |  | |      |  |  |  |  |  | | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | | |  | | --- | | MPphoto | |  | **Vladimír Maňka (S&D),***písomne***.** – Návrh nariadenia EP a Rady o zriadení, prevádzke a používaní Schengenského informačného systému (SIS) v oblasti hraničných kontrol posilňuje vonkajšiu ochranu hraníc a vnútornú bezpečnosť Únie. Opatrenia sú zamerané na posilnenie systému tak, aby bol schopný absorbovať viac údajov o osobách (najmä biometrických), aj aby bol systém technicky a informačne bezpečný. Spresňujú sa podmienky prístupu do systému pre európske agentúry a zavádza sa postup konzultácií, ktorý by mal na základe spolupráce členských krajín zamedziť tomu, aby ten istý príslušník tretej krajiny mal v členských krajinách Únie odlišný status na pobyt. Opatrenia by mali prispieť k väčšej flexibilite a efektivite kontrolných orgánov na hraniciach Únie a tým aj k vyššej bezpečnosti. |  | |  |  |  | |  | | --- | |  | |      |  |  |  |  |  | | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | | |  | | --- | | MPphoto | |  | **Tonino Picula (S&D),***napisan***.** – Rastući osjećaj nesigurnosti među europskim građanima očekivano je i opravdano utjecao na preslagivanje prioriteta Europske unije koja nastoji odgovoriti na potrebe država članica i njihovih građana. Imajući u vidu takve izmijenjene okolnosti, podržavam namjeru da se poveća sigurnost vanjskih granica Unije od kojih je 1351 kilometar u nadležnosti Republike Hrvatske.  Prilagođavanje Schengenskog informacijskog sustava II u cilju učinkovitijeg zajedničkog rješavanja sigurnosnih problema povezanih s graničnom kontrolom treba pozdraviti. Međutim, valja istaknuti da potrebe sigurnosti ne smiju poslužiti kao izlika za kršenje prihvaćenih standarda zaštite ljudskih prava ili osobnih podataka. Unaprjeđenje sustava nipošto ne bi trebalo dovesti do otežanog pristupa Uniji za one koji legalno traže ulazak i/ili izlazak. Suradnja je temelj uspješnosti Europske unije te je ključna za njezinu sigurnost, pri čemu Schengen ima važnu ulogu.  Uključivanje Rumunjske, Bugarske i Hrvatske, koja od svih članica ima najdužu vanjsku kopnenu granicu Europske unije, u šengenski prostor zato ima i važnu sigurnosnu komponentu. Hrvatska je u samo 4 mjeseca od pristupanja Schengenskom informacijskom sustavu obavila 75 milijuna kontrola i identificirala preko 4000 prekršaja. To dokazuje važnost Hrvatske kao partnera u osiguravanju vanjske granice Europske unije te opravdava njeno što skorije priključenje Schengenu |  | |  |  |  | |  | | --- | |  | |      |  |  |  |  |  | | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | | |  | | --- | | MPphoto | |  | **Theodor Dumitru Stolojan (PPE),***în scris***.** – Discutăm, din nou, despre sistemul Schengen, din care România încă nu face, pe nedrept, parte. Îndeplinim condițiile tehnice de securitizare a frontierelor noastre externe, care sunt și frontierele Uniunii Europene. Există un număr mic de state membre ale Uniunii care se opun, în mod repetat, la intrarea României in spațiul Schengen. Este timpul ca aceste state membre să renunțe la această opoziție și ar fi bine să facă acest lucru în timpul Președinției României a Consiliului Uniunii Europene. Orice stat membru poate constata că România exercită controlul frontierelor sale în condiții foarte bune și își respectă pe deplin obligațiile în ceea ce privește schimbul de informații cu celelalte state membre în acest domeniu. |  | |  |  |  | |  | | --- | |  | |      |  |  |  |  | | --- | --- | --- | --- | | |  | | --- | | MPphoto | |  | **Janusz Zemke (S&D),***na piśmie***.** – Schengen jest jednym z najważniejszych rozwiązań w ramach Unii Europejskiej, gdyż pozwala obywatelom UE na nieskrępowane przemieszczanie się po Europie. System Schengen musi jednak także sprzyjać bezpieczeństwu Europejczyków. Dlatego też jedną z najważniejszych spraw jest skuteczny powrót osób niebędących obywatelami UE, które znalazły się i przebywają nielegalnie w Europie. Niestety system ten nie jest w pełni skuteczny. Często osoby przebywające nielegalnie w jednym unijnym państwie otrzymują nakaz jego opuszczenia. Jednak ponieważ nie ma sprawnego przepływu informacji o tych nakazach, osoby takie w większości nie opuszczają Europy a jedynie przemieszczają się do innego państwa UE. Dane Eurostatu potwierdzają, że z UE wyjeżdża jedynie około 40% nielegalnych migrantów, od których zażądano jej opuszczenia. Z tego powodu chciałem zdecydowanie wesprzeć stworzenie skutecznego, ogólnounijnego systemu przekazywania informacji na temat decyzji nakazujących powrót. Rzecz w tym, by decyzje podjęte tylko w jednym unijnym państwie docierały jak najszybciej do wszystkich państw i były przez nie egzekwowane. Bez wątpienia poprawiłoby to bezpieczeństwo wewnętrzne UE i poprawiło stosunek Europejczyków do tych imigrantów, którzy przebywają w UE legalnie. | |
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| |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | | **3. Establishing an Entry/Exit System (EES) to register entry and exit data of third country nationals crossing the EU external borders - Amendment of the Schengen Borders Code as regards the use of the Entry/Exit System (debate)** | |  |  |  | | --- | --- | --- | |  | [**Video of the speeches**](https://www.europarl.europa.eu/plenary/en/vod.html?mode=chapter&vodLanguage=EN&playerStartTime=20171025-09:03:20&playerEndTime=20171025-10:29:14) |  | | |  |  |  | | --- | --- | --- | |  | [**Minutes**](https://www.europarl.europa.eu/doceo/document/PV-8-2017-10-25-ITM-003_EN.html) |  | |      |  |  |  |  |  |  | | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | | |  | | --- | | MPphoto |  |  | | --- | |  | |  | **President. –**The next item is the joint debate on:  – the report by Agustín Díaz de Mera García Consuegra, on behalf of the Committee on Civil Liberties, Justice and Home Affairs, on the proposal for a regulation of the European Parliament and of the Council establishing an Entry/Exit System (EES) to register entry and exit data and refusal of entry data of third country nationals crossing the external borders of the Member States of the European Union and determining the conditions for access to the EES for law enforcement purposes and amending Regulation (EC) No 767/2008 and Regulation (EU) No 1077/2011 ([**COM(2016)0194**](https://eur-lex.europa.eu/smartapi/cgi/sga_doc?smartapi!celexplus!prod!DocNumber&lg=EN&type_doc=COMfinal&an_doc=2016&nu_doc=0194) – C8—0135/2016 – [**2016/0106(COD)**](https://oeil.secure.europarl.europa.eu/oeil/popups/ficheprocedure.do?lang=en&reference=2016/0106(COD))) ([**A8—0057/2017**](https://www.europarl.europa.eu/doceo/document/A-8-2017-0057_EN.html)), and  – the report by Agustín Díaz de Mera García Consuegra, on behalf of the Committee on Civil Liberties, Justice and Home Affairs, on the proposal for a regulation of the European Parliament and of the Council amending Regulation (EU) 2016/399 as regards the use of the Entry/Exit System ([**COM(2016)0196**](https://eur-lex.europa.eu/smartapi/cgi/sga_doc?smartapi!celexplus!prod!DocNumber&lg=EN&type_doc=COMfinal&an_doc=2016&nu_doc=0196) – C8—0134/2016 – [**2016/0105(COD)**](https://oeil.secure.europarl.europa.eu/oeil/popups/ficheprocedure.do?lang=en&reference=2016/0105(COD))) ([**A8—0059/2017**](https://www.europarl.europa.eu/doceo/document/A-8-2017-0059_EN.html)). |  | |  |  |  | |  | | --- | |  | |      |  |  |  |  |  |  | | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | | |  | | --- | | MPphoto |  |  | | --- | |  | |  | **Agustín Díaz de Mera García Consuegra,***ponente***.** – Señora presidenta, en primer lugar, me gustaría dar las gracias a todos los actores implicados, especialmente al comisario Avramopoulos, a la Presidencia maltesa, a todos los ponentes alternativos y también a los servicios jurídicos.  La Comisión Europea lanzó su propuesta legislativa definitiva en abril de 2016, después de que en 2013 se preparara el terreno en ámbitos de estudio complementarios, proyectos piloto, proyecciones presupuestarias y estudios de diferentes alternativas, como los datos biométricos o la arquitectura del sistema.  Se aborda la tarea legislativa porque se han detectado lagunas técnicas en la gestión de las fronteras exteriores de la Unión. Actualmente, las fronteras exteriores son controladas por guardias de fronteras que verifican la autenticidad de los pasaportes y visados para aquellos nacionales de terceros países que quieren entrar en la Unión Europea para 90 días en un período de 180, pero no existe ningún procedimiento para controlar a los que, agotado el plazo autorizado, permanecen en territorio europeo de forma irregular.  Así, nuestro Reglamento establece un sistema centralizado de gestión y control, a través del cual se verifica la autenticidad de los documentos de viaje de los nacionales de terceros países con el registro de los datos alfanuméricos, de los datos biométricos y la información sobre la fecha, la hora y el lugar de entrada y salida. También se crea una calculadora para el cálculo real de los 90 días autorizados.  En cuanto a los objetivos del Reglamento, son dos: en primer lugar, mejorar la gestión de las fronteras exteriores y prevenir la inmigración irregular y facilitar la gestión de los flujos migratorios; y, en segundo lugar, contribuir a la prevención, detección e investigación de delitos terroristas y de otros delitos penales graves. Este segundo objetivo es también crucial, ya que ayudará a detectar criminales con múltiples identidades falsas, como fue el caso del terrorista que atentó en el mercadillo navideño de Berlín, que había entrado y salido de nuestras fronteras con quince identidades diferentes.  Pero el acceso a la información sobre las entradas y salidas por parte de las autoridades policiales de los Estados miembros y de Europol se hará en condiciones estrictamente definidas. Esto es fundamental porque el Acuerdo interinstitucional garantiza el pleno respeto de los derechos humanos, como los relacionados con la intimidad, la protección de datos de carácter personal y los principios de necesidad, proporcionalidad y legalidad. Para garantizarlo, será el Supervisor Europeo de Protección de Datos el responsable de supervisar las actividades de tratamiento de datos del sistema.  Además, se crea el acceso central de entradas y salidas, que es el soporte técnico de la Agencia eu-LISA —su responsable—, bajo la vigilancia del Supervisor Europeo de Protección de Datos. Y, además, habrá un sitio web donde los pasajeros podrán comprobar su período de estancia.  El período de retención de datos será de tres años para aquellos pasajeros de buena fe y de cinco años para los que hayan superado el período legal de estancia.  También me gustaría destacar el ámbito territorial del sistema, que son las fronteras exteriores de los Estados miembros que aplican el acervo de Schengen y también aquellos países que, aunque no lo aplican, han superado la evaluación. Me refiero específicamente a Bulgaria y Rumanía: este Parlamento ha defendido desde el principio la necesidad de incluir a estos dos países. Y quiero señalar que, por supuesto, en cuanto se pueda, se contará también con Croacia.  Para ello, fue necesario dar acceso pasivo al VIS a Bulgaria y a Rumanía, y fue votado por abrumadora mayoría en el pasado Pleno. Es necesaria también, señorías, la interoperabilidad entre el SES y el VIS para que el sistema pueda verificar que el visado con el que se intenta entrar en la Unión Europea es un visado legal y auténtico. A los tres años de la utilización del sistema, la Comisión hará una evaluación sobre su uso.  Por último, quiero destacar que el Reglamento entrará en vigor en 2020 y, para alcanzar esa fecha, son necesarios muchos procedimientos que desde el punto de vista de la implementación deben cumplirse —hablamos de licitaciones, contrataciones, desarrollo de programas, tests, etcétera—.  En conclusión, considero que es fundamental que aprobemos hoy y no más tarde el Sistema de Entradas y Salidas. ¿Por qué? Porque mejorará la identificación y la autenticidad de los documentos de viaje y, por lo tanto, identificaremos más fácilmente a criminales con identidades falsas; sustituirá el sellado; sabremos en tiempo real quién se ha quedado en nuestras fronteras de manera irregular; protegeremos mejor la libertad de tránsito en el espacio Schengen; mejorará la facilitación de entrada y salida —es decir, menos colas—, y contribuirá a más protección y a una mejor gestión de las fronteras exteriores de la Unión.  En conclusión, se entrará más rápido y más seguro. |  | |  |  |  | |  | | --- | |  | |      |  |  |  |  |  |  | | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | | |  | | --- | | MPphoto |  |  | | --- | |  | |  | **Dimitris Avramopoulos,** *Member of the Commission***.** – Madam President, our debate today, ahead of the vote, is inevitably on an important priority, for, as we all know, it is linked to Schengen. Preserving and strengthening Schengen is one of the Commission’s – and my personal – priorities.  Schengen is a great achievement of European integration. As Mr Díaz de Mera García Consuegra said – and as I have repeatedly said many times in this Chamber – we need a unified Schengen, which should include Bulgaria and Romania and, soon, Croatia too. In order to ensure that the Schengen area of free movement is sustainable and secure, it is essential that we manage, protect and secure our external borders effectively and that we have full knowledge of who is coming in.  It is in this spirit that we have proposed the Entry/Exit System. Its overall objectives are to improve the management of external borders, to prevent irregular migration and to facilitate the management of migration flows. It will enhance cooperation and facilitate information exchange between our Member States. I would like to express my thanks to Mr Díaz de Mera García Consuegra and the shadow rapporteurs for their hard work and for the agreement reached with the Council.  This new instrument will bring several urgently needed improvements. First of all, it will enable us to monitor better the rules on short stays. The Entry/Exit System will calculate the duration of third country nationals’ authorisation for short stays in the European Union. It will alert border officials if a third country national is about to exceed 90 days in any 100-day period – for example, if someone makes several trips to the European Union. The Entry/Exit System will also check that the duration of the stay corresponds to the visa issued.  Second, the Entry/Exit System will reduce the time needed to cross the border and will reduce the workload of border guards. The Entry/Exit System will allow Member States to automate most data and information—capturing steps as well as data verifications. Visitors to the European Union will benefit from process accelerators and self-service systems. For the border guards it will mean more time to focus on the most important parts of the border-check assessments. That is also why the Schengen Borders Code had to be amended. In addition, Member States may also create national facilitation programmes on a voluntary basis to further facilitate border crossings of pre—vetted frequent travellers. The compromise proposed describes the conditions these programmes must meet.  Third, as the Entry/Exit System will record travel document identity data, including biometrics, this will improve the detection of document and identity fraud and therefore increase security.  Fourth, this system will support the competent authorities in combating terrorism and serious crimes. When necessary, these authorities will be able to access data in the system if all strict conditions are met.  Lastly, the provisions on data protection are aligned to the new data protection framework and to the rulings of the Court of Justice. The current text includes all the necessary data protection safeguards.  The coming into force of the legislation will be timely, so we can rapidly start to develop the system and get it up and running by 2020 at the latest. I am looking forward to the debate and I thank the honourable Members for their continued constructive shaping of European legislation in the area of border management. |  | |  |  |  | |  | | --- | |  | |      |  |  |  |  |  |  | | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | | |  | | --- | | MPphoto |  |  | | --- | |  | |  | **Barbara Kudrycka,***w imieniu grupy PPE***.** – Pani Przewodnicząca! Panie Komisarzu! Wszyscy wiemy, jak ważny jest powrót do pełnego funkcjonowania strefy Schengen. Często to powtarzam – to jeden z kluczowych symboli wspólnej Europy i wielki sukces integracji, nasz sukces. Nie możemy tego zaprzepaścić. Dlatego dzisiaj gratuluję Agustínowi Díaz de Mera sprawozdania, które jest kolejną cegiełką w tzw. pakiecie inteligentnych granic. Zapewniając rejestrację każdego przekroczenia unijnej granicy przez obywateli państw trzecich, a także rejestrację ich danych biometrycznych, eliminujemy istniejącą wcześniej lukę w zapewnieniu lepszej ochrony granic zewnętrznych Unii i zapewnieniu nam bezpieczeństwa. To ogromny krok naprzód.  Co niezmiernie ważne, system wjazdu i wyjazdu umożliwia dostęp do bazy wiz i *vice versa*, a to zredukuje powielanie informacji i zapewni spójność danych o osobach przekraczających nasze granice. To pomoże też skrócić procedury graniczne. Nasza europejska otwartość i gościnność bywała nadużywana przez osoby wjeżdżające na teren Unii Europejskiej ze złymi intencjami, m.in. członków organizacji przestępczych czy terrorystycznych. Nowy system pozwoli nas przed tym skuteczniej ochronić. Systematyczne rejestrowanie wjazdów i wyjazdów ułatwi też identyfikację takich osób oraz ich sposobu przemieszczania się. Co ogromnie ważne, ten system nie zmusza nas do rezygnacji z wartości i swobód, które stanowią istotę Unii, przede wszystkim bezpiecznej Europy, Europy bez granic.  Oczywiście nasza wspólna praca nad wzmacnianiem Schengen trwa, kontynuujemy prace nad systemem ETIAS, wzmocnieniem mandatu agencji eu-LISA oraz czekamy na propozycje Komisji Europejskiej w sprawie interoperacyjności baz danych. Skuteczność nowych baz danych, w tym niezawodne działanie systemu wjazdu i wyjazdu, będzie zależała od ich maksymalnego wykorzystania i pełnej integracji, między innymi dzięki możliwości ich jednoczesnego przeszukiwania.  Dlatego chciałam jeszcze raz pogratulować Agustínowi Díaz de Mera. Jesteśmy dzisiaj bliżej osiągnięcia tej trudnej równowagi między swobodą przemieszczania się i bezpieczeństwem Europejczyków. |  | |  |  |  | |  | | --- | |  | |      |  |  |  |  |  |  | | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | | |  | | --- | | MPphoto |  |  | | --- | |  | |  | **Tanja Fajon,***v imenu skupine S&D***.** – Zahvala poročevalcu Agustinu de Mera za izvrstno sodelovanje, tudi drugim poročevalcem v senci in ekipam.  Za nami so več kot štiri leta napornih pogajanj, izmenjav mnenj ter obiskov na terenu. Pred seboj imamo enega najbolj težkih, tehnično in politično občutljivih dosjejev kot tudi enega finančno najtežjih projektov, ki jih bomo v Evropski uniji uvedli z letom 2020. Upravljanje z mejami tako z novim sistemom evropeiziramo in prilagajamo potrebam 21. stoletja.  Prehojena pot je bila zelo dolga in v marsičem se s poročevalcem nisva strinjala. Še vedno me močno skrbi, da glavni namen nove tehnologije ne bo upravljanje in lažje prehajanje meja. Vse bolj se zdi, da je poglavitni namen postal zgolj in samo boj proti terorizmu.  Pogovori so večinoma potekali ob temeljni predpostavki, da je vsak potnik, ki dopotuje v Evropo, potencialni zločinec ali terorist, ki mu moramo preprečiti vstop. Navkljub pogosto težkim razmeram v govorih smo v skupini socialistov in demokratov uspeli v besedilu uredbe preprečiti najslabše. Skrajšati ... Uspelo nam je vzpostaviti pomembno ločnico med kategorijami potnikov, skrajšati čas hrambe podatkov, uspelo nam je dodatno omejiti dostop za organe pregona ter oklestiti stroške.  A kljub pozivom Parlamenta na drugi strani ni bilo veliko razumevanja za večjo zaščito zasebnosti posameznikov, za enoten sistem tudi ne-schengenskih držav ter za odpravo ločenih vizumskih sporazumov, ki osnovni namen preračunavanja bivanja v Uniji postavljajo na glavo.  Pod velikimi političnimi pritiski držav članic s tem sistemom uvajamo v schengenski pravni red, lahko rečem, kar tudi precejšen kaos. Žal mi je, da je moč argumenta in razuma ob aktualnih razmerah v Evropi in vzponu populizma večinoma zamenjal argument nerazumevanja in moči. Tvegamo do neke mere, da kakovost zakonodaje nadomešča tudi količina. Na žalost v Parlamentu ni bilo posluha za dodaten premislek.  Kar me posebej te dni bremeni in iskreno priznam, je julijska odločitev Evropskega sodišča, da sporazum med Kanado in Unijo o prenosu podatkov potnikov krši temeljne pravice. Informacije bi po omenjenem sporazumu hranili pet let, kar ni več skladno s potrebami boja proti terorizmu. Dvomov o hrambi podatkov žal tudi v tem kompromisu, ki je na mizi, nismo odpravili.  Zato socialisti in demokrati z dopolnilom predlagamo, da skrajšamo obdobje hrambe podatkov za *bona fide* potnike na 178 dni. To je razumna poteza in pozivam kolege, da jo opoldne na glasovanju podprejo. Pametne meje, kolegi, bodo pametne le, če bodo ukrepi sorazmerni, delujoči in pa predvsem prijazni do potnikov.  *(Govornica se je strinjala, da bo sprejela vprašanje, postavljeno z dvigom modrega kartončka (člen 162(8))* |  | |  |  |  | |  | | --- | |  | |      |  |  |  |  |  |  | | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | | |  | | --- | | MPphoto |  |  | | --- | |  | |  | **Milan Zver (PPE),***Vprašanje, postavljeno z dvigom modrega kartončka***.** – Kolegico, spoštovano kolegico Fajonovo, bi samo rad vprašal, ali je to relativno odklonilno stališče stališče nje osebno, ali je to stališče poslanske skupine socialistov in demokratov. |  | |  |  |  | |  | | --- | |  | |      |  |  |  |  |  |  | | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | | |  | | --- | | MPphoto |  |  | | --- | |  | |  | **Tanja Fajon (S&D),***Odgovor na vprašanje, postavljeno z dvigom modrega kartončka***.** – Kot sem omenila v nastopu, je moja poslanska skupina v vsem času podpirala uvedbo sistema *entry/exit*, vstop/izstop iz Evropske unije. Uspeli smo zagotoviti nekaj pozitivnih elementov, pa vendarle je uvedba tega sistema do neke mere tveganje, ker postaja predvsem sistem, mehanizem v boju proti terorizmu.  Želim predvsem, da smo razumni, da imamo sorazmerno tehnologijo, ki je predvsem namenjena cilju. To je lažje potovanje potnikov, ki vstopajo in izstopajo Evropske unije *(predsedujoča je prekinila govornico),* hkrati pa bolj varne meje. |  | |  |  |  | |  | | --- | |  | |      |  |  |  |  |  |  | | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | | |  | | --- | | MPphoto |  |  | | --- | |  | |  | **Jussi Halla-aho,***on behalf of the ECR Group***.** – Madam President, there are no internal border checks in the Schengen area. Therefore, the external border is a common concern for all Member States. We must have an effective way to monitor who comes in and who goes out if we want to prevent illegal immigration, cross-border crime and terrorism.  At the same time, the number of legitimate travellers into the European Union keeps growing. With the tools that we have now, more security means longer queues and more waiting for the bona fide traveller. The Entry/Exit System (EES) is one answer to this challenge.  The EES is not a political project. It does not change the rules that concern entry, immigration, asylum or repatriation. This must be made clear. It is a technological update, something that brings our border management into the 21st century. It is a tool that helps us to enforce the rules that we already have. The EES should have been in place before, and as a precondition to, the abolition of internal border checks.  There has been much political opposition to the EES over the years, very often based on misconceptions. I truly hope that those who want Schengen to survive in the long term, who want a safe Europe and smooth travel flows, support the outcome of the interinstitutional negotiations. For the ECR, it was particularly important that law—enforcement authorities have reasonable access to the data stored in the EES and that data retention periods are sufficient for the system to benefit legitimate travellers on the one hand, and to make life harder for those who do not respect the rules on the other. We regret that the Registered Traveller Programme was not included in this proposal.  Finally, I want to thank the rapporteur, Mr Díaz de Mera, for his great professionalism, patience, determination and constructive approach. |  | |  |  |  | |  | | --- | |  | |      |  |  |  |  |  |  | | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | | |  | | --- | | MPphoto |  |  | | --- | |  | |  | **Angelika Mlinar,***on behalf of the ALDE Group***.** – Madam President, first of all I would like to thank the rapporteur, Agustín Díaz de Mera García Consuegra, for his open and very cooperative attitude. He was always seeking the broadest majority, and he defended Parliament’s mandate in an impeccable manner. Thanks to our common work, we improved the text proposed by the Commission, making a clear distinction between *bona fide* travellers and over-stayers and lowered the data retention period for *bona fide* travellers.  The Entry/Exit System is an important and truly European project aimed at strengthening security at our borders and ensuring systematic and reliable identification of over—stayers. At the same time, it is reinforcing internal security and strengthening the fight against terrorism and serious crime.  My Group welcomes the text as agreed in the interinstitutional negotiations and will vote in favour of it in plenary. However – and this is my personal opinion – this legislation has a big impact on the fundamental rights of third—country nationals travelling to Europe, especially when it comes to the extensive data retention period. I believe that we should be very careful when designing a system with such a broad scope. We, as legislators, should make sure that the fundamental rights acquis is respected without relying on the ex—post check of the Court of Justice, which I believe will come back negative in this case. |  | |  |  |  | |  | | --- | |  | |      |  |  |  |  |  |  | | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | | |  | | --- | | MPphoto |  |  | | --- | |  | |  | **Marie-Christine Vergiat,***au nom du groupe GUE/NGL***.** – Madame la Présidente, ce texte est le premier volet du paquet «Frontières intelligentes», tout un programme. Cette nouvelle gestion des frontières, ce sont de nouveaux fichages numériques, de nouvelles connections et plus de données et, notamment, désormais, des empreintes palmaires et des images faciales.  Au départ, ces textes devaient faciliter le passage des frontières pour les 50 millions de ressortissants des pays tiers qui se rendent chaque année dans l’Union européenne. Au final, c’est d’abord et avant tout, comme viennent de nous l’écrire les autorités françaises, un outil pour repérer les personnes en situation irrégulière, via un système d’alerte automatique signalant tout dépassement du séjour autorisé. Il s’agit de favoriser les retours et donc les expulsions.  Je ne suis pas satisfaite de la façon dont nous avons travaillé sur ce texte qui, sous des apparences très techniques, cache une réalité politique lourde. Sous couvert d’un droit à la sécurité, bien légitime, on va multiplier les accès des forces répressives à des données sensibles, y compris en coopération avec les pays tiers, et peut-être avec le Soudan, comme on vient de l’apprendre du gouvernement français. Certes, quelques garde-fous ont été posés, mais ils sont insuffisants et très en deçà des principes de proportionnalité et de nécessité tels que définis par la Cour de justice de l’Union européenne.  Sur ces bancs, nous refusons cette Europe bunkerisée, qui bafoue ses propres valeurs, qui joue avec les peurs, et fait d’une toute petite partie de ceux qui migrent vers l’Europe des boucs émissaires, au mépris des textes internationaux.  Cette fuite en avant liberticide ne résoudra rien. Elle sert des intérêts industriels bien précis et elle fait, comme nous le voyons, élection après élection, le lit des nationalismes, des populismes et de l’extrême-droite. Après le Conseil et la Commission, le Parlement s’y enfonce. Le réveil risque d’être brutal.  *(L’oratrice accepte de répondre à une question «carton bleu» (article 162, paragraphe 8, du règlement))* |  | |  |  |  | |  | | --- | |  | |      |  |  |  |  |  |  | | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | | |  | | --- | | MPphoto |  |  | | --- | |  | |  | **Bill Etheridge (EFDD),***blue-card question***.** – It seems from your speech that you seem incredibly uncomfortable with monitoring and understanding who it is who is entering Europe. If this is the case, I wonder: in your own home, would you open the doors to anybody without knowing who they were? Surely you need to know who is coming, why, how long they are going to stay and what their purpose is? Is this not just a natural thing, that people all over Europe would legitimately ask for their politicians to be pushing for them?  *(Applause)* |  | |  |  |  | |  | | --- | |  | |      |  |  |  |  |  |  | | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | | |  | | --- | | MPphoto |  |  | | --- | |  | |  | **Marie-Christine Vergiat (GUE/NGL),***réponse «carton bleu»***.** – Je vous remercie de cette question. Sur ces bancs, notamment, il est très facile, très souvent, de mélanger les extrêmes. Vous venez de faire la démonstration qu’entre extrême droite et extrême gauche, il y a une différence bien nette.  Non, je n’ai pas peur. Non, je n’ouvre pas ma porte à tout venant, mais je regarde qui je fais rentrer et je n’ai pas besoin de mettre en cause les droits de l’homme et la protection des données de façon systématique et généralisée. |  | |  |  |  | |  | | --- | |  | |      |  |  |  |  |  |  | | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | | |  | | --- | | MPphoto |  |  | | --- | |  | |  | **Jan Philipp Albrecht,***on behalf of the Verts/ALE Group***.** – Madam President, of course we need to know who is coming into our European Union, into our Schengen Area. But what do we have to do for that? We have to check their passports, and that is exactly what we are doing. We have a system, the Schengen Information System (SIS), in which – if it worked perfectly – we would have information about every suspicious person, every risky person, and at the outer borders of our common Schengen Area there would be checks against every traveller, and everyone would be checked. We would know who is coming in. If this system worked, no doubt we would have a better, more secure environment in our European Union.  What are we doing? We are not fixing the system, which is not working because some of the Member States’ authorities are not thoroughly working with the system and feeding information into it. At some of the outer borders the checks are perhaps not working, yet we are building a completely new database – a database which does not focus, like the Schengen Information System, on risky persons or on suspicious persons, but one which just retains the data of completely irrelevant and innocent travellers – travellers like businesspeople, travellers or tourists who are coming to the European Union. We are welcoming them, and now are registering them for up to four years along with their sensitive personal data, their biometrical data, but without any suspicion and without any risk.  Not only is that unnecessary because of the Schengen Information System, it is also not necessary to check visa over-stayers. If you really want to keep track of visa over-stayers, you need to know not only that there is a visa over-stayer, but also where the visa over—stayer is. But with this system you do not keep track of any visa over-stayer in the European Union. You just know that they have not left. There is no added value in this system. It will cost EUR one billion – that is the estimation of a study of this House. It will be an unnecessary collection of much information about travellers who are completely innocent. In July, the Court of Justice ruled that the Canadian authorities, in the case of PNR data, are not allowed to retain the data of travellers longer than the time of their travels in Canada. They have to delete the data after the exit, unless there is a risk or a suspicion. What we expect from the Canadian authorities with regard to our citizens, we should also respect with regard to citizens of third—countries like Canada.  We propose to limit the collection to 181 days, which is the longest any non-EU national can stay in the European Union, and after that only on risk or suspicion. We hope that you will vote in favour of that to make a legal proposal here. |  | |  |  |  | |  | | --- | |  | |      |  |  |  |  |  |  | | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | | |  | | --- | | MPphoto |  |  | | --- | |  | |  | **Gerard Batten,***on behalf of the EFDD Group***.** – Madam President, the proposals for an Entry/Exit System using biometric data is not an unreasonable one on the face of it. The US has got a system and Britain has got a system already, and it is not unreasonable for European countries to want to have their own, similar systems. This proposal is for the Schengen area, of which Britain is not a member, so technically it will not affect us – but in reality it will. When Britain leaves the European Union – when that happy day arrives – then we will actually be a third country. Biometric data on our citizens will be gathered and will be shared with the EU’s Member States and its crime agencies. This biometric data can be accessed by all EU countries, as well as by those crime agencies. Some of those countries are deeply and institutionally corrupt and untrustworthy. The EU has been building its legal institutions and crime agencies for some years, and a few years ago I published a short study which explained how that could easily develop into an EU police state. UKIP is not opposed to countries having biometric data systems, but they should be under the control of national governments, and they should only be shared with foreign states where we can be reasonably assured that that information will not be misused. We certainly cannot say that about this system. |  | |  |  |  | |  | | --- | |  | |      |  |  |  |  |  |  | | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | | |  | | --- | | MPphoto |  |  | | --- | |  | |  | **Auke Zijlstra,***namens de ENF-Fractie***.** – Voorzitter, ergens onderweg is de Europese Unie van de oplossing het probleem geworden. In mijn Commissie LIBE zie je de toekomst van de EU verschijnen: een litanie van wetten die de soevereiniteit van lidstaten aantast en de heiligheid van de EU benadrukt. De nationale parlementen gaan straks helemaal nergens meer over: niet over monetair beleid, niet over sociaal beleid, niet over privacy, niet over strafwetgeving, niet over migratie, en ook niet over wie er wel en niet in hun land mag verkeren. Het nu gepresenteerde inreis-uitreissysteem is daar een heel mooi voorbeeld van: lidstaten verliezen hun vrijheid om de buitengrenzen te controleren en in plaats daarvan komt er dan een systeem van scanners en databases.  Er zijn meerdere doelen geformuleerd, waaronder het bestrijden van terrorisme en zware misdaad. Ging dat vóór Schengen niet goed dan? In het nieuwe systeem worden van toeristen weliswaar de paspoorten gescand voordat ze de EU in mogen, maar terroristen die illegaal met bootjes arriveren, kunnen zo doorlopen. Dus hoe helpt dit dan? Bovendien blijken aanslagplegers later altijd al bekend bij de geheime diensten, maar werden ze gewoon niet opgepakt, want ja, we slagen er ook niet in om te bedenken hoe we om moeten gaan met de islam. En misdaad, ja, dat is in Nederland in groeiende mate een gevolg van rondreizende bendes die door het ontbreken van binnengrenzen juist alle ruimte krijgen. Dus waarom is dit beter? Wie wil dit?  Het nieuwe systeem zou ook moeten helpen tegen illegaliteit, omdat de computer op een gegeven moment weet wanneer iemand langer is gebleven dan mag. Maar illegalen gaan helemaal niet meer weg. Ze worden ook niet uitgezet. Ook daar hebben we geen oplossing voor. Dus waarom dan toch dit systeem?  Voorzitter, dit systeem gaat niet helpen tegen terrorisme. Het helpt ook niet tegen misdaad. Het helpt niet tegen illegaliteit. Het kost wel héél veel geld. En nog veel belangrijker: het ontneemt de lidstaten opnieuw macht, macht om problemen wél aan te pakken. Dus, Voorzitter, het lijkt mij helder dat wij zullen tegenstemmen.  *(De spreker gaat in op een "blauwe kaart"-vraag (artikel 162, lid 8, van het Reglement)* |  | |  |  |  | |  | | --- | |  | |      |  |  |  |  |  |  | | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | | |  | | --- | | MPphoto |  |  | | --- | |  | |  | **Tomáš Zdechovský (PPE),***otázka položená zvednutím modré karty***.** – Pane kolego, můžete nám, prosím, konkrétně na třech bodech upřesnit, jak díky tomuto systému ztratíme suverenitu? Kritizujete také, jakým způsobem nespolupracují tajné služby. Váš předřečník tady hovořil o tom, že bychom měli mít kontrolu nad vlastními údaji členských států. Není právě tento ochranářský způsob Velké Británie překážkou pro to, abychom si tyto informace vyměňovali? |  | |  |  |  | |  | | --- | |  | |      |  |  |  |  |  |  | | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | | |  | | --- | | MPphoto |  |  | | --- | |  | |  | **Auke Zijlstra (ENF),***"blauwe kaart"-antwoord***.** – Ja interessante vraag. Hoe verlies je soevereiniteit als er een Europese wet is die vertelt dat lidstaten verplicht lid moeten zijn van Schengen – in ieder geval de nieuwe lidstaten, en wij zijn ook verplicht lid – die vertelt dat wij op grond daarvan de binnengrenzen niet mogen controleren, alleen onze buitengrenzen, dat er nu een systeem is dat voorschrijft hoe dat moet plaatsvinden en op welke manier, en wie dat dan betreft, en hoe lang dat moet bewaard blijven, en wanneer dat het wordt weggegooid? Het lijkt mij… alleen al deze opsomming geeft aan dat wij dus nergens meer over gaan. Dat lijkt mij een verlies van soevereiniteit. |  | |  |  |  | |  | | --- | |  | |      |  |  |  |  |  |  | | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | | |  | | --- | | MPphoto |  |  | | --- | |  | |  | **Ελευθέριος Συναδινός (NI).** – Κυρία Πρόεδρε, η εφαρμογή της πολιτικής του «ξέφραγου αμπελιού» αποτυπώνεται σε αίμα ανύποπτων αθώων ανθρώπων και σπορά φόβου στους πολίτες των κρατών μελών. Εσωτερικοί εχθροί και πολέμιοι του εθνικισμού απεργάζονται σχέδια άλωσης της Ευρώπης ενάντια στα δικαιώματα των γηγενών Ευρωπαίων και εις βάρος της εθνικής ασφάλειας και του κράτους δικαίου. Όσο οι πολιτικοί προωθούν την εθνική ισοπέδωση μέσω της πολιτικής των ανοιχτών συνόρων και της ανεξέλεγκτης ανεκτικότητας, τόσο θα αυξάνεται η ηθική συναυτουργία και η εγκληματική συνυπευθυνότητα στη σφαγή, κυριολεκτικά και μεταφορικά, των λαών της Ευρώπης. Η άμεση επαναφορά του ελέγχου στα εξωτερικά σύνορα της Ένωσης και η πλήρης κατάργηση της Συνθήκης Σένγκεν είναι πιο επίκαιρα και αναγκαία, ως πρώτα βήματα καταπολέμησης της λαθρομετανάστευσης, της τρομοκρατίας και του διασυνοριακού οργανωμένου εγκλήματος. Τα κυρίαρχα κράτη χρειάζονται ισχυρά και ασφαλή σύνορα, εκρίζωση των αποσταθεροποιητικών και αντεθνικών πυρήνων και εμπέδωση του κλίματος τάξης και ασφάλειας ως πρωταρχικές παράμετροι ανάπτυξης, ειλικρινούς συνεργασίας και αλληλεγγύης μεταξύ των εθνών. |  | |  |  |  | |  | | --- | |  | |      |  |  |  |  |  |  | | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | | |  | | --- | | MPphoto |  |  | | --- | |  | |  | **Monika Hohlmeier,***Verfasserin der Stellungnahme des mitberatenden Haushaltsausschusses***.** – Frau Präsidentin, liebe Kolleginnen und Kollegen! Mit einer gewissen Fassungslosigkeit höre ich der extremen Linken und extremen Rechten zu und denke mir, dem Berichterstatter und den Schattenberichterstattern ist eine gute Verhandlung gelungen, denn sie ist sehr vernünftig ausgefallen.  Wir sichern die Außengrenzen, um zu verhindern, dass kilometerlange Staus durch Kontrollen an den Innengrenzen stattfinden. Niemand wünscht sich diese kilometerlangen Staus zurück. Wir möchten, dass die Menschen in der Europäischen Union frei reisen, Dienstleistungen erbringen und ihre Wirtschaftsgüter transportieren können, und wünschen uns nicht mehr den Separatismus und den Nationalismus früherer Jahrhunderte und Jahrzehnte zurück.  Ich glaube, dass ein europäisches System auch das effektivste und das günstigste ist und wir können damit die Einreise und die Ausreise kontrollieren. Das heißt, es ist nicht ein Instrument des Terrorismus, sondern es ist ein Instrument allgemein für die Sicherheit, in vielfältiger Hinsicht, und auch dafür, ob jemand rechtmäßig auf dem europäischen Territorium ist oder ob er ausreisepflichtig ist.  *(Die Rednerin ist damit einverstanden, eine Frage nach dem Verfahren der „blauen Karte“ gemäß Artikel 162 Absatz 8 der Geschäftsordnung zu beantworten.)* |  | |  |  |  | |  | | --- | |  | |      |  |  |  |  |  |  | | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | | |  | | --- | | MPphoto |  |  | | --- | |  | |  | **Λάμπρος Φουντούλης (NI),***ερώτηση με "γαλάζια κάρτα"***.** – Κυρία Hohlmeier, σας άκουσα να λέτε και να υπαινίσσεστε ότι για όλα τα δεινά φταίνε οι ακροδεξιοί, οι εθνικιστές και οι ακροαριστεροί. Όταν ερχόμαστε στο Στρασβούργο από την Ελλάδα, πριν βγούμε από το αεροπλάνο μας ζητάνε την κάρτα επιβίβασης. Όταν φτάνουμε στο αεροδρόμιο περνάμε έναν δαίδαλο για να ελέγξουν τα διαβατήρια μας. Για ποια Σένγκεν μιλάμε και για ποια ενιαία Ευρώπη όταν υπάρχει Ευρώπη δύο ταχυτήτων; |  | |  |  |  | |  | | --- | |  | |      |  |  |  |  |  |  | | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | | |  | | --- | | MPphoto |  |  | | --- | |  | |  | **Monika Hohlmeier (PPE),***Antwort auf eine Frage nach dem Verfahren der „blauen Karte“***.** – In Griechenland am Flughafen bin ich selbst erst gewesen, und ich habe sehr einfach ein Flugzeug betreten und innerhalb der EU reisen können. Das war ziemlich unproblematisch, und es gab die üblichen Kontrollen, die wir am Brüsseler Flughafen zur Sicherheit der Menschen ganz normal erleben.  Ich wüsste nicht, welchen Sonderkonditionen Griechenland unterstehen würde. Ich glaube, dass es vernünftig ist, an Flughäfen Sicherheitskontrollen für die Sicherheit von Flugzeugen zu machen, damit die Sicherheit von Passagieren und Flugzeugen gewährleistet ist. Ich glaube, dafür ist jeder dankbar, und jeder will das auch. |  | |  |  |  | |  | | --- | |  | |      |  |  |  |  |  |  | | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | | |  | | --- | | MPphoto |  |  | | --- | |  | |  | **Dubravka Šuica (PPE).** – Gospođo predsjednice, najprije se želim zahvaliti gospodinu Díazu de Meri na ovom vrlo stručnom i profesionalnom izvješću i na predanom radu. Isto tako mi je bilo drago čuti od našeg povjerenika Avramopoulosa da će i Hrvatska, ukoliko ispunimo kriterije, a nadamo se da hoćemo do kraja 2018. godine, biti dijelom Schengena.  To nam je jako važno, jer imamo ogromnu vanjsku granicu, a rekli smo da je ovaj projekt, odnosno ovo izvješće, upravo za bolju zaštitu vanjskih granica. Dakle, na schengenskim granicama se ne treba pokazivati putovnica ukoliko usvojimo ovaj projekt. Ja ga ne vidim kao politički projekt, smatram da je on isključivo za unapređenje provjera na vanjskim granicama, ali isto tako je vrlo bitan za provjere onih građana trećih zemalja koji u određenoj zemlji borave dulje no što su na to dobili pravo vizom.  Stoga maksimalno podržavam ovaj projekt, budući da ste rekli da će 2020. stupiti na snagu, ja vjerujem da ćemo do tada i mi, Hrvatska država, biti članicom Schengena i da ćemo moći pristupiti ovom velikom projektu. A onima koji dvoje između zaštite podataka i ljudskih prava i borbe protiv terorizma i sigurnosti, poručujem da je sigurnost građana na prvom mjestu i želimo da sigurnost građana Europske unije bude na prvom mjestu, i stoga zaista još jedanput čestitam i drago mi je da smo postigli konsenzus. Vjerujem da ćemo velikom većinom izglasovati ovaj prijedlog. |  | |  |  |  | |  | | --- | |  | |      |  |  |  |  |  |  | | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | | |  | | --- | | MPphoto |  |  | | --- | |  | |  | **Birgit Sippel (S&D).** – Frau Präsidentin! Bessere Gesetzgebung muss mehr sein als eine nette Phrase: Gute Gesetze – gut gemacht. Was bedeutet das für *Entry/Exit*? Die Stellungnahme des Europäischen Gerichtshofs vom Juli zum Kanada-PNA hat Zweifel an der Rechtmäßigkeit dieses Textes klar bestätigt. Die Speicherung der Daten von Menschen, die völlig unbelastet sind, ist nicht verhältnismäßig, ist nicht mit unseren Grundrechten und dem Recht auf Privatsphäre vereinbar. Das gilt dann auch für andere Maßnahmen.  Unsere juristischen Dienste blieben in ihrer Bewertung der Bedeutung des Urteils für *Entry/Exit* mehr als vage. Eine überzeugende Einschätzung sind sie bis heute schuldig geblieben. Nicht besser steht es um die wenig überzeugenden Antworten der Kommission auf unsere Fragen hierzu. Gute Gesetzgebung würde bedeuten, sich etwas Zeit zu nehmen, um rechtliche Bedenken klar aus dem Weg zu räumen oder schlicht die Speicherfristen von unverdächtigen Personen mindestens deutlich zu kürzen, wie es ursprünglich auch die Kommission vorgeschlagen hatte.  Das können wir diese Woche noch erreichen. Wir hätten dann die Gewissheit, alles getan zu haben, damit dieser Text auch einer Prüfung vor dem Gerichtshof standhält. Die praktische Anwendung von *Entry/Exit,* absehbar für 2020, wäre weiter möglich. Bessere Gesetzgebung: Hoffentlich mehr als nur eine Phrase. |  | |  |  |  | |  | | --- | |  | |      |  |  |  |  |  |  | | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | | |  | | --- | | MPphoto |  |  | | --- | |  | |  | **Helga Stevens (ECR).** – Voorzitter, collega's, via het nieuwe digitale inreis-uitreissysteem, met als Engelse afkorting EES, willen we beter opvolgen wie de EU binnenkomt of verlaat. Omdat alles digitaal verloopt, moet dat normaal gezien vlot gaan. Dit komt het toerisme naar de EU zeker ten goede.  Het EES registreert de datum, tijd en plaats van binnenkomst en vertrek van reizigers. Zo lopen bijvoorbeeld visumhouders die langer in de EU blijven dan toegestaan makkelijker tegen de lamp. Het EES is ook belangrijk in de strijd tegen terrorisme. Het systeem zal toelaten buitenlanders te identificeren die hun documenten hebben vernietigd of van wie de paspoorten werden gestolen. Het is ook een opsporingsinstrument, want verdachte personen kunnen getraceerd worden via de plaats van binnenkomst of via hun vingerafdrukken. Het komt er nu op aan om alle databanken up te date te houden en effectief informatie te laten delen.  Daarom steunt de N-VA dit voorstel volledig. De veiligheid van onze burgers en het tegengaan van illegaal verblijf zijn absoluut prioritair voor de N-VA. |  | |  |  |  | |  | | --- | |  | |      |  |  |  |  |  |  | | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | | |  | | --- | | MPphoto |  |  | | --- | |  | |  | **Gérard Deprez (ALDE).** – Madame la Présidente, Monsieur le Commissaire, mon groupe – et je remercie ma collègue, Angelika Mlinar de l’avoir affirmé d’emblée, malgré ses réserves personnelles – est en faveur de l’accord intervenu entre le Parlement européen et le Conseil.  À nos yeux, le renforcement de l’identification des personnes qui entrent et sortent de l’espace Schengen est un corollaire obligé de la liberté de circulation à l’intérieur de cet espace. Grâce au système d’entrée/sortie muni de portiques automatiques, nous espérons – et ce sera sans doute le cas – réduire les temps d’attente lors des contrôles aux frontières, renforcer la qualité de ces contrôles en détectant plus facilement les fraudes documentaires et les fraudes à l’identité. Cela nous permettra de calculer automatiquement la durée du séjour autorisé de chaque voyageur et de vérifier si elle est respectée.  Bien sûr, je n’ignore pas qu’après l’avis de la Cour de justice sur l’accord PNR avec le Canada, il était légitime de se poser des questions sur la compatibilité de certaines dispositions du système d’entrée/sortie avec le respect de la charte des droits fondamentaux. Ces interrogations, je le répète, étaient pertinentes et légitimes. J’estime toutefois – et l’écrasante majorité de mon groupe est du même avis – qu’après l’analyse des conclusions qui a été faite par notre service juridique, nous pouvons procéder sereinement à l’approbation de l’accord intervenu. |  | |  |  |  | |  | | --- | |  | |      |  |  |  |  |  |  | | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | | |  | | --- | | MPphoto |  |  | | --- | |  | |  | **Cornelia Ernst (GUE/NGL).** – Frau Präsidentin! Es ist wohl meiner ostdeutschen Biografie geschuldet, dass ich ein ausgeprägtes Misstrauen gegenüber solchen Datensammlungen habe. Wenn der Bürger allgemein und in dem Fall qua Einreise in die EU zum Verdachtsobjekt wird, dann stimmt etwas nicht und rechtsstaatliche Prinzipien werden auf den Kopf gestellt.  Abgesehen von meiner Phobie gegenüber Datensammlungen, bei denen massenhaft und anlasslos personenbezogene Daten gehortet werden, gibt es ja noch den EuGH. Sie erinnern sich dunkel: Das waren diejenigen, die das Fluggastdatenabkommen mit Kanada in den Orkus geschickt haben. Wir bezweifeln, dass das Ein- und Ausreisesystem mit der Grundrechtecharta vereinbar ist, und sind gegen eine Vorratsdatenspeicherung von unbescholtenen Reisenden, die überhaupt keinen nachweisbaren Nutzen hat, aber eine Milliarde Euro verplempert.  Wenn Sie unbedingt etwas gegen Terrorismus oder insbesondere gegen die sogenannte illegale Migration machen wollen, dann, bitte schön, schaffen Sie doch ein humanes Asyl- und Einwanderungssystem – das wäre ja schon mal was. So, wie das Ein- und Ausreisesystem jetzt beschaffen ist, dürfte es ganz locker auf dem EuGH-Tisch landen. Dafür werden wir tun, was wir können.  *(Die Rednerin ist damit einverstanden, eine Frage nach dem Verfahren der „blauen Karte“ gemäß Artikel 162 Absatz 8 der Geschäftsordnung zu beantworten.)* |  | |  |  |  | |  | | --- | |  | |      |  |  |  |  |  |  | | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | | |  | | --- | | MPphoto |  |  | | --- | |  | |  | **Monika Hohlmeier (PPE),***Frage nach dem Verfahren der „blauen Karte“***.** – Ich habe nur eine sehr präzise Frage: Warum hat man bei Datensammlungen zu Steuerzahlern und bei ständigen Kontrollen unangekündigter Art – was ein Generalverdacht gegen Steuerzahler ist – überhaupt keine Bedenken, während man bei normalen Kontrollen an Grenzen plötzlich so große Probleme hat? Also ich empfinde den Widerspruch als etwas seltsam. |  | |  |  |  | |  | | --- | |  | |      |  |  |  |  |  |  | | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | | |  | | --- | | MPphoto |  |  | | --- | |  | |  | **Cornelia Ernst (GUE/NGL),***Antwort auf eine Frage nach dem Verfahren der „blauen Karte“***.** – Ich weiß zwar nicht, wie Sie zu diesem Vergleich kommen, aber okay. Steuern müssen gezahlt und dürfen nicht hintertrieben werden. Dafür sollten wir alles tun und dafür wird viel zu wenig gemacht. Auch hier in Europa gibt es Steueroasen, und ich würde mich freuen, wenn Sie mit uns gemeinsam etwas gegen die Steueroasen machen würden. Das hat aber damit nichts zu tun, hier geht es um unbescholtene Reisende. Es ist doch nutzlos, es bringt auch gar nichts im Sinne der Sache. Insofern, glaube ich, sind Sie da auf dem falschen Weg. |  | |  |  |  | |  | | --- | |  | |      |  |  |  |  |  |  | | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | | |  | | --- | | MPphoto |  |  | | --- | |  | |  | **Tim Aker (EFDD).** – Madam President, it seems the European Union has developed an alarming set of contradictions. It was only a few years ago that Angela Merkel and other European leaders said ‘come ye, come ye’, and the great waves of migration began, and we have seen the consequences as the infrastructure in Italy, Greece and Hungary is crumbling before our eyes. And now it says ‘oh no, there is a problem, so we need this Entry/Exist System’, and Mr Juncker gave the game away at his State of the Union speech that he wants a ‘united states of Europe’, he wants a country called Europe, and this is just the first part of the plan.  But there is the other contradiction when you say you want borders at the European level but then you have the Schengen zone, which means that there is an internal free—for—all. It seems the European Union is riddled with panic. It is seeing parties that love country, nation and sovereignty rise across the European Union, and it hasn’t got a clue how to stop them. I am just glad that we are walking away from this, and I encourage many others to follow our lead. |  | |  |  |  | |  | | --- | |  | |      |  |  |  |  |  |  | | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | | |  | | --- | | MPphoto |  |  | | --- | |  | |  | **Gilles Lebreton (ENF).** – Madame la Présidente, la présente proposition de règlement vise à créer un système européen d’entrée et de sortie de l’espace Schengen. Ce système pose deux problèmes à mes yeux.  D’abord, c’est un énième replâtrage de Schengen. L’objectif est, en effet, de faciliter l’entrée dans l’espace Schengen en réduisant le temps d’attente aux points de passage frontaliers. Je ne peux donc cautionner une telle réforme, car je ne veux pas fluidifier le système Schengen, mais le supprimer.  Par ailleurs, c’est une réforme qui va inscrire tous les entrants dans des fichiers informatiques interconnectés sous prétexte de lutter contre le terrorisme. Or, je pense que le meilleur moyen de lutter contre le terrorisme consiste à surveiller les suspects et les fichés S et non à perdre son temps à ficher des millions d’honnêtes gens.  Vous sacrifiez la liberté et vous n’aurez même pas la sécurité. |  | |  |  |  | |  | | --- | |  | |      |  |  |  |  |  |  | | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | | |  | | --- | | MPphoto |  |  | | --- | |  | |  | **Diane Dodds (NI).** – Madam President, given recent events it is right to consider measures that allow for the smooth passage of legal, short-term travellers while continuing to enhance the security of European borders. I am confident that in negotiating Brexit, the United Kingdom Government will be keen to work with its European partners to ensure continued cooperation to keep our borders safe and secure.  My constituents in Northern Ireland know well the scourge of terrorism. Close cooperation between partners, both within the EU and beyond, whether through Interpol, Europol or on a bilateral basis, is vital in building our security. When we consider the last century or even more recent times, there have been few more reliable and willing contributors to the defence of Europe than the United Kingdom.  I trust that colleagues here in Brussels recognise this and will work closely with the British Government to keep that mutually beneficial relationship beyond Brexit. |  | |  |  |  | |  | | --- | |  | |      |  |  |  |  |  |  | | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | | |  | | --- | | MPphoto |  |  | | --- | |  | |  | **Carlos Coelho (PPE).** – Senhora Presidente, Senhor Comissário, caras e caros Colegas, começo por agradecer o excelente trabalho levado a cabo pelo relator Agustín Díaz de Mera, cuja seriedade e competência há muito admiramos.  O Sistema de Entrada e Saída pretende também contribuir para o esforço coletivo de mais segurança nas nossas fronteiras. Por esse motivo, o sistema é bem-vindo. Contudo, disse diversas vezes e desde o início que tenho dúvidas sobre o valor acrescentado deste sistema. Ele pretende, sobretudo, detetar os *overstayers*, ou seja, os nacionais de países terceiros quem excedem o período do seu visto.  Esta informação será, sobretudo, quantitativa, mas não permitirá localizá-los. Tenho dúvidas que o seu elevado custo encontre justificação na sua mais—valia. Tenho dúvidas quanto à sua implementação, tenho dúvidas sobre o seu real valor acrescentado, sobretudo à luz dos sistemas de informação já existentes e no terreno, como o SIS (o Sistema de Informação de Schengen). Temos de olhar para a gestão das nossas fronteiras de uma forma integrada. Os sistemas de informação devem estar ao serviço desta estratégia.  Mas sejamos claros: a despeito de qualquer dúvida, não é legítimo considerar que este sistema é afetado pelo acórdão do Tribunal de Justiça sobre o acordo PNR entre a União e o Canadá. Confio na solidez do texto negociado e termino como comecei: não tenho dúvidas sobre o trabalho levado a cabo pelo relator em nome deste Parlamento. |  | |  |  |  | |  | | --- | |  | |      |  |  |  |  |  |  | | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | | |  | | --- | | MPphoto |  |  | | --- | |  | |  | **Josef Weidenholzer (S&D).** – Frau Präsidentin! Zu den Fragen, über die die Menschen mit Recht besorgt sind, gehört der Schutz der Außengrenzen. Warum so vieles bisher nicht funktionierte, hängt auch mit den nationalen Engstirnigkeiten zusammen. Daher ist es richtig und überfällig, zu einem gemeinsamen *Entry/Exit* zu kommen. Das ist ein notwendiger Schritt, den wir gerne mitgehen.  Es sind aber auch Zweifel angebracht. Oft tendieren wir dazu, Verantwortung an *big data*zu delegieren, in der Hoffnung, dass sich dann alles automatisch regelt. Das ist ein Irrtum.  Es ist aber auch der Schutz der Grundrechte, der Anlass zur Sorge gibt. Die Kolleginnen und Kollegen haben sich hier sehr bemüht, diesen Bedenken Rechnung zu tragen. Es bleibt aber die offene Frage, ob wir nicht nach dem Kanada-PNA-Urteil des EuGH die Speicherfristen verkürzen sollten, und zwar ganz konkret auf 181 Tage. |  | |  |  |  | |  | | --- | |  | |      |  |  |  |  |  |  | | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | | |  | | --- | | MPphoto |  |  | | --- | |  | |  | **Anders Primdahl Vistisen (ECR).** – Fru formand! Det, vi forsøger i dag, er at reparere på endnu et europæisk prestigeprojekt, nemlig Schengensamarbejdet, der ligesom euroen, da den blev implementeret, ikke have de nødvendige lovmæssige rammer til at virke effektivt. Derfor er vi så nødt til nu, 17 år efter, at reparere på det, vi den gang indførte, fordi det har vist sig, at den ydre Schengengrænse ikke har været hverken effektiv eller i stand til at dæmme op for terrorisme, massemigration og andre ting, som man ville forvente, at grænsekontrol kunne udføre. Derfor er vi på det sidste forsøg. Hvis vi ikke nu får repareret de ydre grænser, så vil Schengen kollapse, og så er det bedre at gå tilbage til et system med nationale grænser og national grænsekontrol, særligt når man ser på den store modvilje, der er her i salen for at iværksætte helt nødvendige tiltag, som et ind- og udrejsesystem. Så er det tankevækkende at tro på, at den eksterne grænse nogensinde kommer til at blive effektivt beskyttende for den europæiske befolkning. |  | |  |  |  | |  | | --- | |  | |      |  |  |  |  |  |  | | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | | |  | | --- | | MPphoto |  |  | | --- | |  | |  | **Georg Mayer (ENF).** – Frau Präsidentin! Ja, dieses System ist auf jeden Fall mal eine wesentliche Verbesserung des Status quo, und dafür bin ich dem Kollegen Díaz de Mera, den ich sehr schätze, sehr dankbar.  Es ist erstmalig eine Verbesserung des Status quo. Denn was ist denn der Status quo? Der Status quo ist eigentlich totales Chaos, und was macht denn das Wesen eines Staates aus? Das Wesen eines Staates macht ja gerade aus, dass er seine Grenzen schützt und gleichzeitig auch kontrolliert, wer ins Land einreist und wer das Land verlässt. Das ist etwas ganz Logisches.  An die Grünen gerichtet: Ihr könnt ruhig Eure Politik so weiter verfolgen; immer wieder die gleichen Vokabeln: Hetzer, Panikmache und Angstmache. Dann werdet Ihr, denke ich, nur das Schicksal der österreichischen Grünen erleiden, die bei der letzten Nationalratswahl aus dem Parlament geworfen wurden.  Aber in diesem Sinne haben wir ja erlebt, dass bei der Flüchtlingskrise Millionen Menschen nach Europa gekommen sind, die nirgendwo registriert wurden, die niemand kontrolliert hat und die nun im Land und in Europa sind. Insofern ist dieses System also ein notwendiger Schritt. Wir warnen nur davor, dass es nicht zu einer übermäßigen Kontrolle der EU Bürger führen darf. |  | |  |  |  | |  | | --- | |  | |      |  |  |  |  |  |  | | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | | |  | | --- | | MPphoto |  |  | | --- | |  | |  | **Heinz K. Becker (PPE).** – Frau Präsidentin, Herr Kommissar, werte Kolleginnen und Kollegen! Wir stimmen über einen großen Schritt Europas ab. Ein sehr guter Kommissionsvorschlag wurde vom Berichterstatter der Europäischen Volkspartei zu einem effektiven Instrument geformt, das mit moderner Technik einerseits wirksam gegen illegale Einreise nach Europa vorgeht und damit mehr Sicherheit an den EU-Außengrenzen schafft und zugleich Reisenden aus Drittstaaten – speziell Touristen und Geschäftsleuten – eine deutlich erleichterte und schnellere Grenzkontrolle bietet.  Mit modernsten elektronischen Systemen gehen wir konsequent gegen jene vor, die legal einreisen wollen, aber dann illegal länger bleiben und die EU nicht verlassen. Alle relevanten Datenbanken werden vernetzt und zeigen bei der Grenzkontrolle sofort irreguläre Vorkommnisse und Beobachtungen eines irregulären Status auf. Mehrfachidentitäten und Einreise mit falschen Papieren werden zukünftig praktisch ausgeschlossen.  Meine Forderung im Interesse der Sicherheitsbedürfnisse unserer Bürger ist, dieses System noch effizienter zu nutzen und auch zur Aufklärung der Schwerstkriminalität und zur Terrorbekämpfung einzusetzen. An einem Mordtatort sichergestellte Fingerabdrücke und biometrische Daten sollten in Echtzeit abgeglichen werden.  Noch eine Ermahnung an die linksgrünen Träumer hier im Haus mit spezieller Datenphobie: Vertrauen Sie der von uns gestalteten demokratischen Arbeitsweise in Europa!  *(Der Redner ist damit einverstanden, eine Frage nach dem Verfahren der „blauen Karte“ gemäß Artikel 162 Absatz 8 der Geschäftsordnung zu beantworten.)* |  | |  |  |  | |  | | --- | |  | |      |  |  |  |  |  |  | | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | | |  | | --- | | MPphoto |  |  | | --- | |  | |  | **President. –**Mr Szanyi has a blue card but, Mr Szanyi, you are also on catch-the-eye, so do you wish to ask the question? Mr Becker, will you accept the question? So no, Mr Szanyi is not going to ask a question.  There is a blue-card question from the Greens Group; do you accept this question, Mr Becker? Yes. |  | |  |  |  | |  | | --- | |  | |      |  |  |  |  |  |  | | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | | |  | | --- | | MPphoto |  |  | | --- | |  | |  | **Jan Philipp Albrecht (Verts/ALE),***Frage nach dem Verfahren der „blauen Karte“***.** –  Sehr geehrter Herr Becker! Sie haben den Kollegen von der FPÖ eben gehört. Sie übernehmen die gleiche Rhetorik wie die Rechtspopulisten und Hassredner in diesem Hause, und Sie stärken sie damit. Sind Sie sich eigentlich der Tatsache gewahr, dass das, was in Österreich passiert ist, eine Problematik ist, die wir in ganz Europa haben?  Wenn Sie diese Redeweise hier im Europäischen Parlament weitertragen, dann unterminieren Sie unsere Werte in der Europäischen Union und unsere gemeinsame Stärke. |  | |  |  |  | |  | | --- | |  | |      |  |  |  |  |  |  | | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | | |  | | --- | | MPphoto |  |  | | --- | |  | |  | **President. –**Please stop heckling. Thank you. I am not sure that was a question about the issue we are debating, but perhaps Mr Becker would choose to answer? |  | |  |  |  | |  | | --- | |  | |      |  |  |  |  |  |  | | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | | |  | | --- | | MPphoto |  |  | | --- | |  | |  | **Heinz K. Becker (PPE),***Antwort auf eine Frage nach dem Verfahren der „blauen Karte“***.** – Ja, ich erkenne einfach eine wirkliche – wie ich es ja vorhin schon sagte – Phobie, eine manische Angst vor der Verarbeitung von Daten, die in unserem Rechtssystem keinesfalls verbrecherische – wie Sie unterstellen – Dimensionen hat. Und die politische Lage ist die: Sie verlieren laufend Wahlen, das macht Sie besonders anfällig für spezielle Aggressivität. Bleiben wir – so, wie es hier im Parlament üblich ist – sachlich und arbeiten wir an den gemeinsamen Lösungen für die Bürger Europas! |  | |  |  |  | |  | | --- | |  | |      |  |  |  |  |  |  | | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | | |  | | --- | | MPphoto |  |  | | --- | |  | |  | **President. –**Mr Albrecht, one moment. Ms Sippel, you have a point of order? |  | |  |  |  | |  | | --- | |  | |      |  |  |  |  |  |  | | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | | |  | | --- | | MPphoto |  |  | | --- | |  | |  | **Birgit Sippel (S&D).** – Frau Präsidentin! Ich möchte lediglich alle Kolleginnen und Kollegen hier im Hause bitten, wenn wir über ein solches Thema reden, über das Thema zu reden, über Fakten zu reden, und hier nicht zu polemisieren und zu politisieren. Das hilft in der Sache nicht weiter. |  | |  |  |  | |  | | --- | |  | |      |  |  |  |  |  |  | | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | | |  | | --- | | MPphoto |  |  | | --- | |  | |  | **President. –**Please, colleagues, we are now in a debate. We will now move on to our next speaker. |  | |  |  |  | |  | | --- | |  | |      |  |  |  |  |  |  | | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | | |  | | --- | | MPphoto |  |  | | --- | |  | |  | **Iratxe García Pérez (S&D).** – Señora presidenta, teniendo en cuenta los recientes y graves errores cometidos en el marco del intercambio de información sobre nacionales de terceros Estados que viajan al espacio Schengen, el Sistema de Entradas y Salidas constituye un instrumento importante para mejorar la protección de las fronteras exteriores y contribuir a la prevención e investigación de delitos de terrorismo y de otros delitos penales graves.  El Sistema de Entradas y Salidas reemplazará el tradicional sistema de sellado de pasaporte por uno adaptado al uso de las nuevas tecnologías. Asimismo, retendrá los datos personales de los nacionales de terceros que viajan a la Unión con un visado de corta duración, incluidas una imagen facial y huellas dactilares.  Durante el periodo de retención de los datos personales, los organismos encargados de la aplicación de la ley tendrán acceso a esa información, siempre que se cumplan ciertos criterios establecidos. Por ello, el resultado del informe es positivo, ha sido fruto del consenso y de la necesidad de fortalecer el control de las fronteras en el actual contexto de lucha contra el terrorismo. |  | |  |  |  | |  | | --- | |  | |      |  |  |  |  |  |  | | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | | |  | | --- | | MPphoto |  |  | | --- | |  | |  | **Ulrike Trebesius (ECR).** – Frau Präsidentin! Das Schengen-System droht aktuell zu scheitern. Mehrere Staaten haben die Anwendung ausgesetzt, weil zu viele Migranten, Kriminelle oder gar Terroristen innerhalb der EU unterwegs sind. Die Außengrenzen werden nach wie vor nicht überall angemessen geschützt. Aus diesen Gründen ist das *Smart-Border-*Systemund *Entry/Exit-*Systemunterstützenswert. Es wird uns helfen, zumindest die Kriminalität und die illegale Migration, die uns über die Außengrenzen hinweg erreicht, einzudämmen. Aus meiner Sicht ist das aber nicht genug, um das Schengen-System zu retten.  Illegale Grenzübertritte in die EU sind weiterhin an vielen Stellen möglich. Die Kriminalität, die von Personen innerhalb der EU ausgeht, wird so auch nicht eingedämmt. Die EU-Mitgliedstaaten sollten das Recht bekommen, nach Bedarf die biometrische Identifizierung aller Ausländer, die sich auf ihrem Gebiet aufhalten – und damit meine ich auch EU-Bürger in einem anderen Staat - einzufordern.  Wenn Bürger sich etwa beim Grenzübertritt innerhalb der EU oder bei einer Polizeikontrolle in einem anderen Staat biometrisch ausweisen müssten, wäre das kein unangemessener Eingriff und würde den Behörden gerade in Zeiten des grenzüberschreitenden Terrorismus deutlich helfen. |  | |  |  |  | |  | | --- | |  | |      |  |  |  |  |  |  | | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | | |  | | --- | | MPphoto |  |  | | --- | |  | |  | **Jeroen Lenaers (PPE).** – Voorzitter, ik kom uit Limburg, een prachtige grensprovincie in Nederland, ingeklemd tussen België en Duitsland. Welke kant ik ook oprijd vanaf mijn voordeur, ik kom altijd snel een grens tegen. Ik ben me dus als geen ander bewust van de enorme luxe die de open grenzen met zich meebrengen, en die zal ik ook altijd verdedigen hier.  Maar er zijn ook zorgen. Als wij die verworvenheid van het vrije reizen binnen Europa willen behouden, zullen we gezamenlijk het beheer en het management van onze buitengrenzen moeten verbeteren. Dat doen we via de gezamenlijke grens- en kustwacht. Dat doen we via de controle van EU-burgers aan de buitengrenzen. Dat doen we straks via ETIAS. En dat doen we vandaag met een belangrijke stap: via het inreis-uitreissysteem.  Eindelijk brengen wij het grensbeheer van de EU naar de 21e eeuw, van middeleeuwse stempels naar computers en scans. Ik feliciteer collega Díaz de Mera dan ook met dit mooie resultaat. Het is een efficiënte en doeltreffende manier om te controleren wie echt Europa binnenkomt en hoe lang men wil blijven. We verkleinen de tijd die nodig is om die grens over te gaan, waardoor we het makkelijker maken voor reizigers met goede bedoelingen om naar Europa te komen, en door het gebruik van vingerafdrukken en gezichtsscans maken we het veel moeilijker om identiteitsfraude te plegen. Recente gebeurtenissen in Europa geven daar alle aanleiding toe. Bezoekers hebben er baat bij. De burgers van de Europese Unie hebben er baat bij. Iedereen heeft hier baat bij. |  | |  |  |  | |  | | --- | |  | |      |  |  |  |  |  |  | | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | | |  | | --- | | MPphoto |  |  | | --- | |  | |  | **Maria Grapini (S&D).** – Domnule Președinte, domnule comisar, stimați colegi, doresc de la bun început să felicit raportorul și raportorii din umbră și pe toți membrii Comisiei LIBE. A fost o muncă în comisie și votul arată că s-a ajuns la o propunere de regulament echilibrată, care cu siguranță aduce îmbunătățiri sistemului de intrări-ieșiri.  Noul sistem va putea verifica dacă persoanele non-europene care intră în spațiul UE respectă perioada autorizată de ședere și, sigur că, așa cum spunea un coleg, este foarte costisitor sistemul. Eu vreau să spun că viața oamenilor este cea mai importantă și nu există o comparație de preț.  Mulțumesc, de asemenea, raportorului că a susținut intrarea României și Bulgariei în acest sistem, pentru că, da, granițele Uniunii Europene sunt importante și pentru cele două țări membre ale Uniunii Europene. Sunt convinsă că votarea acestui regulament va contribui la o mai bună verificare a identificării și să nu uităm că orice drept de circulație aduce și o obligație: să respectăm regulile, și cred că este importantă această verificare la frontieră și pentru combaterea terorismului, dar nu numai. Mulțumesc. |  | |  |  |  | |  | | --- | |  | |      |  |  |  |  |  |  | | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | | |  | | --- | | MPphoto |  |  | | --- | |  | |  | **Νότης Μαριάς (ECR).** – Κυρία Πρόεδρε, διαφωνώ με την αφαίρεση κυριαρχικών εξουσιών από τα κράτη μέλη, τα οποία πρέπει να συνεχίσουν να ελέγχουν τα σύνορά τους. Επιπλέον, το υπό συζήτηση σύστημα ελέγχου εισόδου και εξόδου στην Ευρωπαϊκή Ένωση θα πρέπει να λειτουργήσει σεβόμενο τα προσωπικά δεδομένα, την αρχή της αναλογικότητας, αλλά και τη νομολογία του Δικαστηρίου των Ευρωπαϊκών Κοινοτήτων. Ταυτόχρονα όμως, κύριε Αβραμόπουλε, πρέπει να διασφαλιστεί η νομιμότητα λειτουργίας της Σένγκεν εδώ, στη Γαλλία. Όπως γνωρίζετε προκειμένου να έρθουμε αεροπορικώς από την Αθήνα εδώ στο Στρασβούργο υφιστάμεθα διαβατηριακό έλεγχο εδώ και δύο χρόνια. Δεύτερον, αύριο όπως συμβαίνει κάθε φορά όταν λήγουν οι εργασίες της ολομέλειας, θα περιμένουμε τεράστιες ουρές στο αεροδρόμιο για να γίνει διαβατηριακός έλεγχος από έναν αστυνομικό. Αυτό είναι νόμιμο; Ρωτώ επίσης, είναι νόμιμο, κύριε Αβραμόπουλε, να μας ζητούν πριν βγούμε από το αεροπλάνο, εδώ στο Στρασβούργο, να επιδείξουμε boarding pass; Αυτό είναι ιδιαίτερα πρωτότυπο. Θέλω να αποκαταστήσετε τη νομιμότητα της λειτουργίας της Σένγκεν εδώ στο Στρασβούργο. Όλοι οι ευρωβουλευτές είναι στις ουρές για διαβατηριακό έλεγχο. Είναι απαράδεκτο αυτό που συμβαίνει εδώ στο Στρασβούργο. |  | |  |  |  | |  | | --- | |  | |      |  |  |  |  |  |  | | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | | |  | | --- | | MPphoto |  |  | | --- | |  | |  | **Емил Радев (PPE).** – Г-жо Председател, уважаеми дами и господа, през последните години Европейският съюз предприе редица мерки за подобряване на европейската сигурност и по-специално сигурността по външните граници и борбата с незаконната миграция. Новата система за влизане/излизане е точно такава мярка, която ще позволи на правоприлагащите органи автоматично да изчисляват продължителността на престоя на гражданите на трети държави, за да установят дали е надвишен разрешеният им престой в Европейския съюз.  За моята страна България – като пазител на една от най-тежките външни европейски граници – това досие е от изключително значение, защото то неминуемо ще подпомогне работата на българските органи по охрана на границата. Считам за голям успех факта, че новата система ще бъде ефективно използвана на българска територия, въпреки липсата на пълноправно членство на страната в Шенген. Включването на България в географския обхват на системата, въвеждането на единно калкулиране на разрешения престой на територията на целия Европейски съюз, а не само в Шенгенското пространство, и получаването на пасивен достъп до Визовата информационна система ще допринесат за повишаване на сигурността на всички европейски граждани. Нека все пак не забравяме, че сигурни външни граници като българските означават повече сигурност вътре в Европа.  Новата система за влизане/излизане е изключително важна и в контекста на взаимосвързаността на европейските системи за охрана на границите и е от особено значение за доброто функциониране на Шенгенската информационна система за целите на връщането на нередовни мигранти.  В тази връзка бих искал да Ви призова да подкрепите постигнатото споразумение във вида, който беше договорен в рамките на тристранните преговори. Благодаря на докладчика Диас де Мера за отличната работа. |  | |  |  |  | |  | | --- | |  | |      |  |  |  |  |  |  | | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | | |  | | --- | | MPphoto |  |  | | --- | |  | |  | **Cécile Kashetu Kyenge (S&D).** – Signora Presidente, onorevoli colleghi, abbiamo ancora una volta dato prova di grande responsabilità portando avanti, pur nelle nostre divisioni, un sistema di modernizzazione della gestione delle frontiere esterne dell'Unione.  È di questo che si tratta, della registrazione elettronica dei dati in ingresso e in uscita dei cittadini di paesi terzi nello spazio Schengen. È per tale motivo che i dati personali registrati nel sistema di ingresso non dovrebbero essere conservati più di quanto strettamente necessario agli scopi del trattamento dei dati.  Chiediamo quindi proporzionalità agli obiettivi perseguiti ma chiediamo anche che le autorità, nell'utilizzo del sistema, rispettino scrupolosamente la dignità e l'integrità delle persone i cui dati vengono richiesti. Non accetteremo nessun tipo di discriminazione basata su sesso, razza, religione, colore della pelle o di altro tipo. Il sistema deve essere usato per le sue finalità e in nessun caso, per nessun motivo, per negare ai richiedenti asilo vie sicure ed efficaci di ingresso nel territorio dell'Unione per esercitare il loro legittimo diritto alla protezione internazionale. |  | |  |  |  | |  | | --- | |  | |      |  |  |  |  |  |  | | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | | |  | | --- | | MPphoto |  |  | | --- | |  | |  | **Željana Zovko (PPE).** – Gospođo predsjednice, poštovani povjereniče, čestitam kolegi Augustinu Díazu de Meri na iscrpnom izvješću na koje, nažalost, imam određene primjedbe. Države članice koje se nalaze na vanjskim granicama Europske unije više su izložene sigurnosnim prijetnjama zbog njihove duge vanjske granice te zbog njihove otvorenosti prema prijetnjama koje dolaze iz trećih država. Stoga smatram kako bi se njima trebala dati posebna pažnja unutar uredbe o uspostavi sustava ulaska i izlaska za registraciju podataka o ulasku i izlasku državljana trećih zemalja koji prelaze vanjske granice Europske unije. Iako je ovaj Prijedlog uredbe imao za cilj uspostavu učinkovitog mehanizma za dodatno jačanje sigurnosti unutar Europske unije, s njegovog aspekta implementacije postoje određeni nedostaci koji bi i te kako mogli ugroziti sigurnost Europske unije.  Ono što vidim kao ključan nedostatak u ovom Prijedlogu jest nejednak tretman svih država članica u primjeni ovog mehanizma tj. primjena u državama članicama Schengena, dok se implementacija odgađa u državama koje se nalaze na vanjskim granicama Europske unije, koje uključuju Hrvatsku. Primjena ove uredbe u državama članicama koje nisu u schengenskom prostoru može utjecati na nemogućnost registracije boravka državljana trećih zemalja, a samim time eventualni propusti mogli bi predstavljati prijetnju za države na vanjskim granicama, njihove građane, ali i za sve ostale.  Nejednaka primjena uredbe, odgoda primjene u državama članicama Europske unije koje se nalaze na vanjskim granicama, čekaju na punopravno članstvo u schengenski prostor.  *(predsjednica je oduzela riječ govornici)*. |  | |  |  |  | |  | | --- | |  | |      |  |  |  |  |  | | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | | |  | | --- | |  | |  | *Catch-the-eye procedure* |  | |  |  |  | |  | | --- | |  | |      |  |  |  |  |  |  | | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | | |  | | --- | | MPphoto |  |  | | --- | |  | |  | **Ivica Tolić (PPE).** – Gospođo predsjednice, čestitke izvjestitelju i zahvala povjereniku i izvjestitelju koji su spomenuli nužnost što skorijeg ulaska u EES članica koje još nisu u schengenskom prostoru. Ovo je sustav unapređenja i sigurnosti Europske unije, ali dok se on ne primjenjuje u svim članicama ne možemo, nažalost, govoriti o zaštiti vanjskih granica Europske unije nego o zaštiti schengenskog prostora.  Baš zbog toga što je riječ o sustavu koji će olakšati borbu protiv terorizma, organiziranog kriminala, nezakonite migracije i koji će olakšati prekogranični promet, treba od početka operativne primjene uredbe uključiti sve zemlje članice – zaštititi vanjske granice. Jedino će tako ova uredba imati puni smisao i pozitivne učinke na unutarnju sigurnost Europske unije i na prekogranični promet također.  Hrvatska čini 1350 km vanjske granice Europske unije i, ako nije u ovom sustavu, to ranjivom čini cijelu Europsku uniju, ne samo Hrvatsku. |  | |  |  |  | |  | | --- | |  | |      |  |  |  |  |  |  | | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | | |  | | --- | | MPphoto |  |  | | --- | |  | |  | **Emilian Pavel (S&D).** – Doamna Președintă, domnule comisar, dragi colegi, astăzi vom vota pentru sistemul de intrare și ieșire în spațiul Schengen. Ne-am luptat pentru un astfel de sistem european unic de intrare și ieșire care să cuprindă și România și Bulgaria și este foarte bine că am reușit să le obținem.  Stabilirea acestui sistem a mai facilitat accesul României și Bulgariei la sistemul de informare privind vizele. Oficializăm, astfel, rezultatul multor luni de negocieri la care ați participat foarte mulți dintre dumneavoastră și vă felicit pentru rezultat. Oficializăm, de asemenea, și sunt foarte mândru de acest lucru, încă un pas spre integrarea deplină a României și Bulgariei în Spațiul Schengen. Cele două țări merită și îndeplinesc toate criteriile posibile pentru aderarea la Schengen. Mai mult, încă de dinaintea aderării la Uniunea Europeană și mai ales după aceea, ele au acționat în permanență și în conformitate cu prevederile acordului Schengen și pentru respectarea și consolidarea acestuia.  Consiliul Uniunii Europene, impulsionat de Parlament și de Comisie, domnule comisar, trebuie să facă noi pași să acționeze pentru recunoașterea unei realități incontestabile, aceea că locul nostru este în Schengen. |  | |  |  |  | |  | | --- | |  | |      |  |  |  |  |  |  | | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | | |  | | --- | | MPphoto |  |  | | --- | |  | |  | **Ruža Tomašić (ECR).** – Gospođo predsjednice, kao zastupnica iz Hrvatske, članice s najduljom vanjskom kopnenom granicom, iznimno sam zadovoljna time što Unija konačno na konstruktivan način pristupa izazovima migracije te nastoji uvesti reda u sustav i zaštititi svoje vanjske granice. No, dobro zakonsko rješenje ne može dati rezultata ako ga se dosljedno ne primjenjuje pa očekujem kako će se uredba, suprotno nekim najavama, od početka operativne primjene ipak provoditi i na vanjskim granicama, kako joj i samo ime nalaže.  Nejednaka primjena na članice Schengena i države poput Hrvatske, koje to još nisu, obezvrijedila bi naša nastojanja da se bez diskriminacije zaštite interesi svih članica i podigne razina sigurnosti u cijeloj Europskoj uniji. Operativni izazovi koji bi proizišli iz nejednake primjene ove uredbe također nisu zanemarivi i zato smatram da bi nam jednaka primjena trebala biti apsolutni prioritet. |  | |  |  |  | |  | | --- | |  | |      |  |  |  |  |  |  | | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | | |  | | --- | | MPphoto |  |  | | --- | |  | |  | **Hilde Vautmans (ALDE).** – Mevrouw de voorzitter, commissaris, een Europese Unie zonder binnengrenzen is natuurlijk alleen maar mogelijk met sterke, slimme buitengrenzen. Vandaar dat ik dit nieuwe inreis-uitreissysteem alleen maar kan toejuichen. Het zal gedaan zijn met het systeem van paspoorten stempelen aan de grenzen, met de lange wachtrijen, en we zullen de bonafide reizigers sneller toegang kunnen geven tot het grondgebied.  Maar waar het mij vooral ook om gaat, is dat we de malafide reizigers, de illegale migratie, de terroristen met dit systeem veel beter kunnen gaan tegenhouden, kunnen gaan opsporen. We gaan gegevensuitwisseling stimuleren en we gaan vooral zorgen dat we door sterke buitengrenzen ons huidige systeem van vrij reizen binnen de Europese Unie kunnen behouden. Wij zullen dit alvast van harte steunen. |  | |  |  |  | |  | | --- | |  | |      |  |  |  |  |  |  | | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | | |  | | --- | | MPphoto |  |  | | --- | |  | |  | **Γεώργιος Επιτήδειος (NI).** – Κυρία Πρόεδρε, για να εφαρμοστεί η Συνθήκη Σένγκεν πρέπει να υπάρχει σωστός και αποτελεσματικός έλεγχος στα εξωτερικά σύνορα. Από τη στιγμή όμως κατά την οποία η Ευρωπαϊκή Ένωση, στα πλαίσια της αφαιρέσεως αρμοδιοτήτων από τα εθνικά κράτη, δεν επέτρεψε σε αυτά να ελέγχουν τα σύνορά τους και ανέλαβε η ίδια να κάνει αυτό το πράγμα, έχουμε πλήρη αποτυχία. Λάβετε υπόψη τα παραδείγματα της Ιταλίας και της Ελλάδος. Όταν ανέλαβαν να φυλάξουν τα σύνορα των χωρών αυτών κάποιοι άχρηστοι και ευρωβόροι οργανισμοί, όπως είναι ο Frontex, η ακτοφυλακή και η Ευρωπαϊκή Συνοριοφυλακή έχει δημιουργηθεί αυτό το χάος, με αποτέλεσμα στην πράξη η Συνθήκη Σένγκεν να καταρρεύσει. Επί δεκαετίες ολόκληρες ο έλεγχος γινόταν από τις εθνικές αρχές χωρίς κανένα πρόβλημα. Άλλωστε είναι πολύ αφελές να πιστεύουμε ότι ο τρομοκράτης και ο παράνομος μετανάστης θα έρθει από τα επίσημα σημεία ελέγχου. Ας είμαστε ειλικρινείς, κύριε Επίτροπε. Και μόνο το γεγονός ότι η Ευρωπαϊκή Ένωση προσπαθεί με ένα λάθος να διορθώσει ένα άλλο λάθος που κοστίζει 1 δισεκατομμύριο, αυτό σημαίνει σαφή ομολογία αποτυχίας. Θα το πείτε αυτό στους συμπατριώτες μας, κύριε Αβραμόπουλε; |  | |  |  |  | |  | | --- | |  | |      |  |  |  |  |  |  | | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | | |  | | --- | | MPphoto |  |  | | --- | |  | |  | **President. –**Mr Epitideios, your time of one minute is up, please stop speaking. I would ask you to respect the request of the Chair to keep to your time. Mr Sógor, I am sure you will respect the one minute. |  | |  |  |  | |  | | --- | |  | |      |  |  |  |  |  |  | | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | | |  | | --- | | MPphoto |  |  | | --- | |  | |  | **Csaba Sógor (PPE).** – Madam President, in 2015 alone more than 50 million non-EU nationals visited the EU, crossing the external border of the Schengen area more than 200 million times. These passenger flows are expected to increase substantially in the future too. A system of stamping passports, a legacy of the past century, is inefficient, slow to cope with the increase in traveller numbers, unreliable, and inadequate in addressing the complex security challenges we face today.  The basic building blocks of the Entry/Exit System (EES) – precise and rapidly delivered information, better monitoring of the authorised stay, more efficient border checks and automated border controls – will further bring our border controls into the 21st century. As to the link between border controls and internal security, I very much welcome the rapporteur’s work on granting security forces access to the EES with the aim of fighting serious crime and terrorist threats. |  | |  |  |  | |  | | --- | |  | |      |  |  |  |  |  |  | | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | | |  | | --- | | MPphoto |  |  | | --- | |  | |  | **Tibor Szanyi (S&D).** – Elnök Asszony! Bármilyen döntés születik is az állásfoglalási indítványról, az mindenképpen súlyosan érinti egyrészről az Unió biztonságát, másrészről a jó szándékú utazók, turisták jogait, adataik védelmét.  Bárhogy határozunk azonban, az bizony pótcselekvés és látszatintézkedés marad mindaddig, amíg az EU eltűri azt a biztonsági rést a schengeni határvédelem rendszerén, amit az úgynevezett letelepedési kötvények, a pénzért árult uniós állampolgárság gyakorlata jelent. A leggyengébb láncszem pedig e rendszerben Magyarország, ahol a kormány az elmúlt években laza feltételekkel ellenőrizetlen hátterű, sokszor okkal bűnöző-, vagy terrorgyanúsnak vélt harmadik országbeli személyek ezreit látta el magyar, tehát uniós állampolgársággal, sőt, nem ritkán nemzetközileg körözött egyének is európai papírokat kaptak.  A magyar példa két szempontból kirívó: a tranzakciók bevétele nem közvetlenül az államkasszát gyarapítja, hanem nagyrészt kormányzati vezetőkhöz köthető off-shore vállalkozásokat. Kettő: ugyanez a magyar kormány eközben gátlástalan kampányt folytat minden idegen ellen. |  | |  |  |  | |  | | --- | |  | |      |  |  |  |  |  | | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | | |  | | --- | |  | |  | *(End of catch-the-eye procedure)* |  | |  |  |  | |  | | --- | |  | |      |  |  |  |  |  |  | | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | | |  | | --- | | MPphoto |  |  | | --- | |  | |  | **Dimitris Avramopoulos,** *Member of the Commission***.** – Madam President, I would like to thank the honourable Members for their contributions to this debate and their comments. Our external border management is the nexus of our policy on security and migration and the European Union is implementing several initiatives in this domain. I therefore welcome the negotiations starting today – indeed now – between this House and the Council, and I hope a compromise will be reached soon.  The compromise on the Entry/Exit System will modernise and strengthen the Schengen area’s external management. It will help Member States to deal with increasing traveller flows without having to increase the number of border guards. It will also promote mobility between the Schengen area and third countries in a secure environment, while contributing to the fight against terrorism and serious crime, and safeguarding fundamental rights.  I want to be clear on a point that was mentioned earlier. The Court of Justice opinion on the EU-Canada Passenger Name Record (PNR) Agreement does not have any direct and binding legal effect on the Entry/Exit System. The Court ruled on a specific legal situation, which cannot be automatically extrapolated to other situations. There are significant differences between PNR and the Entry/Exit System. The legal basis, the purpose and the scope of data gathered, and the basis and rationale in respect of retention periods are not comparable.  I am glad that this long process is now coming to an end and that we can soon start developing the system. I therefore encourage the honourable Members to support these important pieces of legislation when they vote later today. |  | |  |  |  | |  | | --- | |  | |      |  |  |  |  |  |  | | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | | |  | | --- | | MPphoto |  |  | | --- | |  | |  | **Agustín Díaz de Mera García Consuegra,***ponente***.** – Señora presidenta, muchas gracias, señorías, por este debate tan rico. Da idea de lo que digo el hecho de que haya habido 44 intervenciones: las agradezco todas. Doy las gracias a todos aquellos que han apoyado el informe, a los que han apoyado mi trabajo, a los que han manifestado elocuentes silencios. Todos, en definitiva, han contribuido a enriquecer este debate.  Quiero terminar, señora presidenta, con una cita literal de los servicios jurídicos de las tres instituciones para que, de una manera diáfana y clara, quede establecido que no ha habido ninguna ambigüedad en el pronunciamiento de los tres servicios jurídicos con referencia a la sentencia 1/15 del Tribunal de Justicia en relación con el convenio internacional entre la Unión Europea y Canadá PNR.  Dice literalmente el informe de nuestros servicios jurídicos interinstitucionales: «La sentencia 1/15 no tiene impacto directo ni automático en el SES debido a muchas diferencias entre el sistema y el PNR. En particular, al respecto, a los objetivos, el ámbito y los datos personales recogidos». |  | |  |  |  | |  | | --- | |  | |      |  |  |  |  |  |  | | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | | |  | | --- | | MPphoto |  |  | | --- | |  | |  | **President. –**The joint debate is closed.  The vote will take place on Wednesday, 25 October 2017.  ***Written statements (Rule 162)*** |  | |  |  |  | |  | | --- | |  | |      |  |  |  |  |  | | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | | |  | | --- | | MPphoto | |  | **Ivo Belet (PPE),***schriftelijk***.** – Het nieuwe grenscontrolesysteem voor reizigers die naar de Schengenzone reizen, laat ons toe de bescherming van de buitengrenzen te verscherpen en de gaten in het net te dichten. Zolang we niet weten wie onze grenzen binnenkomt, kunnen we de veiligheid van onze burgers niet garanderen. Dit geautomatiseerde systeem komt in de plaats van het handmatig afstempelen van paspoorten. De verstrengde grenscontrole registreert de biometrische gegevens (vingerafdrukken en gezichtsscan) en in- en uitreisdata van de meer dan 50 miljoen reizigers die jaarlijks naar de Schengenzone reizen en vergelijkt die info met gegevens uit Europol, Europese en nationale databanken. Het laat zo toe om verdachte personen met een valse identiteit meteen aan de grens te stoppen. Zo maken we het terroristen onmogelijk onder de radar de Schengenzone in te reizen en zich dan ongemerkt van de ene naar de andere lidstaat te verplaatsen. |  | |  |  |  | |  | | --- | |  | |      |  |  |  |  |  | | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | | |  | | --- | | MPphoto | |  | **Monika Beňová (S&D),***písomne***.** – Systém vstup/výstup je najmä elektronickou databázou na evidenciu času a miesta prekročenia hraníc a trvania pobytu občanov tretích krajín na území Schengenu. Starý tzv. pečiatkový spôsob fungovania pohraničných kontrol sa v súvislosti so zvýšením počtu cestujúcich, ale aj s výzvami, akými sú napríklad nárast migrácie či medzinárodný organizovaný zločin, ukázal ako nepostačujúci. Nový systém prináša dôkladnú identifikáciu osôb na základe odoberania biometrických údajov. Policajné orgány, ale aj iné bezpečnostné zložky získajú v prípade potreby detailnejší prehľad o pohybe občanov tretích krajín na území Schengenu. Ich kontrola bude posilnená. Žiaden členský štát Európskej únie si v oblasti boja proti terorizmu, či potláčania organizovanej trestnej činnosti neporadí sám. Prehlbovanie vzájomnej spolupráce a podpora rozvoja tzv. inteligentných hraníc sú tak v boji proti aktuálne existujúcim hrozbám nanajvýš potrebné. |  | |  |  |  | |  | | --- | |  | |      |  |  |  |  |  | | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | | |  | | --- | | MPphoto | |  | **Ангел Джамбазки (ECR).** – Свидетели сме на безпрецедентен миграционен поток от трети страни към Европейския съюз. През 2015 г. повече от 50 милиона души са посетили ЕС. И докато ръстът на туризма е положителен за нашите икономики, то според ФРОНТЕКС има увеличение в нелегалното преминаване на външните граници на ЕС, като само за 2015 г. броят на тези преминавания е повече от 1.8 милиона. Ясно е, че този факт налага засилване на сигурността по нашите външни граници. Снемането на биометрични данни, предвидено от изменението на Регламент (ЕС) 2016/399 във връзка с използването на Системата за влизане/излизане, е стъпка в правилната посока. Това би попречило на нелегални мигранти да изхвърлят паспортите си твърдейки, че са бежанци. Също така, снемането на биометрични данни би създало една неоспорима база данни с информация за потенциални терористи, които се опитват да влязат в ЕС. Искам да спомена и още нещо. Картата на Европейския съюз не е завършена докато България и Румъния не станат част от Шенген. Вече изпълняваме всички условия за влизане в зоната и фактът, че нелегалното преминаваме през България е сведено до минимум, е безспорното доказателство за това. Ние защитаваме външните граници на ЕС с достойнство и смятам, че е редно да бъдем възнаградени за нашите усилия. |  | |  |  |  | |  | | --- | |  | |      |  |  |  |  |  | | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | | |  | | --- | | MPphoto | |  | **Vladimír Maňka (S&D),***písomne* – Zavedenie používania biometrických údajov osôb pri cezhraničnom prekračovaní vonkajších hraníc bude mať viacero pozitívnych vplyvov. Okrem plynulejšej a efektívnejšej kontroly na hraniciach Schengenu sa zároveň zlepší a posilní kontrola pohybu osôb v rámci Únie. To vzhľadom na zvyšujúcu sa migráciu obyvateľstva prispeje k vyššej bezpečnosti a včasnejšiemu zachyteniu možného ohrozenia. Je dôležité, aby biometrické údaje boli používané výlučne v súlade s cieľmi tohto opatrenia a aby boli jasne zadefinované podmienky, za akých je možné sprístupniť tieto údaje orgánom presadzovania práva v súvislosti s bojom proti cezhraničnému zločinu a terorizmu. |  | |  |  |  | |  | | --- | |  | |      |  |  |  |  |  | | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | | |  | | --- | | MPphoto | |  | **Marijana Petir (PPE),***napisan***.** – Republika Hrvatska je obavila sve potrebne pripreme i spremna je učiniti korak dalje u svojoj pripadnosti europskoj obitelji i postati članicom Schengenskog prostora. To je dobro i za Hrvatsku i za ostale države članice. Osim što će ulazak u Schengenski prostor ukloniti granične kontrole sa zemljama članicama Europske unije, kao i kontrole putovnica u zračnim lukama pri putovanju iz i prema zemljama koje pripadaju Schengenskom prostoru, ovime će se osnažiti i sigurnost na vanjskim granicama Europske unije.  Najduža vanjska granica Europske unije je upravo granica Republike Hrvatske s Bosnom i Hercegovinom stoga je i Europskoj uniji u interesu da tu granicu još snažnije zaštiti i to čim prije. Hrvatska bi također morala imati pristup sustavu ulaska/izlaska za registraciju podataka o ulasku i izlasku državljana trećih zemalja koji prelaze vanjske granice EU-a te se nadam da ćemo do početka primjene ovog sustava i mi biti dio Schengenskog područja i aktivan dionik sustava.  Europska unija mora osigurati ravnopravan tretman prema svim svojim državama članicama i ne smije diskriminirati zemlje koje se nalaze na putu ka Schengenu, stoga očekujem da i Hrvatska automatski postane dio sustava ulaska/izlaska kako bi mogla kvalitetnije prikupljati podatke i sudjelovati u njihovoj razmjeni. |  | |  |  |  | |  | | --- | |  | |      |  |  |  |  |  | | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | | |  | | --- | | MPphoto | |  | **Claudia Țapardel (S&D),***în scris***.** – Într-un context geopolitic volatil, marcat recent atât de criza migraționistă, cât și de o creștere a numărului de atacuri teroriste, este important ca Uniunea Europeană să aibă frontiere „smart”, eficiente și integrate pentru a gestiona fluxurile de oameni care tranzitează teritoriul său. În calitate de raportor din partea Grupului S&D din Comisia de Bugete a PE pe propunerea Comisiei pentru instituirea unui sistem armonizat în ceea ce îi privește intrarea și ieșirea cetățenilor non-UE în spațiul comunitar, consider că realizarea acestui lucru ar ajuta semnificativ statele membre să gestioneze în mod uniform și, totodată, în timp util granițele externe ale UE.  Având în vedere că prin acest raport s-a stabilit că România și Bulgaria sunt parte integrantă a sistemului EES, iar Schengen reprezintă un reper al unității și al cooperării europene, solicit liderilor europeni să urgenteze finalizarea procesului de aderare al acelor țări. Acestea au dovedit deja că îndeplinesc toate condițiile pentru o participare corespunzătoare la Spațiul Schengen. Securitatea europeană nu se poate înfăptui decât printr-o colaborare strânsă între statele membre, iar acest lucru presupune în primul rând un tratament egal al acestora. |  | |  |  |  | |  | | --- | |  | |      |  |  |  |  |  | | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | | |  | | --- | | MPphoto | |  | **Valdemar Tomaševski (ECR),***raštu***.** – Tema, kuria šiandien buvo kalbėta, buvo kruopščiai paruošta Piliečių laisvės, teisingumo ir vidaus reikalų komiteto, nes pranešimas liečia labai svarbius ES valstybių narių saugumo ir asmenų privatumo aspektus. Per pastaruosius keletą metų ties Europos Sąjungos išorės sienomis padidėjus keleivių srautams tapo akivaizdu, kad dabartinės sienų kontrolės sistemos yra neveiksmingos, ir ši padėtis galėtų tapti dar sudėtingesnė atsižvelgiant į pabėgėlių antplūdį. Privalome modernizuoti savo keliautojų valdymo sistemas, kad jos būtų darnesnės ir veiksmingesnės, taip pat saugesnės. Kontrolė negali būti grindžiama vien tikrinant keleivių pasus ir juose esančius antspaudus, kurie ne tik gali būti suklastoti arba neįskaitomi, bet ir būti pernelyg didelė našta sienos apsaugos institucijoms – trukdyti joms sutelkti dėmesį į tikrus savo darbus ir taip kelti pavojų saugumui. Europos atvykimo ir išvykimo sistemos nustatymas bus naudingas keleiviams, nes sutrumpės jų laukimo sienos perėjimo punktuose laikas. Tai taip pat atneš naudą valstybėms narėms, nes jos greičiau sutvarkys su *bona fidae* keleiviais susijusius formalumus ir kartu padidins ES išorės sienų saugumą. |  | |  |  |  | |  | | --- | |  | |      |  |  |  |  | | --- | --- | --- | --- | | |  | | --- | | MPphoto | |  | **Janusz Zemke (S&D),***na piśmie***.** – W ostatnich kilku latach pogorszyło się w UE poczucie bezpieczeństwa obywateli, co wiąże się m.in. ze wzrostem liczby nielegalnych imigrantów oraz z przypadkami zamachów terrorystycznych. Jednym z warunków ograniczenia tych niepokojących zjawisk jest przyjęcie systemu wjazdu na terytorium UE. Zgłoszone propozycje poprawiają w moim przekonaniu system identyfikacji osób przybywających do UE.  Szczególnie ważna jest tutaj identyfikacja nielegalnych imigrantów dzięki tworzeniu ogólnoeuropejskich baz danych biometrycznych. Te bazy danych umożliwią śledzenie historii podróży obywateli państw trzecich, uwzględniając także osoby podejrzane o popełnienie przestępstwa. Rzecz w tym, by proponowane rozwiązania jak najszybciej weszły w życie, by państwa członkowskie nie tylko gromadziły konieczne dane na własne potrzeby, ale także dzieliły się tymi informacjami z wszystkimi państwami członkowskimi i instytucjami UE odpowiadającymi za walkę z terroryzmem jak Europol czy Eurojust. | |

<https://www.europarl.europa.eu/doceo/document/CRE-8-2017-10-25-ITM-003_EN.html>
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| |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | | **18. Annual Report on the functioning of the Schengen area (debate)** | |  |  |  | | --- | --- | --- | |  | [**Video of the speeches**](https://www.europarl.europa.eu/plenary/en/vod.html?mode=chapter&vodLanguage=EN&playerStartTime=20180529-19:12:51&playerEndTime=20180529-20:44:40) |  | | |  |  |  | | --- | --- | --- | |  | [**Minutes**](https://www.europarl.europa.eu/doceo/document/PV-8-2018-05-29-ITM-018_EN.html) |  | |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | | |  | | --- | | MPphoto |  |  | | --- | |  | |  | **Puhemies.** – Esityslistalla on seuraavana Carlos Coelhon kansalaisvapauksien sekä oikeus- ja sisäasioiden valiokunnan puolesta laatima mietintö Schengen-alueen toimintaa koskevasta vuosikertomuksesta ([**2017/2256(INI)**](https://oeil.secure.europarl.europa.eu/oeil/popups/ficheprocedure.do?lang=en&reference=2017/2256(INI))) ([**A8—0160/2018**](https://www.europarl.europa.eu/doceo/document/A-8-2018-0160_EN.html)). |  | |  |  |  | |  | | --- | |  | |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | | |  | | --- | | MPphoto |  |  | | --- | |  | |  | **Carlos Coelho,***Relator***.** – Senhora Presidente, Senhor Comissário, Caros Colegas, em 1990, numa pequena localidade do Luxemburgo que ficaria na História, assinava-se a convenção de aplicação do Acordo de Schengen. O mais tarde Presidente do Parlamento Europeu, Pieter Dankert, perguntou na altura quem é que há quarenta anos poderia ter imaginado que a França, a Alemanha, quase reunificada, e o Benelux assinariam um acordo aqui em Schengen. Permitam-me que adapte aos dias de hoje estas palavras históricas. Quem imaginaria, há vinte anos, que o espaço de livre circulação incluiria vinte e seis países, quatrocentos milhões de pessoas e cinquenta mil quilómetros de fronteiras externas? Quem imaginaria que o Parlamento Europeu estaria, pela primeira vez, hoje a debater o seu relatório sobre o estado de Schengen?  Em 1990, Pieter Dankert respondia à sua pergunta com um resoluto «Conseguimos». Hoje, sabemos, porém, que Schengen nunca está concluído, nem garantido. A entrada plena da Bulgária e da Roménia permanece por cumprir. É inaceitável que, sete anos depois de cumprirem todos os requisitos para beneficiarem da liberdade de circulação, búlgaros e romenos continuem a ser tratados pelo Conselho como cidadãos de segunda. Espero que, amanhã, o Parlamento Europeu reafirme, uma vez mais, que a Bulgária e a Roménia devem, de pleno direito, ser membros de Schengen.  Caros colegas, Schengen nunca está concluído nem garantido, de facto, e trinta e três anos depois da assinatura do Acordo de Schengen enfrentamos novos perigos e desafios. Os últimos três anos foram dramáticos. Uma aparente nova normalidade emergiu. Controlos nas fronteiras internas voltaram a fazer parte do quotidiano de milhões de europeus. Os governos nacionais, a par das franjas mais populistas do nosso espetro político, transformaram Schengen no bode expiatório para as falhas nas políticas de segurança e para as fragilidades do sistema europeu comum de asilo. Colocaram Schengen em coma, a carregar males que não são os seus. Para espiar culpas e ganhar eleições, os Estados—Membros estão a utilizar de forma leviana a bomba atómica de Schengen e fazem-no ilegalmente. O período máximo acordado pelos próprios Estados-Membros foi largamente ultrapassado e os motivos vagos e apresentados a contragosto não encontram reflexo na realidade. Se Schengen perecer, o impacto económico poderá alcançar os cinquenta mil milhões de euros, mas desaparece, sobretudo, a maior expressão da Europa dos cidadãos.  Sr. Presidente, o Sistema de Informação de Schengen é o maior sistema europeu no combate ao crime e no controlo das nossas fronteiras. No entanto, há Estados-Membros que continuam a desrespeitar as normas relativas à sua utilização. O Reino Unido, não sendo único, é particularmente grave neste domínio. Já após a aprovação deste relatório da Comissão, o grupo de trabalho para Schengen a que presido foi informado dos graves problemas na utilização do SIS pelo Reino Unido. O acesso deste Estado é provisório pela circunstância de não ser membro de Schengen e é, portanto, independente do seu processo de saída. Esta avaliação já não é a primeira com resultados graves. No entanto, causa particular preocupação neste momento, porque o Reino Unido está em processo de saída mas pretende manter uma relação com a União também no âmbito da segurança. Também aqui o Conselho e a Comissão deverão trabalhar com o Parlamento no sentido de encontrar uma solução.  Sr, Comissário Avramapoulos, precisamos de devolver Schengen aos cidadãos. A Comissão não pode temer utilizar todos os instrumentos à sua disposição e pode contar com o apoio deste Parlamento. Com este relatório, damos um passo significativo no exercício do escrutínio democrático de Schengen, aumentamos a transparência e, com isso, uma discussão mais séria e, caros colegas, o problema do combate ao terrorismo não se resolve com mais fronteiras, resolve-se com mais cooperação. Se os governos nacionais não têm a coragem de resgatar Schengen, tenhamos nós a coragem de salvar a liberdade dos cidadãos europeus. |  | |  |  |  | |  | | --- | |  | |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | | |  | | --- | | MPphoto |  |  | | --- | |  | |  | **Dimitris Avramopoulos,** *Member of the Commission***.** – Madam President, I don’t need to repeat how important economically, politically and, in particular, symbolically Schengen is. We all know.  I would like to express my thanks to the Members of the Schengen Working Group for their continuous work and in particular the European Parliament’s ‘Mr Schengen’, Mr Carlos Coelho. Thank you for your report and this very timely debate. It comes at the moment where we are reflecting a lot on the future of our common external border management but also on how to enhance our internal security and free movement in the Schengen Area.  The thing is, we need to be pragmatic but without ever forsaking our values and fundamental principles. This is why one of our concerns is how to better make use of the existing tools at our disposal to fully implement the legislative measures we have recently adopted and to conclude pending legislation. But we also look to the future. How do we see the future as regards borders management but also as regards the free movement of European citizens in an area without border controls?  My answer to this is clear and simple. We need to take joint responsibility for the management of our common external borders but also ensure mutual trust among Member States and everything that is implied by this.  During the last three years, as we all know, we have been working together intensively in order to safeguard Schengen. During the last three years Schengen has been confronted with the most important challenges since its conception. Several Member States have reintroduced temporary internal border controls to address irregular migration flows and secondary movements and also in reaction to the multiple terrorist attacks. But temporary internal border controls cannot and should not become permanent ones. That is why it is so important to preserve the right balance between ensuring mobility, on the one hand, whilst guaranteeing security on the other hand.  It is important to use, but also to improve, all the tools we have at our disposal to ensure high standards of security. It is precisely to maintain this balance that the Commission has proposed, among others, to amend the Schengen Borders Code, which is also one of our priorities.  Member States retain the main responsibility when it comes to security. The temporary reintroduction of border controls is a legitimate measure available to Member States confronted with a serious threat to internal security or public policy in exceptional cases. We should never forget this essential point: that internal border controls are, and should indeed remain, exceptional.  Our proposal does not intend to make controls at internal borders easier or permanent. On the contrary, we have proposed reinforcing the procedural safeguards. The reintroduction of border controls should only be a measure of last resort, with the Council having the last word. And the views of the other Member States affected by such decisions must be duly taken into account. Alternative solutions, such as police checks and cross-border cooperation must always take priority.  I would also like to stress the Schengen Borders Code amendment, which aims to adapt the rules for the reintroduction of temporary internal border controls to the current needs to respond to evolving and persistent serious threats to public policy or internal security.  In the meantime, the Commission is in contact with the Member States concerned on lifting internal border controls as soon as possible, allowing them to maintain the same level of security by using other tools, such as reinforced police checks and increased cross-border cooperation. We all agree that we should return to the full, normal functioning of the Schengen Area as soon as possible. I made this very clear in all my recent contacts with the countries that have done it.  Mobility inside our Schengen Area requires secure external borders. This is exactly why since 2015 we have made significant progress in our external borders management. A key element has been the establishment of the European Border and Coast Guard Agency, bringing together the national border guard authorities of the Member State and the European Borders and Coast Guard Agency, which now operates along the European borders.  As part of our proposal for the next Multiannual Financial Framework which we put forward on 2 May 2018, we proposed to almost triple the expenditure for external borders management, migration and asylum, which could fund 10 000 border guards by 2027 for the European Borders and Coast Guard Agency.  The EU budget for the management of external borders, migration and asylum would reach more than EUR 34.9 billion overall, compared to EUR 13 billion for the period 2014-2020. A new integrated border management fund will help to guarantee a high level of security in the European Union by ensuring strong and effective border management, while safeguarding the free movement of persons.  If adopted, it will reinforce financial and operational support given to Member States in securing the European Union’s common external borders. We equally need to know who is crossing our borders and be able to stop those who pose a threat whilst ensuring mobility for bona fide travellers.  We have already made substantial progress. The development of the entry/exit system is starting. We have also reached a political agreement on the European travel information and authorisation system (ETIAS). I would like to thank you for your work on this file too.  We also have proposals on the table to strengthen existing systems, such as the Schengen Information System where negotiations are about to close, and the European Criminal Records Information System in respect to third country nationals convicted in the European Union by creating this centralised system on third-country nationals. Again, we need to reach swift agreements on these files.  We also aim to improve the exchange of information and to make our systems interoperable to help us counter terrorism and serious crime and secure our borders, with full respect for data protection. Our proposal on interoperability will be a game-changer in this respect, and we need to complete the work on it by the end of this year.  As you can see, we have many building blocks in place to strengthen our external borders, but we need to make yet further efforts to preserve Schengen, to make it even stronger and more resilient.  Finally, let me repeat: the absence of internal border controls constitutes the very essence of Schengen, but in a common area without border controls, security concerns are common too. This is why we must do everything to preserve the careful balance between free movement and mobility, on the one hand, and security on the other. This is also what our citizens expect from us, and we can only achieve this through a coordinated and united Schengen framework, which brings me to my last point.  Schengen should include Romania and Bulgaria too, because a more inclusive Schengen is a more secure Schengen. We call on the Council to finally decide on Bulgaria and Romania to join the Schengen family and Croatia too, once all criteria are met. |  | |  |  |  | |  | | --- | |  | |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | | |  | | --- | | MPphoto |  |  | | --- | |  | |  | **Agustín Díaz de Mera García Consuegra,***en nombre del Grupo PPE***.** – Señora presidenta, señor comisario, felicito al señor Coelho por su trabajo y por su compromiso. El espacio Schengen y la libre circulación de personas están amenazados. El restablecimiento de fronteras interiores por parte de algunos Estados miembros ha mermado los principios de solidaridad, cooperación y confianza mutua. Restablecer los controles en las fronteras interiores ha demostrado ser más sencillo que eliminarlos. Los nuevos controles para regular los movimientos de nacionales han sido la respuesta de algunos Estados ante la llegada de solicitantes de asilo y refugiados y el terrorismo.  Las causas no remiten a la esencia de Schengen, sino a ámbitos conexos, como las deficiencias del SECA. Por esto, resulta muy necesario seguir trabajando en el paquete de migración y asilo presentado en el año 2016. Hay que utilizar al máximo los sistemas actuales y seguir impulsando la cooperación policial y judicial, entre Estados y con Europol, Eurojust y Frontex. También la reforma en curso del SIS II es indispensable. Además, los sistemas SIS y VIS deben estar siempre operativos en los puestos fronterizos.  Las nuevas propuestas legislativas sobre interoperabilidad de las bases de datos son necesarias para optimizar el rol de eu—LISA con el Sistema de Entradas y Salidas. La voluntad política, la solidaridad con países de primera entrada, el refuerzo de los sistemas existentes y la interoperabilidad son herramientas esenciales para fortalecer el espacio Schengen. Y sí, yo también digo «Bulgaria y Rumanía, dentro». |  | |  |  |  | |  | | --- | |  | |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | | |  | | --- | | MPphoto |  |  | | --- | |  | |  | **Sylvie Guillaume,***au nom du groupe S&D***.** – Madame la Présidente, l’espace Schengen de libre circulation est une des plus grandes avancées de l’Union européenne. Cette phrase, qui témoigne de la fierté des progrès réalisés, résonne aussi comme une banalité à laquelle on se serait presque habitué. Mais il nous faut atterrir et se pincer pour croire que c’est encore vrai et que cela fait encore la force de l’Union européenne dans le monde.  Pourtant, tout avait si bien commencé quand, en 1995, les citoyens européens de 22 États membres, d’Islande, du Liechtenstein, de Norvège et de Suisse obtiennent la possibilité de circuler librement d’un pays à l’autre, ce qui a largement amélioré les échanges sociaux, culturels et économiques. Pour garantir cela, nos prédécesseurs ont édicté une règle commune, finalement assez simple dans son élaboration: des contrôles harmonisés aux frontières extérieures en contrepartie de la liberté de circuler à l’intérieur de l’espace ainsi créé.  Je parle au présent, mais beaucoup de choses ont changé depuis quelques années. C’est parce que nous ne nous résignons pas à cette lente dégradation que le Parlement européen affirme dans ce premier rapport annuel son attachement à l’espace Schengen et à la libre circulation. Il souligne les failles dans la mise en œuvre des politiques de l’espace Schengen et il émet des recommandations. La plus importante d’entre elles est partagée par la grande majorité du Parlement. Alors que plusieurs États membres ont rétabli les contrôles à leurs frontières nationales, parfois depuis plus de deux ans, et bien que ces contrôles soient autorisés par les règles du code frontières Schengen, ils sont contraires à l’esprit de la libre circulation. Ils doivent donc être limités dans le temps et justifiés, par exemple, en raison de risques sécuritaires.  Or, alors que des législations pour renforcer la sécurité à nos frontières extérieures s’empilent – réforme de Frontex, vérification systématique des Européens et des ressortissants de pays tiers, nouvelles bases de données –, la contrepartie de Schengen n’existe plus et plusieurs États membres continuent à mener ces contrôles à leurs frontières nationales, parfois en contravention avec les règles. Nous dénonçons ce non-respect des règles communes.  En tant que rapporteure fictive pour les socialistes et démocrates sur ce texte, j’ai voulu insister aussi pour que d’autres recommandations y figurent, car l’espace Schengen interagit avec d’autres politiques communes, notamment la gestion des flux migratoires. Je m’astreins à ne citer que deux exemples.  L’accueil des personnes qui tentent de rejoindre l’espace Schengen. Trop de migrants ont perdu la vie en Méditerranée. Il faut augmenter les opérations de recherche et de sauvetage en mer avec Frontex, qui est tenu de participer pleinement à ces opérations, et les États membres peuvent s’accorder sur un système d’asile européen solide, des voies d’accès légales à l’Union et un accueil solidaire et partagé des demandeurs d’asile entre les États membres.  Au moment où les négociations sur l’asile sont bloquées au Conseil, nous, nous voulons une politique courageuse et progressiste pour aider à renforcer la gestion de l’accueil aux frontières extérieures et la stabilité de l’espace Schengen. |  | |  |  |  | |  | | --- | |  | |  |  |  |  |  | | --- | --- | --- | --- | |  |  | **PRZEWODNICTWO: BOGUSŁAW LIBERADZKI** *Wiceprzewodniczący* |  | |  |  |  | |  | | --- | |  | |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | | |  | | --- | | MPphoto |  |  | | --- | |  | |  | **Anders Primdahl Vistisen,***for ECR-Gruppen***.** – Hr. Formand! Hele Schengenprojektet har i høj grad mistet europæernes tillid, og det er med god grund, for Schengenprojektet har fejlet i alt det, som er essensen af en grænse. Det har fejlet i forhold til bekæmpelsen af den organiserede kriminalitet, det har fejlet i forhold til at holde den ukontrollable migration ude af Europa, og det har fejlet i forhold til at bekæmpe terrorisme.  Den største tragedie i Schengensystemets fejlslagne historie har været, at man endnu engang har implementeret et europæisk prestigeprojekt uden at have de underliggende strukturer på plads. Man fjernede simpelthen de interne grænser uden at have et tilstrækkelig robust og komplet system af ekstern grænsekontrol i orden, og det har vist sig at have helt fatale konsekvenser for borgernes sikkerhed i de europæiske lande.  Derfor står det klart, at vi må gøre to ting: For det første skal den ydre grænse være langt mere robust, langt mere sikker og langt mere uigennemtrængelig for folk, der forsøger at komme til Europa. For det andet må vi sige, at så længe der ikke er helt fundamentalt styr på de ydre grænser, på den ydre sikkerhed i EU, er det enhver medlemsstats prærogativ at opretholde en intern grænsekontrol og sikre, at borgerne i vores medlemslande er så sikre, som det er muligt.  Derfor er vi langt fra i mål endnu for så vidt angår Schengensamarbejdet, og derfor må den interne grænsekontrol have lov at fortsætte, indtil det er opnået. |  | |  |  |  | |  | | --- | |  | |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | | |  | | --- | | MPphoto |  |  | | --- | |  | |  | **Cecilia Wikström,***för ALDE-gruppen***.** – Herr talman! En av de första, största och viktigaste framgångarna med EU-samarbetet är rätten för oss EU-medborgare att röra oss fritt över nationsgränserna, men sedan 2015 har den här rättigheten dessvärre begränsats i land efter land. Flera medlemsländer, bland annat Sverige, har återinfört gränskontroller som skulle vara tillfälliga men tyvärr verkar ha permanentats mer eller mindre.  Idag är flyktingsituationen inom EU under kontroll. Den yttre gränsen är stärkt. Många åtgärder har vidtagits för att trygga säkerheten. Gränskontrollerna har spelat ut sin roll, men de slår i dag mycket, mycket hårt mot ekonomi och välstånd för oss medborgare. De är dessutom varken proportionerliga eller nödvändiga och borde ha avskaffats för länge sedan.  Jag vill tacka föredraganden Carlos Coelho för ett välbalanserat, mycket viktigt betänkande som är nödvändigt eftersom det visar sig att alla medlemsländer inte lever upp till de grundläggande krav som ställs. För två år sedan presenterade kommissionen en färdplan för att återgå till ett fullt och fast Schengen. Två år senare är det en avlägsen dröm. Förlängda gränskontroller innebär en påfrestning på den inre marknaden och det är inte en nationell fråga. Det är en fråga som måste få ett europeiskt och internationellt svar.  Jag tycker att det är väldigt viktigt att vi nu återgår till ett fullt Schengen, och jag tycker, precis som kommissionären, föredraganden och många kollegor här, att det är hög tid för Rumänien och Bulgarien att finnas med i ett fullt fungerande Schengensamarbete. |  | |  |  |  | |  | | --- | |  | |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | | |  | | --- | | MPphoto |  |  | | --- | |  | |  | **Bodil Valero,***för Verts/ALE-gruppen***.** – Herr talman! Schengensamarbetet är nog det som många medborgare uppskattar allra mest i EU-samarbetet, och det har gett betydande fördelar för såväl EU-medborgare som näringslivet. Detta är något som vi alla vill värna, men det har satts på hårt prov de senaste åren och särskilt i samband med flyktingsituationen 2015 då flera medlemsländer återinförde gränskontroller.  Även om situationen ser annorlunda ut i dag fortsätter medlemsländer att förlänga kontrollerna med hänvisning till hot om terrorism och säkerhet. Jag skulle vilja påstå att det är medlemsländernas upplevda känsla av hot snarare än den faktiska förekomsten av hot som styr i det här fallet. Det svar som vi i EU vanligtvis ger på den otrygghetskänslan är att vi ska stärka våra yttre gränser och hindra människor från att komma hit, både migranter och potentiella terrorister, trots att de senare i de allra flesta fall är uppvuxna i våra länder. Jag tycker att det är synd att även dagens betänkande alltför mycket kommer in på den tankebanan, men jag kommer att tala om det som för mig är viktigast i betänkandet, det vill säga parlamentets starka kritik mot att medlemsländer fortsätter att införa de interna kontrollerna, i synnerhet eftersom flera av dem inte är i linje med de befintliga reglerna när det gäller omfattning, behov och proportionalitet. De är enligt parlamentet alltså inte lagliga.  Vi i parlamentet menar också att det inte finns någon proportion mellan åtgärder som antagits för att stärka de yttre gränserna och åtgärder för att kunna avskaffa de inre. Vi menar att det finns andra och bättre metoder att förhindra bland annat gränsöverskridande brottslighet än id-kontroller vid de inre gränserna. |  | |  |  |  | |  | | --- | |  | |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | | |  | | --- | | MPphoto |  |  | | --- | |  | |  | **Marie-Christine Vergiat,***au nom du groupe GUE/NGL***.** – Monsieur le Président, l'espace Schengen est, ou était, un des principaux acquis de la construction européenne pour les citoyens européens. Il était le symbole de la libre circulation. Or, il est devenu le symbole de l'échec des gouvernements européens à se montrer solidaires. Plus on met en place des outils pour lutter contre la criminalité organisée, les trafics en tout genre, le blanchiment des capitaux, la lutte contre le terrorisme, plus certains États mettent en cause Schengen pour masquer leurs carences et leur absence de volonté à partager des informations touchant leurs compétences régaliennes.  L'obsession est la lutte contre l'immigration dite irrégulière. On multiplie les fichages, on confond «contrôle des frontières» et «objectifs de police», on oublie les principes de nécessité et de proportionnalité, tandis que l'équilibre entre sécurité et droits fondamentaux est rompu. La France est en première ligne de ces défaillances majeures et, pire, elle a osé utiliser la lutte contre le terrorisme pour mettre en place des contrôles au faciès à la frontière franco-italienne. C'est un dévoiement des règles de Schengen.  Je voudrais terminer en remerciant M. Coelho pour son travail, pour sa volonté d'avoir une approche inclusive sur ce rapport. Je partage son inquiétude sur ce qui se passe au Royaume-Uni et je soutiens son amendement sur ce point, comme je soutiens l'adhésion de la Bulgarie et de la Roumanie sans exclusive à l'espace Schengen. |  | |  |  |  | |  | | --- | |  | |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | | |  | | --- | | MPphoto |  |  | | --- | |  | |  | **Laura Ferrara,***a nome del gruppo EFDD***.** – Signor Presidente, onorevoli colleghi, gli accordi di Schengen rappresentano un pilastro del progetto europeo.  Parliamo della libera circolazione dei cittadini senza controlli alle frontiere interne, ma anche di rafforzamento alla lotta contro la criminalità organizzata, con controlli alle frontiere esterne. Bene, il funzionamento di Schengen è strettamente legato a dei punti basilari, ovvero la fiducia reciproca tra gli Stati membri, la cooperazione, lo scambio di informazioni, elementi tutti che sono stati messi duramente alla prova dagli ingenti flussi migratori degli ultimi anni, con la conseguenza, da un lato, di arrivare all'insano binomio tra migrazioni e terrorismo e, dall'altro, di vedere soli e in difficoltà i paesi di frontiera, messi anche sotto accusa.  Le debolezze dello spazio Schengen sono allora le debolezze dell'intera Unione europea ed è quanto mai vitale trovare tra tutti gli Stati membri una volontà politica per rinsaldare il progetto europeo, in modo tale da arrivare ad una reale cooperazione tra tutti gli Stati membri e soprattutto per arrivare ad un'equa ripartizione delle responsabilità, tutelando la libertà dei cittadini, da un lato, la sicurezza, dall'altro, e non sospendere Schengen per evitare i movimenti secondari dei migranti. |  | |  |  |  | |  | | --- | |  | |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | | |  | | --- | | MPphoto |  |  | | --- | |  | |  | **Auke Zijlstra,***namens de ENF-Fractie***.** – Voorzitter, in het verslag over Schengen kiest het Europees Parlement vóór open grenzen en dus tegen veiligheid. Net als de Europese Commissie wil het Parlement kritiek op illegale grensoverschrijding niet horen en is het blind voor de criminele gevolgen ervan. Zelfs de 1200 aanrandingen op één avond heeft het Parlement de ogen niet geopend.  De komst van enorme aantallen illegale migranten heeft geleid tot de herinvoering van grenscontroles, ook in Duitsland, en terecht. Zelfs mevrouw Merkel – toch de akela van de multiculti – lijkt van de verkrachtingen en de criminaliteit geschrokken, en de grenscontroles zijn niet weer afgeschaft.  Als zelfs Merkel minder illegalen wil, hoe kan het dan dat dit Europees Parlement blind is voor de ellende die de open grenzen met zich hebben meegebracht en geen enkel mededogen toont met de getroffen vrouwen? |  | |  |  |  | |  | | --- | |  | |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | | |  | | --- | | MPphoto |  |  | | --- | |  | |  | **Γεώργιος Επιτήδειος (NI).** – Κύριε Πρόεδρε, όταν δημιουργήθηκε για πρώτη φορά ο χώρος Σένγκεν, πολλοί πίστεψαν ότι ήταν ένα από τα μεγαλύτερα επιτεύγματα της Ευρωπαϊκής Ενώσεως. Είναι αλήθεια ότι η ελεύθερη μετακίνηση ανθρώπων, μέσων και υλικών μεταξύ των χωρών της Ευρωπαϊκής Ενώσεως είναι μία ιδιαίτερα ελκυστική και επιθυμητή από όλους εξέλιξη. Βασική, όμως, προϋπόθεση για να ισχύσει η Συνθήκη Σένγκεν είναι η ασφάλεια των εξωτερικών συνόρων. Αυτή τη βασική προϋπόθεση οι σοφοί της Ευρωπαϊκής Ενώσεως δεν την έλαβαν υπόψη, αφαίρεσαν την αρμοδιότητα της ασφαλείας των συνόρων από τις χώρες των εξωτερικών συνόρων και ανέθεσαν αυτή τη λεπτή αποστολή σε έναν εντελώς ανίκανο, άχρηστο και, όπως απεδείχθη στην πράξη, επικίνδυνο οργανισμό, ο οποίος ακούει στο όνομα Frontex. Μοιραίο επακόλουθο της αδυναμίας του Frontex ήταν να πλημμυρίσουν με λαθρομετανάστες η Ιταλία και, κυρίως, η Ελλάδα. Επιπλέον, η Ελλάδα αυτή τη στιγμή έχει μετατραπεί σε ένα στρατόπεδο συγκεντρώσεως δυστυχισμένων και εξαθλιωμένων ψυχών. Εάν, λοιπόν, η Ευρωπαϊκή Ένωση θέλει να διασώσει τη Συνθήκη Σένγκεν, θα πρέπει να κάνει δύο πράγματα: πρώτον, να επιβάλει στην Τουρκία να μην στέλνει λαθρομετανάστες στην Ελλάδα και, δεύτερον, να αναθέσει και πάλι την ασφάλεια των εξωτερικών συνόρων στις αρμόδιες χώρες. |  | |  |  |  | |  | | --- | |  | |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | | |  | | --- | | MPphoto |  |  | | --- | |  | |  | **Kinga Gál (PPE).** – Elnök Úr, Biztos Úr, az európai polgárok ma az Unió legnagyobb vívmányának a belső határellenőrzések nélküli szabad mozgást tartják. Ha azt akarjuk, hogy a polgáraink számára fontos maradjon az Unió, akkor a schengeni rendszer megőrzése prioritás kell legyen. Ugyanakkor mára egyértelmű, hogy a belső határmentességnek feltétele, hogy a külső határok teljes ellenőrzés alatt legyenek, hogy valamennyi külső határral rendelkező tagállam maradéktalanul betartsa a meglévő schengeni szabályozást, ahogyan Magyarország is teszi. Ezt a külső határra fordított energiát és költséget pedig a szolidaritás részévé kell nyilvánítani, ezért növelni kell azon tagállamok forrásait, amelyek megvédik a schengeni külső határokat, és így az egész Unió biztonságát. Egy sikeres migrációs politika csakis a külső határok teljes védelmével valósulhat meg. Sajnos az Európai Unió migrációs válságra adott rossz, kötelező betelepítési kvótán alapuló válasza, és ennek következményei miatt számos tagállam visszaállította a határellenőrzést az Unió belső határainál. Ez gyakorlatilag veszélyezteti a schengeni térség működését. Ezeket az ideiglenes határellenőrzéseket haladéktalanul meg kell szüntetni, ugyanis a belső határok nélküli Európa jelenti a polgárok számára a kézzel fogható Uniót, és itt az ideje, hogy ez jelentse végre Románia és Bulgária lakosai számára is. |  | |  |  |  | |  | | --- | |  | |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | | |  | | --- | | MPphoto |  |  | | --- | |  | |  | **Péter Niedermüller (S&D).** – Elnök Úr, Coelho úr jelentése, azt gondolom, hogy egy pontos, találó és felelősségteljes látlelet a schengeni térség jelenlegi állapotáról, és ezért külön köszönet illeti a jelentéstevőt. Az egyes tagállamokban megfogalmazódó populista érvelésekkel szemben fontos hangsúlyozni, hogy a schengeni térség védelme érdekében foganasított intézkedések részeként igenis megerősítésre került az Európai Unió külső határainak a védelme, és a megfelelő adatbázisokon alapuló ellenőrzések bevezetése. Ugyanakkor önmagában értelmetlen a belső határellenőrzések fenntartása. Messzemenően egyetértek a jelentéstevővel abban a tekintetben, hogy a schengeni kódexnek a módosítása nem jelenthet további lehetőséget a belső határellenőrzések fenntartására. Kell reagálni az új kihívásokra, de ez a reakció nem vezethet a schengeni térségen belüli szabad mozgás korlátozásához, és még kevésbé az olyan szélsőséges tervekhez, mint valamely ország határainak a lezárása, vagy az azzal való fenyegetőzés.  Abban is egyetértek a jelentéstevővel, hogy a schengeni rendszer, a schengeni térség jelenlegi rendszere nem a térség struktúrájával és szabályaival kapcsolatos problémák, hanem elsősorban a közös európai menekültügyi rendszer hiányosságai miatt alakult így. Ezért további elzárkózás helyett a menekültek és bevándorlók számára legális utakat kell teremteni, és a Tanácsnak pedig el kell szánnia magát arra, hogy tárgyalásokat kezdjen a dublini rendelettel kapcsolatban, és hagyja végre jóvá az új Európai Menekültügyi Ügynökséget. |  | |  |  |  | |  | | --- | |  | |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | | |  | | --- | | MPphoto |  |  | | --- | |  | |  | **Helga Stevens (ECR).** – Voorzitter, binnen het Schengengebied kunnen wij zonder paspoortcontrole vrij reizen. Maar dit wederzijds vertrouwen tussen de landen kan niet zonder een sterke gezamenlijke bescherming van de EU-buitengrenzen.  Helaas zijn deze buitengrenzen nog steeds poreus, aangezien Europese rechters pushbacks verbieden. Bootjes worden nog steeds overgebracht naar Europa, naar redding in plaats van naar het laatste veilige doorreisland.  Het lijkt me daarom perfect verdedigbaar dat lidstaten de mogelijkheid hebben om interne grenscontroles tijdelijk opnieuw in te voeren. Dit verslag veroordeelt echter die aanpak. Ook is het kritisch over de systematische controle van EU-onderdanen, die van buiten de EU komen, waaronder ook terugkerende Syriëstrijders, op bijvoorbeeld de luchthaven van Zaventem.  Wij vinden die kritiek zeer misplaatst vanuit veiligheidsoogpunt. Het herinvoeren van grenscontroles binnen de EU brengt inderdaad economische kosten met zich mee. Maar het is juist doordat de EU te weinig doet om deze buitengrenzen te versterken, dat lidstaten willen weten wie er binnen en buiten gaat. Grenscontroles zijn, net zoals gerichte politieacties, soms nodig. |  | |  |  |  | |  | | --- | |  | |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | | |  | | --- | | MPphoto |  |  | | --- | |  | |  | **Филиз Хюсменова (ALDE).** –Г-н Председател, eжегодният доклад относно функционирането на Шенгенското пространство отново констатира, че България и Румъния вече преди 7 години изпълниха критериите за прием. Готовността за присъединяването беше удостоверена многократно и от Европейския парламент, и от председателя на Комисията, и заключенията на Съвета. Напълно подкрепям становището на доклада, че „цялостното прилагане на Шенгенското право в държавите членки, които са изпълнили критериите, е от съществено значение за координирана и надеждна рамка за правна сигурност“.  Ако вътрешните граници бъдат премахнати, ще бъде подобрена оперативната съвместимост на граничните схеми. Шенген наистина би бил по-силен, ако България и Румъния са част от него, както преди време заяви комисар Аврамопулос. Аргументите против са изцяло и само политически. Ето защо подкрепям настоящия доклад, но и настоявам Съветът да приеме отдавна нужните действия по приемане на България и Румъния в Шенген. |  | |  |  |  | |  | | --- | |  | |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | | |  | | --- | | MPphoto |  |  | | --- | |  | |  | **Kristina Winberg (EFDD).** – Herr talman! Alla imperier faller förr eller senare. Den första brickan som föll för EU var då brexit startade. Nu kan nästa bricka vara på väg att falla för att den inte längre tjänar sitt syfte. Jag talar naturligtvis om Schengensamarbetet. Tanken med Schengen var i grunden bra; det skulle underlätta för EU-medborgare att kunna röra sig fritt och smidigt inom Europa. Detta gjorde att många, i varje fall i mitt land Sverige, valde att rösta för ett EU-medlemskap. Tänk vad smidigt att kunna åka runt i Europa utan att behöva passera pass- eller gränskontroller.  För att detta skulle fungera och vara möjligt förutsatte man att EU:s yttre gränsskydd skulle fungera. Det vet vi ju att det inte gör, även om vi har mutat Turkiet med 60 miljarder för att stoppa migranterna från att ta sig över Medelhavet. På senare tid har vi även bistått Libyen med hjälp för att stoppa migrantströmmarna till Italien. Under denna tid har vi även trefaldigat anslagen till Frontex som ska bevaka och säkra våra yttre gränser. Resultatet blir i det stora hela ett större uppdrag för dem att söka och rädda människor till havs som de sedan transporterar till Grekland och Italien. Cirka 80 procent av deras verksamhet består av detta uppdrag.  Med facit i hand, och med den förändring vi ser i dag, håller det inte längre. Vi har sett en illegal migration utan dess like. Vapen och droger har också i princip haft fri rörlighet, för att inte tala om terrorister, hur de organiserat sig och begått terrordåd i våra medlemsstater. |  | |  |  |  | |  | | --- | |  | |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | | |  | | --- | | MPphoto |  |  | | --- | |  | |  | **Angelo Ciocca (ENF).** – Signor Presidente, onorevoli colleghi, in questi minuti mi stanno davvero chiamando e scrivendo tantissimi cittadini italiani, chiedendomi di difenderli dentro questi palazzi e chiedono di essere difesi da questi palazzi e questo ci deve far riflettere, è pazzesco pensare di aver trasformato i palazzi europei nel primo fronte di difesa dei cittadini italiani.  Oggi c'è un cittadino italiano, vede una bandiera europea, non vede il futuro, non vede speranza, non vede opportunità. Purtroppo oggi se un cittadino italiano vede questa Europa vede la guerra europea "4.0" e di questo sono estremamente preoccupato, una guerra politica, una guerra di speculazione finanziaria, come assistiamo in queste ore.  Questa Europa ha tolto al popolo italiano sovranità monetaria, ha tolto la sovranità del controllo dei confini, ha portato come causa appunto di questa guerra europea 4.0 povertà, clandestinità, disoccupazione, insicurezza, meno nascite e quindi morte.  E allora noi chiediamo a questa Europa di non entrare nel voto italiano, chiediamo a questa Europa di lasciare libero il popolo italiano nel scegliere i ministri, nel scegliere i programmi, nel scegliere la speranza e il nostro paese. La Lega e tanti cittadini italiani oggi chiedono in modo forte e chiaro di restare liberi da questa Europa, altrimenti diventerà un'Europa che farà schifo all'Italia. |  | |  |  |  | |  | | --- | |  | |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | | |  | | --- | | MPphoto |  |  | | --- | |  | |  | **Асим Адемов (PPE).** – Г-н Председател, поздравявам г-н Куелю за този обективен доклад, който дава реална оценка за състоянието на Шенгенското пространство днес, изтъква плюсовете и минусите, както и действията, които трябва да се предприемат. Шенгенското пространство през последните години беше под голямо напрежение и именно такива периоди изискват от Европейския парламент по-сериозно да играе роля за съхраняването на това пространство.  Европейският парламент е длъжен да защитава правата на гражданите, като активно се бори за опазването на Шенгенското пространство. За съжаление обаче, не може да се каже, че функционирането на Шенген днес дава оптимални резултати. Въвеждането отново на граничен контрол сериозно уронва доверието на гражданите в европейската интеграция. Поради това се налага да се вземат мерки за възстановяването на ползите за гражданите, за да не пострада основната идея за свободно движение.  Пред Европейския съюз има нови предизвикателства – заплахи от атентати и тероризъм. Всички тези заплахи изискват по-добър обмен на информация, по-добра координация, по-тясно сътрудничество и повече европейска солидарност. Ефективното функциониране на Шенгенското пространство зависи от това, доколко страните ще бъдат единни и солидарни една с друга. Именно тази солидарност изисква България и Румъния да бъдат приети незабавно в Шенген. Приемането на България и Румъния в Шенген ще допринесе за повече сигурност и стабилност в Европейския съюз. Съюзът незабавно трябва да вземе решение за присъединяването на България и Румъния към Шенгенското пространство, защото двете държави защитават надеждно външните граници и затова трябва да бъдат пълноправни членове на това пространство. |  | |  |  |  | |  | | --- | |  | |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | | |  | | --- | | MPphoto |  |  | | --- | |  | |  | **Josef Weidenholzer (S&D).** – Herr Präsident! Der Schengen-Raum ist eine wesentliche Voraussetzung für den Binnenmarkt. Wer an diesem Fundament rüttelt, der gefährdet unseren Wohlstand und setzt die europäische Zukunft aufs Spiel. Deshalb ist es wichtig, regelmäßig und selbstkritisch zu überprüfen, was man verbessern kann. Der jährliche Fortschrittsbericht, wie er heute von Carlos Coelho vorgelegt wird, ist dazu eine gute Gelegenheit. Er zeigt vor allem: Schengen ist eine Erfolgsstory, allen Unkenrufen zum Trotz. Die Wiedereinführung von Grenzkontrollen würde immensen Schaden nach sich ziehen. Daher sind Schwachstellen schonungslos zu identifizieren. Ich sehe da drei Bereiche: Der ungenügende Schutz der Außengrenzen, der auch im Pochen mancher Mitgliedstaaten auf ihre nationale Souveränität begründet ist, und vor allem das von Anfang an nicht funktionierende Dublin-Regime haben viel zur Glaubwürdigkeitskrise beigetragen. Zu beiden gibt es klare Vorstellungen unseres Hauses. Und in der Tat könnte mehr Europa die Sicherheitslage verbessern.  Ein ernstzunehmendes Problem stellen auch die symbolpolitisch motivierten permanenten Grenzkontrollen dar. Wir erleben das jedes Mal am Straßburger Flughafen, wenn wir zur Plenartagung reisen. Worin besteht da der Sicherheitsgewinn? Oder wenn im österreichisch-bayrischen Grenzgebiet die Autobahnübergänge kontrolliert werden, aber die anderen Grenzübertrittstellen nicht. Da kann man sich des Eindrucks nicht erwehren, dass so manches innenpolitisch motiviert ist. |  | |  |  |  | |  | | --- | |  | |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | | |  | | --- | | MPphoto |  |  | | --- | |  | |  | **Jussi Halla-aho (ECR).** – Arvoisa puhemies, monet ihmiset ovat huolissaan Schengen-järjestelmän romahtamisesta. Todellinen ongelma ei kuitenkaan ole se, että osa jäsenmaista on palauttanut valvonnan sisärajoille. Todellinen ongelma on se, että rajavalvonnan puute on mahdollistanut laittoman siirtolaisuuden ja turvapaikkashoppailun. Jos tätä ongelmaa ei ratkaista, me menetämme vapaan liikkuvuuden.  Tiukka ulkoraja- ja turvapaikkapolitiikka on paras ja ainoa keino puolustaa Schengen-järjestelmää. Jäsenmailla tulee olla mahdollisuus palauttaa valvonta sisärajoille joustavasti ja niin pitkäksi aikaa kuin tilanne edellyttää. Tämä mahdollisuus kannustaa ulkorajavaltioita ja Euroopan unionia huolehtimaan ulkorajasta. Me voimme valita vuotavat ulkorajat tai vapaan liikkuvuuden Schengen-alueella, mutta me emme voi valita molempia. |  | |  |  |  | |  | | --- | |  | |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | | |  | | --- | | MPphoto |  |  | | --- | |  | |  | **Patrick O'Flynn (EFDD).** – Mr President, in the age of ISIS and mass migratory waves, the Schengen area is pie—in—the—sky utopian student politics. It is a concept that is out of time. If an external border is porous – as it has been with the EU for many years – then the absence of internal borders becomes still more critical. When Ms Merkel invited everyone in who claimed to be displaced by wars in the Middle East, she invited them in not just on behalf of Germany, but on behalf of 25 other Schengen members and, to a large extent, on behalf of the EU’s six non—Schengen members too. So no wonder internal border checks are creeping back within Schengen – in the case of France, for wholly understandable security reasons, and for some other countries, to cope with the sheer volume of Merkel migrants.  Social and cultural cohesion is a precious and fragile thing. When it exists, it enhances the life of almost everyone in a community, but allow the pace of population change to run too fast or be careless as to the character of people moving from one country to another and you will ignite the indignation of indigenous populations. Italians want to control their own borders; Hungarians wants control their own borders; one of the big reasons for Brexit was the desire of the British to control their own borders again. The European political class is insulated from the downsides of uncontrolled mass migration. Instead of empathising with European populations who feel overrun, far too many European politicians show contempt for their electorates – even branding them as racist just for wanting a degree of social stability. If you were wise you would make the Schengen area the second item thrown into the dustbin of history – hard on the heels of the eurozone – but we know you won’t do that, and so the confrontation between Europe’s citizens and its elites is set to intensify.  *(The speaker agreed to take a blue-card question under Rule 162(8))* |  | |  |  |  | |  | | --- | |  | |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | | |  | | --- | | MPphoto |  |  | | --- | |  | |  | **Tomáš Zdechovský (PPE),***otázka položená zvednutím modré karty***.** – Pane kolego, vy jste tady zmínil, že členské státy chtějí převzít odpovědnost za hlídání hranic, jmenoval jste Maďarsko, jmenoval jste Itálii. Tak bych se vás rád zeptal, proč Itálie už tu odpovědnost nepřevzala? |  | |  |  |  | |  | | --- | |  | |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | | |  | | --- | | MPphoto |  |  | | --- | |  | |  | **Patrick O'Flynn (EFDD),***blue-card answer***.** – I think I said – or I certainly meant to say – Italians and Hungarians and the British. It’s the people who want to take back control of the borders. To some degree the governments of some countries do as well, but they are forbidden from doing so by the rules of the European Union, as you must well know. I am simply pointing out that the European elite and its rules are on a collision course with the popular will in many countries which are members of this Union. |  | |  |  |  | |  | | --- | |  | |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | | |  | | --- | | MPphoto |  |  | | --- | |  | |  | **Dubravka Šuica (PPE).** – Gospodine predsjedavajući, postavlja se pitanje kako povećati unutarnju sigurnost, a istovremeno zaštititi naše vanjske granice. Kao što je poznato, u području slobodnog kretanja, vanjske granice postaju zajedničke pa tako dijelimo više od 50 000 kilometara zajedničkih granica, što znači da sigurnosni problem u jednoj državi ili na njezinoj vanjskoj granici, može utjecati na sve.  Ali, postoji pravna stečevina na kojoj se temelji uzajamno povjerenje iz čega bi se trebalo razviti područje slobode, sigurnosti i pravde. Šteta je što države članice što češće podižu zidove na vanjskim i unutarnjim granicama kao mjeru odvraćanja od ulaska u Europsku uniju. Zamislite podatak da su europske države izgradile više od 1 200 kilometara zidova i granica, na što su utrošile oko 500 milijuna eura. A sve to protivno je duhu schengena.  Stoga se nadam da će se stvari promijeniti, da će Bugarska i Rumunjska koje ste svi ovdje spomenuli vrlo uskoro ući u schengen, a vama se zahvaljujem gospodine Avramopoulos koji ste spomenuli i Hrvatsku jer je Hrvatska na najboljem putu, potrošila je oko 117 milijuna eura za uspostavljanje tehničkih uvjeta iz omotnice. Nadamo se da ćemo 2019. godine biti spremni. Znamo da se Hrvatska sama pridružila Europskoj uniji 2013. godine, tako se nadam da će sama ući i u schengenski prostor.  Samo želim još jedan podatak reći da je schengenski informacijski sustav u Hrvatskoj pokazao svu opravdanost primjene – u sedam mjeseci zabilježeno je 168 milijuna pregleda s 8 000 identificiranih automobila ili ljudi koji su bili zanimljivi sa sigurnosnog aspekta.  Stoga sam čvrsto uvjerena da je schengenski prostor dio rješenja, a ne problema. Ako on prestane postojati, a to se nadam da neće, dogodilo bi se to i s Europom građana u kojoj danas živimo. |  | |  |  |  | |  | | --- | |  | |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | | |  | | --- | | MPphoto |  |  | | --- | |  | |  | **Ana Gomes (S&D).** – Senhor Presidente, agradeço ao relator Carlos Coelho e apoio tudo o que aqui sublinhou, incluindo sobre o uso do SIS pelo Reino Unido e a inclusão da Roménia e Bulgária. Neste relatório mostramos que os principais problemas no funcionamento do sistema de Schengen resultam da tacanhez política, do egoísmo e da falta de solidariedade entre Estados-Membros na resposta a desafios de segurança transnacionais, em especial o terrorismo, que pedem mais Europa e mais Europa passa por Schengen.  Também a Comissão Europeia, Sr. Avramopoulos, não pode continuar a assobiar para o ar, ignorando violações de Schengen que comprometem a integridade do sistema e põem em causa a segurança coletiva. Dos vistos gold em que competem perversamente diversos Estados-Membros, incluindo o meu país, Portugal, ao caso de Malta, onde há testemunhos alarmantes de esquemas organizados de venda massiva de vistos Schengen a líbios e argelinos, para não falar da vergonha que é o *dirty deal* ilegal feito pela União Europeia com a Turquia.  Quando vai a União Europeia cumprir Schengen e não deixar mais que sejam as máfias traficantes a gerir os fluxos migratórios, como denunciou o Secretário-Geral das Nações Unidas António Guterres? Quando vai o Conselho desbloquear a revisão do sistema europeu comum de asilo e abrir vias legais e controladas, seguras, para que requerentes de asilo e refugiados não tenham que pôr as vidas à mercê dos traficantes que a falta de gestão europeia vem, de facto, alimentando? |  | |  |  |  | |  | | --- | |  | |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | | |  | | --- | | MPphoto |  |  | | --- | |  | |  | **Lara Comi (PPE).** – Signor Presidente, onorevoli colleghi, Commissario, mi permetta di ringraziare e di complimentarmi con l'on. Coelho per l'ottimo lavoro svolto.  Devo dire che ho sentito tante volte citare l'Italia oggi e quindi mi permetto di fare una riflessione concentrata sull'Italia e sull'area Schengen. E allora la riflessione è questa: sentendo i cittadini, sentendo gli artigiani, sentendo i commercianti, sentendo la base e quindi gli italiani, vedete Schengen è una grande conquista, sicuramente va gestita bene, va gestita al meglio, però io pongo una questione: con che controlli?  L'Italia andrebbe bene o andrebbe male? L'Italia otterrebbe di più o otterrebbe di meno? Secondo un'analisi, primo, otterrebbe più problemi e quindi già ne abbiamo abbastanza. Per quanto riguarda l'immigrazione: caso Ventimiglia. Nel momento in cui la Francia ha ampliato i controlli ce li siamo tenuti tutti in casa. Noi abbiamo un problema di frontiere esterne, lì dobbiamo effettuare i blocchi, non di frontiere interne.  Secondo: caso Brennero. Bene, l'Austria ha deciso di aumentare i controlli e abbiamo avuto 70 chilometri di coda, perché in questo caso abbiamo danneggiato il commercio di import ed export degli italiani. E allora vede, io penso che siano le frontiere esterne da controllare, quelle che è difficile costruire muri come il mare, e lo sa bene anche il Commissario, vista la sua origine, e anche altri colleghi del Mediterraneo. E permettetemi, questo lo chiedono i cittadini italiani di rimanere nell'Europa, ma in un'Europa diversa. Non di uscire né dall'euro, né dall'Europa. |  | |  |  |  | |  | | --- | |  | |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | | |  | | --- | | MPphoto |  |  | | --- | |  | |  | **Emilian Pavel (S&D).** – Domnule președinte, domnule comisar, dragi colegi, acest prim raport anual al Parlamentul European privind funcționarea spațiului Schengen stabilește un precedent pentru anii următori, fiind așadar esențial să ne asigurăm de faptul că drepturile și libertățile cetățenilor noștri sunt respectate. Spațiul Schengen nu funcționează atâta timp cât unele țări mențin controlul la granițele interne. Astfel, șase state membre Schengen sunt în ilegalitate încă din noiembrie 2017. Mai mult, în loc să le sancționeze, Comisia Europeană încearcă să le legalizeze practicile.  În tot acest timp, din 2011 încoace, România aplică dispozițiile aquis-ului Schengen și acționează ca un membru de facto prin gestionarea peste 2 000 de kilometri de frontieră externă a Uniunii Europene, fără a beneficia însă de avantajele liberei circulații. De aceea am solicitat în cadrul acestui raport lărgirea spațiului Schengen, primind astfel și România și Bulgaria. Fiecare zi în afara acestui spațiu reprezintă o discriminare clară a cetățenilor români și bulgari, dar și o înfrângere și o rușine pentru proiect european. Vă mulțumesc, dragi colegi, domnule comisar, pentru că a-ți susținut acest demers și sper că mâine o majoritate clară va vota pentru această aderare, care este prea întârziată. |  | |  |  |  | |  | | --- | |  | |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | | |  | | --- | | MPphoto |  |  | | --- | |  | |  | **Frank Engel (PPE).** – Monsieur le Président, au moment où la France, il y a quelques années, pour de bonnes raisons à l’époque, a décidé de réintroduire les contrôles aux frontières, je me souviens que les 100 000 citoyens français qui avaient un emploi à Luxembourg, parce que chez eux il n’y en avait pas – et qui, malgré tout, votaient Front national parce que cela doit être bon pour la protection des frontières –, passaient chaque matin et chaque soir trois à quatre heures dans leur voiture pour se rendre à leur travail. Ceux-là étaient guéris de ce souhait bête et stupide de voir les frontières rétablies pour le bien de nous tous.  J’ai entendu le collègue anglophone tout à l’heure. Il me semble que le gouvernement britannique n’est pas du tout en faveur de la réintroduction d’une frontière dure en Irlande, entre la République d’Irlande et l’Irlande du Nord, parce que cela signifierait la catastrophe, la débâcle économique pour l’Irlande et pour les gens qui vivent des deux côtés de cette frontière.  C’est lamentable, Monsieur le Président, et je le dis en pesant mes mots, c’est lamentable que des motifs politiques strictement internes en Autriche, en Bavière, en France et ailleurs, justifient le maintien d’une chose qui devrait être abolie depuis des décennies, et abolie pour de bon. Je suis heureux qu’en face de Schengen – c’est un village du Luxembourg pour ceux qui ne s’en souviendraient pas –, il y ait le Land allemand de la Sarre, parce que les Sarrois sont encore assez raisonnables pour ne pas y réintroduire de frontières. Si c’était la Bavière, on aurait bientôt une troupe régionale de protection des frontières pour les besoins d’une campagne d’un homme politique qui veut être réélu en septembre.  Cela n’est pas normal. Nous ne pouvons plus continuer à faire dépendre le bon fonctionnement de l’une des très grandes réalisations de l’Union européenne des lubies politiques de certains qui croient qu’avec la sécurité, on justifie toute mauvaise politique qui puisse être imaginée. C’est faux et cela doit cesser. |  | |  |  |  | |  | | --- | |  | |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | | |  | | --- | | MPphoto |  |  | | --- | |  | |  | **Juan Fernando López Aguilar (S&D).** – Señor presidente, señor comisario Avramopoulos, es evidente en este debate como en tantos anteriores que si los antieuropeos y los eurófobos, que cada vez son más numerosos en esta Cámara, odian Schengen es exactamente porque Schengen es el activo más preciado de la ciudadanía europea, lo que los ciudadanos europeos más y mejor identifican con lo mejor de la historia de Europa como la hemos construido.  Exactamente por eso, cuando Schengen entra en crisis, como consecuencia de lo que se llamó la crisis migratoria, la presión sobre las fronteras exteriores, y se suspendió la efectividad de Schengen durante casi tres años, el Parlamento Europeo, a través de la Comisión de Libertades Civiles, hizo lo correcto constituyendo un grupo de trabajo, informando para evaluar cómo podemos ser más eficaces y garantes de la cooperación leal y de la solidaridad de la gestión de las fronteras exteriores, manteniendo al mismo tiempo la libre circulación de personas en la Unión.  Por eso apoyamos este informe. Por eso queremos, contra lo que opinan los eurófobos, que, cuanto antes, Schengen vuelva a la normalidad y se restablezca plenamente la circulación de personas en el interior de la Unión Europea.  Y la objeción que ponemos a este informe tiene que ver con el sesgo securitario que pretende imponer en Schengen un marchamo sobre controles biométricos e interoperabilidad, además de una política de retornos que nada tiene que ver con la libre de circulación entre fronteras.  *(El orador acepta responder a una pregunta formulada con arreglo al procedimiento de la «tarjeta azul» (artículo 162, apartado 8, del Reglamento interno)).* |  | |  |  |  | |  | | --- | |  | |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | | |  | | --- | | MPphoto |  |  | | --- | |  | |  | **Marek Jurek (ECR),***pytanie zadane przez podniesienie niebieskiej kartki***.** – Czy nie uważa Pan jednak, że to nie partie polityczne, które wyrażają obawy przed niekontrolowaną imigracją, ale właśnie polityka władz Unii Europejskiej zachęcająca do nielegalnej imigracji, bagatelizująca ten problem doprowadziła do tego najpoważniejszego kryzysu strefy Schengen? Czy to nie opanowanie tego zjawiska jest najlepszą metodą, żeby ona miała zaufanie i działała dobrze? Tymczasem w naszym sprawozdaniu znowu pojawiają się postulaty legalizacji nielegalnej imigracji. Czy naprawdę to jest droga do zagwarantowania dobrego funkcjonowania naszych granic zewnętrznych? |  | |  |  |  | |  | | --- | |  | |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | | |  | | --- | | MPphoto |  |  | | --- | |  | |  | **Juan Fernando López Aguilar (S&D),***respuesta de «tarjeta azul»***.** – Con el debido respeto, querido colega Jurek, no ha manifestado usted una pregunta, sino su opinión. Y lo primero que hice cuando llegué al Parlamento Europeo fue leerme el Tratado de Lisboa, que mandata precisamente a la Unión Europea construir juntos, de manera solidaria y cooperativa, una política de libre circulación de personas, al mismo tiempo que una gestión integrada de las fronteras exteriores de la Unión.  Y debe hacerse cuanto antes más europea, para que tengamos más y mejor Europa, incluyendo a Bulgaria y Rumanía en el espacio de libre circulación de personas. Ese es el objetivo que prometía el Tratado de Lisboa y, en la medida en que tengamos contradicción contra este activo, que era el más preciado de la Unión Europea, la Unión Europea continuará fallando a su promesa. |  | |  |  |  | |  | | --- | |  | |      |  |  |  |  |  |  | | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | | |  | | --- | | MPphoto |  |  | | --- | |  | |  | **Tomáš Zdechovský (PPE).** – Pane předsedající, chtěl bych zpravodaji poděkovat za tuto zprávu. Myslím si, že ten dokument vychází z velmi dobrého základu. Myslím si, že vedle toho, že tam popisuje reálně situaci, tak navrhuje některé nápady na zlepšení toho systému.  Zaznělo zde mnohokrát, my nejsme spokojeni s tím, jak funguje. Pokaždé, když jezdíme do Francie, tak je poměrně trapná kontrola pasů tady ve Štrasburku. Myslím si, že každý, kdo jí prochází, si musí ťukat na hlavu, protože to není způsob, jak zabránit útoku nebo zvýšit bezpečnost občanů. Myslím si, že nikdo si nemyslí, že tato kontrola zabrání jakémukoliv teroristovi, aby se do Štrasburku dostal.  Já si myslím, že v rámci schengenského prostoru nám chybí vymahatelnost práva, a to je i to, co je v té zprávě popsáno. To, aby opravdu všechny členské státy skutečně dodržovaly to, co mají, a aby to opravdu neobcházely, ať už formou zmiňovaných zlatých víz nebo formou různých pasů, které dávají občanům třetích zemí. To je to, co vede ke skepticismu nad fungováním schengenského prostoru.  Schengenský prostor sám o sobě je výborná myšlenka a věřte mi, že jako student Papežské univerzity jsem zažil to, co znamená být *out of Schengen*, a zažil jsem ty kontroly na hranicích a už bych nikdy nechtěl, aby se tyto kontroly vrátily zpátky do Evropy. |  | |  |  |  | |  | | --- | |  | |      |  |  |  |  |  |  | | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | | |  | | --- | | MPphoto |  |  | | --- | |  | |  | **Miriam Dalli (S&D).** – Grazzi President, Kummissarju, nibda billi nirringrazzja lir-rapporteur ta’ dan ir-rapport u llum qegħdin nisimgħu ħafna varjanzi, b’mod partikolari jiena ngħid ċertu anki estremiżmu żejjed. Qegħdin nitkellmu dwar immigrazzjoni bla kontrolli ta’ xejn, meta fir-realtà, illum il-ġurnata, aktar minn qatt qabel, qegħdin naħdmu biex verament ikollna bilanċ.  Jiena nirreferi għal dak li għamilna matul din is-sena, flimkien mal-MEP Coelho, fejn qegħdin fuq ir-riforma tal-Kummissjoni Ewropea dwar is-Sistema ta’ Informazzjoni ta’ Schengen. Għaliex din hija riforma li permezz tagħha rridu niżguraw kooperazzjoni akbar bejn l-Istati Membri biex, iva, nassiguraw is-sigurtà tal-Unjoni Ewropea kollha kemm hi. U hemmhekk ninsabu fl-aħħar stadji biex nikkonkludu leġiżlazzjoni mmirata biex tiżgura l-iskambju ta’ informazzjoni dwar theddid li jista’ jkun hemm.  Imma, u din hija xi ħaġa li ġiet enfasizzata anki fir-rapport, biex din il-leġiżlazzjoni taħdem, neħtieġu li l-Istati Membri jimplimentaw kif suppost l-acquis ta’ Schengen.  Għaliex, wara kollox, iċ-ċittadini tagħna jridu jkunu siguri però jridu wkoll ikunu ħielsa.  Għandna pjan, għandna r-regoli u s-sistemi konkreti li, jekk implimentati sew, iva jistgħu jaħdmu u għandna l-għodod neċessarji biex liċ-ċittadini tagħna nagħtuhom il-libertà li jeħtieġu. |  | |  |  |  | |  | | --- | |  | |      |  |  |  |  |  |  | | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | | |  | | --- | | MPphoto |  |  | | --- | |  | |  | **Емил Радев (PPE).** – Г-н Председател, през последните години Шенгенското пространство е изправено през редица изпитания – миграционната криза и терористичната заплаха. И станахме свидетели на въвеждане на вътрешен граничен контрол между държави, които от четвърт век нямат граница помежду си. Това е опасна тенденция, защото реално Европейският съюз би функционирал много трудно без Шенген. Дори можем да кажем, че Шенген и Европейският съюз са неделими. Ето защо е важно всички държави членки да бъдат част от общото пространство без граници, след като са изпълнили необходимите законово установени критерии.  България и Румъния са сторили това още преди седем години. Ние използваме активно Шенгенската информационна система, като се надявам Съветът да вземе решение за стопроцентов достъп до системата за двете страни в съвсем скоро време. Част сме от европейската гранична и брегова охрана, ползваме се от Единния калкулатор на новата система „Вход-изход“, имаме достъп до визовата информационна система, прилагаме Шенгенското законодателство изцяло, пазим най-трудната и най-натоварена външна граница – тази с Турция, както от престъпници, така и от нелегални мигранти.  България реално е част от Шенген. Време е това да бъде отразено и чрез политическо решение за вдигане на вътрешния граничен контрол и за присъединяване на страната към Шенген. България в Шенген означава по-сигурен Европейски съюз. |  | |  |  |  | |  | | --- | |  | |      |  |  |  |  |  |  | | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | | |  | | --- | | MPphoto |  |  | | --- | |  | |  | **Cristian-Silviu Bușoi (PPE).** –Domnule președinte, stimați colegi, felicit grupul de lucru Schengen instituit de Comisia LIBE și raportorul, domnul Coelho, pentru munca la acest raport și viziunea cuprinzătoare asupra funcționării Schengen. Raportul arată foarte clar care ar trebui să fie acțiunile prioritare ale instituțiilor europene și ale statelor membre pentru a întări siguranța, securitatea și integritatea liberei circulații a persoanelor, a bunurilor, a serviciilor și a capitalului în spațiul Schengen. Avem în mod clar nevoie de o mai strânsă colaborare a țărilor în reformarea și îmbunătățirea sistemului de informații Schengen, cât și de întărirea cooperării transfrontaliere între autoritățile polițienești, sistemul judiciar, autoritățile de vamă și de viză. Statele membre ale spațiului Schengen trebuie să implementeze recomandările privind evaluarea vulnerabilităților ale Agenției Europene pentru Poliția de Frontieră și Garda de Coastă.  Susțin recomandarea din raport care condamnă reintroducerea continuă a controalelor la frontierele interne. Verificările sistematice trebuie să se transforme în verificări punctuale. Din păcate și în unele țări non-Schengen, așa cum este și țara mea, s-au introdus în ultimii 2 ani unele măsuri neproporționale de control la graniță, care îngreunează nejustificat circulația persoanelor.  În mod special, salut reiterarea sprijinului pentru aderarea imediată a Bulgariei și a României la spațiul Schengen. România este complet pregătită din punct de vedere tehnic și al securității frontierelor și doar motive care țin de politica internă și de unele discursuri facile, populiste, în unele state membre s-au opus aderării României și Bulgariei și au făcut acest lucru imposibil până acum. |  | |  |  |  | |  | | --- | |  | |      |  |  |  |  |  |  | | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | | |  | | --- | | MPphoto |  |  | | --- | |  | |  | **Jaromír Štětina (PPE).** – Pane předsedající, schengenský prostor je jedním z největších úspěchů Evropské unie. Je zásadní součástí projektu evropské integrace. Schengenský prostor se v posledních letech ocitl pod tlakem a přestávají fungovat jeho základní pravidla a úmluvy. Mám na mysli zavádění opětovných kontrol na vnitřních hranicích Evropské unie či budování hraničních plotů uvnitř Evropské unie. Poprvé byl aktivován článek 29 schengenského kodexu, objevují se nové hraniční kontroly. To je velmi nebezpečné. Zanikne-li schengenský prostor, zmizí Evropská unie tak, jak ji známe dnes.  Zachování schengenského prostoru zůstává klíčovým nástrojem rozšíření hospodářského a sociálního přínosu, volného pohybu osob, zboží a kapitálu. A nejen zachování. Usilujme, dámy a pánové, o rozšíření schengenského prostoru. Rumunsko a Bulharsko například o vstup do schengenského prostoru profesionálně usilují. Své hranice se snaží ochránit, aby si svůj vstup do prostoru odůvodnily. Nedávno jsem navštívil bulharsko-tureckou pozemní hranici, kde Bulhaři vybudovali asi 300 km dlouhý plot. Dali tak prakticky najevo, že dokážou vnější hranice Evropské unie ochránit. Přispěli k úsilí zabránit vnitřním hranicím v Evropské unii. Díky za to Bulharsku! |  | |  |  |  | |  | | --- | |  | |      |  |  |  |  |  | | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | | |  | | --- | |  | |  | *Zgłoszenia z sali* |  | |  |  |  | |  | | --- | |  | |      |  |  |  |  |  |  | | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | | |  | | --- | | MPphoto |  |  | | --- | |  | |  | **Claudia Țapardel (S&D).** –Domnule președinte, dragi colegi, domnule comisar, Comisia LIBE a aprobat primul raport privind funcționarea spațiului Schengen în care a fost reiterat foarte clar faptul că România și Bulgaria sunt pregătite pentru o intrare imediată în Schengen. În calitate de reprezentant al României în Parlamentul European, aprecieze evaluarea corectă și echitabilă a Comisiei LIBE, precum și a raportorului și consider că suntem pregătiți din toate punctele de vedere pentru acest demers.  Astfel, dacă acest lucru este recunoscut inclusiv de către Comisia Europeană și de către Parlamentul European, e timpul ca și anumite state membre să recunoască acest fapt și să susțină aderarea României la Schengen. Totodată, doresc să evidențiez faptul că spațiul Schengen s-a creat în baza unei abordări tehnice, acesta nefiind un acord de natură politică. Le reamintesc încă o dată tuturor colegilor faptul că România îndeplinește integral, încă din anul 2011, toate criteriile pentru a deveni parte a acestui spațiu. Este inacceptabil faptul că până în acest moment România nu este parte a spațiului Schengen și sunt ferm convinsă că orice amânare în acest sens nu este justificabilă, reprezentând o veritabilă discriminare a unui număr considerabil de cetățeni europeni. Din punctul meu de vedere, orice nelămuriri pe acest subiect țin de poziții strict politice și e timpul să admitem la nivel european faptul că locul României este în spațiul Schengen. |  | |  |  |  | |  | | --- | |  | |      |  |  |  |  |  |  | | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | | |  | | --- | | MPphoto |  |  | | --- | |  | |  | **Νότης Μαριάς (ECR).** – Κύριε Πρόεδρε, Κύριε Αβραμόπουλε, είναι προφανές ότι η λειτουργία του Σένγκεν παρουσιάζει αρκετά προβλήματα. Στο εξωτερικό πεδίο, ο Frontex δεν λειτουργεί σωστά. Αυτή τη στιγμή, σύμφωνα με σημερινά στοιχεία, 16 627 άτομα βρίσκονται στα νησιά του Αιγαίου, 3 274 εξ αυτών στη Σάμο. Υπάρχει Frontex σε όλα τα νησιά και είναι προφανές ότι δεν μπορεί να διασφαλίσει τη φύλαξη των συνόρων. Θα πείτε ότι τα θαλάσσια σύνορα έχουν προβλήματα. Συμφωνώ. Στον Έβρο, που είναι χερσαία τα σύνορα, έχουμε μία τεράστια αύξηση εισροών. Επομένως, πρέπει να υπάρξουν πολύ συγκεκριμένα μέτρα. Δεύτερον, υπάρχει επανεισαγωγή στα εσωτερικά σύνορα. Τι θα γίνει με τους ελέγχους εδώ στο αεροδρόμιο του Στρασβούργου; Υπάρχουν τρία χρόνια. Έλεγχος διαβατηρίων σε όλους τους ευρωβουλευτές. Θα συνεχιστεί αυτή η κατάσταση; Απαράδεκτη κατάσταση επίσης: γερμανική και βελγική καραντίνα κατά των ελλήνων επιβατών που φτάνουν στα αεροδρόμια της Γερμανίας και στις Βρυξέλλες. Θα συνεχιστεί αυτή η κατάσταση; Είναι απαράδεκτο. |  | |  |  |  | |  | | --- | |  | |      |  |  |  |  |  |  | | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | | |  | | --- | | MPphoto |  |  | | --- | |  | |  | **Τάκης Χατζηγεωργίου (GUE/NGL).** – Κύριε Πρόεδρε, Κύριε Αβραμόπουλε, έχετε ακούσει τα πάντα και δεν χρειάζεται καν να επαναλάβω πόσο θετικό πράγμα είναι η ελεύθερη διακίνηση ανθρώπων. Ξέρετε και εσείς καλύτερα από μένα πόσες δυσκολίες υπάρχουν στην εφαρμογή της, έτσι ώστε να λειτουργεί με τον τρόπο που θέλουμε. Έχω μόνο μία ερώτηση και, παρακαλώ, δείτε πώς μπορείτε να μου την απαντήσετε. Όταν χώρες μέλη, με το πρόσχημα ότι βάζουν προσωρινά κάποια μέτρα, παραβιάζουν ουσιαστικά τη Συνθήκη, και η Ευρωπαϊκή Ένωση δεν μπορεί να τους πει και κάτι, τότε οι κανόνες πάνε στον βρόντο. Τι προτίθεστε ή τι μπορούμε να κάνουμε ή τι μπορείτε να κάνετε, έτσι ώστε, αν μελλοντικά επαναληφθεί η παραβίαση κανόνων που έχουν υπογραφεί, να το αντιμετωπίσετε με έναν τρόπο αποτελεσματικό; Διαφορετικά, αποδεικνύουμε ότι λέμε απλώς λόγια. |  | |  |  |  | |  | | --- | |  | |      |  |  |  |  |  |  | | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | | |  | | --- | | MPphoto |  |  | | --- | |  | |  | **Ελευθέριος Συναδινός (NI).** – Κύριε Πρόεδρε, η ζώνη Σένγκεν έχει ουσιαστικά καταλυθεί και εκκρεμεί μόνο η τυπική διαπίστωση, ενώ πύλες εισόδου και χώρες-προστάτες των εξωτερικών συνόρων, όπως η Ελλάδα, επιβαρύνονται υπέρμετρα από την αθρόα εισροή λαθρομεταναστών παρά τις σκανδαλώδεις ικανοποιήσεις της παράλογης Τουρκίας από την Ένωση. Όμως, συγχέονται βασικές έννοιες. Η ελεύθερη κυκλοφορία αφορά στο δικαίωμα που έχει αποδοθεί προς τους πολίτες. Ο έλεγχος δε των συνόρων υπάγεται στην αρμοδιότητα των κρατών, αποτελώντας υποχρέωση της πολιτείας να επιτυγχάνει και να συντηρεί την ασφάλεια και το αίσθημα της ασφαλείας εντός της επικράτειάς της. Η διενέργεια ενδελεχών και συστηματικών ελέγχων, λοιπόν, δεν καταλύει την ελευθερία διέλευσης. Αντιθέτως, απαιτούνται κανόνες, ώστε να διασφαλίζεται πως τα διερχόμενα πρόσωπα έχουν το αντίστοιχο δικαίωμα. Απαιτείται, λοιπόν, συνοριογραμμή ανθεκτική προς κάθε εξωτερική επιβολή ή παρείσφρηση, μεταρρύθμιση των βάσεων δεδομένων και προσαρμογή της χρήσης τους, ισχυρό θεσμικό πλαίσιο και ταχεία επιστροφή όσων παρανόμως εισήλθαν. |  | |  |  |  | |  | | --- | |  | |      |  |  |  |  |  |  | | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | | |  | | --- | | MPphoto |  |  | | --- | |  | |  | **Michaela Šojdrová (PPE).** – Pane předsedající, děkuji za porozumění a udělení slova. Nesouhlasím s kritikou dočasné obnovy kontroly na vnitřních hranicích ze strany některých členských států. Ta kritika tady poměrně často zaznívá.  V době propuknutí uprchlické krize se ukázalo, že Evropská unie zatím nedokáže zabezpečit své vnější hranice, a tedy taková opatření byla samozřejmě legitimní a myslím, že i na místě. Podmínky se změnily a Evropská unie zřídila evropskou pobřežní a pohraniční stráž a přijala řadu dalších opatření, která vnější hranici zabezpečují. Je tedy načase, aby byla přijata taková verze schengenského hraničního kodexu, která stanoví objektivnější podmínky pro obnovu vnitřních hranic a zamezí nadměrnému užívání tohoto opatření. Současně ale nesmíme polevit v úsilí ještě více chránit naše vnější hranice. |  | |  |  |  | |  | | --- | |  | |      |  |  |  |  |  |  | | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | | |  | | --- | | MPphoto |  |  | | --- | |  | |  | **Tonino Picula (S&D).** – Gospodine predsjedavajući, zahvaljujem izvjestitelju na dobrom izvješću i prihvaćanju svih amandmana koje sam podnio; posebno onog gdje Europski parlament potvrđuje potporu za primanje Hrvatske u schengen čim zadovolji potrebne kriterije.  Ipak, ne smijemo zanemariti vanjske i unutarnje izazove schengenu kao jedinstvenom sustavu slobodnog kretanja ljudi i roba između čak 26 zemalja. Manjak političke volje i boljeg pravnog okvira da zajednički rješavamo sigurnosne prijetnje i migrantske krize doveli su do ponovnog uvođenja graničnih kontrola među nekim članicama schengenskog prostora.  Dolazim iz zemlje članice koja je gotovo ispunila kriterije za ulazak u schengen, uspješno kontrolira vanjsku granicu, ali je svejedno od ostatka Europske unije ograđena bodljikavom žicom.  Schengen, kao veliko postignuće europskih integracija ne smije biti kolateralna žrtva deficita naših sigurnosnih politika. Rješenja nisu podizanje ograda i zatvaranje granica među članicama, kao ni političke blokade. Schengen možemo nadograditi samo zajedničkim djelovanjem i uvažavanjem članica koje ispunjavanjem svih kriterija zaslužuju biti njegovim dijelom. |  | |  |  |  | |  | | --- | |  | |      |  |  |  |  |  |  | | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | | |  | | --- | | MPphoto |  |  | | --- | |  | |  | **Csaba Sógor (PPE).** – Elnök Úr, a schengeni rendszer működése terén valóban súlyos rendellenességek merültek fel az elmúlt években és sajnos látnunk kell, hogy a megoldás irányába csak nagyon lassú léptekkel haladunk. Azért is súlyos probléma ez, mert a belső határellenőrzés nélküli övezet léte az egyik legkomolyabb európai vívmány, a polgárok pedig ezt eddig egyértelműen az Európai Unió egyik legkézzelfoghatóbb pozitívumaként élték meg. Nekünk azonban tudomásul kell vennünk, hogy ameddig nem lesz megfelelő védelem az övezet külső határain, addig sajnos teljesen jogos a tagállamok aggodalma és a belső határellenőrzés fenntartása nem csak ideiglenes jelleggel képzelhető el. Olyan tagállamból jövök, amelyet a többi tagállam nem tartott alkalmasnak arra, hogy a schengeni térség tagjává váljon, miközben több Schengen-állam képtelen fenntartani saját határának – ami egyben a schengeni határ – védelmét. A román és bolgár polgárok – akik uniós állampolgárok – azt látják, hogy még ma sem lehetnek részesei a schengeni térségnek, miközben nem ebbe a két országba érkeznek százezerszámra ellenőrizhetetlenül és illegális módon a bevándorlók. |  | |  |  |  | |  | | --- | |  | |      |  |  |  |  |  |  | | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | | |  | | --- | | MPphoto |  |  | | --- | |  | |  | **Maria Grapini (S&D).** – Domnule președinte, domnule comisar, vreau să vă mulțumesc dumneavoastră că ați reamintit încă o dată că România și Bulgaria trebuie să fie în Schengen. Vreau să-i mulțumesc colegului Coelho, care a făcut un raport excelent și tuturor colegilor care au subliniat importanța zonei Schengen și nevoia ca România și Bulgaria să fie acolo. Domnule comisar, după piața unică, zona Schengen este cea mai importantă. Cum să avem competitivitate? Sunt costuri suplimentare. Cum să avem granițe în interiorul Uniunii Europene? Care mai este scopul Uniunii Europene?  Vă rog frumos, domnule comisar, încercați să insistați la Consiliu ca România și Bulgaria se intre în Schengen, iar așa cum spunea raportorul și cum e cuprins în raport, să se respecte de către toate statele membre zona Schengen și, fără granițe, vom putea împreună, cu solidaritate și comunicare, să apărăm mai bine granița Uniunii Europene, o singură graniță. |  | |  |  |  | |  | | --- | |  | |      |  |  |  |  |  |  | | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | | |  | | --- | | MPphoto |  |  | | --- | |  | |  | **Marijana Petir (PPE).** – Gospodine predsjedavajući, schengenski se prostor s punim pravom smatra jednim od najvećih postignuća Europske unije budući da omogućuje slobodu kretanja unutar njenog jedinstvenog teritorija.  I Republika Hrvatska kao najmlađa članica europske obitelji teži postati dio tog jedinstvenog prostora bez unutarnjih graničnih kontrola.  Zahvaljujem kolegi izvjestitelju Coelhu na izraženoj potpori pristupanju Hrvatske schengenskom prostoru.  Kao hrvatska zastupnica vjerujem da će tehnički uvjeti koji moraju biti zadovoljeni biti ispunjeni do kraja ove godine te da će Hrvatska, koja uskoro slavi petu godišnjicu pridruživanja Uniji, za mandata ove Komisije pristupiti i schengenskom prostoru.  Ovo nije važno samo za Republiku Hrvatsku, već je važno za sigurnost cijele regije i Europske unije u cjelini. Kako je hrvatska granica u većini vanjska granica Unije, ulaskom u schengenće se ojačati i nadzor vanjskih granica što je posebice važno u ovim vremenima kada smo, s jedne strane, suočeni sa sigurnosnim prijetnjama, a s druge strane, s migracijama. |  | |  |  |  | |  | | --- | |  | |      |  |  |  |  |  |  | | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | | |  | | --- | | MPphoto |  |  | | --- | |  | |  | **Dimitris Avramopoulos,** *Member of the Commission***.** – Mr President, thank you for this interesting debate. I can assure you that I have taken note of all your remarks.  The first thing I would like to say is that almost all of us are on the same side. We share the will to return to a fully-fledged Schengen area, but also a unified one, including all the Member States from the moment they are, or will be, technically ready. We should continue turning the crisis of the last three years into opportunities for stronger and more effective cooperation. We should keep on learning from our experiences, fully follow up on our joint evaluations and use the tools at our disposal to the maximum.  As I said, I took good note of all your interventions that are feeding the current reflection about the future of our border management, and I am sure that we will soon have more opportunities to follow up on this debate. We have to continue working together on all parts of our comprehensive approach on migration, security and border management, in a spirit of solidarity, joint responsibility and trust. Yes, Schengen is the greatest achievement of all times, and we have to uphold and defend it. And this is what we share in this room today.  Together we have to strengthen and preserve this great achievement as the core symbol of our unity. Europe can only exist if it is united: united politically, economically, socially and geographically. And Schengen is the guarantee and also the symbol of a geographically united Europe, ensuring the unity of our nations and of all European citizens.  Let me now reply in Greek to the question raised by Mr Hadjigeorgiou.  Όσον αφορά στους εσωτερικούς ελέγχους που αυτή τη στιγμή έξι κράτη μέλη συνεχίζουν, τόνισα και το επαναλαμβάνω ότι πρέπει σύντομα να λήξουν και να προτιμηθούν – και είμαστε σε θέση να προτείνουμε – εναλλακτικές λύσεις και μέτρα αστυνομικής συνεργασίας που θα εξασφαλίζουν ένα υψηλό επίπεδο ασφάλειας. Αυτό το έχω επαναλάβει τον τελευταίο καιρό σε όλες τις συναντήσεις που είχα με τους Υπουργούς Εσωτερικών των έξι αυτών χωρών. Θα πρέπει να σας πω ότι σε γενικές γραμμές όλοι συμφωνούν μαζί μας ότι πρέπει να επανέλθουμε σε μία ομαλή λειτουργία της ζώνης του Σένγκεν. Η Επιτροπή είναι πάντα πρόθυμη και έτοιμη να συνεισφέρει με τις προτάσεις της σε αυτήν την κατεύθυνση. |  | |  |  |  | |  | | --- | |  | |      |  |  |  |  |  |  | | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | | |  | | --- | | MPphoto |  |  | | --- | |  | |  | **Carlos Coelho,***Relator***.** – Senhor Presidente, palavras finais, primeiro, para agradecer a todos os *shadow* relatores que ajudaram a construir este relatório e a todos aqueles que, ao longo deste tempo, têm trabalhado no Schengen Working Group; segundo, para recordar que aquilo que temos de proteger é a liberdade de circulação e que as fronteiras internas, e que os controlos nas fronteiras internas, são um regresso ao passado. Destruir Schengen é demolir a Europa dos cidadãos. Temos, portanto, todos a obrigação de salvar Schengen e creio que amanhã se tornará evidente que há nesta Casa uma maioria clara para defender este património.  Sr. Comissário Avramopoulos, todos temos uma responsabilidade, mas a Comissão também. Tem de exercer os seus poderes e não duvide do apoio deste Parlamento para este efeito, porque há dificuldade em fazer que o Conselho compreenda o que está em causa. Hoje foi sensível a ausência do Conselho neste debate. Não pudemos ouvir as suas opiniões e não lhe pudemos transmitir as nossas mensagens, mas como disse, e bem, o Conselho é essencial porque há responsabilidades próprias dos Estados-Membros não apenas relativamente às fronteiras, mas relativamente à confusão em que todos estamos envolvidos.  Sr. Comissário, todos nós, Comissão, Parlamento e Conselho, temos a mesma obrigação: a obrigação de devolver Schengen aos cidadãos europeus. |  | |  |  |  | |  | | --- | |  | |      |  |  |  |  |  |  | | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | | |  | | --- | | MPphoto |  |  | | --- | |  | |  | **Przewodniczący. –**Zamykam debatę.  Głosowanie odbędzie się w środę 30 maja 2018 r.  *Oświadczenia pisemne (art. 162)* |  | |  |  |  | |  | | --- | |  | |      |  |  |  |  |  | | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | | |  | | --- | | MPphoto | |  | **Marian-Jean Marinescu (PPE),***în scris***.** – Prin acest raport, PE a reiterat sprijinul său pentru aderarea imediată a Bulgariei și a României la spațiul Schengen, pentru că și-au îndeplinit condițiile și ca să nu mai fie considerate țari de mâna a doua. Și Comisia Europeană solicită Consiliului să ia o decizie în ceea ce privește Bulgaria și România, spațiul Schengen devenind mai sigur o dată cu includerea acestor două țări.  Parlamentul European trebuie să sprijine controlul democratic al spațiului Schengen. Anumite state membre au instituit controale temporare la frontierele interne, lucru care nu trebuie să devină ceva permanent. Guvernele naționale au adesea tendința de a transfera acordului Schengen unele responsabilități, dând astfel vina pe el de ceea ce se întâmplă la granițe. De aceea, trebuie găsit un echilibru între securitatea internă și circulația cetățenilor.  Trebuie modificat Codul Schengen, așa cum a propus și Comisia, printr-o readaptare a controalelor interne la frontiere la un nivel actual, pentru a răspunde cererilor de securitate și pentru a sprijini zona. |  | |  |  |  | |  | | --- | |  | |      |  |  |  |  |  | | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | | |  | | --- | | MPphoto | |  | **Eva Maydell (PPE),***in writing***.** – I congratulate the rapporteur, Mr Coelho, for his diligent work on the report and his dedication throughout the years of defending the principles and merits of Schengen as one of EU’s brightest achievements. I consider Schengen indeed to be a space of not only security and open borders, but also a space of solidarity and recognition of the trust between our economies and societies. In that relation I highly value the acknowledgements of the rapporteur for the role of countries like Bulgaria and Romania, who are at the forefront in protecting our common borders and ensuring high-levels of control by allocating the necessary financial, technical and human resources to those tasks.  I would like to reiterate the rapporteur’s conviction that Bulgaria and Romania should be granted immediate accession to the Schengen area as fully-fledged members, as this has already been announced in the European Parliaments resolution from June 2011. Those conclusions in the report are based on proven facts that both countries comply and fulfil all criteria for conclusion of their Schengen accession. This will reinforce citizen’s trust in the credibility of European institutions and will foster further cohesion including the full benefits related to the freedom of movement. |  | |  |  |  | |  | | --- | |  | |      |  |  |  |  |  | | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | | |  | | --- | | MPphoto | |  | **Eleni Theocharous (ECR),***in writing***.** – I would like to stress out that Turkey violates the EU's external borders and the question of the Schengen zone and the security of the external borders, which is the core subject of the Annual Report on the functioning of the Schengen area, is not just about the implementation of Schengen under normal circumstances, and even in countries with no land borders such as Cyprus and Malta, but also about the unacceptable situation in a Member State which is under occupation, such as the Republic of Cyprus. Cyprus does not belong to the Schengen zone because, due to the occupation, it cannot exercise effective control over its occupied part. This issue is not only our problem but also the EU's one, whose borders are being violated by Turkey, while security issues are being raised for which Ankara has sole responsibility. |  | |  |  |  | |  | | --- | |  | |      |  |  |  |  | | --- | --- | --- | --- | | |  | | --- | | MPphoto | |  | **Maria Gabriela Zoană (S&D),***în scris***.** – Săptămâna trecută s-a mai făcut un pas pentru ca România să fie acceptată ca membru în spațiul Schengen. În Comisia LIBE am votat un raport pentru punerea în aplicare a dispozițiilor rămase neaplicate ale acquis-ului Schengen referitoare la Sistemul de informații Schengen (SIS) în România și în Bulgaria. Ca deputat european, observ că lucrurile se mișcă extrem de încet, iar faptul că o țară membră a Uniunii Europene este privată de acces în Spațiul Schengen în anul 2018, deși toate documentele oficiale consfințesc faptul că îndeplineam condițiile impuse încă din 2011, denotă nu numai dedesubturi și calcule politice interne ale țărilor care se opun, ci și o distanțare de principiile egalității între membrii Uniunii Europene.  La 9 iunie 2011, Consiliul a concluzionat că Romania a îndeplinit toate condițiile în domeniile acquis-ului Schengen referitoare la frontierele aeriene, maritime, terestre, cooperarea polițieneasca, protecția datelor, Sistemul de informații Schengen și vize. România merită și trebuie să fie primită ACUM în Spațiul Schengen! Nu mai tergiversați, stimați colegi europeni. Consiliul, prin amânarea aderării României la spațiul Schengen, nu face altceva decât sa alimenteze sentimente anti-europene de genul celor care au început deja să escaladeze în unele state membre. | |
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| |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | | **18. Enlargement and strengthening of the Schengen area: Bulgaria, Romania and Croatia (topical debate)** | |  |  |  | | --- | --- | --- | |  | [**Video of the speeches**](https://www.europarl.europa.eu/plenary/en/vod.html?mode=chapter&vodLanguage=EN&playerStartTime=20171213-15:17:13&playerEndTime=20171213-16:46:09) |  | | |  |  |  | | --- | --- | --- | |  | [**Minutes**](https://www.europarl.europa.eu/doceo/document/PV-8-2017-12-13-ITM-018_EN.html) |  | |      |  |  |  |  |  |  | | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | | |  | | --- | | MPphoto |  |  | | --- | |  | |  | **El Presidente. –**El punto siguiente en el orden del día es el debate de actualidad (artículo 153 bis del Reglamento interno) sobre ampliación y fortalecimiento del espacio Schengen: Bulgaria, Rumanía y Croacia ([**2017/3009(RSP)**](https://oeil.secure.europarl.europa.eu/oeil/popups/ficheprocedure.do?lang=en&reference=2017/3009(RSP))).  Informo a sus señorías de que no se aplicarán a este debate ni el procedimiento de solicitud incidental de uso de la palabra, es decir, «catch the eye», ni el de la «tarjeta azul». |  | |  |  |  | |  | | --- | |  | |      |  |  |  |  |  |  | | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | | |  | | --- | | MPphoto |  |  | | --- | |  | |  | **Gianni Pittella,***autore***.** – Signor Presidente, onorevoli colleghi, l'area Schengen, come molti sanno in quest'Aula, è la più grande area di libera circolazione nel mondo ed è una delle più grandi conquiste dell'Unione europea. Un'area Schengen più forte – sono convinto che il Commissario Avramopoulos condivida questa affermazione – un'area Schengen più forte e più unita migliora la sicurezza e la fiducia nell'Unione europea.  Se vogliamo rafforzare la protezione delle nostre frontiere esterne, spesso qui, in quest'Aula, si dice che dobbiamo rafforzare la protezione delle frontiere esterne. Bene, se vogliamo davvero rafforzare la protezione delle frontiere esterne, allora dobbiamo allargare senza esitazioni l'area Schengen alla Romania, alla Bulgaria e alla Croazia, quando la Croazia sarà pronta.  Il nostro gruppo ha chiesto, d'intesa con tutta la famiglia socialista, con il presidente del Partito Socialista Europeo Sergej Stanišev, tutta la famiglia socialista, e il gruppo parlamentare dei Socialisti e Democratici, hanno chiesto questo dibattito prioritario perché consideriamo che sia un'ingiustizia escludere la Romania e la Bulgaria dall'area Schengen e, quando sarà pronta, la Croazia. Non ci possono essere, nell'Unione europea, Stati di serie A e Stati di serie B.  Ai nostri concittadini bulgari, rumeni e croati abbiamo sempre detto una cosa semplice: chi rispetta i criteri di Schengen ha diritto ad aderire allo spazio Schengen. E il Presidente Juncker – lo potrà confermare il Commissario – ha riconosciuto già alla Bulgaria e alla Romania il rispetto dei criteri. Quindi non è un'invenzione o una richiesta di un gruppo parlamentare, c'è un riconoscimento da parte della Commissione europea. E la Croazia è sulla strada giusta.  Ora, non si può dire da parte del Consiglio – e mi dispiace rivolgermi sempre al Consiglio, ho anche un po', diciamo, di tristezza nel polemizzare, purtroppo ve lo meritate, non è una mia cattiva volontà, è che voi non decidete, e io per forza con voi me la devo prendere, se voi decideste, sarei ben felice di dire: grazie al Consiglio degli Stati membri. Fatelo, e avrete l'apprezzamento e il ringraziamento dei Socialisti e Democratici. Fatelo sullo spazio Schengen! Non esitate ancora, fatelo nell'interesse dell'Europa, è fondamentale per la sicurezza dell'Unione europea, che Romania e Bulgaria, e poi la Croazia siano parte dello spazio Schengen, e quindi alla Presidenza bulgara – ho visto la ministra, che ho ospitato nel nostro gruppo ieri e che saluto affettuosamente – dico alla Presidenza bulgara: avrà tutto il nostro sostegno per far sì che il Consiglio mantenga gli impegni presi e integri questi paesi nello spazio Schengen. |  | |  |  |  | |  | | --- | |  | |      |  |  |  |  |  |  | | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | | |  | | --- | | MPphoto |  |  | | --- | |  | |  | **Matti Maasikas,** *President-in-Office of the Council***.** – Mr President, I want to thank you most cordially for the chance to take part in this topical debate which is very close to my heart, on a case on which I have, in my national capacity in the Council, intervened repeatedly in the direction that Mr Pittella just indicated.  Ten years ago, on 6 December 2007, the Council decided to lift internal border controls for nine Member States that had joined the Union in 2004. The decision, which applied as of December 2007, marked a significant step forward for the benefit of people travelling in the enlarged Schengen area with no internal border controls. In recent years we have been faced with migratory pressures and terrorist threats to an extent not seen before. This has put the Schengen area under heavy pressure, but we have not remained idle. Many steps have been taken to sustain the full and proper functioning of Schengen, and many proposals are in the pipeline.  At the Justice and Home Affairs Council in October this year, ministers had an extensive exchange of views on Schengen, particularly on the proposed Schengen border, the Borders Code Amendments, in relation to temporary internal border controls. While progress has been made on a number of files, a number of questions remain outstanding, with internal border controls in place in six countries in the Schengen area. It is therefore necessary for us to further intensify our work to get back to normal operation of Schengen, including viable alternatives to internal border controls.  Against this background, the Presidency organised an informal debate between the Ministers of the Interior at last week’s Justice and Home Affairs Council on 7 and 8 December. Ministers had a good and constructive debate, and even if there are diverging views on some issues, there is a general consensus that we must do our utmost to reinstall and strengthen our trust in Schengen.  Ministers took stock of measures already taken, such as the entry/exit system. We looked at measures currently discussed, such as the EU Travel Information and Authorisation System, the Schengen Information System proposals and the proposal for amending the Schengen Borders Control. And, in direct relation to the issue discussed in our debate today, Ministers also reflected on how we can move forward on the pending full application of the Schengen *acquis* in Bulgaria and Romania. Both countries have fulfilled all the necessary conditions and have made significant efforts to guarantee the security of the EU’s external borders. However, the decision to fully apply the Schengen *acquis* for the two countries, for which we need unanimity, is still outstanding.  The improved situation regarding migratory pressures, and expected early agreement on a number of the measures currently under discussion, could perhaps change the situation. The Presidency on 7 December was happy to conclude the discussion, concluding that we have to continue working hard in the coming months on strengthening the Schengen area, including via enlargement.  As for Croatia, it is still in the process of being evaluated in the run-up to full application of the Schengen *acquis*. The Council has already adopted several implementing decisions setting out recommendations to address the deficiencies identified with a view to Croatia fulfilling the conditions necessary for the application of the Schengen *acquis*. A small number of issues remain to be evaluated and we are looking forward to receiving the Commission’s proposal for implementing decisions thereon in the near future. |  | |  |  |  | |  | | --- | |  | |      |  |  |  |  |  |  | | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | | |  | | --- | | MPphoto |  |  | | --- | |  | |  | **Dimitris Avramopoulos,** *Member of the Commission***.** – Mr President, I would like to start by expressing my thanks for adding this very important debate to the agenda and, in particular to thank Mr Gianni Pittella for this initiative. I know that this was – and remains – a priority for all political groups. Only some days ago we also had a fruitful and frank discussion in the Justice and Home Affairs Council with the Ministers of the Interior.  Let me start by highlighting the following. No matter how much work we collectively do in the three institutions, in the end, we will be judged by our success or failure only on three or four topics. Schengen is one of them. For our citizens, it is the symbol of the European Union itself. It is the most tangible example of European integration. It represents all the rights and benefits of being European, as it is closely connected to the freedom of movement and the notion of European citizenship. You all know my personal commitment to safeguarding and upholding Schengen since the very first moment I took office. We said in the past that a unified Schengen is a stronger Schengen. We are convinced that Bulgaria, Romania and also Croatia, as soon as it is ready, should fully join the Schengen family. This will enlarge the area of free movement and make the Schengen tools perform better and thus increase security.  For a long time the Commission’s position is that Bulgaria and Romania already fulfil the necessary conditions. They were positively assessed between 2009 and 2011. As you know, it is now for the Council to decide on the lifting of internal border controls with Bulgaria and Romania unanimously, and it is high time that this happened. Our discussion with the Interior Ministers last week left me optimistic that there is agreement that this issue must now again be seriously considered. As far as Croatia is concerned, we are working closely with the authorities to identify the areas where improvements are still necessary in order to positively conclude all the Schengen evaluations as soon as possible. This will allow us in the Commission to complete the first stage and conclude that Croatia is also ready to join Schengen. Then it will again be for the Council to decide.  The Schengen evaluations in 2016 and 2017 verify the necessary conditions for the application of all relevant parts of the acquis. In some areas, Croatia meets the necessary conditions for joining Schengen. In other areas, further improvement is required, and we stand by the Croatian authorities to continue with the same commitment. A full implementation of the Schengen acquis will also allow the drawing of full benefits from systems such as a Schengen Information System and the Visa Information System in relations between Romania, Bulgaria, Croatia and the other Schengen states.  It would also allow them to implement the Entry—Exit System in the most efficient way, without installing it in border sections which would become internal borders after their accession to Schengen. The implementation of the EES will be a particular challenge for Croatia given its long land border. Here the European Union is willing to provide support.  Finally, the setting up of the ADS will strengthen the management of the external borders and therefore Schengen. Bulgaria, Romania and Croatia are playing their equal part in protecting the European Union’s external borders. Fully joining Schengen is not only politically fair, but it is also needed from a security point of view, because the internal security of one Member State is the internal security of all and the security of all our citizens. I hope that we can welcome these Member States to Schengen soon following a positive decision by the Council.  As I said before, from the moment that I took office, I have been advocating that we need a strong and unified Schengen. Today I would like to commend and to praise the authorities of the three countries for their commitment. We are running the last mile. Let us run it all together. Today the Parliament and the Commission, tomorrow the Council. I hope your message will be heard by the Council, Mr Pittella. |  | |  |  |  | |  | | --- | |  | |      |  |  |  |  |  |  | | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | | |  | | --- | | MPphoto |  |  | | --- | |  | |  | **Esteban González Pons,***on behalf of the PPE Group***.** – Mr President, the Schengen area is one of the greatest achievements of the European project. It is a dream come true. After World War II, few people could imagine that one day Europe would be united and living in peace. Seventy-two years after, borders between European countries do not exist any more. They exist only on maps and in the heads of those who want to destroy the Union.  Four hundred million nationals of more than 25 different states travelling free with no passport check, with no border controls and within a single country: this is what Europeans have accomplished, and we have to be very proud of it. But Schengen will not be completed until all members who want to be part of it have the chance to join.  My Group has a clear position on this: any Member State that fulfils the membership criteria should join Schengen, and the truth is that Bulgaria and Romania fulfil these criteria. Already in 2011 this House adopted the Coelho report confirming that Romania and Bulgaria were sufficiently well prepared, and regarding Croatia, even if they have not yet fulfilled all the conditions, they are making great progress.  In this situation, trying to politicise this debate with different issues is a huge mistake. First, because these three countries are not in the same situation, and second, because accession to Schengen cannot be mixed with the cooperation and verification mechanism. The decision on accession to Schengen must be based on technical criteria, and a delay based on political reasons is simply unacceptable. There are no first-class and second-class countries. We are all European countries and we all deserve the best. That is why we stand today with our Romanian, Croatian and Bulgarian colleagues. This is what we can all call solidarity, and the day we stop showing solidarity among us is the day we will lose the right to call ourselves Europeans. We ask the Council to please do all that they can. |  | |  |  |  | |  | | --- | |  | |      |  |  |  |  |  |  | | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | | |  | | --- | | MPphoto |  |  | | --- | |  | |  | **Sergei Stanishev,***on behalf of the S&D Group***.** – Mr President, let me first thank Mr Pittella for raising this debate and bringing it to the plenary of the European Parliament; it is extremely important. As was already said, it is difficult to imagine the European Union today without Schengen. This is a very tangible expression of our solidarity and of the freedom and unity of European citizens, and it brings a lot of economic benefits – but not for all Europeans. For six years now, Bulgaria and Romania have fulfilled the criteria for membership, and what is happening is a double standard and treating the two countries in a discriminatory way. It should be stopped, because it may look as though this is an issue only for Bulgaria and Romania, but it affects very fundamental issues and principles of the European Union.  First, it is about credibility if we as a Union follow our own rules. We do not. Second, the economic benefits will bring benefits to all citizens of the European Union. Thirdly, it is about security. Instead of wasting money for internal controls, we should strengthen through resources and enough financing the external borders of the Union. This is what is needed; this is what is effective. We often complain that anti-European forces, populists, are using arguments against the European Union. This is one of the cases, because it shows injustice to too many European citizens, and now the European Council has to do its job, which is not performed – an injustice has to be stopped. This should be a very clear message from the European Parliament today. |  | |  |  |  | |  | | --- | |  | |      |  |  |  |  |  |  | | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | | |  | | --- | | MPphoto |  |  | | --- | |  | |  | **Helga Stevens,***namens de ECR-Fractie***.** – Toen Roemenië en Bulgarije lid werden van de Unie in 2007 stond hun rechtsstelsel nog niet op punt. Zij moesten een inhaalbeweging maken en noodzakelijke hervormingen doorvoeren. Ook de bestrijding van corruptie en georganiseerde misdaad moest worden opgevoerd. De Commissie volgt sindsdien de situatie op via het mechanisme voor samenwerking en toetsing, kortweg CVM genaamd. Onlangs heb ik samen met mijn ECR-collega Macovei de recente ontwikkelingen in Roemenië nog aangeklaagd. De overheid had ordonnanties uitgevaardigd om fiscale misdrijven door de vingers te zien en politieonderzoeken en rechtszaken te dwarsbomen, dit alles om corrupte machtshebbers aan de macht te houden. Ik vroeg de Europese Commissie de zaak op te volgen. In het CVM-rapport van dit jaar werd Roemenië daar dan ook op afgerekend.  Als wij beoordelen of deze drie EU-lidstaten in aanmerking komen, moeten wij de CVM-rapporten van november 2017 centraal stellen. Zo ook de bepalingen inzake georganiseerde criminaliteit. Het Schengengebied kent immers geen interne grenzen. Het is dus van fundamenteel belang om te vermijden dat wij op die manier criminaliteit importeren naar onze contreien. Er valt echter weinig vooruitgang te noteren. Ja, er zijn positieve ontwikkelingen, maar onvoldoende. Daarom is mijn delegatie, N-VA, tegen de toetreding van Bulgarije, Roemenië en Kroatië tot het Schengengebied. Er moeten echt meer inspanningen worden geleverd vooraleer politiek groen licht kan worden gegeven. |  | |  |  |  | |  | | --- | |  | |      |  |  |  |  |  |  | | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | | |  | | --- | | MPphoto |  |  | | --- | |  | |  | **Cecilia Wikström,***on behalf of the ALDE Group***.** – Mr President, securing a common area of free movement for people within the Schengen area is one of the biggest achievements of the European project, as it brings people together, makes life simpler for businesses and builds a sense of belonging together. During the last few years, this historical achievement has been put under threat. Under pressure caused by the collapse of the asylum system in 2015 and the unwillingness of certain Member States to address the obvious flaws in the Dublin regulation, we have seen a domino effect in play among Member States as they start to reintroduce border controls.  The Schengen area also faces another fundamental challenge, namely the discrimination against Bulgaria and Romania. Both of these EU countries have for a long time now fulfilled all the criteria for joining the Schengen area but are still being refused access by other Member States of this Union, and for political reasons alone. This is unacceptable and has to come to an end. We cannot, on the one hand, criticise certain Member States for not respecting due process and then ignore ourselves the rules that we have set up for accession to the Schengen zone!  I am proud that this Parliament always fights for the Union and for the rights of its citizens. Today, I would like to reach out to Romanian and Bulgarian citizens and say that you enjoy the same rights and the same values as any other European citizen! Member States need to show respect for common agreements, allow for the full integration of these two countries into the Schengen area without any further delay, and allow the full integration of Croatia as well, as soon as it meets the criteria. |  | |  |  |  | |  | | --- | |  | |      |  |  |  |  |  |  | | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | | |  | | --- | | MPphoto |  |  | | --- | |  | |  | **Κωνσταντίνα Κούνεβα,***εξ ονόματος της ομάδας GUE/NGL***.** – Κύριε Πρόεδρε, αγαπητοί συνάδελφοι, καλωσορίζουμε στη ζώνη Σένγκεν τις τρεις χώρες. Χαίρομαι ιδιαίτερα, γιατί, εκλέγομαι στην Ελλάδα, αλλά γεννήθηκα και μεγάλωσα στα σύνορα Βουλγαρίας–Ρουμανίας. Πιστεύω στη Σένγκεν. Όμως η Επιτροπή και το Συμβούλιο την πιστεύουν; Γιατί εδώ και δύο χρόνια τη μετατρέπουν σε σκουπίδι. Πώς; Παρατείνοντας τους συνοριακούς ελέγχους που επιβλήθηκαν από κάποια κράτη για να φράξουν τον δρόμο στους πρόσφυγες. Οι Έλληνες αναρωτιούνται: Γιατί όταν φτάνουν στη Γερμανία, στη Γαλλία ή στο Βέλγιο υποβάλλονται σε προσβλητικούς ελέγχους; Μήπως τελικά η Ελλάδα αποκλείστηκε από τη Σένγκεν και δεν το ξέρουμε;  Και κάτι ακόμα: Ευτυχώς που η Επιτροπή και ο Επίτροπος Αβραμόπουλος απέρριψαν το σχέδιό τους. Είναι όμως ειλικρινείς; Γιατί –ας μη γελιόμαστε– οι προτάσεις της Επιτροπής για αλλαγές στη Σένγκεν, που παρατείνουν μέχρι και δύο χρόνια τους ελέγχους στα σύνορα, είναι σαν να λένε «μπράβο» στα κράτη που αρνήθηκαν την αλληλεγγύη στην προσφυγική τραγωδία, κι έτσι μπορεί να εγκλωβιστούν χιλιάδες πρόσφυγες στην Ελλάδα και στην Ιταλία. Ρωτάω την Επιτροπή, το Συμβούλιο και όλους εσάς, συνάδελφοι: Αυτό θέλει η Ευρώπη; Αυτή είναι η Σένγκεν; |  | |  |  |  | |  | | --- | |  | |      |  |  |  |  |  |  | | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | | |  | | --- | | MPphoto |  |  | | --- | |  | |  | **Ska Keller,***on behalf of the Verts/ALE Group***.** – Mr President, I think Schengen is one of the most fundamental expressions of the European idea, the idea to cross borders, to overcome borders, overcome differences that divide us and to grow together. That is the European ideal, and that is being expressed by Schengen. Every Member State has the right, but even the obligation, to join Schengen as soon as it fulfils the criteria for the common membership. And those conditions, those criteria, are very clear. They are crystal clear and the procedures should not be changed in the middle of the process.  Precisely because Schengen is so important, it is such an important right for all European citizens, it cannot be withheld from particular Member States and from their citizens. It is a right, and we cannot allow second-class citizens to be established. Another rightful expectation of citizens is that the rule of law be upheld. If we are looking now at Romania, this does not seem to be totally guaranteed. We are very worried about the proposed changes to the justice laws that are currently being discussed and debated in the Romanian parliament, and EU citizens in Romania are expecting Europe to do something about it. I think we absolutely have to do something, and I want to thank those people in Romania who go out on the street and demonstrate for their rights, for democracy, and are telling all of us, all the time reminding us, that democracy is more than going to vote once in a while, it is more than having the rule of the majority. It tells us that there is also the responsibility of the majority for all citizens. We stand with you. But it is very clear that Schengen is also and especially for those people – they are European citizens, they need to be allowed to travel freely like everyone. I am also very proud that the European Parliament has been very clear on this all the time and now it is time for the Council to act, and I hope it will do this very soon. |  | |  |  |  | |  | | --- | |  | |      |  |  |  |  |  |  | | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | | |  | | --- | | MPphoto |  |  | | --- | |  | |  | **Margot Parker,***on behalf of the EFDD Group***.** – Mr President, at a time when the Schengen area is under considerable strain from mass movement of illegal migration, I find it remarkable that a debate on expanding the Schengen area has been considered. For as we all know, and yet many choose to deny, having no border checks at the internal borders helps to facilitate the free movement of terrorists and the free movement of weapons. It assists criminal gangs by allowing them to easily transport illegal drugs. It also plays a significant role in facilitating human trafficking across the EU.  Citizens in our own countries ask our governments to commit to some core responsibilities. One of the most important of these is to ask that our people can feel safe. I would ask you to consider this, because it is something that is very seriously at risk here and people constantly ask us about safety and governments keeping the people safe. |  | |  |  |  | |  | | --- | |  | |      |  |  |  |  |  |  | | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | | |  | | --- | | MPphoto |  |  | | --- | |  | |  | **Laurenţiu Rebega,***în numele grupului ENF***.** – Domnule președinte, domnule comisar, dragi colegi, aș vrea întâi să îi răspund doamnei Keller, care, în plenul Parlamentului European, îndeamnă lumea la demonstrații de stradă, îndeamnă lumea din Parlamentul European să dărâme guverne care au fost alese democratic – și vorbim de democrație.  Dragi colegi, democrația este respectarea votului. În România, perspectiva aderării la spațiul Schengen a devenit un fel de discuție despre sexul îngerilor, domnule Președinte, domnilor colegi – adică, pe cât de savantă, pe atât de a inutilă. Toți politicienii promit în campania electorală că îi vor convinge pe europeni să primească România în Schengen, dar nici cetățenii și nici politicienii înșiși nu mai cred așa ceva.  Cu câteva luni în urmă, președintele Macron a venit la București și, de acolo, a plecat la Sofia, pentru a ne convinge să sprijinim poziția Franței cu privire la Directiva privind detașarea lucrătorilor. Când a fost întrebat de spațiul Schengen, ne-a tăiat-o scurt: Schengen trebuie reformat și, abia după aceea, vorbim de aderarea României și a Bulgariei.  Am înțeles foarte bine reținerea țărilor occidentale privind aderarea României și a Bulgariei la Schengen în 2007. Am înțeles-o și în 2010. Am putut accepta acest lucru în 2012. În tot acest timp, eforturile de securizare a frontierei au costat mulți, foarte mulți bani. În 2015 însă, invazia refugiaților nu s-a făcut prin România și nici prin Bulgaria, dragi colegi. Este clar că păstrarea acestor țări în afara Schengen are un alt motiv.  Pot înțelege și acest motiv: anume că unele țări sau unii politicieni din Occident consideră că Uniunea trebuie să aibă două viteze. Îl pot înțelege și pe președintele Macron, care sugerează că ar vrea renegocierea acordului Schengen. Ceea ce nu pot înțelege este ipocrizia și prietenii falși.  Este ok ca națiunile să dorească să își controleze frontierele. Este ok să avem o Uniune cu două sau mai multe viteze. Dar nu este ok ca țările mari sau puternice să împiedice țările mai mici sau mai slabe să adopte aceleași măsuri protecționiste ca și cele mari.  Susțin din toate puterile competiția și sunt convins că egalitarismul inhibă dorința și capacitatea de a progresa. Prin urmare, nu militez pentru omogenitatea Europei, dar vreau să se asigure o egalitate de șanse și o independență reală a statelor membre. Dacă statele mari și puternice vor să împiedice, prin piedici artificiale, țările mai mici să facă progrese, atunci Uniunea Europeană va înceta să mai existe.  Reformarea spațiului Schengen poate fi un proiect interesant, dar aceasta presupune cu necesitate și începutul unei reforme profunde a întregii Uniuni Europene. Din 1957 până la Maastricht, Comunitatea Europeană s-a dezvoltat prin adăugiri succesive, care au fost posibile pentru că numărul de state membre era mic. Acum însă, nu se mai poate cu peticeala! Trebuie o reformă adevărată a Uniunii Europene, dragi colegi. |  | |  |  |  | |  | | --- | |  | |      |  |  |  |  |  |  | | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | | |  | | --- | | MPphoto |  |  | | --- | |  | |  | **Κωνσταντίνος Παπαδάκης (NI).** – Κύριε Πρόεδρε, όχι εξαίρεση αλλά υλοποίηση της Σένγκεν αποτελούν οι πρόσθετοι έλεγχοι αυτές τις μέρες σε έλληνες επιβάτες, όπως και οι σύγχρονες ηλεκτρονικές μέθοδοι λήψης βιομετρικών στοιχείων, παρακολούθησης, φακελώματος των λαών της Ευρώπης, προσφύγων και μεταναστών, με συνοριοφυλακή και το απαράδεκτο Δουβλίνο. Σένγκεν σημαίνει λαοί δεμένοι χειροπόδαρα, αφού ελευθέρας να μετακινηθεί έχει μόνο το κεφάλαιο και οι πάμφθηνοι εργάτες χωρίς δικαιώματα για τα συμφέροντα των επιχειρηματικών ομίλων. Αυτό είναι το ευρωπαϊκό κεκτημένο σας, που επεκτείνεται τώρα και στα Βαλκάνια. Η επιστολή Tusk δεν συνιστά κάποια παραφωνία της Ευρωπαϊκής Ένωσης, αλλά επιβεβαίωση της πολιτικής της, της συμφωνίας Ευρωπαϊκής Ένωσης-Τουρκίας, που εγκλωβίζει πρόσφυγες και μετανάστες σε άθλιες συνθήκες τύπου Μόριας στην Ελλάδα και στην Ιταλία. Τεράστια ευθύνη φέρει και η ελληνική κυβέρνηση, που δεν εγγυάται, λέει, τις ζωές των προσφυγών από την άλλη όμως παρέχει εγγυήσεις για fast track απελάσεις πίσω στην κόλαση του ιμπεριαλιστικού πολέμου, που αυτή και οι σύμμαχοί της πριμοδοτούν και του παρέχουν διευκολύνσεις. Αλληλεγγύη των λαών, για να φτάσουν οι πρόσφυγες στον προορισμό τους, ενάντια σε ιμπεριαλιστικούς πολέμους, Ευρωπαϊκή Ένωση, ΝΑΤΟ, κυβερνήσεις και εκμετάλλευση! |  | |  |  |  | |  | | --- | |  | |      |  |  |  |  |  |  | | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | | |  | | --- | | MPphoto |  |  | | --- | |  | |  | **Marian-Jean Marinescu (PPE).** – Domnule președinte, România a securizat frontierele și și-a îndeplinit angajamentul luat prin tratatul de aderare. A cheltuit peste un miliard de euro din bani proprii și din facilitatea Schengen, sub conducerea unui concert franco-german. Frontiera românească este mult mai securizată decât alte frontiere externe ca, de exemplu, a Franței, în sud, pe Marea Mediterană.  Din păcate, acest lucru s-a întâmplat în 2011. Îndeplineam toate condițiile. Nu am fost acceptați în Schengen și nici ulterior. Motivele invocate sunt motive pur populiste sau de natură națională, din cauza alegerilor naționale: fiecare stat a vrut să arate votanților ce eforturi face pentru un subiect care nu exista.  Eu cred că această situație trebuie abordată diferit. Faptul că în România există, eu știu, evenimente politice care nu sunt în conformitate cu normele europene este adevărat. Și acuma sunt astfel de lucruri: legile justiției sunt atacate în Parlament. Aceste lucruri trebuie tratate separat și cer Comisiei să facă acest lucru. Dar Schengen trebuie tratat, de asemenea, separat.  Eu cred că aderarea pe aeroporturi e un lucru de bun simț în acest moment. Consiliul ar trebui să facă acest lucru fără întârziere și, ulterior, și pe frontierele terestre. |  | |  |  |  | |  | | --- | |  | |      |  |  |  |  |  |  | | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | | |  | | --- | | MPphoto |  |  | | --- | |  | |  | **Tanja Fajon (S&D).** – Mr President, in my Group we remain strongly committed to the full and immediate accession of Romania and Bulgaria in the Schengen area. We demand it now! If we say we are a community of values and based on the rule of law, we should act like one. It is quite unacceptable that, despite the required conditions being fulfilled, the decision on accession has not yet been made.  Fragmenting, or creating a second-class Schengen, with the solutions found in the entry/exit system for example, is putting the integrity of freedom of movement at risk. Such political games by the Council erode the trust of our citizens in the European project, which we are so desperately trying to protect from collapsing.  I would also like to welcome Croatia as soon as it meets the criteria. Have we really forgotten that Schengen is one of the greatest achievements of the European integration? We are tired of hypocrisy: promising restoration and full functioning of the Schengen area by the end of 2016 failed miserably. On the contrary, the Commission further proposed the extension of internal border controls beyond the current legal basis this year, while admitting that the conditions are not fulfilled.  If you do not to reverse the course of action soon, I am seriously afraid that Schengen as we know it will be a thing of the past, and there is no European Union without Schengen. |  | |  |  |  | |  | | --- | |  | |      |  |  |  |  |  |  | | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | | |  | | --- | | MPphoto |  |  | | --- | |  | |  | **Monica Macovei (ECR).** – Domnule președinte, eu sunt unul dintre cei mai mari susținători ai intrării României în Schengen. Dar eu muncesc pentru asta și nu vin cu vorbe goale, așa cum fac colegii socialiști din PSD și din ALDE, care sunt la guvernare și care spun că vor România în Schengen dar, în realitate, fac totul ca să împiedice acest lucru.  O să vă dau câteva exemple: în acest moment, în Parlamentul României se votează modificarea legilor justiției în procedură de urgență – practic, în secret, fără dezbatere. Lumea se uită la televizor și vede la televizor ce se modifică și toate astea pentru a subjuga politic justiția, a nu mai avea stat de drept – apropo de statul de drept, care trebuie să ne unească – și pentru a crea mecanisme de anchetare, de amenințare și de șantajare a judecătorilor și procurorilor. De ce? Ca să scape politicienii din ALDE și PSD aflați la guvernare.  Dacă faci asemenea lucruri și susții că vrei să intri în Schengen, atunci îți pui o întrebare: chiar vrei să intri în Schengen sau doar vii și vorbești în plenul Parlamentului și spui că vrei să intri în Schengen?  Da, eu vreau să intru în Schengen și de asta nici nu leg MCV-ul de Schengen, pentru că MCV-ul este una. Comisia niciodată nu a cerut această legătură, și el trebuie să se oprească atunci când toate sunt îndeplinite. Orice se întâmplă azi în România, pe justiție, este contrar MCV-ului.  Da, să intrăm în Schengen, dar lucrați pentru asta, dragi colegi socialiști și din ALDE. |  | |  |  |  | |  | | --- | |  | |      |  |  |  |  |  |  | | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | | |  | | --- | | MPphoto |  |  | | --- | |  | |  | **Филиз Хюсменова (ALDE).** – Г-н Председател, уважаеми колеги, вече шест години напомняме, че България и Румъния изпълниха критериите за Шенгенското пространство. Недопускането ни в Шенген е нарушение на европейското право. Аргументите „против“ са само политически. Е тогава и контрааргументите да са такива. Парадоксално е, аргументът да е, че двете страни са под мониторинг и не установяват законност. А отговорът да е същият – нарушение на правовия ред.  Парадокс е 3 264 километра граници на Съюза да се охраняват без претенции към България и Румъния, а да им се отказва достъп до Шенген. Парадокс е да се търсят съмишленици за бъдещето, а да се прилага друг стандарт към България, която е лоялен партньор, с много добра бюджетна дисциплина и с трайна посока към силна интеграция. Парадоксално е, че въпреки отхвърлянето българските граждани са сред най-големите привърженици на Съюза, но е и вяра, че политическите аргументи ще отстъпят. |  | |  |  |  | |  | | --- | |  | |      |  |  |  |  |  |  | | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | | |  | | --- | | MPphoto |  |  | | --- | |  | |  | **Bodil Valero (Verts/ALE).** – Herr talman! Schengensamarbetet är en av de fördelar EU:s invånare uppskattar allra mest med EU. Det har gett betydande fördelar för såväl EU-medborgare som näringsliv, och gör det möjligt för över 400 miljoner européer från 26 europeiska länder att resa utan pass.  I samband med flyktingsituationen 2015 sattes det på hårt prov då flera medlemsländer återinförde gränskontroller, bland annat mitt eget, Sverige. När kontrollerna infördes 2016 fick det långtgående ekonomiska konsekvenser när pendlingstiden ökade och antalet resenärer mellan Sverige och Danmark minskade med 15 procent. Det kostade regionen 152 miljoner men bara 78 personer av de cirka tre miljoner personer som kontrollerades var flyktingar.  Tanken är ju att alla medlemsstater ska ansluta sig till Schengensamarbetet så snart villkoren är uppfyllda. Men vi kan inte hitta på nya krav för anslutande länder än de som redan finns i existerande regelverk. Både Rumänien och Bulgarien har ju sedan 2011 uppfyllt förutsättningarna för att gå med i samarbetet och bör få bli fullvärdiga medlemmar så snart som möjligt utan att blockeras av andra medlemsländer i rådet. Detsamma gäller naturligtvis Kroatien när de tekniska kriterierna är uppfyllda. |  | |  |  |  | |  | | --- | |  | |      |  |  |  |  |  |  | | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | | |  | | --- | | MPphoto |  |  | | --- | |  | |  | **Auke Zijlstra (ENF).** – Schengen was in eerste instantie een heel sympathiek verdrag want waarom zouden we elkaar niet vertrouwen, nietwaar? Maar ondertussen is de bevolking in West-Europa van samenstelling veranderd en zijn terroristische dreigingen aan de orde van de dag. De fout die hier met opzet, ook in dit debat, in het Europees Parlement, continu gemaakt wordt is het verwarren van het vrij verkeer van personen met het paspoortvrij reizen. Maar gelukkig heeft ook de Commissie in antwoord op vragen van mij nu toegegeven dat deze twee zaken niets met elkaar te maken hebben.  Praktisch gezien is Schengen allang overleden. De rouwadvertentie heeft alleen nog niet in de krant gestaan. Een groeiend aantal lidstaten, waaronder Duitsland en Frankrijk, verlengt de grenscontroles ieder half jaar opnieuw. En die soevereiniteit, die bevalt eigenlijk wel. Laten we erkennen dat Schengen uit een ander tijdperk stamt en niet meer toepasbaar is heden ten dage. |  | |  |  |  | |  | | --- | |  | |      |  |  |  |  |  |  | | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | | |  | | --- | | MPphoto |  |  | | --- | |  | |  | **Λάμπρος Φουντούλης (NI).** – Κύριε Πρόεδρε, η ένταξη της Βουλγαρίας, της Ρουμανίας και της Κροατίας στον χώρο Σένγκεν έχει καθυστερήσει αδικαιολόγητα. Από τη στιγμή που αυτές επιθυμούν να ενταχθούν και πληρούν τα κριτήρια, μόνο προκαταλήψεις τις έχουν κρατήσει εκτός εδώ και μερικά χρόνια. Το πρόβλημα δεν εντοπίζεται στον αριθμό των κρατών που θα ανήκουν στη Σένγκεν αλλά στις ίδιες τις προβλέψεις της συνθήκης αυτής και κυρίως τον τρόπο εφαρμογής τους. Τη στιγμή που μιλάμε, πολλές ευρωπαϊκές χώρες έχουν προσωρινά αναστείλει την εφαρμογή της Σένγκεν για τις προερχόμενες από την Ελλάδα πτήσεις, με πρόφαση την πιθανή είσοδο λαθρομεταναστών. Η γερμανική κυβέρνηση διά της καγκελαρίου Μέρκελ ήταν που κάλεσε εξαρχής τους λαθρομετανάστες στην Ευρώπη, αλλά πλέον μετά την πολιτική ζημιά που υπέστη το κόμμα της αποφάσισε να προβεί σε αυτή την κίνηση μικροπολιτικής, που απευθύνεται κυρίως στο εσωτερικό της ακροατήριο. Σε κάθε περίπτωση όμως αυτό αποδεικνύει τα κενά της συνθήκης αυτής.  Η πρότασή μας είναι η πλήρης επαναφορά όλων των συνοριακών ελέγχων, χωρίς αυτό να σημαίνει πως περιορίζεται η διέλευση των ανθρώπων· απλά θα ελέγχεται. Μέχρι στιγμής άλλωστε τα μεγαλύτερα οφέλη από την ανεξέλεγκτη κυκλοφορία ατόμων εντός της Ένωσης τα έχουν αποκομίσει διάφοροι εγκληματίες, λαθρέμποροι, έμποροι ναρκωτικών και διακινητές ανθρώπων. |  | |  |  |  | |  | | --- | |  | |      |  |  |  |  |  |  | | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | | |  | | --- | | MPphoto |  |  | | --- | |  | |  | **Асим Адемов (PPE).** – Г-н Председател, уважаеми колеги, при приемането на България и Румъния в ЕС през 2007 г., Европейският съюз е поел ангажимент двете страни да бъдат приети за пълноправни членове на Шенген, когато са готови. От няколко години вече те са готови. Това е потвърдено както от правителствата на двете страни, така и от Европейския парламент и Европейската комисия.  Въпреки това сме свидетели на многократното отлагане на решението за присъединяване на България и Румъния в Шенген. Обективно погледнато не е справедливо да се прилагат такива двойни стандарти към България и Румъния. Не е справедливо да не се признават усилията и резултатите на двете страни. Не е справедливо да не се признава фактът, че при сполетялата ни бежанската криза България е с най-добри резултати.  Отдавна България е доказала, че генерира сигурност и стабилност в един много проблемен и сложен регион. България доказа, че е надеждна външна граница на Европейския съюз. България има тежката отговорност за опазването на външната ни граница с Турция и тя се справя отлично с това. България не заплашва сигурността на Европа.  Съветът трябва незабавно да вземе решение за присъединяването на България и Румъния към Шенгенското пространство. Ние трябва заедно и обединени да се изправим срещу заплахите в едно сплотено Шенгенско пространство. Бъдещето на Европейския съюз зависи от това доколко страните ще бъдат единни и солидарни една с друга. Именно тази солидарност изисква България и Румъния да бъдат приети незабавно в Шенген, а Хърватия – когато изпълни условията. |  | |  |  |  | |  | | --- | |  | |      |  |  |  |  |  |  | | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | | |  | | --- | | MPphoto |  |  | | --- | |  | |  | **Victor Boştinaru (S&D).** – Domnule președinte, domnule comisar, domnule ministru Maasikas, vă spun din start că nu îmi propun astăzi să îi învăț pe colegii de la ECR și cu atât mai puțin pe doamna Macovei despre ce înseamnă Schengen. Ar fi o pierdere de timp.  România și Bulgaria sunt două țări profund europene, cu contribuții majore în cadrul Frontex, recunoscute ca atare, și contribuie considerabil la asigurarea controlului și securității frontierelor externe ale Uniunii Europene, fiind angajate, în același timp, cu onestitate și loialitate la construcția viitorului Uniunii Europene.  Rapoarte succesive ale Parlamentului European și evaluări succesive ale Comisiei Europene după 2011 au confirmat îndeplinirea tuturor – repet, tuturor – standardelor tehnice prevăzute în procesul de aderare. Opoziția unor state membre se bazează mai degrabă pe rațiuni politice și economice, devenind deja o formă vădită de discriminare, care continuă sa afecteze, inclusiv economic, negativ cele două state.  Parlamentul European trebuie să ceară astăzi Consiliului să dea în sfârșit curs propunerii Comisiei de acum două luni de zile, pentru primirea deîndată a României și Bulgariei în spațiul Schengen, fiind convins că valorile solidarității între statele membre și excluderea standardelor duble nu sunt doar sloganuri bune pentru campania electorală.  Închei cu încrederea și speranța că partenerii europeni ai României și Bulgariei și ai Croației vor dezgheța acest dosar, astfel încât cele două țări, România și Bulgaria, să devină cât mai repede membre ale spațiului Schengen, iar Croația să adere atunci când condițiile sunt îndeplinite. |  | |  |  |  | |  | | --- | |  | |      |  |  |  |  |  |  | | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | | |  | | --- | | MPphoto |  |  | | --- | |  | |  | **Ангел Джамбазки (ECR).** – Г-н Председател, уважаеми г-н Комисар, уважаема г-жо министър Павлова, уважаеми колеги, нека да си кажем нещата честно: причината България, Румъния и Хърватска да не са в това пространство е само единствено политическа. Техническите критерии отдавна са изпълнени, но три държави в Европейския съюз се съобразяват със своите вътрешнополитически проблеми, правят отстъпки пред партии, които са меко казано антиевропейски и евроскептични, и заради вътрешните си проблеми пречат на присъединяването на нашите държави към това пространство.  И тук съм съгласен с колегата Хюсменова: това е нарушаване на европейското право, това е несправедливо и това е двоен стандарт. Чух преди малко от колега, че проблем било престъпността. Колеги, къде се намира квартал „Моленбек“, известен с това, че в него има незаконно оръжие повече отколкото цялата белгийска армия, че е средище на трафик, на наркотици, на насилствен трафик на хора, на жени? Ами не се намира нито в България, нито в Румъния. Намира се в Кралство Белгия.  Къде се намират проблемите, които са в Холандия? Защото за тези държави говорим. Да ги кажем. Държавите, които пречат, са тези, уважаеми колеги. Затова говорим ли тук да изключим тези държави от Шенген? Май не. Крайно време е да се сложи край на лицемерието и двойния стандарт, уважаеми колеги, и да се спазва европейското право. България и Румъния трябва да са част от Шенген, а също и Хърватска, защото ние пазим външните граници на Европейския съюз. |  | |  |  |  | |  | | --- | |  | |      |  |  |  |  |  |  | | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | | |  | | --- | | MPphoto |  |  | | --- | |  | |  | **Norica Nicolai (ALDE).** – Domnule președinte, domnule comisar, vreau să vă asigur că și pentru cetățenii români și bulgari spațiul Schengen este un simbol. Ceea ce nu înțeleg cetățenii noștri este de ce permitem unor state membre, cu așa zise democrații consolidate, să își bată joc de simbolurile Uniunii Europene. Dacă toți privilegiem libertatea de mișcare, dacă toți dorim mai multă Europă, de ce acceptăm ca unii să nu respecte tratatele europene și introducem condiții parazitare și precare în tratate care nu prevăd astfel de condiții.  Domnule președinte, noi suntem convinși că am îndeplinit criteriile, dar începem să fim din ce în ce mai convinși că se formează un dublu limbaj, un fariseism european pe care cetățenii noștri nu-l acceptă. Suntem cetățeni europeni, suntem cetățeni cu drepturi egale, dorim mai multă Europă, dorim mai multă încredere în Europa și trebuie ca cei care au creat această Uniune să înțeleagă că de încredere depinde totul, nu de jocuri politice partizane ieftine. Dacă Franța, dacă Olanda, dacă Austria, dacă Germania, doresc mai multă Europă, vor trebui să voteze la Consiliul European pentru spațiul Schengen. Așa vor dovedi că au încredere în ceea ce spun în discursurile lor publice și că nu folosesc un dublu limbaj, antamat politic în relațiile cu alte țări.  România nu este o colonie, România nu este un stat periferic, România este stat membru al Uniunii Europene, are o limbă care este limbă a Uniunii Europene și, pentru asta, cetățenii români cer respectul acelora care au uitat să ni-l acorde de prea multă vreme. |  | |  |  |  | |  | | --- | |  | |      |  |  |  |  |  |  | | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | | |  | | --- | | MPphoto |  |  | | --- | |  | |  | **Mara Bizzotto (ENF).** – Signor Presidente, onorevoli colleghi, oggi in quest'Aula discutiamo se ampliare e rafforzare Schengen, se permettere quindi la libera circolazione delle persone all'interno dell'Unione europea senza nessun tipo di controlli ai confini.  Io dico invece chiaramente che i controlli ai confini vanno fatti, anzi dico di più: le frontiere vanno chiuse, perché in questi anni a circolare liberamente in Europa sono stati i terroristi islamici. O vi siete dimenticati degli attentati di Parigi, Bruxelles, Nizza, Londra, Barcellona? Vi siete dimenticati delle centinaia di persone morte a causa del fanatismo assassino, a causa del terrorismo islamico?  Questo ragazzo è Luca Russo, anzi era Luca Russo. Aveva 25 anni, era un ingegnere, viveva a Bassano del Grappa, a pochi chilometri da casa mia. Il 17 agosto era a Barcellona assieme alla sua fidanzata Marta. Marta è tornata ferita, lui è morto.  La famiglia di Luca Russo mi ha pregato di non dimenticare mai questo ragazzo. Gli amici di Luca Russo mi hanno chiesto di fare di tutto per bloccare questi bastardi! Di intervenire per fermare questo terrorismo islamico. Questa supplica la rivolgo a voi: dobbiamo fermare questi terroristi, dobbiamo fermare il terrorismo islamico, l'invasione, gli immigrati che stanno arrivando. Dobbiamo controllare i confini.  Schengen va sospeso, dovete ripensare Schengen, dobbiamo bloccare i confini, dobbiamo fermare questa invasione. Non bastano più i minuti di silenzio, non bastano più le manifestazioni: serve un ripensamento di Schengen. |  | |  |  |  | |  | | --- | |  | |      |  |  |  |  |  |  | | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | | |  | | --- | | MPphoto |  |  | | --- | |  | |  | **Željana Zovko (PPE).** – Gospodine predsjedniče, niz aktualnih zbivanja i sigurnosnih izazova, izbjeglička i migracijska kriza s kojom se Republika Hrvatska suočila krajem 2015. godine, kada je kroz državu prošlo više od pola milijuna izbjeglica, učinila je sigurnost granica jednim od glavnih prioriteta Vlade Republike Hrvatske.  Od tog razdoblja do danas učinjeno je mnogo. Pripremajući se za punopravno članstvo u schengenskom prostoru, Hrvatska je iskoristila skoro sva sredstva schengenskog instrumenta: nabavila je brodove, helikoptere za nadzor granica, izgradila novu i obnovila postojeće granične policijske postaje i time pridonijela u nastojanjima pune primjene schengenske pravne stečevine. Smatram kako bi se posebna pažnja trebala posvetiti jačanju vanjskih granica Europske unije, koje su ujedno i naše nacionalne granice, posebice ako uzmemo u obzir da Hrvatska ima najdužu vanjsku granicu s Europskom unijom.  Sve navedeno ukazuje na nužnost što skorijeg uključenja Republike Hrvatske u schengenski prostor. Nadam se da će Hrvatska što prije ispuniti tehničke kriterije i očekujem u 2019. godini da bude punopravna članica Schengena. |  | |  |  |  | |  | | --- | |  | |      |  |  |  |  |  |  | | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | | |  | | --- | | MPphoto |  |  | | --- | |  | |  | **Claude Moraes (S&D).** – Mr President, when the Commissioner spoke, it was a detailed explanation of why the full integration of Romania and Bulgaria must happen now. At the heart of that, he said that Schengen was precious to the whole idea of the European Union. I have never heard, in all the years that I have been here, a stronger case made for anything about the central cause of this European Union. Let us also be clear about this institution, the European Parliament, for anyone who is in any doubt.  Since 2011, for six long years, the European Parliament in its Committee on Civil Liberties, Justice and Home Affairs (LIBE), has had unambiguous majority debates, well—examined, detailed debates, making one conclusion, namely that second class status for Romania and Bulgaria is not an option. They must be fully integrated into Schengen. We have supported the measures to grant Romania and Bulgaria access to the Entry-Exit System, the Visa Information System. We have even talked about visa-free travel to the US. We are doing this and being proactive in this cause, not just because we believe it, but because we have examined the case for these countries. This is a case not just for justice but for practicality. This is not just a case for the politics, but for understanding what it means for Romania and Bulgaria to be full members.  Then I refer again to the Commission and I ask the Council on this: this has not been a static process. In all of these six years, we have been strengthening the external border: Entry-Exit System, external border controls, the border agency, one of the fastest files ever created in this Parliament. All these measures and the hard work that has gone on with all of the issues of privacy and individual liberties that we had to tackle was to safeguard the external border. With all of this, we can surely ask that today there is an unambiguous and clear demand that two countries have justice and are fully integrated Member States of the European Union. Schengen is precious, all the measures are coming to make it, and I echo what the Commissioner said: together, all of us together, will make this happen. |  | |  |  |  | |  | | --- | |  | |      |  |  |  |  |  |  | | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | | |  | | --- | | MPphoto |  |  | | --- | |  | |  | **El Presidente. –**Observo algunas peticiones de uso de la tarjeta azul. La cuestión es que en debates de esta naturaleza el Reglamento no contempla ni el uso del procedimiento de la «tarjeta azul» ni tampoco el de «catch the eye». Al principio del debate lo señalé, pero observo que hay quienes lo solicitan. Es una cuestión puramente reglamentaria, no es arbitrario, no es un capricho de quien en este momento está presidiendo el Pleno, simplemente me ajusto al Reglamento. Gracias por su comprensión. |  | |  |  |  | |  | | --- | |  | |      |  |  |  |  |  |  | | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | | |  | | --- | | MPphoto |  |  | | --- | |  | |  | **Ruža Tomašić (ECR).** – Gospodine predsjedniče, veliki migracijski pritisci i teroristička prijetnja ostavili su traga na Schengenu koji nije ni predviđen za okolnosti koje trenutno vladaju u Europi i njezinom neposrednom susjedstvu.  Dokazane slabosti, međutim, nisu razlog za odbacivanje Schengena, već pravi poticaj za njegovo unaprjeđenje. Ono što schengenski prostor predstavlja od prvog svog dana – prostor povjerenja, sigurnosti i mira, danas nam je u Europi potrebnije nego ikad u posljednjih dvadeset godina.  No, cijeli je koncept prilično obesmišljen ako u njega nisu uključene sve države s vanjskim granicama. Naravno, postoje vrlo objektivni kriteriji koje trebaju ispuniti, ali sad kad nam je taj cilj nadohvat ruke trebali bismo pogurati Hrvatsku, Bugarsku i Rumunjsku da što prije uđu u Schengen.  Zato s ovog mjesta još jednom pozivam sve koji sudjeluju ili doprinose u procesu odlučivanja da maksimalno ubrzaju pristupanje ovih triju država schengenskom prostoru. |  | |  |  |  | |  | | --- | |  | |      |  |  |  |  |  |  | | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | | |  | | --- | | MPphoto |  |  | | --- | |  | |  | **Jozo Radoš (ALDE).** – Gospodine predsjedniče, gospodine povjereniče, gospodine ministre, želim zahvaliti kolegama iz S&D-a na ovoj vrlo aktualnoj temi koju su pokrenuli.  S povećanjem sigurnosnih ugroza povećava se i potreba za stvaranjem jedinstvenog europskog prostora sigurnosti odnosno uključenja svih zemalja Europske unije u schengenski prostor. Razbijeni schengenski prostor ne samo da otežava kontrolu vanjskih granica i sigurnost nego i komunikaciju, slobodno kretanje ljudi, roba, kapitala i usluga i time slabi gospodarsku snagu Europske unije, a pogotovo stvarajući neravnopravnost među državama članicama i među građanima Europske unije.  Stoga, pozdravljam najavljeni ulazak Rumunjske i Bugarske u schengenski prostor, kao i moje zemlje Hrvatske čim ispuni uvjete. Drago mi je da su i ministar i povjerenik rekli da je Hrvatskoj preostalo vrlo malo kriterija koje treba ispuniti da bi postala članica schengenskog prostora i kao što se protivim svim nejednakostima i nejednakom tretmanu Bugarske i Rumunjske prilikom njihovog ulaska u schengenski prostor tako očekujem da će odluka o ulasku Hrvatske biti donesena temeljem kriterija, temeljem tehničke i upravne sposobnosti, a nikako temeljem političkih kriterija, zahtjeva i uvjeta. |  | |  |  |  | |  | | --- | |  | |      |  |  |  |  |  |  | | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | | |  | | --- | | MPphoto |  |  | | --- | |  | |  | **Franz Obermayr (ENF).** – Herr Präsident! Es ist schon einigermaßen verwirrend, wenn der Präsident der Kommission, Herr Juncker, den jüngsten Bericht seiner eigenen Behörde betreffend Rumänien und Bulgarien offensichtlich ignoriert.  Denn in dem Bericht wird ja klar festgehalten, dass weder die Reform der Justiz noch die Bekämpfung der Korruption und der organisierten Kriminalität zufriedenstellend ist. Nun will Herr Juncker beide Länder so schnell wie möglich in den Schengen-Raum aufnehmen, in der Schengen-Informationssystem einbinden – sie sollen die europäische Außengrenze sichern.  Natürlich wäre es wünschenswert, wenn die europäische Außengrenze etwas weiter südöstlich gesichert und geschützt würde. Aber es müssen auch die Rahmenbedingungen dafür passen, und der Bericht der Kommission spricht ja eindeutig dagegen. Wie eine verlässliche Grenzsicherung bei Korruption in der Polizei und auch in der Justiz gehen soll, entzieht sich meiner Kenntnis, aber vielleicht hat hier Herr Juncker eine passende Antwort.  Eines ist allerdings klar: Schengen, das ist heute schon mehrmals festgestellt worden, muss überarbeitet werden, Schengen ist reformbedürftig. Und klar ist auch: Mit dem Schnellschuss einer Erweiterung, bei der die Rahmenbedingungen noch nicht passen, wird Europa nicht sicherer, die Grenzen werden nicht sicherer! Und ob Sie es hören wollen oder nicht, unsere Bürger in Europa sehen es genauso. |  | |  |  |  | |  | | --- | |  | |      |  |  |  |  |  |  | | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | | |  | | --- | | MPphoto |  |  | | --- | |  | |  | **Jaromír Štětina (PPE).** – Pane předsedající, minulý týden jsme měli slavit v České republice desetileté výročí od vstupu do schengenského prostoru. Oslavy však byly téměř nepostřehnutelné. Jedinečná myšlenka, díky které se mohou lidé volně a bez kontrol pohybovat napříč Evropskou unií, je dnes mnohými z nás považována za samozřejmou.  Česká republika je navíc ekonomicky takřka závislá na bezproblémovém fungování pohybu zboží. O to víc je překvapivé, že schengenský prostor nedokážeme ocenit. Mnozí politici se v souvislosti s migrační a bezpečnostní politikou nerozpakují schengenský prostor zneužít ke svým populistickým hrám. Schengenský prostor je podrobován zásadní zkoušce ve svém fungování. Jen pro představu, zrušení schengenského prostoru by podle studie Evropského parlamentu přišlo na sto až dvě stě třicet miliard EUR během deseti let. Schengenský prostor byl od začátku koncipován jako organismus, který zahrnuje prvky svobody a bezpečnosti.  Svoboda volného pohybu bez vnitřních hranic je od počátku této myšlenky vyvažována. Vyvažována nejenom důležitou ochranou vnějších hranic, ale i systémem řady dalších navazujících předpisů. Za poslední dva roky právě bezpečnostní aspekt schengenského prostoru výrazně posílil. Posílily pravomoci Frontexu, ke zkvalitnění kontroly na hranicích jsme schválili zavedení systému vstupu/výstupu (EES) a řadu dalších předpisů.  Těším se na nové členy schengenského prostoru. Bulharsko a Rumunsko a Chorvatsko musí být do schengenského prostoru přijata okamžitě po splnění všech závazných kritérií. |  | |  |  |  | |  | | --- | |  | |      |  |  |  |  |  |  | | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | | |  | | --- | | MPphoto |  |  | | --- | |  | |  | **Tonino Picula (S&D).** – Gospodine predsjedniče, prije svega želim zahvaliti Gianniju Pittelli i svojoj grupi, na čiji prijedlog danas raspravljamo o proširenju Schengena. Rasprava, posve opravdano, pored Bugarske i Rumunjske, uključuje i Hrvatsku. Hvala i povjereniku Avramopoulosu na jasnim i ohrabrujućim stajalištima Komisije.  Čak milijardu i dvjesto pedeset milijuna putovanja zabilježi se godišnje na schengenskom prostoru. O gospodarskim, političkim i integrativnim učincima tog velikog dostignuća Europske unije ne treba previše govoriti. Pravila pristupanja su jasna – to je opsežan popis tehničkih kriterija koje zemlja treba ispuniti prije pristupanja. Međutim, na kraju je potreban ključni – politički – pristanak svih članica Europske unije.  Važno je nastaviti s provedbom schengenske stečevine. To jača stupanj povjerenja među članicama schengenskog prostora. Jednako tako, treba imati povjerenja i prema članicama koje već dugo intenzivno rade na ispunjavanju svih kriterija.  Ističem kako je Hrvatska od pristupanja Schengenskom informativnom sustavu u samo 4 mjeseca obavila 75 milijuna kontrola i identificirala preko 4000 prekršaja. Dokaz da već obavljene pripreme donose rezultate. Osim toga, Hrvatska od svih članica ima najdužu vanjsku kopnenu granicu Europske unije. Želimo doprinijeti boljoj sigurnosti našeg dijela vanjskih granica Europske unije. Želimo unutarnje granice Europske unije bez bodljikave žice koja nas danas dijeli od naših susjeda.  Na Hrvatskoj je da ispuni sve kriterije za pristupanje Schengenu, što očekujemo do kraja sljedeće godine. Na Vijeću je potom da uvaži sve što je napravljeno. Kredibilitet Europske unije jasno će se potvrđivati na ovom pitanju. |  | |  |  |  | |  | | --- | |  | |      |  |  |  |  |  |  | | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | | |  | | --- | | MPphoto |  |  | | --- | |  | |  | **Νότης Μαριάς (ECR).** – Κύριε Πρόεδρε, Κύριε Αβραμόπουλε, ενώ η Βουλγαρία, η Ρουμανία και η Κροατία γίνονται μέλη της Σένγκεν, οι Έλληνες επιβάτες αεροπορικών πτήσεων από την Ελλάδα υποβάλλονται σε παράνομους ελέγχους στα γερμανικά και βελγικά αεροδρόμια. Την επιβολή γερμανικής καραντίνας κατά των ελλήνων επιβατών είχα καταγγείλει σ’ αυτήν εδώ την αίθουσα στις 15 Νοεμβρίου. Παρά ταύτα οι παράνομοι έλεγχοι των ελλήνων επιβατών όχι μόνο συνεχίζονται στα γερμανικά αεροδρόμια, αλλά επεκτάθηκαν και στο αεροδρόμιο των Βρυξελλών στις 4 Δεκεμβρίου, ζήτημα για το οποίο σάς υπέβαλα, κύριε Αβραμόπουλε, κατεπείγουσα γραπτή ερώτηση και αναμένω την απάντησή σας.  Επιπλέον, εδώ στο αεροδρόμιο του Στρασβούργου, όλοι οι επιβάτες Σένγκεν, συμπεριλαμβανομένων των ευρωβουλευτών, υποβάλλονται κατά την άφιξη και αναχώρησή τους σε διαβατηριακούς ελέγχους. Έτσι, ενώ η Γερμανία, το Βέλγιο, η Γαλλία και η Αυστρία δεν εφαρμόζουν τη Σένγκεν, τελικά αυτή εφαρμόζεται απ’ την Ελλάδα, με αποτέλεσμα η πατρίδα μας να έχει μετατραπεί σε μαγνήτη για τους χιλιάδες πρόσφυγες και παράνομους μετανάστες. Ενόψει όλων αυτών η Ελλάδα οφείλει εδώ και τώρα να αποχωρήσει από τη Σένγκεν. Το έχω ξαναπεί σ’ αυτήν εδώ την αίθουσα. |  | |  |  |  | |  | | --- | |  | |      |  |  |  |  |  |  | | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | | |  | | --- | | MPphoto |  |  | | --- | |  | |  | **Cristian Dan Preda (PPE).** – Domnul președinte, zilele astea se fac șapte ani de când avea loc ultima evaluare tehnică a dosarului României privitor la Schengen. Din vara lui 2011, Comisia și Parlamentul consideră că România e gata să între în zona de circulație liberă.  Tot de atunci, câteva guverne europene s-au opus acestei intrări. Argumentul a fost că securitatea zonei Schengen e afectată de felul defectuos în care funcționează statul de drept din România. Mecanismul de Cooperare și Verificare a devenit astfel cheia care trebuia să deschidă poarta Shengen. În ultimii cinci ani, guvernele de la București au avut trei atitudini referitoare la MCV.  Prima a fost subminarea directă a justiției, inclusiv a celei constituționale. Guvernul Ponta și majoritatea PSD-PNL au aruncat România, în vara lui 2012, într-o criză instituțională foarte gravă, adăugând noi criterii de îndeplinit în dosarul MCV. Ulterior, supărați că europenii așteptau o justiție independentă, premierul Ponta și ministru de externe Corlățean au zis că nu-i mai interesează Schengen-ul.  A doua atitudinea, a fost efortul de a îmbunătăți funcționarea justiției. E perioada scurtă, din păcate, în care premier a fost Dacian Cioloș.  În fine, de la începutul anului, asaltul împotriva domniei legii a fost reluat de guvernele Grindeanu și Tudose. Majoritatea PSD-ALDE vrea limitarea independenței magistraților și protejarea corupților. În ianuarie au folosit o ordonanță de urgență adoptată la miezul nopții. De câteva săptămâni au la îndemână o mașină de vot, bine unsă de corupți, de veleitari sau de deputați incompatibili. Cum criticii de acum 6 ani din alte state membre nu și-au schimbat opinia despre relația Schengen-MCV, câtă vreme nu va fi dreptate în România, nu va fi nici libertate deplină de mișcare pentru români. |  | |  |  |  | |  | | --- | |  | |      |  |  |  |  |  |  | | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | | |  | | --- | | MPphoto |  |  | | --- | |  | |  | **Juan Fernando López Aguilar (S&D).** – Señor presidente, comisario. Érase una vez un tiempo en que en la Unión Europea todas las instituciones —al hablar de Schengen— hablábamos la misma lengua, conscientes de que se trata, junto al modelo social europeo, del activo más preciado y más precioso de la construcción europea para quinientos millones de europeos.  Pero ese tiempo se ha encontrado ahora con un problema. Y el problema se llama Consejo, que no solamente ha suspendido la libre circulación de personas, el activo más preciado por los europeos —Schengen—, sino que amenaza con prorrogar la suspensión hasta 2020 y, sobre todo, excluye de esa libre circulación a dos Estados miembros de la Unión Europea que han hecho sus deberes, que han cumplido con todos los criterios técnicos. Y, por tanto, perpetra una grave injusticia contra Rumanía y Bulgaria y amenaza con hacer lo mismo con Croacia, impidiendo la libre circulación de personas a ciudadanos europeos que lo son de cuerpo entero y de pleno derecho.  El Grupo socialista les quiere decir a los rumanos y a los búlgaros que apoya plenamente su derecho de libre circulación y no quiere que los rumanos y los búlgaros, ni mañana los croatas, sean menos ciudadanos que otros en la Unión Europea y le dice, comisario, que la suspensión de Schengen deteriora la credibilidad de la Unión Europea como actor global y deteriora la consistencia del proyecto europeo ante los europeos. Y, por tanto, alimenta a esos enemigos rampantes que amenazan y acechan a la Unión Europea: el nacionalismo excluyente y el populismo. |  | |  |  |  | |  | | --- | |  | |      |  |  |  |  |  |  | | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | | |  | | --- | | MPphoto |  |  | | --- | |  | |  | **Емил Радев (PPE).** – Г-н Председател, уважаеми г-н Комисар, дами и господа, десет години след присъединяването на България към Европейския съюз нашата страна ще поеме за първи път председателството на Съвета на ЕС и ще води Съюза в един важен момент за неговото развитие от гледна точка на промените в миграционната политика и Шенген. В същото време обаче България не е пълноправен член на Шенген, въпреки че прилага изцяло шенгенските актове, използва активно Шенгенската информационна система, получи пасивен достъп до визовата информационна система и е в обхвата на новосъздадената система за вход/изход.  Изпълнила всички технически критерии за влизане в Шенген – единствените критерии за присъединяване, България се е доказала като надежден партньор в охраната на външната европейска граница. Време е многократно получаваното признание на думи да бъде подкрепено с ясни и категорични политически действия от страна на европейските ни партньори.  В момент на нарастващ политически популизъм, традиционните партии, особено когато са управляващи, следва да проявят разум и да не се поддават на популистки похвати. Не следва да се потъпкват европейските правила и закони в името на печеленето на гласове. Не е и проява на солидарност, както и правно не е издържано, правилата за едни да бъдат променяни за други.  Затова призовавам държавите членки да вземат положително решение колкото се може по-скоро за присъединяването на България и Румъния в Шенген. Само така ще докажат, че думите им са подплатени с реални намерения в рамките на правила, които самите те са написали. |  | |  |  |  | |  | | --- | |  | |      |  |  |  |  |  |  | | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | | |  | | --- | | MPphoto |  |  | | --- | |  | |  | **Josef Weidenholzer (S&D).** – Herr Präsident! Ich bin in Oberösterreich aufgewachsen, in einer Region, die von Grenzen umgeben war, Schlagbäume und Stacheldraht engten meinen Horizont ein.  Diese Grenzen schützten uns nicht, sie hinderten uns, Kontakte aufzunehmen und schwächten unsere Region. Europa: Das war für meine Generation der Traum, ohne Grenzbalken zu leben. Schengen hat Europa verändert, hat die Menschen zusammengebracht und unseren Wohlstand gemehrt. Besonders Österreich hat davon profitiert.  Offene Grenzen sind ein wertvolles Gut. Sie setzen Vertrauen voraus, und mit diesem Vertrauen muss man sorgfältig umgehen. Aber wir dürfen deswegen nicht andere davon abhalten, in den Genuss eben dieser Freizügigkeit zu kommen. Vor allem, wenn sie – wie Rumänien und Bulgarien –alle Voraussetzungen erfüllen, und das schon seit sieben Jahren, wie das der Vorsitzende Moraes gerade eindrucksvoll erklärt hat. Das ist unfair und ungerecht, unklug noch dazu, und es zerstört das Vertrauen in das gemeinsame Europa.  Es ist höchste Zeit, endlich das zu tun, was man schon längst hätte tun sollen. |  | |  |  |  | |  | | --- | |  | |      |  |  |  |  |  |  | | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | | |  | | --- | | MPphoto |  |  | | --- | |  | |  | **Dimitris Avramopoulos,** *membre de la Commission***.** – Monsieur le Président, chers collègues, je vous remercie pour vos interventions.  Je ne le répéterai jamais assez, mais l’espace Schengen est, pour moi, la plus grande réalisation de l’Union européenne, pour les citoyens surtout, et leurs droits en tant qu’Européens, mais aussi pour nos économies. Plus que cela, Schengen est un symbole de confiance entre les États membres. C’est un signe que les pays européens travaillent ensemble, vivent ensemble et non les uns contre les autres.  Si les défis migratoire et sécuritaire nécessitent que nous renforcions, adaptions, réformions l’espace Schengen, y faire face n’implique surtout pas de revenir en arrière. Les États membres doivent, au contraire, affronter ensemble ce défi commun, unis dans un espace Schengen plus fort. C’est pourquoi il est grand temps que la Bulgarie et la Roumanie, elles aussi, deviennent membres à part entière de l’espace Schengen et que la Croatie fasse de même dès qu’elle sera prête. La Bulgarie et la Roumanie ont démontré leur capacité à devenir membres à part entière de l’espace Schengen et devraient donc être en mesure d’y adhérer dans un avenir très proche.  L’avenir de l’espace Schengen réside dans le juste équilibre entre deux principes importants: la liberté de circulation et la nécessité de pouvoir faire face à d’importantes menaces à la sécurité. Ainsi, la réintroduction des contrôles aux frontières internes reste l’exception, je le répète, reste l’exception.  C’est pourquoi la Commission a présenté une proposition visant à modifier les codes frontières Schengen afin de maintenir précisément cet équilibre et d’assurer une approche coordonnée de l’Union européenne en matière de contrôles aux frontières intérieures. En contrepartie d’une possibilité plus longue de réintroduire le contrôle aux frontières internes, nous proposons de renforcer les procédures et le devoir de coopérer avec les États membres voisins. Je suis vraiment ravi de constater que la Bulgarie, qui assurera la prochaine présidence, est déterminée à faire avancer ces dossiers en priorité.  Maintenant, permettez-moi de parler pour quelques minutes en grec pour répondre aux préoccupations des membres grecs du Parlement.  Κύριε Πρόεδρε, είπα ακριβώς ότι θα μου επιτρέψετε να απαντήσω στα Ελληνικά σχετικά με τις ανησυχίες ελλήνων ευρωβουλευτών.  Είναι αλήθεια, κυρίες και κύριοι βουλευτές, ότι η Γερμανία έχει επιβάλει ηυξημένους ελέγχους στις πτήσεις από την Ελλάδα. Αλλά τόσο οι ελληνικές όσο και οι γερμανικές αρχές συνεργάζονται για την επίλυση του συγκεκριμένου ζητήματος και βέβαια με τη σειρά μου ενθαρρύνω τη συνέχιση αυτής της συνεργασίας. Βρισκόμαστε και εμείς σε επαφή με τις αρχές και των δύο χωρών. Όπως ενδεχομένως θυμόσαστε, με πρωτοβουλία της Επιτροπής πραγματοποιήθηκε τριμερής συνάντηση εμπειρογνωμόνων στις 22 Νοεμβρίου, δηλαδή της Ελλάδας, της Γερμανίας και της Επιτροπής. Η συνάντηση διευκόλυνε την εποικοδομητική ανταλλαγή απόψεων και τη συζήτηση σχετικά με τα πρακτικά ζητήματα για να περιοριστεί κυρίως η επιβάρυνση των επιβατών.  Δεν σας κρύβω ότι δέχθηκα με ικανοποίηση τις διαβεβαιώσεις που έδωσε η Γερμανία, σύμφωνα με τις οποίες οι έλεγχοι θα γίνονται πλέον μόνο στην πύλη εντός του χώρου αφίξεων Σένγκεν των γερμανικών αεροδρομίων. Οι έλεγχοι πρακτικά περιορίζονται στον έλεγχο της ταυτότητας και στην εγκυρότητα των ταξιδιωτικών εγγράφων. Μέχρι στιγμής δεν έχουμε λάβει καμία πληροφορία για το αντίθετο ούτε από τη γερμανική ούτε από την ελληνική πλευρά. Επίσης με ικανοποίηση δέχθηκα τη διευκρίνιση εκ μέρους των εκπροσώπων της Ελλάδας σχετικά με την ενίσχυση των υφιστάμενων ελέγχων στα ελληνικά αεροδρόμια. Θα συνεχίσουμε να συνεργαζόμαστε στενά και με εποικοδομητικό πάντα πνεύμα με τη Γερμανία και την Ελλάδα, για να επιλυθεί αυτό το ζήτημα.  Όσον αφορά στο Βέλγιο, οι βελγικές αρχές μάς ενημέρωσαν επίσημα ότι πραγματοποιούν μη συστηματικούς δηλαδή απλά σποραδικούς αστυνομικούς ελέγχους στο αεροδρόμιο των Βρυξελλών, στη βάση εκτιμήσεων κινδύνου, κι αυτό όχι μονάχα με πτήσεις που έρχονται από την Ελλάδα αλλά και από άλλες χώρες μέλη της Ευρωπαϊκής Ένωσης. Το ίδιο πρέπει να σας πω κάνουν κατά καιρούς και οι ελληνικές αρχές, όταν ακριβώς υπάρχει μία εκτίμηση κινδύνου. Αυτό το δικαίωμα το έχουν όλες οι χώρες της Ευρωπαϊκής Ένωσης και κατά καιρούς το ασκούν όταν υπάρχει κάποια ειδοποίηση. Συνεπώς ήταν κάτι που συνέβη μια φορά· δεν έχει συμβεί ενδιάμεσα. Να σας πω ότι κι εγώ ταξιδεύω από την Ελλάδα στο Βέλγιο και δεν αισθάνθηκα ότι υπήρχε κάτι το ιδιαίτερο. Νομίζω ότι ήταν υπερβολική η αντίδραση αλλά σωστά, εν πάση περιπτώσει, έγινε, για να ξεκαθαρίσει και αυτό το θέμα.  Επιτρέψτε μου να σας θυμίσω ότι αυτοί οι αστυνομικοί έλεγχοι δεν γίνονται αυθαίρετα. Προβλέπονται από τον κώδικα συνόρων Σένγκεν και περί αυτού και μόνο πρόκειται. Ειδικά για τη Γαλλία, μιας και έγινε αναφορά πρωτύτερα, θα μου επιτρέψετε να θυμίσω ότι έχει επανεισαγάγει προσωρινούς συνοριακούς ελέγχους όπως και άλλες χώρες. Στην εισαγωγική μου ομιλία εξήγησα πώς έχει η κατάσταση.  Τώρα θα μου επιτρέψετε πάλι να αλλάξω και να μιλήσω στα Αγγλικά, για να απαντήσω σε ερωτήσεις συναδέλφων σας.  I will turn to English to answer some of your questions. One of them was from Ms Fajon. Yes, six Member States are currently carrying out temporary internal border controls in line, as I said before, with the Schengen rules. I welcome that these Member States too share the goal of returning to an area without internal border controls. According to these Member States, the controls are being carried out in a targeted manner and strictly limited to safeguarding public policy or internal security, and the impact on free movement will be limited. The Commission is in close contact with them. My services are finalising the analysis of all letters received and, whenever further clarifications are needed, follow-up letters will be sent. As I said already, internal border controls are an exception used only as a measure of last resort.  It is important now that Member States make progress in the discussions on a proposal to update the Schengen Borders Code to be fit for the current context. Here I want to be crystal clear: the Commission’s objective is and will continue to be to preserve and strengthen the Schengen area as an area without controls at internal borders. I am glad to see that we here share the same objective.  I have also carefully listened to the strong message of Mr Moraes, Chair of the Committee on Civil Liberties, Justice and Home Affairs (LIBE). I would like to qualify him as a guardian of Schengen because he has been advocating and fighting for it from the very first moment. He has been expressing the full support of this House, through the LIBE Committee, for Bulgaria and Romania and Croatia to join Schengen as soon as possible.  Once more, I hope that the Council – because it is now up to the Council to take the final decision – will hear this double call from this room: the call of the Commission and the call of Parliament, and that we will all of us very soon be in the happy position of opening the doors of the European Union to our co-citizens, co-Europeans, of Bulgaria, Romania and Croatia. |  | |  |  |  | |  | | --- | |  | |      |  |  |  |  |  |  | | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | | |  | | --- | | MPphoto |  |  | | --- | |  | |  | **Matti Maasikas,** *President-in-Office of the Council***.** – Mr President, please be reassured that the Presidency has taken good note of all the comments that were made today on this subject, including that of Commissioner Avramopoulos at the end of the debate. I would like to reiterate the Council’s strong determination to carry on with our work until we reach our ultimate goal, which is the preservation and further development of Schengen, including via enlargement, which will be on the Council agenda in the coming months. |  | |  |  |  | |  | | --- | |  | |      |  |  |  |  | | --- | --- | --- | --- | |  |  | **PRESIDENZA DELL'ON. DAVID-MARIA SASSOLI** *Vicepresidente* |  | |  |  |  | |  | | --- | |  | |      |  |  |  |  |  |  | | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | | |  | | --- | | MPphoto |  |  | | --- | |  | |  | **Monica Macovei (ECR).** – Domnule președinte, nu este un „point of order”, este un răspuns, o declarație personală, pentru că numele meu a fost menționat de un coleg din Parlament, domnul deputat PSD Boștinaru și, potrivit Regulamentului de procedură, am dreptul să răspund.  Am fost întrebată de domnul Boștinaru dacă știu ce înseamnă Schengen, că a considerat că nu trebuie să îmi dea lecții și vreau să îi spun că da, știu ce înseamnă Schengen. Am fost raportor al Parlamentului pentru modificarea codului Schengen și am introdus România și Bulgaria între statele care trebuie să asigure frontiera externă a Uniunii Europene, cu drepturi și obligații egale față de celelalte state membre. Deci, am făcut un pas înainte, tocmai pentru aderarea țării mele și a Bulgariei la Schengen, pentru că în raportul inițial al Comisiei nu existau România și Bulgaria.  Dar ce a făcut acest guvern socialist și ALDE în România? Din cele peste 60 de milioane, fonduri alocate pentru componenta „frontieră și control frontiere”, au folosit până acuma sub 10 %. Nu au cumpărat niciun scanner pentru verificarea celor care intră și ies din Uniunea Europeană și pentru protejarea Uniunii împotriva terorismului *(oratorul a fost întrerupt)*. |  | |  |  |  | |  | | --- | |  | |      |  |  |  |  |  |  | | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | | |  | | --- | | MPphoto |  |  | | --- | |  | |  | **Presidente. –** Scusi onorevole, il regolamento Le dà facoltà di respingere le affermazioni che sono state fatte sul Suo conto, non di riaprire il dibattito. Quindi Lei ha smentito le dichiarazioni che Le attribuivano di non conoscere le questioni relative a Schengen e la questione può finire qui. La ringrazio, onorevole.  La discussione è chiusa.  ***Dichiarazioni scritte (articolo 162)*** |  | |  |  |  | |  | | --- | |  | |      |  |  |  |  |  | | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | | |  | | --- | | MPphoto | |  | **Marlene Mizzi (S&D),***in writing***.** – The Schengen area is the largest free travel area in the world and the biggest achievement of the European Union. It has marked a significant step forward for the benefit of people travelling in the enlarged Schengen area with no internal border controls. Romania and Bulgaria have fulfilled all the necessary conditions and have made significant efforts to guarantee the security of the EU’s external borders. It is time to take the necessary steps to enable those countries to finally become full members of the Schengen area in order to make citizens’ lives easier and boost our economies. |  | |  |  |  | |  | | --- | |  | |      |  |  |  |  |  | | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | | |  | | --- | | MPphoto | |  | **Marijana Petir (PPE),***napisan***.** – Pristupanje schengenskom prostoru jedan je od strateških prioriteta Republike Hrvatske kojem se pristupa s velikom ozbiljnošću i predanošću jer hrvatska vanjska granica predstavlja najdužu vanjsku granicu EU-a.  Europska migracijska kriza te problem radikalizacije i vehabijskih naselja koja rastu s druge strane granice, u BiH, čine pitanje proširenja i nužnost ulaska Hrvatske u schengenski prostor neodgodivim i nužnim. Spomenuta naselja služe kao centri za zapošljavanje i osposobljavanje radikaliziranih članova koji su izravna prijetnja europskoj sigurnosti stoga je pojačana kontrola i međusobna suradnja i podrška s ostalim članicama Schengena važan element sigurnosti vanjske granice EU-a s BiH što će ujedno rezultirati i adekvatnim sankcioniranjem i sprečavanjem ilegalnih prelazaka vanjske granice.  Cilj Republike Hrvatske je ostvariti tehničku spremnost tijekom 2018. godine kako bi Vijeće najkasnije početkom 2019., a svakako prije kraja mandata sadašnje Europske komisije, moglo donijeti političku odluku o pristupanju Hrvatske schengenskom prostoru. To bi predstavljalo značajnu odluku i poslalo pozitivnu poruku koja bi išla u prilog ujedinjenoj i snažnoj Europi, jer samo je zajedničkim naporima moguće pružati adekvatnu zaštitu europskim građanima.  Ovim putem izražavam podršku ulasku Bugarske i Rumunjske u schengenski prostor te smatram kako je Europa bez granica jedini put prema jedinstvenoj i sigurnoj Europi. |  | |  |  |  | |  | | --- | |  | |      |  |  |  |  |  | | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | | |  | | --- | | MPphoto | |  | **Kati Piri (S&D),***schriftelijk***.** – Vandaag debatteren wij over het toelaten van Kroatië, Bulgarije en Roemenië tot het Schengengebied. Volgens de Commissie voldoen Bulgarije en Roemenië aan alle gestelde criteria. Als we het hebben over Schengen, hebben we het ook over grenzen. Afgelopen zomer hebben wij meer dan 200 klachten ontvangen over misstanden aan de grens in Bulgarije: lange wachttijden, het moeten betalen van smeergeld en onterechte boetes - het kwam allemaal voorbij. Uit eigen onderzoek is bovendien gebleken dat geen enkele grensambtenaar tot op heden is veroordeeld. Een groot struikelblok hierin vormt de integriteit. Men staat open voor smeergeld, maar is de stap naar georganiseerde misdaad dan niet snel gemaakt? Al met al betekent het dat Bulgarije na tien jaar lidmaatschap nog steeds niet aan de eisen voldoet en er ondanks alle EU-subsidies weinig vooruitgang wordt geboekt. Dat kan niet langer. Het wordt tijd dat het land de corruptie nu eens serieus gaat aanpakken en zich niet langer verschuilt achter schijnoplossingen. |  | |  |  |  | |  | | --- | |  | |      |  |  |  |  |  | | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | | |  | | --- | | MPphoto | |  | **Csaba Sógor (PPE),***írásban***.** – Azt gondolom, hogy a schengeni övezet kibővítését nem lehet tovább halogatni: a Bizottság már leszögezte, hogy Románia és Bulgária készen áll a csatlakozásra és ezek az országok és polgáraik évek óta várják a pozitív döntést az uniós belügyminiszterektől. A két ország igazságszolgáltatási rendszerének uniós monitorizálása semmilyen kapcsolatban nincs a schengeni csatlakozással, az európai jog megsértése, ha ezt a két dolgot összekötik. Megfontolhatná továbbá a Bizottság, hogy a monitoring–jelentéshez hasonló uniós mechanizmust az összeg tagállamra vezessen be, hiszen a tagállamok akkor fogják elfogadni ezt a fajta kontrollt, ha nem tesznek különbséget közöttük és nem érzik azt a kettős mérce megnyilvánulásának. Ezt a fajta monitoring-mechanizmust természetesen nagy körültekintéssel lehetne alkalmazni és működtetni, de ha valóban a polgárok Európájának kialakítását tűzzük ki célul, akkor az EU nem tehet mást. |  | |  |  |  | |  | | --- | |  | |      |  |  |  |  |  | | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | | |  | | --- | | MPphoto | |  | **Claudia Țapardel (S&D),***în scris***.** – În urma eforturilor depuse de România pentru a îndeplini criteriile de aderare la spațiul Schengen, este evident că țara noastră nu mai poate trăi din promisiuni deșarte și trebuie să facă parte din acest spațiu. Așa cum recunosc și Comisia Europeană și PE, de mai bine de șase ani, țara noastră îndeplinește toate criteriile tehnice. Mai mult chiar, România face parte deja și implementează sistemele instituite pentru a gestiona mai bine frontierele externe ale Uniunii, precum Sistemul de Informații Schengen sau Sistemul de Informații privind Vizele. Consider însă că acest statut ambiguu în care România este deopotrivă observator, dar și un participant de facto trebuie să înceteze.  Ar trebui, în schimb, să ne axăm pe consolidarea spațiului Schengen actual și a frontierelor sale externe și să punem mai mult accent pe solidaritate. Refuzul de a extinde spațiul Schengen în România trădează o lipsă de solidaritate și desconsideră angajamentele asumate. Aderarea la Schengen nu este un favor acordat României sau Bulgariei, ci o situație de normalitate și necesitate pentru Europa. Această permanentă amânare nu face altceva decât să aducă gustul amar al nedreptății și să erodeze popularitatea proiectului european și a principiului de egalitate între statele membre. |  | |  |  |  | |  | | --- | |  | |      |  |  |  |  | | --- | --- | --- | --- | | |  | | --- | | MPphoto | |  | **Ivica Tolić (PPE),***napisan***.** – Pristupanje schengenskom prostoru strateški je prioritet Hrvatske. Sve dok to ne postignemo, ne možemo govoriti o jednakopravnosti svih članica Europske unije.  Postupak evaluacije primjene schengenske pravne stečevine u Hrvatskoj se primjenjuje od srpnja 2014. godine. Europskoj komisiji predali smo izjavu o našoj spremnosti za evaluaciju te smo dostavili odgovore na 384 pitanja i prijevode svih relevantnih pravnih akata u kolovozu 2015. godine. Do sada su provedene evaluacije u 6 područja (zaštita podataka, zajednička vizna politika, upravljanje vanjskim granicama, povrat i ponovni prihvat, policijska suradnja i propisi o vatrenom oružju). Za sve uočene nedostatke i preporuke za korektivne mjere, Hrvatska je dostavila akcijske planove za otklanjanje nedostataka te je većina preporuka ispunjena. U okviru schengenskog instrumenta, Hrvatskoj je na raspolaganju bilo 120 milijuna eura, od čega je utrošeno 116,7 milijuna ili 97,33%. Naš cilj je ostvariti tehničku spremnost tijekom 2018. godine, kako bi Vijeće najkasnije početkom 2019. godine moglo donijeti političku odluku o pristupanju Hrvatske schengenskom prostoru.  U tom smislu, cijenjene kolegice i kolege očekujemo i vašu potporu, potporu Europskog parlamenta ovom realnom planu. | |

<https://www.europarl.europa.eu/doceo/document/CRE-8-2017-12-13-ITM-018_EN.html>
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| **Verbatim report of proceedings** |  |
| **Tuesday, 11 December 2018 - Strasbourg** |  |

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| |  |  |  |  |  | | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | | **6.7. Full application of the provisions of the Schengen acquis in Bulgaria and Romania (**[**A8-0365/2018**](https://www.europarl.europa.eu/doceo/document/A-8-2018-0365_EN.html)**- Sergei Stanishev)** | |  |  |  | | --- | --- | --- | |  | [**Video of the speeches**](https://www.europarl.europa.eu/plenary/en/vod.html?mode=chapter&vodLanguage=EN&playerStartTime=20181211-13:26:27&playerEndTime=20181211-13:27:57) |  | |      |  |  |  |  |  | | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | | |  | | --- | |  | |  | **Dichiarazioni di voto orali** |  | |  |  |  | |  | | --- | |  | |      |  |  |  |  |  | | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | | |  | | --- | | MPphoto |  |  | | --- | |  | |  | **Monica Macovei (ECR).** – Domnule președinte, România și Bulgaria trebuie să intre în spațiul Schengen pentru că îndeplinim toate condițiile tehnice pentru a face parte, și formal, din acest spațiu. În realitate, noi suntem în Schengen, chiar prin regulamentul Schengen de apărare a granițelor din țările Schengen am introdus România și Bulgaria. Deci, repet, în realitate noi apărăm granițele Uniunii Europene.  De aceea, trebuie să ducem până la capăt această realitate și să o și formalizăm. De altfel, președintele Juncker a declarat, în mai multe rânduri, că și-a propus ca cele două țări să intre în spațiul Schengen până la finalul mandatului său, care se încheie anul viitor. De asemenea, e foarte important acest aspect: nu trebuie legată intrarea în Schengen de Mecanismul de Cooperare și Verificare. Acest mecanism trebuie să continue până când toate criteriile și toate condiționalitățile, atât pentru România, cât și pentru Bulgaria, sunt, în mod real, îndeplinite, pentru că mecanismul este pentru oameni. Oamenii nu vor corupție, oamenii vor justiție și așa mai departe, tot ceea ce se prevede acolo. | |

<https://www.europarl.europa.eu/doceo/document/CRE-8-2018-12-11-ITM-006-07_EN.html>
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| **Verbatim report of proceedings** |  |
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|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| |  |  |  |  |  | | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | | **14.7. Annual Report on the functioning of the Schengen area (**[**A8-0160/2018**](https://www.europarl.europa.eu/doceo/document/A-8-2018-0160_EN.html)**- Carlos Coelho)** | |  |  |  | | --- | --- | --- | |  | [**Video of the speeches**](https://www.europarl.europa.eu/plenary/en/vod.html?mode=chapter&vodLanguage=EN&playerStartTime=20180530-14:21:59&playerEndTime=20180530-14:28:07) |  | |      |  |  |  |  |  | | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | | |  | | --- | |  | |  | **Dichiarazioni di voto orali** |  | |  |  |  | |  | | --- | |  | |      |  |  |  |  |  |  | | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | | |  | | --- | | MPphoto |  |  | | --- | |  | |  | **Monica Macovei (ECR).** – Domnule președinte, am adus România și Bulgaria mult mai aproape de Schengen. Ele pot acum să folosească informațiile introduse de alte state membre în baza de date Schengen și, de asemenea, toate statele membre pot vedea informațiile introduse de România și Bulgaria în această bază de informații. Ca atare, vor putea colabora perfect și în timp real. Când ai informații, ai știință, ai putere și poți să previi terorismul, migrația ilegală, criminalitatea transfrontalieră. De asemenea, poți să-i identifici și să-i prinzi pe cei care se pregătesc să comită astfel de infracțiuni sau pe cei care deja le-au comis și se plimbă dintr-o țară în alta sau, în fine, se ascund pe undeva.  Aplicarea acestor lucruri, care sunt deja în lege, stau în viziunea, în știința, în capacitatea politică a conducătorilor, a politicienilor care ne conduc și a instituțiilor judiciare, polițienești, de frontieră și așa mai departe. Nu mai avem nici o secundă de pierdut. |  | |  |  |  | |  | | --- | |  | |      |  |  |  |  |  |  | | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | | |  | | --- | | MPphoto |  |  | | --- | |  | |  | **Petras Auštrevičius (ALDE).** – Mr President, to begin with, I want to emphasise that the Schengen agreement is a fundamental part of the European Union’s project, and the benefits it brings to the citizens’ daily lives and businesses are undeniable. However, during recent years, due to the ongoing migration crisis and influx of unregulated migrants caused by the failure to protect common external borders, the Schengen area experienced serious challenges, including some Member States even changing their legislation. I believe that this is very alarming, and we need to guarantee the free movement of people and services, as this comprises a crucial part of European Union.  I fully support the rapporteur’s call on the Member States to swiftly implement the Commission’s roadmap on bringing back the Schengen. |  | |  |  |  | |  | | --- | |  | |      |  |  |  |  |  |  | | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | | |  | | --- | | MPphoto |  |  | | --- | |  | |  | **Diane James (NI).** – Mr President, I did not support the adoption of this report. It is the duty of every sovereign nation to keep its borders safe and intact and to ensure the safety of its people. The Schengen agreement has undermined this principle fundamentally, and if I could change a key sentence in the report, it would actually say that the Schengen agreement has been one of the greatest failures of the European Union, not an achievement.  The enormous number of migrants who have been able to vanish within the Schengen area has actually led to one of the most significant threats to the European continent, and by reintroducing border controls, certain Member States have been able to fulfil their primary duty to help keep their people safe. The United Kingdom never signed up to Schengen, and with very good reason, and we will continue to support those countries who assert their right to say who can, and who cannot, cross their borders. |  | |  |  |  | |  | | --- | |  | |      |  |  |  |  |  |  | | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | | |  | | --- | | MPphoto |  |  | | --- | |  | |  | **Νότης Μαριάς (ECR).** – Κύριε Πρόεδρε, η λειτουργία της Συνθήκης Σένγκεν έχει αποτύχει πλήρως. Η Γερμανία, η Γαλλία, η Αυστρία, η Δανία και το Βέλγιο έχουν επαναφέρει τους εσωτερικούς ελέγχους. Στα γερμανικά αεροδρόμια και στο αεροδρόμιο των Βρυξελλών επιβάλλεται καραντίνα σε όσους επιβάτες προέρχονται από αεροπορικές πτήσεις από την Ελλάδα. Μάλιστα, υπάρχει και πλήρης νομιμοποίηση από την Επιτροπή, μια και στις συνεχείς διαμαρτυρίες μας και στις ερωτήσεις που έχουμε υποβάλει η Επιτροπή θεωρεί ότι αυτό είναι μια δήθεν νόμιμη διαδικασία. Για ποια λειτουργία της Σένγκεν μιλούμε; Ακόμη και εδώ στο Στρασβούργο, επί τρία χρόνια, όλοι, ακόμη και οι ευρωβουλευτές, υποβάλλονται σε έλεγχο διαβατηρίων. Αποδεικνύεται, λοιπόν, πλήρης η αποτυχία της λειτουργίας της Σένγκεν. Ταυτόχρονα, η περίφημη Frontex δεν κάνει τίποτε. Τα νησιά του Αιγαίου έχουν γεμίσει από προσφυγές και παράνομους μετανάστες και η Frontex απλά παρακολουθεί. Βρίσκεται εκεί με όλες της τις δυνάμεις. Δεκαεξίμιση χιλιάδες είναι αυτή τη στιγμή οι πρόσφυγες και οι παράνομοι μετανάστες στα νησιά του Αιγαίου. Δεν αντέχουν άλλο τα νησιά του Αιγαίου |  | |  |  |  | |  | | --- | |  | |      |  |  |  |  |  | | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | | |  | | --- | | MPphoto |  |  | | --- | |  | |  | **Marek Jurek (ECR).** – Zasadniczym, a w istocie rzeczy jedynym źródłem kryzysu systemu Schengen – systemu otwartych granic – jest nielegalna imigracja. To sprawozdanie zamiast mówić o tym wyraźnie, postuluje po pierwsze starą już ideę, powtarzaną przez Komisję Europejską, tj. legalizację nielegalnej imigracji, a co więcej, niestety w tym sprawozdaniu znalazły się tak kuriozalne sformułowania, jak branie określenia „nielegalna imigracja” w cudzysłów albo mówienie o „tak zwanej nielegalnej imigracji”. No jak można kwestionować jej nielegalny charakter, a jednocześnie opowiadać bez przerwy o rządach prawa?  Ochrona granic jest obowiązkiem wszystkich państw, obowiązkiem potrójnym: wobec własnych obywateli, wobec prawa, które to nakazuje, ale również – jeżeli chodzi o zewnętrzne granice Unii – wobec naszych zgodnych ustaleń. I pora najwyższa, żeby to władze Unii Europejskiej zaczęły prawo Unii szanować. | |

<https://www.europarl.europa.eu/doceo/document/CRE-8-2018-05-30-ITM-014-07_EN.html>