

THE LINK - LE LIEN

BULLETIN U4U - FEBRUARY 2019 N°69

SUMMARY

- ▶ U4U at your service: Conferences and Proximity meetings
- ▶ Let's improve staff representation at the Commission
- ▶ EASA: where we are, one year after the agreement on social dialogue
- ▶ U4U proposes the in-sourcing of canteens
- ▶ Brexit: Update on the fate of British staff
- ▶ School year 2019: no outdoor childcare on 2-3 September 2019
- ▶ Overcrowding at European Schools is such that there is fear of not being able to ensure the next school year
- ▶ Children with special needs: are the European schools doing enough?
- ▶ European citizenship, at the heart of democracy
- ▶ La citoyenneté européenne, au cœur de la démocratie
- ▶ Resident in Belgium? How to vote for the European Parliament on 26 May 2019?

WWW.U4UNITY.EU



U4U at your service: Conferences and Proximity meetings

U4U organizes conferences and proximity meetings with a clear and transparent objective of informing the staff from all EU Institutions about their statutory rights, the different scenarios available for implementing them and of the economic consequences of many individual choices.

We have brought to Luxembourg, to Strasbourg, to Grange, to EUIPO in Alicante, to F4E in Barcelona and to Brussels (EEAS, Beaulieu site, Genève site, AGRI, RTD, OLAF, EAC,...) a series of conferences and events where the staff has been duly informed on the general legal framework applicable to our statutory rights. Moreover, we shared practical procedures, best practices and individual advices steaming from our experience in advocating for staff before the PMO, the HR and other instances in the Commission, European Parliament, Council and the EU bodies and Agencies. We have already covered important subjects for many colleagues such as the evaluation and appraisal procedures, the retirement pension, the unemployment benefits, Brexit, disciplinary procedures, internal competitions, medical care and JSIS, the rights of contractual agents...

More than 1000 colleagues have already attended these information sessions since January 2019 and had the opportunity to raise their questions on the spot or bilaterally after the general session. Our way of working is different : We do not read the staff regulation to the attendance, we do not bump 100 slides presentations and we do not promise anything. We just share the experience of hundreds of procedures handled, including (pre)litigation and try to find concrete solutions. Therefore, don't hesitate to contact us if you think that such events should be organized in your services and which thematic could be interesting.

Let's improve staff representation at the Commission

Negotiations on this subject are in progress. If they are successful, staff representation and social dialogue will come out stronger. U4U opts for a single staff committee for the entire Commission elected at the same time as its local sections, with the same electoral rules: we recommend the proportional system. These elections are organised on the basis of electoral colleges representing the different workplaces. It is also necessary for these workplaces to be represented, as in the case of Seville, which is not presently represented. Some rebalancing between locations will also be required. Brussels will therefore need to be better represented.

This will enable the staff committee to start work immediately, which is not the case with the current system. For information purposes, it should be noted that three months after the last elections for the Brussels and non-EU staff committees, neither the Brussels nor the non-EU staff committees had been fully established, nor had the Central Staff Committee team, made up of members of different local committees.

The changes we have proposed are necessary for things to function correctly.

U4U at EASA

EASA, the European Aviation Safety Agency, is based in Cologne/Germany. With around 800 staff, we are one of the biggest European Union agencies. EASA's main task is to ensure safety and environmental protection in civil aviation in Europe. On 12 January 2018, after a few months of negotiations, U4U and EASA Management have signed a Framework Agreement that formalises social dialogue in EASA. Since then U4U@EASA has constantly grown. Our Secretariat now consists of nine colleagues, representing a good combination of EASA employees with respect to gender, age and grade. Also the number of U4U@EASA members is continuously increasing.

Based on the Framework Agreement, U4U@EASA has negotiated the conditions for the exercise of trade union rights with EASA management. Essential basic support tools, such as a functional EASA mailbox, a site on the intranet, the use of office IT hardware (printers, copy machines, etc.) and meeting rooms for trade union work, 4 hours working time per week to be used for trade union work, a budget for missions, etc. On top of that we also have the administrative support of the "Assistant to Social Partners". Beginning of September we had a first All-Staff-Meeting which attracted more than 100 colleagues. Topics such as reclassification issues, Brexit, feedback from recent meetings with HR, U4U@EASA Work Programme 2019, equal opportunities were presented and discussed.

In the past months U4U@EASA has been mainly dealing with reclassification issues and individual cases. The reclassification exercise 2018 has resulted in a relatively high number of staff questioning for example the pace of reclassification, despite appropriate managerial assessments in every appraisal received. The discontent has been regularly increasing to a level which is difficult to sustain. U4U@EASA supports their members to make sure that all processes are followed properly and is together with HR discussing the best way forward. More and more U4U@EASA is also being invited to participate in internal working groups and task forces, such as for reclassification or gender equality.

For the U4U@EASA Work Programme 2019 our proposed main topics will be reclassification, Brexit, equal opportunities and resource management in the light of the new Basic Regulation. The Work Programme will be discussed with HR and EASA management and agreed upon before the end of 2018. As U4U@EASA our main goals are to promote and maintain a healthy working environment at EASA and to make sure changes are negotiated rather than imposed.

Canteens: when will they be insourced?

The contract for operating the canteens and cafeterias in the Commission's buildings in Brussels is about to expire and

will probably have been the most complicated contract to manage in the entire history of sub-contracting the Brussels canteens.

The experience has proved disappointing, if not downright awful. The outsourcing to three different service providers did not live up to expectations, especially with regard to healthy competition between them to guarantee us the best service at the lowest price.

In fact, the sheer number of representatives proved to be a real headache for the management of contracts and was of no benefit to staff:

- ▶ the competition between canteens did not improve the supply nor the prices
- ▶ the feeble advances of the specifications in terms of healthier food could not overcome the financial constraints
- ▶ the service was not suited to our needs, which were constrained by the financial realities of the service providers
- ▶ the canteens experienced constant periods of strike and instability, all of which were related to working conditions and salaries of employees of the service providers
- ▶ the OIB's workload tripled without a corresponding increase in its resources
- ▶ the list of problems is long and far from exhaustive

In addition, between 2012, the year of the previous call for tenders, and today, the sociology of our population has changed significantly. There have been a number of moves and building closures, the working hours have got longer, and teleworking has become more widespread, influencing the use and profitability of the canteens and making their management more complex. Furthermore, a growing number of us want a sustainable, healthy and ethical diet. It is a shame that the EU's policies on this subject are not translated into action when we ourselves become involved in contract catering.

The service therefore did not deliver on its expectations nor on its challenges. And with the failed gamble of this three-way outsourcing, let's not forget the disaster that is the restaurant. The Commission is the largest institution in Brussels, receiving guests from around the world, and yet it does not have a restaurant. On the basis of these findings, the OIB is preparing a new call for tenders. However, the paradigm remains that of sub-contracting a service that is essential for our well-being at work and for our health.

In U4U's opinion, the solution lies in the insourcing of canteens. Previously, the canteens and restaurants belonged to the Commission. They did not exist to remunerate shareholders;

it was enough for them to achieve a balance. The discounts offered by wholesalers on the quantities purchased benefited the economy of the internalised canteens (rather than the capital of service providers) and influenced prices, which could remain favourable without affecting quality. We were therefore being offered a good service.

A flexible management, as close as possible to the end consumer, can take the sociology of each location and the practices of the General Directorates into account, and can therefore continuously adapt itself as appropriate.

The current situation proves that it is necessary to regain control of the canteens in order to attain a level of flexibility that a contract simply cannot offer, due to the fact that the slightest change to a call for tenders results in a time and energy consuming amendment. A contract is a straitjacket, rigid and unsuited to rapid change. Three contracts simply triple the difficulty. Direct management also allows for a new pricing policy and takes account of the purchasing power of trainees, for example, and that of certain categories of agents and officials. Many public canteens in other Member States innovate in this matter by implementing flexible pricing schemes.

This is certainly not a time for recruitment, but a time for imagination. Solutions do exist and inspiration can be taken from the practices of the OIL (in Luxembourg), which manages its local canteens and employs its cooks, but subcontracts some of the kitchen and serving staff. The infrastructure exists in and belongs to the Commission, whether it owns the premises or leases them. The OIB has the experience and skills to do everything just as well as the OIL. Freed from the tasks of contract supervision, controls and triple audits, the OIB could devote its resources to direct management. There is therefore no objective obstacle to such a solution. U4U has advocated for this change for years. Through our patient work raising awareness on the health and environmental issues related to nutrition and responsible consumption, U4U has made OIB managers aware of the need to develop our canteens and purchases and increased awareness of the "Good Food" label, developed in the Brussels Region.

With more than 7,000 meals served daily, the Commission is one of the most influential stakeholders in the Brussels region. Its behaviour as a consumer of foodstuffs therefore has a considerable influence on supply and, finally, on production. Better control of our food consumption today means prioritising organic, local and in-season food items and sustainable fishing, for example. It also means re-evaluating our dietary needs, our consumption of meat, sugar, salt, fats and dairy products, and taking on board a series of preventive health recommendations, such as promoting "veggie" Thursdays. Being part of a Brussels-based approach means establishing ourselves as responsible and concerned guests of the land that welcomes us to live and work.

U4U has already written extensively about the failure of the division of canteens and cafeterias that should have put the 3 service providers selected in a situation of mutual

competition and thus guarantee us the best quality at the cheapest price, a principle that causes substantial social damage. This strategy has failed and the service has not improved overall. All you have to do is visit our neighbours at the European Parliament, the EEAS or the CESE/CDR to realise that we are the least well fed. Also, the only ones to have experienced repeated strikes, which are related at least in part to the current sub-contracting model. Particular care must be taken when establishing the canteen service for our crèches and childcare centres.

What's happening with Brexit?

The Commission adopted a position that was in line with our own from the outset. For the most part, the workforce, both officials and temporary staff, remains in place. This position is favourable for British staff and for the Civil Service as a whole, whose Staff Regulations have been strengthened by this experience. The English-speaking sections are being maintained at the European Schools. The low number of British teachers leaving (53) means that they can easily be replaced. A few hints on BREXIT for EU Staff British nationals with no other EU nationality:

- ▶ The AIPN will not make use of art 49 of the Staff Regulations on 'compulsory resignation' and British civil servants will continue to hold their post. They will no longer be employed in Delegations after UK withdrawal (on 30/03/2019 in case of no deal or end of transition period). They will be transferred to headquarters by September 2019. Contract agents will then serve in headquarters for a maximum of 4 years. British Seconded National Experts or seconded Temporary Agents will return back to the UK on the date of the withdrawal. The process to grant exceptions will use precise and transparent criteria and there will be a right to be heard. The process will last at least 3 months
- ▶ Temporary or contract agents also can no longer be employed by the EU after UK withdrawal, but current contracts will continue and not be renewed
- ▶ Acquired pension rights are valid and costs will be borne by the EU budget. British staff are covered by the sickness insurance as long as they are contributors. Only active employees are covered by accident insurance
- ▶ Persons not under the Staff Regulations (Commissioner, MEP, CJUE judges...) will be dismissed. Parliamentary assistants to British MEPs will leave, whatever their nationality and duration of contract

For European schools, with the withdrawal agreement, UK stays until the end of the school year that is ongoing at the end of the transition period. UK shall recognize the European Bac for pupils graduated before 31/08/2021. Without a deal, seconded teachers will leave when the UK ceases to be a party of the EE Convention (31 August 2020). Contracts will still be valid for locally recruited.

School year 2019: no outdoor childcare on 2-3 September 2019

In its note of 5 February, the OIB informed parents that there would be no outdoor childcare service on Monday 2 and Tuesday 3 September 2019. U4U believes that this decision, taken unilaterally and without consultation, will have a negative impact not only on colleagues who will have to find a childcare solution despite the fact that there is no such offer on the Belgian market for these two dates, but also on the services.

It is obvious that a number of staff will be obliged to take leave on these dates in the absence of alternative solutions. In this context, it is important to emphasise the social mission of open-air childcare, which should provide a solution for colleagues whose annual leave does not cover days on which schools are closed in order to enable them to carry out their professional activities. It is also important that some trade unions, like the OIB services, not only see to the expectations of the staff at childcare centres and crèches but also to the users of these services, who are also members of staff.

U4U therefore hopes that a social dialogue meeting will be held as soon as possible with the aim of finding a solution that would meet the needs of colleagues, and therefore of their services, as well as the needs of staff working at the childcare centres.

Our union wrote to the DG HR as follows: U4U letter re school year 2019: no outdoor childcare on 2-3 September 2019 (page 6)

Panic in the European Schools of Brussels

The overpopulation of the European Schools is such that it may no longer be possible to guarantee all the desired places for the next school year. The Board of Governors and the Belgian authorities are procrastinating. U4U has sounded the alarm and proposes immediate action. At its meeting in December 2018, the Board of Governors noted that the Brussels Schools were operating above their capacity and that soon they would no longer be able to accommodate a sufficient intake of new pupils. The project for a fifth school is making slow progress: it is planned to occupy the Boulevard Léopold III, the military land released by NATO, to open a school for 2,400 pupils in 2024. However, a concrete and budgeted project is yet to be defined.

To cope with this crisis, the Board of Governors proposes that Berkendael should be permanently allocated to the European Schools (which will not solve anything as the premises will be filled quickly, and the transition of the pupils to this site for the secondary cycle poses insurmountable difficulties due to the lack of space), and to occupy a site in the rue du Commerce (Arts-Loi district), an office site totally unsuitable for a school, even dedicated to children in the final secondary cycle. The plan is, in September 2020, to transfer all of the S6 and S7 Secondary classes of the Brussels schools II and III to this site, i.e. a thousand children. The feasibility of such a geographical split between the two schools has not

been considered, particularly for its impact on school schedules, nor has the ability of this site to meet the needs of a secondary school. The Commission must not sign the MoU proposed by the Belgian authorities before these feasibility studies are performed, and before meeting parent and staff representatives.

The Régie des Bâtiments dismisses the possibility of a temporary site of prefabricated buildings on the military site, estimating that the cost of this would be equal to that of a permanent structure and arguing that it would take at least three years to build. These two arguments are open to question and merit an independent evaluation.

U4U recommends:

- ▶ 1. That a temporary prefabricated school is made available to the European Schools within 18 months, which could partially occupy the Boulevard Léopold III site, while waiting for a permanent school to be built there, provided there are hygiene and safety guarantees for the pupils during the work
- ▶ 2. That the project for a permanent fifth Boulevard Léopold III school is launched immediately and budgeted, with the objective of opening in five years
- ▶ 3. That in view of the fact that this fifth school will be full as soon as it opens (as were Ixelles and Laeken at the same time), the project for a sixth school should be launched, for example on the Josaphat site, with the objective of opening Brussels VI in ten years

U4U notes that the Board of Governors must also tackle similar situations where there is a capacity crisis, for example at the Centre for European Schooling Dunshaughlin (IRL). The Board of Governors must take very seriously its task of supporting and maintaining European education (including the associated schools) and must therefore take all necessary steps to ensure that there are always sufficient places available with this objective in mind.

It should not be forgotten that access to the European Schools is a key element of the social package of EU officials and agents that forms part of the job attractiveness of the European Civil Service. At a time when the Commission is wondering how to rebuild this attractiveness, school access must be preserved, although it has already been compromised as almost half of new pupils in Brussels do not enrol with them due to the chronic overpopulation at the European Schools, as well as the deteriorating quality of the facilities and the teaching, an inevitable consequence of the restrictive budgetary policies of recent years. The Board of Governors must allocate sufficient financial resources to the existing schools to guarantee a high-quality education.

“Sink or swim” report:

The obstacles encountered by disabled children in the European Schools system, published by Human Rights Watch and the European Disability Forum

This report is still to be contextualised. Numerous children with disabilities successfully attend our European Schools. We even have blind children who manage very well. This report gives us an overview of the limited capacity of our schools to overcome difficult situations. The report as a whole is not negative and recognises the efforts already made. You can see here the actions undertaken to educate children with special needs. It is of course always possible to do better and, at its meeting in December 2018, the Board of Governors decided to establish an “action plan” to increase current capacities and find additional budgetary resources. That said, the ES are “generic” schools whose main aim is to help the children pass their European BAC, and they will never be in a position to deal with situations that require a highly specialised education. It would be an exaggeration to say that the ES can now and will always be able to cover all disabilities and would probably be against the wider interests of disabled children who require an alternative education.

The recommendation of the United Nations, which advocates for all disabilities, is aimed at governments, which have hundreds of schools (for example, the Brussels region has 602 primary schools) and can if necessary create more specialist schools or adapt existing schools to allow for the co-education of children with varying levels of disability and non-disabled children. This recommendation is not aimed at an isolated group of 13 schools spread across the entire EU. As regards the higher cost of specialist education, there are real financial problems for the families concerned, and the solution must be found at a Budget level.

And finally, it is true that the brutal austerity to which the European Schools have been subjected has not helped. The schools must urgently be provided with the means to operate effectively.

European citizenship, at the heart of democracy

The European Citizens 'Platform (ECP) of which U4U is one of the founders organizes citizens' debates, the last on the theme “European citizenship at the heart of European democracy”. Here is the verbatim. Next citizen meeting: 5 March at 12 noon on the theme: “Migration, which crisis?”

La citoyenneté européenne, au cœur de la démocratie

U4U a créé il y a deux ans avec d'autres associations européennes une Plateforme citoyenne européenne (PCE) permettant d'organiser des rassemblements pro-européens, des événements culturels, des débats citoyens. Le 5 février dernier une première rencontre citoyenne a été organisée sur le thème “La citoyenneté européenne au cœur de la démocratie européenne”. En voici le verbatim qui traduit un débat vif mais qui n'a pas encore cristallisé des réponses. La rencontre citoyenne suivante se tiendra le 5 mars à 12 heures sur le thème : “Migration, quelle crise”? Le 5 février, au PressClub, la plateforme ECP organisait une rencontre citoyenne sur

« La citoyenneté au cœur de la démocratie européenne ». Ceci, dans le cadre des consultations citoyennes sur l'avenir de l'Union européenne organisées jusqu'aux élections au Parlement européen fin mai 2019.

Une première intervention souligne que le droit de vote local et européen des citoyens européens n'est pas aligné sur la structure européenne : les Européens élisent les membres du Parlement européen et les instances locales mais pas les membres du Conseil ou du Conseil européen (qui sont des ministres nationaux ou des chefs d'Etat). Les espaces démocratiques ne dialoguent pas entre eux et la sphère publique dans l'UE est fragmentée. Cela peut expliquer que peu de gens prennent part aux élections européennes. Un participant belge rappelle que l'abstention est un acte significatif : il faut la prendre en compte, c'est un indicateur. Un autre relève l'inégalité des droits électoraux en Europe : parfois le vote est obligatoire (Grèce, Belgique), parfois non ; les règles varient notamment pour les expatriés et les non nationaux ; les règlements électoraux eux aussi différent. Les citoyens mobiles ne savent pas où ils peuvent voter.

Un autre fait valoir que le vote est souvent ignoré et que cela convainc beaucoup de gens que voter ne sert à rien. Delors voulait l'Europe monétaire et l'Europe sociale, on a eu la première mais pas la seconde. Après l'échec du Traité constitutionnel, on l'a remplacé par le traité de Lisbonne (adopté par les parlements, pas les peuples). Les gens se sont dit que l'élite avait son programme et qu'on ne pouvait rien changer. Puis il y a eu la crise financière : on a sauvé l'euro mais le dégât sur les personnes a été catastrophique dans plusieurs pays. 3,5 millions de personnes se sont exprimés contre le TTIP : où en est-on aujourd'hui ?

D'autres avancent que la controverse n'est pas anti-démocratique, au contraire il faut l'accueillir. Un participant estime que le débat sur le TTIP a été pris en otage par les dirigeants wallons qui faisaient campagne locale et qui ont surfé sur la résistance à l'Europe. D'autres estiment qu'il faut réagir à la révolte des gilets jaunes et même au Brexit et ramener les gens à l'Europe. Un participant remarque que l'acquis européen aujourd'hui va de soi : les dirigeants actuels n'ont plus de lien avec le projet historique et sont incapables de l'expliquer/de l'assumer. Dans les années 90, le projet était de faire l'euro et de l'accompagner d'une Europe sociale mais cette dernière a été oubliée. Et donc, les gens et les jeunes sont devenus cyniques. Une question se pose: qui bloque, la technocratie ou les Etats membres ? Qui a bloqué le social au Royaume Uni ? Pourquoi T. Piketty veut-il renforcer les parlements nationaux comme s'ils étaient plus légitimes que le Parlement européen. On occulte les causes des blocages : on a divisé les Européens entre nouvelle et vieille Europe, sans qu'on s'y soit opposé. Un participant avance que la citoyenneté européenne manque de visibilité : c'est un problème de sensibilisation. HK reconnaît la complexité des questions européennes, fort éloignées des problèmes quotidiens (les questions de consommateurs par exemple), mais il observe aussi que les dirigeants nationaux font peu de chose pour remédier au manque de connaissance : ils sont dans une situation de conflit d'intérêts

en tant que décideurs européens qui n'ont de compte à rendre à personne au niveau européen.

Un participant mentionne la « lasagne institutionnelle » en Belgique : l'Europe n'a pas le monopole de la complexité. Il faut sensibiliser, pas seulement communiquer. Quelqu'un rappelle qu'en Belgique, on tient trois scrutins en même temps, en faisant le calcul que l'électeur qui vote aux régionales, au fédéral votera pour la même tendance au niveau européen. Suzan opine : trop lier les élections nationales et européennes c'est condamner ces dernières à l'invisibilité.

Le manque de connaissance des questions européennes génère la suspicion et le manque de confiance. Même si les Européens ont des valeurs et une culture communes, les vécus varient : la perception de l'euro n'est pas la même en Allemagne et en Grèce. L'opinion publique reste fragmentée car il n'y a pas d'espace politique paneuropéen et que par ailleurs, on n'explique pas que l'Europe protège. Mais ajoute un participant, l'adhésion à l'Union européenne est majoritaire. On souligne que l'hétérogénéité des lois électorales empêche l'émergence de partis transnationaux et l'expression démocratique européenne, ce qu'un parti comme VOLT essaie de corriger en présentant des listes dans tous les Etats membres. Par ailleurs, le fait que le Parlement européen n'ait pas le droit d'initiative est aussi un frein, (même si rien n'empêche de faire des listes transnationales dans chaque pays). Cette dernière remarque ne convainc pas : le triangle institutionnel (une Commission qui propose, un Parlement et un Conseil des Etats qui font les lois ensemble et à égalité) respecte la séparation des pouvoirs en outre, le Parlement européen demande à la Commission de présenter certaines initiatives.

Une autre rappelle qu'on ne peut pas parler seulement d'institutions : il faut aborder la question des valeurs, de la confiance et du sentiment d'appartenance. Par ailleurs, tout citoyen européen peut être candidat mais cela est peu connu. Aujourd'hui, on observe une montée d'intérêt pour faire campagne dans un autre pays (notamment parmi les citoyens britanniques) et cela coexiste avec la montée de l'euroscpticisme. Elle interroge : êtes-vous prêts à faire campagne ?

Quelqu'un rappelle que la Commission Delors a pu jouer son rôle parce qu'il y avait un accord politique entre Etats membres ce qui a permis que la Commission puisse jouer réellement son rôle pour promouvoir l'intérêt général européen.. Ce n'est plus le cas aujourd'hui et les instances dominantes ne sont pas forcément démocratiques (l'eurogroupe par exemple). En l'absence d'accord, comment l'UE peut-elle répondre à l'urgence sociale et aux questions qui sont européennes (emploi, éducation supérieur, énergie, environnement, etc.) ? C'est là qu'il faut se mobiliser. Une participante signale une plateforme (« I am a Federalist ») qui promeut les candidats pro-européens. Les pro Européens sont dispersés, là où les populistes s'organisent. Il faut collaborer. On rappelle que la Plateforme citoyenne se donne justement cet objectif : c'est une structure sans financement majeur, qui n'est pas destinée à être permanente mais qui vise à faciliter le regroupement des forces en vue des élections de mai 2019. L'objectif est bien de collaborer.

On revient aussi sur le fait que les populistes prennent en otage le débat citoyen et le coince dans des espaces renationalisés, en faisant miroiter que le salut est dans le chacun pour soi. Quelles solutions peut-on trouver pour contourner cette difficulté? Une participante mentionne le besoin d'éduquer à l'Europe et signale l'initiative Retour à l'école. Une autre relève que l'éducation civique à l'Europe n'est pas même disponible dans les Ecoles européennes. La presse ne parle pas des élections européennes et les élites ne communiquent pas. Un participant nuance : à la télévision française (FR2), on a présenté les têtes de listes (françaises) aux Européennes et il souligne que Macron a osé parler de souveraineté européenne.

Quelqu'un critique l'idée de candidatures connues pour les élections européennes : reprendre les mêmes ne mènera nulle part ! On note aussi que 70 000 personnes ont manifesté pour le climat, la mobilisation pour les GAFAs a été forte. Il faut dire que ce sont des sujets pour l'Europe qui a la capacité d'une réponse pour le Continent. Il faut aussi sans doute dépasser les clivages idéologiques du passé. Il faut croire en l'éducation civique mais à la mobilisation citoyenne: les gens savent que la mondialisation les dessert et qu'ils sont enfermés dans leur territoire. Tout le monde comprend quand on parle de solidarité pour le climat, la migration, l'énergie...

Une intervenante observe qu'on ne peut être ambigu (ne pas se fâcher avec Orban) sans perdre en crédibilité. Une autre demande de la cohérence : on ne peut donner d'une main et reprendre de l'autre. Les citoyens comprennent tout à fait les enjeux.

On mentionne aussi les Brexiteers, en particulier les Gallois qui vont perdre les financements européens dont ils ont largement bénéficié. Il faut sans doute aller au-delà du vote pour défaire les campagnes mensongères comme celles qui ont été menées au Royaume Uni. On rappelle que, l'opinion pro-européenne s'est affirmée dans les autres pays. Il faut profiter de ce rebond. Par ailleurs il faut dire aussi ce que l'Europe ne peut pas faire (le social par exemple, qui est à l'unanimité, un seul pays peut tout bloquer) et clarifier les responsabilités entre le niveau national et le niveau européen.

Il est rappelé que le Royaume Uni n'a pas voulu de dérogation à la libre circulation des travailleurs. Son est donc largement la cause du sentiment anti migrant qui s'est développé en Angleterre. Le problème a été une libéralisation forcée qui a été menée sans accompagnement social. Par ailleurs, il ne faut pas dramatiser le Brexit: nous savons ce que nous voulons être, laissons partir ceux qui veulent et avançons sans eux.

On opine : oui, nous voulons une « économie sociale de marché ». Enfin, il est proposé propose que les citoyens fassent pression pour réintroduire les valeurs (sociales, environnementales) dans l'agenda européen. Plusieurs propositions sont avancées : organiser une Marche pour la citoyenneté européenne, par exemple lors de la journée Portes ouvertes le 4 mai et répéter ainsi la mobilisation qui avait eu lieu lors du 60e anniversaire du Traité. Favoriser un mouvement euro citoyen avec 3-4 messages-clés.

Resident in Belgium? How to vote for the European Parliament on 26 May 2019?

Rules for registering on the special list of electors:



WWW.U4UNITY.EU

