Amtsblatt der Europäischen Union

C 240

Ausgabe in deutscher Sprache

Mitteilungen und Bekanntmachungen

66. Jahrgang

6. Juli 2023

Inhalt

IV *Informationen*

INFORMATIONEN DER ORGANE, EINRICHTUNGEN UND SONSTIGEN STELLEN DER EUROPÄISCHEN UNION

Europäisches Parlament

SITZUNGSPERIODE 2022-2023

Sitzungen vom 21. bis 24. November 2022

2023/C 240/01 Ausführliche Sitzungsberichte vom 21. November 2022 1

2023/C 240/02 Ausführliche Sitzungsberichte vom 22. November 2022 62

2023/C 240/03 Ausführliche Sitzungsberichte vom 23. November 2022 199

2023/C 240/04 Ausführliche Sitzungsberichte vom 24. November 2022 346

DE

Legende der verwendeten Zeichen

*	Konsultationsverfahren
***	Zustimmungsverfahren
***I	Ordentliches Gesetzgebungsverfahren, erste Lesung
***II	Ordentliches Gesetzgebungsverfahren, zweite Lesung
***III	Ordentliches Gesetzgebungsverfahren, dritte Lesung

(Das angegebene Verfahren entspricht der von der Kommission vorgeschlagenen Rechtsgrundlage.)

Abkürzungen der Ausschüsse

AFET	Ausschuss für auswärtige Angelegenheiten
DEVE	Entwicklungsausschuss
INTA	Ausschuss für internationalen Handel
BUDG	Haushaltsausschuss
CONT	Haushaltskontrollausschuss
ECON	Ausschuss für Wirtschaft und Währung
EMPL	Ausschuss für Beschäftigung und soziale Angelegenheiten
ENVI	Ausschuss für Umweltfragen, öffentliche Gesundheit und Lebensmittelsicherheit
ITRE	Ausschuss für Industrie, Forschung und Energie
IMCO	Ausschuss für Binnenmarkt und Verbraucherschutz
TRAN	Ausschuss für Verkehr und Fremdenverkehr
REGI	Ausschuss für regionale Entwicklung
AGRI	Ausschuss für Landwirtschaft und ländliche Entwicklung
PECH	Fischereiausschuss
CULT	Ausschuss für Kultur und Bildung
JURI	Rechtsausschuss
LIBE	Ausschuss für bürgerliche Freiheiten, Justiz und Inneres
AFCO	Ausschuss für konstitutionelle Fragen
FEMM	Ausschuss für die Rechte der Frau und die Gleichstellung der Geschlechter
PETI	Petitionsausschuss
DROI	Unterausschuss Menschenrechte
SEDE	Unterausschuss Sicherheit und Verteidigung
FISC	Unterausschuss für Steuerfragen

Abkürzungen der Fraktionen

PPE	Fraktion der Europäischen Volkspartei (Christdemokraten)
S&D	Fraktion der Progressiven Allianz der Sozialdemokraten im Europäischen Parlament
Renew	Fraktion Renew Europe
Verts/ALE	Fraktion der Grünen/Freie Europäische Allianz
ID	Fraktion Identität und Demokratie
ECR	Fraktion der Europäischen Konservativen und Reformer
The Left	Fraktion Die Linke im Europäischen Parlament – GUE/NGL
NI	Fraktionslos

Montag, 21. November 2022

IV

(Informationen)

INFORMATIONEN DER ORGANE, EINRICHTUNGEN UND SONSTIGEN STELLEN DER EUROPÄISCHEN UNION

EUROPÄISCHES PARLAMENT

SITZUNGSPERIODE 2022-2023

Sitzungen vom 21. bis 24. November 2022

STRASSBURG

AUSFÜHRLICHE SITZUNGSBERICHTE VOM 21. NOVEMBER 2022

(2023/C 240/01)

Inhalt Seite

1. Wiederaufnahme der Sitzungsperiode . . . 3

2. Eröffnung der Sitzung . . . 3

3. Erklärungen der Präsidentin . . . 3

4. Genehmigung der Protokolle der vorangegangenen Sitzungen . . . 4

5. Zusammensetzung des Parlaments . . . 4

6. Antrag auf Schutz der Immunität . . . 5

7. Zusammensetzung der Fraktionen . . . 5

8. Zusammensetzung der Ausschüsse und Delegationen . . . 5

9. Verhandlungen vor der ersten Lesung des Parlaments (Artikel 71 GO) (Weiterbehandlung) . . . 5

10. Delegierte Rechtsakte (Artikel 111 Absatz 6 GO) . . . 5

Montag, 21. November 2022

Inhalt Seite

11. Unterzeichnung von nach dem ordentlichen Gesetzgebungsverfahren angenommenen Rechtsakten (Artikel 79 GO) . . . 5

12. Arbeitsplan . . . 5

13. Bewertung der Einhaltung der Rechtsstaatlichkeitsbedingungen durch Ungarn im Rahmen der Konditionalitätsverordnung und Stand des ungarischen Aufbau- und Resilienzplans (Aussprache) . . . 9

14. Vorbeugung von, Umgang mit und bessere Versorgung bei Diabetes in der EU anlässlich des Weltdiabetestags (Aussprache) . . . 23

15. Prüfung der Mandate . . . 30

16. Die Menschenrechtslage im Zusammenhang mit der bevorstehenden FIFA-Weltmeisterschaft in Katar (Aussprache) . . . 31

17. Anleihestrategie zur Finanzierung von NextGenerationEU (Aussprache) . . . 42

18. Umsetzungsbericht über den Europäischen Innovationsrat (kurze Darstellung) . . . 51

19. Ausführungen von einer Minute zu Fragen von politischer Bedeutung . . . 54

20. Tagesordnung der nächsten Sitzung . . . 61

21. Genehmigung des Protokolls der laufenden Sitzung . . . 61

22. Schluss der Sitzung . . . 61

Montag, 21. November 2022

AUSFÜHRLICHE SITZUNGSBERICHTE VOM 21. NOVEMBER 2022

PRESIDENZA: ROBERTA METSOLA

President

1. Wiederaufnahme der Sitzungsperiode

President. – I declare resumed the session of the European Parliament adjourned on Thursday 10 November 2022.

2. Eröffnung der Sitzung

(The sitting opened at 17.01)

3. Erklärungen der Präsidentin

President. – Good afternoon, dear colleagues, welcome back. I have a few announcements from my side before we go to the adoption of the agenda. This will take quite a while.

First of all, on Afghanistan, 15 months after the fall of Kabul, women are increasingly being squeezed out of public life and refused entry to public spaces. Reports from Kandahar indicate that the world will soon bear witness to a return of public executions, stonings, floggings and punitive amputations. Despite initial promises to protect women's rights, years of progress are being rolled back. The European Parliament is committed to the people of Afghanistan, not to its rulers. The Taliban want women to be invisible. We want them to thrive. And until they can regain their rightful place in society we will continue to amplify their voice.

Last week, we saw a death sentence imposed on arrested protesters in Iran. The European Parliament strongly opposes capital punishment and violent oppression of legitimate protests. I urge the Iranian authorities to stop, here and now. The European Parliament welcomes the addition of 29 individuals and 3 entities to the list of those subject to restrictive measures or sanctions. We call on Member States to keep the pressure up. In response to the unacceptable Iranian sanctioning of Members of this House, let me announce that there shall be no direct contact between European Parliament delegations and committees with official Iranian counterparts until further notice. We will not look away from those who look to us from the streets of Iran. We are with you. We will stay with you.

Dear colleagues, the Turkish airstrikes we are seeing in northern Syria and Iraq after the bomb attack in Istanbul are claiming more lives and causing more bloodshed. Let me, from here, call on the Turkish authorities to exercise restraint and respect for international law and standards.

Also, last week's explosions and casualties in Poland are proof that we must not let down our guard. Russia's continued illegal invasion of Ukraine continues to cause innocent lives to be lost. Our thoughts and solidarity are with the victims, their loved ones, the people of Poland and all the victims of Russian attacks in Ukraine.

Montag, 21. November 2022

This week we also mark the 90th anniversary of the Holodomor, the Great Famine of 1932 and 1933, when millions of people in Ukraine were starved intentionally by the Soviet regime. Ninety years later, Ukrainians have to fight again to preserve their lives, identity and freedom. We will not forget the fate that Stalin had in store for Ukrainians during Holodomor. Nor will we forget Russian crimes committed in Bucha, Irpin, Mariupol, Izium and in so many other places in Ukraine.

Dear colleagues, the attack on two police officers in Brussels last week – killing one, wounding the other – reminds us of the risks our police forces face daily. We must remain vigilant to threats to our internal security, and the European Parliament works so closely with the Belgian police that it is difficult for this not to feel personal to all of us. Our thoughts are with the families of the victims.

4. Genehmigung der Protokolle der vorangegangenen Sitzungen

President . – The minutes and the texts adopted of the sittings of 9 and 10 November are available.

Before I give the floor to some colleagues, I see there are no comments and therefore the minutes are approved.

Antonius Manders (PPE). – Madam President, I have a point of order. In addition to your remarks, on Article 120 on Human Rights, last weekend FIFA didn't allow the captains of the national teams to wear the 'One Love' armband, and this is a breach of their position. I ask you and the European Parliament to condemn this behaviour strongly, because we are talking about human rights everywhere, and yet when you want to show something at a very big event then it is not allowed by the organisation.

Pina Picierno (S&D). – Signora Presidente, onorevoli colleghi, anch'io per un richiamo al regolamento.

Il 21 novembre di nove anni fa i giovani ucraini scesero in piazza avvolti dalle bandiere europee per protestare contro il mancato accordo di associazione all'Unione europea, che non fu firmato al tempo dal Presidente filorusso Janukovyč.

Così, Presidente, nacque Euromaidan, un movimento che per tre mesi nella piazza centrale di Kiev chiedeva a gran voce un futuro europeo, chiedeva di poter scegliere autonomamente la propria strada all'interno dell'Unione europea e chiedeva che l'Ucraina fosse una democrazia e non un paese sottomesso ad un autocrate.

Questa voglia di libertà è stata frenata nel 2014 dall'occupazione della Crimea e poi dall'inizio della guerra nel Donbass, ma ancora oggi questa voglia di libertà è salda davanti alle bombe, davanti ai morti che la Russia sta infliggendo alla popolazione ucraina ormai da nove mesi.

E allora vorrei che il pensiero di quest'Aula, oggi, fosse rivolto alla memoria di quei giovani che hanno pagato con la vita, perché molti furono ammazzati. La loro adesione al sogno è la prospettiva europea. E vorrei che ricordassimo quanti ogni giorno resistono alla guerra criminale di Putin. Il posto di Kiev è dentro la nostra comunità e dobbiamo ribadirlo ogni giorno con forza.

5. Zusammensetzung des Parlaments

President. – Following the election of Søren Gade, Linea Søgaard-Lidell and Peter Kofod as members of the national parliament of Denmark, Parliament takes note of the vacancy of their seats from 15 November 2022, in accordance with the Rules of Procedure.

6. Antrag auf Schutz der Immunität

President. – Nikos Androulakis has submitted a request for defence of his parliamentary immunity in the context of the complaint he has made against the Greek authorities on phone tapping.

That request is referred to the Committee on Legal Affairs.

7. Zusammensetzung der Fraktionen

President. – Hervé Juvin is no longer a member of the ID Group and sits with the non-attached Members as of 10 November 2022.

8. Zusammensetzung der Ausschüsse und Delegationen

President. – The Renew Europe, Verts/ALE and ID groups have notified me of decisions relating to changes to appointments within committees and delegations. These decisions will be set out in the minutes of today's sitting and take effect on the date of this announcement.

9. Verhandlungen vor der ersten Lesung des Parlaments (Artikel 71 GO) (Weiterbehandlung)

President. – In relation to the decisions by the TRAN and LIBE committees to enter into interinstitutional negotiations pursuant to Rule 71(1) announced on Wednesday 9 November, I have received no request for a vote in Parliament. The committees have therefore started their negotiations.

10. Delegierte Rechtsakte (Artikel 111 Absatz 6 GO)

President. – I was also informed that no objections have been raised within the Conference of Committee Chairs to the recommendations by the ECON Committee not to oppose two delegated acts pursuant to Rule 111(6) of the Rules of Procedure. The recommendations are available on the Plenary webpage.

If no objections are raised by a political group or Members reaching at least the low threshold within 24 hours of this announcement, the recommendations shall be deemed to have been approved; otherwise, they will be put to the vote.

11. Unterzeichnung von nach dem ordentlichen Gesetzgebungsverfahren angenommenen Rechtsakten (Artikel 79 GO)

President. – I would like to inform you that, together with the President of the Council, I shall today sign eight acts adopted under the ordinary legislative procedure in accordance with Rule 79 of Parliament's Rules of Procedure.

The titles of the acts will be published in the minutes of this sitting.

12. Arbeitsplan

President. – We now come to the order of business.

The final draft agenda as adopted by the Conference of Presidents on 17 November pursuant to the Rule 157 has been distributed.

Montag, 21. November 2022

I would like to inform you that I have received three requests for urgent procedure from BUDG Committee and from the Commission pursuant to Rule 163 on the following legislative files:

— amending Council Regulation (EU, Euratom) 2020/2093 of 17 December 2020 laying down the multiannual financial framework for the years 2021 to 2027;

— amending Regulation (EU, Euratom) 2018/1046 as regards the establishment of a diversified funding strategy as a general borrowing method; and

— 'Macro-Financial Assistance+', the instrument for providing support to Ukraine for 2023.

The vote on these three requests will be taken tomorrow. If adopted, the vote will be held on Thursday.

We now move to changes requested by political groups. For Monday, the Renew Group has asked that the title of the Commission statement entitled 'State of play of the negotiations between the Commission and the Hungarian Government linked to the Conditionality Regulation and the RRP' be changed to 'Freezing of European funds to Hungary under the RRF and the Conditionality Regulation' with resolution.

I give the floor to Moritz Körner to move the request on behalf of the Renew Group.

Moritz Körner, *on behalf of the Renew Group*. – Madam President, dear colleagues, we had some talks with the other groups on the title because right now it states: negotiations between the Commission and Hungary. To be very honest, it's what happens right now but it should not be this way. The rule of law in Europe should not be negotiable. That is very clear from our side. We call on the Commission not to negotiate, but to assess, and that's why I would propose a new wording, President: 'assessment of Hungary's compliance with the rule of law conditions under the conditionality mechanism and state of play of the Hungarian RRP'. Let's make clear it's about assessing, it's about the guardianship of the Treaties, and it's not about negotiating about the rule of law. Be very clear about that.

President. – Moritz, just to be clear, you are proposing the change of title to this: 'Assessment of Hungary's compliance with the rule of law conditions under the Conditionality Regulation and the state of play of the Hungarian RRP'. Does anybody want to speak against? I don't see that to be the case. So we put the request to the vote by roll call.

(Parliament agreed to the request)

So the title is changed.

Also for today, The Left Group has requested that the Commission statement on the 'Situation of human rights in the context of the FIFA World Cup in Qatar' be wound up with a resolution to be voted on Thursday. I give the floor to Manon Aubry to move the request on behalf of The Left Group.

Manon Aubry, *au nom du groupe The Left*. – Madame la Présidente, chers collègues, au nom de notre groupe de la Gauche, je demande en effet l'adoption d'une résolution sur les violations des droits de l'homme liées à la Coupe du monde au Qatar. Cette Coupe du monde, vous le savez, se joue sur le corps et le cadavre de 6 500 ouvriers exploités sur les chantiers qatariens, et dont les familles ont été abandonnées sans compensation. Des milliers de violations des droits humains ont été documentées, du quasi-esclavage aux arrestations arbitraires.

Plusieurs groupes de ce Parlement, je m'en félicite, acceptent le débat, mais refusent pourtant une résolution. Alors, chers collègues, face à ce massacre, on ne peut pas se contenter de juste discuter. Notre rôle est de prendre une position sur la création d'un fonds d'indemnisation pour rendre justice aux familles endeuillées, à défaut de leur rendre la vie de leurs proches; sur la responsabilité des entreprises européennes complices; sur la caution diplomatique donnée par nos dirigeants à cette publicité géante pour un régime autoritaire; sur les conditions d'attribution des événements sportifs; sur l'interdiction de la FIFA, Monsieur Manders, de porter le brassard en faveur des LGBT… Alors que les citoyens et les amateurs de foot, dont, je pense, nous sommes assez nombreux ici, n'ont que le dilemme de boycotter ou non, nous avons les moyens d'agir pour ramener la Coupe à la raison. Alors votons cette résolution.

President. – Does anybody want to speak against? I see that's not the case. So we will put the request to a vote by roll call.

(Parliament agreed to the request)

Therefore, we will have the debate, which will be wound up with a resolution. The vote will be on Thursday.

So I'll give you the deadlines. For the motions for resolutions, the text has to be available by Tuesday 22 November at noon. Amendments to the motions for resolutions and the joint motion for resolution, Wednesday 23 November at noon. Amendments to the joint motion for resolution, Wednesday 23 November at 13.00. Split votes and separate votes, Wednesday at 19.00.

Also for Wednesday, the PPE Group has asked that the title of the Council and the Commission statements on 'Eliminating violence against women' be changed to 'Eliminating violence against women and combating sex crimes, including in the case of the recently adopted Spanish law that effectively reduces sentences of convicted offenders'.

I give the floor to Rosa Estaràs Ferragut to move the request on behalf of the PPE Group.

Rosa Estaràs Ferragut, *en nombre del Grupo PPE.* – Señora presidenta, el 25 de noviembre es el Día Internacional de la Eliminación de la Violencia contra la Mujer. Es una prioridad para la Presidencia, para todas las instituciones europeas y para todas las mujeres y los hombres de Europa y del mundo.

Vamos a tener un debate al respecto el miércoles. Unánimemente, todos estamos de acuerdo; sin embargo, en España se ha publicado y se ha aprobado una ley que reduce las condenas a los violadores y a los que atentan contra la libertad sexual de las mujeres. Se han producido más de cinco excarcelaciones de pederastas y violadores de mujeres, puestas en libertad, reducciones de condena de seis a ocho años y, así, una tras otra. Es urgente que debatamos este asunto ese día para detener esta cascada de excarcelaciones y el despropósito de esta ley.

No es ideología lo que estoy pidiendo en este Parlamento; apelo a las conciencias de los hombres y mujeres de este Parlamento. Hemos dicho en reiteradas ocasiones que la violencia contra la mujer es un atroz atentado contra los derechos humanos. Hemos dicho que ni una más. Ahora podemos demostrarlo. Por favor, paremos esa ley.

President. – I now give the floor to Iratxe García Pérez to speak against.

Iratxe García Pérez (S&D). – Señora presidenta, cierto, el 25 de noviembre se conmemora el Día Internacional contra la Violencia de Género. Desde que yo soy diputada, este Parlamento ha tenido un debate al respecto para unir nuestras voces desde la diferencia, pero con un mensaje claro de solidaridad y apoyo a las mujeres víctimas de violencia de género, a las mujeres que han sido asesinadas por el mero hecho de ser mujeres. El terrorismo machista mata: mata en Europa y en el resto del mundo. Y es necesario hacer un debate como todos los años hemos hecho.

Montag, 21. November 2022

Pero esta propuesta que plantea el Grupo popular me parece que contiene pocos escrúpulos y ningún respeto. Pocos escrúpulos, porque las leyes nacionales se cambian en los Parlamentos nacionales. Este es un Parlamento europeo y debemos de respetar los debates que aquí tenemos. Y, por lo tanto, tengamos en cuenta que hay que demostrar mucho más respeto al Parlamento Europeo. Y respeto a las víctimas, a las mujeres que han sido asesinadas. No se puede permitir que se mienta de esta manera. Más respeto a las mujeres víctimas de violencia de género.

Pido el voto en contra de esta propuesta del Grupo popular, que lo único que intenta es hacer un debate partidista en lo que merece ser un debate en apoyo de todas las mujeres europeas.

President. – Mr Séjourné, do you want to come in?

Stéphane Séjourné (Renew). – Madame la Présidente, ce n'est pas un vote, je ne vais donc pas faire une explication de vote, mais peut-être plus un rappel à l'ordre et un rappel au règlement. On va fêter les 70 ans du Parlement européen. Ce Parlement européen est un parlement transnational. On a des questions énergétiques à traiter, on a des questions de pouvoir d'achat.

Je sais qu'on va aller vers les élections européennes de 2024 et que, de plus en plus, les groupes politiques seront tentés d'intégrer dans ce Parlement européen les polémiques nationales. Mais, chers collègues, au vu des enjeux qui sont les nôtres dans les prochains mois et dans les prochaines années qui arrivent, évitons ces modifications d'ordre du jour. Et en cela, Madame la Présidente, c'est plus un rappel au règlement qu'autre chose. Mon groupe votera systématiquement contre, sans entrer dans la polémique et sans entrer même dans le bien-fondé des polémiques des parlements nationaux contre les demandes de modification de l'ordre du jour sur des questions uniquement nationales. C'en est une, et ce sera le cas également avec la demande d'ID sur une question électorale en Allemagne, qui n'a rien à faire dans le débat démocratique et politique du Parlement européen.

President. – I put the request to a vote by roll call.

(Parliament rejected the request)

The agenda therefore remains unchanged.

For Wednesday as well, the ID Group has asked that the Commission statement on 'Judicial annulment of the 2021 Berlin state election due to numerous irregularities' be added as a third item in the afternoon. As a consequence, the sitting would be extended until 22.00. I give the floor to Christine Anderson to move the request on behalf of the ID Group.

Christine Anderson, *im Namen der ID-Fraktion*. – Frau Präsidentin, meine Damen und Herren! Bei der Wahl zum Berliner Abgeordnetenhaus gab es gravierende strukturelle Fehler, der Vorwurf des Wahlbetrugs steht im Raum: Stimmzettel fehlten, wurden vertauscht, Wahllokale hatten zeitweilig geschlossen, andere wiederum waren lange nach dem offiziellen Wahlende noch geöffnet. Der Landeswahlleiter ist inzwischen zurückgetreten. Der Berliner Verfassungsgerichtshof hat die Wahlen inzwischen für ungültig erklärt.

Faire und freie Wahlen sind das Fundament einer jeden Demokratie, und es wird darüber zu sprechen sein, wie es überhaupt zu derartigen Zuständen kommen konnte – im besten Deutschland aller Zeiten.

Zeigen wir, dass sich dieses Haus grundsätzlich mit Verstößen gegen Demokratie und Rechtsstaatlichkeit befasst, und zwar unabhängig davon, ob sie sich nun in Deutschland oder in Ungarn ereignen.

President. – Would anybody like to speak against?

I see that not to be the case, and therefore we open the vote by roll call.

(Parliament rejected the request)

The agenda therefore remains unchanged.

The agenda is adopted, and the order of business is thus established.

(The sitting was suspended for a few moments)

Montag, 21. November 2022

IN THE CHAIR: DITA CHARANZOVÁ

Vice-President

13. Bewertung der Einhaltung der Rechtsstaatlichkeitsbedingungen durch Ungarn im Rahmen der Konditionalitätsverordnung und Stand des ungarischen Aufbau- und Resilienzplans (Aussprache)

President. – The next item is the Commission statement on the assessment of Hungary's compliance with the rule of law conditions under the Conditionality Regulation and state of play of the Hungarian RRP (2022/2935(RSP)).

Didier Reynders, *Member of the Commission*. – Madam President, honourable Members, I would like to thank you for your organisation of this debate, and I just ask for your attention.

If I have well followed the previous discussions is an important debate about the rule of law that we will have. So the European Commission is highly appreciative of the commitment of this Parliament in promoting and defending the rule of law in all the Member States. In this perspective, it is important for us to have a constructive dialogue on the enforcement of the Conditionality Regulation and on the opportunity that the recovery and resilience plans offer to drive change in the Member States – in this case Hungary – to improve and strengthen the rule of law situation.

Today, within the European Union, we have a whole range of instruments that the Commission is ready and has proven to be able to use effectively to protect the EU budget from breaches to the principles of the rule of law.

Different instruments apply different methodologies and are subject to different rules. The Conditionality Regulation aims at protecting the EU budget and the financial interests of the Union against breaches of the principles of the rule of law, compromising the correct use and management of EU funds. This concerns breaches of the principles of the rule of law that have a sufficiently direct link with the implementation of the Union budget or the protection of the financial interests of the Union. This requirement is clear from Conditionality Regulation and it has also been stressed by the Court of Justice.

The case in relation to Hungary is the first case under the Conditionality Regulation. It was launched in April this year, when the Commission notified Hungary of its concerns relating to breaches of the principles of the rule of law. Serious deficiencies and irregularities in the public procurement framework, and Hungary's inability to tackle corruption directly affects or risks affecting the sound financial management of the Union.

In its finding, the Commission considered that in Hungary there are systemic irregularities, deficiencies and weaknesses in public procurement, insufficiencies in detecting, preventing and correcting conflicts of interest, concerns related to the use of Union funds by public interest trusts, weaknesses in the effective pursuit of investigations and prosecutions in cases involving Union funds, and shortcomings in the anti-corruption framework. These issues and their recurrence over time demonstrate a systemic inability and failure on the part of the Hungarian authorities to prevent decisions from being in breach of applicable law.

To address all these concerns in a sustainable manner. Hungary committed to 17 remedial measures that would address the risk to the EU budget related precisely to those breaches. These remedial measures were carefully assessed by the Commission. In fact, on 18 September, when adopting the proposal for the Council implementing decision, the College considered that if these remedial measures are correctly specified in enacting laws and implementing rules, and that the implementing steps are fully and effectively implemented, then taken together, in principle, they could be capable of addressing the issues at stake. However, pending the assessment of the details and implementation of the key implementation steps, the College considered that a risk remains for the EU budget. It was in view of this that the Commission proposed budgetary protection measures to the Council.

Montag, 21. November 2022

Since then there have been intense discussions with the Hungarian authorities at technical and political level to monitor the steps taken by Hungary in the implementation of its commitments. As set out in the Commission's proposal to the Council, Hungary committed to fully inform the Commission about the fulfilment of the key implementation steps by 19 November. On that date, the Commission received details of the measures taken by Hungary so far. The Commission is now carefully analysing all the information received, including the available versions of the legal text, to verify the full and correct implementation of the commitments by Hungary. The Commission will finalise its assessment on the basis of the information that it has received by that deadline.

The intention of the Commission is to come with its assessment without delay and to inform the Parliament and the Council. Ultimately, the final decision on whether to adopt budgetary protection measures or not lies with the Council. The assessment of the Commission will feed into the process of the Council and is meant to support the Council in its decision.

On 13 October, the Council decided to extend the power to decide on the measures proposed by the Commission by two months, namely until 19 December. This will allow for consideration of the fulfilment of the commitments by Hungary. The Council could then adopt, amend or reject the Commission's proposal by qualified majority.

Rest assured that, as has been the case since the adoption of the regulation and the start of this process, the Commission will continue to provide Parliament with information on the relevant developments and remains available to update you as needed. Our ultimate objective under this mechanism is that the Union budget is no longer at risk and we hope to achieve this as soon as possible through the adequate reforms in Hungary.

Concerning the Hungarian recovery and resilience plan, the Commission had many discussions with Hungary on their proposed plan. We have made progress on a number of issues over the past months. As for all the Member States, the Commission assesses the plan against the 11 criteria set out in the RRF Regulation. The same criteria apply to all the Member States. The criteria require notably an assessment of whether the measures address the challenges identified in the country-specific recommendations of the European Semester or a significant subset of those recommendations and whether the plans provide an adequate control and audit mechanism.

For Hungary, the country-specific recommendations refer to the need to address challenges concerning the rule of law situation, in particular as regards anti-corruption measures and the independence of the judiciary. The Commission has therefore been discussing the setting of milestones and targets in the Hungarian plan that would cover these country-specific recommendations. We are now aiming to conclude our assessment on the recovery and resilience plan as soon as possible. The idea is that the milestones of the recovery and resilience plan also fully reflect the remedial measures proposed by Hungary under the conditionality procedure. Furthermore, the disbursement of funds to Hungary should be linked to the fulfilment of milestones covering those remedial measures, as well as those linked to strengthening the independence of the judiciary. And about the independence of the judiciary, I have asked the Minister of Justice of Hungary, Judit Varga, to implement completely the country-specific recommendations coming from the European Semester and the recommendation that we have put in the last rule of law report, published in July 2022.

We apply the tools at our disposal in good faith and with the firm intention to raise the rule of law standards and improve the situation on the ground. We will continue monitoring the legal and practical implementation of Hungary's commitments and will not let go until we are satisfied that the EU budget can be protected. So we are working on our own assessment. I thank you for this opportunity to explain what we are doing for the moment in those procedures. And, of course, thank you for your attention. I am looking forward to our debate.

Petri Sarvamaa, *on behalf of the PPE Group*. – Madam President, honourable Commissioner, dear colleagues, almost four and a half years ago, we began the work here in Parliament on the Commission proposal on the Conditionality Regulation. And now – I mean, really, this time – we can talk about historical days and weeks because now we are finally here. The timeline set by the regulation is running to its end and, as the Commissioner just explained, we are waiting for the final assessment from the Commission – as far as the chosen criteria that, by the way, was mainly and also only about corruption, about public procurement, about conflict of interest – as to whether those criteria have now been met by Hungary, whether the 17 remedial measures have been implemented by the deadline of 19 November.

But the unified message from this Parliament to the Commission is actually the following. The real question, regardless of the exact text on the 17 measures, that everybody is waiting to get an answer to is: has Hungary done enough so that there is no risk anymore or risk of affecting or seriously affecting the sound financial management of the EU budget? This is the real question. This is the assessment that everyone is now waiting for from the Commission. This is because the conditionality mechanism is now at stake. This is a test of this mechanism. And, Honourable Vice-President, this is not against the Hungarian people. This is to defend basic values of the European Union. So, this is what we are doing here.

Eider Gardiazabal Rubial, *en nombre del Grupo S&D*. – Señora presidenta, señor comisario Reynders, podemos partir de diferentes puntos de vista, podemos tener diferentes apreciaciones o matices, podemos tener incluso diferentes estrategias, pero no hay nada que pueda justificar una conclusión diferente. Escuchando muy atentamente cuál ha sido la valoración de la Comisión, entiendo que hemos llegado a la misma conclusión: el Gobierno húngaro no respeta el Estado de Derecho y eso está afectando gravemente a los intereses financieros de la Unión, objeto del Reglamento que hemos votado en esta Cámara. Por lo tanto, no hay mucho margen de maniobra, no hay mucho margen para el matiz. Solo podemos tomar una única decisión correcta: aprobar la congelación de los fondos.

Y ¿por qué digo esto? Podemos empezar directamente por el final. De las diecisiete medidas acordadas con el Gobierno húngaro, tan solo se han puesto en marcha tres, y la mitad de ellas, además, no pueden evaluarse, dado que se van a poner en marcha dentro de un tiempo y, por lo tanto, ahora no tenemos información suficiente. Así pues, no se está cumpliendo y, por lo tanto, el presupuesto sigue corriendo peligro. Esto es lo que tiene que evaluar la Comisión Europea.

Pero es que, además, si analizamos las diecisiete medidas, podemos concluir que son claramente insuficientes y muchas de ellas, inadecuadas. Si a esto le añadimos que solo estamos hablando de contratación pública, es decir, de una pequeña área donde hay problemas, evidentemente, obtenemos una fotografía de la situación nada positiva.

En conclusión: tres medidas cumplidas no pueden justificar la liberación de los fondos. Porque ¿qué mensaje estaríamos enviando si cedemos al chantaje de Orban?: ¿que no nos importa lo que está pasando en un Estado miembro?; ¿que doce años de despropósitos se pueden arreglar en dos meses?; o ¿es que estamos de *Black Friday* y, además de regalarle los 7 500 millones de euros de los fondos de cohesión, les vamos a aprobar también el plan de recuperación? Esto no sería ni comprensible ni aceptable ni justificable. Tenemos que ser consecuentes con lo que llevamos tanto tiempo defendiendo.

Sophia in 't Veld, *on behalf of the Renew Group*. – Madam President, dear Commissioner, dear absent Council, the Commission is assessing Hungary's compliance with the 17 very weak conditions for the release of funds. A child can see that they have not remotely been met. So the conclusion can be fairly simple: no compliance, no money.

Now, this is the view of the vast majority of this House. But Orbán wields massive power because the European Council – absent – has failed disgracefully for many years to suspend his voting rights under Article 7. And Viktor has been using his veto power as a tool to blackmail and extort the European Union at every turn in the road.

After 12 years of Orbán, government leaders still naively or opportunistically believe they can buy him off. They should know better. He will not back down but, on the contrary, step up his game, encouraged by his success. The rule of law conditionality mechanism was explicitly designed to overcome this stalemate. But again, we see horse trading with our values instead of the Commission and the Council standing up to defend our common European values.

Montag, 21. November 2022

It's time for the Commission and the European Council to show some backbone. Giving in to blackmail by a kleptocrat will be a historic failure. Commissioner, don't miss your appointment with history; the European Council has already missed it.

Daniel Freund, *im Namen der Verts/ALE-Fraktion*. – Frau Präsidentin, liebe Kolleginnen und Kollegen, sehr geehrter Herr Reynders! Die Stunde der Wahrheit ist gekommen. Akzeptieren wir den ersten EU-Autokraten, Viktor Orbán, und seine unfassbare Korruption, oder frieren wir ihm die EU-Gelder ein? Das Ganze entscheidet sich jetzt anhand von 17 Maßnahmen.

17 Maßnahmen, von denen Sie, Herr Reynders, eigentlich wissen sollten, dass sie den Rechtsstaat in Ungarn nicht richten, dass sie die Korruption nicht stoppen. Und warum? Weil Viktor Orbán diese Korruption im Grunde in die ungarische Verfassung geschrieben hat. Seit sieben Jahren regiert er nur noch per Dekret. Er hat 1083 Projekten nationale Bedeutung gegeben; das heißt, es gelten überhaupt keine Regeln mehr. Zum Beispiel das Lipizzaner-Reitsportzentrum in Szilvásvárad, gebaut von seinem Oligarchenfreund Mészáros. Dieser Mészáros hat allein in der letzten Woche Ausschreibungen über 120 Millionen Euro gewonnen. Wo ist denn da der Reformwille?

Herr Reynders, Sie glauben doch nicht, dass man diese Korruption jetzt mit Weiterbildungsmaßnahmen für Beamte stoppen kann, mit einem Aktionsplan, mit der Förderung von kleinen Unternehmen? Die meisten Maßnahmen sind nicht umgesetzt, und sieben haben allein Deadlines, die teilweise bis Mitte 2026 gehen.

Und trotzdem müssen Sie jetzt sagen, wo Sie stehen. Es muss endlich Geld eingefroren werden. Es ist die einzige Sprache, die Viktor Orbán versteht. Wir können zu jedem Zeitpunkt wieder Geld freigeben, wenn wir wirklich Veränderungen sehen. Aber es kann nicht sein, dass man jetzt nichts tut, weil Orbán uns das Blaue vom Himmel verspricht. Ich will, dass er endlich liefert. Also legen Sie ein ehrliches Assessment vor und einen daran angepassten neuen Vorschlag für Sanktionen! Das ist der einzige Weg, wie wir jetzt endlich das bekommen können, was wir alle unbedingt wollen: keine Steuergelder für Autokraten in der EU.

Gilles Lebreton, *au nom du groupe ID*. – Madame la Présidente, chers collègues, au nom du respect de l'état de droit, l'Union européenne a désormais le pouvoir exorbitant d'exercer une tutelle idéologique sur ses États membres. Quand le règlement sur la conditionnalité, qui lui donne ce pouvoir, a été voté en décembre 2020, j'avais protesté contre cette dérive autoritaire. Les faits me donnent aujourd'hui raison.

L'Union menace la Hongrie de la priver des sept milliards et demi d'euros de subventions auxquelles elle a droit, ainsi que de près de six milliards d'euros d'aides au titre du plan de relance post-COVID. Le motif de cet acharnement est le prétendu manque d'indépendance de la justice hongroise. La Hongrie vient pourtant d'annoncer une réforme de sa justice destinée à rassurer l'Union. Malgré tout, le chantage européen persiste.

Dans ces conditions, j'estime normal que la Hongrie menace de bloquer certaines décisions européennes par mesure de rétorsion. Comme chaque État, la Hongrie a le droit de défendre ses intérêts vitaux. Je soutiens donc sans aucune ambiguïté Viktor Orbán dans son bras de fer contre l'Union.

Patryk Jaki, *w imieniu grupy ECR*. – Pani Przewodnicząca! Panie Komisarzu! Węgry jak zwykle są przedmiotem Państwa ataków. Ale trzeba się zastanowić, dlaczego. Czy demokracja na Węgrzech wygląda gorzej niż ta w Niemczech, gdzie właśnie trzeba było powtórzyć wybory ze względu na tak liczne oszustwa? Czy coś takiego na Węgrzech się wydarzyło? Czy jest gorzej niż w Słowenii czy w Słowacji, czy Malcie, gdzie zamordowano dziennikarzy? I po tylu latach nie ma do dzisiaj przekonujących wyjaśnień w tej sprawie? Czy uniwersytety i media są bardziej podporządkowane niż te lewicowe u was, gdzie, jeżeli myśli się inaczej, to człowiek jest od razu „kancelowany"?

Powiedzmy sobie wreszcie szczerze, że prawdziwym problemem w przypadku Węgier jest, proszę Państwa, to, że bronią religii, tradycyjnych wartości, na których została zbudowana cywilizacja zachodnia. Bronią dzieci przed demoralizacją, a narodów przed państwem europejskim, w którym demokracja będzie wyglądać właśnie tak, jak widzimy to w tej Izbie. To znaczy Węgrzy nie będą mogli sobie wybierać władzy, nie będą mieli nic do powiedzenia. Tylko administracja europejska tutaj z góry będzie mówiła, w których państwach kto może rządzić, bez żadnych wyborów i bez woli narodów.

To jest wasza demokracja, to jest ta nowa demokracja, proszę Państwa, i dlatego temu trzeba się twardo przeciwstawiać. Właśnie w imię demokracji i praworządności.

Younous Omarjee, *au nom du groupe The Left*. – Madame la Présidente, Monsieur le Commissaire, l'heure n'est pas de transiger sur les principes, ni de céder au chantage odieux de M. Orbán, qui utilise la guerre en Ukraine pour nous faire plier.

Rappelons-le, en Hongrie, les voyants sont toujours au rouge, car depuis des années, tous les principes sont un à un foulés aux pieds: liberté de la presse, indépendance de la justice, mise à mal du principe d'élections équitables, violation continue des droits des personnes LGBT, mise en place d'un système clientéliste permettant aux proches du pouvoir d'empocher les marchés publics et les fonds européens, de la PAC au FEDER.

Les mesures récemment proposées par le gouvernement hongrois doivent bien sûr être évaluées, mais nous ne sommes pas dupes. Ces mesures sont insuffisantes. Elles sont pleinement insuffisantes et c'est pourquoi les fonds doivent aujourd'hui être gelés. Ils doivent l'être non pour punir les Hongrois, mais pour faire avancer la Hongrie sur la voie du respect de l'état de droit et du partage du socle des valeurs qui fonde l'appartenance à l'Union européenne.

Renoncer aujourd'hui à défendre cela coûte que coûte, c'est laisser s'étendre le poison distillé par les gouvernements illibéraux et faire courir, en définitive, à toute l'Union de graves dangers pour l'avenir.

Tamás Deutsch (NI). – Elnök Asszony! A mai immár a tizenegyedik magyar vita a ciklusban. Világjárvány, gazdasági válság, háború, energiaválság. De önök mégis képesek évente háromszor-négyszer Magyarország gyalázásával múlatni a csermelyléptű időt? Ez már beteges politikai elvakultság. A kondicionialitási eljárásban ráadásul nincs jogköre az Európai Parlamentnek arra, hogy a Bizottság mellett értékelje egy tagállam vállalásainak teljesítését. Önöknek nem osztottak lapot, amit csinálnak, az szabálytalan. Önök kétségbeesettek és vagdalkoznak, mert minden jel arra mutat, hogy a magyarok ellen folytatott politikai háborút a baloldal elveszti.

Lesz ugyanis megállapodás az Európai Bizottság és Magyarország között, ezért a hazugságaikat mantrázva most a Bizottságot támadják, hogy ne merjen megállapodni Magyarországgal. A baloldali jogállamisági boszorkányüldözés igazi bolsevik tempó, felsőbbrendűségi tudattól vezérelve kizárólagosságra törekednek, fenyegetnek és büntetni akarnak mindenkit, aki nem ért egyet Önökkel. Mindezzel éppen a baloldal az, aki a demokratikus és jogállami érdekeket, értékeket megsérti, az európai együttműködést aláássa.

Jeroen Lenaers (PPE). – Madam President, I never quite understand the position of our Hungarian Fidesz colleagues, because for years they have been telling us that there is nothing wrong in Hungary on the rule of law, on democracy, on anti-corruption, that all is good and that everybody who criticises it is part of an ideological jihad against Hungary, etc. and we are all part of the extreme left here.

Now there is EUR 7.5 billion at stake, and all of a sudden there are so many things wrong in Hungary that they felt the need to do 17 very urgent reforms, and we are expected now to believe that these reforms will actually make a difference in practice.

The Hungarian Government so far has never shown any willingness to make meaningful reforms. But we are expected to believe now that a quick push of some legislation is making a lasting difference on the ground. This for us, as the EPP, is the key bottom line: only significant, tangible and lasting reform can enable the release of EU taxpayers' money. Nothing less will do.

But this is not only about the Hungarian Government and its reforms, it's about Europe. It's about the kind of European Union we want to be, and there is a clear choice. We can be a European Union of shared fundamental values like democracy and the rule of law, a Union that is willing to fight for those values, also when it's difficult, or particularly when it's difficult. Or the other choice, we can be a Union that falls at the first bit of pressure and bows to blackmail.

These are our options, and only one of them will have a viable future for the European Union. So, Commissioner, please take that into consideration when you assess these Hungarian reforms. This is about the future of our Union, so please act wisely.

Montag, 21. November 2022

Lara Wolters (S&D). – Madam President, I see that we have visitors here, and I think it's Parliament's sad honour to welcome you to this end of the year budget showdown. It's brought to you against the backdrop of widespread reports that the Commission will soon be approving Hungary's recovery plan.

So, for our visitors, on the one hand, you've got the European Parliament, on the other you have Hungary. And, frustratingly for us, the outcome of whether Hungary is to receive billions in European funds will be determined by EU Member States and the European Commission and not by us. Which is why, once again, we urge them to take a long-term view here that is respectful of those Hungarians who are hoping for a return to democracy and respectful to the foundations of our Union.

Now, the British have this great phrase and it's 'putting lipstick on a pig' and, in this case, the pig is a captured, illiberal state that is deeply dependent on and intertwined with corruption and the lipstick is the proposed Hungarian Integrity Authority. Now, let us be clear that no hastily put together anti-corruption body can be effective without an independent judiciary, and especially not if credible civil society organisations are being sidelined.

Being blackmailed into submission by Hungary would not be embarrassing only but it would be short-termist. And I urge the European Member States and the Commission to take this very seriously because whether or not we unlock billions in taxpayer money for Hungary, that's not so much a test case for Hungary, that's a test case for the European Union itself and how seriously we take the rule of law.

Katalin Cseh (Renew). – Madam President, Commissioner, colleagues, whenever I talk to constituents on the ground, one question tends to come up over and over again, which is: does the European Commission really believe that a new authority and a couple of new laws would change anything in Hungary? Because Hungarian people on the ground know from years of experience that systemic deficiencies with the rule of law have never been about a lack of a new authority, because this is a government that hollows out the institutions and acts in bad faith. They are never going to feel bound by a set of adjustments created by themselves as opposed to a credible, already existing authority like the EU Prosecutor's Office.

And please answer me this: why is the Orbán government so insistent on creating new authorities instead of joining the EPPO? We have said it so many times, this is a real chance. This can be a historic chance, a historic moment to slow down or even reverse Hungary's rapid slide into authoritarianism. This Parliament worked long and hard to achieve more efficient rules. And we have reiterated our call. Let's help the people, not the government. Direct EU funds to local governments, to civil society, to schools and hospitals, to those who need it the most. Commissioner, it's time to make this happen. Not only the EU's financial interests are at stake, but also the rights of Hungarian citizens.

Gwendoline Delbos-Corfield (Verts/ALE). – Madam President, there cannot be – in no place in the world because it's just not possible – a true, efficient, anti-corruption system where there is not independence of the judiciary. And it feels bizarre to have to say it out loud, but because we have to state the obvious, let's imagine.

Let's imagine a Member State where the son-in-law of the leader of the country has just been awarded a tender in the context of public procurement concerning European funds. All very fictional, of course. And all of this was done in mysterious ways. There are a number of important problematic failures in the procedures, and there's this new tool that has been created and implemented in this country. We could name it the 'Integrity Authority'. And it's just been created and it's a really independent monitoring body. It has serious expertise and good staff, and it will bring the case to court. Plenty of fact, plenty of evidence.

And then the president of the highest level of justice in this country, let's call it the Supreme Court, decides to allocate himself the case to a judge because, you know, he is a friend of the leader of the country, he has been nominated at this job by friends of the leaders and he has the power to overrule on political cases. Still, very theoretical. And so he gives the case to a specific judge, another friend of all of these people, all friends, all sharing the same interests, the same money. And then, of course, the case drags on and drags on and justice is never made. End of story.

How we can be studying, on one side, the 17 measures to fight anti-corruption in Hungary and, on the other side, not requesting a true plan of reforms for judiciary bewilders me.

Nicolaus Fest (ID). – Frau Präsidentin, Herr Kommissar! Um diese Diskussion einschätzen zu können, muss man sich mal die Kritiker angucken. Das gilt vor allem für Herrn Körner, der ein Angehöriger der FDP ist, und die FDP gilt in Deutschland nun geradezu als ein Synonym für Käuflichkeit: Das geht bei den Mehrwertsteuersenkungen für Hoteliers los und endet bei den E-Fuels für Porsche noch lange nicht.

Herr Freund von den Grünen wiederum sagt mit viel Pathos: Keine Steuergelder für Autokraten in der EU. Aber für linke NGOs sind alle Steuergelder natürlich immer in ausreichender Menge vorhanden – selbst wenn Interpol inzwischen davor warnt, dass viele dieser NGOs nichts anderes sind als Geldwäscheunternehmen.

Ich glaube auch, dass es in Ungarn sehr viel zu verbessern gibt und dass wir nicht allzu große Beträge immer an korrupte Länder geben sollten. Aber man muss eben sehen, dass das Hauptproblem darin liegt, dass die EU einfach mit dem Geld wirklich nur so um sich wirft und ja auch immer mehr Gelder aufnimmt. Ich glaube, da müsste man ansetzen: Man müsste die Budgets der EU deutlich zurückschneiden, dann wird auch die Korruption deutlich zurückgehen.

Mislav Kolakušić (NI). – Poštovana predsjedavajuća, poštovani kolege, dragi građani, zadovoljan sam zbog činjenice da se Komisija Europske unije i Mađarska približavaju stajalištima.

Međutim, jedna me stvar još više veseli, a to je da je Mađarska iznimno suverena država i da ona u svojim odlukama u Vijeću čuva ne samo svoju suverenost, nego suverenost i drugih članica Europske unije. Čuva također i proračun Europske unije. Posljednjim odlukama i samostalnim glasanjem u Europskom vijeću sačuvano je i 20 milijardi eura građana Europske unije i na tome sam im zahvalan.

Lijepo je vidjeti da se država može sama braniti i zbog toga je nužno da zauvijek ostane da se sve bitne odluke u Europskom vijeću moraju donositi jednoglasno. U suprotnom ulazimo u Sovjetski Savez koji se je raspao, a raspast će se i Europska unija ako ukinemo pravo svake države na glasanje o bitnim stvarima.

Siegfried Mureșan (PPE). – Madam President, Commissioner, dear colleagues, this year, the European Union is spending more money than ever from the budget of the European Union and from NextGenerationEU, the Recovery and Resilience Facility. We have a duty to make sure that this money is well spent. We have to make sure that this money is protected.

We see that these budgets are already creating positive results in many countries. In most of the countries of the European Union, these two categories of budgets are flowing. We are seeing hospitals being modernised, schools being digitalised, we are seeing infrastructure being made more competitive, more modern, greener, we are seeing it renewed. But the principle is clear. Money can only flow if rules are respected and the rule of law is fundamental. It is the most important of them all.

So far, everyone has agreed. On Hungary, there were deficiencies with regards to the management of EU funds, with regards to the rule of law, and these deficiencies have to be corrected. Now it is up to the Hungarian Government to implement the measures which it has agreed with the European Commission, and then it is up to the European Commission to assess.

Our expectation is clear: the Commission should only give a positive assessment once the measures are implemented by the Hungarian Government and money should only flow when money is safe. Money should only flow when it is protected. Our position, as the European Parliament, should be we want to help the people of Hungary as we are helping people in other EU Member States. We hope that the Hungarian Government is not an obstacle in the desire of Europe to help the people of Hungary.

Thijs Reuten (S&D). – Madam President, Commissioner and, indeed, absent Council – regrettably absent Council.

Montag, 21. November 2022

EUR 18 billion of emergency aid to Ukraine, meant to keep hospitals running, to rebuild destroyed railways, and to build new houses for Ukrainians; Prime Minister Orbán has the heart to block this crucial money in order to blackmail us – the EU, everyone – over the funds he himself denies to the citizens of Hungary. And we are supposed to believe that this same person has the genuine intention of improving the rule of law in his own country. I'm sorry, but I can't.

The creation of the Rule of Law Conditionality Regulation was historic. Finally, we could connect EU money to the core democratic values of our Union. By risking to release funds to Hungary, against better judgment, the Commission dismantles the mechanism at its first use. The Commission should not give an inch. And this is not a cue for the Council to finally make progress with Article 7 procedure. And I hold all 26 governments accountable because Orbán can only blackmail us if we let him. Naivety with autocrats needs to belong to the past.

(The speaker agreed to respond to a blue-card speech)

Enikő Győri (NI), *kékkártyás felszólalás.* – Tisztelt Elnök Asszony! Tisztelt Képviselő Úr! Az Ön frakcióvezetője a napirend elfogadásakor azt mondta, hogy a nemzeti törvényekről a nemzeti parlamentekben kell dönteni és vitázni. Tudja, annak a spanyol törvénynek az összefüggésében hangzott ez el, amelynek értelmében a nők elleni erőszakot elkövetők és pedofilok hamarabb az utcára tudnak kerülni, tehát kevesebb büntetést kell letölteniük. Kérdezem, elfogadja-e, hogy azért ez Magyarországra is igaz, hogy a magyar nemzeti hatáskörbe tartozó ügyekben otthon döntünk? Miért vonja kétségbe, kérdezem, hogy a Bizottság a szerződések és a jogszabályok, így a kondicionalitás jogszabály szerint jár el, és tárgyal a magyar kormánnyal?

Mi lenne Önnek elég, ha nem elég jó az a 17 intézkedés, amelyről közel vannak a felek a megállapodáshoz? Nem arról van-e szó, hogy addig nem nyugszanak, amíg konzervatív kormány van Magyarországon? Nem akarják-e Önök gyámság alá helyezni Magyarországot?

Thijs Reuten (S&D), *blue-card reply.* – Yes, beginners mistake to accept a blue-card. Sorry for that but my answer is very simple and very short because we are not talking about all these issues that you mentioned. We are talking about the core fundamentals of the Union, which is enshrined in treaties, and these treaties have been signed by the democratic Hungarian people a long time ago, and these treaties need to be respected. And that's our job; that's what we do here.

Moritz Körner (Renew). – Frau Präsidentin, Herr Kommissar, liebe Kolleginnen und Kollegen! Vor einigen Monaten kam die Nachricht, die Europäische Kommission schlage vor, 7,5 Milliarden Euro an Ungarn tatsächlich zurückzuhalten. Und ich habe bei meinen Gesprächen mit Bürgerinnen und Bürgern gehört: Endlich, endlich findet etwas statt. Endlich passiert etwas. Endlich wird gegen den Abbau der Rechtsstaatlichkeit in Europa vorgegangen.

Aber was ist dann passiert? Wir haben gesehen, dass schon die Art und Weise, wie der Mechanismus angewendet wurde, viel zu klein war: Die Verordnung würde viel mehr zulassen – nicht nur Kohäsionsmittel, sondern auch noch andere Mittel betreffend. Um Rechtsstaatlichkeit hat es sich bei diesen Maßnahmen, die die Kommission mit Ungarn verhandelt hat, überhaupt nicht gehandelt. Um Rechtsstaatlichkeit, um die Unabhängigkeit der Justiz ging es gar nicht, sondern nur um Korruptionsbekämpfung. Und selbst dieser kleine Teil wird – wenn man sich die 17 Maßnahmen anschaut – nicht konsequent zu Ende geführt. Schon jetzt ist klar: Die 17 Maßnahmen, die bis zum Wochenende umgesetzt sein sollten, sind größtenteils nicht umgesetzt.

Was passiert jetzt? Wird die Europäische Kommission jetzt trotzdem möglicherweise die 7,5 Milliarden Euro nicht mehr zurückhalten? Ich sage ganz klar: Wenn die Europäische Kommission jetzt die EU-Mittel freigibt, dann macht sich Ursula von der Leyen ganz persönlich mitverantwortlich dafür, Ungarn unwiederbringlich in einen Korruptionssumpf zu verwandeln. Und dann muss man auch so ehrlich sein als Europäische Kommission: Dann wird man diesen Rechtsstaatsmechanismus auch nicht mehr anwenden, dann ist er tot.

Diese Ehrlichkeit, die muss dann auch klar sein; deswegen ist unser Appell hier noch einmal deutlich: Die Gelder dürfen nicht freigegeben werden, Rechtsstaatlichkeit in Europa muss endlich verteidigt werden.

Damian Boeselager (Verts/ALE). – Madam President, Commissioner, dear colleagues, after three years in politics, I think I have identified the real big threat for humanity: it's unhinged, uncontrolled men. Uncontrolled individual men who somehow lost it because of their ego, their delusional narratives, their hunger for power, their narcissistic need to feel important. They are the real problem. We have seen it with Donald Trump in the US. We have seen it in China quite recently. We have seen it in Qatar with the Ayatollahs in Iran and with Putin in Ukraine. Uncontrolled men can be deadly.

And sadly, Viktor Orbán, in his own way, is heading in a similar direction. He is unchecked by the media. He is unchecked by the justice system, which he controls. He is unchecked by his party, who would never vote him out of power. He is unchecked by the opposition, who he threatens. And he's unchecked by the Hungarian people who he lies to, blatantly.

However, Orbán does know that you, Commissioner, could actually rein him in by cutting the funds that oil his corrupt machine. And that's why he's blackmailing today. But this time he has gone too far. His blackmail is too outrageous and too dangerous. Today he's vetoing the NATO membership of two EU countries, effectively putting the citizens at risk. He's vetoing sanctions against Russian oligarchs. He's vetoing the 18 billion for Ukraine that they need so urgently. And he's vetoing the global minimum tax on Apple and co., depriving us of better schools and of higher pensions.

So, Commissioner, as we can see with Trump, the only language that these people understand is the language of hard power. Therefore, I ask you again, stand firm. Once Orbán reinstates the justice system, allows for fair elections, stops stealing EU cash, invites the European Public Prosecutor's Office and stops this blackmail, we can talk about unblocking funds. Until then, stand firm.

France Jamet (ID). – Madame la Présidente, Monsieur le Commissaire, mes chers collègues, nous débattons aujourd'hui de l'état d'avancement des négociations entre la Commission et le gouvernement hongrois pour savoir s'il remplit les conditions pour bénéficier du plan de relance dont tous les autres États ont déjà bénéficié, c'est-à-dire savoir si, selon Bruxelles, il y a bien un état de droit en Hongrie, ce que la Commission et certains semblent lui dénier. Non, non. S'agit-il vraiment de parler de corruption ou de la défense des deniers publics? Il s'agit de sanctionner, en fait, un pays qui ne fait pas ce que la Commission lui demande de faire quand elle le lui demande.

Parce que la Hongrie défend prioritairement la volonté de son peuple, qui s'est clairement exprimé dans les urnes, parce que la Hongrie défend sa souveraineté nationale et parce que la souveraineté nationale est un principe fondamental au cœur de nos identités et de nos démocraties, contester ce droit serait un acte violent et antidémocratique.

Balázs Hidvéghi (NI). – Tisztelt Elnök Asszony! Akik ezt a mai vitát kezdeményezték, a jogállamiság őrének szerepében tetszelegnek itt, de valójában mára a szabadság legfőbb ellenségeivé váltak. Megtestesítenek mindent, ami elromlott az EU-ban: intoleránsak, agresszívek, kioktatók és lekezelők. Semmibe veszik az emberek döntéseit és akaratát, és nem tudják megbocsájtani, hogy a magyarok, és egyre többen mások is Európában, nem kérnek a maguk politikájából, nem kérnek az életidegen, veszélyes javaslataikból. Azt követelték, hogy Magyarország tárgyaljon. Most pedig, hogy tárgyaltunk, és megállapodtunk, most még frusztráltabbak lettek, mert maguk sohasem a jogállamiságért aggódtak valójában.

Minden vád, amivel Magyarországot évek óta támadják, csak ócska hazugság volt. Egy cinikus eszköz a Daniel Freund-, Katarina Barley- és Petri Sarvamaa-féle rögeszmés politikai bohócok kezében. Maguk azt akarják, hogy a magyar emberek egy fillér uniós támogatás se kapjanak. Elutasítjuk ezt a szégyenletes zsarolást, lábbal tiporják az európai együttműködés alapjait!

György Hölvényi (PPE). – Tisztelt Elnök Asszony! Végre sikerül lezárni egy nehéz, hosszú tárgyalássorozatot. A magyar kormány és az Európai Bizottság egy konstruktív párbeszéd végéhez közeledik. Most, a megegyezés küszöbén az Európai Parlament baloldala mégis egy újabb rohamot indít. Az Európai Bizottság elvárása a kezdetektől és következetesen az uniós források felhasználásának javítása volt. A magyar kormány az elvárt elvárásoknak megfelelően 17 átfogó vállalást tett, ezeknek megteremtette a jogi környezetét. A reformok elkezdődtek, az intézményi változtatások megtörténtek. Az eddigi eredményeket szeretnék most Önök semmissé tenni.

Nem kevesebb a tét, mint hogy tízmillió európai, európai magyar állampolgár hozzájusson a neki járó milliárdokhoz.

Montag, 21. November 2022

Tisztelt Képviselőtársaim! Önök most itt döntési helyzetben vannak: támogatják az elért eredményeket, vagy a vélt egyéni, és láttuk, egyéni és pártpolitikai érdekeiket helyezik szembe a magyar polgárok érdekeivel? Ez most nem a maszatolás ideje. Igen vagy nem? A baloldali tagadás csakis a szélsőségeseket segíti a párbeszéd elutasításával Európában. Hiába mondják, hogy egy kormányt támadnak, döntéseikkel egy országot, annak közel tízmillió lakosát hozzák lehetetlen helyzetbe. Mégis, miért és hogyan bízzanak az egyébként Európa-párti magyarok és ezek után az európai állampolgárok milliói az Európai Parlamentben? Önök közül sokan különböző párteseményeken még ma is éneklik, hogy ez a harc lesz a végső. Na, ezt én is szeretném most remélni.

Csaba Molnár (S&D). – Tisztelt Elnök Asszony! Ma Magyarországon sajnos nem az a kérdés, hogy jöjjenek-e az uniós pénzek a magyaroknak. Sajnos most az a kérdés, hogy jöjjenek-e az uniós források néhány kiválasztott magyarnak. Mert Orbán Viktor az uniós forrásokat nem a magyar embereknek, az önkormányzatoknak és a kisvállalkozásoknak szánja, hanem a saját üzlettársainak, oligarcháinak, családtagjainak. És ez nem jóslat. Ezt bizonyítja az elmúlt 12 év története, amelyben a magyar miniszterelnök gyermekkori barátja egyszerű falusi gázszerelőből az ország leggazdagabb emberévé vált.

Orbán 12 évnyi lopás után most azt bizonygatja Európának, hogy ő majd egy független hatóságot állít fel a korrupció kiszűrésére, hogy majd lehet pereket indítani a rendszerszintű lopások miatt, hogy majd más lesz a közbeszerzések rendszere. Mintha egy csapat hiéna azt próbálná bebizonyítani, hogy ugyan már felfalták a fél szavannát, de a jövőben majd vegetáriánusok lesznek. Ez szemfényvesztés, ez porhintés. Ez csak az Európai Bizottság átverését szolgálja. Az orbáni korrupció nem megfékezhető Orbán által felállított intézményekkel. 17 álintézkedés helyett egyetlenegy valódi intézkedés kéne, az Európai Ügyészséghez való csatlakozás. Csak az Európai Ügyészség képes eredményt elérni, mert az valóban független ettől a rendszertől.

Csak ez garantálhatná azt, hogy az európai adófizetők pénze oda kerüljön, ahova való, a magyar emberekhez, a magyar kisvállalkozásokhoz és a magyar önkormányzatokhoz. Mi a magyar emberek pártján állunk, őket védjük, és őket képviseljük akkor, amikor ragaszkodunk az Európai Ügyészséghez való csatlakozáshoz.

Valérie Hayer (Renew). – Madame la Présidente, Monsieur le Commissaire, chers collègues, un bruit court selon lequel la Commission s'apprêterait à céder au chantage de Viktor Orbán en lui offrant douze milliards d'euros pour racheter son veto. Orbán qui méprise tout ce que l'Union défend et représente, sauf son argent.

Monsieur le Commissaire, cette rumeur ne rassure personne dans cet hémicycle et encore moins les contribuables. Alors, pouvez-vous nous confirmer que les dix-sept réformes engagées sont déjà effectives, qu'elles ont réglé tous les problèmes de corruption en Hongrie et qu'elles sont bien irréversibles? Pourrez-vous nous garantir que l'indépendance des juges et des médias sera de nouveau assurée après dix ans de démantèlement des principes démocratiques? Car, en l'état, personne ici n'y croit.

Monsieur le Commissaire, la responsabilité de la Commission est grande, vous le savez. Nous attendons de la Commission qu'elle protège l'état de droit, qu'elle ne plie pas face aux apprentis dictateurs, qui usent et qui abusent de l'argent des Européens. Nous attendons de la Commission et de sa présidente qu'elles ne leur cèdent rien.

Stanislav Polčák (PPE). – Madam President, the rule of law is a key value of our community. It is supposed to guarantee equal treatment to every EU citizen in every EU country. Without a functioning system of the rule of law, citizens, companies and the non-government sector find themselves uncertain about their rights. And that is exactly the current situation in Hungary. For a long time, Europeans have felt the absence of guarantees of the rule of law, state-controlled media, interference in the free status of universities, systemic corruption and clientelism, etc., etc.

Last week we witnessed the shameful diplomatic action of the Hungarian Government, which started negotiating with the Iranian regime; a regime that murders women, young people, supplies attack drones against Ukraine. In this situation, we offer to Mr Orbán very weak 16 measures, but still we don't see any progress. The time is ending. We need to act now and we need to act according to the law of our community and protect EU values and taxpayers' budget funds.

Juan Fernando López Aguilar (S&D). – Señora presidenta, comisario Reynders, este Parlamento Europeo hace nada menos que seis años adoptó la iniciativa de incoar el procedimiento de sanción contemplado en el artículo 7 por estimar que, ya entonces, el Gobierno que preside Viktor Orbán en Hungría indicaba riesgo claro de violación grave y sistémica de los valores fundamentales de la Unión Europea. Y desde entonces no ha hecho sino empeorar el deterioro de la libertad de expresión, del respeto del pluralismo informativo, del respeto de las minorías y del respeto del pluralismo político y, por supuesto, el asalto a la independencia del poder judicial y del ministerio fiscal.

Pero esta discusión no es sobre el Estado de Derecho, es sobre el Reglamento sobre condicionalidad que este Parlamento Europeo adoptó como ley vinculante para los Estados miembros y que, por tanto, condiciona el acceso a los fondos europeos al cumplimiento de las reglas del Estado de Derecho.

La finalidad no es sancionar a gobiernos ni tampoco, por supuesto, sancionar al pueblo húngaro. La finalidad es proteger los intereses financieros de la Unión. No es congelar los fondos, es asegurar transparencia en el manejo de los intereses financieros de la Unión. Y resulta que la Comisión impone diecisiete condiciones de las cuales el Gobierno Orbán, todavía, solo parece haber puesto en marcha el respeto de tres. Y esas medidas requerirán, en todo caso, tiempo para su implementación.

Por tanto, no puedo sino suscribir el dictamen del equipo negociador, que señala que no hay ninguna razón para que la Comisión Europea, efectivamente, permita el acceso a los fondos europeos y al Fondo de Recuperación, por un importe de nada menos que 7 500 000 000 de euros, al Gobierno de Hungría. Queda mucho trabajo por hacer. No ha hecho los deberes y, por tanto, solo cabe una conclusión: no procede el levantamiento de la condicionalidad del acceso de los fondos al cumplimiento de las reglas del Estado de Derecho.

Ramona Strugariu (Renew). – Madam President, nobody's trying to punish Hungary, as the Hungarian Government is saying publicly when discussing the application of the Conditionality Regulation. But we in this House have a responsibility towards the European citizens to protect EU values, to make sure EU funds are used correctly and that there is no risk affecting the EU budget. I know the European Commission is also aware of this huge responsibility.

We cannot base our decisions on vague commitments to rule of law and promises of reforms without long-term monitoring. If we release these funds without true restoration of the rule of law in Hungary, then we will fail our collective responsibility. We will fail the Hungarian and European citizens alike. We will undermine all the work done so far in order to protect the rule of law in Europe.

Then we must make sure that Hungarian citizens do not suffer for the actions of their government and channel EU funds towards the civil society and local authorities. And, finally, freezing money for Ukraine and vetoing NATO's membership in order to negotiate one's unique interpretation of the rule of law is a form of international blackmail. If I were you, Mr Orbán, I would never go that far. The boomerang effect could be international, too, and I am not sure that you could ever explain it to the Hungarian people.

Maria Walsh (PPE). – Madam President, in the past three years of this Parliament, how many times have we discussed the actions or, in most cases, the lack of action by the Hungarian Government? How many?

We have debated the serious consequences of their decisions that have impacted, in my belief, the founding principles of our Union. And yet here we are, again. The Hungarian Government has not delivered in solidarity in protecting the fundamental rights of EU citizens, yet they sit comfortably in protecting their economic assets with their continued push back against sanctions on Russian energy.

The Commission and the Council must understand when a country continues to strike and strip the LGBTI+ community and other minority groups of their rights. We cannot continue to ignore. We cannot. Discrimination against one group festers, it spreads outwards and it can affect more and more communities, and we must pay attention. We cannot turn our backs on EU citizens no matter which EU governments attempt to work against the founding principles. We work to protect the people of Hungary, to protect all citizens. And as shared earlier, the rule of law is not to be negotiated.

Montag, 21. November 2022

István Ujhelyi (S&D). – Tisztelt Elnök Asszony! Engem egyetlen egy dolog érdekel, méghozzá a magyar emberek, a magyar családok érdeke. Ezen a szemüvegen keresztül tudom csak vizsgálni a mostani helyzetet. Érdeke az a magyar családoknak, hogy a kormány évi egymilliárd euróból most például hazudik arról, hogy mi min vitázunk? Érdeke az a magyar családoknak, hogy megszűnt Magyarországon a jogállamiság? Nem, nem érdeke. Tény, hogy az uniós támogatások járnak Magyarországnak. Az is tény, hogy ezeket az Orbán-rendszer miatt a rezsim korrupt, útonálló, zsaroló, agresszív politikája miatt jelenleg nem kapjuk meg. És az is tény, hogy akkor fog megérkezni a magyar családokhoz és a magyar gazdasághoz a támogatás, ha az Orbán-kormány hajlandó változtatásra.

Kedves Magyar Választó! Erről vitatkozunk, hogy mikor és milyen módon tudjuk rákényszeríteni Orbánékat arra, hogy kevesebbet vagy semennyit se lopjanak, és tartsák be azokat a szabályokat, amelyek a magyar emberek érdekében kell, hogy a jogállamiságot alkossák. Ez az egyetlen kérdés, és magyar európai parlamenti képviselőként a következő időszakban is azért fogok harcolni, hogy a forrásainkat megkapjuk. De azok ne Orbánék, hanem a magyar családok érdekében érkezzenek Magyarországra.

Tom Vandenkendelaere (PPE). – Voorzitter, wij hebben hard gevochten voor wetgeving die de Europese begroting tegen corruptie beschermt, omdat corruptie in bepaalde lidstaten welig tiert. Zo ging de situatie in Hongarije de afgelopen jaren onder het bewind van Orbán van kwaad naar erger.

In september oordeelde het Parlement dat Hongarije niet langer als volwaardige democratie kon worden beschouwd en dat alle Europese middelen voor Hongarije bevroren moesten worden. Hongarije stemde hiermee in en legde 17 maatregelen voor om de corruptie te bestrijden. Dit volstaat echter niet.

Er is op dit moment onvoldoende bewijs om te kunnen concluderen dat er geen risico's meer bestaan voor onze Europese begroting. Het zou dan ook een historische vergissing zijn indien de Commissie zou besluiten toch weer Europees geld naar Hongarije te laten vloeien, rechtstreeks in de zakken van Orbán en zijn entourage.

Dit is een test voor het conditionaliteitsmechanisme.

Catch-the-eye procedure

Μαρία Σπυράκη (PPE). – Κυρία Πρόεδρε, Επίτροπε Reynders, συνάδελφοι, είναι η πρώτη φορά που εφαρμόζεται ο μηχανισμός αιρεσιμότητας για να κριθεί η επίδοση μιας κυβέρνησης, εν προκειμένω της κυβέρνησης Orbán, στην εφαρμογή των κανόνων του κράτους δικαίου. Και είναι η πρώτη φορά που η Ευρωπαϊκή Ένωση εξετάζει στην πράξη τη σύνδεση της χρηματοδότησης με την εφαρμογή των θεμελιωδών αρχών και των αξιών μας.

Επιτρέψτε μου μια προσωπική αναφορά: όλοι εμείς που υπογράψαμε το αίτημα για την προφορική ερώτηση τον Ιούνιο του 2020 μπορούμε σήμερα να αισθανόμαστε δικαιωμένοι. Η κυβέρνηση Orbán, ο ίδιος ο πρωθυπουργός της Ουγγαρίας, θεωρεί πως μπορεί να εκβιάζει την Ένωση, να περνάει πάνω από τις αρχές και τους κανόνες που καθορίζουν την ευρωπαϊκή ταυτότητα, να χρησιμοποιεί την ψήφο του στο Συμβούλιο ως όπλο εκβιασμού, να απειλεί την ευρωπαϊκή ενότητα στη στήριξη της Ουγγαρίας, να ακυρώσει τις αρχές μας.

Η απάντηση σε αυτή την περίπτωση είναι μία: η Ευρωπαϊκή Ένωση δεν εκβιάζεται. Κανένας συμβιβασμός σε θέματα αρχής. Ο Orbán και η κυβέρνησή του στερούν από τους Ούγγρους βασικές προϋποθέσεις του ευρωπαϊκού τρόπου ζωής, παραβιάζουν τις αρχές του κράτους δικαίου και, αν δεν εφαρμόσουν μέχρι κεραίας όσα επί της αρχής μάς ενώνουν, θα στερήσουν και κονδύλια για την οικονομική ανάταξη της Ουγγαρίας.

Margarida Marques (S&D). – Senhora Presidente, Senhor Comissário, o regulamento é aprovado no Conselho sem o voto de Orbán. Não deu o seu apoio à condicionalidade de Estado de Direito e tudo está a fazer para bloquear, adiar a aplicação deste mecanismo.

Senhor Comissário, a Comissão Europeia é a guardiã dos Tratados. Conheço bem o seu já antigo compromisso com o respeito e fazer respeitar o Estado de Direito. Ouvi explicar-nos os passos que a Comissão está a dar, o calendário, as 17 medidas. A questão é: serão efetivos?

Senhor Comissário, temos de ser coerentes. Não nos podemos deixar convencer por um empacotamento diferente do mesmo produto.

Clare Daly (The Left). – Madam President, the story going around here, of course, is that the mighty Hungary is holding the poor EU hostage, demanding billions in exchange for lifting its Council veto on the Ukraine aid deal and on corporate tax rates.

But who's blackmailing who? Because what's going on here looks a lot less like Hungary blackmailing the EU and a lot more like the EU extorting Hungary. Get in line on Ukraine. Give us your Council votes or you won't get your cash.

Both sides, of course, are happily colluding in the pretence that Hungary is actually doing anything about the rule of law and fundamental rights. And the people of Hungary, the ones suffering because of the rule of law crisis in that country, they don't feature in the calculus anywhere.

It's absolutely disgraceful that the rule of law has been weaponised by the Commission in this way. The only condition for Hungary getting its money should be that it sorts out its rule of law problems, nothing else. If a filthy deal on Council votes has been cut, the Commission has to come clean about it and the Parliament has to oppose it.

Łukasz Kohut (S&D). – Pani Przewodnicząca! Panie pośle Jaki, jak to się stało, że sprowadziliście Polskę, 38-milionowy kraj, do roli sługi cztery razy mniejszych Węgier? Jak to się stało? Przedłożyliście sojusz z Orbanem i licencję na łamanie prawa nad interes własnych obywateli? Czy wam nie jest po prostu wstyd? Bo to wstyd i hańba stać ramię w ramię z Orbanem. Po tym wszystkim, po tym jak siał ruską propagandę, po tym jak blokował sankcje na Putina, po tym jak utrudniał transport broni, i dziś, gdy blokuje 18 mld euro unijnej pomocy dla Ukrainy. Nasi przyjaciele zza Odry, z którymi wam nie jest po drodze, zaoferowali nam samoloty Euro Fighter i wyrzutnie Patriot. A co Węgry dały Polsce? Wskażcie chociażby jedną korzyść dla Polski, dla mieszkańców, którą dał wasz sojusz z Orbanem. Wiem, wiem, nie wskażecie, bo jej po prostu nie ma.

Oprzytomnijcie. Po pierwsze wyrzućcie Węgry, ani jednego euro dla Orbana. Po drugie przywróćcie prześladowanych sędziów. Panie pośle Jaki, niech pan porozmawia z szefem. Po trzecie - tu zwracam się do Komisji - fundusze unijne powinny trafić do obywateli i samorządów.

Mick Wallace (The Left). – Madam President, Hungary certainly has huge rule-of-law problems, but giving out about Hungary would carry a lot more weight if we were consistent. But sadly, the European Union could sell hypocrisy. You lecture Hungary and Poland, yet in your own Member States, police can beat protesters in the streets and fire rubber bullets at them and that's OK.

The Commission talks about withholding EUR 7.5 billion from Hungary under the Conditionality Regulation, yet the EU is happy to pour billions and support Ukraine, despite the fact that in 2021 the European Court of Auditors' report said it was one of the most corrupt countries in Europe.

The EU lectures countries about rule of law, and also on human rights when it suits its geopolitical agenda. We have an Association Agreement with Israel. How come we've no problem with the rule of law when it comes to how Israel treats the Palestinians? What about the human rights of the Palestinians? Do they not matter? We're perfectly happy to do business with them.

Malin Björk (The Left). – Fru talman! Över tio år av attacker på demokrati och rättsstat, av attacker på hbtq-aktivister, av attacker på försvarare av mänskliga rättigheter. Sedan 17 otillräckliga reformer, och inte ens de här kan Orbáns regering leva upp till. Kommissionen, resultatet måste vara: inga pengar. Inga pengar ska gå ut till den här regeringen. För om inte de här pengarna fryses, så finns det kamrater runtom i Europa som tittar på den här situationen, som gillar Orbán precis för hans brist på demokrati, och som gärna vill se någonting liknande.

Vi har sådana krafter i mitt land också, i Sverige. Sverigedemokraterna heter de. De är imponerade av hur Orbán kan trampa på allas rättigheter, trampa på demokratin, trampa på domstolarnas oberoende. Precis så vill de göra i Sverige också – om vi inte ser upp. Låt inte detta sprida sig. Betala inte ut några pengar till Ungern. Se till att upprätta respekt för demokrati och rättsstat.

(End of catch-the-eye procedure)

Didier Reynders, *Member of the Commission*. – Madam President, honourable Members, I would like to thank you for this debate which reflects its important positions and considerations.

Montag, 21. November 2022

The Commission is taking good note of your concerns. Let me recall that the Conditionality Regulation is a preventive tool against risk to the EU budget. We have to approach the problems we can all see with the mind-set of fixing problems.

The ongoing conditionality procedure is an opportunity to prove that triggering the new mechanism brings results. Hungary has committed to substantially reform its system. As I explained, the Commission's assessment is ongoing and will be finalised without undue delay before the end of this month.

To answer to your remarks, we are assessing whether the commitments have been correctly specified in the enacting laws and implementing rules, and implemented accordingly and hence put an end to the risk of the breaches of the rule of law for the sound financial management of the Union budget and the Union's financial interests.

The European Parliament is an important partner in the implementation of the regulation. Let me assure you on the importance we attach to applying the regulation in the soundest way.

The Recovery and Resilience Facility follows a different objective and distinct parameters. It will be important to link the disbursements of funds under the RRF to the milestones of the national plan, including those linked to strengthening the independence of the judiciary. Like in the case of the conditionality procedure, the final decision regarding the approval of Hungary's recovery and resilience plan lies with the Council.

Concerning the conditionality mechanism, the mitigation of the risks to the sound financial management and the protection of the EU budget remain our ultimate goals.

Moreover, let me recall that the Commission also shares a number of the perceptions relating to the wider rule of law concerns in Hungary, for instance, in the European Parliament's resolute proposals in the Article 7 procedure. I updated the Council during a hearing relating to the Article 7 procedure on Hungary last Friday.

We also had the opportunity to exchange with Parliament's rapporteur, Madam Gwendoline Delbos-Corfield. We will continue to use all the instruments at our disposal to protect the rule of law, including the infringement proceedings against different laws containing, for us, some discriminations.

And before concluding, I want to add that we are also concerned by the context: only a month ago, the Hungarian Government launched a national consultation on EU sanctions against Russia after the government itself gave its express approval, like all other Member States. But, for the moment, we assess the efficiency of the measures proposed by the Hungarian Government in the framework of the Conditionality Regulation and the milestones put in the recovery and resilience plan.

So we'll come, very soon as said, with an assessment, our own assessment of the Commission on all those measures to see if they are efficient enough to go forward.

President. – The deadline for tabling motions for resolutions to wind up this debate will expire today at 19.00.

The debate is closed and the vote will be held on Thursday.

Written statements (Rule 171)

Lívia Járóka (NI), *írásban*. – Magyarország jogállamisági helyzetét számtalan alkalommal vizsgálta már az Európai Parlament. Politikai céloktól vezérelve, az ország helyreállítási és rezilienciaépítési terveinek hátráltatása azonban példátlan, és intézményi szinten is megdöbbenésre okot adó. Az Európai Unió közös értékeinek tiszteletben tartása közös érdekünk, így Magyarország számára is prioritást élvez. Mint az Európai Unió teljes jogú tagjait, bennünket is megillet azokhoz a közös uniós finanszírozási alapokhoz való hozzáférés, amelyek jogszerűen járnak Magyarország számára. Az elmúlt évtizedben számtalan eredményt értünk el, többek között a szegénységfelszámolás és roma felzárkóztatás területén is.

27,8%-ról 8%-ra csökkentettük a súlyos anyagi szegénységben élők számát, és közel egymillió új munkahelyet teremtettünk. A forrásvisszatartás azonban nemcsak eddigi eredményeinket, de jövőbeli vállalásainkat is veszélyezteti. Ezért méltánytalannak tartok minden olyan törekvést, amely politikai nyomásgyakorlásként használva törekszik nehezíteni az uniós források felhasználását és azok tagállami lehívását. Különösen elszomorít, hogy ellenzéki képviselőtársaim itt, az EP-ben, saját állampolgáraik érdekeit figyelmen kívül hagyva asszisztálnak ehhez a politikai akcióhoz. A magyar baloldali képviselők számára láthatóan nem fontos, hogy országunk az EU sikeres és prosperáló tagállamává tudjon válni, segítve ezzel a magyar társadalom felzárkózását és közös európai céljaink megvalósulását.

Javaslom képviselőtársaim figyelmébe, hogy inkább a baloldalhoz köthető, 2022-es országgyűlési választási kampány tiltott pártfinanszírozási gyanúját vizsgálják ki. Higgyék el, sok érdekességre bukkannának.

Ivan Štefanec (PPE), *písomne*. – Európska únia je založená na hodnotách, ako sú úcta k ľudskej dôstojnosti, sloboda, demokracia a rovnosť. Zásady právneho štátu a dodržiavanie ľudských práv vrátane práv osôb patriacich k menšinám sú zohľadnené v Charte základných práv EÚ a zakotvené v medzinárodných zmluvách o ľudských právach.

Európsky parlament potrebuje záruky, že to Maďarsko s nápravnými opatreniami myslí naozaj vážne. Nie je možné tolerovať korupciu a pochybné verejné obstarávania pri európskych prostriedkoch v žiadnom členskom štáte Európskej únie. S tým súvisí aj stav súdnictva a právneho štátu v krajine. Nie pozitívnym signálom je aj rozhodnutie Maďarska nezúčastniť sa na posilnenej spolupráci na účely zriadenia Európskej prokuratúry.

Predostreté opatrenia maďarskej vlády nie sú dostatočné na riešenie existujúceho systémového rizika pre finančné záujmy EÚ. Transparentnosť musí byť základom pri prerozdeľovaní európskych finančných zdrojov.

14. Vorbeugung von, Umgang mit und bessere Versorgung bei Diabetes in der EU anlässlich des Weltdiabetestags (Aussprache)

President. – The next item is the debate on the Commission statement on 'prevention, management and better care of diabetes in the EU on the occasion of World Diabetes Day' (2022/2901(RSP)).

Stella Kyriakides, *Member of the Commission*. – Madam President, honourable Members, more than 32 million people live with diabetes. That is one in ten adults in the EU. This figure has doubled in the last decade and that is an alarm call for us all. Diabetes is one of the greatest health challenges of modern times and this challenge will continue to increase unless we take action and unless we all work together.

Last week we marked World Diabetes Day, and this gives us an opportunity each year to shine a light on diabetes and to relook and examine our efforts, to identify what we need to do better, to prevent, to educate and to raise awareness and to listen to patients and all stakeholders. But we all know that this is not a responsibility that we should be doing just one day a year. So I'm delighted to be part of today's discussion, and I welcome the European Parliament's resolution on diabetes.

This resolution is an important signal to European citizens and of course to all diabetes patients. Diabetes cannot be seen as only one disease. It is also a dangerous multiplier. It is important to address the risks of developing diabetes or even having high blood sugar levels, including through nutrition and physical activity. Diabetes, we know, increases the risks of other conditions, such as cardiovascular diseases and stroke. And those with diabetes run a more serious risk of serious disease when affected by COVID.

Diabetes puts a heavy economic strain on health budgets, at about 9% of the EU health expenditure in 2019. But let's look at the positive side and let's see what can be done. The burden of type-2 diabetes can be reduced through healthy lifestyles, through better diets, through physical activity, through not smoking and avoiding alcohol use. We need to help citizens live healthy lives with healthy minds and healthy bodies. And this is in order to ensure healthy futures. We need to help them to make healthy choices. The 'Healthier Together' EU non-communicable diseases initiative aims to do exactly this. This has a budget for 2022 of EUR 156 million, and through this initiative, we are helping Member States to identify and to implement actions to reduce the burden of non-communicable diseases. We are financing joint actions that address risk factors related to diabetes and of course other non-communicable diseases.

Data on diabetes and prediabetes is often lacking and we're working to fill this gap. To do this, we're financing a feasibility study to assess the possibility for the collection of data on non-communicable diseases, and this will start with diabetes as the pilot area. We are financing research to better understand diabetes and to answer important questions such as how can we prevent the development of type-2 diabetes? Or how can we replace insulin for the treatment of diabetes type 1? How can we help those with diabetes in the self-management of their disease? Horizon 2020 and Horizon Europe – through the innovative medicines initiative that partners with the pharmaceutical industry – enable this research.

Montag, 21. November 2022

Ladies and gentlemen, on World Diabetes Day, I called on Member States and all stakeholders to collaborate, to work together to improve the lives of all Europeans living with diabetes. With the actions under the EU4Health programme, we will support Member States, patient groups and health professionals, and I want to thank you for the ongoing support of this Parliament for EU4Health.

But more importantly, we can deliver concrete benefits to all diabetes patients and we can strengthen prevention across the EU. Together, I firmly believe we are able to build healthy societies and we are able to look towards a healthier future for all.

Pernille Weiss, *for PPE-Gruppen*. – Fru Formand! En resolution om diabetes? Ja, hvorfor ikke. Det er jo ti år siden sidst og udfordringerne, de er hverken blevet færre, ligesom omfanget heller ikke er blevet mindre.

I dag har 33 millioner borgere i EU diabetes, og i 2030 vil 38 millioner have det. De fleste af den type, som hænger sammen med livsstil: Hvor meget vi spiser, hvad vi spiser, sover, bevæger os og så videre. Alt det vi forsøger at forebygge eller forbyde - alt afhængig af politisk ståsted. Men også afhængig af, om vi tør skifte gear i diabetesdebatten og forstå, at diabetes er et symptom på, at vi endnu ikke har forstået, at svær overvægt ofte er årsagen. En årsag, der IKKE handler om, at alle med overvægt selv har valgt det og i øvrigt selv kan ændre på det.

Nej, svær overvægt eller forstadier til det er rent faktisk en kronisk lidelse, som næsten 60 procent af alle voksne i EU har. Det er jo et vildt tal. En kronisk lidelse, som mange aldrig slipper af med igen - uanset hvor meget de lægger deres kost om eller bevæger sig anderledes. En kronisk lidelse, som stadigvæk lever i ly af, at vi har en angst for at tale om overvægt. En kronisk lidelse, som derfor medvirker til, at stadig flere borgere udvikler diabetes, som faktisk kunne være undgået. En kronisk lidelse, der koster kassen! Også i mistet livskvalitet.

Som sygeplejerske - og som europapolitiker – så er jeg simpelthen så træt af, at vi behandler udvalgte sygdomme uden at tage fat i selve årsagen til de over 200 andre sygdomme - udover diabetes - der tynger den enkelte, familien og samfundsøkonomien. Lad os dog i hele EU anderkende - også som det er foreslået af WHO for lang tid siden - at svær overvægt er en kronisk lidelse, og den skal også behandles som en kronisk lidelse.

Christel Schaldemose, *for S&D-Gruppen*. – Fru formand! Tak skal du have, fru kommissær. Tak for en god indledning og for at anerkende de store udfordringer, der er med diabetes i EU, hvor næsten hver niende EU-borger har diabetes - enten type et eller type to. Derfor er det også rigtig vigtigt og godt, at vi i dag debatterer det og nu også får vedtaget en ny resolution. For der er meget, vi kan gøre, og der er meget, vi bør gøre. Det er alvorligt for de mennesker, der lever med diabetes. De skal have en bedre livskvalitet. Men det er også alvorligt for vores sundhedsvæsner. Og det værste af det hele er, at vi jo godt kan gøre noget ved det! Efter min mening skal vi have knækket kurven i EU i forhold til antallet af folk med diabetes. Særligt type to er jo mulig at forebygge ved sundere livstil, og vi har faktisk mange ting, vi kan gøre i EU. Vi kan være med til at skabe bedre forbrugerinformation for vores fødevarer, vi kan reducere salt og sukkerindholdet i mange af vores forarbejdede varer osv. Risikofaktorerne, dem har vi et ansvar for i EU. Men først og fremmest skal vi tænke på de patienter, der lever med diabetes, og de skal kunne leve et bedre liv. Diabetes er en alvorlig sygdom. Lad os også tage den alvorligt politisk, tak.

Frédérique Ries, *au nom du groupe Renew*. – Madame la Présidente, le diabète est l'un des plus grands défis sanitaires de notre époque. C'étaient d'ailleurs les mots que vous avez prononcés dans l'ouverture de vos remarques, Madame la Commissaire. Et j'ajouterais à cela: l'un des défis les plus minimisés.

Un Européen sur dix – cela a été dit – vit avec le diabète et près de la moitié d'entre eux n'arrivent pas à le maîtriser. Le diabète est un facteur multiplicateur d'une série d'autres maladies, cardiaques notamment, mais pas seulement. Et pourtant, un diabétique sur trois en Europe s'ignore.

Dix ans après la première résolution de notre Parlement sur le sujet, on parlait à l'époque d'«épidémie», celle d'aujourd'hui est un véritable signal d'alarme. La Commission a publié en juin une initiative sur les maladies non transmissibles. Parmi les pistes étudiées, mais laissées au bon vouloir des États membres, je recherche les véritables objectifs concrets pour le diabète. Quels sont ces objectifs? Où sont les objectifs de réduction des risques – et pourtant, vous avez évoqué la prévention du diabète de type 2 –, de diagnostic systématique, de contrôle de la glycémie, de lutte contre des préjugés qui sont dépassés et aussi contre une certaine stigmatisation?

Il nous revient donc impérativement maintenant de fixer ces objectifs ambitieux pour susciter une nouvelle vague de plans nationaux et soutenir les patients, souvent délaissés entre deux consultations annuelles, au mieux parfois, accélérer bien évidemment aussi la recherche et l'arrivée d'innovations.

On l'a dit et redit, pendant la pandémie notamment, le traité est peu généreux en termes d'Europe de la santé. Mais même dans cette lecture étriquée, l'Europe a ici encore une valeur ajoutée. Réelle. C'est à nous de l'imposer.

Tilly Metz, *au nom du groupe Verts/ALE.* – Madame la Présidente, la Journée mondiale du diabète était lundi dernier et a malheureusement été l'occasion de souligner le nombre croissant de personnes atteintes de cette maladie. Malgré les différentes initiatives au niveau européen, la coordination pour la prévention et l'accès aux soins reste limitée. Cela doit changer et tel est l'objectif de cette résolution.

Mais plus encore, cette résolution contient trois changements importants. Le premier est la fin des discriminations envers les personnes atteintes de diabète. Non, une personne diabétique ne devrait pas être exclue d'une profession ou d'un cours à l'école du fait de sa maladie. Le deuxième est l'accès aux soins et à l'innovation. Pour cela, la transparence des prix des médicaments ainsi que de l'utilisation des fonds pour la recherche est clé. Le troisième changement que demande cette résolution, c'est la transition vers un environnement et une alimentation saine.

L'Europe a un rôle majeur à jouer pour coordonner les efforts des États membres, au moyen, par exemple, du pacte vert et de la PAC. Encore une fois, je terminerai pour souligner que les enjeux environnementaux et sanitaires sont extrêmement liés et demandent à être traités ensemble.

Simona Baldassarre, *a nome del gruppo ID.* – Signora Presidente, signora Commissaria, onorevoli colleghi, ricordare tutti i pazienti affetti da diabete è un obbligo per quest'Aula.

Una malattia con un'incidenza in crescita in tutto il mondo, in particolare per il diabete di tipo 2, per cui è doveroso agire prevenendo i fattori di rischio come il sovrappeso, l'obesità, la sedentarietà, le diseguaglianze socioeconomiche e la scorretta alimentazione. Un'epidemia silenziosa che, solo nel 2021, ha causato oltre un milione di decessi in Europa, classificandosi come la quarta causa di morte nell'Unione europea.

Bene allora programmi come EU4Health, ma non basta. Da medico ribadisco che il primo passo è sempre la prevenzione: identificare attivamente i soggetti a rischio, promuovendo corretti stili di vita, una sana nutrizione e attività fisica, con piani di informazione e screening per intervenire quanto prima. La metà dei diabetici e prediabetici non sa addirittura di esserlo e purtroppo, quando la malattia diventa evidente, i sintomi sono macroscopici, il danno è già fatto e si rischia un fine vita complicato e invalidante, con enormi costi personali, familiari, sociali e sanitari.

Nella lotta contro il diabete, cari colleghi, questo Parlamento deve rispondere «presente».

Joanna Kopcińska, *w imieniu grupy ECR.* – Pani Przewodnicząca! Pani Komisarz! Szanowni Państwo! Cukrzyca jest jedną z najgroźniejszych i najczęściej występujących chorób cywilizacyjnych o charakterze przewlekłym. W Unii Europejskiej, o czym wspominała pani komisarz, cierpią na nią ponad 33 miliony osób, a według szacunków w niespełna osiem najbliższych lat ich liczba wzrośnie do 38 milionów. Co więcej, szacuje się, że na pewnym etapie choroby do 80% pacjentów będzie zmagać się również z innymi najczęstszymi powikłaniami cukrzycy.

I choć ostatnie lata przyniosły pacjentom wiele ułatwień w dostępie do nowoczesnych leków i technologii w terapii leczenia oraz zapobiegania cukrzycy, to wciąż pozostaje wiele do zrobienia w kontekście holistycznego podejścia do tego wieloczynnikowego wyzwania zdrowotnego. Dlatego jeżeli rzeczywiście mamy na celu realnie zadziałać na korzyść pacjenta diabetologicznego, podejmijmy kroki do osiągnięcia większej synergii poprzez istniejące programy przekładające się na lepsze skoordynowanie opieki diagnostycznej i lekarskiej. Optymalnie wykorzystujmy tę wiedzę, którą mają już państwa członkowskie, poprzez wymianę doświadczenia, wspólne uwzględnianie danych epidemiologicznych odnośnie zapadalności na chorobę oraz dostępności do zakresu świadczeń lekarskich, włączając w to analizę, ścieżkę oraz

prognozę leczenia pacjenta.

Scalenie dotychczasowych programów oraz wysoko wykwalifikowanej pomocy medycznej może sprawić, że leczenie będzie miało cechy spójnego działania, w którym liczy się podstawowa zasada, że dobro pacjenta jest najważniejsze.

Kateřina Konečná, *za skupinu The Left*. – Paní předsedající, vážená paní komisařko, vážení kolegové a kolegyně, dovolte mi v prvé řadě poděkovat zpravodajům za příkladnou spolupráci při vyjednáváních této rezoluce, kterým jsem měla tu čest předsedat. Doufám, že se konsenzus, který jsme v průběhu celého procesu měli, podaří přetavit také do hladkého hlasování. Na čem se však shoda nenašla a mrzí mě to, je opětovně otázka patentových práv. Je to téměř 100 let, co se vynálezce inzulinu Frederick Banting vzdal patentu k této látce a pronesl onu slavnou větu: „Inzulin patří světu, ne mně". A je smutné, že téměř 100 let po obětavém gestu tohoto vědce jsou někteří mí kolegové, zejména z pravice, natolik ideologicky zaslepeni, že odmítají byť i zmínku o tomto kroku v projednávané rezoluci.

Až 32 milionů lidí v EU žije s některým typem cukrovky. Polovina z nich běžně nemá správnou hladinu cukru v krvi, což u nich vede k dlouhodobým a závažným zdravotním problémům. Při příležitosti Světového dne cukrovky a 100 let od nesobeckého gesta jednoho vědce musíme na evropské úrovni prohloubit spolupráci v boji s tímto onemocněním.

Edina Tóth (NI). – Tisztelt Elnök Asszony! Biztos Asszony! Napjainkban világszerte több százmillió embert érint a cukorbetegség és az inzulinrezisztencia. Én is egy vagyok közülük. Ez lett korunk népbetegsége. Az elmúlt két évben a járvány tovább nehezítette a betegséggel élők helyzetét, és jelentősen csökkentette a megelőzésre irányuló lehetőségeket. Éppen ezért kértem már korábban az Európai Bizottságot, hogy dolgozzon ki a cukorbetegség megelőzésére és kezelésére irányuló cselekvési tervet, de sajnos eddig elutasító választ kaptam. Jó hír viszont, hogy vannak olyan országok, köztük hazám, Magyarország, ahol a kormány kiemelt figyelmet szentel a cukorbetegeket érintő problémák kezelésének, amely során az érintettek több területen kapnak segítséget.

Továbbra is úgy gondolom, hogy az egyre romló tendencia megállítása érdekében sürgető szükség van egy irányelv kidolgozására. Bízom abban, hogy a Bizottság álláspontja a közeljövőben változni fog, és sikerül együtt és hatékonyan fellépni a diabétesszel szemben.

Ljudmila Novak (PPE). – Spoštovana gospa komisarka, predsedujoča, kolegice in kolegi.

Ob nenehnem povečevanju števila sladkornih bolnikov je jasno, da moramo bolj odločno in učinkovito ukrepati. Največ lahko naredimo na področju izobraževanja in ozaveščanja državljanov na vseh nivojih in pri vseh starostih. Ko zboli en član družine, to vpliva na življenje celotne družine, še posebej, če zboli otrok. Z ozaveščanjem o vzrokih za nastanek bolezni lahko vplivamo na življenjski slog državljanov, da bi bili manj izpostavljeni tveganjem. Preventiva je vedno cenejša in boljša od kurative. V Evropski uniji je veliko znanja, žal pa naši državljani nimajo vsi enakih pogojev in možnosti v boju s to boleznijo. Kadar v Evropski uniji povežemo znanje, izkušnje, ukrepe, in zato namenimo tudi sredstva iz našega skupnega proračuna, lahko naredimo neverjetne premike, lahko veliko stvari spremenimo na bolje.

Heléne Fritzon (S&D). – Fru talman! Kommissionär! Ingenstans i världen är det så vanligt med typ 1-diabetes bland barn och unga som här i EU. Det är ett underbetyg till dagens förebyggande arbete. Nu måste vi öka takten. Vi måste förebygga rökning, minska alkoholkonsumtionen och äta mer hälsosamt. Här har EU en roll, exempelvis genom att vi åstadkommer tydligare märkning på förpackningar av alkohol.

Vi måste också säkra så att EU aldrig hamnar i den situation som 1,3 miljoner amerikaner är i, där man tvingas att hoppa över sitt insulin för att man inte har råd. För oss socialdemokrater är det självklart med lika tillgång till medicin för alla. Jag vill också lyfta fram vikten av att följa den tekniska utvecklingen inom mätning av blodsocker. Inga gamla fördomar ska leda till diskriminering av diabetiker.

Véronique Trillet-Lenoir (Renew). – Madame la Présidente, Madame la Commissaire, 33 millions de personnes souffrent aujourd'hui du diabète en Europe et 90 % d'entre elles d'un diabète de type 2. Il faut dire les choses clairement: le diabète de type 2 est essentiellement une maladie de la mauvaise alimentation, trop riche, trop sucrée et déséquilibrée. La clé de la prévention du diabète, c'est l'éducation à une alimentation saine dès le plus jeune âge et une information simple, compréhensible et basée sur la science des consommateurs sur les produits alimentaires qu'ils achètent. C'est pourquoi, Madame la Commissaire, la révision de la directive sur l'étiquetage nutritionnel est un des éléments clés de l'initiative Healthier Together que vous avez récemment lancée.

Et parce que les facteurs de risque du diabète sont communs, entre autres, à ceux du cancer et des maladies cardiovasculaires, nous avons besoin d'une véritable stratégie européenne de prévention contre les maladies chroniques permettant d'intégrer la prise en compte des déterminants de la santé dans toutes les politiques européennes, d'établir une gouvernance inclusive rassemblant notamment les représentants des consommateurs et des patients, et surtout d'encourager les États membres à mettre en œuvre des mesures de prévention ambitieuses sans jamais céder aux pressions des groupes d'intérêts.

Aurélia Beigneux (ID). – Madame la Présidente, depuis 30 ans, l'Europe a réussi à maîtriser la propagation du diabète et les décès associés à cette maladie surviennent majoritairement en raison d'un diagnostic trop tardif. Les efforts pour démocratiser les outils de prévention ne doivent donc jamais faiblir. Mais depuis 30 ans, l'Europe a aussi tout fait pour développer les causes du diabète: vous avez provoqué un repli sur les métiers du service, apporté une alimentation hyper sucrée en masse, favorisé un nutriscore inadapté et avez préféré lutter pour les quotas dans les entreprises plutôt que de combattre le stress au travail. En parallèle, le vieillissement de la population européenne fera mathématiquement augmenter le nombre de personnes à risque.

La politique européenne de santé aurait dû faire ses preuves pendant la pandémie. Bien au contraire, elle a montré son incompétence à la face du monde, laissant les frontières ouvertes et faisant venir les masques de Chine et les vaccins des États-Unis. Une remise en cause sérieuse du mode de vie promu en Europe et de votre politique de santé est donc nécessaire. Éliminer les causes à la source, c'est éviter de poignarder une deuxième fois les services hospitaliers de nos pays.

Margarita de la Pisa Carrión (ECR). – Señora presidenta, señora comisaria, señorías, cada persona es distinta; su diabetes, también. Se deben dar posibilidades para elegir la forma más adecuada para cada paciente. Existen avances tecnológicos que deben ser aprovechados porque alargan la esperanza de vida y disminuyen las complicaciones. Es imprescindible la monitorización próxima de glucosa con sistemas modernizados, la administración a tiempo real de insulina. Y las bombas. Y ya no es un sueño el implante de liberación sostenida de nanoformulaciones de insulina.

También son muy importantes la concienciación social y la comprensión de la enfermedad y de los enfermos con diabetes, una tarjeta de identificación mundial que permita a quién esté más cerca reconocer los síntomas y dar soporte en hipoglucemias, naturalidad en los controles de seguridad en aeropuertos, facilidades para los niños, formación o las etiquetas de los azúcares de los alimentos. Y, también, fomentar los servicios de enfermería, pues son quienes llevan el manejo habitual de los pacientes, para saber cómo actuar, por ejemplo, en las descompensaciones de la adolescencia: su labor permite que Europa tenga una posición privilegiada.

Y, por supuesto, se necesita inversión en investigación para profundizar y saber el porqué del aumento de las enfermedades autoinmunes como la diabetes. Es necesario crear y compartir conocimiento y buenas prácticas para conseguir mayores logros en el espacio europeo.

Tomislav Sokol (PPE). – Poštovana predsjedavajuća, povjerenice, kolegice i kolege, procjenjuje se da u Europskoj uniji svaka deseta odrasla osoba boluje od dijabetesa, a da troškovi povezani s liječenjem iznose devet posto ukupnih troškova u zdravstvu. Dodatno zabrinjava podatak da čak polovica oboljelih osoba nema postavljenu dijagnozu koja je ključna za pravilno liječenje.

U tom kontekstu pozdravljam inicijativu Europske komisije „Zdravi zajedno za borbu s nezaraznim bolestima". Međutim, za borbu s dijabetesom potreban nam je još ambiciozniji okvir. Zato pozivam na donošenje europskog plana za borbu protiv dijabetesa koji bi sadržavao precizno definirane ciljeve, regulatorne mjere, indikatore i snažno financiranje po uzoru na europski plan za borbu protiv raka. Samo tako Europa može pobijediti dijabetes, bolest s kojom se u Europskoj uniji bori 170 tisuća djece.

Na kraju, želim istaknuti da je za uspješnu borbu s dijabetesom, ali i drugim bolestima, važno uspostaviti europski prostor zdravstvenih podataka. Ponosan sam zato da kao izvjestitelj Europskog parlamenta već radim na ovom fajlu koji će omogućiti razmjenu i pristup zdravstvenim podacima kako u svrhu izravnog liječenja tako i u svrhu istraživanja i razvoja novih oblika liječenja ove teške bolesti.

Montag, 21. November 2022

Puhetta johti HEIDI HAUTALA

varapuhemies

István Ujhelyi (S&D). – Tisztelt Elnök Asszony! 100 évvel az inzulin felfedezése után és mintegy 10 évvel az ezt megelőző parlamenti vita után én azt sikernek tartom, hogy ezt a kérdést most ide tudtuk hozni a plenárisra. De vajon mitől lesz ezáltal jobb az inzulinrezisztenciában, a cukorbetegségben szenvedők élete az Európai Unióban? Magyarországon tízezer emberből több mint ezerháromszáz érintett, több mint egymillió-egyszázezer ember. És a kérdés az, hogy egy ilyen vita hoz e nekik valami újat, valami könnyebb életet, vagy azoknak, akik a jövőben esnek bele ebbe a betegségbe. Ezért találtuk ki az európai egészségügyi uniót.

Ezért beszélünk arról, hogy miközben tagállami hatáskör az egészségügy, közben kell legyen egy európai koordinációs, támogató és a politikákat összehangoló szintje az európai egészségnek. Mert számomra a legfontosabb, hogy minden európai polgár ugyanolyan eséllyel jusson hozzá az ellátáshoz, a prevencióhoz, a kezelésekhez, a gyógyszerekhez, az eszközökhöz. Erről szól az egészségügyi unió nemcsak a cukorbetegségek, hanem más betegségek terén is.

Danilo Oscar Lancini (ID). – Signora Presidente, signora Commissaria, onorevoli colleghi, ogni malattia è grave, ma quando la malattia ci riguarda in prima persona, allora la malattia, per assurdo, diventa ancora più grave. È così per tutti ed è così anche per me. E allora cosa si fa? Si scavano i dati, ci si dà da fare per capire cosa si può fare, come, quando, perché, dove, chi?

La stima mondiale dei diabetici (dati della Federazione internazionale del diabete) cresce vorticosamente. Si passa dai 151 milioni stimati nel 2000 ai 285 milioni stimati nel 2009, per arrivare ai 536 milioni del 2021.

Il diabete è una piaga, colpisce le fasce sociali più deboli. Ma in Europa cosa facciamo? Ho scoperto che in Europa non c'è ad oggi nemmeno una distinzione nella raccolta dei dati tra il diabete di tipo 1 e il diabete di tipo 2. Se vogliamo vincere la battaglia contro il diabete dobbiamo fare gioco di squadra, allineare i dati di tutti gli Stati membri UE, investire in ricerca e sperimentare tutte le possibili innovazioni proposte dalla scienza.

Prevenire è meglio che curare, ma per prevenire bisogna conoscere; conoscenza uguale ricerca, ricerca uguale investimento, investimento significa, ancora una volta, prevenire.

Liudas Mažylis (PPE). – Gerbiama Pirmininke, Komisijos nare, kolegos. Pasaulinė diabeto diena primena, ko nepadarėme ar per mažai padarėme kovodami su diabetu, kaip ir kitomis lėtinėmis ligomis. O kovos su jomis schemos iš tikrųjų yra panašios: nuo sveikos gyvensenos ir rizikos faktorių poveikio sumažinimo iki gydymo paslaugų kokybės suvienodinimo įvairiose valstybėse. Dar 2012-aisiais Europos Parlamente pasiūlyta kurti kovos su diabetu strategiją, o per tą laiką sergančiųjų tik daugėjo. Diabetas siejamas su kitomis lėtinėmis ligomis, su COVID-19, tas ligas komplikuoja, o svarbus esminis faktorius yra nutukimas. Manau, kad keitimosi gerosios praktikos pavyzdžiais nepakanka. Pabrėžčiau europinio masto prevencijos programas, ankstyvą diagnostiką, nacionalinių registrų sukūrimą ir bendrą europinį registrą. Nutukimo temą reikia plačiau įtraukti į „Horizonto" programą. O Europoje, manau, pats laikas skelbti nutukimo epidemiją. Nelaukdami, kol kokia nors kita pandemija mus užklups. Tada ir kalbos apie Europos sveikatos sąjungą nebus tik proginės.

Franc Bogovič (PPE). – Gospa predsednica, diabetes, sladkorna bolezen ali pa tudi tihi ubijalec, radi rečemo ti zelo razširjeni bolezni. Tihi ubijalec pa zato, ker mnogi izmed nas ne vemo, ali je naš spremljevalec ali ni.

33 milijonov ljudi je danes že zaznanih v Evropi kot bolnikov sladkorne bolezni, 38 naj bi jih bilo do leta 2030 in tudi sam sem pred enim dobrim mesecem pri zdravniškem pregledu v Evropskem parlamentu dobil diagnozo, da je bolje, da pričnem z jemanjem tablet in da ulovim raven sladkorja blizu mejne vrednosti. Hkrati je logično doktor povedal, kaj je potrebno storiti. Zgubiti med 10 do 15 kilogramov, imeti bolj zdrav življenjski slog, gibanje. Govorim zato, ker mislim, da je najbolj pomembno pri vsem tem, da resnično zagotovimo dostopnost do diagnosticiranja, da ljudje čim prej spoznamo, da je diabetes naš spremljevalec, da imamo v nadaljevanju tudi dostop do zdravljenja, ki je na enakem nivoju širom po Evropi. Zato je prav, da je to evropska akcija, da imamo tudi raziskave na tem področju in da tudi s pomočjo evropskih sredstev, predvsem pa nacionalnih, financiramo preventivne akcije in pa tudi samo zdravljenje te bolezni. Izmenjava dobrih praks je zagotovo zelo pomembna. Zelo sem vesel, da ob svetovnem dnevu diabetesa obravnavamo to pomembno točko tudi v Evropskem parlamentu.

Luisa Regimenti (PPE). – Signora Presidente, signora Commissaria, onorevoli colleghi, in Europa sono più di 33 milioni le persone affette da diabete e tali numeri sono destinati ad aumentare.

Il diabete inoltre è una malattia complessa, perché nella maggior parte dei casi è connessa a patologie associate: malattie cardiovascolari, complicazioni renali, fino alla disabilità permanente. Alla base della cura di questa malattia altamente invalidante e diffusa, i cui casi sono in notevole aumento, vi sono la dieta, l'attività fisica, ma soprattutto i farmaci.

L'Unione europea deve incoraggiare un campo fertile per la ricerca, che non deve fermarsi, al fine di rendere disponibili ai pazienti farmaci efficienti a prezzi accessibili e rendere i nostri sistemi sanitari più resilienti, anche attraverso programmi di screening e di prevenzione.

Questi devono essere gli obiettivi principali dell'impegno europeo per migliorare l'assistenza e la qualità di vita delle tante persone affette da diabete e anche delle loro famiglie.

Pyynnöstä myönnettävät puheenvuorot

Clare Daly (The Left). – Madam President, we have heard the statistics: 33 million people in the EU living with diabetes, predicted to rise to 38 million in 2030. These are absolutely astounding figures. I mean, one in ten people, hundreds of millions of people worldwide.

Particularly concerning is the fact of the rise of Type 1 diabetes in children increasing considerably, with strong geographical disparities being indicated. Although the reason for the epidemic cannot yet be precisely explained, environmental factors are being put forward.

It's really clear that in the face of this epidemic, there has to be major investment in this area to ensure scientific advances on the source of the disease, but also – as colleagues have said – to support patients. Type 2 diabetes has been strongly linked to diet, obesity, lack of exercise and so on.

We absolutely have to get to the core of this. But in the face of an already dismal situation in many European health systems, lack of public investment and privatisation of care, diabetes risks once again exacerbating inequalities between different socio-economic groups. We cannot allow that to happen.

(Pyynnöstä myönnettävät puheenvuorot päättyvät)

Stella Kyriakides, *Member of the Commission.* – Madam President, honourable Members, I'm really very pleased that we're able to have this discussion today and to be part of this debate. I believe that is one of the times that we are all saying and sending the same messages.

All of us here to different numbers of the incidents. Each of these numbers represents a person, represents a family. And as someone that has worked in the area of diabetes, in working with children and their families to then diagnosis of diabetes, I know how important it is that we do bring this topic to the highest of the political agendas and this is what the commission is doing.

And when we speak with people affected by diabetes, they repeat much of what was said here today. I was hearing very carefully a number of the MEPs – MEP Weiss and MEP Kopcińska – saying how important it is to have a holistic approach to all non-communicable diseases. And MEPs Lancini and Mažylis had said we need better data and we do. And Véronique Trillet-Lenoir and MEPs Metz, Ries and others spoke of the multidisciplinary approach we need and the fact that we need to address all the risk factors looking at prevention, looking at nutrition, raising awareness and working with education.

And this is exactly what the Healthier Together Initiative, as many of you mentioned, has done. It has prioritised many of the actions on diabetes that address these very points. And this is very close cooperation with member with Member States.

Montag, 21. November 2022

I also heard MEP Tóth share with us her personal experience of diabetes and asking for it to have a separate strategy. And I just want to say here, because I think that we need to sometimes look at what we are doing to make sure that we are effective, the Health Together initiative was created in coordination with the Member States and the stakeholders, including the patient groups on diabetes. And looking at how we can have effective actions to reduce the burden of most non-communicable diseases in the EU.

This is a holistic approach that looks at prevention and care, and diabetes as one of the five target strands of the Healthier Together Initiative. And there is already a number of projects ongoing which are looking at diabetes in the EU4Health programme of 2021 and this year.

So I believe that we need to look at how this Healthier Together Initiative brings fruit, see how it is being implemented, and then see how we move forward with this. We have actions which are launched which target specifically not only diabetes as a disease but also the risk factors, which all of you today said that this is what we need to do.

This is why Parliament's work is a very important contribution to this effort. It will galvanise action. It will help us guide, direct our efforts and together, and in the spirit of what we have all worked on for a strong European Health Union, I believe that we can reduce the burden of diabetes on all. So thank you so much for all the interventions.

Puhemies. – Keskustelu on päättynyt.

Äänestys toimitetaan keskiviikkona 23. marraskuuta 2022.

Kirjalliset lausumat (171 artikla)

Sara Cerdas (S&D), *por escrito*. – No dia 14 de novembro, celebrou-se o dia mundial da diabetes com o lema «Educação para proteger o amanhã». Em território europeu, estima-se que 1 em cada 3 pessoas com diabetes não estarão diagnosticadas e a prevalência desta doença continua a aumentar. A diabetes tem um impacto muito significativo na vida das pessoas e, se não estiver devidamente monitorizada e farmacologicamente controlada, pode provocar cegueira, amputação de um membro e falência renal, entre outras comorbilidades. Atualmente, é a principal causa evitável destas complicações incapacitantes. A União Europeia tem uma obrigação moral acrescida na definição de políticas de saúde pública de prevenção, mas também de gestão da doença. O tratamento eficaz requer o acesso à insulina e outros medicamentos orais usados para controlar a diabetes tipo 2 e prevenir complicações, bem como intervenções de estilo de vida relevantes, educação para a saúde, para a autogestão da terapêutica e o acesso a dispositivos e tecnologias. Estas são medidas que trazem benefícios muito significativos para a saúde dos cidadãos.

Jadwiga Wiśniewska (ECR), *na piśmie*. – Tegoroczny Światowy Dzień Cukrzycy koncentruje się na edukacji. Odgrywa ona istotną rolę w zapobieganiu nie tylko cukrzycy, ale także jej komplikacjom. Cukrzyca dotyka prawie 10% całej populacji UE. Istnieje również wysokie prawdopodobieństwo, że u 32 milionów obywateli UE zaburzenia tolerancji glukozy mogą doprowadzić do cukrzycy. Koszty cukrzycy ponoszone przez systemy opieki zdrowotnej państw członkowskich stanowią obecnie około 10% wydatków na opiekę zdrowotną w całej UE. Starzenie się i coraz większa nadwaga, niezdrowa dieta i siedzący tryb życia powodują szybki wzrost liczby przypadków cukrzycy typu 2. Cukrzyca stanowi rosnące zagrożenie w UE. Inwestowanie w profilaktykę ma zasadnicze znaczenie dla zapobiegania cukrzycy poprzez zdrowy styl życia rozpoczynający się w dzieciństwie.

15. Prüfung der Mandate

Puhemies. – Ennen kuin siirrymme seuraavaan asiaan, annan muutamia ilmoituksia:

Parlamentti vahvistaa oikeudellisten asioiden valiokunnan ehdotuksesta valtakirjojen pätevyyden seuraavasti: Eva-Maria Poptcheva 15. syyskuuta 2022 alkaen, Carina Ohlsson 26. syyskuuta 2022 alkaen, Matthias Ecke 3. lokakuuta 2022 alkaen, Theresa Muigg 10. syyskuuta 2022 alkaen ja Johan Nissinen 11. lokakuuta 2022 alkaen.

Montag, 21. November 2022

16. Die Menschenrechtslage im Zusammenhang mit der bevorstehenden FIFA-Weltmeisterschaft in Katar (Aussprache)

Puhemies. – Esityslistalla on seuraavana komission julkilausuma ihmisoikeustilanteesta Qatarissa järjestettävien jalkapallon MM-kisojen yhteydessä (2022/2948(RSP)).

Stella Kyriakides, *Member of the Commission.* – Madam President, honourable Members of the European Parliament, today's debate is really a timely opportunity to discuss the situation of human rights in the context of the FIFA World Cup in Qatar. Yesterday, one of the most watched global sports events kicked off in Doha. Over 1 million visiting football fans are expected and billions will be watching worldwide.

Besides the hosting of this important tournament, the country's human rights record has been in the global spotlight throughout its preparation over the last few months. According to the International Labour Organization, for example, 50 people died in Qatar and some 500 others suffered serious injuries in work related accidents linked to building the World Cup infrastructure in 2020.

Each single one of those deaths is, of course, a tragedy. But Qatar has also made significant progress on labour rights over the past years. It was the first country in the Gulf to dismantle the discriminatory *kafala* system which kept Qatar's large migrant worker population at the mercy of their employers. And Qatar has adopted a new law establishing a non-discriminatory minimum wage. In addition, they have ensured a stricter oversight of World Cup infrastructure projects. In many projects, Qatar is a frontrunner in this sense.

What is important to notice is that the organisation of the World Cup and the fact that it has made existing deficiencies become more evident have in fact accelerated labour reform in Qatar.

At the same time, we all know that numerous challenges remain. Segments of the society and business community are resisting the reforms, including certain Western multinationals operating in Qatar. Thousands of migrant workers have seen their wages or work allowances cut or not paid at all, despite the government's effort under the new minimum wage legislation. Living conditions of migrant workers need improvement and there is a need for better data collection of work-related fatalities and injuries.

There are also concerns around the rights of LGBTIQ persons – either visiting football fans or, more importantly, those residing in Qatar, where homosexuality is still illegal.

So, yes, the human rights path for Qatar is far from complete and, as for any other country, it is a continuous journey that will never be finished. Human rights – and in particular labour rights – are key elements of the EU's bilateral engagement with Qatar at all levels. Qatar has been open to this and welcomed this engagement. In fact, Vice-President Schinas and Commissioner Schmit regularly discuss labour rights with Qatari leaders, and the EU Special Representative for Human Rights, Eamon Gilmore, has also engaged extensively on this matter, including through his field visit to the construction site of one of the World Cup stadiums in Qatar in February of 2020 and through his follow-up meetings earlier this year.

More recently, last week, the European Parliament DROI Committee held a constructive public hearing in the presence of the Qatari labour minister, providing the opportunity to raise openly all pertinent concerns about the situation of labour rights in that country. It is important that we remain engaged and continue to encourage the Qatari authorities to address those remaining challenges, with a view to ensuring the sustainability of the ongoing reforms beyond the World Cup and to the benefit of the Qatari people and all those residing in the country.

Qatar has now a chance to show the world that it is ready and that it is willing to continue on the path of openness, the path of tolerance and the path of modernisation. This will encourage human rights reforms elsewhere in the region as well as in other countries hosting big sports events.

Montag, 21. November 2022

Tomasz Frankowski, *w imieniu grupy PPE*. – Pani Przewodnicząca! Pani Komisarz! Tuż po rozpoczęciu jednej z najważniejszych imprez sportowych, czyli mistrzostw świata w Katarze, piłka nożna wcale nie jest tematem numer jeden. Choć powinien to być powód do wielkiego święta sportu, wszyscy wiemy, że organizacja tych mistrzostw wiąże się z wysokimi kosztami i wywołała wiele krytyki, zwłaszcza jeśli chodzi o prawa człowieka, czy prawa pracownicze. Tysiące robotników, którzy budowali stadiony, straciło życie, żeby piłkarski mundial się udał. To budzi nasz ogromny smutek i sprzeciw. Należy jednak powiedzieć, że pewne pozytywne postępy w zakresie liberalizacji i reform pracy w Katarze zostały dokonane.

Jak wspomniała Pani Komisarz, system Cafalli został *de facto* zniesiony, o czym mówi ostatnie sprawozdanie Międzynarodowej Organizacji Pracy. Doceniamy ten postęp, jednak potrzebujemy gwarancji dotyczących kontynuacji tych wysiłków w Katarze, również po zakończeniu mistrzostw świata. Prawa człowieka są uniwersalne i muszą obowiązywać wszędzie. Dlatego w 2017 roku FIFA wprowadziła nowe wymogi dotyczące praw człowieka podczas procesu składania ofert na organizację mistrzostw świata, kolejnych mistrzostw świata. Te wymogi zostały opracowane zgodnie z wytycznymi Organizacji Narodów Zjednoczonych i po raz pierwszy zostały wdrożone w odniesieniu do organizacji Mistrzostw Świata w 2026 roku, które odbędą się w USA, Kanadzie i Meksyku. Ja, jako były piłkarz zawodowy i przewodniczący Grupy Sport w Parlamencie Europejskim, mam nadzieję, że świat sportu i polityki wyciągnie wnioski z tych mistrzostw i kolejne imprezy sportowe odbędą się z pełnym poszanowaniem praw człowieka.

Maria Arena, *au nom du groupe S&D*. – Madame la Présidente, contrairement à mon prédécesseur, je ne suis pas footballeur et donc je ne peux pas échanger comme lui sur la situation du football. Mais quand on me demande si une Coupe du monde est une opportunité pour parler des droits de l'homme, j'aimerais répondre que non. J'aimerais répondre qu'aucun pays ne devrait attendre un événement, quel qu'il soit, pour pouvoir aborder la question des droits de l'homme.

Quand, il y a dix ans, la FIFA a décidé d'organiser cette Coupe du monde au Qatar, nous savions que ce choix était contestable. Nous avons d'ailleurs contesté dans le cadre d'une résolution votée ici au Parlement européen en 2013. Mais aujourd'hui, nous y sommes et donc il est important, effectivement, de pouvoir faire le point sur la situation des droits de l'homme au Qatar, avec cette visibilité qui nous est donnée par la Coupe du monde, et de pouvoir voir ce qui a pu être fait, ce qui a été violé et ce qui peut encore être fait. Je pense que c'est l'objectif du débat aujourd'hui et c'est l'objectif que nous avons eu en sous-commission «Droits de l'homme» la semaine dernière avec les ONG, Human Rights Watch – qui était invitée en sous-commission DROI –, l'OIT, la CES et avec, bien entendu, les membres de la sous-commission DROI.

Alors, oui, vous l'avez dit, Madame la Commissaire, le Qatar a fait des avancées. Il n'y a plus aujourd'hui de kafala. C'est vrai, la loi n'existe plus en tant que telle. Mais on sait que dans certains secteurs, la kafala existe encore de manière assez particulière, notamment pour les personnes à domicile. Un bureau de l'OIT est présent. Des ONG sont présentes. Mais il y a eu des violations, des morts et il faut des compensations. Nous devons travailler avec le Qatar pour que ces compensations aient lieu.

Enfin, surtout, il y a l'avenir. L'avenir repose aussi sur la responsabilité de nos entreprises, parce que nos entreprises au Qatar n'ont pas toujours respecté le minimum exigé par le Qatar.

Katalin Cseh, *on behalf of the Renew Group*. – Madam President, the Qatar football World Cup will always be remembered as the World Cup of shame.

As the world is watching these grand stadiums, all I can think about is how they were built. Credible sources show that thousands of workers lost their lives and the Qatari authorities even refused to investigate these cases. A giant amount of financial resources flowed into a project that was tainted by forced labour, environmental destruction and deep corruption.

These violations have not stopped; they are ongoing. It's absurd and unacceptable that organisers threaten journalists or penalise players for wearing rainbow armbands. All that this is really showing is that they just don't understand the value of sports at all – the spirit of community and respect for each other.

This parliament has to condemn in the strongest possible terms both FIFA and the host country. We can never turn our backs on these human rights violations and we have to fight to ensure that there will be consequences.

Ernest Urtasun, *en nombre del Grupo Verts/ALE*. – Señora presidenta, la FIFA y el señor Infantino les han robado el sueño del Mundial a millones de aficionados al fútbol.

En primer lugar, la sede elegida lo ha sido en un proceso lleno de irregularidades que está investigando la justicia francesa.

En segundo lugar, una sede con unas infraestructuras cuya construcción ha costado, según algunas estimaciones, hasta 6 500 muertos, una cifra que no se había visto en ningún acontecimiento deportivo en toda la segunda mitad del siglo XX.

Tercero, un coste climático altísimo, no hace falta ni decirlo: 3,6 millones de toneladas de CO_2 y los futbolistas jugando a fútbol en estadios que tienen que estar siendo climatizados continuamente.

Y, en cuarto lugar, hoy acabamos de ver a la FIFA prohibiendo a los futbolistas de equipos nacionales europeos lucir manifestaciones en solidaridad con la comunidad LGTBI o con otras causas en favor de los derechos humanos.

Le exigimos a las instituciones europeas que denuncien estos atropellos; que exijan a la FIFA que permita a los futbolistas europeos manifestarse libremente en los partidos de fútbol; y, en tercer lugar, que le exijan también un fondo de compensación y de reparación para las familias de los muertos en la construcción de las instalaciones del Mundial.

Nicolaus Fest, *im Namen der ID-Fraktion*. – Frau Präsidentin! Wir reden hier über die Situation der Menschenrechte in Katar. Ernsthaft? Katar ist ein islamischer Staat. Es ist seit Jahrzehnten bekannt, dass es dort keine Gleichberechtigung gibt, keine freien Wahlen, keine Mehrparteiensysteme, keine Gewerkschaften, keine Religionsfreiheit, keine Meinungsfreiheit und erbärmliche Arbeitsbedingungen, und dass Homosexuelle dort um ihr Leben fürchten müssen.

Aber immer, wenn man solche Zustände, wie sie in fast allen islamischen Ländern herrschen und leider auch immer mehr in europäischen, hier im Parlament ansprechen wollte, schrien Grüne, Linke, Sozialisten und Liberale, das sei islamophob und kulturelle Hegemonie, und überhaupt sollten sich die Europäer mit ihrem strukturellen Rassismus, der ja angeblich überall herrscht, zurückhalten.

Haben Sie das alles vergessen? Jetzt zur WM finden Sie endlich den Mut, diese Zustände anzusprechen. Sind Sie nun alle islamophob? Finden Sie kulturelle westliche Hegemonie vielleicht doch ganz gut?

Ich brauche keine kulturelle Hegemonie. Mir ist nur wichtig, dass hier unsere Werte gelten. Andere Völker sollen tun und lassen, was sie wollen, aber eben nicht hier, wie viele von Ihnen das oft fordern.

Die Kritik an Katar ist die pure Heuchelei. Wenn in Rom, verhalte dich wie die Römer: Das sollten wir auch Katar zugestehen. Viel wichtiger aber ist, dass wir es hier in Europa auch endlich einfordern.

Nicola Procaccini, *a nome del gruppo ECR*. – Signora Presidente, onorevoli colleghi, questo dibattito sui diritti umani in Qatar arriva con dodici anni di ritardo. Affrontarlo oggi che il campionato mondiale è già iniziato suona ipocrita, e non è la prima volta che ciò accade in quest'Aula.

Ciò di cui non si discuterà, purtroppo, è il motivo che spinge Doha a investire le sue grandi risorse economiche per ospitare il più popolare evento sportivo di tutto il pianeta. I soldi sono il mezzo, non sono il fine.

In questi dodici anni le squadre delle principali capitali d'Europa, Lisbona, Londra, Parigi, Monaco, Manchester, Barcellona, Madrid, Roma, Milano, sono state tutte controllate o sponsorizzate da Emirati Arabi e Qatar. La verità è che non esiste un *soft power* più efficace del calcio per diffondere l'islamismo nel mondo.

Ora è tardi per piangere sulla violazione dei diritti umani. Noi europei abbiamo messo in vendita il nostro modo di vivere e qualcuno l'ha comprato, ma siamo tutti diventati più poveri.

Montag, 21. November 2022

Manon Aubry, *au nom du groupe The Left*. – Madame la Présidente, dimanche, le coup d'envoi de la Coupe du monde a été donné au Qatar. Mais pour une fois, sans même connaître les cotes, je peux déjà vous donner le vainqueur: c'est la honte qui l'a emporté.

La honte pour la France, Nicolas Sarkozy et Michel Platini, d'avoir attribué ce Mondial contre la vente d'avions de chasse et de contrats juteux, démontrant ainsi combien le sport était politique, n'en déplaise à Emmanuel Macron.

La honte de jouer au foot sur les cadavres de plus de 6 500 ouvriers exploités jusqu'à la mort et d'abandonner leurs familles sans compensation alors que la FIFA empoche 6,4 milliards de dollars.

La honte d'enterrer le climat dès le lendemain de la COP27 dans un pays qui n'est pas champion du monde de foot mais des émissions de CO_2, avec ses stades climatisés en plein désert.

La honte de voir nos dirigeants cautionner un régime autoritaire qui paye les spectateurs pour cacher la sordide réalité de son pouvoir et les arrestations arbitraires des dissidents.

La honte d'interdire de porter un simple brassard «one love» en soutien aux homosexuels et LGBTQI opprimés dans ce stade — et que je suis fière de porter ici, dans cet hémicycle.

La honte pour nous tous qui aimons le foot et voyons ce sport populaire créé par les pauvres et volé par les riches. La honte, la honte!

Mais j'entends les cyniques dire que c'est trop tard. C'est faux. Nous devons mettre en place un fonds de compensation pour les victimes et assumer un boycott diplomatique. Surtout, nous pouvons décider que cela n'arrivera plus avec une directive ambitieuse sur le devoir de vigilance. Toutes les entreprises complices — la FIFA, Vinci, Bouygues, Deutsche Bank — seraient tenues pour responsables. À nous de revoir les règles du jeu pour qu'à l'avenir, plus jamais la honte ne gagne le Mondial.

President. – Ms Aubry, I need to say that banners are not allowed in the plenary. Two colleagues already voluntarily agreed to the rule, so perhaps you will as well. Thank you.

Daniela Rondinelli (NI). – Signora Presidente, onorevoli colleghi, signora Commissaria, Lei ha esposto un quadro davvero ottimista, ha tentato di difendere l'indifendibile, perché nei dodici anni di preparazione di questi mondiali del Qatar le istituzioni europee e le istituzioni internazionali sono rimaste silenti davanti a 6 500 lavoratori morti, questi sono i dati del Guardian, e ai diritti di donne, omosessuali, minoranze etniche e religiose sistematicamente calpestati.

Un silenzio che suona come assenso, ma anche come connivenza.

Sono stati stanziati 220 miliardi, una cifra esorbitante, pari a un terzo del nostro Recovery Fund, il budget più alto mai stanziato per un mondiale, forse con l'intento di legittimare qualunque azione pur di ripulire l'immagine del Qatar, campione del mondo dei diritti negati.

Allora mi chiedo a che cosa serva oggi questa discussione sui diritti umani in Qatar dopo che i mondiali hanno già avuto inizio. Spero che questa discussione non serva a lavare la coscienza di qualcuno di fronte al caso più scandaloso di *sportswashing*, difeso pure dal presidente della FIFA che qualche giorno fa ha dichiarato: «Prendiamo atto della questione dei diritti, ma adesso pensiamo ai mondiali». Il Commissario Schinas ieri sui social ha addirittura elogiato questi mondiali e ha scritto «Il modello europeo dello sport, un'ispirazione per tutti».

Allora vorrei chiedere alla Commissione, vista questa situazione, affinché migliaia di persone non siano morte invano: quali sono i rapporti che l'Unione europea vuole instaurare con il Qatar per portare questo paese al rispetto dei diritti umani e delle libertà fondamentali della persona?

Juan Fernando López Aguilar (S&D). – Señora presidenta, señora comisaria, hace doce años que la FIFA decidió que el mundial de fútbol de 2022 tuviese lugar en Qatar. ¿Es o no es una triste paradoja que, ahora que arranca este campeonato, esté más caldeado que nunca el debate sobre la situación de los derechos laborales, los derechos humanos, el principio de no discriminación contra la mujer, contra el colectivo LGTBI…? Lo es.

Este Parlamento no puede revisar la decisión de la FIFA. Este Parlamento tampoco puede exigir que cualquier relación de cooperación de la Unión Europea con un tercer país esté basada sobre la exigencia de que ese tercer país observe nuestros mismos estándares de derechos fundamentales. Pero lo que sí puede hacer este Parlamento, y lo hace, es exigir que la relación de asociación y de cooperación esté condicionada a progresos tangibles en los derechos laborales, en los derechos humanos, en la no discriminación de las mujeres y del colectivo LGTBI y, esperablemente, en la mejora de la libertad de crítica y, por supuesto, a la proscripción de la tortura y de la pena de muerte. Y este es el sentido de este debate.

La Comisión ha tomado la iniciativa de modificar el Reglamento que establece los Estados que están exentos de visado para la entrada en la Unión Europea sobre la base de la reciprocidad. Este Parlamento está convencido de que la exención de visados es buena porque incentiva, precisamente a través del intercambio, la mejora en los derechos humanos y en las libertades. Pero exige también que se informe regularmente a este Parlamento Europeo anualmente con respecto a sus progresos tangibles en derechos laborales, en derechos humanos, en no discriminación y en proscripción de la tortura y de la pena de muerte.

Laurence Farreng (Renew). – Madame la Présidente, Madame la Commissaire, chers collègues, hier, on espérait un geste de la FIFA, un hommage aux 6 500 ouvriers morts en construisant au Qatar, dans des conditions inhumaines, des stades démesurés, climatisés, en plein désert. L'hommage n'a pas eu lieu. Aujourd'hui, la FIFA fait pression directement sur les joueurs pour qu'ils renoncent à porter un brassard en soutien aux LGBT, dont les droits sont bafoués au Qatar. Messieurs de la FIFA, il y a des limites à la compromission.

Alors que nous devrions célébrer la grande fête du football, nous sommes honteux de vivre ce choix fait en 2010 et entaché de soupçons de corruption. Certes, l'actuel président de la FIFA n'était pas là en 2010. Mais où sont ses regrets quand il dit souhaiter ouvrir de grandes compétitions à des pays comme, je cite, la Corée du Nord?

La dernière Coupe du monde en Russie ou les JO en Chine n'ont rien changé. Mais en fin de compte, la Coupe du monde a agi comme un immense révélateur. L'opération séduction du Qatar a viré au «bad buzz» planétaire. Et le message est clair pour la FIFA: réformez vos instances, renouez avec les valeurs d'égalité, de tolérance, de transparence et d'universalité. Les vraies valeurs du sport.

Hannah Neumann (Verts/ALE). – Madam President, earlier this year, I visited a refugee camp near Duhok in Iraq – the place that is right now being bombed by Iran and Turkey at the same time. Even five years after the defeat of ISIS, Yazidi families still live there in confined places in an environment of unhealed trauma and limited possibilities.

But that day I played soccer with the Scoring Girls, a team of girls that practice every afternoon, and the day I visited their fathers and brothers – even them – were watching their kids, their girls playing proudly. There was laughter, there were hugs, there was hope and the clear message that girls can do everything – even Yazidi girls in Iraq.

That is the power of soccer, dear colleagues. And then there's this FIFA show happening right now – money, bribes, migrant workers dying on construction sites and big bosses celebrating their toxic privileges.

Yes, the laws for migrant workers in Qatar have improved – and we will follow up if implementation will happen once the spotlight moves on, believe me – but no one needs a championship where even messages as simple as 'One Love' are penalised with a yellow card.

Dear colleagues, this is just a lost opportunity for soccer and for the sad world in which we live today.

Paolo Borchia (ID). – Signora Presidente, signora Commissaria, onorevoli colleghi, io sono deluso, ma non sorpreso da un dibattito a tratti degno della banalità di un Infantino qualunque.

Ci sono dei grandi assenti in questa discussione, e sono gli uomini e soprattutto le donne di religione cristiana che in Qatar sono costretti a nascondere la propria fede, in un paese dove la conversione dall'islam al cristianesimo neppure è riconosciuta dal governo. Ma oggi si sta discutendo, doverosamente, di molti, troppi casi di morti bianche nei cantieri del mondiale, si sta discutendo di violazioni dei diritti della comunità LGBT, ma abbiamo visto che manca un pezzo. Tutti, dico, tutti hanno diritto al rispetto, ma chi sta seguendo questa plenaria da casa stasera si è fatto un'idea diversa, si è fatto un'idea di un'Europa che pensa ad alcuni diritti e in maniera codarda si volta dalla parte opposta e non pensa ad altri diritti.

Montag, 21. November 2022

Colleghi, giusto per mantenere un lessico calcistico: avete perso l'ennesima occasione per dimostrare che per quest'Aula non esistono discriminazioni di serie B.

Nikolaj Villumsen (The Left). – Fru Formand! Fodbold-VM i Qatar er en skandale. Bag de glitrende facader gemmer sig blod, sved og tårer fra tusindvis af migrantarbejdere, der har slidt i ørkensolen. De døde i tusindtal, mens verden har set passivt til. Denne underdanighed over for det brutale ørkendiktatur må høre op. EU bør melde klart ud, at man ikke deltager. Lad være med at gemme jer bag dårlige undskyldninger. Sig fra over for undertrykkelsen. Skandalen i Qatar bør ikke alene føre til diplomatisk boykot. Det skal også sikres, at det aldrig sker igen. Ingen undertrykkende diktaturer skal kunne købe sig til store sportsarrangementer. Fodbold skal være for alle. Også for LGBT+ personer. Og aldrig igen skal bolden trille over tusinder af døde arbejderes lig.

Marc Tarabella (S&D). – Madame la Présidente, Madame la Commissaire, chers collègues, il y a tout juste neuf ans, nous votions une résolution sur la situation déplorable des travailleurs au Qatar. Pendant neuf ans, il n'y a plus rien eu comme résolution pour la simple raison – et vous l'avez expliqué, Madame la Commissaire, dans votre discours très mesuré – qu'il y a eu des progrès sur le droit des travailleurs.

Alors, certes, évidemment, la situation n'est pas parfaite au Qatar aujourd'hui, loin de là. Beaucoup de progrès restent à faire, mais c'est quand même le pays qui s'est engagé sur la voie des réformes. Et l'organisation de la Coupe du monde, au delà de tous les événements qu'il a organisés, a été probablement l'élément déclencheur qui a accéléré ces réformes. Il faut le reconnaître aujourd'hui, l'abandon de la kafala, ce système de dépendance des travailleurs, c'est quand même le seul pays de la péninsule arabique qui l'a fait. Salaire minimum, versement sur un compte bancaire, organisation de concertations au sein des entreprises, même si les syndicats ne sont toujours pas autorisés aujourd'hui.

Donc aujourd'hui, le discours unilatéralement négatif m'apparaît préjudiciable à l'évolution des droits dans l'avenir au Qatar. Parce que ce qui est important, c'est que, quand les lumières de la Coupe du monde se seront éteintes, l'évolution positive continue non seulement au Qatar, mais qu'elle puisse faire tache d'huile dans tous les pays de la péninsule arabique. Et je le rappelle, s'il y a deux millions de travailleurs migrants au Qatar, il y en a quarante millions dans toute cette zone et ils méritent tous un sort bien plus favorable demain qu'aujourd'hui.

Abir Al-Sahlani (Renew). – Madam Chair, dear colleagues, it is amazing how that government in Qatar is using this to say that this is a smear campaign, that this is about racism, this is about them being a middle Eastern country when in fact there is nothing more racist than when you treat a migrant workers like this.

Because, let's admit it, if they were Europeans, this treatment would not be in place. It is because they are Asian. It is because they are poor that this government is protecting these oppressors and there is nothing more racist than when a government protects the ones who are abusing human rights, the ones who are not paying these salaries for these migrant workers.

And to the FIFA chair: You suddenly started to understand how it is to be an Arab. Really? Do you know how it is to be a woman in the Middle East, deprived of your human dignity? You cannot file for divorce because then your children will be taken from you. You cannot be yourself. You cannot choose what to wear. You cannot even apply for a passport without a man. Do you understand how it is to be an Arab woman? No, you don't.

Mounir Satouri (Verts/ALE). – Madame la Présidente, l'interdiction de bière dans les stades aura autant fait parler que la mort de 6 500 travailleurs esclaves. Je ne sais pas quoi en conclure pour notre humanité, mais je sais ce que cela dit du gouvernement qatarien. Il n'a aucun respect pour ses partenaires, ni pour les droits humains, et se montre incapable de respecter ses engagements.

Ne feignons pas la surprise parce que, derrière le paravent de la FIFA, nous sommes responsables — la France, plus particulièrement -, responsables de confier à un État, dont on connaissait pourtant les pratiques, l'organisation de cette Coupe, de laisser souvent aussi la corruption guider ses choix.

Posons-nous la question de ces événements démesurés, souvent convoités par des États répressifs en quête d'une nouvelle image. Posons-nous la question en amont de l'impact climatique et faisons en sorte que des critères préalables soient enfin établis. La FIFA impose un cahier des charges luxueux pour l'organisation des mondiaux. Il est temps qu'elle impose un cahier des charges des droits humains et de l'écologie, et qu'on le lui impose. C'est à nous, politiques, de faire entendre cette voix. Se défiler, c'est nous rendre complices de cela.

Miguel Urbán Crespo (The Left). – Señora presidenta, el Mundial de Qatar es otro ejemplo más de cómo se utilizan grandes eventos para lavar la cara de regímenes autoritarios.

Organizar un Mundial de fútbol en un país que viola veinte de los treinta artículos de la Carta de las Naciones Unidas es un mensaje político, el mensaje de que el dinero está por encima de los derechos humanos.

La legislación qatarí considera que las mujeres son personas bajo tutela masculina y la homosexualidad, un daño mental penado con la cárcel. Por no hablar de la censura, de la prohibición de los sindicatos y los partidos políticos o de los miles de trabajadores migrantes que han muerto en las obras de este Mundial. Un Mundial manchado de sangre. Mientras la FIFA y sus corruptelas se llenan los bolsillos, los brazaletes en apoyo a la comunidad LGTBI son vetados. Eso es un mensaje político.

Por todo ello, yo apoyo el boicot a este Mundial de la vergüenza. Si no lo podemos evitar, por lo menos que se escuchen nuestras voces. Boicot al Mundial de Qatar.

Eva Kaili (S&D). – Madam President, so today, the World Cup in Qatar is proof, actually, of how sports diplomacy can achieve a historical transformation of a country with reforms that inspired the Arab world. I alone said that Qatar is a frontrunner in labour rights, abolishing kafala and reducing minimum wage. Despite the challenges that even European companies are denying to enforce these laws, they committed to a vision by choice, and they opened to the world. Still, some here are calling to discriminate them. They bully them and they accuse everyone that talks to them or engages of corruption. But still, they take their gas. Still, they have their companies profiting billions there.

I have been lectured as a Greek and I remind us all that we have thousands of deaths because of our failure for legal ways of migration in Europe. We can promote our values, but we do not have the moral right for lectures to get cheap media attention. And we do not impose our way, we respect them, even without LNG. They are a new generation of intelligent, high-educated people. They helped us to reduce the tension with Turkey. They helped us with Afghanistan to save activists, children, women. They helped us. And they are peace negotiators. They are good neighbours and partners. We can help each other to overcome the shortcomings. They achieved the impossible already.

Anna Cavazzini (Verts/ALE). – Madam President, dear colleagues, of course, Qatar's government has made some reforms, has put some efforts into reforming its labour laws and this also shows that international pressure is working. But serious labour laws violations remain. Forced labour and other forms of abuse continue. And so many workers died. And a lot of these cases are not being investigated.

Hundreds of thousands of migrant workers have still not been compensated for stolen wages in the past decade. The payment of recruitment fees for migrant workers remains widespread, tying up workers in debt bondage. For me, it is clear: FIFA and the Qatari Government they need to do more, now but also after the attention afforded by the World Cup ends. The most important thing is they need to compensate all workers that got their wages stolen in the run up to the World Cup. It is time for FIFA and Qatar to pay up.

Niels Fuglsang (S&D). – Madam President, today, I feel embarrassed. Today, I feel ashamed. Today, I feel sad. I feel embarrassed, ashamed and sad because what might very well be the darkest moment in the history of sports is taking place right now as we speak – the World Cup in Qatar.

Montag, 21. November 2022

And we should not be silent about that for the next 3 000 years as somebody wants us to be. Because since Qatar was handed the World Cup, more than 6 500 migrant workers have lost their lives, because it's illegal to be in a union or to be homosexual in Qatar, because human rights are violated every single day, and FIFA and the Qatari regime don't seem to care at all about it. Today, I feel certain that if we want things to change, we need a fundamental reform of FIFA. Mr Infantino, do us all a favour, step down now.

Pyynnöstä myönnettävät puheenvuorot

Paulo Rangel (PPE). – Senhora Presidente, Senhora Comissária, a decisão de organizar o Campeonato do Mundo no Catar foi tomada, mal, mas foi tomada. Depois, esse campeonato era também uma oportunidade para melhorar os direitos e a situação política do Catar. É uma oportunidade perdida.

Não há dúvida de que hoje nós sabemos que os direitos das mulheres, os direitos das minorias sexuais, religiosas e étnicas, sabemos que os direitos dos trabalhadores e, especialmente, a morte de migrantes é verdadeiramente chocante para a organização deste evento. Sabemos que há trabalhadores que não receberam e que há trabalhadores e famílias de trabalhadores mortos que precisam de ser indemnizadas. Sabemos que não há liberdade de expressão nem de manifestação contra este evento.

Não há no Catar e também não há em Portugal, país em que se proibiu a entrada de pessoas com t-shirts num jogo de futebol. E eu lamento que o meu Presidente da República, que o meu Presidente do Parlamento e que o meu Primeiro-Ministro – especialmente o Primeiro-Ministro –, dizendo que vai apoiar a seleção quando pode fazê-lo, como 10 milhões de portugueses, em Portugal, estejam a dar apoio a uma iniciativa com estas características.

Nesta fase podem perfeitamente estar em suas casas em Portugal e, ao mesmo tempo, estarem solidários com o sofrimento dos catarianos e dos imigrantes no Catar.

Lara Wolters (S&D). – Madam President, we heard Mr Infantino say the other day, indeed, that he feels many things, including being disabled, gay, a woman and a migrant worker. What I felt mainly there, and I think many colleagues here with me, was embarrassment. Not only at his very ill-advised speech. Because no matter how much progress was made in Qatar – and progress was made – it's not okay, and I'm going to state the obvious here, for people to die on building sites in their thousands, it's not okay for people to be jailed for asking for their wages and it's certainly not okay for the gay people that Mr Infantino says he feels for to have to live in fear that the death penalty will one day be enforced.

Now, I don't think we are teaching anyone any moral lessons by being clear about those things. And contrary to what Mr Infantino thinks, it's not quite incredible that if as a country you invite the world in to promote yourself, that you also get scrutinised by the world. Now what we need for the future are serious, credible human rights commitments from host countries and FIFA, and a serious duty of care for companies, including compensation.

We might have a side dish of progress here today, but the main course of this World Cup is human tragedy and embarrassment.

Barry Andrews (Renew). – Madam President, Commissioner, I just want to pay tribute today to the footballers of the Iran national team, which showed incredible courage to stand up to their regime today in the face of very, very grave danger when they return to their countries. It stood in stark contrast to the English team, which refused to wear a simple armband. While they might have lost on the field today, a very profound victory will long outlast when the game itself is forgotten.

But we should not be surprised by sports watching, particularly in football. No company would get away with the reputational damage that FIFA is experiencing right now. FIFA gets away with it because it's a cartel, and the European Commission has to seriously consider the relationship that it has developed with UEFA around the promotion of the European Green Deal. I think that really has to be looked at.

In the same way that some carbon consumption is unavoidable but can be offset, my message to those who feel they have to watch this is that you can offset your watching of this by making a contribution to some of the great human rights defenders organisations around the globe.

Viola von Cramon-Taubadel (Verts/ALE). – Frau Präsidentin! Wie viele Menschen müssen sterben, um euch den Spaß hier zu verderben? Wie viele vertuschte Unfälle, verzweifelte Familien, wie viele leidende Arbeitsmigranten, wie viele Suizide sind okay?

FIFA-Präsident Infantino gibt an, es seien drei Menschen ums Leben gekommen. Laut Amnesty International sind es 15 021 Tote. Aber ist nicht jedes Leben, das verloren wurde, nur damit wir unseren Teams zujubeln können, eines zu viel? Egal, ob drei, 30 oder 3 000 Tote – jeder hat das Recht auf Leben, das Recht auf ein würdevolles Leben.

Ausbleibende Löhne, abgenommene Pässe, fensterlose Zimmer und nicht einmal die Freiheit, den Arbeitsplatz zu wechseln – all dies wartete auf Arbeitsmigranten in Katar, einem Land, in dem die Menschenrechte quasi nicht existieren. Ein Land, in dem Frauen eine Vergewaltigung nicht anzeigen können, da diese als Beweis für außerehelichen Geschlechtsverkehr gilt – eine Straftat, die mit Freiheitsstrafe, Auspeitschung und Steinigung verurteilt werden kann. Ein Land, in dem der eigene WM-Botschafter Homosexualität als Schaden im Kopf bezeichnet. Ein Land, in dem Journalisten festgenommen werden fürs Fotografieren und bei einer regimekritischen Äußerung eine Geldstrafe droht.

Diese WM ist eine Schande. Sport und Fußball sind so wichtig, können so viel Gutes tun. Doch diese WM wird durch die FIFA und die Verhältnisse vor Ort in Katar für immer ein schwarzer Fleck im Sport bleiben.

Ladislav Ilčić (ECR). – Poštovana predsjedavajuća, poštovani dame i gospodo, dvanaest godina se zna da će Katar biti domaćin nogometnog prvenstva. Dvanaest godina ste znali kakva je tamo situacija s ljudskim pravima. Dvanaest godina ste mogli istraživati ima li kakve korupcije u FIFA-i. Dvanaest godina ste imali priliku za svoju toliko omiljenu kulturu otkazivanja i - ništa.

I sada se javljaju oni koji su uvijek protiv domoljublja, uvijek protiv nacionalnog ponosa. Pozivaju nas da ne gledamo utakmice, žele spriječiti da se milijuni ljudskih srdaca vežu uz svoje nacionalne simbole, a ja vam kažem: volim Hrvatsku, volim nogomet, volim gledati hrvatsku nogometnu reprezentaciju. Nećete nam nametati osjećaj krivnje.

Hrvatska je sportska nacija i naša srca gore kad naša reprezentacija igra i zato nas nitko neće spriječiti da gledamo utakmice hrvatske nogometne reprezentacije!

Clare Daly (The Left). – Madam President, everybody knows, of course, that Qatar is one of the most repressive regimes in the world, where human rights simply don't exist for the majority of the people. Of course, it's not the only one, but the idea of improvements in minimum wage and labour conditions and so on really belies the reality for so many people – particularly the thousands who have lost their lives without any compensation. But for all the standing-up in here and crying about 'sportswashing' and giving out about football, the truth is that next week most people will come in here behind closed doors and agree to give Qatar the privilege of visa-free travel to the EU, a privilege that most countries – more than a hundred actually – in the world don't have.

You'll sign off on Qatari progress on human rights, even as the families of the dead are still mourning their loved ones. You'll do it for oil and gas, because the EU has cut itself off from Russian energy as it's an authoritarian regime fighting an illegal war, but you will do business with an authoritarian regime that's fighting an illegal war in Yemen. Nobody's fooled. If there was a world cup for hypocrisy, the EU would walk away the victors without a match being played!

Stanislav Polčák (PPE). – Paní předsedající, již před deseti lety se Evropský parlament vyjádřil a vyjádřil své výhrady k udělení šampionátu právě do Kataru. Myslím si, že to nás –i některé členské státy EU se na tomto rozhodnutí podílely v rámci kartelu FIFA – nezbavuje viny. Myslím, že je důležité, že se tato témata, jako jsou lidská práva, ochrana menšin, práva žen, otázka otrocké práce, dostala skutečně takto do popředí. Já to vnímám jako pozitivní na celé epizodě kolem přidělení tohoto šampionátu Kataru. Ale není to jenom epizoda. Myslím si, že zůstane po tomto šampionátu, ať bude jakýkoli, jednoznačné přesvědčení, že i hráči a trenéři se vymezili proti nedodržování lidských práv, proti nedodržování toho základního, těch základních hodnot, které vnímáme, že jsou univerzální napříč celým světem. A možná, že i Katar stojí na rozcestí, jestli trochu otevře dveře těmto lidským právům anebo naopak bude striktně stát na represivním systému, kde bohužel neplatí tato univerzalita, kterou vnímáme napříč celým světem.

Montag, 21. November 2022

Pierre Karleskind (Renew). – Madame la Présidente, que risquent les footballeurs européens en portant un brassard arc-en-ciel dans l'enceinte des stades? Se faire tirer dessus comme cinq personnes qui ont trouvé la mort dans un bar gay à Colorado Springs? Non. Risquent-ils, comme leurs collègues iraniens, leur peau? Ces collègues iraniens qui ont, eux, eu un comportement d'une bravoure remarquable cet après-midi? La réponse est à nouveau non, ils ne risquent rien. Ils ne risquent rien à faire parler de l'homosexualité et du respect des LGBTI sur les terrains de foot.

Parce qu'enfin, les insultes homophobes sont omniprésentes sur les terrains de foot. Le capitaine de l'équipe de France a même pu déclarer que cela faisait partie du folklore. Eh bien, Messieurs de la FIFA, aussi longtemps que cela fera partie du folklore, nous maintiendrons notre pression pour que ce folklore fasse partie d'un lointain et mauvais souvenir.

Ana Miranda (Verts/ALE). – Señora presidenta: gol. La FIFA ha metido un gol, el gol del dinero y el gol de la corrupción.

¿A quién le importan las vidas de los migrantes trabajadores, de las mujeres o de las personas LGBTI en Qatar? Desde luego, a la FIFA no le importan. A nosotros sí nos importan. Por eso, la semana pasada, la Comisión de Derechos Humanos organizó una audiencia con un ministro de Qatar y con varias ONG que vinieron a propósito a hablar de la gravísima situación, comisaria.

El deporte es más que el dinero. A nosotros no nos gusta tener relaciones con un país esclavista, homófobo y machista. Nos preocupan esas vidas.

Por eso, apoyo la campaña «Boycott Qatar», como esta fotografía que están promoviendo muchos colectivos, incluidos deportistas, incluidos jugadores de fútbol que defienden los derechos humanos.

Apaga la televisión, apaga la televisión durante el Mundial. Boicot al Mundial de Qatar.

President. – I should however say that according to our Rules we are not allowed to show photos or banners here in the plenary. Same rules for everyone.

Mick Wallace (The Left). – Madam President, I've been involved in football all my life. I love football. The game of football thrives in spite of FIFA, not because of it. And the human rights situation in Qatar is soul destroying. And FIFA and Qatar should ensure a massive and comprehensive remediation programme for migrant workers and their families.

But the EU's hypocrisy in calling out human rights abuses in Qatar is a bit galling. The Commission's REPowerEU plan to wean Europe off Russian gas involves buying more of it from Qatar. Meanwhile, the EU is about to provide visa-free, short-stay travel for Qataris. Why don't we give it to every country if Qatar qualifies? We do what suits our business interests and our geopolitical agenda.

Where is the next World Cup? Four years' time in the US. A failed state of systemic racism, police brutality and impunity, extraordinary renditions, extrajudicial detentions and torture of prisoners. The US imprisons more of its population than any country on earth. And they produce 11 billion worth of business and slave labour rates. If Qatar shouldn't have got the World Cup, the Americans shouldn't get it either.

(Pyynnöstä myönnettävät puheenvuorot päättyvät)

Stella Kyriakides, *Member of the Commission*. – Madam President, honourable Members, what the debate today testifies is your continued, of course, interest on the engagement of the human rights situation in Qatar. As I said in my opening remarks, yes, the human rights path for Qatar is far from complete. And as for any other country, it is a journey that will continue, that will never be finished and numerous challenges remain.

Now, the EU has adopted a very clear gender equality strategy in 2020-2025, where women, men, girls and boys in all their diversity have equal opportunities. And on LGBTQI persons in Europe, the EU of course is fully committed to addressing inequalities and challenges, and we presented the strategy in 2020, and we will not be compromising on our principles and values because we believe in a Europe and a world that embraces diversity and not hides it.

Of course, as I said in my opening remarks, every life lost and every work-related death lost is a tragedy. So let me stress once again that the EU will continue to follow the human rights situation in Qatar very closely. We will do this through our annual political dialogue and human rights dialogue with the government, through our newly established EU delegation in Doha and in close contact with the International Labour Organization.

But we stand ready to support and assist Qatar in its human rights reform agenda. And we strongly encourage the Qatari Government to look beyond the glamour of this sporting feast and beyond the final whistle of the World Cup final on 18 December.

Puhemies. – Keskustelu on päättynyt. Sen päätteeksi jätettävien päätöslauselmaesitysten määräaika on huomenna 22.11.2022 kello 12.

Äänestys toimitetaan torstaina 24.11.2022.

Kirjalliset lausumat (171 artikla)

Andrus Ansip (Renew), *kirjalikult*. – Katar ei ole euroopaliku demokraatiaga riik. Sama väide kehtib ka eelmist MMi ja taliolümpiamänge võõrustanud Venemaa ning olümpiamänge võõrustanud Hiina kohta. Loomulikult peab Euroopa Liit seisma inimõiguste kaitsel kogu maailmas, kuid on variserlik kritiseerida väikest Katari, aktsepteerides samas spordisündmuste korraldamist Pekingis ja Sotšis. Pean Katari kõige euroopameelsemaks riigiks Lähis-Idas. Katar on korduvalt hääletanud ÜROs sarnaselt Eestiga ja teiste lääneriikidega, muuhulgas mõistnud ühemõtteliselt hukka Venemaa agressioonisõja Ukraina vastu. Katar on oluliselt laiendanud töötajate õigusi, kehtestanud valimised ja asutanud ka uudistekanali, mis on palju avameelsem, kui selle araabia konkurendid. See on kaugel Putini Venemaast, kus inimesed saadetakse vangi selle eest, et nad kutsuvad Ukraina sõda sõjaks. Katar on teinud tohutud investeeringud jalgpalli MMi korraldamiseks. Spordivõistluste korraldamine vaid plekitutes riikides on raske. Kui me ei taha, et spordivõistlused toimuksid vaid Soomes, Norras ja Rootsis, tuleb neid korraldada ka riikides, kus demokraatial on arenguruumi. Arvestades positiivseid arenguid Kataris, ei pea ma Katari vastast lauskriitikat proportsionaalseks.

Pedro Marques (S&D), *por escrito*. – O Mundo não para de nos surpreender. À surpresa com que assistimos, há 12 anos, à escolha do Catar para sede do Mundial de Futebol de 2022, podemos acrescentar a estranheza do facto de este campeonato se realizar pela primeira vez no inverno. É que, no Catar, também é inverno, apesar de todos os dias estarem temperaturas acima dos 30 graus. Por causa dessas temperaturas, existem estádios ao ar livre com ar condicionado, numa altura em que o mundo se debate com uma tremenda crise energética. Acontece que há muito pior: suspeitas de suborno e corrupção consideradas credíveis na escolha da FIFA, milhares de trabalhadores migrantes mortos, condições de trabalho obscenas, discriminações de vários tipos e com vários destinatários. Que nos sirva de exemplo para futuras escolhas. Julgo que os cidadãos europeus não vão aceitar novamente algo do género. Que os países da UE sejam os primeiros a dar esse exemplo.

Matjaž Nemec (S&D), *pisno*. – Šport povezuje. Šport združuje. Nogomet je fenomen, ki presega tudi politiko in nas uči o vrednotah timskega dela, kolegialnosti, o vrednotah življenja. To je nogomet, ki ga želimo igrati, ga gledati, se z njim poistovetiti.

Žal temu ni tako za čas svetovnega prvenstva v Katarju. Preveč je ostalo odprtih vprašanj, na katere država vse od leta 2010, ko jo je FIFA razglasila za gostiteljico prvenstva, ni zmogla ali želela odgovoriti.

Govorimo o izkoriščanju delavcev, o eklatantnem kršenju pravic ženskam ter LGBT skupnosti, o negaciji temeljnih demokratičnih standardov. Še več, poroča se o tisočerih umrlih delavcih, o zaprtih ljudeh brez sojenja, o zatiranju in šikaniranju.

Nogomet in ostali športi vse pogosteje padajo v nemilost zlorab interesov kapitala, tudi na račun vrednot, ki bi morale biti samoumevne. Svetovno prvenstvo v Katarju je le eden, ne pa edini dokaz temu. Takšni zlorabi športa se moramo upreti vsi, predvsem pa politika.

Zato pozdravljam resolucijo Evropskega parlamenta o Katarju. To je pomembno sporočilo, ki pa ni dovolj, da šport izvijemo iz vse bolj objestnega primeža kapitalskih interesov. Ne nazadnje ne gre več samo za šport. Gre za človekove pravice, za spoštovanje prava, dostojanstva, gre za človečnost. Nastavimo ogledalo kapitalu in njegovi zlorabi v športu!

Montag, 21. November 2022

17. Anleihestrategie zur Finanzierung von NextGenerationEU (Aussprache)

Puhemies. – Esityslistalla on seuraavana José Manuel Fernandesin ja Valérie Hayerin budjettivaliokunnan puolesta laatima mietintö Next Generation EU -välineen eli EU:n elpymisvälineen rahoittamiseksi laaditun lainanottostrategian täytäntöönpanosta (2021/2076(INI)) (A9 0250/2022).

José Manuel Fernandes, *Relator.* – Senhora Presidente, caras e caros Colegas, Senhor Comissário, a resposta da União Europeia à crise pandémica não tem precedentes. É uma resposta histórica, uma resposta forte. Pela primeira vez, na União Europeia, a Comissão foi aos mercados e não foi só para emprestar dinheiro aos Estados-Membros, foi para reforçar os programas, foi para dar subvenções aos Estados-Membros, para eles fazerem os planos de recuperação e resiliência. São 800 mil milhões de euros que deverão ser pagos no que diz respeito ao montante que o orçamento vai suportar – neste caso, só 420 mil milhões de euros –, que deverão ser pagos até 2058. É algo que tem de nos responsabilizar.

Os Estados-Membros, para além destes montantes, têm ainda aquilo que é o Quadro Financeiro Plurianual até 2027. São 2 biliões de euros que os Estados-Membros têm disponíveis se somarem estes dois instrumentos, uma chuva de milhões. Nunca houve tantos recursos que, no entanto, estão a ser desbaratados porque não estão a ser utilizados à velocidade que deveriam ser usados. E é que não basta gastar, é preciso gastar bem a favor dos cidadãos da União Europeia, de forma a protegermos o futuro dos jovens. E há aqui um ponto que é extremamente importante: é que, se necessário, há que alargar a data do *NextGenerationEU*, a data dos planos de recuperação e resiliência, porque nós precisamos de projetos bons, de projetos de qualidade.

Não é necessário, nem se pode aceitar, que se ande a executar projetos à pressa só para gastar o dinheiro que está disponível. Para além disso, Senhor Comissário, há aqui uma grande responsabilidade, como eu disse que temos: é que há 420 mil milhões de euros que vão ser pagos até 2058. E, neste momento, essa dívida está a ser paga através do orçamento e dentro do orçamento, o que traz constrangimentos, diminui a flexibilidade e prejudica outros programas.

O MRR, o *NextGenerationEU*, os planos de recuperação e resiliência não podem ser feitos à custa dos outros programas, das outras políticas. E, por isso, sempre defendemos e insistimos: o pagamento da dívida deve estar dentro dos limites do orçamento, mas acima dos tetos do orçamento, para não prejudicarmos os programas, para não prejudicarmos as outras políticas.

E há um outro ponto essencial: é que estes recursos, que estão neste momento a ser pagos pelo orçamento da União Europeia, não podem ir contra as próximas gerações, e por isso é essencial que este Parlamento aprove novos recursos próprios, novas receitas que não podem penalizar os cidadãos, que devem estar em linha com os objetivos da União Europeia e dos quais nós precisamos com urgência, e aliás, há um acordo interinstitucional, que é juridicamente vinculativo e que os Estados-Membros devem respeitar.

E o Parlamento Europeu tem feito o seu trabalho, a Comissão Europeia também tem avançado. Está agora nas mãos dos Estados-Membros não penalizar as próximas gerações, e isso é absolutamente crucial, é absolutamente essencial. E eu confio que os nossos governantes tenham a sensibilidade para não prejudicarem o futuro das próximas gerações e terem um Quadro Financeiro Plurianual no futuro, onde a dívida que tem de ser paga não prejudique as políticas, as prioridades e os programas da União Europeia.

Valérie Hayer, *rapporteure.* – Madame la Présidente, Monsieur le Commissaire, chers collègues, il y a deux ans, nous actions le premier grand plan de relance de l'Union européenne, une réalisation concrète créant une solidarité de fait, comme auguré par Robert Schuman en son temps. Une solidarité de fait grâce à l'octroi de subventions qui ont rendu le projet inédit dans l'histoire. Je dis bien inédit. Car quels ensembles régionaux dans le monde peuvent se targuer de tant de solidarité dans l'histoire récente? Imagine-t-on les pays d'Asie du Sud-Est ou d'Amérique du Sud emprunter ensemble? Non. C'est pourquoi la création de cet emprunt commun qui lie les Européens pour sortir plus forts de la crise est absolument remarquable. Remarquable comme l'a été notre Union dans l'achat de vaccins pour mettre fin à la pandémie. Aucun État oublié, aucun Européen mis de côté.

Alors est-ce que ce plan de relance constituera un chapitre à lui seul dans tous les manuels d'histoire européenne? Incontestablement. Cependant, ce que nous tentons de déterminer au travers de ce premier rapport du Parlement évaluant ce grand emprunt, c'est s'il fera également partie des manuels d'économie. Après plus d'un an de mise en œuvre, nous le disons sans ambages: oui, le plan de relance a permis aux États de se relancer. Oui, les investisseurs ont confiance en l'Union. Oui, l'emprunt commun est un succès.

Certains prédisaient que l'Europe, en empruntant 150 milliards par an, bouleverserait les marchés, que les investisseurs se détourneraient des obligations souveraines, mettant à mal les stratégies des États membres pour répondre aux besoins nationaux. Il n'en est rien. Les États sont sortis plus forts, avec toujours le même intérêt des investisseurs pour leurs obligations nationales. Mais en plus, ces investisseurs avaient une demande pour les obligations européennes dix fois plus élevée que ce qui était disponible. L'Europe a ainsi été mise sur un pied d'égalité avec les autres grands émetteurs européens et internationaux, mais sans jamais mettre en péril les États et leurs besoins nationaux.

Par ailleurs, l'Union est devenue le principal émetteur supranational. De ce fait, elle a une incidence positive sur la stabilité et la liquidité des marchés des capitaux. Elle a amélioré les perspectives économiques du continent. Elle a complété l'architecture macroéconomique de la zone euro. Et elle a renforcé le rôle international de l'euro.

Enfin, chers collègues, l'Union est aussi devenue le plus grand émetteur d'obligations vertes au monde. Réclamées par beaucoup depuis des années, ces obligations vertes sont enfin devenue réalité. Pour 250 milliards d'euros, soit l'équivalent, cher José Manuel, du PIB du Portugal – 250 milliards d'euros, juste en obligations vertes. Alors que la COP vient de s'achever, c'est un fait extraordinaire dont beaucoup de nations à travers le monde feraient bien de s'inspirer pour combattre le changement climatique. Désormais, en tant que leader mondial des obligations vertes, il incombe à notre Union, Monsieur le Commissaire, de définir des critères de référence pour les investissements durables dans le monde et à la Commission de continuellement s'assurer que toute tentative de «greenwashing» soit écartée.

Mais notre chantier ne s'arrête pas là. C'est pourquoi nous émettons plusieurs recommandations dans ce rapport que nous nous apprêtons à voter. Et parmi celles-ci, une me tient particulièrement à cœur, Monsieur le Commissaire, et vous le savez bien: nous devons permettre aux Européens d'acquérir directement des obligations européennes, comme cela est possible dans certains États à travers le monde. Donnons aux Européens, à vous, à moi, la possibilité de détenir de la dette européenne. Ne laissons pas seulement les banques centrales, les gestionnaires de grands fonds internationaux, les fonds spéculatifs et les fonds de pension investir dans l'Europe. Donnons aussi le droit à chaque Européen de posséder un bout de l'histoire de notre intégration, et ce quelles que soient les difficultés techniques.

Johannes Hahn, *Member of the Commission*. – Madam President, honourable Members, let me start by thanking the European Parliament and especially the Committee on Budgets for this own-initiative report and the support over the years for the Union's borrowing and lending programme. But I would in particular congratulate the two rapporteurs, José Manuel Fernandes and Valérie Hayer for this extremely valuable work and the support we are gaining.

Indeed, financing NextGenerationEU through joint EU issuances required a significant expansion of the Commission's step management architecture. Building on its previous experience as an issuer and with technical support from Member States and the ECB, the Commission established a state-of-the-art borrowing and lending programme underpinned by a reliable payments settlement and accounting infrastructure in a very short period of time.

Actually, we moved immediately from, let's say, a regional player to a Champions League player. And I have to admit this was not without risks but finally it worked, and I would like to thank also my people in DG BUDG for this extremely challenging time and the way how they have managed it.

Based on this, we have now defined a so-called diversified funding strategy. And this funding strategy is embedded in a robust governance and risk mitigation framework. NextGenerationEU borrowing and lending operations have been a success. This was already mentioned by the previous speakers.

Despite the challenging market conditions, the Union has been able to fund its operations successfully. Thanks to the diversified funding strategy, we have already mobilised more than EUR 160 billion, of which almost EUR 30 billion in the form of green bonds to fund the European recovery and to build a greener, more digital and more resilient Europe. Each of our transactions has enjoyed strong market support from a diverse set of investors from all over the world. So far we have seen, I think, around 1 000 investors from around 70 countries.

Montag, 21. November 2022

This strong demand demonstrates that the Commission has established itself as an important and trusted issuer in euro debt capital markets, raising the required funds in time and at the competitive cost of funding. As a result, the Union has transformed from, as I said already, a small supranational issuer to a large sovereign-scale issuer at the same level as the big European countries: Germany, Spain, France, Italy.

The diversified funding strategy has proved a success. That's why the Commission intends to finance also other EU loans, including the EUR 18 billion macro-financial assistance support package for Ukraine through the diversified funding strategy. Therefore, we have put forward on 9 November a proposal to the European Parliament and the Council to modify the financial regulation to allow for this. But I understand on this there will be a separate debate on Wednesday.

Through this modification of the financial regulation, the diversified funding strategy will be established as the mainstream funding method for any new programmes to be funded by debt issuance. This would be in the interest of the Union, Ukraine and any other further recipients of EU loans. Bringing all the borrowing and lending programmes under the same umbrella would improve the volume and liquidity of EU bonds leading to more attractive terms of buying. This would benefit both the recipients of EU loans and the EU budget.

Moreover, the diversified funding strategy gives more flexibility in the timing of the loans. In the case of Ukraine, this will help to better respond to the needs of the Ukrainian authorities. A swift adoption of this proposal by the co-legislators is therefore key so that we can start financing the loans to Ukraine in the most effective, predictable and attractive manner as of early next year.

I appreciate the proposals put forward in the European Parliament's own-initiative report with a view to further enhancing the Commission's borrowing and lending operations, including the need to work with market participants to stimulate secondary market liquidity of EU bonds. The Commission attaches great importance to these issues and is working to ensure the pricing of EU bonds better reflects the EU's credit quality and liquidity.

Another proposal in the own-initiative report that I would like to highlight is the prevention of greenwashing via the green bonds framework, which we take very seriously and we fully support this, of course. This is why we have put in place a state-of-the-art NextGenerationEU green bond dashboard, which provides full transparency about how the financing raised from NextGenerationEU green bonds is invested.

In addition, the Commission will publish in the coming weeks its first green bond allocation report. So I really invite you to look at this green bond dashboard. We are currently on a weekly updated basis. You can see all the different projects which are financed via green bonds and, I suppose, as of beginning of next year it will be on a daily basis updated.

So finally, I concur that this is key to keep the European Parliament fully involved. The Commission is strongly committed to reporting to Parliament on its issuance and debt management strategy, as we have done since the start of the NextGenerationEU programme and our proposal to bring the diversified funding strategy in the scope of financial regulation would further strengthen the role of the European Parliament in the oversight. So also in this context, I look forward to the continued cooperation with the European Parliament on this file.

IN THE CHAIR: KATARINA BARLEY

Vice-President

Siegfried Mureşan, *on behalf of the PPE Group*. – Madam President, dear colleagues, firstly I would like to start by congratulating the two co-rapporteurs, Valérie Hayer and José Manuel Fernandes, on what is a very good report, widely reflecting the points of view of the Members of this House.

Secondly, I would like to congratulate the Commission and the Commissioners specifically for what has been a successful borrowing strategy so far, if we evaluate it both in terms of volumes raised but also in terms of associated costs.

NextGenerationEU is the largest package of economic support ever created by the European Union. We need to make sure that at the end of the day, the benefits for the people, for enterprises, for the regions affected by the virus, by its economic and social consequences, outweigh the costs and the risks.

This is why, firstly, the borrowing strategy continues to be important and I believe that the borrowing strategy needs to be put in place in such a way that interest rates will continue to be as low as possible for the foreseeable future. But then, of course, we will also have to think about repayment. Making that is never an easy decision and that needs to be paid back. We have to clarify who, how and when pays back that debt.

The Commissioner has rightly said that the European Commission has put forward a first document on own resources. We kindly ask Member States not to delay the implementation of what is a binding interinstitutional agreement between the Parliament, the Commission and the Council, with a clear objective to clarify the repayment of NextGenerationEU, because so far the interest rates of this instrument are included in the budget. They pose a risk for the budget.

We do not want the repayment of this instrument to pose a risk for the budget as a whole.

Margarida Marques, *em nome do Grupo S&D*. – Senhora Presidente, Colega José Manuel Fernandes, Colega Valérie Hayer, Senhor Comissário, há três, quatro anos apenas ninguém poderia imaginar estarmos aqui hoje a fazer o balanço da estratégia da Comissão Europeia na emissão de dívida para constituir progressivamente o *NextGenerationEU*. E quem propusesse antes constituir dívida era considerado um utópico ou uma utópica.

Mas queria felicitar a Comissão pelo sucesso que tem conseguido nas sucessivas emissões. Sucesso também na promoção de *Green Bonds*. E isso revela bem a credibilidade da União Europeia junto dos mercados financeiros, que vai muito para além da soma da credibilidade dos *ratings* dos 27 Estados-Membros.

Temos de tudo fazer para que o *NextGenerationEU* – uma resposta europeia ambiciosa, coletiva e democrática –, seja um sucesso também para que possa ter outros voos no futuro.

Para já, a Comissão Europeia já está a propor usar este mecanismo para o financiamento da União Europeia à Ucrânia. A resposta é possível porque o instrumento existe.

Mas precisamos de passar de soluções *ad hoc* para instrumentos mais estruturantes: dotarmos a União de um instrumento permanente que lhe permita reagir rápida e eficazmente a novos desafios.

Mauri Pekkarinen, *Renew-ryhmän puolesta*. – Arvoisa puhemies, ensinnäkin kiitoksia esittelijöille. Covid oli todellakin nyt vaarassa ajaa Euroopan talouden kriisiin. Finanssikriisistä poiketen EU kykeni kuitenkin yhteisin varoin auttamaan suurempiin vaikeuksiin joutuneita jäsenvaltioita. Ratkaisumme oli elpymisväline. Päätimme ottaa ensimmäisen kerran suuren määrän yhteistä velkaa. Se oli vahva solidaarisuuden osoitus. Näiden rahojen käyttöä pitää nyt tarkkaan seurata. Äsken kuultu komissaarin esitys oli hyvä tässä mielessä.

Montag, 21. November 2022

Tämä ratkaisu elpymisvälineistä tehtiin luottaen siihen, että se oli poikkeuksellinen, kertaluonteinen ja väliaikainen ratkaisu. Suomelle tämä nimenomaan oli välttämätön edellytys, jotta tuki Next Generation EU:lle voitiin antaa.

Nyt käsittelyssä olevan asian yhteydessä onkin syytä muistaa, että tällaisen yhteisvastuullisen velkaratkaisun tulee todellakin jäädä ainutkertaiseksi. Jäsenvaltioiden on itse kannettava vastuu taloutensa tasapainottamisesta. Tulevalla valmistuvalla kasvu- ja vakaussopimuksella on tämän periaatteen käytännön soveltamisen kannalta suuri ja tärkeä merkitys.

David Cormand, *au nom du groupe Verts/ALE*. – Madame la Présidente, Monsieur le Commissaire, chers collègues, oui, cet emprunt partagé, c'était un moment historique — hamiltonien, d'aucuns l'ont dit. Sauf qu'aujourd'hui nous sommes au milieu du gué et la fin de l'histoire reste à écrire. La réalité actuelle, c'est que le financement de cet emprunt partagé est garanti par un budget qui, aujourd'hui, est contraint par de nouvelles urgences, comme la guerre imposée par la Russie de Poutine à l'Ukraine.

Or, il y a un enjeu dont je n'ai, jusqu'à maintenant, pas entendu parlé ce soir, et qui est celui des ressources propres. Il n'y a pas de voie d'arrivée, d'atterrissage, de possibilité d'aller au bout de ce que nous avons initié avec ce plan de relance s'il n'y a pas de ressources propres. Et là, ça bloque au Conseil et on attend que ça avance et que cela soit poussé, y compris par la Commission. J'ai donc une grande inquiétude — surtout, et cela a été dit par des collègues, avec l'augmentation des taux d'intérêt — si nous n'accélérons pas d'autant la création de nouvelles ressources propres.

Et puis, sur l'histoire des obligations vertes, les 30 % d'obligations vertes: là, je tire la sonnette d'alarme, puisqu'on a vu avec le rapport de la Cour des comptes européenne que, sur le précédent CFP, les objectifs verts qu'on s'était fixés n'ont pas été respectés. Il y a donc une exigence absolue, c'est qu'on ait un bilan précis et transparent de ce qui relève réellement d'obligations vertes. Sinon, il y aurait en quelque sorte arnaque sur la marchandise. Donc voilà, ce sont les deux objectifs qu'il faut se fixer: des objectifs vraiment verts et de nouvelles ressources propres.

Joachim Kuhs, *im Namen der ID-Fraktion*. – Frau Präsidentin, Herr Kommissar, werte Kollegen! Mein ältester Enkelsohn fragte mich am Wochenende: „Opa, wo kommt eigentlich das ganze Geld her?" Ich antwortete dem 13-Jährigen: Ich erkläre dir das mal anhand des Corona-Wiederaufbaufonds: Also, zuerst legt man fest, dass der Fonds 750 Milliarden Euro schwer sein soll – so viel bräuchte man, um die Schäden, die durch die von der Regierung verordneten Lockdowns entstanden sind, bezahlen zu können.

In einem zweiten Schritt borgt man sich dann das Geld von den Banken durch Anleihen. Sie machen also Schulden, obwohl in einem EU-Vertrag steht, dass die EU keine Schulden machen darf. Sie versichern ja, das wäre eine einmalige Ausnahme – ist es aber nicht.

Und im dritten Schritt erklären sie der Bank, dass sie die Schulden bis spätestens in 36 Jahren zurückbezahlen werden, und zwar mit Einnahmen, die erst in vier Jahren in vollem Umfang fließen, aber nicht ausreichen, um alle Schulden zurückzuzahlen. So, mein lieber Joel, funktioniert die Finanzierung des Wiederaufbaufonds.

Herr Kommissar, werte Kollegen, ich möchte Ihnen nicht die Frage vorenthalten, die mein Enkel dann gestellt hat: „Opa, sind die verrückt?"

Zbigniew Kuźmiuk, *w imieniu grupy ECR*. – Pani Przewodnicząca! Panie Komisarzu! Koncepcja funduszu NextGenerationEU powstawała w czasie, kiedy mieliśmy do czynienia z tanim pieniądzem. Ta era taniego pieniądza skończyła się bezpowrotnie. W związku z tym koszty obsługi także wyraźnie rosną. Pan Komisarz zapewne zdaje sobie z tego sprawę. Dobrze, że Komisja przygotowała strategię pozyskiwania środków finansowych, że używa różnych instrumentów, „zielonych obligacji", wieloletnich obligacji, bonów skarbowych. Rozumiem, że w ten sposób próbuje pomniejszać koszty pożyczania. Ale nie ulega wątpliwości, że one będą rosły, i z tego trzeba zdawać sobie sprawę. Przy tej okazji chciałbym zgłosić jednak poważne zastrzeżenia.

Reprezentuję duży europejski kraj, Polskę. Jak Pan Komisarz doskonale wie, mój kraj do tej pory nie korzysta ze środków KPO tylko dlatego, że mamy polityczną blokadę dotyczącą polskiego KPO. Złożyliśmy ten plan zgodnie z rozporządzeniem, które reguluje funkcjonowanie planów, a mimo tego ta blokada do tej pory nie została zdjęta. Mam nadzieję, że tak będzie w przyszłości. I wprawdzie nie rozmawiamy dzisiaj o nowych źródłach finansowania, gdyż debata na ten temat odbędzie się jutro, ale chciałbym zwrócić uwagę czy też zgłosić dwa zastrzeżenia w tej kwestii.

Po pierwsze, te nowe instrumenty niestety są zdecydowanie bardziej niekorzystne dla krajów mniej zamożnych niż dla zamożnych. To widać szczególnie po tym podatku od nieprzetworzonego plastiku.

I drugie zastrzeżenie – niektóre z tych instrumentów zabierają środki na transformację energetyczną, klimatyczną z krajów członkowskich, a więc nie będą pozwalały im osiągać tych celów.

Δημήτριος Παπαδημούλης, *εξ ονόματος της ομάδας The Left.* – Κυρία Πρόεδρε, ο κοινός ευρωπαϊκός δανεισμός 750 δισεκατομμυρίων ευρώ για τη δημιουργία του Ευρωπαϊκού Ταμείου Ανάκαμψης ήταν μία από τις σημαντικές θετικές στιγμές για την Ευρωπαϊκή Ένωση.

Για αυτό και το σχέδιο αυτό πρέπει να πετύχει· και για να πετύχει, κύριε Hahn, πρέπει η συμφωνία που κάναμε, Κοινοβούλιο, Επιτροπή και Συμβούλιο, για νέους ιδίους πόρους να προχωρήσει όπως έχει συμφωνηθεί. Αυτό σημαίνει ότι το Συμβούλιο πρέπει να σταματήσει να κρατάει καθυστέρηση και να σέρνει τα πόδια του. Γιατί όσο δεν έχουμε τους νέους ίδιους πόρους, με ευθύνη του Συμβουλίου, την πληρώνουν οι Ευρωπαίοι πολίτες που περιμένουν από τον κοινοτικό προϋπολογισμό που επιβαρύνεται να υλοποιηθούν τα προγράμματα που έχουμε συμφωνήσει.

Και το δεύτερο, αφού όλοι συμφωνούμε ότι είναι ένα καλό εργαλείο και είμαστε σε περίοδο υψηλού πληθωρισμού και με κίνδυνο ύφεσης, χρειάζεται αυτό το εργαλείο όχι μόνο να πετύχει, αλλά να μονιμοποιήσουμε τέτοια εργαλεία. Για αυτό και η επιμονή ορισμένων ότι είναι ένα καλό πράγμα αλλά πρέπει να το ξεχάσουμε αμέσως είναι λάθος.

Λευτέρης Νικολάου-Αλαβάνος (NI). – Κυρία Πρόεδρε, το NextGenerationEU, όπως και το Ευρωπαϊκό Ταμείο Ανάκαμψης, αποτελούν υπερμνημόνιο. Μοιράζει πακτωλούς χρήματος σε ομίλους ανανεώσιμων πηγών ενέργειας και ψηφιακής τεχνολογίας και υποθηκεύει το εισόδημα των εργαζομένων για δεκαετίες. Οι αστικές κυβερνήσεις της Ευρωπαϊκής Ένωσης, όμως, δεν τα βρίσκουν στη μοιρασιά.

Εκφράζονται σφοδρές αντιπαραθέσεις για την αποπληρωμή των δανείων του προγράμματος στο φόντο του ιμπεριαλιστικού πολέμου στην Ουκρανία και των επιπτώσεών του μπροστά στη διαφαινόμενη καπιταλιστική κρίση. Προβάλλετε, λοιπόν, σαν λύση τη δήθεν αγορά ομολόγων από τον λαό. Ουσιαστικά καλύπτετε τις τράπεζες, τους ομίλους και τα funds για να κερδοσκοπήσουν στις πλάτες των εργαζομένων που τους φορτώνετε το βάρος των χρεών, των νέων φόρων ιδίων πόρων —πέρα από τον πληθωρισμό, την ακρίβεια, το ενεργειακό κόστος— και δεν μπορούν να ανταπεξέλθουν.

Οι λαοί, λοιπόν, να μην συμβιβαστούν με τη βαρβαρότητα για να πληρώνουν τα σπασμένα της καπιταλιστικής κερδοφορίας των ανταγωνισμών κρατών και ομίλων. Στον δρόμο των μαζικών μαχητικών αγώνων που διεξάγονται σήμερα, να κλιμακώσουν την πάλη τους για τις σύγχρονες ανάγκες για να πληρώσουν την κρίση αυτοί που τη δημιουργούν, δηλαδή η Ευρωπαϊκή Ένωση και τα μονοπώλια.

Angelika Winzig (PPE). – Sehr geehrte Frau Präsidentin, Herr Kommissar! NextGenerationEU ist das größte gemeinsame Finanzierungsprogramm der Union, das den Mitgliedstaaten direkt – einerseits in Form von Zuschüssen und andererseits in Form von Krediten – zugutekommt. Dafür werden bis 2026 jährlich 150 Milliarden Euro aufgenommen. Die Entscheidung für dieses umfassende Programm war notwendig, um den Wiederaufbau in den einzelnen Mitgliedstaaten zu bewältigen.

Ich gratuliere der Kommission zu dem erfolgreichen Darlehensprogramm. Denn eines ist klar: Wir dürfen der nächsten Generation keinen Schuldenrucksack umhängen, geschweige denn in eine Schuldenunion schlittern.

Ja, die Erhöhung der Leitzinsen durch die EZB zur Bekämpfung der Inflation ist notwendig. Und daher ist es umso wichtiger, dass eine zügige Umsetzung der institutionellen Vereinbarung über die Einführung weiterer Eigenmittel schnell in Angriff genommen wird.

Jonás Fernández (S&D). – Señora presidenta, señor comisario, sin duda el debate que estamos teniendo hoy marca un antes y un después en el diseño de la Unión Europea, al igual que lo marcó la decisión de emitir la deuda del Next Generation EU buscando sin duda los flecos o los espacios que nos permitían los Tratados. Y quiero felicitar a la Comisión por su estrategia de endeudamiento que tiene el aplauso de nuestros acreedores, de los mercados.

Pero me gustaría insistir o incentivar un poco más a la Comisión Europea a la hora de clarificar el mapa para tener los recursos propios necesarios para amortizar la deuda. Sabemos ya que el impuesto digital con el que contábamos previsiblemente no se va a aprobar. Necesitamos buscar recursos adicionales. Tenemos ese acuerdo para fijar un impuesto en sociedades mínimo del 15 % que bien podría darnos la oportunidad de introducir una tasa para aquellos que se benefician del mercado interior, del mercado único. Y yo creo que necesitamos más ambición, más trabajo y más compromiso por parte de la Comisión Europea para clarificar del todo el marco de recursos propios.

Montag, 21. November 2022

Roman Haider (ID). – Frau Präsidentin! Der Hauptzweck dieses Anleiheprogramms ist nicht die gezielte Förderung zukunftsträchtiger Wirtschaftsbereiche, sondern allein der Tabubruch, endlich Schulden machen zu können. Unter dem Vorwand der Krisenbekämpfung dehnt die EU ihre Befugnisse im Bereich des Haushalts einfach weiter aus – und nur darum geht es.

Und zusätzlich werden die Mittel auch noch intransparent und ohne jegliche parlamentarische Kontrolle vergeben. In Wahrheit verteilt die EU hier auf Schulden basierendes Geld völlig ziellos, ohne jegliche Kontrolle, mehr oder weniger willkürlich an die Mitgliedstaaten und bricht dazu noch ihre eigenen Regeln.

Und es ist der Gipfel der Frechheit, das Ganze auch noch als „NextGenerationEU" zu bezeichnen. Für die nächste Generation bleibt nichts als ein Schuldenberg und eine noch weiter aufgeblähte Union. Es ist ein Sittenbild dieser Kommission: undemokratisch, intransparent, kostspielig und sinnlos.

Bogdan Rzońca (ECR). – Pani Przewodnicząca! Panie Komisarzu! Nowe zasoby własne muszą uwzględniać zapisy Protokołu nr 28 do Traktatu o Funkcjonowaniu Unii Europejskiej. Nie mogą w nadmiernym stopniu obciążać państw mniej zamożnych. Jak to ma miejsce w przypadku pierwszego koszyka zasobów własnych, zaproponowanego przez Komisję Europejską. W szczególności w związku z propozycją przekazania do budżetu Unii Europejskiej części wpływów z ETSu.

My tego nie możemy poprzeć, po prostu. Ramy czasowe oraz wielkość zaciąganych przez Komisję Europejską pożyczek są ściśle określone w decyzji o zasobach własnych przyjętej jednomyślnie. Wszystkie kraje żyrowały pożyczkę. Nie wszystkie kraje otrzymały pomoc. To jest skandal. To jest niesprawiedliwość. Nie możemy się z tym pogodzić i będziemy upominać się o te pieniądze, które nam się należą.

Ta decyzja o zasobach własnych, o finansowaniu zasobów własnych wymaga oczywiście współpracy, no ale też wiemy – i widzimy w sprawozdaniu, czy w proponowanej rezolucji – że trzy podatki nie wystarczą do spłaty tych zasobów, czy tych zaciągniętych kredytów. Wobec tego potrzebne będą następne. I będą następne z tego tytułu problemy.

Enikő Győri (NI). – Tisztelt Elnök Asszony! Mi már 2020-ban tudtuk, hogy a tűzzel játszunk, s ez be is bizonyosodott. Mi a pandémia miatti válságot nem a jövő generációi számlájára akartuk megoldani, de meghallgattuk a nehéz helyzetbe került déliek kérését. Tudják, volt rossz saját tapasztalatunk: Magyarországot a kommunisták végtelenül eladósították, s ennek terhébe az első szabadon választott kormány 90 után majdnem belebukott. Mi nem akartuk, hogy az Unió is egyszer így járjon. 2020-ban megállapodtunk, hogy a hitelből finanszírozott Helyreállítási és Rezilienciaépítési Alap egyszeri és rendkívüli megoldás. Most pedig azt látjuk, hogy a Parlament ezt az eszközt állandósítaná, ráadásul a költségvetésen belülre emelné. Meggyőződésem, hogy ez végképp összeegyeztethetetlen a Szerződés 310. cikkével.

Nem újabb hitelfelvétel kellene, hanem az, hogy a meglévő keretet minél előbb és minél kevesebb akadály mellett használhassák fel a tagállamok. Magyarország, ugye, még nem is jutott hozzá a helyreállítási pénzhez, miközben a hitel kamatait már fizeti. A mai vitában is láttuk, a baloldali többség nem nyugszik, míg konzervatív kormánya van Magyarországnak. Én már csak a Bizottság józanságában bízom, hogy pártatlanul ítéli meg a Magyarország által a tisztes forrásfelhasználás érdekében hozott és a Bizottsággal leegyeztetett intézkedéseket.

Michiel Hoogeveen (ECR). – Voorzitter, wij hebben ons altijd verzet tegen het zogenaamde coronaherstelfonds, ook wel NextGenerationEU genoemd. Dankzij premier Rutte werd echter de deur geopend naar gemeenschappelijke Europese schuld, met de "Triple A"-garantie van Nederland uiteraard. Nu blijkt echter dat de haalbaarheid, betaalbaarheid en transparantie van het fonds tekortschieten.

Uit het verslag blijkt dat de Commissie nog geen methode heeft ontwikkeld waarmee zij de beloofde hervormingen van de ontvangende lidstaten kan evalueren. Bovendien heeft de Commissie onvoldoende zicht op de nationale internecontrolesystemen. Hoe kan de Commissie dan controleren of het geld doelmatig is besteed?

De Europese Ombudsman heeft haar zorgen geuit en de Europese Rekenkamer kwam met een waslijst aan verbeterpunten. Het platform voor onderzoeksjournalistiek *Follow the Money* heeft onthuld dat de Commissie weigert documenten vrij te geven, waardoor de controle op de geleende miljarden wordt bemoeilijkt.

NextGenerationEU is een vergissing en de eigen middelen zijn ongewenst. Laat dit eenmalig zijn.

Eugen Jurzyca (ECR). – Madam President, while the borrowing strategy has been conducted without major difficulties, new European debt also brings many hazards into the future which the report overlooks: higher inflation, increased indebtedness of Member States and resistance of Member States to fiscal consolidation and structural reforms.

I think it is a mistake that the Commission does not set fiscal consolidation as the main condition for drawing the recovery funds. Borrowing strategy is the easier side of the coin. The harder one is the not-borrowing strategy, the growth strategy that has been missing so far, fiscal consolidation and structural reforms in Member States. Without them NextGenerationEU risks to be a missed opportunity that we cannot afford.

Spontane Wortmeldungen

Stanislav Polčák (PPE). – Paní předsedající, my jsme si opravdu již v pandemii neříkám, že zvykli, ale vyzkoušeli, jak si půjčit na úkor budoucích generací, a to poměrně vysokou částku. Je důležité skutečně si uvědomit, že Evropská unie je největší emitent dluhopisů a je třeba posilovat zejména stabilitu finančních a kapitálových trhů. A v této konstelaci jsem si jist tím, že je důležité, aby EU budovala své další finanční zdroje. Dříve bych takto nehovořil, ale již několik let se přikláním k této myšlence, že by skutečně i Evropa měla budovat svoje vlastní finanční zdroje. Jsou zde určitě významná rizika, která již zde byla pojmenována. Je to inflace, je to otázka členských států a neprovedených strukturálních reforem. Myslím, že jsou před námi velké výzvy – Ukrajina a nebezpečí ruské agrese. Je důležité si uvědomit, že tyto peníze, po kterých voláme, které si bude muset i Evropská unie případně půjčovat, tak se budou splácet celá desetiletí. To znamená, potřeba vlastních finančních zdrojů je skutečně nezbytná.

Maria Grapini (S&D). – Doamnă președintă, domnule comisar, stimați colegi, sigur dezbatem acest raport legat de strategia de împrumut pentru finanțarea Next Generation, un proiect necesar, pentru că da, este o criză.

Ceea ce trebuie însă să spunem noi cetățenilor, pentru că nu vorbim abstract așa, împrumutăm 2 miliarde, 2000 de miliarde, 450 de miliarde. Cetățeanul vrea să știe cum poate să influențeze acest buget, viața lui, să poată să trăiască mai bine. Și știm bine că sunt zone geografice în care avem o lipsă de coeziune socială și o viață grea pentru cetățeni, vine iarna, avem facturile.

Cum folosim acești bani? Eficiența! Aici trebuie să punem accent pe eficiență. Și da, cine știe cât va fi dobânda până rambursăm în 2058? Trebuia concomitent cu împrumutul să fie automat găsite acele surse proprii de venituri pentru a putea să contracarăm cheltuielile cu aceste mari împrumuturi. Și este o bilă neagră pentru Consiliu, care blochează și mereu în ultima perioadă sau cel puțin de când sunt eu aici, Consiliul se remarcă prin a fi blocator la orice.

De aceea, domnule comisar, vă rog, insistați să mergem pe resurse proprii pentru a putea să fim siguri că nu îndatorăm trei generații după noi.

Mick Wallace (The Left). – Madam President, NextGenerationEU is not a new post-austerity era for Europe. Seven hundred and fifty billion sounds like a lot, but it amounts to barely 5% of the EU's total GDP. What's more, the funds would be given largely in the form of loans, and over the course of six years resulting, according to the ECB's own estimates, in a fiscal expansion of around 1% of GDP on average between 2021 and 2024 at best.

The NextGenerationEU plan is firmly embedded in the EU semester programme. The EU semester programme has consistently demanded that Member State governments cut public spending. It has resulted in public health spending cuts, pension cuts, unemployment benefit cuts.

Now, NextGenerationEU funds come with very strict troika-like conditions attached. This is same old EU debt in exchange for neoliberal reform strategy.

Clare Daly (The Left). – Madam President, NextGenerationEU is the EU's 800 billion temporary recovery instrument, supposedly to support economic recovery from the corona pandemic and to achieve the EU's climate, digital and economic goals. It sounds pretty good – not for Ireland, mind you, where there is less than a billion euros and there won't be much delivered on that.

Montag, 21. November 2022

But let's remember there is no such thing as a free ride: money borrowed from the markets will not be given away without conditions. We've already seen that, for instance, in relation to the monies that France would receive as part of the recovery plan being conditional on achievements in terms of specific objectives such as changing unemployment insurance and so on. This is not good enough. Neither is it good enough that the citizens would be expected to pay this back.

While we can talk, and it's fine, about the idea of a financial transaction tax, this has been discussed since 2013. We've got to join the dots on this. We need to make sure that the citizens don't pay, but get the benefits from this.

(Ende der spontanen Wortmeldungen)

Johannes Hahn, *Member of the Commission*. – Madam President, first I would like to thank the honourable Members for our mostly constructive debate today, and I can reassure you that we have well noted the positions expressed today and are looking forward to receiving the final version of this own-initiative report.

In the context of multiple crises, first Covid now the unprovoked and unjustified Russian war against Ukraine, it's more than ever important that the Union has the tools in place to finance its priorities when it is needed. The diversified funding strategy gives the Commission the flexibility it needs to finance the EU priorities in a transparent, flexible and cost-efficient manner.

The Commission's priority for the coming years will be to build on the successful establishment of the EU as a recognised and trusted issuer, as we continue to navigate the volatility in the market. The constructive role of the European Parliament has not gone unnoticed by investors. I can witness this in our usual investors relation activities and roadshows where we receive this as a very good and valuable feedback and it is important that we show unity in this respect also in particular in turbulent times.

So I would like to thank the European Parliament, the Committee on Budgets, and especially again, the two rapporteurs for their intensive work on this excellent and, may I say, very timely report.

José Manuel Fernandes, *Relator*. – Senhora Presidente, caras e caros Colegas, Senhor Comissário, permitam-me que agradeça à correlatora deste relatório, Valérie Hayer, todo o trabalho que ela tem realizado e, também, um trabalho que está a dar frutos, no objetivo de termos novas receitas, novos recursos próprios. Um agradecimento a todos aqueles que aqui trouxeram a sua posição e a sua opinião e o apoio a este relatório. Um obrigado à Comissão por todo o trabalho que está a desenvolver e um pedido ao Conselho: executem rapidamente todos os milhões que têm à vossa disposição. Os agricultores e os pescadores precisam. As famílias estão à espera. As pequenas e médias empresas necessitam do vosso apoio. Os investigadores, também eles são absolutamente imprescindíveis. Não faltam recursos aos Estados-Membros. Não falta dinheiro aos Estados-Membros. É o dinheiro do *NextGenerationEU*, que deu lugar aos planos de recuperação e resiliência. O Quadro Financeiro Plurianual 2014-2020 ainda tem 100 mil milhões de euros por executar. Em muitos países, infelizmente, como no meu, no Quadro Financeiro Plurianual 2021-2027 há zero pagamentos executados. E, portanto, os Estados-Membros têm muito dinheiro para utilizarem. Devem fazê-lo rapidamente e depois têm de perceber que a união faz a força.

Nós precisamos de uma União da energia, do digital, da segurança, uma postura comum no objetivo da proteção civil. E isso precisa de recursos. E as dívidas também são para se pagarem. E os novos recursos próprios, novas receitas do orçamento, são possíveis sem penalizarem o cidadão, com um princípio muito simples: quem não paga deve pagar. Quem beneficia do mercado interno deve contribuir.

E é com este objetivo que, estou certo, construiremos uma União forte, solidária e onde o desenvolvimento exista em todo o território.

Valérie Hayer, *rapporteure*. – Madame la Présidente, chers collègues, d'abord, oui, effectivement, je voudrais, comme José Manuel, remercier l'ensemble des collègues qui sont intervenus dans le cadre de ce débat et remercier Monsieur le Commissaire.

Quelques éléments de réaction: un enseignement que je n'ai pas entendu et dont je voudrais vous faire part ce soir, puis évidemment, un point sur l'un de nos sujets favoris avec José Manuel, à savoir les ressources propres.

On a constaté largement dans les interventions combien ce plan de relance est une réussite à bien des égards. Il faut aussi avoir à l'esprit que ce succès est la preuve que sortir de nos dogmes budgétaires peut ouvrir la voie vers un monde meilleur. Cela doit même être une nécessité lorsqu'il s'agit de protéger et d'affirmer l'Europe dans un monde en crise. Si je le dis autrement: n'écartons pas la possibilité de réaliser d'autres emprunts européens, en particulier pour sortir de nos dépendances, qui chaque jour nous affaiblissent. C'est tout l'enjeu du futur fonds pour la souveraineté européenne, que nous avons appelé de nos vœux dès le printemps dernier, Monsieur le Commissaire, et nous attendons les propositions concrètes de la Commission après l'annonce faite par la Présidente von der Leyen en septembre dernier.

Deuxième élément, effectivement, les ressources propres – cela a été rappelé par beaucoup d'entre vous. Rappelons-nous collectivement que les Européens ne considèreront le plan de relance comme une réussite pleine et entière que si nous respectons l'accord de remboursement. Nous avons décidé collectivement que ce sont les grands pollueurs, les importateurs de CO_2 étrangers, les grandes multinationales qui ne paient pas leur juste part d'impôts, les spéculateurs financiers, qui porteraient la charge de cet emprunt. Ce n'est pas seulement une question de justice fiscale et sociale, c'est aussi une question de respect de nos engagements collectifs et de notre crédibilité auprès des investisseurs. Nous leur avons promis, nous députés, commissions, États membres, nous leur avons promis que cela ne se ferait ni en augmentant les impôts, ni en coupant dans les programmes européens comme les aides aux agriculteurs ou Erasmus. Alors oui, réjouissons-nous de voir notre économie remise sur pied, mais ne considérons pas pour autant que le travail pour rendre l'Europe plus puissante et indépendante est terminé. Il nous reste encore beaucoup de travail.

Die Präsidentin. – Die Aussprache ist geschlossen.

Die Abstimmung findet am Dienstag, 22. November 2022, statt.

18. Umsetzungsbericht über den Europäischen Innovationsrat (kurze Darstellung)

Die Präsidentin. – Als nächster Punkt der Tagesordnung folgt die kurze Darstellung des Berichts von Christian Ehler über die Einrichtung des Europäischen Innovationsrats (2022/2063(INI)) (A9-0268/2022).

Christian Ehler, *rapporteur.* – Madam President, Commissioner, ladies and gentlemen, the European Innovation Council (EIC) is a centrepiece of the European innovation policy. It's a new instrument that was set up to do things differently. An essential part of the Green Deal, the industry's policy strategy of the EU, Europe's innovation agenda, it was most likely the most valuable contribution to the new Horizon Europe programme.

A one-stop agency where innovators could ask for support through grants as well as equity. The EIC had a great start during its pilot under Horizon 2020. It was a popular instrument with a growing reputation in the venture capital market and I am talking not about a small instrument, it is the biggest public instrument in Europe in the venture capital market for deep technology.

That is how it was supposed to continue on the rise in Europe as well but it ran into a wall of a settled bureaucracy inside the European Commission because this new approach to support innovators was pushing the boundaries of the budget implementation as traditionally done by DG BUDG. This fight or fear about loss of reputation led to a yearlong or more than yearlong fight between three DGs. Personally, I don't think it reached even the political level, but it blocked the biggest innovation programme for more than a thousand start-up deep-tech companies – we selected more than hundreds – which had been waiting more than a year for the money which had been dedicated to them originally.

And so the programme is no longer a question of the reputational risk. Who is going to manage that? The Commission itself, the EIB, not known as a racing horse in the capital market if I may say. The question is no longer about reputational risk, it is about reputational damage for the Union. It had been blocked. We lost the confidence of start-ups in Europe that we would have that interesting instrument, that challenges-addressing instrument.

Montag, 21. November 2022

We need, and Parliament needed, to step in through that. The whole thing is a disgrace. In the public sector, someone would have to resign. If your proceeding of a billion budget and you're not able to allocate that budget in the private sector, you would have to resign. We needed, as a Parliament, to publicly call out the problems created by the Commission.

We needed to publicly set out a positive agenda for the EIC and we did; through great collaboration between all political groups, we quickly developed a shared vision of the future of the EIC as co-legislator. We delivered a list of recommendations for the Commission that would restore the transformative nature and ambition of the EIC. A key recommendation is that the implementation of both the equity and the grant components are under full control of the Commission. This ensures that our start-ups really experience EIC as a one-stop shop. It also ensures that investment decisions are informed by the strategic interest by the Union. To deliver on strategic interests of the Union, the EIC also needs to be able to be an investor on its own. It needs to be able to be a sole investor, to take the lead in an investment around and to take a major share in a company. It is the only way we can fix the market failure of the European VC capital market where we don't have the needed investment in deep-tech technology. And the EIC needs to deliver investment decisions in line with industry standards.

Deep-tech start-ups cannot wait months and months for European institutional machinery and we need the money now for the sector. We also made some recommendations to address some challenges in this programme. Europe has a major issue with the underrepresentation of women in this sector. This is costing us billions of euros each year and the rise of it deprives us of great innovations that could have been done. We still have an innovation divide on our continent. This is reflected in the low participation in successful start-ups from some European regions.

To sum it up, we appeal to the Commission now to act. This is one of the valuable instruments that is needed for us to reach the 2030 goals because we need innovation, we need creative start-ups. So I appeal to the Commission to come to terms and let this common undertaking run.

Spontane Wortmeldungen

Maria Grapini (S&D). – Doamnă președinta, domnule comisar, un subiect extrem de important. Cea mai mare greșeală în managementul privat este ca atunci când e criză să tai fondurile de la cercetare, de la inovare. Din păcate, în spațiul public și iată și aici, Comisia Europeană s-a gândit chiar acest program să îl oprească.

Nu putem promova în primul rând dezamăgirea firmelor care au așteptat și au crezut în acest proiect. Al doilea, fără bani de inovare nu putem să avem start-up-uri, nu putem să avem societăți comerciale mici, mijlocii sau chiar foarte mari, cu tehnologie modernă.

Este absolut de neînțeles de ce chiar acest program a trebui să fie blocat și sigur că și eu fac apel pentru că lucrez cu mediul privat. Sunt vicepreședinta Comisiei pentru piața internă, vicepreședintă a Intergrupului pentru IMM-uri și știu ceea ce înseamnă nevoia de a investi în inovare.

Așadar, cheia este la dumeavoastră, domnule comisar. Noi, ca și Parlament, susținem. Nu cred că există vreun eurodeputat care nu înțelege de ce tocmai în criză avem nevoie de bani pentru inovare, pentru cercetare, pentru retehnologizare.

Ivars Ijabs (Renew). – Paldies, prezidentes kundze! Eiropas Inovāciju padome ir instruments, lai pārvarētu Eiropas atpalicību inovāciju jomā, kas ir īpaši svarīgs uzdevums šajos sarežģītajos ģeopolitiskajos apstākļos, un mūsu pienākums kā Eiropas institūciju pārstāvjiem ir izturēties pret to atbildīgi. Tas līdz šim nav pilnībā izdevies, un šīs kavēšanās ar naudas izmaksām dēļ institūciju savstarpējām cīņām un domstarpībām ir absolūti nepieņemama, un tam ir jātiek novērstam. Un tas ir tas, uz ko mēs aicinām arī Komisiju un Padomi. Un turklāt, protams, mums ir jādomā par īpašas Eiropas Investīciju institūcijas izveidi kapitāla daļu pārvaldībai, kā arī par vienas pieturas aģentūras izveidi topošajiem inovatoriem un topošajiem pieteikuma iesniedzējiem. Tikai tādā veidā mēs varēsim panākt šo tehnoloģiju izcilību un arī to komercializāciju, kas mums visiem ļaus piedzīvot tehnoloģisku izrāvienu Eiropā. Paldies !

Lina Gálvez Muñoz (S&D). – Señora presidenta, el presente informe goza de un importante consenso entre todos los grupos políticos porque todos somos conscientes de la importancia que tiene salvar la brecha en términos de innovación que tenemos con otras regiones, sobre todo ahora que tenemos que avanzar en resiliencia, en autonomía estratégica y acometer, además, las transiciones verde y digital.

Necesitamos realmente que la aplicación del Consejo Europeo de Innovación se haga de manera ambiciosa y transformadora, de una vez. Necesitamos realmente que se ponga en funcionamiento.

Hemos pedido expresamente que se cierren brechas importantes en materia de innovación, como la brecha de género, y también las brechas regionales existentes entre las distintas regiones y los territorios europeos.

Asimismo, para terminar, hemos pedido un mejor acceso al Acelerador por parte de las pymes, que son realmente el corazón de la innovación en Europa.

(Ende der spontanen Wortmeldungen)

Johannes Hahn, *Member of the Commission*. – Madam President, Mr Ehler, honourable Members, the European Innovation Council is a crucial instrument for the implementation of the New European Innovation Agenda, no doubt. This Agenda aims to position the Union as a global leader in deep-tech innovation to address our deepest societal challenges. This ambition remains the same against the current economic downturn.

The European Innovation Council is a major novelty of the Union's innovation policy. It's key in providing support to high-risk, deep-tech start-ups with a unique mix of grants, equity investments and innovation ecosystem services.

The Commission is currently finalising the work programme of the European Innovation Council for 2023, with a budget of over EUR 1.6 billion, it will continue to help identify, develop and scale up breakthrough technologies and game-changing innovations.

The Commission shares the views in the report that the European Innovation Council Fund should be a key player in supporting breakthrough innovation in Europe. I am happy to say after taking yet another step in the required restructuring, and the appointment of an external fund manager in September, the EIC fund is fully operational. It has already taken 35 investment decisions worth around EUR 190 million and many more decisions are expected in the coming weeks.

Under the EIC accelerator, offering grants and equity investments, 313 companies have been selected for support since June 2021. The total grant funding to these companies is EUR 680 million and 185 grant agreements have already been signed. Over half of the 313 companies – 184 exactly – are also proposed to receive equity investments ranging from EUR 1.5 million to EUR 15 million each through the EIC fund. The EIC fund is fully engaged to deal with the backlog of equity investments.

I would also like to reassure this House that the essential features of the EIC will be fully preserved as the Commission is moving towards indirect management of the EIC fund, as foreseen in the Horizon Europe regulation.

I would like to underline that, first, the Commission will continue to steer the direction of investments through the EIC annual work programmes, on which Parliament will continue to be informed in full transparency. Second, the investment decisions of the external fund manager must follow the investment guidelines endorsed by the Commission covering the terms of investment. Under these guidelines, the EIC fund will continue to be fully able to invest alone when the company is not ready for a funding round. The Commission will take a close look at the suggestion made with respect to the work of the Executive Agency EISMEA.

Once again, I would like to thank also the rapporteurs for this work, also on behalf of my fellow Commissioner, Mariya Gabriel, and – if you allow, because DG BUDG has been addressed – to say a few words. First, with the experience of a former business person and a Minister of Science and Research, you have all my sympathy for this kind of project, and I believe it's something extremely important because it is also addressing some, let's say, of the market failures we unfortunately see in Europe.

Montag, 21. November 2022

But it is also uncharted territory for a public administration, at least at the Union level. There are some Member States who are already rather successful on this. But the huge majority of public administration, for them, it's, so to say, a new territory. This is why, and I can fully understand your impatience, it took us some time to find the right model. May I say, not, unfortunately, but I have to admit, I spent much more time with your colleagues from the Budget Committee, from the Budget Control Committee, from the Court of Auditors and we have tried to anticipate potential concerns in order not to enter into a situation where we are finally blocked or criticised. The whole initiative is, I wouldn't say at the brink, but there might be questions. Therefore, again, please understand. There have also been some personal issues, but also this has been, I think, cleared. Therefore, I'm very confident that now we are in the rollout phase.

Indeed, this instrument should show its capacity, its potential, because if it works, it should be also a role model for many other public administrations in our Member States, because it's definitely something where the Union for the huge majority of Member States can serve as an excellent, interesting, and let's say, positive role model, where others should follow. That's why I think we should have – and we have – a joint interest that this is really a common success story of all of us.

Die Präsidentin. – Damit ist die Aussprache geschlossen.

Die Abstimmung findet am Dienstag, 22. November 2022, statt.

19. Ausführungen von einer Minute zu Fragen von politischer Bedeutung

Die Präsidentin. – Als nächster Punkt der Tagesordnung folgen die Ausführungen von einer Minute zu wichtigen politischen Fragen (Artikel 172 GO).

Ich möchte Sie darauf hinweisen, dass Sie für die Ausführungen von einer Minute von Ihrem Platz aus das Wort ergreifen können.

Ελισσάβετ Βόζεμπεργκ-Βρυωνίδη (PPE). – Κυρία Πρόεδρε, κυρίες και κύριοι συνάδελφοι, σύμφωνα με επίσημες ευρωπαϊκές έρευνες, τρία στα τέσσερα παιδιά ηλικίας μέχρι τεσσάρων ετών υφίστανται τακτικά τιμωρία και ψυχολογική βία από γονείς ή φροντιστές. Ποσοστό 3% παιδιών ηλικίας από δύο έως τεσσάρων ετών δεν αισθάνονται ασφάλεια στο σπίτι, 9% στο σχολείο και 8% στο διαδίκτυο. Είναι αυτονόητο ότι τα ποσοστά αυτά ανεβαίνουν δραματικά σε εφήβους με πολύωρη καθημερινή ενασχόληση στο διαδίκτυο.

Το διάστημα της πανδημίας και του lockdown παρατηρήθηκε τεράστια αύξηση περιστατικών ενδοοικογενειακής βίας με θύματα παιδιά, καθώς επίσης αυξήθηκε ανησυχητικά η βία κατά ανηλίκων μέσω διαδικτύου και ειδικότερα το έγκλημα της σεξουαλικής κακοποίησης. Θύματα αυτού του εγκλήματος, που επιτέλους τολμούν να μιλήσουν, προβάλλουν την ανάγκη μιας νέας νομοθετικής πρότασης για την πρόληψη και καταπολέμηση της πλέον αποτρόπαιης μορφής βίας.

Συνάδελφοι, έχουμε πρωταρχική υποχρέωση να προστατεύσουμε αποτελεσματικά κάθε παιδί που αντιμετωπίζει κίνδυνο. Πιστεύω να συμφωνείτε ότι αν εμείς, ως ευρωπαϊκή οικογένεια, δεν έχουμε επίκεντρο τα παιδιά και το μέλλον τους, δεν έχουμε λόγο ύπαρξης.

Victor Negrescu (S&D). – Madam President, dear colleagues, the accession of Romania to the Schengen area leads to benefits for the entire European Union. Specialists estimate that the trade volume between Romania and its main EU partners would be boosted by more than 10% in the next few years.

The increase of GDP in Romania, Bulgaria and Croatia will lead to a multiplier effect on the European economy already facing an increased risk of recession. Schengen enlargement also means a strong pro-European message in our region, but also better support capacities for Ukraine and its reconstruction. Finally, the internal market will be better integrated across the region, leading to more opportunities for SMEs.

Cross-border areas will become bowls of development and the increased mobility will lead to the development of digital trade and tourism. Among the countries that will benefit the most from these new opportunities are the Netherlands and Austria, with whom Romania maintains special trade links, led by right-wing government that currently oppose enlargement without any arguments.

I call upon my colleagues here in the Parliament and the Commission to continue helping us by presenting these arguments in order to have a positive vote at the December Justice and Home Affairs Council.

Vlad-Marius Botoș (Renew). – Doamna președintă, stimați colegi, domnule comisar, proiectele de dezvoltare cu fonduri europene reprezintă în multe zone din Uniunea Europeană o mare parte a investițiilor administrației publice, poate chiar una dintre cele mai mari părți.

Noi, aici, în Parlamentul European, am trasat anumite direcții pentru utilizarea acestor fonduri; digitalizarea, dezvoltarea sustenabilă, accentul pe aspectele ecologice, dar și pe prioritizarea energiei regenerabile. Am inclus în regulamente condiții clare de transparență și obligativitatea consultării reale a societății civile, a cetățenilor pentru a respecta interesele și prioritățile acestora în regiune.

Din păcate, avem semnale clare că prioritățile trasate nu sunt deplin înțelese, că unele autorități încearcă să țină la distanță societatea civilă, iar sugestiile ei la stabilirea strategiilor de dezvoltare, la luarea deciziilor sunt aproape inexistente.

Pentru că noi am stabilit niște priorități, pentru că noi am hotărât aici, în Parlamentul acesta, că societatea civilă va fi implicată. Noi suntem cei care trebuie să fim atenți ca aceste condiții să fie respectate chiar și acolo unde autoritățile publice nu sunt obișnuite să colaboreze, când vine vorba de cheltuirea banilor publici.

Nico Semsrott (Verts/ALE). – Frau Präsidentin! Die EU hat dieses Jahr Sanktionen gegen russische Oligarchen verhängt. Wann verhängt sie endlich Sanktionen gegen die restlichen?

Wir sollten allen Milliardären weltweit ein Ultimatum setzen: Wenn ihr in einem Jahr die Klimakrise nicht gelöst habt, werdet ihr enteignet. Ihr besitzt alles, was man dafür braucht: die fossilen Unternehmen, Geld, alle Medien, alle sozialen Medien, Millionen Arbeitskräfte und viele Politiker.

Als mildere Variante schlage ich ein TV-Format vor. Das Konzept: Jedes Jahr wird der jeweils reichste Mensch begleitet. Schafft es Elon Musk, mit seinem Vermögen die Klimakrise zu lösen, oder ist er einfach zu böse dafür? Am Schluss der Show wird er dann enteignet. Da hätte man wenigstens als Zuschauer auch was davon.

Wichtig: Wir sollten die Milliardäre nicht so im Stich lassen, wie sie uns im Stich lassen. Ich finde, man sollte ihre Geldabhängigkeit genauso behandeln wie andere Süchte auch. Ich denke zum Beispiel an Fixerstuben, in denen ihnen als Ersatzstoff Spielgeld ausgezahlt wird.

André Rougé (ID). – Madame la Présidente, chers collègues, l'île de La Réunion, région ultrapériphérique française, est le premier producteur de canne à sucre européen. Depuis la suppression par l'Union des quotas sucriers et l'émergence de pays tiers sur le marché, le gouvernement français, sous l'impulsion de la Commission, est contraint de combler le manque à gagner d'une profession qui représente 13 % de l'emploi marchand, soit 20 000 emplois. Or, non seulement le gouvernement d'Emmanuel Macron a réduit de 30 à 14 millions le montant annuel d'indemnisation des planteurs, mais il a tardé à les verser, générant ainsi de nombreux mouvements de rue.

Aujourd'hui, le gouvernement persiste dans l'erreur. Il entend répartir ses subventions de façon totalement illogique, inéquitable et contraire au principe du couplage aux tonnages destiné à privilégier les producteurs les plus modestes. M[me] Borne et M. Darmanin entendent faire la part belle aux plus gros. Face à cette situation, l'Union européenne n'envisage-t-elle pas de rétablir les quotas sucriers?

Michiel Hoogeveen (ECR). – Voorzitter, hoeveel macht moet de Europese Unie hebben? Wanneer houdt het op en wanneer zeggen we: genoeg? Sinds de oprichting van de Unie streven velen in het Parlement naar meer EU. De macht en de begrotingen zijn enkel toegenomen, zelfs na de Brexit.

Montag, 21. November 2022

Wij willen een kleinere, andere EU. Wat betekent dat? Het uitgangspunt moet zijn dat de lidstaten de EU maken, niet andersom. Veel activiteiten van de EU moeten worden teruggedraaid. Met andere woorden: veel zaken kunnen vandaag nog worden opgeheven. Een Europees buitenlandbeleid, crisisbeheer, ontwikkelingssamenwerking, genderbeleid of zaken zoals cultuur en nabuurschap zijn stuk voor stuk zaken die niet nodig zijn voor een succesvolle gemeenschappelijke markt. De EU moet zich beperken tot haar kerntaak. Daar wordt iedereen beter van.

Clare Daly (The Left). – Madam President, this year Ireland sanctioned Russian officials and – surprise surprise – last week Russia returned the favour, sanctioning 52 Irish politicians.

States respond in kind. In international law it's called 'retorsion': a legal and proportionate diplomatic response to hostility. Yet the Irish Government were apoplectic with outrage, our Taoiseach talking about 'hybrid warfare'.

What does he expect? Foreign policy isn't a game, it should be conducted in the interests of our people. Instead, our Taoiseach has leapfrogged us over France and Germany to align with the extremist outliers in Poland and the Baltics. He's gone out of his way to provoke.

This is lunacy for a small country with a small military. And where is his mandate? Neutrality is incredibly popular. Not only that, we pimped it in order to get a seat on the UN Security Council. And, instead of using that seat for peace, we have escalated and talked up the fight at every turn.

De Valera must be turning in his grave.

Tatjana Ždanoka (NI). – Madam President, during this summer and autumn, more than 70 monuments to the liberators of Latvia from German Nazi occupiers were dismantled, despite the decision of the UN Human Rights Committee urging Latvia to refrain from demolition.

I was among those who addressed the committee. It appeared that the land on which one of the monuments was staying belonged to my ancestors, victims of the Holocaust. The fight against monuments of the past continues with the repressions of people living in Latvia nowadays.

After dissolution of the USSR, one third of Latvian residents became so-called 'aliens'. Most of them are local natives. Some are still preserving this status, but some, mostly elderly people, acquired the citizenship of Russia.

The new retroactive law norm requires annulation of their permanent residence permit in case of weak knowledge of Latvian language. Thousands will soon face being made illegal in their homes in Latvia and, therefore, in the EU. Shame.

Anna-Michelle Asimakopoulou (PPE). – Κυρία Πρόεδρε, όσοι κατηγορούσαν την Ελλάδα για τους 92 μετανάστες που διέσωσαν οι ελληνικές αρχές στον Έβρο, θα ζητήσουν άραγε συγγνώμη τώρα που το μέσο που δημοσίευσε το σχετικό ρεπορτάζ το απέσυρε λόγω αμφιβολιών; Μήπως θα ζητήσουν συγγνώμη όσοι συκοφαντούσαν τους διωκόμενους στο υποτιθέμενο σκάνδαλο Novartis που αθωώθηκαν πλήρως τώρα που ακόμα και ο δικηγόρος του κυρίου Τσίπρα λέει ότι ήταν όλοι αθώοι από την αρχή;

Είναι αυτοί που για το πανευρωπαϊκό πρόβλημα της χρήσης παρανόμου και κακόβουλου λογισμικού υιοθετούν και αναπαράγουν ανυπόστατες κατηγορίες κατά της Ελλάδας. Αυτοί, λοιπόν, που προσπαθούν να παρασύρουν την Ελλάδα μέσα στον βούρκο της λάσπης και της τοξικότητας, να ξέρουν ότι δεν χάνουμε χρόνο περιμένοντας τη συγγνώμη τους. Η κυβέρνηση Μητσοτάκη είπε από την αρχή «όλα στο φως» και συνεργάστηκε πλήρως με τα ευρωπαϊκά όργανα, με την επιτροπή PEGA, και πρωτοπορεί πανευρωπαϊκά με νομοσχέδιο που απαγορεύει και ποινικοποιεί την κατοχή, τη χρήση και την εμπορία του παράνομου λογισμικού παρακολούθησης. Η Ελλάδα, κυρίες και κύριοι συνάδελφοι, όχι μόνο δεν υπολείπεται, αλλά πρωτοστατεί στην προστασία των ανθρωπίνων δικαιωμάτων και του κράτους δικαίου.

Maria Grapini (S&D). – Doamna președintă, domnule comisar, coeziunea socială este unul din obiectivele Uniunii Europene. Coeziunea socială în piața internă, în cele 27 de state. Dar cum să fie coeziune socială când avem piața fragmentată ? Când avem dublă măsură? Când eu văd că țara mea de 11 ani nu se află în spațiul Schengen.

Avem două Europe, Schengen și Non-Schengen. Și chiar astăzi s-a discutat despre modul de aplicare a regulamentului. Avem un regulament Schengen, Regulamentul se aplică, nu se discută, nu se negociază. De ce la Regulamentul Schengen avem această problemă, că o țară, două, vor să o controleze pe cealaltă și se deschide o cutie a Pandorei. Așa se aplică regulamentele? Eu știam că gardianul aplicării tratatelor și a regulamentelor este Comisia Europeană.

Cer, pe bună dreptate, ca țara mea, ca cetățenii mei, să nu mai fie tratați de mâna a doua și, așa cum s-a explicat aici, sigur că va fi o eficiență pentru toată piața internă. Dar, domnule comisar, este un pericol enorm să se dezvolte euroscepticismul, neîncrederea cetățenilor și, sigur, ce se întâmplă cu proiectul european.

De aceea, cer Consiliului să voteze intrarea României și Bulgariei în spațiul Schengen. Nu pentru că am cerșit acest sprijin, ci pentru că este dreptul nostru, al cetățenilor.

Ana Miranda (Verts/ALE). – Senhora Presidente, lutar contra o despovoamento, fortalecer a economia do noroeste peninsular, melhorar as infraestruturas são algumas das medidas que levamos anos defendendo para a Galiza por parte do meu partido político, o Bloque Nacionalista Galego: incluir a Galiza no corredor europeu da Rede Transeuropeia de Transportes.

Mas não só existe esta reivindicação da Galiza: também Castela-Leão e Portugal assim o reivindicam e a consideram uma infraestrutura estratégica para o desenvolvimento dos territórios.

Mas devemos evitar confundir e manipular com controvérsias estéreis. A pressão pelo corredor Atlântico não é incompatível com o corredor Mediterrâneo e vice-versa. Devem ser tratados como dois projetos estratégicos complementares do Estado espanhol para a Europa. Tentar eliminar um em detrimento do outro nada mais é que defender a discriminação dos territórios, neste caso o noroeste peninsular.

A igualdade de tratamento entre o corredor Atlântico e o Mediterrâneo implica um aumento dos investimentos no corredor Atlântico.

Markus Buchheit (ID). – Frau Präsidentin! Der Automobilzulieferer Schaeffler hat 1300 Stellen aufgrund des Umstieges auf die Elektromobilität gestrichen. Borgers ging gar ganz pleite und ist momentan in Insolvenz. Diese Liste ließe sich beliebig fortführen, denn laut einer Studie der Beratungsfirma Horváth leiden drei Viertel unserer Zulieferer unter den massiv gestiegenen Energie-, Rohstoff- und Produktionskosten. Die gesamte Automobilindustrie ist allein in Deutschland für 400 Milliarden Euro Jahresumsatz verantwortlich und beschäftigt mehr als eine Million Menschen.

In dieser gesamten Problematik und trotz dieser Bedeutung, die die Automobilzulieferindustrie insbesondere für unseren Wirtschaftsstandort hat, werfen wir genau dieser Industrie noch weitere Knüppel zwischen die Beine, indem wir eben gerade jetzt gnaden-, sinn- und nutzlos auf die E-Mobilität einschwenken und uns dazu verpflichten, hier einzusteigen. Das führt zu massiven Problemen, und wir können sagen, dass das eben nicht nur für meine eigene Region und Ingolstadt, sondern für den gesamten Wirtschaftsstandort Deutschland für massive Probleme sorgen wird.

Mick Wallace (The Left). – Madam President, the UN Special Rapporteur on the negative impact of unilateral coercive measures on the enjoyment of human rights, Alena Douhan, has just published her preliminary findings on our mission to the Syrian Arab Republic.

Everyone should read this document, it is both tragic and infuriating. It's tragic to read about the plight of the working-class people of Syria. And it's infuriating to learn of the gross violations of human rights being wilfully perpetrated against the Syrian people by these illegal unilateral measures imposed by the US and EU.

The figures detailed in the report are shocking. The poverty, food and fuel insecurity, the impact on health care and education. The catastrophic impact of unilateral sanctions is affecting people from all walks of life across the country, Douhan has said.

As long as they are silent on our authoritarianism, our blanket repression and our immiseration of the Syrian people, EU states and politicians have no credibility talking about human rights anywhere.

Montag, 21. November 2022

Κώστας Παπαδάκης (NI). – Κυρία Πρόεδρε, αγριότητα και πρόκληση η επιχείρηση έξωσης από το σπίτι της στην Αθήνα μιας χαμηλοσυνταξιούχου για χρέος 15.000 ευρώ. Ξεγυμνώνει τα ψέματα της κυβέρνησης της Νέας Δημοκρατίας ότι δεν γίνονται πλειστηριασμοί πρώτης κατοικίας, ενώ πλειοδοτεί αυτή σε παχιά λόγια για τους ευάλωτους την ώρα που μαζί με την Ευρωπαϊκή Ένωση και την Ευρωπαϊκή Κεντρική Τράπεζα υλοποιούν τον στόχο τους για 40.000 πλειστηριασμούς ως το τέλος του έτους.

Το νομοθετικό πλαίσιο που ψήφισε ο ΣΥΡΙΖΑ και υλοποιεί η Νέα Δημοκρατία παραδίδει τα λαϊκά σπίτια σε τράπεζες και κοράκια τύπου Πάτση, ξεσπιτώνοντας λαϊκές οικογένειες ή μετατρέποντάς τες σε νοικοκύρηδες στα ίδια τους τα σπίτια. Η αποφασιστική απάντηση χιλιάδων εργαζομένων σήμερα απέτρεψε την έξωση και έπληξε στην πράξη την ποινικοποίηση κινητοποιήσεων ενάντια στους πλειστηριασμούς που έβαλε η κυβέρνηση ΣΥΡΙΖΑ. Τα σπίτια του λαού τα σώζει ο λαός. Τώρα τείχος προστασίας στη λαϊκή κατοικία από εκβιασμούς και πλειστηριασμούς. Να καταργηθεί το νομοθετικό πλαίσιο που όμιλοι αρπάζουν τον μόχθο του λαού, να σταματήσουν οι διώξεις αγωνιστών για συμμετοχή σε κινητοποιήσεις ενάντια στους πλειστηριασμούς.

Stanislav Polčák (PPE). – Paní předsedající, jsme svědky masivního ničení kritické infrastruktury na Ukrajině. A my budeme tento týden hlasovat o tom, zda je Rusko teroristický stát. Já se ptám: Jak se liší ruský voják, který střílí, vraždí nevinné ukrajinské civilisty, jak se liší ruský voják, který vede spoutanou ženu k tomu, aby ji na dvorku jejího domu zastřelil, jak se liší ruský voják od teroristy, pokud unáší ukrajinské děti, pokud nacházíme masové hroby? My jsme dnes svědky obrovského ničení kritické infrastruktury na Ukrajině. Co provedli tak strašného Ukrajinci Rusům, že dochází k tomu, že se jim ničí jejich domovy, jejich elektrárny? Nepochybně pociťují hlad, pociťují samozřejmě chlad a také nedostatek energií. Ale jsou nezlomní ve své víře, že vyhrají. A my musíme Rusům vzkázat, že žádný zločin nezůstane nepotrestán, že budou nutné reparace a že bude nepochybně každý terorista stíhán po desetiletí.

Juan Fernando López Aguilar (S&D). – Señora presidenta, la semana pasada, en la sede del Parlamento Europeo en Bruselas, tuvo lugar la Conferencia de las Regiones Ultraperiféricas de la Unión Europea, en la que Canarias recibió el testigo de la presidencia para el próximo año 2023.

Y la conferencia tiene dos objetivos fundamentales. El primero es coordinar la acción de las propias regiones insulares y alejadas en la defensa de sus intereses. Pero el segundo es asegurar el refuerzo de la propia respuesta europea en el respeto de las singularidades que están consagradas en el artículo 349 del Tratado de Funcionamiento de la Unión Europea. Entre ellas, el seguimiento de la estrategia para las regiones ultraperiféricas de la Comisión para el período 2021-2025, que pretende aprovechar las oportunidades y sinergias de las regiones ultraperiféricas para convertirse en campeonas de la economía verde, de la economía azul y de la economía circular, pero sin olvidar sus sectores tradicionales, como la agricultura y el turismo.

Canarias es candidata a albergar la agencia europea del turismo y es la primera vez en que una agencia europea podría tener sede en una región ultraperiférica con el apoyo unánime de las propias regiones ultraperiféricas. Esperamos que la Comisión adopte cuanto antes la iniciativa y Canarias lo consiga.

Patricia Chagnon (ID). – Madame la Présidente, chers collègues, je souhaite revenir sur le dernier épisode de la crise migratoire qui secoue notre continent: l'accostage d'un bateau, l'Ocean Viking, sur les côtes françaises avec à son bord 234 migrants clandestins. Nous apprenons ce soir que plus de 95 % d'entre eux se sont volatilisés.

L'ONG SOS Méditerranée masque derrière un principe humanitaire, le sauvetage en mer, en réalité une opération politique pour mettre la pression sur les États et accélérer l'accueil des migrants sur le continent européen. Une politique qui vous tient également très à cœur.

Ces interventions d'ONG de plus en plus nombreuses et effrontées encouragent les migrants à se lancer sur les routes de l'immigration, accélèrent et facilitent le business des passeurs mafieux. L'Afrique compte aujourd'hui 1,2 milliard d'habitants. À l'horizon 2050, ce chiffre va au moins doubler. Même confronté à ce chiffre, à la réalité et à l'opposition des peuples d'Europe, votre funeste pacte d'immigration et d'asile va continuer à encourager et faciliter ces migrations. Car pour vous, l'immigration n'est pas un problème, mais bien votre projet.

Ici, au Parlement européen, aux côtés de Jordan Bardella et Marine Le Pen, nous continuerons à nous opposer et à exposer vos sinistres intentions.

Cristian Terheș (ECR). – Madam President, 'personal identity or digital identity' is the question that we all – regular people or elected officials – need to answer in the current rash of global developments.

Personal identity is composed of distinctive qualitative qualities like personal beliefs, aspirations and desires that make a human being unique in their relationship with the state and with other human beings. This is because a human being is seen as a subject with rights, including inalienable fundamental rights which are inherent to human dignity.

Digital identity, on the other side, starts from the presumption that human beings are not subjects with inalienable rights, but objects at the disposal of governments which have to assign them different attributes in order to grant them certain privileges. We saw this happening during communism in Eastern Europe. We see this happening right now in China with the social credit system. And we see this being implemented right now in the Western world by organisations like the World Economic Forum.

I call therefore on all the Members of the European Parliament to reject any proposals that are implementing a digital identity in the EU, and nevertheless I call on all the people of Europe and the world to reject and vote against such politicians that are proposing a digital identity.

Sandra Pereira (The Left). – Senhora Presidente, nas últimas semanas temos assistido um pouco por toda a Europa a diversas lutas dos trabalhadores na exigência de melhores salários, na defesa e conquista de mais direitos e na urgência de medidas de controlo dos preços na Bélgica, na Grécia, na Suíça, no Chipre, no Reino Unido, em França, em Espanha, entre outros. E também em Portugal, no seguimento das grandes manifestações de 15 de outubro contra o aumento do custo de vida. No passado dia 18 de novembro a enorme adesão à greve nacional dos trabalhadores da Administração Pública teve um grande impacto na generalidade dos serviços públicos. São trabalhadores que se recusam a empobrecer a trabalhar e exigem soluções para acabar com a desvalorização dos seus salários e carreiras.

Daqui apoiamos as justas reivindicações dos trabalhadores e expressamos a nossa solidariedade com os seus sindicatos de classe. Juntamos a nossa à sua voz na exigência de outras políticas que defendam melhores condições de trabalho e de vida.

A luta continua.

Domènec Ruiz Devesa (S&D). – Señora presidenta, el intelectual George Steiner, judío europeo y filósofo, defendía que «el verdadero ser de Europa» es la confluencia de varias tradiciones, entre ellas Atenas y Jerusalén.

No hace falta extenderse en el gran legado que la comunidad judía ha aportado a la civilización europea y al conjunto de la humanidad. Nombres como Maimónides, Freud, Einstein, entre otros muchos, hablan por sí solos.

Vivimos tiempos difíciles en los que el odio al diferente, sea judío o musulmán, cristiano o ateo, crece en todas partes. El antisemitismo, en particular, está en ascenso, precisamente en el continente que gestó la barbarie del Holocausto.

Por eso es importante recordar que España ofrece desde el año 2015 la posibilidad de obtener la nacionalidad española a los descendientes de los judíos sefardíes, es decir, los que vivían en Iberia, «Sefarad» en hebreo. La iniciativa persigue reparar la injusticia histórica cometida en el año 1492, cuando los judíos fueron expulsados de Aragón y Castilla. Hasta el momento, más de 90 000 solicitudes han sido acogidas favorablemente.

Gunnar Beck (ID). – Frau Präsidentin! Gesetze gegen Geldwäsche, gegen Offshore-Steuerhinterziehung und für eine Crypto-Assets-Regulierung sind die wenigen noch sinnvollen EU-Vorhaben. Doch wie ernst nehmen Sie hier Ihre eigenen Pläne?

Der ukrainische Präsident Selenskij, so wissen wir von den Pandora-Papieren, hat 40 Millionen Euro von Oligarchen erhalten und auf Offshore-Konten auf den British Virgin Islands und in Belize steuerfrei gesichert. Außerdem scheint Selenskij an der bankrotten Kryptobörse FTX hunderte Millionen Euro für Militär und Bevölkerung der Ukraine bestimmte EU-Hilfsgelder verspielt zu haben.

Montag, 21. November 2022

Das Geld unserer deutschen und europäischen Steuerzahler verschwand also in einem amerikanischen *Ponzi scheme*. Scheinbar nehmen Sie den Kampf gegen Geldwäsche und Kryptospekulation keineswegs ernst, denn wie sonst erklären Sie Ihre Unterstützung für Selenskij?

João Pimenta Lopes (The Left). – Senhora Presidente, passou mais uma conferência sobre alterações climáticas. Os países desenvolvidos sacodem responsabilidades, os objetivos de redução de emissões permanecem insuficientes, aprofundam-se caminhos de responsabilização individual, de acumulação de capital, de apropriação de recursos naturais. Os problemas ambientais ou não se resolvem ou se agravam. Acentuam-se desigualdades sociais. Condiciona-se o desenvolvimento de países.

Para os países em desenvolvimento: endividamento. Para o sistema financeiro: mecanismos de transferência de fundos. O mercado de carbono não reduz emissões, garante lucros e normaliza o direito a poluir dos que possam pagar.

Cada vez mais se expõe a perversidade da chamada economia verde e a incapacidade do capitalismo de responder aos problemas da Humanidade e ambientais.

Exigem-se outras respostas: o controlo público de setores estratégicos, como a energia; a aposta no transporte público; promover a produção e consumo locais; garantir o direito de cada Estado a produzir e à soberania alimentar; o controlo público da água; o combate à obsolescência programada; a rejeição da guerra.

Respostas também elas reclamadas pelos que lutam em defesa do ambiente e da natureza, e em particular os jovens, que daqui aproveitamos para saudar.

Елена Йончева (S&D). – Г-жо Председател, България не е втора категория член на Европейския съюз и това сме го доказали многократно през годините. Когато охраняваме външните граници на Европейския съюз, ние получаваме потупване по рамото. Когато сме солидарни с финансовите проблеми на Гърция, ние получаваме отново потупване по рамото, когато се съобразяваме с европейските правила за каботаж в ущърб на нашия транспортен бизнес, ние отново получаваме потупване по рамото. Преди 11 години доказахме, че сме отговорили на всички технически изисквания за Шенгенското пространство, но и до днес за вас ние сме неподходящи.

Обръщам се към премиера на Нидерландия. Всички допълнителни условия, които поставяте, г-н Рюте, нямат нищо общо с писаните правила на Шенген. Нека да Ви кажа нещо и за българското общество. Ако през декември България получи поредния отказ за Шенген, недоверието в Европейския съюз ще нарасне. И Вашите решения засягат пряко функционирането на Европейския съюз. Не ни предавайте!

Gianantonio Da Re (ID). – Signora Presidente, onorevoli colleghi, l'Unione europea ha deciso che, a partire dal 2035, le case automobilistiche non potranno più vendere le auto a benzina e diesel. Una decisione scellerata, dettata da una fobia ecologista che non ha valutato le gravi conseguenze socioeconomiche derivanti dal proprio delirio.

Con la messa al bando dei motori a combustione interna, l'Italia rischia di perdere, tra il 2025 e il 2040, oltre 70 000 posti di lavoro. Il Commissario Breton ha dichiarato che l'Europa perderà circa 600 000 posti di lavoro, con un enorme aumento del consumo di materie prime e di energia elettrica, affermando che lo stop del 2035 non è un tabù. Ben venga questa presa di coscienza da parte della Commissione nel rivedere la decisione adottata.

La transizione energetica richiede gradualità e un'attenta analisi delle conseguenze socioeconomiche da essa derivanti. L'Unione europea non scarichi sulle imprese e sui cittadini europei la follia dei gruppi ecologisti.

Иво Христов (S&D). – Г-жо Председател, на 15-ти ноември украинска ракета уби двама европейци граждани на Полша, за което бе обвинена Русия. Преживяхме 24 часа, в които войната можеше да подпали целия континент.

Европейският парламент от години осъжда поведението на Русия по основателни поводи. Тревога обаче буди доброволната ни слепота по отношение на властите в Киев. Нашият Съюз безкритично подкрепя Украйна, с което легитимира дезинформации, провокации и злоупотреби с доверие от страна на Киев. С поведението си позволяваме европейските институции да бъдат инструментализирани в един военен конфликт, който може да взриви собствения ни дом.

Мълчахме, когато бе обстрелвана атомната централа в Запорожие. Мълчим и сега, когато с твърденията си за произхода на ракетите украинските власти де факто режисираха повод за въвличането на Съюза в конфликта чрез механизмите на НАТО.

Европейската комисия трябва да осъзнае мащаба на риска и да излезе с мирна инициатива, която от 9 месеца гражданите на Европа напразно очакват.

Die Präsidentin. – Damit ist dieser Tagesordnungspunkt geschlossen.

20. Tagesordnung der nächsten Sitzung

Die Präsidentin. – Die nächste Sitzung findet morgen, Dienstag, den 22. November 2022, um 9.00 Uhr statt.

Die Tagesordnung wurde veröffentlicht und ist auf der Website des Europäischen Parlaments verfügbar.

21. Genehmigung des Protokolls der laufenden Sitzung

Die Präsidentin. – Das Protokoll dieser Sitzung wird dem Parlament morgen zu Beginn der Nachmittagssitzung zur Genehmigung vorgelegt.

Ich bedanke mich bei den Kolleginnen und Kollegen, der Kommission, den Dolmetscherinnen und Dolmetschern.

22. Schluss der Sitzung

(Die Sitzung wird um 22.02 Uhr geschlossen.)

Dienstag, 22. November 2022

AUSFÜHRLICHE SITZUNGSBERICHTE VOM 22. NOVEMBER 2022

(2023/C 240/02)

Inhalt Seite

1. Eröffnung der Sitzung . . . 65

2. Resilienz kritischer Einrichtungen (Aussprache) . . . 65

3. Ausgewogene Vertretung von Frauen und Männern unter den nicht geschäftsführenden Direktoren börsennotierter Gesellschaften (Aussprache) . . . 74

4. Wiederaufnahme der Sitzung . . . 92

5. Feierliche Sitzung - Zeremonie anlässlich des 70-jährigen Bestehens des Europäischen Parlaments . . . 92

6. Wiederaufnahme der Sitzung . . . 102

7. Abstimmungsstunde . . . 103

7.1. Änderung der Verordnung (EU, Euratom) 2020/2093 des Rates vom 17. Dezember 2020 zur Festlegung des mehrjährigen Finanzrahmens für den Zeitraum von 2021 bis 2027 (C9-0386/2022) (Abstimmung) . . . 103

7.2. Änderung der Verordnung (EU, Euratom) 2018/1046 im Hinblick auf die Festlegung einer diversifizierten Finanzierungsstrategie als allgemeine Methode für die Mittelaufnahme (C9-0374/2022) (Abstimmung) . . . 103

7.3. Instrument zur Unterstützung der Ukraine im Jahr 2023 (Makrofinanzhilfe+) (C9-0373/2022) (Abstimmung) . . . 103

7.4. Vorschlag, ein Gutachten des Gerichtshofs zum Zweiten Zusatzprotokoll zum Übereinkommen über Computerkriminalität einzuholen (Abstimmung) . . . 103

7.5. Ernennung eines Mitglieds des Rechnungshofs – Keit Pentus-Rosimannus (A9-0272/2022 - Mikuláš Peksa) (Abstimmung) . . . 103

7.6. Rechnungsabschluss der Europäischen Agentur für die Grenz- und Küstenwache für das Haushaltsjahr 2020 (B9-0488/2022) (Abstimmung) . . . 103

7.7. Protokoll zum Europa-Mittelmeer-Interimsassoziationsabkommen: Teilnahme der Palästinensischen Behörde für das Westjordanland und den Gaza-Streifen an Programmen der Union (A9-0253/2022 - Manu Pineda) (Abstimmung) . . . 103

7.8. Ausgewogene Vertretung von Frauen und Männern unter den nicht geschäftsführenden Direktoren börsennotierter Gesellschaften (A9-0275/2022 - Lara Wolters, Evelyn Regner) (Abstimmung) 103

7.9. Resilienz kritischer Einrichtungen (A9-0289/2021 - Michal Šimečka) (Abstimmung) . . . 104

7.10. Gemeinsame Fischereipolitik (GFP): Beschränkungen des Zugangs zu Unionsgewässern (A9-0206/2022 - Pierre Karleskind) (Abstimmung) . . . 104

7.11. Entscheidungen der europäischen Normungsorganisationen (A9-0205/2022 - Svenja Hahn) (Abstimmung) . . . 104

7.12. Grundqualifikation und Weiterbildung der Fahrer bestimmter Kraftfahrzeuge für den Güter- oder Personenkraftverkehr (kodifizierter Text) (A9-0267/2022 - Angel Dzhambazki) (Abstimmung) . . . 104

7.13. Abkommen zwischen der EU und Neuseeland: Änderung der Zugeständnisse für alle in der EU-Liste CLXXV aufgeführten Zollkontingente (A9-0273/2022 - Daniel Caspary) (Abstimmung) 104

Dienstag, 22. November 2022

Inhalt Seite

7.14. Änderung des Beschlusses (EU) 2015/2169 über den Abschluss des Freihandelsabkommens zwischen der Europäischen Union und der Republik Korea (A9-0277/2022 - Catharina Rinzema) (Abstimmung) . . . 104

7.15. Anleihestrategie zur Finanzierung von NextGenerationEU (A9-0250/2022 - José Manuel Fernandes, Valérie Hayer) (Abstimmung) . . . 104

7.16. Umsetzungsbericht über den Europäischen Innovationsrat (A9-0268/2022 - Christian Ehler) (Abstimmung) . . . 104

8. Wiederaufnahme der Sitzung . . . 104

9. Haushaltsverfahren 2023 — gemeinsamer Entwurf (Aussprache) . . . 104

10. Eigenmittelsystem der Europäischen Union (Aussprache) . . . 114

11. Zusammensetzung der Ausschüsse und Delegationen . . . 122

12. Wiederaufnahme der Sitzung . . . 122

13. Genehmigung des Protokolls der vorangegangenen Sitzung . . . 122

14. Fragestunde mit Anfragen an die Kommission – Künftige legislative Reform des Rahmens für die wirtschaftspolitische Steuerung in Zeiten der sozialen und wirtschaftlichen Krise . . . 122

15. Delegierte Rechtsakte (Artikel 111 Absatz 6 GO)(Weiterbehandlung) . . . 136

16. Zusammensetzung der Ausschüsse und Delegationen . . . 136

17. Wiederaufnahme der Sitzung . . . 136

18. Fragestunde (VP/HV) – Auswirkungen des russischen Angriffskriegs gegen die Ukraine auf Drittländer in Bezug auf das Abkommen im Rahmen der „Schwarzmeer-Getreide-Initiative“ . . . 136

19. Beziehungen zwischen der EU und China (Aussprache) . . . 146

20. Zusammensetzung der Ausschüsse und Delegationen . . . 159

21. Reaktion der EU auf die zunehmende Unterdrückung von Protesten im Iran (Aussprache) . . . 159

22. Förderung von regionaler Stabilität und Sicherheit in den Ländern des Nahen und Mittleren Ostens (Aussprache) . . . 170

23. Neue Strategie der EU für die Erweiterung (Aussprache) . . . 180

24. Lage in Libyen (Aussprache) . . . 191

25. Erklärungen zur Abstimmung . . . 197

Dienstag, 22. November 2022

Inhalt Seite

26. Tagesordnung der nächsten Sitzung 197

27. Genehmigung des Protokolls der laufenden Sitzung 197

28. Schluss der Sitzung 198

AUSFÜHRLICHE SITZUNGSBERICHTE VOM 22. NOVEMBER 2022

ΠΡΟΕΔΡΙΑ: ΔΗΜΗΤΡΙΟΣ ΠΑΠΑΔΗΜΟΥΛΗΣ

Αντιπρόεδρος

1. Eröffnung der Sitzung

(Η συνεδρίαση αρχίζει στις 9.00)

2. Resilienz kritischer Einrichtungen (Aussprache)

Πρόεδρος. – Το επόμενο σημείο στην ημερήσια διάταξη είναι η συζήτηση επί της έκθεσης του Michal Šimečka, εξ ονόματος της Επιτροπής Πολιτικών Ελευθεριών, Δικαιοσύνης και Εσωτερικών Υποθέσεων, επί της προτάσεως οδηγίας του Ευρωπαϊκού Κοινοβουλίου και του Συμβουλίου για την ανθεκτικότητα των κρίσιμων οντοτήτων (COM(2020)0829 - C9-0421/2020 - 2020/0365(COD)) (A9-0289/2021).

Michal Šimečka, *rapporteur.* – Mr President, colleagues, Madam Commissioner, it is quite an honour for me to stand here and present to you the result of almost two years of legislative work, which was grounded in extensive debates and consultations with stakeholders, the Member States and the European institutions. The initial promise was to deliver on a Europe that protects, which in practice also means strengthening the resilience of the critical systems underpinning our way of life in our internal market. And today, with the CER Directive, the EU is in a position to deliver on that promise.

Before we vote, let me just give a brief overview of what has transpired in Europe while we have been working on this file, which also provides the strongest arguments for why the European Union needs a new piece of legislation to better protect its critical entities.

Right before the Commission rolled out its draft, the COVID pandemic broke out, infecting and killing millions of Europeans and disrupting our healthcare, our economy and our societies. Later, while we were negotiating this law, or this directive, Russia launched its brutal attack, its brutal aggression against Ukraine. And since then, the European Union has been facing an unprecedented increase in sabotage operations on its critical infrastructure – from the energy sector to transport services – and experiencing an increasing number of hybrid attacks on its public institutions.

And in the meantime, the climate crisis has been burning and flooding our continent from Greece to Portugal, Sweden to Italy. And all of these crises, all of these events have also served as a sort of compass for the co-legislators as they were finetuning this directive.

Now more than ever, we must prove to our citizens that the European Union protects their lives, protects their jobs, their companies, the essential services that affect the daily lives of our citizens and, eventually, the entire European Union. Therefore, our ambition with this directive is to strengthen the ability of critical entities to cope with these risks to their operations, while improving the functioning of the internal market in these essential services.

There are 11 crucial sectors covered, and this directive addresses the various measures and requirements so that its implementation will adequately respond to both natural catastrophes and man-made attacks. I trust that our joint compass throughout this process has brought solid rules and established the cooperation, coordination and information flows among the Member States, the entities and the European Commission that will strengthen preparedness for these incidents, the response to these incidents and, eventually, their evaluations. Because resilience is not just about preventing a risk – a disaster can always occur; the crucial thing is how we cope with it and how we, as the European Union, bounce back from it.

Moreover, this is reflected in the legislation. There are entities which have a pan-European dimension because they operate simultaneously in several Member States, and a risk to their operations is therefore a risk for the single market as a whole. And this directive puts a special focus on these entities and on the cross-border cooperation of these entities, which are of particular European significance.

Finally, I would like to say that I'm delighted – and this is thanks to you, Madam Commissioner, and thanks to my colleagues, our shadow rapporteurs, our advisers in the European Parliament and our counterparts in the Council – that our mutual work has resulted in what I believe is the best possible legislation. It is a big step for the European Union, and I really hope that this Parliament will broadly support it by adopting our interinstitutional agreement later today.

Nils Torvalds, *rapporteur for the opinion of the Committee on Industry, Research and Energy.* – Mr President, Commissioner Johansson, resilience of critical entities could be slightly changed as a headline to 'resilience of critical entities and slightly naive and sometimes stupid minds'. Why? After the collapse of the Soviet Union, many Member States thought that we are living in a problem-free world.

I think the home country of Commissioner Johansson actually abandoned obligatory military service after 1990, thinking that we don't ever need military operations in Europe. And then, all of a sudden on 24 February, we woke up to a new reality – a very bitter reality, actually, where we are going to need all the things we actually discussed during all the discussions around the critical entities file.

Many Member States thought the need for a comprehensive directive on critical entities was useless, so they didn't even implement the old directive on European critical infrastructure. Fourteen years after this directive, we finally managed to agree on a directive that could actually highlight the importance of keeping our critical entities safe.

We don't know how much we actually lost during these 14 years. But what we are losing now because of the lack of an appropriate way for addressing critical entities, we are losing lives, and that's the real issue for the day. But I hope that we are going into a better future with this directive.

Alex Agius Saliba, *rapporteur for the opinion of the Committee on the Internal Market and Consumer Protection.* – Mr President, Commissioner, we all depend on essential services such as energy, transport, water, digital infrastructure, health, production and also food distribution. During the COVID-19 pandemic, countries had to work together to protect the health of the population while avoiding disruptions to the free movement of people and the delivery of goods and essential services throughout the European Union.

The recent sabotage against Nord Stream pipelines is another example of our energy infrastructures' vulnerability. Pipelines and underwater cables are essential infrastructure that connect European citizens and companies throughout the world.

In an increasingly interdependent world, it is in the interests of all Europeans to protect those services and infrastructures that play an indispensable role in maintaining vital societal functions, our economic activities and the very internal market.

As the rapporteur for the IMCO opinion, I support the agreement and believe that the new rules come just at the right moment to strengthen and prepare the resilience of the European Union as a whole. We don't always have to wait till something negative happens and, instead, be prepared and resilient for sudden disruptions and crises, situations, be it pandemic, be it wars, or even natural disasters. Thanks a lot and, also, well done again to the rapporteur.

Ylva Johansson, *Member of the Commission.* – Mr President, in a few hours, we will celebrate 70 years of the European Parliament. From very humble beginnings has grown this great House of European Democracy. And as Members of this House, this is for you a moment of great pride and solemn reflection, as it is for me a great honour to speak here today and every other day.

Today, as we speak about the resilience of our critical infrastructure, I think about the resilience of the Ukrainian people. Last Tuesday, Russia launched 100 missiles, leaving 50 % of Kyiv, 80 % of Lviv, and 90 % of Ternopil without electricity. The goal? Let me quote Andrey Gurulyov – a Russian state Duma representative. This is what he said, 'One week after all electricity is cut off, the city of Kyiv will be swimming in shit. There will be a clear threat of an epidemic'. The words of a Russian lawmaker, not mine. How calculating, how callous, how cold-hearted can you be to call on national TV to freeze, starve and terrorize civilians into submission? Showing us the will to destroy critical infrastructure; a blatant disregard for human life of a regime that's hostile to the European Union. Just think: there is a map somewhere in

Moscow pinpointing hospitals, power plants and water supply as targets.

At the end of September in the shallow waters of the Baltic, at 80 metres deep, a series of explosions tore gaping holes in the Nord Stream pipelines, one of them 50 meters wide, causing on the surface a maelstrom of whirling water one kilometre wide. Up to 400 000 tonnes of methane escaped. An act of sabotage and it is not yet clarified who did it. But it happened just after Putin's mobilisation, just when Russia was conducting fake referendums and just before Putin's illegal annexations.

About two weeks later, unknown perpetrators paralysed rail traffic in North Germany, disrupting rail links to the Netherlands and Denmark by cutting fibre optic communication cables. The attackers are so far unknown, but the message is clear, 'We know where you are weak. We know where to strike, any time we like'.

At the meeting of the G7 last week, I made clear the EU utterly condemned these acts of sabotage. We will not be intimidated. We will not tolerate these wanton attacks. We will defend ourselves. And we can do that, thanks to you. Thanks to the political agreements this Parliament reached with the Council this summer. First to strengthen our cyber-security. Russian cyber-attacks against Ukraine already caused damage in the EU, disrupting the internet in Central Europe. The NIS2 Directive you approved with overwhelming majority will help us fight cyber threats that do real world harm. And today you will vote on the directive improving the resilience of our critical entities, greatly expanding the sectors we will protect. Beyond energy and transport today, also banking and finance and space, drinking water, wastewater, health, food and more. Sharing information on incidents much more quickly, while allowing Member States to protect sensitive information.

We need to do more. Last month, this Parliament called on Member States to protect critical infrastructure as a matter of priority. And here in this Parliament, President von der Leyen announced further steps. As a result, we proposed a Council recommendation. We are asking Member States to carry out stress tests. That's our most urgent task right now, to make sure our critical infrastructure can resist any act of sabotage or attack. Starting with the energy sector – under such brutal attack now in Ukraine. And we call on Member States to start to implement the directive on critical entities already now. Adopt or update national strategies already now. Already now, start to identify entities critical to society and the economy.

I expect swift entry into force early next year, but it will take nearly two years to write this directive into national laws and we cannot afford to waste a single moment when rockets have already fallen on European soil. Let's build up our preparedness already now. Now crank up our response – through the Union Civil Protection Mechanism – already now. And scale up our cooperation with NATO and other international partners already now.

Honourable members, we must never forget attacks on infrastructure or attacks on people. So, dear Michal, dear rapporteur Šimečka, dear shadows, thank you for helping to protect Europe and protect people. You completed your important work not a moment too soon. More attacks may come. Worse attacks may come. And when this House passes this legislation today, we will be better prepared to meet them.

Lukas Mandl, *Verfasser der Stellungnahme des mitberatenden Ausschusses für auswärtige Angelegenheiten*. – Herr Präsident, Frau Kommissarin! Kritische Infrastruktur, das ist lebenswichtige Infrastruktur, und es ist wichtig, dass sich die Europäische Union in ihrer Gesamtheit darum kümmert, diese Infrastrukturen für den Krisenfall aufrechtzuerhalten. Ich danke dem Berichterstatter, ich danke den Schattenberichterstattern für die guten Verhandlungen.

Drei Dinge waren mir wichtig zu verankern in diesen Verhandlungen. Erstens: Wer für eine Einheit kritischer Infrastruktur verantwortlich ist, verdient öffentliche Wertschätzung. Wir müssen es in Europa möglich machen, klar zu kommunizieren, dass das etwas bedeutet – für die Sicherheit, für die Lebensqualität, für die Vorsorge, für mögliche Krisen.

Zweitens: Was für die Allgemeinheit gemacht wird, muss auch von der Allgemeinheit finanziert werden. Das bedeutet, dass wir nicht zusätzliche Lasten auferlegen wollen, wo jemand für Einheiten kritischer Infrastruktur Verantwortung übernimmt, sondern dass wir ermöglichen wollen, dass es funktioniert.

Und drittens: Die wohnortnahe Lebensmittelversorgung war mir wichtig. Die hybriden Angriffe, der Krieg Putin-Russlands haben gezeigt: Auch die Lebensmittelketten nach Europa und in andere Teile der Welt sind wichtig. Und mit all dem, mit dem Schutz kritischer Infrastruktur, begegnen wir dieser Welt der Konfrontation mit unserem Zugang der Kooperation, aber auch der Vorsorge für künftige Krisen.

Ангел Джамбазки, *докладчик по становището на комисията по транспорт и туризъм*. – Г-н Председател, г-жо Комисар, приветствам предложението за директива относно устойчивостта на критичните обекти и се радвам, че се взема предвид и становището на комисията по транспорт и туризъм.

Транспортът е основен сектор, свързаността е важно нещо и, разбира се, критичната инфраструктура трябва да бъде подредена, оценена и пазена. Но когато се говори за тези неща, неизбежно се набива на очи едно противоречие и едно много силно разминаване. Тук ще се говори много по този доклад за свързаност, за това как трябва да се оценява инфраструктурата и т.н. И същевременно има държави членки, които продължават да блокират присъединяването на България и Румъния към Шенгенското пространство. За каква свързаност говорим, при положение че от Русе до Букурещ, между които има 70 километра разстояние, се пътува 12 часа, г-жо Комисар, как да стане тази работа?

Вижда се отново разминаването между думи и дела. Вече 11 години двете държави са изпълнили всички технически критерии, отговарят на изискванията, но не са част от Шенгенското пространство и това е абсолютно несправедливо към нашите граждани, към нашия транспорт, към нашата инфраструктура и към нашия бизнес.

Така че, когато говорите за тези неща, първо трябва да се видят и въпросите, свързани с присъединяването на България и на Румъния към Шенген, за да може да бъде това пространство завършено и за да може да бъде оценено и работено изцяло.

Salvatore De Meo, *a nome del gruppo PPE*. – Signor Presidente, signora Commissaria, onorevoli colleghi, la vulnerabilità delle nostre infrastrutture strategiche è sotto gli occhi di tutti.

Infatti, negli ultimi anni abbiamo assistito all'incremento di attacchi ibridi dovuti sia ai cambiamenti climatici sia a minacce interne e al terrorismo, per non parlare della pandemia, per poi arrivare alla guerra che ha messo a repentaglio la sicurezza del nostro continente.

Oggi più che mai è essenziale difendere il corretto funzionamento delle nostre infrastrutture critiche, renderle più resilienti per poter garantire il loro corretto funzionamento a favore delle nostre economie e del mercato unico. I rischi sono chiari, è stato detto. Un'interruzione di una di queste infrastrutture critiche può potenzialmente generare effetti a catena non solo nello Stato in cui si trova, ma anche in tutti gli altri Stati.

Accolgo quindi con favore il rafforzamento delle norme che mirano ad aumentare la resilienza delle strutture e infrastrutture strategiche per i servizi e per lo svolgimento delle attività economiche essenziali ed esprimo soddisfazione per aver ottenuto un'estensione dei settori di applicazione di questa direttiva anche al settore agroalimentare. In particolare, mi riferisco ai grandi mercati all'ingrosso, che ovviamente vengono riconosciuti in questo provvedimento nel loro ruolo di infrastrutture strategiche.

Il funzionamento della catena agroalimentare è un servizio essenziale per il benessere della nostra società e i mercati all'ingrosso sono fondamentali, in quanto strutture di pubblico interesse, basti pensare che, grazie a loro, durante la pandemia è stato evitato in molti paesi il blocco del sistema agroalimentare e si è potuto garantire l'approvvigionamento e la distribuzione dei generi alimentari.

Petar Vitanov, *on behalf of the S&D Group*. – Mr President, I would like, first of all, to thank the rapporteur, of course, and all the shadows for the excellent work that they have managed to provide, because I am absolutely positive that especially after 24 of February, nobody's going to underestimate the importance of this file since we are witnessing how peace and democracy depend on the level of security and on the strength of our critical systems, transport, energy, water and so on and so forth.

Critical entities are the providers of essential services, and in this increasingly interdependent union they play an indispensable role in the maintenance of economic activities in the internal market. And I remember in the beginning of the negotiations that we were discussing the essence of the essential services. I'm glad that during this negotiations, this definition was finally precisely detailed, and it includes also the safeguarding of public health and safety, the environment, and not just the continuation of the economic functions.

I'm also glad that in these negotiations we were guaranteeing the additional financial support to those critical entities. Now every Member State should be required to adopt a national strategy to guarantee the resilience of critical industries, to carry out regular risk assessment and based on this assessment, to identify critical entities. Also entities that provide services to six or more Member States will be subject to specific oversight. So I think that a lot of improvements were made, and I am sure that with the adoption of this legislation, we will be absolutely better prepared to face any future challenges before the European Union.

Bart Groothuis, *on behalf of the Renew Group*. – President, dear Commissioner, yet another piece of well-crafted, much needed and warmly welcomed legislation protecting Europe's critical infrastructure is key in making Europe safe and prosperous. Thank you, dear rapporteur.

It's just like the NIS 2, like you mentioned, dear Commissioner, and the foreign direct investment screening, the Democracy Action Plan, but also the Economic Coercion Instrument. But what do these files have in common? Against whom are we protecting ourselves?

Let's be clear: the reality is we are protecting ourselves against a small number of three countries who have something in common, namely an offensive intellectual property theft programme directed against us. The second thing is they want to thwart the liberal world order. And thirdly, last but not least, they are willing and able to do so in our own backyard, here, extraterritorially.

That's the problem. It's Russia, Iran and China; let's name these three. We might believe we live in peace with the world, but yet they declared a conflict against us. And yet we formulate generic responses.

But, dear Commissioner, country-specific problems require country-specific legislation against these three nations. That's what we'd like to see in future.

Markéta Gregorová, *on behalf of the Verts/ALE Group*. – Mr President, dear colleagues, dear Commissioner, the geopolitical climate for Europe is getting harsher and we step up our efforts to secure vital entities in our single market as a whole. We respond to the growing impacts of climate change and to gaps and vulnerabilities that opened up in the pandemic.

And this directive really well complements our new DORA Act on financial services and our newly updated NIS 2 Directive for the resilience of digital infrastructure. And my colleagues already mentioned several other important legislation that has been built up in this House, and this is one of them.

This is where the magic happens, too. It lowers the bureaucratic burden by creating a single point of contact for businesses on these three and more legislations and streamlines requirements and reporting. This is a huge success and showcases the true potential what benefits the EU and cooperation in general can bring.

I am also happy to see that the risk assessment by Member States will now include cyber threats and risks for cross-sectoral or cross-border nature. This has been an important addition as we see our adversaries increasingly blurring the lines in their attacks and switching between domains.

I was hoping that this period of security cooperation and open access will prevail. In the form which I proposed, we will find ways to regularly publish findings of the Critical Entities Resilience Group for the general public for use in academia and security research, of course, adequately anonymised. Unfortunately, we still have some trust to build in this, I see.

That, of course, does not does not hinder the important work that has been done. This directive is timely and relevant, and it is my hope that Member States will diligently transpose it into their national laws, together with DORA and NIS 2.

Dienstag, 22. November 2022

Silvia Sardone, *a nome del gruppo ID*. – Signor Presidente, onorevoli colleghi, deve essere una priorità dell'Unione europea proteggere le infrastrutture critiche che sono essenziali per il funzionamento della nostra società e della nostra economia.

Negli ultimi anni abbiamo visto un notevole aumento di attacchi informatici, che hanno messo in seria difficoltà numerosi Stati, con gravi disagi per i servizi essenziali dei cittadini.

Bisogna garantire maggiore sicurezza per quei soggetti, in particolare le amministrazioni pubbliche, che ultimamente stanno subendo ciberattacchi e corrono anche il rischio di essere potenziali bersagli terroristici.

L'interconnessione tra reti, operatori e infrastrutture è sempre più globale ed è giusto ampliare i settori coinvolti. Bene infatti aver incluso anche l'agroalimentare tra quelli considerati di maggiore importanza critica, aver snellito gli oneri burocratici per i soggetti privati e aver fatto misure a sostegno delle piccole e medie imprese.

L'Europa si concentri sulla difesa dei cittadini e sulla sicurezza dei paesi dell'Unione con maggiore impegno.

Joachim Stanisław Brudziński, *w imieniu grupy ECR*. – Panie Przewodniczący! Pani Komisarz! Szanowni Państwo! To, czego jesteśmy dzisiaj świadkami na Ukrainie, to barbarzyństwo putinowskich siepaczy, którzy, nie mogąc pokonać żołnierzy ukraińskich na polu bitwy, sięgnęli po ataki na obiekty cywilne, a przede wszystkim na infrastrukturę krytyczną, czego efektem jest praktyczny *lockdown* większości dużych miast Ukrainy. To wszystko powinno uświadomić nam, że dzisiaj w obliczu tego rosyjskiego satrapy żadne państwo w Europie nie jest bezpieczne. W ubiegłym tygodniu wskutek tych barbarzyńskich ataków rakietowych, o których mówiła Pani Komisarz – za te słowa chciałbym bardzo serdecznie podziękować, bo były to słowa prawdziwe, pokazujące w prawdziwym świetle to, czego dzisiaj doświadczają Ukraińcy – również w Polsce, w państwie członkowskim Unii Europejskiej, zginęło dwóch moich rodaków, ponieważ na terytorium Polski spadła rakieta.

Myślę, że to jest dobry czas, żeby ci wszyscy z państwa, szczególnie tutaj po lewej stronie, którzy atakują Polskę, atakują Polskę jako kraj frontowy, lojalny kraj Unii Europejskiej, pamiętali. Mamy chociażby w pamięci te wszystkie niemądre ataki, kiedy chroniliśmy Polskę przed hybrydowym atakiem ze strony Łukaszenki i Putina, kiedy próbowano przetransportować do Polski jako uchodźców nieszczęsnych zwiezionych przez Łukaszenkę tzw. turystów. Ilu wśród tych turystów mogło być potencjalnych terrorystów, agentów Putina, agentów Łukaszenki, którzy tak jak byliśmy tego świadkami, o czym mówiła Pani Komisarz, nie wahali się chociażby wysadzić gazociąg Nord Stream? Miejcie to Państwo w pamięci. Warto słuchać Polski.

Mislav Kolakušić (NI). – Poštovani predsjedavajući, poštovani kolege, poštovani građani, građani Europske unije danas žive neusporedivo lošije i nesigurnije nego prije par godina. Vodstvo Europske unije nas želi uvjeriti da su uzrok tome isključivo pandemija COVID-a 19 i rat Rusije i Ukrajine.

Međutim, činjenice govore da su koronavirusi oduvijek s nama i bit će zauvijek s nama. Zauvijek će mutirati kao što su mutirali i do sada. Problem je u našoj reakciji na pandemiju COVID-a 19. koja je odnijela mnogobrojne živote. Poglavito pogrešna i katastrofalna upotreba respiratora koja je kriva za smrt milijuna ljudi od koje se nije htjelo odustati.

Rat u Ukrajini, tko je odrezao dotoke jeftine energije europskim građanima nego vodstvo Europske unije. Mi sami. Morate biti svjesni da su ratovi u ljudskoj prirodi i da će ratova biti dok budu dva čovjeka na planetu. Zanošenje da će ratovi nestati jer smo se mi skupili u Europsku uniju su vrlo naivni i trebamo ih napustiti.

Benoît Lutgen (PPE). – Monsieur le Président, Madame la Commissaire, mes félicitations. Votre texte va dans le bon sens, celui de plus de protection par rapport à l'ensemble des infrastructures critiques pour l'Europe, notamment dans les secteurs de la santé et de l'alimentation. La pandémie nous a montré combien il était urgent de protéger ces secteurs aussi importants, aussi vitaux pour l'Europe – santé, alimentation, énergie –, de les protéger, notamment, contre les cyberattaques.

J'invite la Commission à aller plus loin. Je pense que pour ce qui est de notre indépendance – une forme de souveraineté qu'on peut trouver au niveau européen dans des secteurs aussi importants que l'énergie, que le numérique, que l'alimentation, que la santé et j'ajouterais même la défense –, nous devons aller plus loin pour éviter toute dépendance à l'avenir. On la crée parfois, notamment si on prend l'exemple de la décision qui a été prise ici et ailleurs d'avoir 100 % de véhicules électriques en 2035, ce qui crée une forme de dépendance à l'égard de la Chine. On le voit aussi lorsque la même Chine s'approprie des ports et des aéroports en Europe. Par rapport à tous ces secteurs stratégiques, tous ces endroits stratégiques, la Commission doit aller plus loin pour protéger les Européens, pour protéger au maximum notre indépendance, notre autonomie.

Maria Grapini (S&D). – Domnule președinte, doamna comisar, stimați colegi, de multe ori vorbim foarte tehnic și poate mai puțin inteligibil pentru cetățeni. De fapt, ce înseamnă reziliența entităților critice? Înseamnă că noi ne gândim acum, prin această directivă, să creștem rezistența unor sectoare care țin până la urmă de calitatea vieții, de viața lor.

Energie, sănătate, alimentar, spațial… 11 domenii, așa cum s-a spus, sunt acoperite prin această directivă și evident că o rezistență mai mică a unui sector, a unei entități critice dintr-un anumit stat membru va duce în cascadă efecte în tot spațiul, în toată piața internă.

De aceea, cred foarte mult că este necesar să fie bine adoptată în legislația națională această directivă. Dar mai cred că infrastructurile în domeniile pe care le-am amintit aici trebuie să fie de calitate și de aceeași calitate, pentru a fi o competiție echitabilă în piață și pentru a avea rezistență egală în piață.

De aceea, cred foarte mult că trebuie să avem un singur spațiu, doamna comisar, și fac apel din nou la dumneavoastră. Știu că s-a votat în Consiliul Comisarilor să intre cele trei state România, Bulgaria și Croația în spațiul Schengen și să putem lucra la creșterea calității infrastructurii în cele 11 domenii.

Moritz Körner (Renew). – Herr Präsident, liebe Kolleginnen und Kollegen, Frau Kommissarin! Sabotage auf Nord Stream, Angriff auf das Bahnnetz in Norddeutschland – wir dürfen nicht naiv sein, wenn es um kritische Infrastruktur geht. Und gerade auch eine europäische Abstimmung in dieser Frage, was kritische Infrastruktur für uns ausmacht, wie wir sie gemeinsam schützen, ist wichtig. Und deswegen ist es wichtig, dass wir die Debatte haben und auch eine entsprechende Richtlinie jetzt, heute gemeinsam voranbringen.

Wir müssen aber auch darauf schauen, welche autoritären Staaten Einfluss auf unsere kritische Infrastruktur haben, welche Häfen von welchen Staaten gekauft sind oder welche Beteiligungen es gibt, wie wir unsere digitale Welt besser schützen müssen, indem wir Verschlüsselung schützen und nicht noch ihr schaden. Da müssen wir gemeinsam draufschauen. Wir müssen kritisch auf kritische Infrastruktur schauen – das tut die neue Richtlinie.

Vielen Dank an den Berichterstatter. Das ist ein richtiger Schritt, um unsere kritische Infrastruktur besser zu schützen.

Tom Berendsen (PPE). – Voorzitter, een belangrijk stuk wetgeving vandaag, omdat de bescherming van onze kritieke infrastructuur heel belangrijk is. Wij hebben gezien hoe kwetsbaar onze energie-infrastructuur en onze data-infrastructuur kan zijn. Maar terwijl wij hier op Europees niveau bezig zijn met deze wetgeving, zetten lidstaten de achterdeur naar buitenlandse invloed wagenwijd open. 22 Europese havens zijn in zee gegaan met Chinese investeerders en geven daarbij belangrijke controlepunten in onze aanleveringsketen in handen van buitenlandse mogendheden. Er is een Europese havenstrategie nodig. We moeten die uitverkoop van Europese havens stoppen. Dat betekent dat we moeten werken aan een strategie waarin onze Europese havens concurrerend kunnen blijven zonder dat ze afhankelijk zijn van buitenlandse mogendheden. Want vrije handel is nog wel iets anders dan het uit handen geven van onze kritieke infrastructuur. We hebben de verantwoordelijkheid om onze economische veiligheid te garanderen voor de toekomst.

Ondřej Kovařík (Renew). – Pane předsedající, vážená paní komisařko, pane zpravodaji, kolegové, vývoj v posledních letech nám jasně ukázal, že ochrana kritické infrastruktury už není pouze doménou bezpečnostní či striktně vojenskou. Hybridní působení, kybernetické útoky, pandemie koronaviru i probíhající válka na Ukrajině ukazují šíři možných hrozeb, kterým v současné době čelíme. Je zřejmé, že cílem útoků se stále více stává kybernetický prostor. Ten má potenciál doslova paralyzovat některé kritické aktivity, a to nejen na území jednoho státu, ale i v mezinárodním, potažmo globálním měřítku.

Vítám proto, že dnes projednávaná směrnice bere tuto novou realitu v potaz. Rozšiřuje množinu oblastí spadajících mezi kritická odvětví. Zahrnuje tak dopravu, zdravotnický systém, dodávky vody a tepla, energetiku nebo v neposlední řadě také finanční služby. Tato směrnice nabízí řadu nástrojů, jak se na tyto situace připravit, jak posílit naši vzájemnou odolnost a jak čelit hrozbám ve chvíli, kdy nastanou. Doufám, že vlády členských zemí tyto nástroje plně využijí.

Henna Virkkunen (PPE). – Arvoisa puhemies, komissaari, Euroopan kriittisen infrastruktuurin häiriönsietokykyä on vahvistettava niin kyberturvallisuuden kuin fyysisen ympäristönkin osalta. Tämä nyt hyväksyttävä lainsäädäntö, yhdessä tieto- ja verkkoturvadirektiivin IS2:n kanssa, on tärkeä askel yhteisen eurooppalaisen turvallisuuden vahvistamiseksi.

Me olemme nähneet viime kuukausina, millaista tuhoa Venäjä kylvää Ukrainassa tuhoamalla kriittistä infrastruktuuria ja ajamalla ihmisiä ahdinkoon. Euroopan unionissa olemme kokeneet Nord Stream 2:n räjäytykset ja Saksan rataverkkoon kohdistuvat sabotaasit. Ne osoittavat, että on tärkeää vahvistaa yhteistä varautumista ja yhteistä reagointia ja tiivistää myös yhteistyötä Naton kanssa, kuten komissio lokakuussa esitti.

On hyvä askel, että tässä nyt hyväksyttävässä lainsäädännössä energia- ja liikenneinfran lisäksi mukaan on otettu kaikkiaan yksitoista hyvin kriittistä toimialaa, mukaan lukien digitaalinen infrastruktuuri, pankkitoiminta, juomavesi, terveys, elintarvikkeet. Tiedämme, että nämä kaikki ovat erittäin kriittisiä toimintoja yhteiskunnan ja kansalaisten elämän kannalta.

Maite Pagazaurtundúa (Renew). – Señor presidente, señorías, pocas veces podemos estar de acuerdo sobre algo que es realmente tan importante y tan necesario. La Directiva para adaptar los ataques a nuestro sistema de infraestructuras críticas que van mutando, igual que va mutando la sociedad, es realmente un momento de felicitación colectiva. Tenemos que felicitar también a la Presidencia francesa por este acuerdo de última hora.

No podemos permitirnos estos ataques. Por ejemplo, hace menos de un mes en España, a través del Punto Neutro Judicial, un sistema gestionado por el Consejo General del Poder Judicial que conecta las redes de distintas administraciones públicas, los atacantes accedieron a millones de datos sensibles: carnets de identidad, declaraciones de la renta, cuentas bancarias, direcciones, vidas laborables, relaciones empresariales de todos y cada uno de los ciudadanos que figuraban en esas bases de datos conectados, políticos, empresarios, personajes de relevancia pública. Se lo llevaron todo: las bases de datos íntegras de los servicios de la Agencia Tributaria, la Seguridad Social, el Servicio Público de Empleo, Dirección General de la Policía, Extranjería o la Dirección General de Tráfico.

Estos y otros tipos de infraestructuras críticas son las principales vulnerabilidades en las guerras híbridas del presente — lo ha dicho hoy la comisaria— y del futuro. En Ucrania se ataca la electricidad, las comunicaciones. El secuestro de datos y el ataque de la energía puede llevar al desastre a nuestras sociedades.

Estamos reaccionando. Estamos de enhorabuena precisamente por eso. Pero debemos ser rápidos y debemos hacer visible este tipo de vulnerabilidad a nuestras sociedades.

Hoy estamos de enhorabuena.

Διαδικασία «catch the eye»

Miriam Lexmann (PPE). – Mr President, I welcome this directive I was calling for since the beginning of my mandate. As Putin continues to wage his brutal and aggressive war against the people of Ukraine, he's also continuing in his attempts to weaken and divide our democracies. Disinformation, cyber-attacks, espionage, strategic corruption of businesses and political cycles.

That's why it is crucial that we seek attacks on critical infrastructure in this broader context and develop necessary tools. For this reason, I welcome the Protection of Critical Infrastructures Directive and the extension of the scope to 11 sectors, in order to better reflect the scale of the threat.

However, we can never adequately protect ourselves if we allow malign regimes to invest in our critical infrastructure. The case of Nord Stream 2 must be a lesson not only for our dealings with Russia, but also when it comes to Chinese Communist Party and others.

Such regimes must never again be allowed to use our critical infrastructure to undermine our resilience.

Juan Fernando López Aguilar (S&D). – Señor presidente, señora comisaria Johansson, este Parlamento saluda esta revisión de la Directiva sobre el refuerzo de las infraestructuras y de las entidades críticas, que se enmarca en el refuerzo de la seguridad de los europeos frente a los ataques híbridos, puestos dramáticamente de manifiesto con ocasión de la guerra de Putin contra Ucrania, y que extiende la seguridad de los europeos, más allá de las energías y el transporte, a otros sectores afectados, como es la banca, como son las infraestructuras digitales y como son, por supuesto, el suministro de alimentos y, sobre todo, la sanidad y los datos de la salud pública.

Pero me permito una observación adicional: ahora que este Parlamento Europeo cumple 70 años, que es una edad en la que normalmente uno se retira o accede a la pensión, este Parlamento tiene las mejores razones para sentirse más joven que nunca y, por tanto, es importante también modernizar el lenguaje.

Cuando se habla de resiliencia, de entidades críticas, ¿estamos diciéndole claramente a los europeos de lo que se trata? Mi respuesta es no. Podemos ser mucho más gráficos y eficaces si les decimos que estamos reforzando su seguridad frente al sabotaje y frente a los ataques a la intimidad y a la privacidad de las personas, y que estamos protegiendo mejor sus derechos fundamentales en el mundo en que nos toca vivir.

Juozas Olekas (S&D). – Gerbiamas Pirmininke, gerbiama Komisijos nare, iš tikrųjų, prisijungiu prie kolegų sveikinimų, kad toks dokumentas yra pateiktas ir, tikiuosi, bus priimtas. Bet kolegos taip pat paminėjo, kiek pavojingos Europos Sąjungai yra tokios kritinės infrastruktūros atakos, kiek tokių pasikėsinimų yra buvę, paminėti Vokietijos atvejai ir kiti. Bet taip pat matome, kaip Putinas panaudoja atakas prieš infrastruktūrą kariaudamas su Ukraina ir nustumdamas Ukrainos tautą į tikrai šaltą žiemą ir sukeldamas didžiulius pavojus gyvybei. Gerbiami kolegos, aš manau, kad mes visi turime pritarti šiam sprendimui ir ypatingai stebėti, kaip tie sprendimai bus įgyvendinti tiek Europos Sąjungos lygmeniu, tiek valstybėse narėse. Nes manau, kad veikiant tik kartu ir panaudojant bendrus finansus, mes pajėgsime apsaugoti šią infrastruktūrą. Pritariu tam, kad infrastruktūros objektai yra išplėsti, ypatingai maisto ir sveikatos sektoriuje, nes manau, kad šios sritys pasirodė ypatingai svarbios tiek pandemijos, tiek karo metu. Ačiū.

(Λήξη της διαδικασίας «catch the eye»)

Ylva Johansson, *Member of the Commission*. – Thank you very much for this important debate. It clearly showed that we all agree on the importance of better protecting critical entities and the importance of this legislation that you will vote on today.

I will again reiterate my special thanks to the rapporteur, Mr Šimečka, and the shadows, but also, of course, to the French Presidency and the Council, which managed to reach a swift agreement on this important legislation.

We have to take responsibility together as a union, and the best action we can take right now is to make sure that we are ready for what is to come. The directive will soon enter into force. It's now up to the Member States to use it to full effect ahead of time, and to carry out the stress tests to bolster our preparedness and response to protect our infrastructure and our people.

Michal Šimečka, *rapporteur.* – Mr President, Madam Commissioner, dear colleagues, thank you so much for the discussion and thank you for the support. It is quite rare that there is such a broad consensus in this Parliament from the left to the right. And not just a consensus and an agreement on this text that is going to be voted on later on, but also consensus and an agreement on the kind of threats that we face and on the kind of actions that we need to take.

I note that a lot of you, colleagues, have approved of the expansion of the sectors that will be covered in this directive to 11. I am also happy that there's strong agreement on that. I should also mention, highlight, that the philosophy of this directive is somewhat different from the last one, and I appreciate that. I think this is also where there is a consensus: that we're moving from just protecting particular pieces of critical infrastructure – assets and buildings and whatnot – to a philosophy where we're focusing on the resilience of those essential services. And I think this reflects this new and dangerous world that we're entering where the risks can't all be eliminated. There will be threats, there will be incidents. And we need to be clear with our citizens that not with this directive, not with anything we can do, can we eliminate all the risks falling from natural catastrophes to war to hybrid sabotage attacks. What we can do, though, is to minimise those risks and to make sure that when incidents happen, we are prepared and our entities, be they public or private, are able to bounce back and carry on with the services that are essential for our societies and for our single market. And this is what this directive does. This is what it's for. And with its approval and with its implementation, the European Union, its citizens, its single market will be all the more secure.

So let me again say thanks so much to the Commission, to the French Presidency, to all my colleagues from the political groups. And I would just reiterate the call of the Commissioner for Member States to implement this as swiftly as possible.

Πρόεδρος. – Η συζήτηση έληξε.

Η ψηφοφορία θα διεξαχθεί σήμερα.

Γραπτές δηλώσεις (άρθρο 171 του Κανονισμού)

Mihai Tudose (S&D), *în scris.* – Am aprobat noile norme europene, menite să consolideze infrastructura esențială din UE în fața unei arii de provocări extinse prin această directivă.

Atacurilor teroriste li se adaugă, de acum, dezastrele naturale și actele de sabotaj. Totodată, se extinde domeniul de aplicare la unsprezece sectoare, între care: energie, transport, bănci, infrastructuri ale pieței financiare, sănătate, apă potabilă, alimente, infrastructură digitală. De asemenea, se instituie reguli minime comune, pe baza cărora statele membre vor clasifica aceiași furnizori ca fiind esențiali.

Susțin solicitarea adresată statelor UE să adopte strategii naționale pentru a consolida reziliența și să efectueze evaluări periodice ale riscurilor. În acest sens, autoritățile naționale vor putea efectua inspecții la fața locului ale infrastructurilor critice și vor putea aplica sancțiuni în caz de nerespectare a obligațiilor. Un rol important va reveni procesului de avertizare în caz de incident și comunicării transfrontaliere între punctele naționale de contact, care se vor înființa.

Crizele succesive ce au pus la încercare infrastructura esențială a UE - pandemia și războiul - au făcut ca aceste modificări legislative să fie necesare și urgente. De aceea, consider că transpunerea directivei de către statele membre trebuie făcută mult mai rapid față de termenul de doi ani prevăzut.

3. Ausgewogene Vertretung von Frauen und Männern unter den nicht geschäftsführenden Direktoren börsennotierter Gesellschaften (Aussprache)

Πρόεδρος. – Το επόμενο σημείο στην ημερήσια διάταξη είναι η συζήτηση επί της σύστασης για τη δεύτερη ανάγνωση της Επιτροπής Νομικών Θεμάτων και της Επιτροπής Δικαιωμάτων των Γυναικών και Ισότητας των Φύλων σχετικά με τη θέση του Συμβουλίου σε πρώτη ανάγνωση ενόψει της έκδοσης οδηγίας του Ευρωπαϊκού Κοινοβουλίου και του Συμβουλίου σχετικά με τη βελτίωση της ισόρροπης εκπροσώπησης των φύλων σε θέσεις διευθυντικών στελεχών των εισηγμένων εταιρειών και σχετικά μέτρα (10521/1/2022 - C9-0354/2022 - 2012/0299(COD)) (Εισηγήτριες: Lara Wolters και Evelyn Regner) (A9-0275/2022).

Lara Wolters, *rapporteur*. – Mr President, colleagues, around 60% of graduates from our universities in Europe are women. And yet, out of every 100 CEOs of listed companies in Europe, only eight are women. In my own country, the Netherlands, often upheld as a progressive bastion, there are more CEOs called Peter than there are women CEOs.

And the reason for their underrepresentation in the boardroom is not a lack of merit or talent; it's structural problems that disadvantage women in their careers, particularly when they want to take on leadership roles. Spoiler alert: the law we have before us today won't solve all of that. For that, we need quality and affordable childcare. We need better paternity leave. We need part-time work to become accepted for men. And let us not forget that most women work not at the top, but in jobs that are hugely undervalued and underpaid.

But what we are doing today will be a step in the right direction. The law we are signing tomorrow aims at getting at least 40% of board positions of listed companies filled by women through better recruitment procedures with clearer criteria, more transparency and broader candidate pools. Member States have until 2026 to achieve gender-balanced boards with measures put in place to make sure that they do.

And I think we all stand to win. Companies stand to benefit from looking more like the consumers they serve. It's unsurprising that research has shown that companies with more diverse teams are more creative, more innovative and have better problem-solving abilities. Diverse leadership, in turn, can lead to more productivity and more successful business operations. And yet, at the moment, only 3 in 10 board members in large EU corporations are women. Zooming in on Hungary, Estonia and Cyprus, that is 1 in 10. Those boardrooms are not a good reflection of society, especially when we think of the fact that these companies are heavy hitters that take decisions that can impact all of us.

As you may know, a lot of my work in this House is about how we make sure that companies don't think only about their bottom line, but also about their place in society. In 2022, we expect more from companies, and that goes from gender equality to respect for human rights, climate change and the environment. That's why I sincerely believe that we all stand to benefit from this: employees, consumers, citizens and, yes, companies themselves.

If a Member State recently introduced legislation, they still have to meet the targets we're talking about today. Otherwise, they are subject to this law. And that means that either way, all 27 Member States will see more women in their boardrooms in the near future. That's a big deal for Europe, and certainly for the 18 countries in our EU without effective legislation.

Now, of course there are those who will say quotas won't work and that this will lead to appointments based on gender rather than merit. I think it's about time that we left that argument where it belongs – in the previous century. We've tried asking nicely. We've tried waiting for the old boys' networks to die out and to no avail.

Quotas are a blunt instrument, yes. But where there's a lack of will, you need a law. This law is a significant achievement and, frankly, a victory for all of those who have campaigned for it since 2012. And to them, I wish to pay tribute. Most of all, though, I think today is a victory for girls, who, as we very well know, cannot be who they cannot see.

Evelyn Regner, *Berichterstatterin*. – Herr Präsident, sehr geehrte Kommissarin! Dankeschön, Lara, für die großartige Zusammenarbeit. Diese Richtlinie ist überfällig. Diese Richtlinie, dass die jetzt kommt, das ist das Teamwork von sehr vielen großartigen, vor allem Frauen natürlich, über Fraktionsgrenzen hinweg, über Institutionengrenzen hinweg und – wir können es natürlich auch sagen – über die Legislaturperioden hinweg.

Wenn es darum geht, dass mehr Gleichstellung – ich würde mal sagen, mehr Normalität – hergestellt wird, nämlich so, wie es in Unternehmen eigentlich ausschauen soll, dann brauchen wir offensichtlich einen ganz besonders langen Atem, weil es ja immer wieder um Macht geht. Zehn Jahre lang haben wir als Europäisches Parlament das Dossier am Leben gehalten. Zehn Jahre habe ich als Berichterstatterin von Anfang an zusammen mit vielen hier im Raum und darüber hinaus darum gekämpft, dass wir endlich die Männerquote in Aufsichtsräten abschaffen. Und jetzt haben wir es endlich geschafft.

Diese Richtlinie zu mehr Frauen in Führungspositionen führt dazu, dass in Aufsichtsräten und Vorständen endlich Qualifikation als Allererstes zählt. Bis zum 30. Juni 2026 sind die Ziele zu erreichen, und damit schaffen wir es auch endlich, die Gesellschaft besser abzubilden, Diversität zu schaffen, top-down die Unternehmenskultur für alle zu verbessern.

Im Mittelpunkt der Richtlinie steht das Verfahren zur Auswahl von Aufsichtsratsmitgliedern und auch Vorständen. Wenn schon das Auswahlverfahren fehlerhaft ist, kommen die Bestqualifizierten ja oft gar nicht mehr in die engere Wahl –zum Nachteil sowohl des Unternehmens als auch der Kandidatinnen und Kandidaten.

Und deshalb setzt die Richtlinie auf Transparenz und auf Leistung im Auswahlverfahren. Gerade, wo es wirtschaftlich schwierig ist – mit Pandemie, mit der Aggression Putins in der Ukraine, mit Inflation und Klimakrise –, brauchen wir widerstandsfähige, starke Unternehmen in der Europäischen Union, und das erreichen wir nur dann, wenn diese Unternehmen endlich auch Frauen mit an Bord nehmen und ans Steuer lassen. Wenn wir das gesamte Potenzial der klugen Köpfe nutzen und transparente Bestellungsverfahren schaffen, dann profitieren am Ende des Tages natürlich auch die Unternehmen selbst. Sie bekommen nämlich die bestqualifizierten Leute. Darum geht es. Und jene Unternehmen, die die Ziele erreichen, sollen auch auf eine Faming-Liste kommen, als Positivbeispiel für alle.

Aber wir wissen auch: Ohne verbindliche Maßnahmen geschieht ganz einfach nichts. Und deshalb sind auch wirksame, verhältnismäßige, abschreckende Sanktionen gegen Unternehmen vorgesehen, die gegen die Verpflichtung zu individuellen quantitativen Zielen, Auswahlverfahren und/oder Berichterstattung verstoßen. Das kann sein eine Geldstrafe, eine Nichtigerklärung der Wahl ebenso wie Einschränkungen bei öffentlichen Aufträgen – je nachdem, was wo am besten wirkt. Natürlich gehört dazu auch, dass transparent berichtet wird, wie die Zahlen aussehen, dass gute Maßnahmen getroffen werden und dass eine Behörde das auch überprüft. Auch das haben wir in dieser Richtlinie erfasst.

Das Verständnis der Richtlinie ist klar: Mehr Frauen in Entscheidungspositionen – das ist nur eine von vielen Maßnahmen, die ergriffen werden müssen, um die Gleichstellung der Geschlechter am Arbeitsplatz zu erreichen. Nichtsdestotrotz ist sie ein wichtiger Teil, ein wichtiger Bestandteil dieses Mosaiks. Es ist höchste Zeit für positive Veränderungen, für moderne Unternehmen und vor allem für die Gleichstellung von Frauen in allen Bereichen der Wirtschaft.

Deshalb sind wir als Team des Europäischen Parlaments mehr als stolz darauf, dass wir das nach zehn Jahren endlich geschafft haben. Und deshalb wirklich mein ganz großer Dank an all diese wunderbaren Schattenberichterstatterinnen, an dieses große Team, das in der Hinsicht schlichtweg zusammengehalten hat. Dankeschön an Helena Dalli als Kommissarin, die sich unglaublich überzeugend eingesetzt hat. Dankeschön auch an die Vertreterinnen und Vertreter von mehreren Präsidentschaften – an die französische vorher, jetzt natürlich auch an die tschechische, aber auch in der Vergangenheit an die luxemburgische und maltesische.

Ich sage das jetzt deshalb ganz besonders, weil wir hier wirklich zusammenhalten mussten über so viel Zeit hinweg. Und es zeigt sich, es zahlt sich aus. Also ein großer Tag, denke ich, für uns alle.

Helena Dalli, *Member of the Commission*. – Mr President, honourable Members, thank you, Lara Wolters, and thank you, Evelyn Regner. You really captured the spirit of this legislation this morning when you say that the girls cannot be what they cannot see. And it's exactly that.

After ten years of negotiations, the directive on gender balance on corporate boards is finally becoming European law. With the adoption of the directive, we will empower women to reach their full potential, move to a new chapter of EU gender equality policy, and, again, girls will now start trying to be what they can see. So we will turn that that statement over its head, hopefully with this.

Europe has many, as we've heard, qualified women, as 60 % of current university graduates are female. Nevertheless, this investment in women's education and training is not mirrored in the positions they hold in decision-making, as women are still underrepresented in high positions, including, of course, on corporate boards.

This is a clear waste of human capital. We have made progress in the past, but not fast enough. And, as we know, not everywhere in the European Union. The Gender Equality Index, published every year by the European Institute for Gender Equality, shows that at a time at the time of the proposal, women represented only 12 % of board members across the EU, compared to 31.6 % today. And the share of women in business management across the EU at the national level ranges from 8 % to 46 %. So data also shows that Member States which introduce binding measures, like gender equality targets, made the biggest progress. While the advancement triggered by voluntary initiatives was much slower and less sustainable.

So when self-regulation does not bring the desired effect, EU regulatory action is necessary. And this is precisely why this directive is so urgently needed. So the directive addresses the lack of transparency in the selection process and the lack of objective qualification criteria which constitute the main obstacle to achieving gender-balanced representation. In this way, the directive ensures that the selection of board members is gender neutral and merit based.

The directive should not be seen as a burden on companies but as a tool to bring concrete benefits to European and national economies. Evidence shows that a broad range of talents and skills and an inclusive and diverse approach in the boardroom contribute to better decisions and corporate governance, increase public trust in business and drive economic growth. And this is particularly important in the current turbulent economic situation. We need all hands on deck to recover and reboost our economies and achieve a Union of equality. Thank you for your hard work.

Puhetta johti HEIDI HAUTALA

varapuhemies

Maria da Graça Carvalho, *em nome do Grupo PPE*. – Senhora Presidente, Senhora Comissária, caras e caros Colegas, hoje fazemos História ao concretizarmos, após uma década de insistência do Parlamento Europeu, a Diretiva *Women on boards*.

Enviamos uma mensagem para o futuro. Uma mensagem dirigida a homens e a mulheres, porque o objetivo é proteger o género mais sub-representado. Mas uma mensagem, sabemo-lo bem, destinada sobretudo às jovens mulheres. A estas dizemos: acreditem, o vosso talento, o vosso empenho, serão os fatores decisivos no acesso a cargos de topo.

Nas grandes empresas, que é o que agora está em causa, e em todas as outras dimensões da sociedade.

Hoje as mulheres representam cerca de 60% dos novos diplomados do ensino superior na União Europeia, metade da força laboral, mas constituem apenas 31,5% dos membros e 8% dos presidentes dos conselhos de administração.

Quando dizem que esta diretiva tem de assegurar o respeito pelo mérito, eu respondo: concordo. É precisamente essa a ambição da diretiva. E este é um passo que irá beneficiar todos os europeus, porque não podemos desperdiçar talento. Precisamos dos melhores, homens e mulheres, nos cargos de decisão.

Muito obrigada a todos e a todas que não desistiram ao longo destes dez anos e uma palavra muito especial de agradecimento a quem iniciou o processo, Viviane Reding, então Vice-Presidente da Comissão.

Heléne Fritzon, *för S&D-gruppen*. – Fru talman! Kommissionär! Sju av tio är andelen män i styrelserna i de största börsnoterade företagen i EU. Sju av tio är män! Det beror inte på att män har en alldeles unik styrelsekompetens, utan det beror ju faktiskt på att man i praktiken har kvoterat in sig själva. Nu är det dock slut med det. Äntligen får vi ett direktiv som kommer att bidra till mer jämställdhet och därmed också en högre kompetens i bolagsstyrelserna. Jag vill verkligen gratulera föredragandena till ett mycket framgångsrikt arbete.

I ett decennium vet jag att vi har kämpat tillsammans för något som borde vara självklart: att bolagsstyrelserna tar till vara på hela befolkningens kompetens och kunskap. Kvotering i bolagsstyrelser handlar nämligen inte bara om en jämn fördelning av makt och inflytande, utan faktiskt också om ett bättre beslutsfattande. Och vet ni vad? Det gynnar både företag, tillväxt och samhälle. För att uppnå ett jämställt och hållbart EU krävs det en jämställd fördelning av både makt och resurser. Det krävs också att vi ständigt prioriterar jämställdhet, eftersom ett jämställt samhälle aldrig, aldrig någonsin kommer av sig självt. Detta direktiv är välkommet och ett viktigt steg i rätt riktning.

Dienstag, 22. November 2022

Samira Rafaela, *namens de Renew-Fractie*. – Voorzitter, het is een historisch moment. Eindelijk krijgen we meer vrouwen over een paar jaar op belangrijke besluitvormingsposities. Het gaat over hun toekomst, het gaat over de toekomst van een nieuwe generatie. Het hoort gewoon zo in 2022 dat wij als vrouwen ook aan die tafels zitten om te besluiten over belangrijke vraagstukken in de samenleving.

Het zorgt voor meer innovatie en creativiteit. Bedrijven gaan het alleen maar beter doen doordat er meer gendergelijkheid is. En het is ook nog eens winstgevend. Hoe mooi is dat? Vrouwelijk leiderschap is winstgevend. Kortom, we gaan er met z'n allen van profiteren. Er zijn bedrijven die dat al snappen. Dat is heel goed, die zijn er al mee bezig. Dankzij deze wet worden die bedrijven ook gezien en komen de bedrijven die het al goed doen op de lijst terecht. De bedrijven die er niet op staan, moeten echt beter hun best doen. Ik ben trots op dit voorstel. Ik dank mijn collega's voor de enorm goede samenwerking. En wat een mooi historisch moment. Laten we dat vandaag vieren.

Pierrette Herzberger-Fofana, *au nom du groupe Verts/ALE*. – Madame la Présidente, après plus de dix ans de négociations, l'Union européenne a adopté cette directive qui vise à améliorer l'égalité de traitement et l'égalité des chances entre les hommes et les femmes. Afin d'aboutir à cet équilibre et de briser ainsi le plafond de verre en ce qui concerne la participation des femmes aux postes-clés dans les conseils des sociétés cotées en bourse, de nombreuses mesures favorables au deuxième sexe vont entrer en vigueur, car le déséquilibre permanent du pouvoir entre les hommes et les femmes est inacceptable.

Si certains États membres ont freiné la mise en œuvre de la directive, d'autres ont évolué sur leurs positions, notamment mon État membre, avec le nouveau gouvernement allemand qui prône une politique féministe inclusive et, à longue échéance, intersectionnelle. Dorénavant, 40 % des administrateurs non exécutifs devraient être des femmes d'ici à 2026, 33 % de tous les postes d'administrateur devraient être attribués à des femmes. Cette initiative est une victoire pour les femmes, un message fort: davantage de femmes dans les sociétés cotées en bourse.

Il est évident que le mérite et les compétences demeurent les critères fondamentaux pour accéder aux postes de décision. Cependant, pour donner à cette directive sa pleine mesure, il nous semble approprié de faire quelques ajouts tels que la possibilité de faire appel à la justice et de contester la nomination d'un candidat masculin. Dans ce cas, il incombe à la société de prouver qu'elle a agi conformément aux règles de la directive. Dans le cas d'une procédure d'élection, les sociétés devraient garantir la diversité ethnique des genres dans la composition de la liste des candidats présélectionnés. Cette diversité comprend la participation de femmes qualifiées, indépendamment de leur origine culturelle, de leur orientation sexuelle, de leur âge et de leurs convictions religieuses. À long terme, nous souhaiterions l'introduction d'une parité pour tous les postes.

Ces priorités-clés, conformes aux valeurs de l'Union européenne, sont le ciment d'une société arc-en-ciel participative et inclusive.

Christine Anderson, *im Namen der ID-Fraktion*. – Frau Präsidentin! Verbindliche Quoten für Frauen in den Topetagen: berufliche Qualifikation war gestern – das richtige Geschlecht ist heute.

Nachdem es jahrelang im Kampf um die Gleichberechtigung darum ging, dem Geschlecht keine Bedeutung beizumessen, und es völlig egal war, ob Mann oder Frau, erheben wir das Geschlecht jetzt wieder zum alles entscheidenden Kriterium. Das ist nicht Fortschritt, das ist Rückschritt – Rückschritt in eine marxistisch ideologische, bessere Welt, in der eine elitäre Obrigkeit die individuelle Freiheit zugunsten vermeintlicher Bedürfnisse des Kollektivs beschneidet.

Weltverbesserungsfanatiker, die glauben, Menschen zu ihrem Glück zwingen zu müssen, schaffen keine glücklichen Menschen. Sie schaffen unterdrückte Menschen – und eine Welt, in der Menschen unterdrückt werden, ist eben keine bessere Welt; sie ist eine autoritäre, diktatorische Welt. Ich will das nicht, und ich hoffe, Sie auch nicht.

Margarita de la Pisa Carrión, *en nombre del Grupo ECR*. – Señora presidenta, comisaria, señorías, hablamos del 40 % de puestos no ejecutivos, del 33 % si incluimos los ejecutivos. ¿Qué se puede celebrar?

Por supuesto que la presencia de las mujeres enriquece y mejora los resultados. Ensalcemos el talento femenino, orgullosas de nuestra naturaleza y de los matices que podemos aportar en la toma de decisiones.

Pero esta directiva: incluso pone un tope a la presencia femenina. Presentarnos como desvalidas y naturalmente desfavorecidas no ayuda si lo que queremos es mostrar la valía de las mujeres.

Se está atacando la libertad de empresa. Corresponde a una organización decidir sobre la composición de su consejo. Es una injerencia política en las empresas, con una regulación que debería ser jurídica-mercantil, conforme a legislación nacional, no europea.

Las cuotas son un sistema drástico, discriminatorio e injusto. La historia del nunca acabar. Ahora por sexo, bueno, no, por género. Pero también podría ser por raza u origen étnico. Es una falta de respeto fijarse en las características de las personas y no en las personas. Es nuestra formación o capacidades o la experiencia la que debe determinarnos.

La colectivización nos convierte en uno más de un grupo. Nos quita nuestros nombres y apellidos, nos enfrenta y acentúa los prejuicios. Convierte causas justas en batallas de poder.

Recuperemos la esperanza y la armonía en este mundo. Medidas como esta solamente aumentan la crispación.

Manon Aubry, *au nom du groupe The Left*. – Madame la Présidente, l'adoption de la directive sur la représentation des femmes au conseil d'administration des entreprises est une bonne nouvelle, mais elle en dit long sur l'inaction européenne pour l'égalité femmes-hommes. On le sait tous dans cet hémicycle, il aura fallu dix ans pour adopter ce texte, et encore, au rabais. Surtout, cette directive n'est pas celle de l'égalité femmes-hommes, mais celle de l'égalité des patronnes et des patrons.

À écouter Bruxelles, on croirait que le patriarcat est tombé. J'aimerais bien, mais en réalité, rien n'est fait encore pour les caissières, les femmes de ménage et les soignantes. Rien n'est fait pour les femmes qui représentent 60 % des travailleurs payés au salaire minimum. Rien n'est fait pour les femmes dont les revenus moyens sont 36 % inférieurs à ceux des hommes.

Nous avons ramé dix ans pour un peu plus de parité dans les salons du CAC 40. Alors, à l'heure où la grande majorité des femmes est sous-payée, où une femme sur trois a subi des violences physiques ou sexuelles et une femme sur vingt a été violée en Europe, je n'ose compter les siècles qui nous séparent encore de l'égalité salariale et de la fin des violences sexistes et sexuelles. Vive l'égalité! Oui, mais l'égalité pour toutes et à tous les niveaux. Et là-dessus, il y a encore du boulot.

Angelika Niebler (PPE). – Frau Präsidentin, Frau Kommissarin, liebe Kolleginnen, liebe Kollegen! Gleichberechtigung ist eine unendliche Geschichte – leider.

Vor zwölf Jahren hat unsere ehemalige EVP-Kommissarin Viviane Reding die *Women- on-Boards*-Richtlinie auf den Weg gebracht und damit schon vor zwölf Jahren die Grundlage dafür gelegt, dass in vielen Mitgliedstaaten Gesetzgebung zur Gleichberechtigung zwischen Männern und Frauen in Unternehmen auf den Weg gebracht wurde.

Gleichberechtigung von Männern und Frauen ist heute immer noch kein Selbstläufer. Noch immer gibt es mehr Männer als Frauen in den Aufsichtsräten, und wenn man in die Etage der Vorstände sieht, dann ist die Luft sehr dünn, es ist sehr überschaubar – die Zahl an weiblichen Vorständen.

Quoten sind Türöffner. Ich denke, sie machen Sinn, um auch langjährige, jahrzehntelang etablierte Strukturen aufzubrechen, und deshalb ist es gut, dass wir heute endlich diese Richtlinie verabschieden. Aber wichtig ist neben den Quoten auch, dass es in den Unternehmen den richtigen Mindset gibt. Diversität darf nicht nur auf dem Papier stattfinden, es reicht auch nicht, nur diese Richtlinie hier zu verabschieden, sondern Diversität muss in den Unternehmen gelebt werden.

Lassen Sie mich auch darauf hinweisen, dass ich zutiefst davon überzeugt bin, dass, wenn wir eine ausgewogene Repräsentation von Frauen und Männern in Führungspositionen in den Unternehmen haben, dies auch ein Gewinn für viele Unternehmen sein wird: Viele Studien weisen darauf hin, dass eine signifikante Vertretung von Frauen in Führungspositionen auch für die Unternehmensumsätze, die Gewinne ein Erfolgsfaktor sein kann. Ich freue mich, dass es heute zur Verabschiedung dieser Richtlinie kommt.

Maria-Manuel Leitão-Marques (S&D). – Senhora Presidente, cinco mais cinco: foram dez anos que tivemos que esperar por um acordo para melhorar o equilíbrio entre homens e mulheres nos conselhos de administração de empresas cotadas em bolsa.

Quantos mais teremos que esperar para que este equilíbrio se torne realidade, não apenas nas empresas cotadas em bolsa mas em todas elas, como algo natural, que não exija esforço, que faça parte da vida numa terra onde homens e mulheres repartem em partes iguais?

As mulheres são 60 % dos novos diplomados do ensino superior na União Europeia, mas apenas 8 % dos presidentes dos conselhos de administração são do sexo feminino. Este foi um grande momento para todas nós e uma luta que as socialistas, em especial, não deixaram morrer. Um obrigado especial às Colegas Evelyn Regner e Lara Wolters.

Devemos estar orgulhosas deste passo mas, ainda assim, não podemos ignorar a sensação que corremos sempre com atraso, atrás do problema e nunca a tempo de o evitar.

Karen Melchior (Renew). – Fru formand! Vi står på skuldrene af giganter. Vi er ikke nået til dette tidspunkt alene. Dette er resultatet af mange års arbejde. EU har sikret ligestilling i Europa igennem mere end 40 år. Vi havde ikke fået ligeløn. Vi havde ikke fået øremærket barsel, hvis ikke det var på grund af EU. I dag sikrer vi, at vi får ligestilling i bestyrelser i vores virksomheder. Fordi vi får, hvad vi måler. Derfor kommer vi fra 2026 til at stille medlemslandene ansvarlige for at sikre ligestilling i bestyrelserne. Det er derfor, at dette direktiv betyder så uendeligt meget. Vi sætter retningen, vi løfter baren for, hvad ligestilling betyder. Vi kommer ikke til at have en kvote for kvinder, men vi kommer til at afskaffe kvoten for inkompetente mænd. Vi kommer til at sikre, at det rent faktisk er folks kvalifikationer og ikke, hvem man kender eller, hvilket køn man har. Derfor hilser jeg det enormt velkommen, at vi får direktivet her i dag, og jeg ser frem til, at medlemsstaterne kommer til at gøre noget for ligestillingen, sådan så vi løfter fra bunden og ikke kun løfter barren i toppen.

Alice Kuhnke (Verts/ALE). – Madam President, Commissioner, some things seem so self-evident, so obviously the right thing to do that we tend to believe that they will eventually just happen, that the persons with the most and the best qualifications take the seat in the room is one of those things.

There are those who want to reduce the long battle to make sure women have a seat at the decision-making tables of companies to only be about fairness, when it is equally as much about competence.

During the course of working with this legislation, we have again and again been told that it is a person's qualifications and skills which should determine if they get a certain position, and that is exactly how it should be. After many years of hard work, we hopefully are a majority who can agree that the competences we need in companies in the EU are not only those of white middle-aged men.

Experiences and knowledge comes in other shapes and colours that we need to make our companies, our Union, the best it can be. Women on boards should be the self-evident first step to take, but it is only the beginning of something that can become even bigger.

Alessandra Basso (ID). – Signora Presidente, onorevoli colleghi, in Italia non abbiamo dovuto aspettare dieci anni per sentirci dire quante donne debbano occupare posti decisionali.

In Italia abbiamo già dal 2011 una legislazione efficace che ci ha permesso di raggiungere uno degli obiettivi alternativi imposti dalla direttiva anzitempo. Imporre a livello europeo un sistema a quote e quindi di quantità nei posti di comando è un approccio che politicamente non può avere il nostro sostegno.

Parafrasando una frase di Oriana Fallaci, i mediocri del politicamente corretto negano sempre il merito e sostituiscono sempre la qualità con la quantità. E quello che le donne vogliono è il riconoscimento dei loro meriti, non un posto riservato e non può e non deve fare alcuna differenza indossare una cravatta o dei tacchi a spillo, perché in futuro non ci dovranno essere leader femminili o maschili, ci dovranno essere solo leader.

Rivolgo un mio pensiero a Roberto Maroni.

Dorien Rookmaker (ECR). – Voorzitter, kunnen we met wet- en regelgeving de ideale wereld scheppen? Veel Europese Parlementsleden schijnen te denken van wel. De Europese Unie wil met behulp van wet- en regelgeving de wereld naar haar hand zetten via antiwitwaswetgeving, duurzaamheidsvoorschriften zoals de CSDDD en genderbepalingen. De wereld naar je hand zetten met een stortvloed aan wet- en regelgeving is onmogelijk en bovendien gevaarlijk.

Iedereen weet dat met meer bemoeienis van de politiek met het bedrijfsleven de grenzen tussen publiek en privaat verdwijnen. Meer administratieve lasten. Meer management en control. Minder vrijheid. Minder welvaart. Een onomkeerbaar proces dat leidt tot verarming. Kunnen we met wet- en regelgeving een ideale wereld scheppen? Seneca vond van niet. Hij stelde: de weg via voorschriften is lang, de weg via voorbeelden is kort en doelgericht.

(De spreker aanvaardt een "blauwe kaart"-reactie)

Lara Wolters (S&D), *"blauwe kaart"-reactie*. – U zei net: wij proberen hier met wet- en regelgeving de wereld naar onze hand te zetten, en daar deed u schamperend over. U zei ook: wij proberen hier de ideale wereld te maken. Ik probeer dat inderdaad en u noemde twee van mijn projecten *Women on board* en duurzaamheidswetgeving. Mijn vraag aan u is dan: waarom bent u lid geworden van het Parlement? Als dat niet is om die ideale wereld te scheppen, waarom dan wel?

Dorien Rookmaker (ECR), *"blauwe kaart"-antwoord*. – Ik ben hier om de overvloed aan wet- en regelgeving onder andere tegen te houden. Ik weet van goede voorbeelden uit bijvoorbeeld Amerika dat het heel goed mogelijk is om je doelen te bereiken zonder een overvloed aan wet- en regelgeving, maar daar is innovatie voor nodig. Ik ben vóór een wereld die veilig is. Ik ben tegen mensenhandel, ik ben tegen dwangarbeid en ik ben een groot voorstander van mensenrechten. Maar ik ben niet een gelovige met betrekking tot wet- en regelgeving.

Έλενα Κουντουρά (The Left). – Κυρία Πρόεδρε, δέκα χρόνια μετά την αρχική πρόταση της Επιτροπής, η Ευρωπαϊκή Ένωση προχωράει στην υιοθέτηση της οδηγίας για τις γυναίκες στα διοικητικά συμβούλια, κάνοντας ένα ουσιαστικό βήμα ώστε να μπει τέλος στην υποεκπροσώπηση των γυναικών στα διοικητικά συμβούλια των μεγάλων ευρωπαϊκών εταιρειών.

Είμαστε υπερήφανοι για το αποτέλεσμα που πετύχαμε στις διαπραγματεύσεις με το Συμβούλιο και την Ευρωπαϊκή Επιτροπή. Θέλω να συγχαρώ τις συναδέλφους εισηγήτριες του Ευρωπαϊκού Κοινοβουλίου και είμαι υπερήφανη που μπόρεσα να συμβάλω και εγώ στη διαπραγματευτική ομάδα του Ευρωπαϊκού Κοινοβουλίου για να επιτευχθεί αυτή η συμφωνία. Παρότι τα επίσημα ευρωπαϊκά στοιχεία αποδεικνύουν ότι οι ευρωπαϊκές εταιρείες που διασφαλίζουν υψηλή εκπροσώπηση και των δύο φύλων στα διοικητικά τους συμβούλια αποδίδουν καλύτερα, οι γυναίκες εξακολουθούν σήμερα να αποτελούν σαφή μειοψηφία, αντιπροσωπεύοντας μόλις το 34% των μη εκτελεστικών μελών των διοικητικών συμβουλίων στην Ευρωπαϊκή Ένωση.

Οι γυναίκες δικαιούνται ίσες ευκαιρίες ανέλιξης στις ηγετικές θέσεις των εταιρειών. Είναι ανάγκη να σταματήσει αυτή η απαράδεκτη σπατάλη ευκαιριών και ταλέντου σε βάρος των γυναικών. Δεν πρόκειται μόνο για ζήτημα κοινωνικής δικαιοσύνης, αλλά αποτελεί προϋπόθεση ώστε να εξασφαλίσει η Ευρωπαϊκή Ένωση την οικονομική ανάπτυξη που έχει τόσο ανάγκη. Η νέα οδηγία προσδοκούμε να ανατρέψει τις δομικές αυτές ανισότητες, φέρνοντας περισσότερες γυναίκες στα κέντρα λήψης των αποφάσεων προς όφελος όχι μόνο των ευρωπαϊκών επιχειρήσεων, αλλά συνολικά της κοινωνίας και της οικονομίας.

Frances Fitzgerald (PPE). – Madam President, I organised the first conference on women and decision-making in Ireland over 30 years ago. This directive has been blocked for ten years. What is it about women's equality that makes it so difficult for people to have agreement, to go forward, to have equal representation?

It continues and we have to work hard. Well done to Commissioner Dalli and to the President of the Commission, Ursula von der Leyen, for unblocking this. Of course we need it, we have to accelerate the representation of women on boards, that is really important. We have good leadership here and we see the presidents of the Commission, the Central Bank, and of course, our own Parliament.

But this cannot just be a shooting star, one effort. It has to be methodical, it has to be systematic. And we have to make sure that there is a permanent change to ensure that women are more equally represented and that our companies benefit from the presence of women, because it is necessarily culturally, socially and of course, financially and economically.

Because having more women on the boards of a company isn't just a step towards societal justice, it is an economic imperative. And right now we have too few women. Isn't it incredible that only 6.7% of women are chairs of boards and only 6.5% across Europe are CEOs? Yet adding one more woman to a company board increases the profits of that company and gives a higher return in assets to the tune of 8 to 13 basis points.

So this directive has the power to change, and from today we will begin to see more women on those EU company boards. And that's a good thing for everybody.

Marc Angel (S&D). – Madam President, Commissioner, dear colleagues, it is a sad fact that only 30.6 % of board members in our largest companies are women, knowing that girls do better in schools than boys and knowing that in the European Union 60 % of new graduates from universities are women.

Many studies show that gender quotas are the most effective instrument for increasing women's presence on company boards. Voluntary regulations without sanctions does not work. Therefore we Socialists and Democrats are pleased that we finally, after 10 years, adopted this Women on Boards Directive.

This directive will improve gender equality by ensuring that at least 40 % of non-executive director posts or 30 % of all director posts are occupied by the underrepresented sex and this by 2026 through transparent, clear and neutral appointment criteria.

This directive also rightly foresees dissuasive penalties for non-compliance and it's a great success for us Socialists and Democrats. Our fight against gender inequalities can no longer wait and it will go on.

I call on more men, I call on all men to speak up for gender equality and fight the patriarchal model that subsists in our society. Gender equality is a recipe for prosperity. This directive is not only good for women, it is good for the progress, the sustainability and the success of our European companies and economy.

María Soraya Rodríguez Ramos (Renew). – Señora presidenta, efectivamente, diez años ha estado bloqueada esta Directiva y durante estos diez años, en los consejos de administración de las empresas cotizadas, siete de cada diez miembros de administración han sido hombres y menos de una de cada diez de las grandes empresas en la Unión Europea ha tenido una presidenta o directora ejecutiva.

Por lo tanto, esta Directiva era absolutamente necesaria y urgente para buscar un equilibrio en estos consejos de administración de las empresas cotizadas, en las que mayoritariamente los puestos están ocupados por hombres, no porque sean los mejores, sino porque en el proceso de selección el género ha sido un criterio y las mujeres han estado discriminadas.

Por eso hoy también lanzamos un mensaje de esperanza a las jóvenes mujeres que están en las universidades, en los colegios. A partir de ahora, esta Directiva garantiza un proceso de selección justo y transparente, con criterios basados en la neutralidad, donde el género no va a ser un elemento discriminatorio. A partir de ahora, como mínimo, el 40 % serán mujeres, pero podrán ser más porque habrá criterios de capacidad. Solamente decirles que diez años muestran las dificultades para avanzar en la igualdad.

Y creo que hoy también es un momento para dar las gracias a todas las mujeres de esta Cámara, de todos los grupos políticos, que han mantenido la llama y la fortaleza para que llegara este gran día.

Sergey Lagodinsky (Verts/ALE). – Madam President, numbers do matter. One in ten, less than one in ten board presidents and CEOs are women. Numbers do matter. Ten, ten years this Council has been blocking this project. Ten more years when young female employees, young and old, did not know what are their chances to get into leadership positions. Ten more years when schoolgirls and young women did not know what are their chances to be leaders of companies.

Well, now it's going to get better. For us three elements are especially important. Number one, we want a guarantee, the guarantee that women are treated fairly throughout the whole selection procedure, the whole selection procedure including preparation of vacancy notices, pre-selection phase, the shortlisting phase; and this holistic approach is in this legislation.

Number two, access to justice. The shift of the burden of proof is essential. It is up to the companies to prove that they do not discriminate. And this is an important step in this legislation, and our conservative and right wing colleagues: do not manipulate. It is not about putting gender over expertise because only equally, equally qualified candidates will be preferred if they are women. So it is about qualification.

Numbers do matter. Thirty-three per cent – only 33% of non-executive and executive directors combined are the target in this legislation and that means that this number should be improved and it will be improved by us when we will evaluate this legislation very soon. There is a bigger target to aim, and this is our goal as the Parliament in the future.

(The speaker agreed to respond to a blue-card speech)

Ladislav Ilčić (ECR), *blue-card speech*. – Dear colleague, you said the 'numbers are important'. So since you consider gender something as the same importance as sex, I suppose that you think that also certain numbers of LGBTQ people should be CEOs there.

And also, since we don't want to be racist, also certain numbers of different skin colours should be in these committees. So my question is: do you intend to implement quotas also and to impose quotas to firms concerning LGBTQ and races?

Sergey Lagodinsky (Verts/ALE), *blue-card reply*. – Madam President, it's a nice try to distract the debate here. Of course, we have 50%, more than 50%, of women as part of our population. And I think after the thousands of years of discrimination against this part of our population, our main goal now is to create legislation that will put the numbers right here. And this is what we are discussing. And don't accuse me of being unbalanced here. I work tirelessly, just as many colleagues here, to improve the proportion of minorities of all different kinds in the leadership positions. For that, we will have different, other approaches, some of them legislative, others not. I think there is a variety of ways and instruments to improve diversity on our boards. And now we are talking about gender and diversity. And by saying that, I mean the representation of women on the board. This is a great, great legislation and we all support this. The majority of this House supports this. The majority of the European population supports this. And, please, stop instrumentalising this issue in order to be populist as so often.

Annika Bruna (ID). – Madame la Présidente, je me réjouis qu'on ait enfin trouvé un accord en vue de l'adoption de la directive concernant la participation des femmes dans les conseils d'administration. Je vous invite à soutenir ce texte raisonnable mis au vote aujourd'hui et qui a pour ambition de donner les moyens nécessaires aux États membres pour parvenir à une représentation plus équilibrée des hommes et des femmes parmi les administrateurs des sociétés cotées en bourse.

Cette directive est un signal fort pour les femmes qui pourront ainsi s'impliquer dans les processus de décision. Cette implication accrue représente un vecteur indispensable pour assurer une meilleure gouvernance des entreprises, en termes tant de performance que d'évolution. Cette directive, soutenue par les députés européens du Rassemblement national, va permettre aux États membres d'accélérer les progrès accomplis en ce domaine et de donner l'exemple aux différentes sphères de pouvoir qui composent nos sociétés.

Michiel Hoogeveen (ECR). – Madam President, coming from the financial sector, one of the companies I worked for was looking for a female director. And after a long and proactive recruitment procedure they couldn't find a candidate. And it wasn't just the board. The company proactively recruited women. Still, men remained overrepresented.

More than three quarters of companies in the financial sector are actively trying to attract female talent. But 64% of them do not see any progress in the number of female applicants. When we compare this to other sectors, for example medicine, we see women on the rise without quotas. In the Netherlands, approximately 66% of all doctors and 55% of specialist doctors will soon be women. Women achieve excellence in their chosen careers.

We should recognise that there are gender-specific preferences to specific types of work. Let us give individuals and businesses the freedom to decide what they want and what works best for themselves.

(The speaker agreed to respond to two blue-card speeches)

Evelyn Regner (S&D), *blue-card speech*. – You mentioned those enterprises who would like to have more women there in top positions. When you talked to those, I mean guys leading the enterprises, did you raise also the question of the culture of how the enterprises are led? I had talks with many of those in top positions and then got information: it's about the culture, it's about how the atmosphere is on boards and that many top women, meanwhile, already say, I expect that there is a change, that there is respect, there is another form of treat, how to treat each other concerning working hours and everything else. So did you take that on board with these considerations you just mentioned?

Samira Rafaela (Renew), *"blauwe kaart"-reactie*. – Mijnheer Hoogeveen, ik heb even een vraag aan u. Wat zegt u nu eigenlijk precies over het nut van een quotum? Want ik hoor u dan zeggen dat we zouden moeten accepteren dat er nu eenmaal genderspecifieke karakteristieken zijn en we nu eenmaal moeten accepteren dat dat binnen bepaalde sectoren een rol speelt. Maar u bent er toch mee bekend dat de bedrijven waar we het hier over hebben, de organisaties waar we het hier over hebben, in principe toch helemaal niet zozeer te maken hebben met genderspecifieke karakteristieken? Dat zijn gewoon grote multinationals in tal van sectoren op tal van terreinen waar gewoon zowel mannen als vrouwen een actieve rol horen te spelen? Het probleem is dat er sprake is van "ons kent ons", vriendjespolitiek. Dat heeft helemaal niets te maken met dat vrouwen niet aan de top zouden kunnen zitten van zo'n groot, machtig consultancykantoor. Dus wat bedoelt u daar nou eigenlijk mee te zeggen? Want ik denk echt dat u fout redeneert.

Michiel Hoogeveen (ECR), *blue-card reply*. – Thank you for these questions, and I will try to answer them and I will try to condense them into one answer. The example I gave on medicine, I think it clearly shows that it is possible for women to choose a career and to make a career in a specific type of environment they would like to seek to make their career.

But if you look at quotas, if you look at the rationale or the ideas behind quotas, it says we need more female ideas because women bring other ideas. But then the question I'm asking is: what are female ideas? Isn't this a very contradicting way? And isn't this a very contradicting thing to say? I mean, I'm all for diversity of ideas, but that should be based on character, not on sex, race or ethnicity. So I think that's the bottom line.

Eugenia Rodríguez Palop (The Left). – Señora presidenta, la ausencia de las mujeres en las empresas ha sido el fruto de decisiones sesgadas, prejuiciosas e injustas. Decisiones que explican la brecha de género en el empleo, en el salario y en las pensiones, los techos de cristal y los techos de cemento. Hemos sufrido barreras que nos han obligado a esforzarnos mucho más para competir, aún estando mejor preparadas, y que nos han obligado a elegir entre nuestra vida personal, familiar y laboral para que los varones no tuvieran que hacerlo.

Hoy sabemos que esta injusticia ha tenido además un efecto negativo sobre el propio desempeño de la economía, porque la feminización de la empresa garantiza sostenibilidad, seguridad, realismo, flexibilidad, cooperación, responsabilidad, confianza, empatía y promoción del consenso. El liderazgo de las mujeres cambia la cultura empresarial y ese cambio incrementa la innovación, la competitividad y la rentabilidad. Resulta que no es el éxito el que nos hace felices, sino la felicidad la que nos asegura el éxito.

En fin, no nos están regalando nada. Somos más bien nosotras las que regalamos al mundo, como llevamos haciendo desde hace siglos, y ahora se trata de recibir algo a cambio. Solo y exclusivamente lo que nos merecemos.

Angelika Winzig (PPE). – Sehr geehrte Frau Präsidentin, Frau Kommissarin, Kolleginnen und Kollegen! Viele Studien und auch die betriebliche Praxis zeigen, dass börsennotierte Unternehmen, die ein ausgeglichenes Geschlechterverhältnis aufweisen, auch in ihren Geschäftsergebnissen besser abschneiden. Darum ist es auch wirtschaftspolitisch wichtig, dass es jetzt zu einer Einigung kommt. Erfreulich ist, dass jene Mitgliedstaaten, die bereits Vorarbeit geleistet haben, jetzt ausgenommen sind, denn sie haben schon die entsprechenden Gesetze, die faire und transparente Auswahlverfahren garantieren.

Eines muss uns aber bei dieser Debatte bewusst werden: Wir sprechen hier von einem Mikrokosmos von sehr erfolgreichen und auch gut ausgebildeten Frauen. Mir ist in diesem Zusammenhang aber ein großes Anliegen, dass wir Mädchen in der Grundausbildung in den sogenannten MINT-Fächern fördern, denn dann können sie nicht nur in ertragsreicheren Firmen und somit auch in besser bezahlten Branchen arbeiten, sondern haben es auch künftig leichter, die gläserne Decke zu durchbrechen.

Pina Picierno (S&D). – Signora Presidente, signora Commissaria, onorevoli colleghe e colleghi, oggi facciamo un passo avanti enorme per la parità di genere, per i diritti delle donne.

Questo è un momento significativo, importante naturalmente per noi, ma è importante soprattutto, io credo, per le future generazioni. E lo facciamo questo passo in avanti così importante – fatemelo dire – grazie alla tenacia di questo Parlamento, grazie alla tenacia della Commissaria, grazie alle colleghe e ai colleghi che hanno lavorato incessantemente a questa direttiva – guardo Evelyn – perché per dieci anni alcuni governi ci hanno assolutamente tenuti in ostaggio, sono stati miopi di fronte al progresso, di fronte alla verità, alla giustizia, hanno bloccato norme di buonsenso che avevano e che hanno l'ambizione semplicemente di correggere una distorsione della realtà che è figlia di stereotipi e di una inaccettabile cultura patriarcale.

E allora facciamo un passo in avanti parziale, signora Presidente e chiudo, in un settore però cruciale per il futuro di tutte le donne.

Barry Andrews (Renew). – Madam President, Commissioner, this is a landmark directive and it's very welcome. And as we've heard many times, there is vast research and evidence which demonstrates the economic value of increasing representation on boards.

In Ireland we have made great progress over the last very short period of time. Irish PLCs already have 32% female representation on boards. Ireland also leads the way with women in top jobs. A survey of 24 countries showed that Ireland actually leads these countries – including the UK, the US, Canada, Australia and Singapore. And perhaps it's no coincidence, despite the dire warnings we've heard about the performance of the economy, that Ireland is the leading economy in the European Union over the last couple of years.

And I wanted to pay tribute to the rapporteurs and everybody that has been involved in this, but also to Renew Europe, because it was a Renew Europe priority for this parliamentary term. I want to pay tribute to my colleagues, Samira Rafaela and to Karen Melchior.

And before I finish, I want to say we should focus as well on representation in politics. It's important that we do this in economics, but some of the most important boards in the world are governments. And just look at the last G20, where there were just two female leaders present among the 20.

Isabella Tovaglieri (ID). – Signora Presidente, onorevoli colleghi, imporre la parità nei CdA delle grandi aziende è un'operazione di facciata, che sicuramente piace ai progressisti, ma che purtroppo non risolve alla radice il problema della disparità di genere sul lavoro.

Per avere più donne ai vertici non servono quote rosa né multe alle imprese, ma un welfare efficiente e una valida offerta formativa, che permettano alle donne di affermarsi grazie al loro merito e alle loro competenze. Lo dimostra il caso dell'avanzata Lombardia – e qui il mio pensiero va al governatore Roberto Maroni, che ha contribuito a renderla grande – dove lavora il 48 % delle manager di tutta Italia.

Allora occorre più pragmatismo e meno ideologia. Non abbiamo bisogno di corsie preferenziali, ma di una competizione equa e ad armi pari, per arrivare a una parità vera e non di comodo, che possa garantire, oltre ai diritti delle donne, anche il progresso economico e culturale delle nostre nazioni.

(L'oratrice accetta di rispondere a un intervento «cartellino blu»)

Maria Grapini (S&D), *intervenție de tip „cartonaș albastru".* – Este pentru mine inexplicabil ceea ce dumneavoastră spuneți aici și vă întreb: ați citit vreodată în viața dumneavoastră un studiu antropologic? Știți ce calități native au femeile? Credeți că dacă se pune această cotă, nu se mai ține cont de criteriile de calitate, de competență? Sau la ce v-ați gândit? Matematic, sunt 60% din absolvenții de studii superioare, este clar că nu pot fi doar 8% în consiliile de administrație. Deci pierdem competențe.

Isabella Tovaglieri (ID) *risposta «cartellino blu»*. – Io credo che puntare solo ed esclusivamente sulle quote rosa sia un diversivo per non affrontare il problema.

Andiamo incontro alla transizione digitale e ci saranno nuove professioni del futuro, soprattutto nelle materie STEM, ma dobbiamo essere consapevoli che soltanto una minimissima percentuale di donne si approccia alle materie tecnico-scientifiche, perché ci dicono che probabilmente queste materie sono appannaggio degli uomini.

Allora lavoriamo su questo, facendo orientamento soprattutto nelle scuole tra i più piccoli, per far affacciare e approcciare le donne a queste materie, dove peraltro ottengono risultati anche più brillanti degli uomini, per dare loro effettivamente posti di lavoro di qualità, che consentano loro di bilanciare anche il lavoro e la famiglia. Questa è la vera pari opportunità, la competizione ci deve essere, ad armi pari, ma la competizione ci deve essere.

(L'oratrice accetta di rispondere a due interventi «cartellino blu»)

Samira Rafaela (Renew), *blue-card speech*. – I heard a lot about what is not actually possible, what actually should not be done, and then you end up with the conclusion that we need fair competition. Like, seriously, how do we reach fair competition? If we have the conclusion now that women significantly lag behind, like how do you want to intervene in the first place on that specific fact? So I wonder, how would you like to organise fair competition if women significantly lag behind already? What will be your first intervention? I'm fine with listening to the whole speech about what is not possible or about how bad this idea is, but then come with a concrete solution. I would like to hear how we organise that fair competition with the facts that we have in place now.

Lara Wolters (S&D), *blue-card speech*. – Yes, my question was very similar. I don't understand at all what I just heard. I think you spoke about education. I think you spoke about how we need better schooling. And the facts – we laid them on the table for you earlier. We have 60% of female graduates in our European universities. And then at the end of the day, we have 8% of female CEOs. That shows very clearly that something is going terribly wrong along the way.

So I don't understand at all what you were saying about how we need better education or better schooling, because the schooling is absolutely not the problem. The schooling is a big success story. It's what happens afterwards that's a problem and that's what we are trying to fix today. So please, can you clarify, because that was very, very confusing?

Isabella Tovaglieri (ID) *risposta «cartellino blu»*. – A questo proposito, io ho proprio citato le buone pratiche della regione da cui provengo, che è la regione Lombardia, dove risiede il 48 % delle donne manager in Italia, senza la necessità di imporre quote.

Noi abbiamo raggiunto percentuali migliori, ma non mi accontento. Il problema è che io non ritengo che le quote siano uno strumento adeguato. Serve il welfare, questa è l'unica soluzione ed è l'unica parola chiave che dobbiamo perseguire.

Per garantire un bilanciamento e pari opportunità dobbiamo consentire alle donne di non dover scegliere se dedicarsi alla carriera o dedicarsi al lavoro. Creare delle quote nei CdA significa soltanto privilegiare delle donne che andranno a ricoprire dei ruoli d'élite ma, al di là delle donne che lavorano nei CdA e delle donne manager, ci sono milioni di donne che non hanno la possibilità di accedere a quei posti, ma che hanno comunque diritto di poter avere una carriera e di poter bilanciare la propria vita familiare.

Quindi, non possiamo fare delle politiche d'élite, dobbiamo pensare a tutte le donne, non lasciare indietro nessuna.

Johan Nissinen (ECR). – Fru talman! Det är tragiskt att EU nu anser att människor ska bedömas utifrån sina kön och inte sina kunskaper. Jag skäms över att det var de svenska Socialdemokraterna som öppnade upp för det här vansinnet, att det var de svenska Socialdemokraterna som 2017 öppnade upp för att EU nu ska lagstifta fram kvotering i bolagsstyrelser och att EU ska ha kontroll över löner. Men tro mig, det finns många fler röster än Socialdemokraterna. Jag är en av dem, och vi är starkt emot detta.

En gång för alla: kvotering är diskriminerande. Det är inte när vi kvoterar efter kön, hudfärg eller sexuell läggning som samhället utvecklas, utan när vi tar vara på människors kompetens och erfarenhet. Jag som hbtq-person hade aldrig velat bli vald till något enbart på grund av att jag är kär, eller har en pojkvän, utan jag skulle vilja göra det bara för att jag är bra på jobbet.

(Talaren godtog att svara på tre inlägg "blått kort".)

Karen Melchior (Renew), *blåt kort-indlæg*. – Mange tak for Deres indlæg. Jeg forstår ikke helt et element i Deres tale: At man skulle vælges på grund af kvoter og ikke på grund af kvalifikationer, når der netop i direktivet står, at det er ligeligt kvalificerede kandidater, som man skal vælge mellem. Hvis man er ligeligt kvalificeret, så skal man foretrække den, som er af det køn, som er mindst repræsenteret. Jeg er enig med taleren i, at det ikke er kvoter alene, som kan gøre det, men at det handler om ligestilling. Men hvordan skal vi få ligestilling, når vi i over hundrede år har haft adgang for kvinder til universiteter, haft adgang for kvinder til at stemme, men vi stadigvæk ikke ser ligestilling? For taleren mener vel ikke, at der er en genetisk eller biologisk forskel på mænd og kvinder, som gør kvinder mindre kompetente?

Maria Grapini (S&D), *intervenție de tip „cartonaș albastru"*. – Stimate coleg, după ceea ce ne-ați prezentat, cred că nu ați citit deloc documentul pe care îl dezbatem acum sau nu înțelegeți nimic.

Dumneavoastră spuneți că 40 % ar fi procentul, că ar fi o discriminare pentru populație, care este peste 50 %. Păi unde este discriminare? Asta este o problemă.

A doua, cum vedeți dumneavoastră rezolvată problema ca în consiliile de administrație să fie și femeile care au competență - că nu se exclude competența în consiliile de administrație?

Nu jucăm, nici nu ridicăm haltere, nu ridicăm saci și nu facem muncă fizică, ci gândim. Și dacă avem 60 % persoane feminine instruite, cu studii superioare, nu credeți că se pierde o competență în aceste consilii de administrație?

Samira Rafaela (Renew), *blue-card speech*. – Madam President, so, you know, this is just this famous common argument that it is about knowledge. It's about expertise. Like, seriously, do you really think that we would attract women for such positions if they would not have the knowledge, talent and competencies? Of course, you know, we will look for competent women. That's not the issue here. We have enough women who are competent. The issue is that constantly men choose their men. Men choose their preferences. You need to be in that old-boys network to become one of those. That's the issue here. It's a cultural problem why these women are not being seen. And you know that it's not an issue of women lacking competencies. We have enough women with competencies. So it's a false argument. The argument here should be that we neglect, we ignore women with competencies. And the issue is how do we get them in the positions that they deserve? And I did not hear anything about a concrete solution. So also for you to question what is your solution?

Johan Nissinen (ECR), *blue-card reply*. – The whole debate about having to quota people in is not doing anyone a favour who will be quota-ed in. Because the problem is that if someone gets quota-ed in for a position – and it doesn't matter what kind of thing they are being quota-ed in for – the other people around will think they are there because of the quota, not because of the competence. That's the biggest problem.

I know from my class when I was studying, from my university classes, that it was over-represented with women, and I can see that many of them now have good positions. It takes time for this to happen, and I believe that it's going to go through and also that if you have two people and they have the same competence you will choose the person who is right. I believe that is true and it's going to be more and more that women will be over-represented in many areas, like my colleague said, in the public sector. It will be like that.

Puhemies – Nyt sitten palaamme puheenvuorolistaan, ja ilmoitan, että en pysty enää myöntämään lisää sinisiä kortteja. Tässähän on ollut vilkasta keskustelua, mutta meidän on lopetettava istunto noin kello 11.20, eli pyydän teitä nyt kunnioittamaan puheaikoja.

Sandra Pereira (The Left). – Senhora Presidente, neste sistema em que vivemos as mulheres têm mais dificuldades em chegarem a cargos de poder. As mulheres e os seus direitos continuam a ser muito incómodas para as forças políticas retrógradas e conservadoras.

Consideramos que, apesar desta diretiva, as desigualdades continuarão a ser uma realidade na vida da maioria das mulheres. Como a existência de disparidades salariais, violando o princípio de salário igual para trabalho igual, ou os obstáculos ao direito à maternidade e à gravidez e, consequentemente, à licença de amamentação e aleitamento, que continua, sistematicamente, a ser negada às mães trabalhadoras. Ou a precariedade laboral e a desregulação dos horários, que impossibilita o equilíbrio entre a vida profissional, familiar e pessoal.

As discriminações e estereótipos contribuem para perpetuar desigualdades, incluindo no acesso à formação e promoção profissional em cargos de chefia e de topo na vida económica e política.

Todas as medidas que invertam esse caminho serão sempre uma boa notícia.

Rosa Estaràs Ferragut (PPE). – Señora presidenta, a pesar de que alrededor del 60 % de las nuevas tituladas universitarias son mujeres, ellas están infrarrepresentadas en muchos sectores, pero especialmente en los sectores económicos y especialmente en las altas instancias. Un 31,5 % de los miembros de los consejos de administración son mujeres y solo el 8 % los presiden.

Con esta nueva legislación, que ha estado una década en el cajón, las empresas cotizadas tendrán que procurar y tendrán que hacer que, de aquí al año 2026, las personas del sexo menos representado ocupen, al menos, el 40 % de los puestos no ejecutivos y el 33 % de los puestos ejecutivos.

Conseguir una representación equilibrada entre todos los sexos, entre mujeres y hombres, es un ejercicio de igualdad, de información, de transparencia, de justicia, de democracia y de paz. El mayor equilibrio siempre supone mejor competitividad. Impulsará el crecimiento económico, no me cabe ninguna duda: un crecimiento inteligente, innovador, sostenible e integrador. Pero también mejorará la competitividad de las empresas y reducirá la pobreza. La diversidad es sinónimo de talento. Impulsar la presencia de las mujeres es una herramienta clave para contar con el mejor talento.

Lina Gálvez Muñoz (S&D). – Señora presidenta, comisaria, a pesar de lo que hemos oído hoy aquí por parte de algunos grupos políticos en el sentido de que las mujeres todavía tenemos que formarnos, que tenemos que esperar, quisiera señalar que hace ya décadas que hay más mujeres que hombres licenciadas por las universidades europeas. Además, con mejores notas. Hay más mujeres que hombres con formación secundaria y terciaria en edad de trabajar.

Y aun así no llegamos a la cima de las empresas porque el poder sigue siendo masculino. Por eso que debemos intervenir. Por eso necesitamos políticas públicas, como esta directiva que equilibra o trata de equilibrar la presencia de mujeres y hombres en los consejos de administración. A pesar de que haya estado varada diez años, la seguimos necesitando.

Hoy hacemos historia, avanzamos en la carrera hacia la justicia social, pero también hacia una mayor resiliencia, sostenibilidad y eficiencia de nuestras empresas porque cuando una mujer ocupa el puesto de director ejecutivo en una empresa, aumenta en un 10 % la presencia de las mujeres en los consejos de administración. Y eso cambia la cultura y genera también modelos que deben seguirse.

Esta directiva es, ante todo y, sobre todo, un imperativo democrático, pero también un imperativo económico.

Ahora nos toca vigilar para que realmente se cumpla.

Gilles Lebreton (ID). – Madame la Présidente, chers collègues, l'égalité des hommes et des femmes est un principe fondamental de la civilisation européenne. C'est pourquoi je suis favorable à cette directive qui demande aux États membres de l'Union de parvenir à un meilleur équilibre des deux sexes dans les conseils d'administration des grandes sociétés. De ce point de vue, l'objectif assorti d'aménagements de réserver au sexe sous-représenté au moins 40 % des postes d'administrateurs non exécutifs à l'horizon 2026 me semble raisonnable. À court terme, ce sont évidemment les femmes qui bénéficieront de cette mesure.

À l'heure où les Iraniennes combattent pour leur liberté face au régime obscurantiste des mollahs, je me réjouis du beau message d'espoir que nous leur envoyons aujourd'hui. Oui, une véritable égalité des droits est possible entre les hommes et les femmes. Non, aucun obstacle n'est insurmontable sur la voie qui y mène, qu'il soit économique, social ou religieux.

Ladislav Ilčić (ECR). – Poštovana predsjedavajuća, poštovane dame i gospodo, ako ste na svom poslu jako dobri, a napreduje i veću plaću dobiva neka druga osoba koja lošije radi od vas, reći ćete nije fer. Ipak, neki političari u ovom Parlamentu žele gospodarstvenicima nametnuti upravo takvo nefer ponašanje.

Umjesto da jedini kriterij napredovanja bude kvaliteta zaposlenika, ova direktiva tvrtkama arbitrarno nameće kvote, rezervirana mjesta koliko bi žena trebalo biti, pa onda valjda koliko bi trebalo biti i LGBTIQ osoba, koliko bi trebalo biti osoba različite rase da tvrtka ne bi bila proglašena rasističkom i tako dalje. Gdje je kraj tom vašem uplitanju ?

Ja se zalažem da samo žene budu u upravnom odboru ako su najkvalitetniji zaposlenici, ali samo ako su najkvalitetniji. Dakle, samo kvaliteta, ništa arbitrarno. Ideja da političar, od kojih mnogi nisu proveli niti jedan dan u realnom sektoru, bolje od gospodarstvenika znaju što je dobro za poslovanje poprilična je ludost.

Dakle, pustite gospodarstvo da se slobodno razvija.

Elżbieta Katarzyna Łukacijewska (PPE). – Pani Przewodnicząca! Pomimo zmian zachodzących na europejskim rynku pracy, pomimo wielu pomysłów na likwidację barier, które ograniczają awans kobiet, nadal zauważalne są stereotypy w ocenie naszej kompetencji. Nadal kobiety doświadczają szklanego sufitu i postrzegania przez pryzmat rodzicielstwa, co ogranicza nasz rozwój zawodowy. Wielu uznaje, także na tej sali, że przygotowywanie przepisów, które dążą do równouprawnienia, do stworzenia takich samych szans pomiędzy kobietami i mężczyznami, jest sztuczne i przeciwskuteczne.

Ja nie zgadzam się z takim podejściem, bo gdy popatrzymy na wykształcenie i kompetencje kobiet, to widzimy, że kobiety osiągnęły niesamowity progres. Niestety, nie idzie za tym wykorzystywanie naszego potencjału, zdolności i umiejętności. To strata, która dotyka gospodarkę i społeczeństwo. To marnotrawstwo, na które nie powinno być dalszej zgody.

W projekcie, o którym dzisiaj mówimy, chodzi przede wszystkim o wyrównanie szans, o sprawiedliwy proces selekcji na najwyższe stanowiska. Nie ma w nim mowy o uprzywilejowaniu jakiejkolwiek grupy. Mam świadomość, że przed nami długa droga. Dziesięć lat trwało, zanim przystąpiliśmy dzisiaj do tej dyskusji i do podjęcia decyzji. Ale zmiany są niezbędne i wierzę, że wdrożenie tej dyrektywy to dobry początek na zmiany w szeroko rozumianym obszarze gospodarczym.

René Repasi (S&D). – Frau Präsidentin, Frau Kommissarin, liebe Kolleginnen und Kollegen! Wo der Markt versagt, wo Unternehmen nicht unter Beweis stellen, dass sie sich selbst regulieren, das heißt selbst in den Griff bekommen können, da müssen wir, muss der Staat regulieren. Sie, die Unternehmen, hatten genug Zeit. Deshalb ist heute ein guter Tag. 40 % der Plätze in Aufsichtsräten müssen weiblich sein, ein Drittel aller Vorstände. Das ist ein Meilenstein.

Junge Frauen wissen jetzt, dass sie in ihrer Leistung nicht übersehen werden, dass sich Leistung lohnt. Und das ist die Nachricht, die ich hier an scharf rechts geben will. Der Fisch stinkt vom Kopf. Dass junge Frauen übersehen werden, liegt daran, dass das Management komplett männlich ist, und daher ist es der entscheidende Schritt, die männliche Gesellschaft zu überwinden und die menschliche Gesellschaft zu erreichen. Dank an Lara Wolters, Dank an Evelyn Regner für ihre Arbeit an diesem Punkt.

Aber dieser Meilenstein ist ein Meilenstein und nicht der Endpunkt: Frauen gehören noch mehr Führungspositionen als 40 % und ein Drittel. Deswegen bekommen Unternehmen jetzt eine zweite Chance, für echte Gleichstellung zu sorgen und die Realität mit diesen Quoten zusammenzuführen.

Cindy Franssen (PPE). – Voorzitter, commissaris, collega's. Bijna tien jaar werd het voorstel voor een richtlijn van de Europese Commissie geblokkeerd door de lidstaten. In die tien jaar van onderhandelen hebben we in Europa jammer genoeg weinig vooruitgang gezien in de aanwezigheid van vrouwen in raden van bestuur. Juist daarom is deze richtlijn zo belangrijk. Vanaf 1 juli 2026 zullen de raden van bestuur evenwichtiger moeten worden samengesteld. Ja, in een ideale wereld zijn quota misschien overbodig, maar we zien dat ze nodig zijn en we zien dat ze werken. Zo is er in België sinds de invoering van de federale quotawet van 2012 een duidelijke verbetering. In 2020 was voor het eerst meer dan een derde van het totaal aantal leden van de raad van bestuur vrouw. Tien jaar geleden was dat minder dan 10 %.

In 2022 zouden raden van bestuur niet meer synoniem mogen zijn voor gesloten mannenclubs. We hebben vrouwen nodig aan elke tafel waar belangrijke beslissingen worden genomen. Enkel zo zullen we evolueren naar een meer evenwichtige unie, naar een meer evenwichtige samenleving.

Łukasz Kohut (S&D). – Pani Przewodnicząca! Pani Komisarz! W sercu Unii Europejskiej w XXI w. prezes Kaczyński, władca pisowskich umysłów, nazywa Polki pijaczkami i mówi, że zamiast rodzić dzieci, dają w szyję. Szanowne panie europosłanki i panowie europosłowie, to jest kłamstwo, to podła dezinformacja. Polki są ambitne, są opiekuńcze i są po prostu wspaniałe. A równość i szacunek powinny być poza dyskusją. Powinny być oczywistością. Strach przed silnymi, niezależnymi kobietami jest uwarunkowany politycznie. Kobiety są świetnymi menedżerami, świetnie radzą sobie tak w spółkach, jak i na wszelkich stanowiskach kierowniczych. I właśnie tego boją się mizogini, którzy nie chcą pogodzić się z równością płci, którzy boją się, że po prostu nie sprostają kobietom. Jarosław Kaczyński przegra tę batalię, przegra właśnie z kobietami, przegra z mężczyznami, którzy bronią praw kobiet. Już niebawem.

Pyynnöstä myönnettävät puheenvuorot

Margarida Marques (S&D). – Senhora Presidente, eu gostaria de, no final deste debate, lembrar que nós temos 60 % de mulheres licenciadas, temos uma maioria de médicos que são mulheres, e temos apenas 8 % presidentes dos conselhos de administração. Alguma coisa não funciona bem.

Nós já percebemos que, na participação política, as quotas foram decisivas e hoje há muito mais mulheres na política do que havia antes da adoção das quotas. É por isso que esta diretiva é necessária. É por isso que é fundamental, ao fim de dez anos, aprovarmos esta diretiva.

E deixo aqui uma palavra de reconhecimento às nossas Colegas Laura Wolters e Evelyn Regner. À Colega Evelyn que há dez anos se bate por esta diretiva. Mas queria também lembrar aqui o papel de Viviane Reding, na altura comissária europeia, que pela primeira vez apresentou esta proposta, que infelizmente demorou dez anos a votar.

Mas espero que agora, finalmente, possa entrar em vigor para repor a igualdade.

(Pyynnöstä myönnettävät puheenvuorot päättyvät)

Helena Dalli, *Member of the Commission*. – Madam President, honourable Members, to say that I welcome the adoption of this directive would be a gross understatement. I thank the Parliament for your continued support and determination on this legislative initiative.

The adoption of this directive is a step on the road to gender equality in Europe. I am sure that the citizens of Europe and businesses will benefit from its effect. The directive will help dismantle the barriers that prevent qualified women from arriving at the top.

Our investment in women's education and, in turn, women's investment in their qualifications, can only give long-term returns when women are recognised, valued and treated as equals at all levels of economic, social, professional and public life.

So women's role, place and voice at the economic – especially right now – decision-making table is of the essence for Europe's future when answering to the multiple crises Europe is facing now.

Lara Wolters, *rapporteur*. – Madam President, so colleagues, after ten years of obstruction, that's a wrap! It has taken three Commissioners, five Parliament rapporteurs and 21 Council Presidencies to get this done. And we persisted in spite of all the obstruction.

Since the adoption of our Parliament position back in 2013, I have lost count of how many resolutions were adopted on this very topic and how many times this European Parliament called to Member States to come back to the negotiating table. We faced every kind of obstacle from Member States, from those who oppose legislating on gender equality out of principle, to those who believe that they've done enough already or that time would simply fix things. Companies in Member States must now get to balanced boardrooms, and if they fail we will be able to hold them to their commitments.

I am very proud of what we have in front of us today, and I want to very warmly thank my colleague Evelyn Regner. I want to thank Commissioner Dalli present here today. Commissioner Viviane Reding, who worked on this previously, Ursula von der Leyen, who personally committed herself to this fight, and all those others who contributed to our success today.

Evelyn Regner, *Berichterstatterin*. – Frau Präsidentin! Die Europäische Union wird 70 Jahre alt, und sie macht ihren Job. Es geht um Werte und Gleichstellung: Da haben wir jetzt wirklich einiges erreicht. Es ist ein Mosaikstein von vielen, aber ein ganz wichtiger, den wir dann endlich erreicht haben. Wir geben Frauen endlich eine faire Chance, in Spitzenpositionen von Unternehmen zu gelangen. Frauen sind klug, sie sind innovativ, und sie sind einfach zu vielem fähig, und das soll auch abgebildet werden. Wir wissen alle, dass das eben nur einer von vielen Mosaiksteinen ist; aber wir alle, wir arbeiten auch weiterhin daran.

Ich möchte zu den Danksagungen, die Lara Wolters jetzt erwähnt hat, auch noch ganz persönliche erwähnen, weil ich nun wirklich schon sehr lange an diesem Dossier arbeiten darf, nämlich an jene, die eben kreativ waren, zu überlegen: Machen wir jetzt wieder mal eine Anfrage an den Rat, versuchen wir jetzt wieder mal über Pressearbeit etwas zu machen, machen wir – also all diese Dinge, die man als Abgeordnete macht. Mein Dank geht also an Hannah Buchinger, an Sabrina Winter, an Melanie Köller, an Stefanie Ricken, an Inês de Matos Pinto. Das sind einige dieser fantastischen Frauen, die eben die richtige *drafting*-Arbeit erledigt haben. Und ich denke mal, genau so arbeiten Frauen: integrativ, inklusiv, über Fraktionsgrenzen hinweg und über geografische und Zeitgrenzen hinweg.

Ich gratuliere uns allen. Jetzt ist es einmal Zeit, zu feiern.

Puhemies. – Keskustelu on päättynyt.

Äänestys toimitetaan tänään.

Kirjalliset lausumat (171 artikla)

Vilija Blinkevičiūtė (S&D), *raštu*. – Gerbiama Pirmininke, komisare, kolegos, daugiau nei po dešimties metų pagaliau radome susitarimą ir jau turime įstatyminį dokumentą dėl moterų įmonių valdybose. Tai yra didelis žingsnis į priekį lyčių lygybės politikoje. Sutikime, jog yra nenormalu, kai Europoje daugiau nei šešiasdešimt procentų moterų turi universitetinį išsilavinimą, tačiau šis skaičius visiškai neatsispindi sprendimų priėmimo pozicijose, kur, deja, moterų yra mažuma. Ir tai yra talento ir žinių švaistymas. Sutinku su Komisare, jog per dešimtmetį gerokai pažengėme gerindami lyčių lygybę, tačiau situacija valstybėse narėse yra labai nevienoda ir išlieka reikšmingi skirtumai tarp vyrų ir moterų atlyginimų, moterų galimybės užimti vadovaujančius postus. Gerbiami kolegos, labai sudėtinga yra pakeisti įsisenėjusį ir deja, norma tapusį požiūrį į moteris. Todėl, kai neveikia savanoriškos priemonės, turime pasitelkti įstatymines priemones ir tokiu būdu ilgainiui užtikrinti moterims lygias galimybes. Labai sveikinu pranešėjas už pasiektą istorinį rezultatą ir tikiuosi, jog šiandien atversime naują puslapį moterų teisių srityje.

Robert Hajšel (S&D), *písomne*. – Všetky štáty EÚ by mali na základe tejto smernice prijať účinné opatrenia na zabezpečenie reprezentatívnejšieho zastúpenia žien nielen v dozorných radách rôznych podnikov, ale aj za všetkými stolmi, kde sa prijímajú dôležité opatrenia.

Situácia v jednotlivých štátoch sa ale výrazne líši, pričom niektoré štáty, ako napríklad Slovensko, kde v takýchto rozhodovacích orgánoch spoločností predstavujú ženy iba 25 percent, čaká ešte dlhá cesta. Ak berieme do úvahy, že už v roku 2026 by až 40 percent riadiacich pracovníkov mali byť ženy, pričom do úvahy treba samozrejme brať aj potrebnú kvalifikáciu a skúsenosti, cesta štátov ako Slovensko nebude len dlhá, ale aj ťažká. V praxi to tiež znamená, že ak sa o miesto budú uchádzať rovnako kvalifikovaní kandidáti, potom prednosť musí dostať zástupca menej zastúpeného pohlavia. Tie spoločnosti, ktoré nebudú spĺňať predpísané kritériá v smernici, ako je aj transparentnosť výberového procesu, budú musieť čeliť sankciám.

Eugen Jurzyca (ECR), *písomne*. – Ženy čelia v živote mnohým umelým bariéram, ktorým muži čeliť nemusia a je správne tieto bariéry odstraňovať. Stanovenie kvót pre súkromné firmy však nie je odbúranie bariér, ale stanovenie výsledkov. Je to podobné, ako keby sa v NHL namiesto toho, že najvyššiu šancu na prvú voľbu hokejistov v drafte má posledný tím tabuľky, zaviedlo pravidlo, že posledný tím automaticky vyhrá každý druhý zápas. Skutočné riešenie by malo vychádzať z odbúrania bariér, teda napríklad z uľahčenia súbehu práce so starostlivosťou o deti.

Dienstag, 22. November 2022

Guido Reil (ID), *schriftlich.* – Mit verbindlichen Quoten soll also das Geschlechterverhältnis unter den nicht geschäftsführenden Direktoren ausgewogen gemacht werden. Gehen wir mal zurück in der Zeit. Als 2012 die Kommission diesen Vorschlag machte, stieß sie bei vielen nationalen Parlamenten auf erheblichen Widerstand. Dänemark, Frankreich, die Niederlande, Schweden und das Vereinigte Königreich verwiesen auf das Subsidiaritätsprinzip. Andere Mitgliedstaaten hatten andere Einwände. Die rumänische Abgeordnetenkammer war der Meinung, dass die Mitglieder solcher Aufsichtsräte nur aus fachlicher Kompetenz ernannt werden sollten, unabhängig vom Geschlecht. Das estnische Parlament sagte, und ich zitiere wörtlich: „Verbindliche Quoten könnten zu einer Situation führen, in der Frauen in die Führung von Unternehmen gewählt werden, um eine Quote zu erfüllen und nicht aufgrund ihrer Fähigkeiten oder früherer Leistungen." Berufliche Qualifikation war bis jetzt das entscheidende Kriterium. Das ist Geschichte. Jetzt ist das richtige Geschlecht das einzige Kriterium. Das hat nichts mit Geschlechtergleichstellung zu tun, aber nur mit Ideologie.

Monika Vana (Verts/ALE), *schriftlich.* – Nach 10 Jahren Blockade und Verhandlungen mit dem Rat ist es endlich soweit. Eine langjährige Forderung der Grünen wird umgesetzt: verpflichtende Frauenquoten in Aufsichtsräten und Direktionen. Ein wichtiger Erfolg auf einem sehr langen Weg, der in den nächsten zwei Jahren in den Mitgliedstaaten umgesetzt werden muss! Das Ende des numerischen Patriarchats auf Führungsetagen ist eingeleitet. Dem Europäischen Parlament ist es gelungen, einige wichtige Schlupflöcher im Ratstext zu schließen. Zum Beispiel wurden die Transparenz von Auswahlverfahren, die jährliche Berichtspflicht von Unternehmen und eine raschere Umsetzung der Richtlinie als Erfolge erzielt. Enttäuschend ist allerdings, dass die Ziele insgesamt nicht ambitionierter sind und es etliche „Ausnahmeklauseln" gibt. Bis zur vorgesehenen Überarbeitung der Richtlinie 2030 werden wir die Leistung der Mitgliedstaaten genau verfolgen und sicherstellen, dass zusätzliche Maßnahmen ergriffen werden, falls die erwarteten Fortschritte ausfallen. Wir werden als Greens/EFA weiter für ambitioniertere Ziele kämpfen!

(Istunto keskeytettiin klo 11.25.)

PRESIDENZA: ROBERTA METSOLA

President

4. Wiederaufnahme der Sitzung

(The sitting resumed at 11.43)

5. Feierliche Sitzung - Zeremonie anlässlich des 70-jährigen Bestehens des Europäischen Parlaments

La Présidente. – Madame la Première ministre, Messieurs les Premiers ministres, chers députés.

Dear Speakers and Presidents of national parliaments, dear colleagues, in 1952, here in Strasbourg, Paul-Henri Spaak presided over the opening of the first ever session of the Common Assembly of the European Coal and Steel Community. It was the starting point of this institution's plenary activity.

In 70 years, the Assembly grew from strength to strength. In 1962, it changed name to become the European Parliament. In 1973, it opened its first own institutional hemicycle in Luxembourg, where many of our staff members still sit. Over time, parliamentary committees' and political groups' activity grew in Brussels, as increased powers came with the responsibility of exercising increased scrutiny over the other European Union institutions.

This institution embodies European reconciliation. It matters that we are here in Alsace today as a living symbol of how far we have come. Symbolism is important, but this House is so much more. Over the years, consecutive treaties have allowed our house of democracy to develop into a powerful, independent political forum with co-legislative and budgetary powers that impact millions of European citizens – that protects the best interests of citizens, that reflects and amplifies the voice of 500 million people.

Today, the European Parliament has become the only directly elected, multilingual, multi-party transnational parliament in the world. Its 705 directly elected members are the expression of European public opinion.

With an ongoing illegal war in Ukraine that destroys, kills and undermines the political will of a people, we are reminded again of the importance of upholding the democratic values and voice of citizens, and the democratic European values that this House stands for.

That is why it is important that we mark the European Parliament's 70th anniversary. It is important that we pause to reflect on our achievements: the achievement of getting Europeans to seek and find compromise and to come together to adopt a common agenda for the benefit of us all; the achievement of making our shared space a little bit safer, a little bit fairer, a little bit more equal; the achievement of creating a union of rights, of values, of solidarity, of equality, of peace, of hope.

From the ashes of war, we have found the wisdom, the courage and the humanity to choose to stand together, to tear down walls and unite people and nations. Together we can continue our mission to tackle generational inequalities, to fight crippling poverty, to keep us safer and ensure our security, to ensure equality of opportunity, to fight discrimination, to stand up for women, to show our LGBTIQ community that this truly is a freedom zone, to create a framework for prosperity and economic growth, to beat climate change, to help create jobs, to ensure dignity to all.

I am not here to say that we are perfect. We are not. Our processes sometimes frustrate. Progress is not always fast enough, or deep enough or easy enough. We must keep reforming, we must keep pushing for positive change, day-in day-out. But I am proud of our achievements, of our way, of Europe being a beacon of the defence of democracy, of the way that we have never been indifferent, of how we have never looked away.

Friends, Europe is the answer to so many of the questions our people ask of us. It is a way of life and a way of living. It was no coincidence that the EU flag was raised over Kherson after so many months of brutal occupation. It is because it symbolises hope, courage and belief. This is the legacy of our Europe, the legacy of this House, the legacy of the last 70 years.

C'est à ce titre que les membres de ce Parlement, que j'ai l'honneur de présider, se retrouvent pour voter démocratiquement, tous les mois, à Strasbourg. C'est pour le respect des droits de l'homme que ce Parlement mène un combat pour le peuple voisin, en peine de démocratie. Et c'est pour honorer les besoins actuels de nos citoyens européens, durement impactés par l'inflation et le coût de la vie, que nous continuerons à chercher, encore et encore, des solutions à nos défis communs.

Ladies and gentlemen, I now invite you to watch a video clip prepared for the 70th anniversary of the European Parliament.

(the video clip was broadcast in the Chamber)

Alexander De Croo, *Prime Minister of the Kingdom of Belgium*. – Madam President, ladies and gentlemen, today's Europe is not necessarily pushed forward by visionary leaders like the ones we know from our history books – Schuman, Spinelli, Spaak. Today, Europe's political project is mainly driven forward by visionary citizens, by the people of Europe.

And that is not abnormal. We do not live anymore in the 1950s. People today are empowered. They are more demanding towards those who are in positions of leadership. And, all in all, that is a healthy evolution, because free and autonomous citizens, together with a free and independent press, are the core of our democracy. They are the guarantee of strong democratic accountability.

We have felt that public pressure during the COVID crisis. While politicians tended to point out that, from an institutional point of view, healthcare was a national competency and vaccines were none of Europe's business, it was public opinion, it was the people of Europe who paved the way for a European response to the pandemic. As President von der Leyen coined it very candidly: this is Europe's moment.

And we now see exactly the same happening in this energy crisis. It is Europeans who see that the energy markets are international, not national. That energy prices are being used as a geopolitical weapon. That individual Member States hit the limits of what they can do on their own. But that Europe should not be impotent. That our sovereignty – our ability to act – is not only at a national level but at a European level.

And, you know, that insight is not new to European citizens. It was already the case before the energy crisis broke out. In 2019, 90% of Europeans thought it was also Europe's task to guarantee the security of energy supply and to keep energy prices under control.

Ladies and gentlemen, this House probably captures best the impatience of our population, because you know from experience what it is to fight long and hard for your rightful place in the Union. The European Parliament has always been the first institution in the formal sense: first in the Treaties and first in protocol.

But for a long time, it was not first in policy-making. In the words of Professor David Farrell, for much of its life the European Parliament could have been labelled a 'multilingual talking shop'. But today, it is 'one of the most powerful legislators in the world'. Today, we Europeans can be proud of the road we have travelled together.

Madame la Présidente, Mesdames et Messieurs, cela étant dit, le travail est loin d'être terminé. La démocratie est une œuvre sans cesse inachevée. Si l'on veut réellement renforcer notre démocratie, il faut aussi s'attacher à renforcer ce Parlement européen.

Il aurait été bizarre de ne pas avoir d'applaudissements par rapport à cela!… Tous les défis majeurs – quels qu'ils soient: la guerre en Ukraine, les flux migratoires, les prix de l'énergie –, tous ces défis se jouent au niveau international. Nous devons donc renforcer notre démocratie à ce même niveau international, à notre niveau européen. Car le monde change et nous devons changer avec lui. Nous le disons souvent au public, à nos électeurs: il est temps de changer. Mais peut-être devrions-nous plus souvent le dire à nous-mêmes.

De nombreux pays aux frontières orientales de l'Europe, dans les Balkans occidentaux, mais aussi en Ukraine, en Moldavie, conçoivent leur avenir dans notre famille. Et cette nouvelle réalité devrait nous pousser à repenser nos repères. Elle nous force à franchir de nouvelles étapes dans la démocratie européenne pour avoir, dans les années et les décennies à venir, une action qui sera plus décisive et pour être mieux armés pour protéger les intérêts européens dans le monde. Nous comptons sur cette Assemblée pour jouer ce rôle.

Nous continuerons à relier Bruxelles et les citoyens européens. Quelle que soit la voie que nous choisirons, le Parlement européen fera immanquablement un nouveau bond en avant, en devenant vraiment la première institution de l'Europe.

Madam President, ladies and gentlemen, I am optimistic about the future. As you said, our European democracy is far from perfect. It needs continuous improvement. But it is not the delicate plant we thought it to be over the past couple of years. Our democracy is more resilient than we sometimes think, and this Parliament is actually the best proof of that.

I would like to honour the fundamental work this Parliament has done in protecting democracy and the rule of law in Europe. We cannot leave this fight for fundamental rights to the courts only. We politicians also have to do our part of the heavy lifting.

As a member of the European Council, I applaud the persistence of this Parliament and the front-runner role that this Parliament has played in this domain. We need you, we need your support to be a vigilant watchdog in that domain.

Still more has to be done together with you – from the European Green Deal, to energy security and transition to migration reform. We still have 18 months left before the end of this mandate. The Belgian Council Presidency that we will have in 2024 will stand ready to engage with you to successfully close the chapter of this legislature.

Let me be clear: you are a key partner to us, day-in day-out. You are part and parcel of the European fabric and you are also part and parcel of the fabric of my country.

And so I would like to say simply: thank you to the Parliament. Thank you to the Parliament and its leadership, with a special mention of the late President Sassoli. Thank you for the solidarity it has shown with the people of Brussels during the COVID crisis and the Ukraine refugee during this crisis.

Madam President, ladies and gentlemen, let me finish by saying this House represents the catharsis of a long history of violence between European countries. This Parliament represents the victory of humanity over nationalism. It represents the best in us, the best in us Europeans. It is the parliament of parliaments.

And so, we look forward to a year of celebrations with European citizens, but we especially look forward to a year of continuing work together with you.

Xavier Bettel, *Premier ministre du Grand-Duché de Luxembourg*. – Madame la Présidente, Madame la Première ministre, Monsieur le Premier ministre, le film que vous nous avez montré fait remonter de nombreux souvenirs. Des souvenirs de jeunesse. Des souvenirs de personnes avec qui j'ai eu la chance de travailler comme M. Sassoli, des personnes comme celle qui – et c'était votre première présidente élue – pour moi représente ce qu'est l'Europe, Simone Veil.

J'ai un discours institutionnel, Madame la Présidente – je vous donnerai une copie – pour remercier bien sûr tout le monde et pour féliciter et pour souhaiter un bon anniversaire. Mais ce film me pousse à dire autre chose. Alors, bon anniversaire, bons 70 ans! Bien sûr, le Premier ministre De Croo a dit qu'il fallait rapprocher Bruxelles des citoyens. Madame Borne dira sûrement qu'il faut rapprocher Strasbourg des citoyens. Donc je pourrais dire aussi qu'il faut rapprocher Luxembourg des citoyens. Mais je vais seulement vous dire qu'il faut rapprocher chaque capitale de l'Europe et surtout chaque citoyen de ce projet européen que nous connaissons.

Et merci aussi pour le secrétariat général qui est au Grand-Duché de Luxembourg. Je pense que les relations avec le gouvernement luxembourgeois sont aussi très bonnes. Nous continuerons à tout faire pour améliorer la situation des personnes sans lesquelles votre travail ne serait pas possible.

Alors permettez-moi de revenir à ce film et d'expliquer pourquoi parler de Simone Veil. Ici, nous sommes dans une assemblée qui a été créée en 1952, donc avant le traité de Rome. Sept ans auparavant, la France et l'Allemagne et le continent européen étaient en guerre. Sept ans avant, en 1945, on termine la guerre. Sept ans plus tard, on décide de construire quelque chose ensemble, dans une assemblée parlementaire, de vouloir faire quelque chose qu'on n'avait pas fait avant: au lieu de se détruire l'un l'autre, vouloir construire quelque chose ensemble.

Alors, pourquoi Simone Veil me tient tant à cœur, et c'était un symbole si fort de l'avoir élue en 1979? Simone Veil est une rescapée des camps de concentration. Et ces camps de concentration étaient sur notre territoire. Ces camps de concentration sont le résultat d'un nationalisme, d'un extrémisme, du nazisme, d'une des idéologies les plus sombres que l'on ait connues à ce jour sur notre territoire européen. Alors que, Madame la Présidente, encore dans certains pays européens, certains essayent de faire comme si c'était une solution à tous les problèmes et même défendent encore aujourd'hui ou nient l'existence des chambres à gaz, Simone Veil pourrait vous dire ce qu'elle a vécu pendant la Seconde Guerre mondiale.

Et je crois que le chancelier Kohl l'a bien décrit.

Es ist ein Friedensprojekt. Frieden.

Notre continent européen, cette Union européenne n'a pas connu de conflit ni de guerre entre ses pays depuis 1952, depuis 1957. Ce n'est pas toujours facile. Mais nous n'avons pas connu les conflits armés qu'on a connus auparavant. Et n'oublions pas que sur notre propre territoire, à l'époque, un grand nombre d'entre nous n'auraient pas eu le droit de vivre parce qu'ils étaient de gauche, parce qu'ils étaient syndicalistes, parce qu'ils étaient handicapés, parce qu'ils étaient homosexuels, parce qu'ils étaient tout simplement différents de l'idéologie. Aujourd'hui, nous sommes dans un territoire où vous êtes élus par des citoyens qui peuvent exercer ce droit librement. Et ici au Parlement européen, vous avez une tâche qui est tellement importante pour nous, celle de nous rappeler aussi ces valeurs.

Je ne veux pas faire de lien et stigmatiser maintenant l'un ou l'autre. On a tendance dans l'Union européenne à dire ce qui se passe et ce qui ne va pas à l'autre bout du monde, mais je dois vous le dire aussi que même pour nous, dans notre famille européenne, il est important de faire un rappel des valeurs, des règles et de l'épine dorsale qui doit nous unir.

Je suis content et je peux parler de nombreux droits: hier à Malte, une avancée pour la liberté des femmes. Mais aujourd'hui des journalistes, des juges ne peuvent pas exercer leur métier librement dans des pays au sein de l'Union européenne. Certains pays stigmatisent les minorités sexuelles. Est-ce acceptable? Eh non. J'insiste vraiment pour que votre Parlement nous le rappelle et que la conditionnalité par rapport aussi aux valeurs qui sont l'épine dorsale de l'Union européenne fasse partie des décisions que l'on prend.

On a l'impression que la paix est quelque chose d'acquis, que les droits sont quelque chose d'acquis. Et je le sens moi-même. Vous savez, moi-même, j'ai parlé de cette Seconde Guerre mondiale et j'ai déjà fait cette comparaison à d'autres endroits, mais je vous le dis aussi aujourd'hui: je suis fier d'avoir, ici aussi, autant de jeunes assis autour, car c'est vous le projet européen.

Pendant la Seconde Guerre mondiale, je n'aurais, moi-même, pas eu le droit de vivre, étant libéral, étant d'origine juive par ma famille, étant marié à un homme belge, ça n'a rien à voir, mais c'est tout simplement le fait d'être homosexuel, d'être d'origine juive et d'être libéral qui m'aurait condamné trois fois à mort. Et aujourd'hui, je suis libre devant vous. Je suis un chef de gouvernement élu et c'est ça le projet européen.

On est peut-être différents, on a des opinions différentes, on a des origines différentes, mais cette richesse n'est pas une limite. C'est la richesse de notre continent européen, cette diversité. Et ne la laissons pas être détruite. Et si nous fêtons cette année les 70 ans du Parlement européen, cette diversité doit rester la force. Ne nous laissons pas diviser, que ce soit au niveau du Conseil européen, au niveau du Parlement, au niveau de la Commission européenne. Et je remercie la Présidente de la Commission européenne et les membres de la Commission européenne qui nous rappellent les obligations que nous nous sommes données. L'Europe, ce n'est pas que recevoir, c'est aussi donner pour avoir quelque chose de plus grand ensemble aujourd'hui, ne l'oublions pas.

Bon anniversaire, et j'espère pouvoir compter, Madame la Présidente, sur vous et votre Parlement pour nous rappeler régulièrement ces valeurs.

Élisabeth Borne, *Première ministre de la République française*. – Madame la Présidente du Parlement européen, Madame la Présidente de la Commission européenne, Messieurs les Premiers ministres, Mesdames et Messieurs les Présidents des parlements nationaux, Mesdames et Messieurs les Commissaires, Mesdames et Messieurs les députés, Mesdames et Messieurs, depuis 70 ans, la France a l'honneur et la fierté d'accueillir ici même à Strasbourg, le centre de la vie démocratique de notre Union, le Parlement européen.

Soixante-dix ans. Une institution née au lendemain de la guerre, aux premières heures d'une Europe voulue pour assurer la paix et qui, très tôt, a eu l'intuition qu'il fallait un dialogue et une construction politique. Une institution marquée par des femmes et des hommes: c'est Robert Schuman, parmi les pères fondateurs; c'est Simone Veil, la première femme à présider le Parlement européen; c'est David Sassoli, ce grand Européen qui nous a quittés début 2022. C'est vous toutes et tous, les élus des citoyens européens, qui en portez les voix et les aspirations.

Soixante-dix ans. C'est l'occasion de revenir sur une histoire, un parcours marqué par des conquêtes essentielles. Conquête du suffrage universel d'abord. Dans un premier temps, les députés européens ont été désignés par les parlements nationaux, puis le suffrage universel direct a été entériné en 1976 et les premières élections se sont tenues en juin 1979. Dès lors, et depuis plus de 40 ans, vous êtes devenus non seulement les députés européens, mais les députés des Européens, qui les représentez directement. Conquête de compétences, ensuite. Alors qu'il n'avait au début qu'un rôle de supervision, le Parlement européen n'a cessé de gagner des pouvoirs plus étendus, prenant de nouvelles compétences en matière de contrôle ou en matière législative à chaque révision des traités européens, jusqu'au traité de Lisbonne en 2009, qui a consacré la codécision comme procédure législative ordinaire.

Tout ceci s'est fait au bénéfice du Parlement européen, bien sûr, mais surtout au bénéfice de l'Europe tout entière. Car là où le Parlement européen a gagné en compétences, l'Europe a gagné en démocratie. Et cette démocratie, nous ne cesserons jamais de la défendre. À l'heure où certains l'attaquent en Ukraine, à l'heure où les régimes autoritaires veulent la faire passer pour faible, nous devons être fiers de notre démocratie, fiers de nos valeurs. Car n'oublions pas que derrière l'invasion de l'Ukraine, ce sont bien la démocratie et les droits humains que la Russie attaque, c'est-à-dire le fondement même de ce qui nous rassemble ici.

Par la vigueur de son action, par sa détermination à défendre l'égalité, la liberté et la solidarité, le Parlement européen apporte un démenti cinglant à ces tentatives destructrices. Le cœur de la démocratie bat ici même, à Strasbourg, depuis 70 ans.

Un anniversaire, c'est aussi l'occasion de se projeter dans l'avenir. L'avenir immédiat, c'est celui de la fin de cette législature, où tant de chantiers majeurs sont engagés. Je pense à plusieurs législations essentielles: pour la transition écologique, avec le paquet «Fit for 55»; pour la réforme de l'espace Schengen, ce bien si précieux pour nos concitoyens; pour la conquête de notre souveraineté, de nos souverainetés – énergétique, numérique, technologique, stratégique –, en mettant en œuvre l'agenda de Versailles. Cette liste n'est bien sûr pas exhaustive. Elle montre néanmoins que vous êtes au cœur de tous les défis de notre temps.

Les prochains mois seront chargés. Vous pouvez compter sur la France pour favoriser des accords et travailler à une Europe plus forte, plus solidaire, plus souveraine. Sous l'autorité du Président de la République, nous nous y emploierons. Viendra ensuite le temps des élections du Parlement européen. Cette respiration démocratique, tous les cinq ans, est structurante dans la vie de l'Union. Je forme un vœu: que cette élection soit l'occasion de vrais débats dans nos pays pour que nous puissions continuer à construire ensemble une Europe des actes, une Europe au service de nos concitoyens.

Mesdames et Messieurs les députés, je terminerai mon propos par là où j'ai commencé, en évoquant Strasbourg. Strasbourg est un symbole, une ville qui porte en elle la marque de l'histoire. Dans ces temps où les nationalismes progressent et tentent de réécrire le passé, dans ces temps où la guerre revient sur le continent européen, nous ne devons jamais cesser de rappeler d'où vient l'Europe, ce qu'elle a subi, pourquoi nous l'avons faite et ce qu'elle a accompli. En incarnant la réconciliation des peuples européens, Strasbourg montre la force de l'Union et la puissance de la paix. Chaque mois, quand les acteurs européens se retrouvent tous à Strasbourg, c'est de fait à notre histoire et à l'idée même de l'Europe qu'ils rendent hommage. Bien sûr, des questions pratiques peuvent exister et mon gouvernement est pleinement engagé pour y apporter des réponses. Mais cela ne doit pas nous détourner de l'essentiel. Au fond, Strasbourg, c'est une certaine idée de l'Europe. L'idée d'une Europe qui se construit et s'écrit en différents endroits du territoire européen, d'une Europe qui a son passé et son avenir en commun.

Cette Europe-là, cette Europe riche de la diversité de ses habitants et de ses territoires, c'est le meilleur remède contre les discours délétères sur une Europe technocratique et déconnectée. La vitalité du Parlement européen, c'est la vitalité de l'Europe et c'est pourquoi je souhaitais célébrer cet anniversaire important pour l'Union avec vous toutes et tous, membres du Parlement européen, et à travers vous avec tous les Européens, car cet anniversaire important nous concerne tous.

Manfred Weber, *Chair of the Group of the European People's Party.* – Madam President of the European Parliament, Commission President, dear prime ministers, 70 years of the European Parliament, our Parliament. I have to share with you my personal experience. When I entered the first time into this institution, into this building, I fell immediately in love with this institution. I experienced a parliament where everybody counts. I was young, 31 years old, and I immediately got the trust of my colleagues to deal with an important piece of legislation, in the LIBE file, in the LIBE Committee. Dear colleagues, when you understand that diversity, to have a colourful perspective about different ideas to solve problems, when you understand that this diversity is an advantage, then you fell in love with the European Parliament and that is what I did when entered here the first time.

It is a very thin line here in this House to have on the one hand the party political position in mind but also the majority position, and you are defending the interests of this institution, the chamber of the European citizens. It is not the party that is in the centre here, not the Chancellor, not the Prime Minister, not even the Commission President, it is the bigger 'we', the bigger common interest which finally is driving this institution.

70 years ago, we hear that our colleagues gathered here in Strasbourg for the first time, seven years – you said it, Prime Minister – after the brutal Second World War had ended. Unbelievable bravery what they showed to us as Europeans. Today, it's now the right moment to celebrate this. The House of Democracy: a place where all Europeans are represented, a place where our political ideas from the common good bring us together, a place where a multinational parliament with broad, real legislative power like no other in the world is present.

My group, the EPP, has always believed that only a democratic Europe – with a strong parliamentarian democracy – is a Europe which has future. Since its first official meeting of my group in June 53, my group contributed to strengthening this House, to being ambitious in the leadership in the spirit of cooperation with other political forces and together we were successful.

But now we can go further, probably even much further. After this big success in 2014, when the first time this House – Jean-Claude Juncker, Martin Schulz – managed that the Commission President was based mainly on the majority here in this House, in 2019 we made other experiences. Now we have to prepare 2024. And the idea behind this is that people see that if they go to vote, they participate, they decide about the majorities, we come here together as elected people, and then we decide the programme and also the candidates for the next five years who has the power to do it. The people in Europe see the direct link between their participation in elections and then the outcome in political terms. That is what we want to guarantee. And don't get me wrong, as an EPP Group leader and as EPP President, I am very proud that the first elected female president of the European Commission is an EPP candidate and the youngest President of the European Parliament, also a female candidate, is an EPP member, so we do not need a quota for this, we are very proud about this.

When we speak about the strengthening of democracy, I want to underline that we should not continue legislative proposals based on Article 122, sounds technical but is very democratically important. We have to strengthen the European Parliament with the full right of legislative initiatives, with full rights on the budget and with the full right of investigation in the interest of our citizens.

So there is still a way in front of us. And I see the Council members now in front of me, I would ask you, I really count on you, that Council members are not doing these speeches here in this House but also when they are at home, that we really are strong in developing even a stronger European Parliament.

And at a time when democracy is under attack, like it is in Ukraine, we have to be the beacon of democracy for Europe and the world. It's a great honour to serve in this institution. All the best for the upcoming 70 years.

Iratxe García Pérez, *presidenta del Grupo de la Alianza Progresista de Socialistas y Demócratas.* – Señora presidenta, señorías, esta es una conmemoración peculiar, podríamos decir, porque la Asamblea de la CECA poco tenía que ver con este Parlamento. Para empezar, tenía setenta y ocho miembros de seis países y además eran delegados de los Parlamentos nacionales. Y digo bien: delegados, porque solo había una mujer. Y, es cierto, hoy tenemos una presidenta de la Comisión Europea —y aquí tengo que corregir un poquito al presidente Weber porque no es una candidata del PPE, es nuestra presidenta—, votada y apoyada por esta Cámara, igual que la presidenta del Parlamento Europeo. Representan a instituciones y representan lo que todos y todas defendemos.

La Asamblea en ese momento no tenía un edificio y le prestaron la sala del Consejo de Europa. Fíjense, ahora tenemos este estupendo edificio.

Con las elecciones directas de 1979 y con el aumento de las competencias, esta casa se ha transformado totalmente. Pero, quizá, el cambio más evidente es que hoy estamos aquí representando a 500 millones de europeos y europeas de veintisiete países. Aquella era una Europa seccionada por el telón de acero. El primer presidente de la Asamblea, Paul-Henry Spaak, dijo que la Comunidad no nacía contra nadie, sino por la libertad, para que cada vez más personas se beneficiaran de la paz y la prosperidad que traen la democracia y el Estado de Derecho.

Así ha sido, aunque falten países. Acabo de estar en Macedonia del Norte y en Albania, que empiezan ahora las negociaciones. Y vendrán otros, como Ucrania y Moldavia. Lo importante es profundizar en la democracia, que es la piedra fundamental, porque no hay guerras entre democracias.

Como digo, las cosas cambian porque este es un Parlamento vivo. La Conferencia sobre el Futuro de Europa nos ha dado pistas de cuál es el camino que debemos seguir y cómo debemos reaccionar más rápidamente frente a las crisis, hacer una mejor gestión de las migraciones, avanzar en las políticas sociales y basarnos en la solidaridad. Todo esto significa avanzar en una unión más política. Y esto es precisamente lo que no ha cambiado: nuestro objetivo, una unión cada vez más estrecha.

Y a los parlamentarios les lanzo un mensaje muy claro: somos representantes, no cada uno de su país, sino del conjunto de la comunidad. Yo, al menos, así lo siento cuando personas de Hungría y Polonia nos piden que no los abandonemos en la deriva autoritaria de sus Gobiernos.

Algunas voces dicen hoy que la Unión se ha desviado de los orígenes. Pero eso no es cierto. Porque los miembros de aquella Cámara de 1952 entendían perfectamente que la democracia europea no debilita la nacional, sino que la refuerza. Lo mismo que la ciudadanía europea complementa y potencia la ciudadanía nacional.

Ahora nos toca a nosotras y a nosotros mantener el espíritu y adaptarnos a los nuevos tiempos.

Stéphane Séjourné, *Président du groupe Renew Europe*. – Madame la Présidente, Madame la Première ministre, Messieurs les Premiers ministres, ce Parlement, tout comme notre aventure européenne, est un miracle politique, un miracle politique de tous les jours. Dans ses 24 langues officielles et dans ses trois sièges, à Strasbourg, à Bruxelles et au Luxembourg. Au centre de cet hémicycle, des centaines de partis nationaux de 27 pays arrivent à se mettre d'accord sur les lois climatiques, les droits numériques, les budgets agricoles, les salaires minimums et tant d'autres sujets, souvent même avant les autres institutions européennes. Je pense notamment à l'achat des vaccins, aux plans de relance et maintenant au plafonnement des prix de l'énergie. Ce Parlement a été le premier à demander et à voter sur ces propositions.

Et les Européens ne s'y trompent pas, puisque dès 2019, ils ont été plus de 18 millions de plus à aller voter aux urnes. Inédit depuis 20 ans. Dans certains pays, les taux de participation ont même dépassé les taux de participation aux élections nationales. Les Européens comprennent mieux que leurs médias, c'est sûr, mieux que leur propre gouvernement parfois, que c'est ici que s'améliore le quotidien et s'écrit l'avenir de nos concitoyens. Et c'est pour cela qu'il faut aller au bout de la logique de la Conférence sur l'avenir de l'Europe que nous avons initiée ici au Parlement européen.

Plus de pouvoir pour cette assemblée, c'est plus d'efficacité pour l'Europe. Donnez-nous le droit d'initiative et vous aurez les clés en main sur notamment les questions d'inflation, d'énergie, d'asile et d'immigration que nous avons encore à traiter dans les prochains mois et dans les prochaines années avant la fin de cette mandature. Donnez-nous plus de pouvoirs budgétaires et vous aurez plus d'investissements dans la souveraineté européenne. Donnez-nous les listes transnationales et vous aurez à traiter une partie du défi démocratique de l'Union européenne.

Alors, je sais que mon groupe peut compter sur le soutien des Premiers ministres ici présents. Je les en remercie. Je demande aussi aux autres groupes de les convaincre et d'aller convaincre l'ensemble des gouvernements sur ces fondamentaux. L'Assemblée parlementaire européenne est élue au suffrage universel dans 27 pays avec un pouvoir de colégislateur. Il y a 70 ans, tout cela était un rêve. Aujourd'hui, cela est une réalité. Alors, surprenons-nous à voir encore plus loin pour la démocratie européenne, pour nos concitoyens, pour que 18 millions d'électeurs de plus rejoignent les urnes en 2024. Merci, Madame la Présidente, merci pour l'organisation de cet événement et bon anniversaire au Parlement européen.

Philippe Lamberts, *Coprésident du groupe des Verts/Alliance libre européenne*. – Madame la Présidente, le 14 juillet 2009, je siégeais pour la première fois au Parlement européen. Je n'oublierai jamais la fierté qui était la mienne de devenir l'un des 736 représentants chargés d'œuvrer à l'intérêt général de 500 millions de citoyennes et de citoyens européens. Je peux vous le dire, et c'est un peu l'émotion, cette fierté est intacte en ce jour où nous célébrons les 70 ans de notre Parlement.

L'Union européenne est la première tentative au monde de réaliser une démocratie transnationale et si elle demeure une construction imparfaite et incomplète, elle est plus que jamais un prototype à développer, dans un monde de plus en plus morcelé et polarisé. Ensemble, nous ne représentons que 5,6 % de la population mondiale. Aussi, agir ensemble, unis dans notre diversité, est la condition sine qua non de l'affirmation de notre souveraineté, souveraineté étant entendue comme notre capacité à faire ensemble et de manière autonome les choix qui déterminent notre avenir.

Si tel est notre objectif, le Parlement européen me semble devoir relever trois défis dans son rôle de représentant direct des citoyennes et des citoyens européens.

Le premier défi est celui de l'ambition. Garder notre planète habitable pour les humains, réduire les injustices sociales grandissantes, ouvrir un avenir aux humains forcés de quitter leur pays, établir des relations internationales fondées sur le droit et non sur la violence, notre monde est confronté à des épreuves existentielles. Pour nous, la tentation peut être grande de se recroqueviller dans un confort idéalisé, celui d'un passé fantasmé. Si l'Union européenne veut se forger un avenir au XXI^{e} siècle, elle doit au contraire redoubler d'audace et retrouver un esprit pionnier.

Le deuxième défi est celui du compromis. Tout autour de nous et au sein même de nos pays, la polarisation de nos sociétés en blocs antagonistes semble inéluctable. Au contraire, et plus que jamais, notre Parlement doit démontrer la force du dialogue et du compromis, qui seuls peuvent accoucher de solutions pérennes, garantes de la possibilité pour tous de vivre ensemble en paix. Prouvons que notre diversité et nos différences, loin d'être des handicaps, sont autant d'atouts pour construire notre avenir.

Le troisième défi est celui de la préservation de la démocratie et de l'état de droit, c'est-à-dire des fondations mêmes sur lesquelles est construite notre Union. Sans elles, ni la paix ni la prospérité, conditions essentielles de la dignité humaine pour toutes et tous, ne peuvent durablement exister. Au siècle dernier, l'Europe a vu des démocraties sombrer, prélude aux horreurs de la Seconde Guerre mondiale. Nous le savons, ce régime politique, dont Churchill a dit qu'il était le pire à l'exception de tous les autres, est fragile et mortel. Et au nom de l'urgence, de l'opportunité ou tout simplement de l'accaparement du pouvoir, nous voyons les assauts auxquels la démocratie et l'état de droit sont soumis au sein même de notre Union. Le Parlement européen doit répondre à ces assauts, quels que soient l'État membre où ils se passent ou l'appartenance politique de ceux qui les commettent.

Mais n'oublions jamais que les démocraties meurent d'abord de la perte de confiance de nos sociétés dans leurs institutions et dans celles qui les incarnent… celles et ceux qui les incarnent – oui, il y a encore quelques hommes, mais tu as raison, c'étaient beaucoup d'hommes au début. Il nous appartient de prendre toute notre part à la restauration de cette confiance en adoptant constamment comme unique boussole, pour tous les actes que nous posons, l'intérêt général et pas l'intérêt de quelques-uns.

Je crois notre assemblée capable de relever ces défis et de s'affirmer plus que jamais comme le lieu par excellence où se construit notre avenir commun.

Marco Zanni, *Presidente del Gruppo Identità e Democrazia*. – Signora Presidente, signora Presidente von der Leyen, signori Primi ministri, onorevoli colleghi, sono trascorsi settant'anni dalla creazione dell'Assemblea comune della Comunità europea del carbone e dell'acciaio.

Era il 1952 e l'Europa era molto diversa da quella che conosciamo oggi. Le grandi guerre erano alle spalle e ci preparavamo a un futuro di pace e di sviluppo con grande speranza. All'epoca i parlamentari – è stato ricordato anche prima – erano soltanto 78 ed erano nominati dai parlamenti nazionali degli Stati membri. Oggi siamo quasi dieci volte tanto, 705, e ciascuno di noi è qui perché sono stati i cittadini con il loro voto a scegliere che fossimo noi qui a rappresentarli.

Credo sia necessario anche in questa ricorrenza ricordare a tutti, ma prima di tutto a noi stessi, il valore della democrazia e il rispetto che dobbiamo ai cittadini che rappresentiamo in quest'Aula. Il peso e la misura delle nostre azioni in ambito parlamentare devono essere guidati dall'importanza delle sfide che ci aspettano e dalle speranze che le persone, i cittadini, ripongono nell'Istituzione di cui facciamo parte. E democrazia in un contesto di peculiarità nazionali, di sensibilità diverse e di culture che sono vicine, ma che mantengono un'identità propria vuol dire anzitutto rispetto di queste differenze e non appiattimento su un modello di pensiero unico.

Bisogna motivare tutti a ritrovare quel senso di comune interesse nel fronteggiare le sfide e nel trovare soluzioni efficienti e rapide al momento cupo che stiamo attraversando, purtroppo, e vi invito a riflettere, a recuperare proprio quello spirito, che nel 1952 aveva dato la spinta per la creazione di quel che questa Istituzione è oggi. All'epoca, infatti, fu proprio attraverso la CECA che gli Stati espressero tutta l'importanza di elementi tanto fondamentali per garantire autonomia, sviluppo e una strategia al continente.

Risorse ed energia: due temi di straordinaria attualità anche oggi. Proprio questo dato dovrebbe spingerci a chiederci: come siamo arrivati al punto in cui ci troviamo oggi? Perché abbiamo deciso, dapprima politicamente, poi nei fatti, di delegare ad altri questioni così strategiche? Perché anche a livello industriale abbiamo ceduto alle sirene di una globalizzazione indiscriminata? Delocalizzazione, dipendenza da paesi terzi in fatto di energia e sostanziale perdita di autonomia sono gli errori che ci hanno condotti a dover trovare oggi, in tutta fretta, soluzioni a una crisi che purtroppo non ci abbandonerà tanto presto.

Io credo che dai nostri predecessori abbiamo molto da imparare e mi auguro che l'odierna ricorrenza motivi ognuno di noi a recuperare le radici di questo progetto e a dare una linea diversa al presente, ma soprattutto al nostro futuro.

E, in conclusione, c'è ancora una cosa che credo manchi a questa istituzione per potersi dire pienamente realizzata: la condivisione di responsabilità e valori con le opposizioni democratiche che rappresentano milioni di cittadini europei. Quando arriveremo a questo passaggio, potremo davvero affermare che la democrazia è finalmente rispettata e rappresentata appieno anche in quest'Aula e in questa Istituzione.

Ryszard Antoni Legutko, *Chair of the European Conservatives and Reformists Group*. – Madam President, Prime Ministers, two minutes of truth, of bitter truth. The bitter truth is that the European Parliament has done a lot of damage in Europe.

It has been sending a false message that it represents the European demos. There isn't, and there won't be any European demos.

The Parliament has infected Europe with shameless partisanship and the infection became so contagious that it spread to other institutions such as the European Commission. The Parliament has abandoned the basic function of representing people. Instead, it has become a machine to implement the so-called European project, thus alienating millions of voters. The Parliament has become a political vehicle of the left to impose their monopoly with their fierce intolerance towards any dissenting view.

No matter how many times you repeat the word 'diversity', diversity is becoming an extinct species in the European Union, and particularly in this Chamber. The Parliament is a quasi parliament because it rejects the essential principle of parliamentarism – namely accountability. The deputy, let me remind you, is elected by the voters and must be accountable to the voters that elected him. Not so in the European Union. The idea that, say, Spanish, German, French, etc. deputies, accountable to their own national electorates, can dictate something to, shall we say, Hungarian society or any other society to which they cannot be held accountable and which cannot take them to task is simply preposterous.

Colleagues, call it what you will, but democracy it is not. To sum up, the Parliament represents the genius that does not exist, works for the project that ignores reality and law, shuns accountability, turns its back on millions of people and serves the interests of one political orientation – and this is just the tip of the iceberg.

Having said that, ladies and gentlemen, I rest my case.

President. – Professor Legutko, with your two minutes you have indeed proven that pluralism, diversity and democracy actually exist in this House.

Manon Aubry, *Coprésidente du groupe The Left*. – Madame la Présidente, Madame la Présidente de la Commission, Mesdames et Messieurs les Premiers ministres, nous célébrons aujourd'hui l'anniversaire de la création du Parlement européen. Mais son histoire, on l'a vu aujourd'hui, démontre tout le chemin qu'il reste encore à parcourir afin de mettre réellement de la démocratie dans les institutions européennes. Je viens d'écouter mon collègue M. Legutko et manifestement il y a encore un long chemin à parcourir parce que j'ai envie de l'inviter à quitter cet hémicycle si lui-même n'a pas envie de participer à l'élaboration des directives européennes.

Un élément symptomatique de cela également: vous ne le savez peut-être pas, chers collègues, mais initialement, ces allocutions des Premiers ministres étaient prévues sans prise de parole des présidents de groupe. Et c'est uniquement à la demande de notre groupe que l'on a procédé à ce débat qui est certes très limité. Je pense que beaucoup dans cet hémicycle auraient aimé un échange plus approfondi. C'est donc une invitation à venir continuer le débat à nos côtés.

Mais si l'on reprend l'histoire du Parlement européen, déjà la naissance du Parlement s'appuie sur un choix initial qui est lourd de sens: le refus de faire élire au suffrage universel les parlementaires européens. Rendez-vous compte qu'il a fallu attendre vingt-sept ans pour que les premiers eurodéputés soient directement choisis par les citoyens. Vingt-sept ans pour obtenir ce qui relève pourtant de l'évidence démocratique la plus absolue. Alors j'ai envie de demander aujourd'hui: combien de décennies faudra-t-il attendre avant que nous, eurodéputés, ayons enfin le droit d'initier des propositions de loi? Combien de décennies avant que notre Parlement ait un pouvoir décisionnel sur l'ensemble des textes de loi adoptés par l'Union et puisse ainsi peut-être agir davantage contre l'évasion fiscale et notamment un de ces pays moteurs de l'évasion fiscale en Europe, le bien nommé Luxembourg? Combien de décennies encore avant que les deals politiques européens ne se fassent plus entre portes closes et que les chefs de gouvernement assument leurs choix politiques? Combien de décennies avant que les référendums d'initiative citoyenne soient contraignants et que la Commission soit obligée d'y donner suite? L'Union européenne est la seule démocratie au monde où trop souvent les lobbies font plus la loi que les représentants du peuple et les citoyens eux-mêmes. Cela n'est plus possible.

Alors, je vous ai entendus, Madame la Première ministre française, Madame Borne, et vous, Monsieur De Croo et Monsieur Bettel, nous expliquer que la démocratie européenne devait et allait être renforcée. Mais comment osez-vous, Madame Borne, venir parler de démocratie au lendemain de votre cinquième 49.3? Cette aberration bien étrange pour nos collègues européens qui permet au gouvernement de passer en force et de faire adopter des textes malgré l'opposition du Parlement. Je le dis, il n'y aura pas de 49.3 au Parlement européen. Et comment osez-vous vous présenter, ici à Strasbourg, comme une grande démocrate, quand vous n'avez de cesse à Paris de bâillonner le Parlement français?

La question démocratique est pourtant au cœur des attentes des citoyens européens. Les conclusions de la Conférence sur l'avenir de l'Europe étaient d'ailleurs très claires à ce sujet. Les citoyens ne veulent pas d'une Europe-marché qui ne fonctionne que sur la concurrence, le libre-échange ou les intérêts des plus riches. Alors, plutôt que de commémorer un passé fantasmé, les dirigeants européens devraient enfin s'atteler à cette refonte totale des traités qui est attendue par tant d'entre nous, ici, dans cet hémicycle et à l'extérieur.

President. – On that note, distinguished guests, fellow Europeans, I would like to invite you to stand for the anthem of the European Union.

(Beethoven's Ode to Joy was sung by the choir 'Les voix de Stras' in the Chamber)

(The sitting was suspended at 12.51)

VORSITZ: KATARINA BARLEY

Vizepräsidentin

6. Wiederaufnahme der Sitzung

(Die Sitzung wird um 12.56 Uhr wieder aufgenommen.)

Marco Zanni (ID). – Signora Presidente, onorevoli colleghi, solo per ricordare che questa mattina è purtroppo scomparso l'onorevole Roberto Maroni, già vicepresidente del Consiglio italiano, più volte ministro di governi della Repubblica, per tanti anni deputato e governatore della regione Lombardia.

Un vuoto che lascia nella politica, alla quale ha dato un contributo importante nei suoi ruoli istituzionali, anche nella costruzione delle istituzioni europee negli ultimi trent'anni, ma soprattutto ci lascia l'uomo ben voluto, sempre pragmatico e sempre pronto alla discussione anche con l'avversario politico. Ci faceva piacere che anche oggi quest'Aula lo ricordasse nel suo impegno come politico italiano e come politico europeo.

Monika Beňová (S&D). – Vážená pani predsedajúca, ja viem, že chceme všetci rýchlo hlasovať, ale prepáčte mi. Chcem sa veľmi ostro ohradiť proti nedávnemu vystúpeniu maďarského premiéra Viktora Orbána. A chcem poprosiť kolegyne a kolegov z Fideszu, ktorých rešpektujem, aby povedali svojmu premiérovi, že Slovensko, Rumunsko a ďalšie krajiny sú suverénnymi štátmi. Pri príležitosti dnešnej oslavy výročia chcem požiadať, aby Maďarsko rešpektovalo územnú celistvosť Rumunska a Slovenska.

7. Abstimmungsstunde

Die Präsidentin. – Als nächster Punkt der Tagesordnung folgt die Abstimmung.

(Abstimmungsergebnisse und sonstige Einzelheiten der Abstimmung: siehe Protokoll.)

7.1. Änderung der Verordnung (EU, Euratom) 2020/2093 des Rates vom 17. Dezember 2020 zur Festlegung des mehrjährigen Finanzrahmens für den Zeitraum von 2021 bis 2027 (C9-0386/2022) (Abstimmung)

7.2. Änderung der Verordnung (EU, Euratom) 2018/1046 im Hinblick auf die Festlegung einer diversifizierten Finanzierungsstrategie als allgemeine Methode für die Mittelaufnahme (C9-0374/2022) (Abstimmung)

7.3. Instrument zur Unterstützung der Ukraine im Jahr 2023 (Makrofinanzhilfe+) (C9-0373/2022) (Abstimmung)

7.4. Vorschlag, ein Gutachten des Gerichtshofs zum Zweiten Zusatzprotokoll zum Übereinkommen über Computerkriminalität einzuholen (Abstimmung)

7.5. Ernennung eines Mitglieds des Rechnungshofs – Keit Pentus-Rosimannus (A9-0272/2022 - Mikuláš Peksa) (Abstimmung)

7.6. Rechnungsabschluss der Europäischen Agentur für die Grenz- und Küstenwache für das Haushaltsjahr 2020 (B9-0488/2022) (Abstimmung)

7.7. Protokoll zum Europa-Mittelmeer-Interimsassoziationsabkommen: Teilnahme der Palästinensischen Behörde für das Westjordanland und den Gaza-Streifen an Programmen der Union (A9-0253/2022 - Manu Pineda) (Abstimmung)

7.8. Ausgewogene Vertretung von Frauen und Männern unter den nicht geschäftsführenden Direktoren börsennotierter Gesellschaften (A9-0275/2022 - Lara Wolters, Evelyn Regner) (Abstimmung)

Dienstag, 22. November 2022

7.9. Resilienz kritischer Einrichtungen (A9-0289/2021 - Michal Šimečka) (Abstimmung)

7.10. Gemeinsame Fischereipolitik (GFP): Beschränkungen des Zugangs zu Unionsgewässern (A9-0206/2022 - Pierre Karleskind) (Abstimmung)

7.11. Entscheidungen der europäischen Normungsorganisationen (A9-0205/2022 - Svenja Hahn) (Abstimmung)

7.12. Grundqualifikation und Weiterbildung der Fahrer bestimmter Kraftfahrzeuge für den Güter- oder Personenkraftverkehr (kodifizierter Text) (A9-0267/2022 - Angel Dzhambazki) (Abstimmung)

7.13. Abkommen zwischen der EU und Neuseeland: Änderung der Zugeständnisse für alle in der EU-Liste CLXXV aufgeführten Zollkontingente (A9-0273/2022 - Daniel Caspary) (Abstimmung)

7.14. Änderung des Beschlusses (EU) 2015/2169 über den Abschluss des Freihandelsabkommens zwischen der Europäischen Union und der Republik Korea (A9-0277/2022 - Catharina Rinzema) (Abstimmung)

7.15. Anleihestrategie zur Finanzierung von NextGenerationEU (A9-0250/2022 - José Manuel Fernandes, Valérie Hayer) (Abstimmung)

7.16. Umsetzungsbericht über den Europäischen Innovationsrat (A9-0268/2022 - Christian Ehler) (Abstimmung)

Die Präsidentin. – Damit ist die Abstimmungsstunde geschlossen.

(Die Sitzung wird für kurze Zeit unterbrochen.)

8. Wiederaufnahme der Sitzung

(Die Sitzung wird um 13.10 Uhr wieder aufgenommen.)

9. Haushaltsverfahren 2023 — gemeinsamer Entwurf (Aussprache)

Die Präsidentin. – Als nächster Punkt der Tagesordnung folgt die Aussprache über den Bericht von Nicolae Ștefănuță und Niclas Herbst im Namen der Delegation des Europäischen Parlaments im Vermittlungsausschuss für Haushaltsfragen über den Standpunkt des Rates zum Entwurf des Gesamthaushaltsplans der Europäischen Union für das Haushaltsjahr 2023 (14783/2022 12108/2022 — C9-0389/2022 C9-0306/2022 – 2022/0212(BUD)) (A9-0278/2022).

Johan Van Overtveldt, *voorzitter Begrotingscommissie*. – Voorzitter, commissaris, collega's. De uitkomst van de conciliatie over de begroting voor 2023 heeft een aantal heroriënteringen en besparingen en ook een aantal belangrijke en noodzakelijke versterkingen opgeleverd. Zo werden er extra middelen vrijgemaakt voor steun aan de Oekraïense samenleving: 290 miljoen in totaal via diverse programma's. Iedereen zal het erover eens zijn dat de Oekraïense samenleving en haar burgers die steun broodnodig hebben. We mogen verwachten dat andere mondiale actoren, zoals de VS, dit voorbeeld zullen volgen.

Naast de noodzakelijke en voor de hand liggende acute uitgaven investeren we via de begroting voor 2023 ook verder in domeinen waarin de EU wel degelijk een verschil kan maken. Dat zijn stappen in de goede richting, maar ze zijn naar mijn smaak te klein en niet ambitieus genoeg. De Europese Unie hangt budgettair nog te veel vast aan beleidsopties uit het verleden die een grote hypotheek leggen op de toekomst. We mogen ons daar niet door laten afremmen.

Ik zou graag een begroting zien die nog meer vooruitkijkt, die nog meer focust in plaats van te versnipperen en die de ambitie uitstraalt om van Europa een koploper te maken op het vlak van onderzoek, ontwikkeling en innovatie. Dringend en noodzakelijk is ook de hertekening van onze aanbodketens, met als doel strategisch minder afhankelijk te zijn van regimes die onze waarden en normen afwijzen. Als u het gevoel hebt dat ik nu vooral China voor ogen heb, dan hebt u goed geconcludeerd.

De geopolitieke context toont ons op diverse fronten dat een dergelijke hertekening noodzakelijk is. Het meerjarig financieel kader zoals het nu bestaat, botst ook op zijn limieten. Het instrument is in zijn huidige vorm niet meer geschikt om antwoorden te kunnen bieden op de grote uitdagingen van vandaag en morgen. Symptomatisch hiervoor is het feit dat er telkens oplossingen en vehikels buiten de begroting op poten moeten worden gezet. Het wijst erop dat het meerjarenkader niet meer geschikt is om alles op de correcte manier te absorberen.

Maar minstens even problematisch is het feit dat de controle op de uitgaven aanzienlijk uitgehold wordt. Op de grote uitgavenposten die zich buiten de reguliere begroting bevinden, zoals het coronaherstelfonds, het RRF, kan dit Parlement zijn controlerende taak niet naar behoren uitoefenen. Het Parlement wordt wel geacht om in te stemmen met de oprichting van dergelijke mechanismen, maar heeft achteraf het raden naar de concrete invulling en besteding van die middelen. Het is mijn taak als voorzitter van de Begrotingscommissie om hierop te wijzen en te blijven wijzen.

VORSITZ: OTHMAR KARAS

Vizepräsident

Nicolae Ștefănuță, *Raportor.* – Doamnule președinte, domnule comisar Hahn, doamna ministră Bek, chiar acum o mamă aprinde cuptorul pentru a găti copiilor singura dată pe săptămâna asta, ca să nu consume gaz, care a devenit atât de scump. Chiar acum, un student din Sibiu renunță la planul de a studia în Franța, pentru că 500 de euro nu mai sunt de mult 500 de euro, ci 420 de euro din cauza inflației, iar chiriile au crescut enorm.

Chiar acum, extremiștii se pregătesc să dea foc Uniunii, iar dacă noi nu răspundem în 2023 acestor crize, în 2024 ne va fi mult prea târziu. Am luptat împreună cu cei care au fost raportori din umbră aici, împreună cu care am fost o echipă, să obținem mai mult pentru Europa și pentru europeni și am obținut cu un miliard de euro mai mult, pentru trei direcții care corespund direcțiilor pe care ni le-au cerut oamenii și acestea sunt energie și facturi mai mici.

Am obținut 80 de milioane în plus pentru Orizont Europa, 100 de milioane în plus pentru Facilitarea Conectarea Europei care finanțează rețele de energie și transport. 30 de milioane în plus pentru Programul LIFE care nu este numai despre mediu, este și despre energie.

Doi, am luptat ca să atenuăm efectele războiului. Am obținut 120 de milioane de euro pentru Erasmus+, pentru studenții care suferă în Europa, 50 de milioane în plus pentru Fondul de azil și din acești bani dorim să vedem bani care merg și pentru Schengen, încât să nu mai avem scuze în ziua de 8 decembrie și să lăsăm România, Bulgaria și Croația să intre, pentru că avem toate dotările necesare. Am obținut 210 milioane de euro pentru Ucraina și pentru Moldova, pentru că acești oameni suferă nu doar de război, suferă și de ger. Și în final ,și este important, pentru Uniunea Europeană, pentru integrarea noastră, am obținut bani în plus, peste 60 de milioane de euro pentru mobilitatea militară, pentru că este important să fim împreună în fața crizelor mondiale.

Să nu uităm un lucru societatea europeană e importantă. Churchill a spus: „dacă tăiem banii de la cultură în timpul războiului, pentru ce mai luptăm?". Exact așa, am luptat ca oamenii din cultură să fie ajutați. Am luptat pentru protecția civilă europeană, am luptat pentru sănătatea europeană care tocmai s-a născut și, nu în ultimul rând, am luptat pentru Parchetul European , condus de Laura Codruța Kovesi, să asigurăm transparența și dreptatea utilizării banilor europeni.

Domnilor și doamnelor, Parlamentul European a luptat în aceste negocieri și răspunde astăzi cu un buget solid de 186 de miliarde de euro. Este un buget foarte important, dar avem o problemă, domnule comisar, dacă noi dăm mai mulți bani pentru politicile de acasă, iar dacă acasă ni se răspunde că nu pot implementa, că nu aduc banii acasă, degeaba ne lăudăm, degeaba spun eu Ștefăniță, domnul Hahn, doamna Bek, că noi sprijinim politicile acestea importante, dacă statele membre nu reușesc și dacă oamenii nu văd rezultatul muncii mele.

Eu cred, domnule președinte, că este o zi bună pentru Europa astăzi. Arătăm unitate, arătăm determinare. Dar hai să vedem, să aducem Europa în casele oamenilor.

Niclas Herbst, *Berichterstatter.* – Herr Präsident, meine sehr verehrten Damen und Herren! Es ist vollbracht: Wir haben ein Ergebnis in unseren Haushaltsverhandlungen. Und das an sich ist schon einmal sehr wichtig, denn ich glaube, es wäre sehr schwer zu vermitteln gewesen, dass wir uns in diesen schwierigen Zeiten sogar über vergleichsweise kleinteilige Themen streiten und es nicht schaffen, einen Haushalt zusammenzubringen.

Trotzdem bleiben auch einige grundlegende Probleme, und ich glaube, das grundlegendste ist, dass wir noch stärker daran arbeiten müssen, auch ins Verständnis aller zu bringen, dass die Europäische Union keine reine Geldverteilungsmaschine sein kann. Es geht darum, dass wir klare Prioritäten setzen, dass wir politische Prioritäten setzen, und ich glaube, dass uns das – und meine beiden Vorredner haben uns darauf hingewiesen – ganz gut gelungen ist als Parlament.

Ich möchte mich auch ganz herzlich bedanken, dass wir – auch über Parteigrenzen hinweg, trotz ja auch unterschiedlicher politischer Sichtweisen auf Prioritäten – es geschafft haben, uns zu einigen und zumindest einige dieser Prioritäten auch haushaltstechnisch verankern zu können.

Für die Zukunft müssen wir lernen, dass wir eben auch mit diesen Prioritäten die Zukunft determinieren. Wir reden über vergleichsweise kleine Beträge. Und wenn man den Gesamthaushalt sieht und den engen Rahmen, den uns der mehrjährige Finanzrahmen bietet, kann man vielleicht an der einen oder anderen Stelle denken: Na ja, das sind nur kleinere Beträge. Aber es geht eben auch darum, für die Zukunft ganz klare Prioritäten zu setzen, und da sind auch kleinere symbolische Beträge manchmal sehr, sehr wichtig.

Wir haben in der Rubrik 7 gesehen, dass die Situation insgesamt sehr schwierig ist. Wir haben als Parlament von Anfang an darauf hingearbeitet, auch hier eine klare Linie zu zeigen. Wir haben es auch gegenüber unserem eigenen Präsidium geschafft, Kürzungen durchzusetzen. Wir haben auf gesetzliche Bestimmungen hingewiesen, auf die Energiesituation. Wir haben einfach eine schwierige Situation, auch in dieser Rubrik.

Aber gerade hier müssen wir auch für die Zukunft lernen. Ich bin sehr froh, dass wir mit dem Thema Cybersecurity einen klaren Schwerpunkt setzen konnten, dass wir es geschafft haben, hier eine echte Verstärkung durchzusetzen, und dass wir uns auch ganz klar dazu *committed* haben und darauf geeinigt haben, dass wir hier auch stark zusammenarbeiten wollen in der Zukunft. Das ist etwas, was wir an dieser Stelle ja auch oft genug betont haben.

Das zeigt eben, dass wir die Herausforderungen der Zukunft auch im Haushalt sehen können müssen. Und wir sagen auch als Parlament, dass wir unserer Rolle als Anwalt der anderen Institutionen gerecht werden wollen; denn Europa funktioniert nur dann, wenn alle Institutionen gut arbeiten können und wenn sie auch finanziell und materiell und auch personell so ausgestattet sind, dass sie ihr Mandat erfüllen können. Das gilt auch für uns als Parlament, wohlwissend, dass uns hier auch eine schwierige Situation bevorsteht, denn die Situation in der Rubrik 7 wird ja nicht einfacher im nächsten Jahr. Wir haben es diesmal ja auch nur relativ knapp geschafft, unter dem Flexibilitätsinstrument zu bleiben. Wir werden auch als Parlament daran arbeiten müssen, dass wir in Zukunft ebenfalls diese Latte nicht reißen. Und deshalb sind wir auch in Zukunft darauf angewiesen, gut zusammenzuarbeiten.

Ich bedanke mich bei den Schattenberichterstattern, ich bedanke mich auch bei der Ratspräsidentschaft und auch bei der Kommission, die hier ihrer Rolle als Hüterin der Verträge und ehrlicher Makler gerecht geworden ist.

Wir haben gerade 70 Jahre Europäisches Parlament gefeiert. Ich denke, dass wir unserer Verantwortung auch als Gesetzgeber in Zukunft gerecht werden. Wir werden unsere Rolle selbstbewusst verteidigen, auch das lernen wir nach 70 Jahren Europäisches Parlament.

Mikuláš Bek, *President-in-Office of the Council.* – Mr President, it's my pleasure to attend today the European Parliament's debate on the general budget of the European Union for the financial year 2023. I would like to express the Council's satisfaction that we were able to reach an agreement in the Conciliation Committee in the very last minutes of 14 November, the last day of the conciliation period, after long and intense discussions. The positive outcome of the negotiations shows that our three institutions can work efficiently in a spirit of good cooperation. Together, we negotiated a budget for 2023, which responds to the concerns of today and to the requirements of tomorrow of European citizens. The European Parliament and the Council have worked hard to find a solution that would equip the Union for the challenges of the third year of the Multiannual Financial Framework. The deal we have reached reflects our common priorities, in particular addressing the consequences of the war in Ukraine, the severe energy crisis combined with the historically high level of inflation, the disruption of global supply lines and the enduring post-pandemic recovery, all in addition to fighting climate change and fostering the EU's green and digital transition.

I will not hide from you that the Council would have preferred more flexibility in the budget to allow the Union to promptly react to unexpected events that we may face in these unpredictable times. In the official meetings in the course of the year, as well as during informal contacts, the Council appreciated very much the positive atmosphere that prevailed in these talks. Both sides of the table were ready to engage constructively to reach an agreement, to reframe the discussion around the shared interests and come up with solutions. I am glad to inform you that after the successful outcome of the Conciliation Committee on 14 November, the joint text was formally approved by the Council earlier today by a qualified majority. The Council expects the European Parliament to also approve the joint text tomorrow. The general budget for the financial year 2023 will then be adopted within the deadlines foreseen by the Treaty.

Coming to the end of my intervention. I would like to thank the Chairman of the European Parliament's Committee on Budgets, Johan van Overtveldt, and the rapporteurs, Nicolae Ștefănuță and Niclas Herbst, for the good cooperation during the last weeks and months. I would also like to extend my special thanks to you, Commissioner Hahn, for the way you facilitated the negotiations.

Johannes Hahn, *Member of the Commission.* – Mr President, dear Minister, honourable Members and, in particular, dear rapporteurs, of course I welcome the agreement on the European Union annual budget 2023 reached by the Conciliation Committee on Monday 14 November, as usual just before midnight. This is not really unexpected, but let me also say, for the protocol, that I very much welcome the fact that we have this debate at a very prominent time. But I have to say that it's for the second time in a row that I am missing a College meeting, because nowadays Parliament is debating at the time when the College meeting is taking place, and I think that's something I would really like to reconsider for the future anyway.

I think the fact that we got an agreement is our shared success. This was already expressed by the previous speakers. In such unprecedented times, it was more than ever important to put aside our differences and to work together on reaching our shared goals and priorities. The initial positions were, like always, quite far apart – a couple of billion euros – but finally it was possible to reconcile them. I appreciate that all parties acted responsibly and made the necessary compromises in order to have finally a solid agreement on time.

I would like to thank the European Parliament, especially the Committee on Budgets and all the specialised committees, for the intensive work on the Commission's proposal for the draft budget 2023. This is a half-year work which starts usually in early July. On behalf of the Commission, I really would like to thank, in particular, the Chair, Mr Van Overtveldt, and the two rapporteurs, Mr Ștefănuță and Mr Herbst, for their cooperation. I would also like to thank the Czech Presidency – and please convey thanks to the Minister Georgiev for his constructive approach during these negotiations.

It also shows that the institutions can work towards a compromise for the benefit of the European Union and its citizens. For this, again, congratulations to the negotiators and the teams. I would also like to include in this my own team, because they have done a great job. For Johan Ureel, who is with me today, this will be his final budget. He was our 'Mr Budget'. He made seven annual budgets and before that he was in charge of the MFF for 14 years. So Johan, thank you very much for your impressive job.

Let me now give you a few details on the agreement. The overall level of commitment appropriations in next year's budget is set at EUR 186.6 billion. The overall level of payment appropriations in the 2023 budget is set at EUR 168.7 billion. The rapporteurs have already explained the reinforcements for Parliament's priorities, with emphasis on Ukraine, Moldova, tackling the energy crisis, building solidarity lanes, strengthening Erasmus+, LIFE, SMEs, EU4Health, Creative Europe, rights and values programmes, as well as the European Solidarity Corps, reinforcing migration funds, providing funds for military mobility, supporting the Eastern and Southern Neighbourhood, the key Global Europe Programme and strengthening the asylum agency and eu-LISA – just to list a few agreed reinforcements.

But the annual budget also includes a package of 39 pilot projects and preparatory actions for a total amount of EUR 80.1 billion as proposed by Parliament. Once adopted, the annual budget 2023 would allow the Union to mobilise significant funds to help mitigate the severe consequences of Russia's war of aggression against Ukraine, not only in the country but also in the Member States and in the neighbourhood.

It would also support the ongoing sustainable recovery from the coronavirus pandemic by maintaining and creating jobs. It would trigger further investments into a greener, more digital and more resilient Europe while protecting the most vulnerable in the European Union, its neighbourhood and around the world. Next year's budget will direct funds to where they can make the greatest difference, in line with the most crucial needs of the Member States and the Union's partners around the world.

Looking forward, let me recall that we are almost halfway through the long-term budget. With the numerous unprecedented developments and challenges it has become even more clear that we should focus on a limited number of important issues to maximise the effectiveness of our funding, with targeted reinforcements concentrated on a limited number of issues with a real impact. In that respect, I would like to thank the rapporteurs again because there was some progress compared to the previous budget, but I think even more focusing and targeted reinforcements could be possible.

I also reiterate my strong plea for all institutions to exercise restraint in administrative expenditure and to keep stable staff numbers in order not to increase the heavy pressure on Heading 7. The reality is that we cannot continue adding new posts for institutions and respect the ceiling and sub-ceilings in Heading 7.

Going forward, we will have to face some tough choices between what we would like to do and what we can do. The key word is negative priorities. I can assure you that the Commission will focus its future proposal, including the upcoming draft budget 2024, on the most effective and efficient use of our limited resources, to deliver on our citizens expectations and needs.

Janusz Lewandowski, *w imieniu grupy PPE.* – Panie Przewodniczący! Porozumienia budżetowe to zawsze jest dobra wiadomość w tych niespokojnych czasach, pośród tylu niepewności. To jest budżet czasu wojny. Macro-Financial Assistance nie rodzi bezpośrednich skutków budżetowych, ale w tym budżecie kryją się elementy pomocy dla Ukrainy, przede wszystkim w polityce sąsiedztwa.

Jest to budżet czasu inflacji, co podraża realizowane projekty. Jest to budżet wysokich stóp procentowych, co zwiększa koszt obsługi European Recovery Instrument. Małe marginesy wymusiły sięgnięcie po instrumenty specjalne: Flexibility i Single Margin Instrument.

Parlament Europejski zwiększył finansowanie swoich priorytetów o 687 mln euro. Oczywiście nasz sprawozdawca, bo to też jest jego, przede wszystkim, zasługa – Nicolae Ștefănuță – dolicza, i słusznie, the commitments. A to, że obie strony wyszły z negocjacji w miarę zadowolone, to już jest miara kreatywności Komisji Europejskiej pod wodzą Komisarza Hahna. Priorytety są bardzo dobrze zarysowane, to również priorytety polityczne mojej grupy: Horyzont – tu wykorzystujemy art. 15 rozporządzenia finansowego, Connectivity – energetyczna i transportowa, małe i średnie przedsiębiorstwa, EU Health, Creative Europe, Clean Energy Transition i Partnerstwo Wschodnie.

Co najważniejsze, w tych niespokojnych czasach, dając pewność finansowania, wnieśliśmy skromny wkład w zmniejszenie niepewności i lęków o przyszłość, które wróciły na nasz kontynent.

Victor Negrescu, *în numele grupului S&D*. – Domnule președinte, dragi colegi, am reușit, am salvat bugetul european pentru anul viitor de politica austerității și de cei care, în contextul dificil actual, doresc să pună în pericol construcția europeană cu un buget mai mic de subzistență.

Dacă ne dorim o Uniune Europeană mai unită și mai puternică, care să ofere răspunsuri adecvate pentru războiul din Ucraina și pentru gestionarea efectelor pandemiei, care să protejeze cu adevărat cetățenii europeni, în contextul inflației galopante și a crizei din domeniul energiei sau care să se ridice la nivelul așteptărilor noastre comune, ne trebuie un buget mai ambițios. Însă, din păcate, nu toți decidenții înțeleg acest lucru. Am negociat până în ultima clipă pentru a proteja programele și politicile europene esențiale pentru cetățenii noștri în contextul actual, am reușit să obținem alocări suplimentare de fonduri pentru a combate creșterea prețurilor la energie pentru sectorul transportului, pentru IMM-uri, pentru educație, pentru tineri, mediu sau cultură.

Acest buget prevede, de asemenea, resurse suplimentare pentru Republica Moldova și Ucraina, dar și pentru intrarea României, Bulgariei și Croației în spațiul Schengen. Pentru a asigura resursele necesare implementării ambițiilor noastre comune fac apel la revizuirea bugetului european pe termen lung.

Fabienne Keller, *au nom du groupe Renew*. – Monsieur le Président Othmar Karas, Monsieur le Commissaire Johannes Hahn, Monsieur le Ministre des affaires européennes tchèque, tout d'abord, je voudrais féliciter mes collègues, et d'abord Nicolae Ștefănuță, pour son énorme travail et pour l'accord ambitieux qui a été conclu sur le budget 2023. Je voudrais saluer aussi Niclas Herbst, pour son travail sur les autres sections.

Cela a été dit à plusieurs reprises, 2023 va de nouveau être une année exceptionnelle pour notre budget. Nous devrons faire face à de nombreux défis: conséquences de la guerre en Ukraine, conséquences de la pandémie, crises énergétique et économique. C'est pourquoi nous avons soutenu un budget plus ambitieux, pour nous donner les moyens de relever ces défis et surtout pour être aux côtés des citoyens européens les plus impactés. Nous avons donc un budget plus ambitieux pour la santé, pour l'énergie, pour le climat, pour la défense, pour les transports, pour la gestion de nos frontières et pour venir en aide à nos voisins ukrainiens.

Nous devons aussi nous préparer au changement climatique, en limiter les effets. C'est pourquoi nous avons voté ici, à Strasbourg, un paquet climat ambitieux. Il faudra nous en donner les moyens. Or, il nous en reste peu, Monsieur le Commissaire, pour la fin de ce contrat financier pluriannuel. C'est pourquoi nous plaidons pour une révision tout aussi ambitieuse.

Être à la hauteur: nous devons l'être face à la montée des populismes en Europe qui, chaque jour, font de l'Union européenne leur bouc émissaire et la raison de tous les maux. Ce budget, nous devons le protéger contre ces populismes qui l'utilisent à leurs propres fins, sans respecter l'état de droit et ses principes fondamentaux. Nous devons, Monsieur le Commissaire, appliquer avec rigueur la conditionnalité.

Ce budget porte une ambition pour l'Europe. Ce projet, c'est ce qui nous permet d'être plus forts ensemble et à la hauteur des enjeux.

Francisco Guerreiro, *on behalf of the Verts/ALE Group*. – Mr President, dear all, Europe is facing multiple crises with the war in Ukraine, the fossil energy dependence, the inflation and the growing climate collapse.

That is why it was so vital that we reach an agreement on making the EU more resilient to the challenges we currently face through the EU budget for 2023. And our 2023 budget shows focus: focus on helping people both in European Union and in the rest of the world; focus on supporting citizens affected by the economic downturn; focus on restoring nature affected by climate change; and focus on those who are most affected by war.

But this focus came with hard work. If we look at the budget proposed by the Commission back in June, the Parliament achieved quite a lot. We have made substantial reinforcements for the environment and climate, energy and health policies, and we also have strengthened the support for our eastern and southern neighbourhoods, and we also have increased the budget for humanitarian aid.

However, we all know that this is not enough. We need to be more active on all of those key areas. Therefore, we must push the Commission and the Council to urgently revise the multiannual framework. The EU budget cannot be pushed to the limit where it won't serve its purpose. And the overall goal is to speed the EU shift towards a decarbonised economy, builds a fairer society, and continue to be a major player in geopolitical affairs.

Joachim Kuhs, *im Namen der ID-Fraktion*. – Herr Präsident, Herr Kommissar Hahn, werte Kollegen, Herr Minister! Herzlichen Glückwunsch zu diesem Haushalt! Sie haben es geschafft, in letzter Sekunde sozusagen, diesen auf Kante genähten Haushalt noch zu verabschieden. Sie waren natürlich zum Erfolg verdammt, sozusagen. Sie konnten gar nicht anders als eine Einigung zu erzielen. Wenn Sie es nicht gemacht hätten, hätten wir von vorne anfangen dürfen und können und der Haushalt wäre nicht mehr rechtzeitig in Kraft getreten. Deshalb: Sie waren zum Erfolg verdammt.

Dennoch bleibt als Fazit zu ziehen: Dieser Haushalt ist so eng gestrickt, so auf Kante genäht, dass er bei der nächsten Krise – und die nächste Krise wird kommen – platzen wird. Heute werden schon Vorschläge gemacht, wie man diesen Haushalt einer gründlichen Revision unterziehen soll, wie man ihn ändern soll, wie man versuchen soll, ihn noch irgendwie zu erweitern. Dabei ist er schon bis unter den letzten *headroom* voll. Wie wollen Sie das machen? Ich muss kein Prophet sein, um Ihnen zu sagen, dass wir in den nächsten Sitzungen im nächsten Jahr immer wieder und immer wieder diesen Haushalt anpacken werden und ihn berichtigen müssen. Änderungen müssen stattfinden, weil er eben so gestrickt wurde.

Ich habe 300 Änderungsanträge mit einem Kürzungsvolumen von 55 % eingereicht. Wenn Sie das gemacht hätten, dann müssten Sie ihn nicht nächstes Jahr wieder komplett neu stricken.

Bogdan Rzońca, *w imieniu grupy ECR*. – Panie Przewodniczący! Panie Komisarzu! Oczywiście poprzemy jako ECR ten budżet, dlatego że są tu środki finansowe na płatności, dlatego że można będzie realizować założone działania i dlatego że też jest odpowiedź – dobra odpowiedź na naszą propozycję, żeby pomóc Ukrainie.

Oczywiście ECR wniósł też swoje poprawki, w szczególności dotyczące mobilności wojskowej, dotyczące pomocy humanitarnej. Te poprawki zostały zaakceptowane, więc widzimy plus w tym całym budżecie. No i oczywiście mamy obawy, tak jak wszyscy, co się wydarzy dalej. Niemniej jednak, na dzisiaj chcielibyśmy to wyraźnie zaznaczyć, że była wola współpracy w trakcie konsyliacji, że te pieniądze na Ukrainę są bardzo ważne dla uchodźców. Tych, którzy są, no ale tych, którzy są poza granicami Ukrainy, którzy uciekli przed tą wojną. Są dodatkowe środki na mobilność wojskową, na energię. Bardzo ciekawe pieniądze dla studentów ukraińskich, więc to wszystko zasługuje na uznanie. I oczywiście chcemy też zaznaczyć, że będzie można realizować politykę spójności, wspólną politykę rolną w roku 2023.

To dla nas jest także bardzo ważne.

Δημήτριος Παπαδημούλης, *εξ ονόματος της ομάδας The Left*. – Κύριε Πρόεδρε, το Ευρωπαϊκό Κοινοβούλιο προσπάθησε και πέτυχε κάποιες βελτιώσεις στην πρόταση της Επιτροπής. Ήταν μια δύσκολη προσπάθεια στην οποία μετείχα ενεργά εκ μέρους της Ομάδας The Left στο Ευρωπαϊκό Κοινοβούλιο. Και ήταν δύσκολη γιατί, ως συνήθως, το Συμβούλιο ζητούσε δραστικές περικοπές. Αλλά οι βελτιώσεις που πετύχαμε σε αυτόν τον δύσκολο συμβιβασμό δεν είναι αρκετές και για αυτό δεν συμμερίζομαι τους πανηγυρισμούς ορισμένων συναδέλφων.

Διότι ο προϋπολογισμός για το 2023 είναι το 1,14% του ευρωπαϊκού ΑΕΠ —μικρότερος από τον περσινό προϋπολογισμό που ήταν το 1,18% του ευρωπαϊκού ΑΕΠ, κύριοι του Συμβουλίου. Και ο ελέφαντας στο δωμάτιο είναι ότι δεν μπορούμε να υλοποιήσουμε τους στόχους που έχετε θέσει εσείς, της Επιτροπής, και εσείς, του Συμβουλίου, με έναν προϋπολογισμό παγωμένο στο 1% του ευρωπαϊκού ΑΕΠ. Και ο δεύτερος ελέφαντας στο δωμάτιο είναι ότι ήδη έχουν εξαντληθεί τα περιθώρια ενός πολυετούς δημοσιονομικού πλαισίου, το οποίο σχεδιάστηκε σε άλλες συνθήκες.

Για αυτό, αντί να συγχαίρουμε εαυτούς και αλλήλους, θα πρέπει να δεσμευτεί η Επιτροπή ότι θα παρουσιάσει, κύριε Hahn, μια φιλόδοξη αναπροσαρμογή του πολυετούς δημοσιονομικού πλαισίου μέσα στις αρχές του 2023. Γιατί, αν δεν το κάνετε, θα έχετε σοβαρό μερίδιο ευθύνης. Ξέρω ότι το θέλετε, αλλά πρέπει και να το τολμήσετε. Και οι frugals του Συμβουλίου, που κρατάνε δεμένη την Ευρώπη σε έναν προϋπολογισμό του 1%, πρέπει να αλλάξουν την άποψή τους.

Andor Deli (NI). – Tisztelt Elnök Úr! Gratulálok az előadóknak, hogy sikerült egyezségre jutni a 23-as költségvetésről. Ez garantálni fogja azt, hogy lesz elegendő pénz az uniós programok támogatására. Ugyanakkor nekünk, a Fidesz-delegációban elvi fenntartásaink vannak, mivel a Magyarország ellen indított eljárások még nem értek véget. Számunkra nagyon fontos, hogy tisztán tudjuk látni a jövő évi forrásainkat. A magyar mezőgazdasági stratégiai terv már jóváhagyásra került a Bizottság részéről, és bízunk abban, hogy a kohéziós partnerségi megállapodás is hamarosan megkötésre kerül.

Ugyanakkor ismerjük a helyreállítási alap körüli helyzetet, tegnap pedig azt is jól láthattuk, hogy az Európai Parlament balliberális oldala nem nyugszik: még a saját találmányának, a kondicionalitási eljárásnak a betű szerinti végrehajtását sem fogadja el. El akarják venni a Magyarországnak járó uniós pénzeket. Zavarja őket, hogy a Bizottság és a magyar kormány higgadtan és sikeresen tárgyalnak, és a helyzet rendezésétől immár csak napok választanak el bennünket. Ezért parlamenti állásfoglalással akarják nyomás alá helyezni a Bizottságot és a Tanácsot a végleges döntéshozatal előtt. Mindezek miatt úgy döntöttünk, hogy tartózkodni fogunk az idei költségvetési szavazáson.

José Manuel Fernandes (PPE). – Senhor Presidente, Senhor Comissário, caras e caros Colegas, o orçamento da União Europeia é sempre um investimento, uma mais-valia para toda a Europa.

As despesas de administração são apenas 6% do orçamento da União. Um orçamento que é essencial para o crescimento, a competitividade e a coesão territorial, e que deve ter uma atenção redobrada, e as nossas propostas vão nesse sentido, face à situação atual das famílias e das pequenas e médias empresas.

Aos Estados-Membros não faltam milhões neste momento, e 2023 é um ano essencial. Se olharmos para o meu país, tem 10 500 milhões de euros disponíveis em 2023. O Quadro Financeiro Plurianual 2014-2020 acaba em 2023. O de 2021-2027 já deveria estar em execução, e ainda temos o Plano de Recuperação e Resiliência.

Exigimos agora aos Estados que cumpram, que executem, a favor dos portugueses no caso de Portugal, dos cidadãos europeus, e também a solidariedade externa é essencial com a Ucrânia e com os países em desenvolvimento.

Evin Incir (S&D). – Mr President, colleagues, our Union and our Member States are not a desert island. So the development in one part of the world affects other parts of the world. In a time of global challenges, we therefore must ensure EU global leadership, an EU that not only take talks the talk about peace, human rights, freedom and security, but also walks the talk. Feminist economic policy is imperative for a gender-equal world.

Colleagues, as the Committee of Foreign Affairs standing rapporteur for the relations with Palestine, I also want to remind everyone in here on our responsibility towards the Palestinian people. Generations of Palestinians are living as refugees.

We must ensure political support to end the Israeli occupation and pave the way for a two-state solution, as well as ensure financial support for them to live as decent a life as possible under a currently abnormal situation. Yes, occupation is abnormal, inhuman and it's a violation of international law.

I am glad, however, that in 2023 budget we are clear on the importance to continue our support to UNRAM, including increased support since the needs have grown. I must say that I have been I have been very disappointed and ashamed of this Parliament about the ongoing debates and discussions that have taken place the last two years on trying to undermine the important work that UNWRA is doing.

Alexandra Geese (Verts/ALE). – Herr Präsident, Herr Kommissar, verehrte Kolleginnen und Kollegen! Der EU-Haushalt für 2023 wurde unter extremen Bedingungen ausgehandelt: ein brutaler russischer Angriffskrieg gegen die Ukraine, die dort nicht nur ihr eigenes Land, sondern gerade auch unsere Werte – Demokratie und Freiheit – verteidigt und dafür unsere Solidarität mehr als verdient hat.

Gleichzeitig stehen wir vor einer Energiepreiskrise und einer Inflation, die Europäerinnen und Europäer um ihre Existenz bangen lässt. Und wir stehen vor der immer schneller voranschreitenden Klimakatastrophe, die die Weltgemeinschaft vor noch schwerere Herausforderungen stellen wird. Darauf reagieren wir mit konkreten Maßnahmen, mit verstärkten Investitionen in die östliche und südliche Partnerschaft, die wir zum Beispiel bei der Aufnahme von Flüchtlingen unterstützen. Wir reagieren mit Erhöhungen für das LIFE-Programm, das unsere Natur bewahrt, und mit Mitteln für die Fazilität „Connecting Europe" im Bereich Verkehr und Energie.

Europa setzt die richtigen Prioritäten – gerade in der Krise. Aber bedeutet das, dass wir handlungsfähig sind? Nein. Dafür sind unsere Spielräume zu klein. Und deswegen erwarten wir von der Kommission eine ehrgeizige Überprüfung des mehrjährigen Finanzrahmens.

Jörg Meuthen (NI). – Herr Präsident, Herr Kommissar Hahn, werte Kollegen! Der EU ist wirklich keine Krise zu schade, um ihr Budget noch weiter aufzupumpen und Verschuldungen zu rechtfertigen.

Beim sogenannten Corona-Wiederaufbaufonds verkaufte man uns die vertrags- und rechtswidrige gemeinsame Schuldenaufnahme als einmalige Ausnahme. Der nun vorliegende Haushaltsentwurf der Kommission für 2023 sieht nun aber schon wieder vor, dass die EU eigene Schulden aufnimmt – diesmal mit Verweis auf den Krieg in der Ukraine. So richtig es ist, wenn die einzelnen Mitgliedstaaten dem Land in seiner Not helfen, so absurd ist es zugleich, dass die EU sich als Gemeinschaft verschuldet, damit die Ukraine ihre Staatsausgaben decken kann.

Ich sage es nicht zum ersten und sicher nicht zum letzten Mal: Nichts kann den Bruch der europäischen Verträge in Form einer Schuldengemeinschaft rechtfertigen. Niemals darf die EU eine Schuldenlizenz oder eigene Steuerhoheit erhalten. Es muss bei der reinen Beitragsfinanzierung durch die souveränen Mitgliedstaaten bleiben. So sehen es die Verträge vor, und dieses Haus hat die Pflicht, für die Einhaltung der Verträge zu sorgen.

Zusätzliche Schulden, um jetzt noch mehr Geld in den Markt zu pumpen, und das auf Kosten der kommenden Generationen, ist im wahrsten Sinne des Wortes – Verzeihung – asozial.

Siegfried Mureșan (PPE). – Mr President, dear colleagues, the European Union has a budget for 2023, and that is good news. All beneficiaries of EU funds now have certainty. Farmers, researchers, small and medium-sized enterprises: they all know that money will come and money will come on time. That is good news.

I would like to congratulate the two co-rapporteurs of the Parliament, Mr Ștefănuță and Mr Herbst, for defending so successfully the priorities of the Parliament. And I would like to thank the Commission, and Commissioner Hahn personally, for the extremely helpful, useful, essential role that they have played in finding a common position between the Parliament and the Council.

It is clear that for next year we have a budget. But we also need to work on the long term and we need to do two things, because the multiannual financial framework has shown its limits. We saw that the budget only has a limited capacity to respond to unforeseen situations.

We should do two things, Minister, Commissioner, colleagues: firstly, we should start together the work on the revision of the multiannual financial framework, and secondly we should clarify the repayment for NextGenerationEU so that it doesn't become a burden for the budget of the European Union in the future.

Karlo Ressler (PPE). – Poštovani predsjedavajući, povjereniče, kolegice i kolege, kada sam prošle godine predstavljao rezultate pregovora za ovogodišnji proračun bilo je nemoguće predvidjeti koliko će dramatično različita biti situacija na europskom kontinentu, koliko će ruska agresija na Ukrajinu okrenuti novo poglavlje i predstaviti jedan novi test, ne samo za našu Uniju nego za cijelu europsku civilizaciju.

Jedan od ključnih aspekata na koji možemo djelovati u takvoj situaciji je proračun. Zato nam treba snažni europski proračun koji je glavni alat našeg odgovora na rastuće europske prioritete.

Imamo jasnu, ljudsku, moralnu dužnost pomoći Ukrajini i pomoći ukrajinskom narodu u borbi za njihovu slobodu.

Moramo također osnažiti našu energetsku neovisnost procesom zelene tranzicije, ali također na jedan pametan način trebamo osigurati dovoljna sredstva za naše poduzetnike, istraživače i studente.

Sve to je sažeto u preko 186 milijardi eura ovog proračuna i zato čestitam izvjestiteljima koji su predvodili pregovore.

Johannes Hahn, *Member of the Commission*. – Mr President, I have listened very carefully to the debate, the priorities and views expressed in this House with respect to the 2023 budget. I note that even so some Members have some hesitations on some specific points we have agreed upon. There is a large support for the overall outcome of these intensive negotiations. Let me stress that the agreement on the 2023 budget respects the agreement on the current MMF and it reflects the priorities of all the three institutions. But there is very limited space for enforcements. I think I have to recall that more than 99% of the budget is pre-allocated and that is why it is not so easy to identify opportunities of relocations, enforcements, etc. and to keep, which was also expressed by some speakers, the necessary flexibility in order to address necessities which might pop up in the course of the upcoming year.

But I think it is nevertheless a very positive signal. And this I would say in particular to our audience, that the institutions have been able to reach a timely agreement on next year's budget. This agreement will ensure that the union has the necessary financial means to respond effectively to the challenges within the Union and globally. The agreement would not have been possible without that determination, the constructive and responsible approach of the European Parliament throughout the whole process, and the same applies to the Council negotiating team.

We know there will be new challenges in 2021 and probably there will be additional challenges we don't know about yet, but at least in budgetary terms, we have a solid basis and still have some limited margin for manoeuvre for unforeseen events in these challenging times.

So I thank first the Council for already its decision today, and after today's discussion I am reassured that the honourable Members of this House will give their full support to the results achieved during the vote tomorrow.

Mikuláš Bek, *President-in-Office of the Council*. – Mr President, honourable members, Commissioner Hahn, ladies and gentlemen, thank you very much for this exchange of views. It has shown that we are united in our commitment to build a better Europe to the benefit of all our citizens.

Let me stress once again that the agreement reached on the budget for 2023 is a balanced compromise. I trust that this compromise budget will allow the Union to adequately finance its different priorities, which have been mentioned a number of times today and which are indeed unprecedented.

These priorities are dealing with the consequences of the war in Ukraine and the related severe energy crises, high inflation and disruption of global supply lines, in addition to advancing the post-pandemic recovery, fighting climate change and fostering the green and digital transition. I thank you once more for your attention.

Johan Van Overtveldt, *voorzitter Begrotingscommissie*. – Voorzitter, minister, commissaris, collega's, ik had het in mijn inleidende toespraak al over de rol die het Parlement zou moeten spelen bij de opmaak van de begroting. Het gaat hierbij niet alleen over het correct toepassen van de bevoegdheden van de Europese instellingen, maar zeker ook over het waken over de kwaliteit van uitgaven die gedaan worden. Daarnaast moet er voldoende aandacht zijn voor het detecteren en corrigeren van fraude, oneigenlijk gebruik van middelen en fenomenen zoals mogelijke *double funding*. Ik ben er trouwens van overtuigd dat mijn collega, de voorzitter van de Commissie begrotingscontrole, dezelfde mening is toegedaan.

Concluderend zou ik het volgende willen zeggen: de begroting voor 2023 of het akkoord bereikt over deze begroting heeft zeker zijn verdienste. Ik wil echter ook een warme maar dringende oproep doen. De Europese instellingen moeten loskomen van de waan van de dag. Men moet durven nadenken over de keuzes die ons op langere termijn het meest te bieden hebben en die ons ook een voorsprong kunnen geven. Op inhoudelijk vlak, maar ook de manier waarop we dat beleid op een transparante en effectieve manier vertalen in een goede begroting. Tot slot wil ik graag alle medewerkers en verantwoordelijken van harte danken voor al hun inspanningen tijdens de lange procedure die vooraf is gegaan aan dit moment, namelijk de goedkeuring van het akkoord voor de begroting van het komende jaar. Daarom wil ik ook uitdrukkelijk de beide rapporteurs feliciteren, de commissaris bedanken, de mensen van het voorzitterschap bedanken en aan allen nogmaals grote dank voor de volgehouden inspanningen.

Der Präsident. – Die Aussprache ist damit geschlossen.

Die Abstimmung findet am Mittwoch, 23. November 2022, statt.

10. Eigenmittelsystem der Europäischen Union (Aussprache)

Der Präsident. – Als nächster Punkt der Tagesordnung folgt die Aussprache über den Bericht von Valérie Hayer und José Manuel Fernandes im Namen des Haushaltsausschusses über den Vorschlag für einen Beschluss des Rates zur Änderung des Beschlusses (EU, Euratom) 2020/2053 über das Eigenmittelsystem der Europäischen Union (COM(2021)0570 – C9-0034/2022 – 2021/0430(CNS)) (A9-0266/2022).

Das ist eine gute Ergänzung zu den offenen Frage der letzten Debatte.

Valérie Hayer, *rapporteure*. – Monsieur le Président, Monsieur le Commissaire, Monsieur le ministre, chers collègues, en 2020, nous avons mis sur pied le plan de relance, un chantier inédit dans l'histoire de l'Europe, avec des retombées économiques sans précédent aux quatre coins du continent. De l'argent qui permet d'isoler nos bâtiments, de développer nos champions du numérique, de créer des emplois de qualité. Ce plan de relance, il protège les Européens, il protège notre prospérité. Et ce plan de relance, chers collègues, nous l'avons adossé à un deuxième plan, un plan de remboursement. Plan de remboursement qui était une nécessité absolue pour rassurer à la fois contribuables et investisseurs.

Nous nous sommes engagés auprès des Européens. Nous, députés, Commission, États membres, nous nous sommes engagés. Nous avons pris l'engagement que cela ne se ferait ni en augmentant les impôts ni en coupant dans les programmes, parce que c'était aussi cela le risque que nous encourions si nous ne pensions, dès 2020, aux moyens de rembourser la dette.

Parce qu'à l'époque, deux options simples se présentaient aux États. Première option: augmenter leur contribution et, en conséquence, les impôts directs qui pèsent sur les citoyens, sur les entreprises, sur les PME dans nos territoires. Cela alors même que nous mettions en place cet instrument pour éviter à ces acteurs du territoire de payer les pots cassés de la crise économique liée au COVID, qui a plongé tout le monde dans les difficultés que nous connaissons. Évidemment, cette option, nous l'avons écartée.

Deuxième option: devoir se résoudre à aller piocher dans nos programmes européens, retirer des aides aux agriculteurs, réduire le nombre de jeunes pouvant partir en Erasmus, revoir à la baisse notre objectif en matière de dépenses de recherche et de développement. Tout cela pour faire de la place pour rembourser l'emprunt. Et bien sûr cette option-là, nous l'avons également écartée.

C'est avec responsabilité que nous nous sommes mis d'accord pour écarter ces deux hypothèses et que nous avons décidé d'une troisième voie. Non, chers collègues, les Européens ne porteront pas la charge de la dette parce que nous avons décidé collectivement que les grands pollueurs, les importateurs de CO_2 étrangers, les grandes multinationales qui ne paient pas leur juste part d'impôts, les spéculateurs financiers, que tous ces acteurs-là contribueraient à ce remboursement. Et ce n'est pas seulement une question budgétaire, c'est aussi et avant tout une question de justice fiscale et sociale. Et les Européens auront raison de considérer que le plan de relance sera une réussite pleine et entière, à condition seulement que nous respections également cet accord de remboursement jusqu'au bout.

Et là, je me serais bien tournée vers le ministre représentant les États membres aujourd'hui, mais il n'y a plus personne. Alors, je le rappelle à tous et aux États également, cette dette commune, nous devrons la rembourser à partir de 2028, c'est-à-dire dans cinq ans, c'est-à-dire demain. C'est une question de respect de nos engagements en tant que décideurs politiques et de crédibilité auprès des investisseurs. C'est pourquoi le Parlement, à l'heure où nous sommes en train de finaliser les négociations sur la réforme du marché carbone, sur le mécanisme d'ajustement carbone aux frontières, le Parlement reconfirmera, au travers de ce vote, ce mandat avec fierté et force.

Et ce rapport n'est que le premier avant d'autres qui devront ouvrir la voie à encore plus de ressources propres, comme nous l'avons convenu dès 2020, là encore. L'Europe remboursera sa dette en faisant contribuer ceux qui ne paient pas leur juste part d'impôts et non pas en taxant plus les contribuables européens.

José Manuel Fernandes, *Relator.* – Senhor Presidente, caras e caros Colegas, Senhor Comissário, este Parlamento Europeu desde sempre defendeu novas receitas para o Orçamento da União Europeia, verdadeiros recursos próprios, que deveriam ser genuínos e não exclusivas transferências dos respetivos orçamentos dos Estados.

É essencial que se acabe com a distinção entre contribuintes líquidos e beneficiários líquidos. Na verdade, todos os Estados-Membros são beneficiários do orçamento da União Europeia, e muitos daqueles que são os chamados frugais esquecem-se, e não dizem aos seus cidadãos, que são os que mais beneficiam, por exemplo com o mercado interno.

Ninguém se pode sentir dono do orçamento em função das transferências que se fazem e, por isso, sempre defendemos a necessária criação de novas receitas, de novos recursos próprios.

A decisão de criar novos recursos próprios é uma decisão complicada, demorada, das mais complexas que existem no ordenamento jurídico da União Europeia. A Comissão Europeia faz a sua proposta. O Parlamento Europeu dá uma opinião que não é vinculativa. Os Estados-Membros, no Conselho, têm de decidir por unanimidade, e depois há a ratificação segundo as normas constitucionais de cada parlamento nacional.

Isto também é a prova de que não há impostos europeus. No final, tem de haver uma ratificação de todos os parlamentos nacionais para termos novas receitas.

Se as receitas eram importantes, hoje ainda são muito mais importantes. Com o *NextGenerationEU*, a Comissão Europeia foi buscar 800 mil milhões de euros aos mercados, mas há 420 mil milhões que deram origem à criação dos planos de recuperação e resiliência e também ao reforço de alguns programas que vão ser pagos pelo orçamento da União Europeia, e que vão ser pagos até 2058. E nós não podemos penalizar as próximas gerações. Também não podemos cortar os próximos programas, e o custo do pagamento da dívida, depois de 2027, é elevado: são mais de 15 mil milhões de euros por ano, e daí a importância, cada vez maior, de novas receitas para pagarmos a dívida e para fazermos face aos novos desafios em termos daquilo que são os projetos comuns que temos de ter.

E os nossos princípios para a criação de novos recursos são simples: quem não paga deve pagar. Quem mais beneficia do mercado interno deve contribuir. Ao mesmo tempo, temos de respeitar e influenciar e procurar as prioridades deste Parlamento e da União Europeia, o combate às alterações climáticas, o objetivo do digital. E, nesse sentido, nós conseguimos e apresentámos novas propostas para recursos próprios, seguindo a linha da Comissão, o reforço do mercado de licenças de emissão, o mecanismo de ajustamento nas fronteiras, que permite mais justiça e uma concorrência mais leal. Aqueles que estão a produzir fora da União Europeia e enviam para aqui produtos que não têm as mesmas regras, nomeadamente em termos do mercado de licenças de emissões, por uma questão de justiça também devem ver esses produtos taxados.

Para além disso, os gigantes do digital e as multinacionais, que beneficiam do mercado interno, também elas devem ser chamadas a este contributo.

Eu espero que este pacote de recursos próprios, e que tem origem no acordo interinstitucional, seja respeitado e haja de seguida um novo pacote para respeitarmos o acordo interinstitucional, o roteiro, de forma a protegermos os cidadãos, respeitarmos as nossas prioridades, termos recursos para fazer face à dívida e aquilo que são os programas comuns na União Europeia que todos temos de defender.

Dienstag, 22. November 2022

Johannes Hahn, *Member of the Commission*. – Mr President, thank you to all of you for providing us with your draft opinion, fully supporting our proposals to introduce new own resources based on the carbon border adjustment mechanism, the emissions trading system, and on the residual profits of large multinational enterprises.

I am glad to see that the Parliament supports our first package of own resources and I would in particular thank the two rapporteurs for their tireless push of this topic and I'm grateful for this huge backing because it is definitely necessary if we look at the, let's say, progress on this debate. Because as it was said by the two speakers and the two rapporteurs, we need a new stream of new own resources for the EU budget to ensure that future generations don't bear the costs of NextGenerationEU borrowing and who will benefit from it.

Why is this important? In a context of rising interest rate costs, financing NGEU debt will become more expensive than initially expected. Credible repayment of NGEU via new own resources is therefore also a litmus test for the Union to remain on the path of sustainable public finance.

But new own resources are also required to ensure the sustainable financing of the social climate fund, helping households and small and medium-sized enterprises. Thanks to the efforts of the French Presidency and an agreement between Member States, it was possible to reach an agreement between Member States on both the revised ETS directive and the CBAM regulation last summer.

At the same time, the European Parliament has adopted its reports on both proposals before the summer negotiations and both files are currently ongoing and progressing between the two institutions. This paved the way for continuing the discussions on our new own resources proposal. I welcome the progress made on the technical level under the Czech Presidency.

It will be difficult to reach an agreement on new own resources before a final agreement between Parliament and Council on the sectoral proposals is reached. However, we must keep in mind the own resource dimension and the principle of universality. No own resource should be earmarked to cover a specific type of expenditure.

As regards the sectoral legislation, let me share with you some observations.

First, on the carbon border adjustment mechanism. Negotiations on the appropriate governance mechanism are still ongoing, but the more centralised governance model seems to be the wish of Parliament and Council. This has important repercussions on own resources.

On the one hand, the Union budget share on CBAM revenues need to increase compared to the 75% that was proposed by the Commission based on a decentralised governance model. On the other hand, a centralised governance model has an important impact on the EU administration's staffing needs.

As you know, the Commission honours the stable staffing principle. We will need to be creative and find ad hoc solutions. In your report you propose that 100% of CBAM revenues go to the EU budget. But for this we have to clarify the governance of CBAM.

On the ETS own resources and the underlying sectoral proposal, negotiations between co-legislators are progressing. As you know, the Commission proposal foresaw the financing of the social climate fund from new own resources. We welcome that both institutions agree with the objective to finance the social climate fund via the general and Union budget under the next MFF if there is agreement on a new own resource based on ETS covering road transport and buildings.

Finally, on the OECD Pillar 1 agreement, the OECD has announced that the draft of the multilateral convention would be delayed. This delay in the schedule will have again repercussions on the proposal for an EU directive on the implementation of the OECD global agreement on the relocation of taxing rights, the basis for our own resource based on profits of large multinationals.

Rest assured, the Commission will carefully monitor the process at international level concerning the Pillar 1 agreement and will take appropriate measures in relation to own resources in case Pillar 1 will not succeed.

So I'm confident that we can make further progress in the upcoming months, and we are looking forward to engaging further with you.

Rasmus Andresen, *Verfasser der Stellungnahme des mitberatenden Ausschusses für Wirtschaft und Währung*. – Herr Präsident! Seit mehreren Monaten blockiert Viktor Orbán die globale Mindeststeuer für große Konzerne wie Starbucks, Amazon, Bayer oder Ikea. Orbán tanzt der tschechischen Ratspräsidentschaft und der EU-Kommission in dieser Frage seit Monaten auf der Nase herum. Anstatt seine Erpressungsversuche für die Freigabe von EU-Geldern aus dem NextGenerationEU-Fonds zu ignorieren, lassen sie ihm freie Hand. Erst hieß es, dass es kurz vor dem Sommer zu einer Einigung kommen soll, dann war es der September, danach der Oktober. Jetzt deutet sich ein Deal für Dezember an. Orbán bekommt die Wiederaufbau-Milliarden und ratifiziert dafür die globale Mindeststeuer.

Dabei gibt es bessere Alternativen. Die EU-Mitgliedstaaten können die Steuer unter verstärkter Zusammenarbeit ohne Ungarn beschließen. Aber auch die USA fehlen für einen Kompromiss. Spätestens seit den *midterms* gibt es keine Mehrheit mehr in den US-Kammern, um die globale Mindeststeuer zu ratifizieren. Das ist extrem bitter, denn gerade jetzt in der Krise brauchen wir mehr Steuergerechtigkeit und Eigenmittel für den Haushalt, um in Klima, Forschung und Digitalisierung zu investieren.

Deshalb brauchen wir neben dem, was jetzt vorliegt, ein zweites Paket, wo aus unserer Sicht auch die EU-Digitalsteuer und eine Finanztransaktionssteuer reingehört. Unsere Unterstützung haben Sie da, aber wir wollen Sie kämpfen sehen.

Jan Olbrycht, *w imieniu grupy PPE*. – Panie Przewodniczący! Panie Komisarzu! Jako współsprawozdawca wieloletnich ram finansowych mam okazję przyglądać się temu, czy budżet Unii Europejskiej jest właściwie przygotowany w swojej konstrukcji do tego, żeby stawić czoło nowym wyzwaniom. Oczywiście, że w ciągu najbliższych miesięcy będziemy prosili Komisję i Radę o rewizję tego budżetu, ale kluczową kwestią jest to, z czego budżet Unii Europejskiej będzie finansowany, jakie będą źródła dochodów, jak zagwarantują nie tylko realizację polityk, ale również spłatę zadłużenia. Z tego punktu widzenia szybka decyzja dotycząca dochodów własnych jest absolutnie kluczowa dla budowania stabilnego systemu i przyszłej wieloletniej perspektywy finansowej.

Eider Gardiazabal Rubial, *en nombre del Grupo S&D*. – Señor presidente, señor comisario, hoy damos un paso muy importante en la construcción europea, avanzamos en un debate crucial para nuestro futuro porque avanzamos en la obtención de nuevos recursos que nos van a permitir reembolsar el NextGeneration, un plan inédito que se puso en marcha para luchar contra los efectos del coronavirus y ahora para luchar contra las consecuencias de la guerra.

Esto constituye un claro éxito del proyecto europeo, pero, en particular, de este Parlamento porque, sin contar con verdaderas competencias legales en materia impositiva, hemos logrado condicionar el debate político y, tras muchos años, hemos conseguido que esto sea una realidad.

Tenemos una hoja de ruta que cumplir imperativamente, porque de ello va a depender la credibilidad europea y el éxito del NextGeneration. Pero tenemos que empezar a trabajar en nuevas propuestas, porque Europa necesita reforzar su presupuesto para conseguir cumplir con todo lo que los ciudadanos nos exigen y con todo lo que los Estados miembros nos encomiendan.

Sobre todo, porque tiene mucho más sentido que tengamos una política fiscal común que haga contribuir a los que escapan a los sistemas nacionales, a los que contaminan, a los que especulan y a los que se benefician de la crisis.

Así que, vamos a por ello.

Billy Kelleher, *on behalf of the Renew Group*. – Mr President, I welcome the Commission's proposals. It shows commitment to the interinstitutional agreement on own resources. I mean if we expect Europe to do more, we ask Europe to do more, well then we must be willing to fund it as well.

We spoke today about 70 years of celebration of Parliament in Strasbourg, representing European citizens. So we have accountability in the context of a parliament through the democratic process but, at the same time, we have no capacity to change people's lives and European citizens' lives because of our inability to provide a continuity around the funding of own resources.

There is no doubt that some of the proposals put forward in regard to the Emissions Trading Scheme and the Carbon Border Adjustment Fund will by their nature reduce over a period of time. And if we want to expand the role that the European Union plays in terms of addressing climate challenges, the digitisation of our economy, supporting the next generation Recovery Resilience Fund and the challenges that are still very evident among the Member States because of the pressures with regard to cost of living, inflation and energy security, we do need to have certainty.

And I would urge the Council in particular to come forward and break loose of their chains with regard to their very restrictive views of how we fund own resources. The template is there. The OECD report has made recommendations, and I believe it is now time for the Council to come forward with proposals. I say this as a person who still advocates for the certainty of national competency around taxation, but the Council collectively can still come to an agreement to address the issue of funding own resources into the future.

David Cormand, *au nom du groupe Verts/ALE*. – Monsieur le Président, Monsieur le Commissaire – on ne se quitte plus –, l'accord sur les ressources propres, depuis que je suis élu, en 2019, c'est à la fois une accélération et une accélération qui va trop lentement. Le rythme des urgences auxquelles nous sommes confrontés va beaucoup plus vite que le rythme auquel nous sommes en train de créer ces ressources propres.

Sur le premier paquet, ce n'est pas assez et ce n'est pas assez vite. Quand on parle du MACF, c'est trop peu d'argent par rapport à ce que nous avons à rembourser. Quand on parle du SEQE, et notamment SEQE2, qui porte des risques de fiscalité injuste, notamment sur les ménages, ce n'est pas assez, ce n'est pas assez vite et ce n'est pas assez juste.

Pour dire un mot du deuxième panier de ressources propres, j'ai vu que la Commission a essayé de l'accélérer. Il y a des mots qu'on n'entend pas ici, qu'on n'entend pas assez: taxe sur les transactions financières. Taxe sur les transactions financières. Taxe sur les transactions financières. C'est 50 milliards d'euros par an. C'est un impôt juste, une fiscalité juste. C'est sur cet objectif que nous devrons concentrer nos efforts.

Antonio Maria Rinaldi, *a nome del gruppo ID*. – Signor Presidente, signori Commissari, onorevoli colleghi, vorrei ricordare a questa assemblea che la stragrande maggioranza dei cittadini europei è dell'opinione che per «grants», così come previsti nel Recovery Fund, si intendono risorse regalate, cioè materializzate dal nulla grazie all'Unione europea, mentre in realtà sono reperite per mezzo delle cosiddette risorse proprie.

Sarebbe pertanto opportuno informare meglio i cittadini europei che, per risorse proprie, e per il Recovery ne sono state previste delle nuove, si intendono nient'altro che tasse che direttamente o indirettamente gravano alla fine sempre sulle tasche dei cittadini.

Inoltre, ho enormi perplessità che tutti i «grants» previsti saranno poi compensati dalle entrate pianificate dalle nuove risorse proprie e si dovrà sicuramente ricorrere in corso d'opera ad altre entrate straordinarie, sempre a carico dei cittadini.

Insomma, il sistema ricorda molto il famoso gioco delle tre carte delle fiere di paese, dove è già noto chi ci rimette sempre. In fondo, come avete potuto ora constatare, basta un solo minuto per far capire correttamente ai cittadini questo equivoco.

Bogdan Rzońca, *w imieniu grupy ECR*. – Panie Komisarzu! My mówimy nie, ale nie w imię jakiejś dziwnej zasady, tylko dlatego, że wedle naszych wyliczeń, wedle wyliczeń ekspertów wszystkie te podatki bardziej dokuczą krajom biednym niż krajom bogatym. I to jest nasze podstawowe tłumaczenie przedstawiane naszym wyborcom. Zaproponowany koszyk jest niezrównoważony, nadmiernie obciąży mniej zamożne państwa członkowskie o wysoko emisyjny gospodarkach. I to jest naga prawda. Przedwczesne również jest w tym momencie podejmowanie decyzji dotyczących zasobów własnych opartych na CBAM oraz na zyskach rezydualnych.

Wszystkie dochody budżetu Unii powinny stanowić jednolitą pulę środków zgodnie z zasadą uniwersalności budżetu Unii Europejskiej i nie należy z góry przesądzać o ich przeznaczeniu w aktach sektorowych. Decyzja o wprowadzeniu nowych zasobów własnych nie powinna być podejmowana pospiesznie, na czas, bez pełnej wiedzy co do kształtu nowych mechanizmów i odpowiedniej analizy skutków. Mamy więc ogromny problem. Ta dyskusja trwa w każdej grupie politycznej. Jestem przekonany, że wszystkie grupy polityczne, nie tylko EKR, mają z tym problem, ale stawiamy sprawę jasno i wyraźnie, że nie będziemy popierać takich sytuacji, żeby pozbawić na przykład Polski wpływów z ETSu. To jest niesprawiedliwe, gdyż zabraknie nam pieniędzy na transformację energetyczną. Więc w tym wypadku EKR będzie głosował przeciw.

Δημήτριος Παπαδημούλης, *εξ ονόματος της ομάδας The Left*. – Κύριε Πρόεδρε, η διοργανική συμφωνία για τη δημιουργία νέων ιδίων πόρων πρέπει να προχωρήσει. Πρώτον, γιατί πρέπει να βρούμε τα χρήματα για να αποπληρώσουμε το δάνειο του NextGenerationEU χωρίς να επιβαρύνουμε τον κοινοτικό προϋπολογισμό περικόπτοντας προγράμματα που περιμένουν οι πολίτες, αλλά και για να χρηματοδοτήσουμε το νέο Κοινωνικό Ταμείο για το Κλίμα και να αντιμετωπίσουμε την ενεργειακή φτώχεια.

Για αυτό στηρίζουμε την πρόταση της Επιτροπής ως Κοινοβούλιο και ζητούμε συγκεκριμενοποιήσεις και βελτιώσεις και ασκούμε δριμεία κριτική στο απόν Συμβούλιο, το οποίο βραδυπορεί και δεν τιμά την υπογραφή του στη διοργανική συμφωνία. Το Ευρωπαϊκό Κοινοβούλιο, κύριε Hahn, ζητά και το επόμενο βήμα για τους ιδίους πόρους να είναι ακόμη πιο φιλόδοξο, γιατί έτσι μπορούμε να ξεπεράσουμε και την πάγια αντίθεση μεταξύ καθαρών εισφορέων και καθαρών ληπτών που κρατά τον προϋπολογισμό της Ευρωπαϊκής Ένωσης στο εξαιρετικά χαμηλό ποσοστό του 1% του ευρωπαϊκού ΑΕΠ.

Και περιμένουμε από εσάς, επιτέλους, να φέρετε και μια δραστική πρόταση για την φορολόγηση του μεγάλου πλούτου. Δεν είναι δυνατόν η Ευρωπαϊκή Ένωση, που πρωτοπόρησε για την αντιμετώπιση της κλιματικής αλλαγής, να μην πρωτοπορήσει και σε αυτό το θέμα, σε μια περίοδο που αυξάνονται επικίνδυνα οι κοινωνικές και οι φορολογικές ανισότητες.

Marcel de Graaff (NI). – Voorzitter, commissaris, de Europese Commissie wil naast de lidstaten ook belasting kunnen heffen. Belasting die bedrijven op burgers afwentelen. Wat doet de Commissie met dit geld? Het geeft dit geld aan de grote farmaceutische bedrijven in ondoorzichtige miljardendeals waar de schijn van belangenverstrengeling vanaf druipt. Het geeft dit geld aan stichtingen die mensensmokkelaars betalen om migranten illegaal binnen te halen. En het geeft dit geld aan Oekraïne waar het verdwijnt in de zakken van corrupte zakenlieden en politici, tot in de Verenigde Staten toe! Want *the big guy* moet ook zijn aandeel krijgen. Het geeft dit geld aan die bedrijven om via digitaalgeldsystemen totale controle over mensen uit te kunnen oefenen. Deze Europese Commissie pakt daarmee de gewone man zijn werk, zijn bezit en zijn vrijheid af. De enige hoop voor de burgers ligt bij de eigen staat. Bij patriottische politici die strijden tegen deze satanische webagenda. Dit voorstel moet onmiddellijk de prullenbak in.

Margarida Marques (S&D). – Senhor Presidente, Senhor Comissário, ontem debatemos aqui a estratégia de constituição do *NextGenerationEU*. Hoje debatemos os nossos recursos próprios do orçamento da União.

Sem novos recursos próprios o *NextGenerationEU* não será um sucesso. Eles são fundamentais para garantir o reembolso desta dívida comum e a capacidade da União para construir novos instrumentos semelhantes no futuro.

Há um acordo interinstitucional vinculativo. Da Comissão, aguardamos a solução para a taxa sobre o digital e a proposta para a criação da taxa sobre as transações financeiras. Do Conselho, que os aprove no calendário necessário, desde já aprovando o Regime de Comércio de Licenças de Emissão e o Mecanismo de Ajustamento Carbónico Fronteiriço como novos recursos próprios do orçamento da União Europeia. Estaremos, assim, a fortalecer a arquitetura da União Europeia e a assegurar que as novas prioridades e ações de emergência da União Europeia não são financiadas, em momento nenhum, nem à custa dos atuais programas, nem das políticas europeias, nem das próximas gerações.

Claudia Gamon (Renew). – Herr Präsident! Warum braucht die Europäische Union unbedingt mehr Eigenmittel, mehr eigene budgetäre Quellen? Weil sie mehr Freiraum schaffen, weil sie uns krisenfest machen.

Dass die Europäische Union für wesentliche budgetäre Entscheidungen in der Vergangenheit de facto fast vollkommen abhängig vom Willen der Mitgliedstaaten war, war ein Konstruktionsfehler. Und wer jetzt hier behauptet, dass mögliche Quellen, wie der Emissionshandel, Unternehmen belasten würden, der kann auch endlich anfangen, zu Hause mal die Hausaufgaben zu erledigen, die eigenen Steuersysteme zu durchforsten und unnötige Belastungen für Unternehmerinnen und Unternehmer und Bürgerinnen und Bürger abzubauen.

Wir übernehmen Verantwortung für das Klima. Wir übernehmen Verantwortung für eine nachhaltige Wirtschaft der Zukunft in Europa. Und wir arbeiten jetzt endlich daran, der Union mehr Freiheit zu geben, wesentliche Investitionsentscheidungen für die Zukunft ihrer Bürgerinnen und Bürger selbständiger und selbstbestimmter treffen zu können.

France Jamet (ID). – Monsieur le Président, passer d'un budget de 1 % du PIB de la zone euro à 10 % démontre une seule chose: l'Union européenne veut plus de pouvoir. Et pour y parvenir, elle dépossède les États membres de la maîtrise de l'impôt prélevé sur nos populations et nos entreprises et, plus grave encore, sur nos choix stratégiques énergétiques. J'en veux pour preuve la confirmation hier, par les commissaires Dombrovskis et Gentiloni, que le plan REPowerEU ne financerait pas la restauration de notre parc nucléaire français. Cela a au moins le mérite d'être clair, après toutes ces semaines de silence ou d'ambiguïtés entretenues de la gauche à la droite.

Mais en pleine crise énergétique et alors que cela fait plus de 50 ans que les Français finançaient à juste titre une filière d'excellence, on les en prive au moment où ils en ont le plus besoin. Notre devoir étant de prioriser l'intérêt général de nos compatriotes, nous ne validons ni la hausse de vos ressources ni votre politique, qui se font contre la France et les Français.

Zbigniew Kuźmiuk (ECR). – Panie Przewodniczący! Panie Komisarzu! Zgodnie z art. 311 Traktatu o funkcjonowaniu Unii Europejskiej te nowe obciążenia podatkowe powinny sprawiedliwie rozkładać ciężary pomiędzy poszczególne kraje członkowskie. W przypadku tych nowych zasobów tak nie jest. Mamy twarde dane dotyczące opłaty od nieprzetworzonego plastiku. W przypadku mojego kraju, Polski, to jest obciążenie wynoszące 8 % całości wpływów. Podczas gdy dochody z DNB, to jest 3 %, a więc to jest trzykrotnie więcej niż dotychczasowa składka. Podobnie jest w przypadku wpływów z ETS-u, dwa i pół raza więcej, w przypadku CBAM-u dwa razy więcej. To jest skrajnie niesprawiedliwe.

I druga poważna wątpliwość. Otóż nowe dochody są głównie oparte na tych opłatach środowiskowych, a więc one pomniejszają możliwości finansowania celów klimatyczno-energetycznych dla krajów członkowskich, które mają z tym największy problem. Takich jak mój kraj, Polska. W tej sytuacji zabieranie tych środków, uderza w cele klimatyczne Unii. To jest pozbawione sensu.

Aurore Lalucq (S&D). – Monsieur le Président, Monsieur le Commissaire, chers collègues, ces dernières années, on a vu un certain nombre de mots tabous réémerger dans le débat politique et industriel: sortie du gaz, État-providence, fiscalité. Et j'aimerais qu'on réhabilite, une fois pour toutes ensemble, un autre mot, celui de politique budgétaire et celui de *policy mix*.

En économie, on n'a pas quinze politiques possibles, on en a deux: la politique monétaire et la politique budgétaire. Et nous avons été assez créatifs au niveau européen pour faire quelque chose qui n'existe nulle part ailleurs et surtout pas en économie: faire une monnaie sans budget. Cela ne fonctionne pas d'un point de vue macroéconomique et pas plus du point de vue de la solidarité.

La question qui se pose à nous aujourd'hui est de savoir si on va décider un jour ou pas de sortir de cet obscurantisme économique, si on va un jour ou pas décider de dépasser les égoïsmes nationaux pour avoir un budget, un vrai, des ressources propres, des vraies, avec une fiscalité – peu importe: pilier I, *single market review*, on peut penser à plein de choses. Ce n'est même pas une question de clivage gauche-droite, c'est une question de bon sens. Comme dirait le Fonds monétaire international, cette grande officine gauchiste, l'enjeu pour l'Europe aujourd'hui, je cite, c'est de «mettre en œuvre une Europe correctement outillée d'un point de vue budgétaire».

Johannes Hahn, *Member of the Commission*. – Mr President, thank you again for this timely and interesting debate and for your constant support to diversify the revenues of our union budget. New types of revenue will avoid undue cuts to Union programmes or increases in Member States' contributions. The Commission will present the second set of new own resources still in 2023. This is one year ahead of what is foreseen in the institutional agreement between the European Parliament, the Council and the Commission. It underscores our commitment to sustainable EU public finance.

The second set of new own resources would complement the first. It aims at generating sufficient revenue for the repayment of NGEU borrowing. As you know, the institutional agreement names two possible contributions for this second basket of resources, one linked to the corporate sector and one linked to the financial sector. But there are also other possibilities like a digital levy, for instance.

In the field of corporate taxation, the Commission intends to come forward with a proposal for a single set of tax rules for doing business in Europe. This could form the basis of an own resource linked to the corporate sector. NGEU repayment is not a choice, but an obligation which we have towards investors and to taxpayers. It's a test of unity and credibility of the union to repay our debts. And this unity will be closely watched by the outside world. Our joint effort, therefore, should be to negotiate and agree a balanced package of new own resources. And again, it's something which is very much linked to the credibility of us, to the capital markets, which are now very important for us more than ever in order to raise the necessary amounts to support our citizens.

Valérie Hayer, *rapporteure*. – Monsieur le Président, Monsieur le Commissaire, je voudrais remercier l'ensemble des collègues qui sont intervenus et évidemment remercier José Manuel pour le partenariat et la relation de confiance et le travail de qualité que nous menons ensemble sur cette question très engageante des ressources propres.

Ce que je retiens de nos échanges aujourd'hui, c'est quand même que le Parlement est uni, qu'il est uni et qu'il ne cédera rien à ceux qui voudraient qu'on rebrousse chemin sur les ressources propres, que ce soit en utilisant les recettes pour d'autres objectifs ou bien en empêchant purement et simplement la mise en place de ces instruments. Je voudrais citer par exemple Viktor Orbán, qui continue à bloquer l'accord sur la taxation des multinationales par pur chantage politique, alors même que les Hongrois demandent eux aussi plus de justice fiscale.

Alors oui, il est justifié que les droits à polluer achetés par les grandes industries sur le marché européen reviennent à l'Europe et qu'en conséquence cet argent vienne rembourser l'emprunt qui a permis à nos industriels de ne pas mettre la clé sous la porte, mais aussi de décarboner leur production. Alors oui, il est justifié qu'ArcelorMittal paie des droits à polluer sur l'acier ultra carboné qu'il importe d'Inde pour le revendre chez nous et qu'en conséquence cet argent permette de rembourser l'emprunt qui a permis de maintenir la demande européenne sur le marché mondial. Et oui, il est justifié de faire contribuer les grandes multinationales qui prospèrent grâce à notre marché intérieur mais qui ne paient pas leur juste part d'impôts aujourd'hui et qu'en conséquence, là encore, cet argent rembourse l'emprunt qui a maintenu la consommation en Europe et qui, de ce fait, a protégé leurs activités.

Alors, chers collègues, soyons fermes, soyons déterminés, allons jusqu'au bout. Et maintenons la pression chaque jour, dans chaque négociation, jusqu'à ce que ces ressources propres soient sur pied. Parce que rien, aucune règle d'unanimité, aucune réserve idéologique ne doit nous arrêter dans cette quête de plus de justice fiscale et de plus de justice sociale.

José Manuel Fernandes, *Relator*. – Senhor Presidente, caras e caros Colegas, Senhor Comissário, com as nossas propostas, com a nossa opinião, que estou seguro que vai ser aprovada, nós conseguimos cerca de 15 mil milhões de euros de receita sem penalizar os cidadãos, contribuindo para o objetivo de combate às alterações climáticas, ajudando ainda a que haja uma justiça fiscal e acelerando os objetivos da transição, também digital. Novas receitas que servem, é verdade, para pagar a dívida, mas nós não podemos ficar por aí. Não é só para pagar a dívida do *NextGenerationEU*: é essencial que se consigam receitas também para aquilo que são os projetos comuns, os objetivos estratégicos da União Europeia, a sua autonomia estratégica. Se não investirmos na segurança, na União da energia, no reforço da nossa capacidade militar, na saúde, na proteção civil, naquilo que são os *chips acts*, os semicondutores, na conectividade segura, se não tivermos estes investimentos, pagaremos um preço enorme. Investimentos que devem ser em projetos comuns, porque trazem eficácia, eficiência. Com menos recursos nós podemos fazer muito mais, e este é um objetivo que nós temos de ter: assumir os compromissos, pagar a dívida, não sobrecarregar as próximas gerações.

Por outro lado, ter um orçamento que invista de forma a que haja autonomia na União Europeia, para darmos futuro aos cidadãos da União Europeia. E, nesse sentido, se não fizermos os investimentos nestes projetos comuns, como demonstra a falta da União da energia, nós teremos e pagaremos um preço muito alto.

Fica aqui um compromisso: o Parlamento Europeu, eu e a Colega Valérie Hayer, já estamos a trabalhar em propostas para um novo pacote e para dar sugestões à Comissão. A Comissão que venha com a segunda fase e o segundo pacote, também em termos daquilo que deve ser o roteiro para os recursos próprios.

Agora falta o Conselho, que tem de decidir por unanimidade. Está nas mãos do Conselho fazer avançar a União Europeia. E eu espero que o Conselho, em vez de governantes, e por uma vez, também tenha líderes. A União Europeia bem precisa deles.

Der Präsident. – Die Aussprache ist damit geschlossen.

Die Abstimmung findet am Mittwoch, 23. November 2022, statt.

Dienstag, 22. November 2022

11. Zusammensetzung der Ausschüsse und Delegationen

Der Präsident. – Ich habe Ihnen eine Mitteilung zu machen.

Die fraktionslosen Mitglieder haben der Präsidentin Beschlüsse über die Änderung von Ernennungen in Ausschüssen übermittelt. Diese Beschlüsse werden im Protokoll der heutigen Sitzung aufgeführt und treten am Tag dieser Ankündigung in Kraft.

(Die Sitzung wird um 14.43 Uhr kurz unterbrochen.)

PRESIDÊNCIA: PEDRO SILVA PEREIRA

Vice-Presidente

12. Wiederaufnahme der Sitzung

(A sessão é reiniciada às 15h03)

13. Genehmigung des Protokolls der vorangegangenen Sitzung

Presidente. – A ata da sessão de ontem já foi distribuída.

Há alguma observação?

Declaro a ata da sessão de ontem aprovada.

14. Fragestunde mit Anfragen an die Kommission – Künftige legislative Reform des Rahmens für die wirtschaftspolitische Steuerung in Zeiten der sozialen und wirtschaftlichen Krise

Presidente. — O próximo ponto da ordem do dia é o período de perguntas à Comissão (artigo 137.º do Regimento).

Apresento as boas-vindas ao Vice-Presidente Executivo da Comissão, Sr. Dombrovskis, e ao Comissário, Sr. Gentiloni, para este período de perguntas.

O tema para este período de perguntas é o seguinte: Futura reforma legislativa do Quadro de Governação Económica em tempos de crise social e económica.

Este período de perguntas durará cerca de 90 minutos. Haverá um minuto para fazer uma pergunta, dois minutos para a resposta, 30 segundos para uma pergunta suplementar e dois minutos para a resposta.

Gostaria de recordar que a eventual pergunta suplementar só será atribuída se estiver estritamente relacionada com a pergunta principal e não consistir numa nova pergunta.

Se desejar fazer uma pergunta, convidamo-lo a registar o seu pedido agora, utilizando a função «catch-the-eye» na sua máquina de voto, depois de ter inserido o seu cartão de voto.

Durante o período de perguntas, as intervenções terão lugar a partir do lugar de cada um e convido todos os oradores a respeitarem o tempo de uso de palavra atribuído.

Os colegas podem precisar de alguns momentos para registar o pedido de pergunta através do dispositivo de votação. Por conseguinte, solicito novamente que apresentem agora o vosso pedido e começaremos com a primeira pergunta.

Margarida Marques (S&D). – Senhor Presidente, Senhor Vice-Presidente da Comissão, Senhor Comissário, eu gostaria de destacar que as orientações da Comissão Europeia para a revisão das regras de governação económica, do nosso ponto de vista, vão na boa direção. Têm em conta uma parte significativa dos princípios políticos aprovados por este Parlamento. Mas precisam de mais ambição e precisamos de conhecer os detalhes.

A minha pergunta é a seguinte: com o *NextGenerationEU* e o Mecanismo de Recuperação e Resiliência, nós temos reformas, investimento e financiamento europeu para fazer estas reformas e o investimento. No futuro, quando estes instrumentos acabarem, como será feito o financiamento para os investimentos necessários para a autonomia estratégica da Europa, a transição climática, a transição digital, sem evitar a fragmentação do mercado interno?

Valdis Dombrovskis, *Executive Vice-President of the Commission*. – Thank you very much for this question. So indeed, from the Commission's side we put forward orientations for a possible revision of our fiscal and macro-economic governance framework. The idea is now, we hope, that based on those orientations, a consensus will be emerging among Member States, with the European Parliament, with different stakeholders, and if this is indeed the case, we will be following this up with legislative proposals. So if everything goes according to plan, that would happen in spring next year.

Orientations, as we put them forward, are obviously already taking into account feedback we were receiving from Member States, from the European Parliament, from others during quite a long period of discussions. As you know, we launched this process already in February 2020 as there was some suspension during the COVID-19 pandemic, but nevertheless we had quite extensive discussions. Correspondingly, what we are putting forward is already, in a sense, factoring in those discussions and narrowing them down because we need to get more concrete on where we actually want to go with this review of fiscal rules.

You mentioned the question of additional common fiscal capacity. Well, we were clear in those orientations that here we are focusing on fiscal rules. So we are not opening another very – as we know – broad and also very controversial discussion on this common fiscal capacity. So here, indeed, it's about how the future of governance framework could look like.

Margarida Marques (S&D). – Senhor Presidente, na proposta de revisão do Quadro Financeiro Plurianual, no relatório de iniciativa que o Parlamento Europeu já aprovou na Comissão de Orçamentos, nós propomos a criação de um fundo para a soberania, para a soberania estratégica da União Europeia, ideia que, aliás, a Presidente Ursula von der Leyen já defendeu aqui no seu discurso sobre o Estado da União.

Gostaria de saber qual é a abertura da Comissão para apoiar a constituição deste fundo, que será, necessariamente, um instrumento fundamental para o apoio ao investimento na União Europeia?

Valdis Dombrovskis, *Executive Vice-President of the Commission*. – So as I was already mentioning, we clearly have this discussion also on a broader kind of future of the EU budget, additional elements, sovereignty fund, euro area fiscal capacity. We have all those discussions.

So what I'm basically emphasising is that we are not making those discussions part of the discussions of our fiscal and macroeconomic governance framework because that's already, I would say, a complicated and complex enough exercise.

You mentioned, for example, specifically NextGenerationEU. We remember that a number of Member States agreed on the NextGenerationEU explicitly on the condition that this is a one-off instrument. But we all know also that the debate on common, for example, euro area fiscal capacity predates NextGenerationEU, and we do not expect that this debate will disappear, but we are just emphasising that it is not part of this particular exercise.

Eva Maria Poptcheva (Renew). – The Commission communication indeed proposes to improve the sanctions regime, which I think makes sense. It improves the corrective arm of the fiscal framework, so basically the sticks. But I'm wondering, what are the carrots you're proposing or having in mind to ensure greater compliance with the rules? Because conditional access to already-accessible funds like the structural funds doesn't seem very compelling to me as carrots.

Paolo Gentiloni, *Member of the Commission*. – I'm not sure that this sticks and carrots mechanism could work, but anyway I take your point.

In my view, indeed, the effort we made with these proposals is an effort to strike a balance. So in this case, we can also say a balance also between sticks and carrots. The balance is on a more simplified mechanism where the rules are more transparent. We have a simpler single indicator of the evolution, which is based on the net primary expenditure. Stronger ownership from Member States, because Member States are the ones proposing their plans of reduction of debt and investments. The possibility to use the investments in the common priorities of the Union to have an even more gradual path of reduction of the debt and at the same time having more gradual, more realistic, rules, more capable to incentivise investments to have them also more enforced.

This enforcement is not based on enlarging the sanctions but paradoxically, it is based on making the sanctions lighter because lighter sanctions are possibly also sanctions that we can really enforce.

Eva Maria Poptcheva (Renew). – You mentioned the individual ownership of the Member States that you tried to focus more on in the proposal. I'm wondering, in this regard, do you think that this should also involve a greater role for national independent fiscal institutions?

Paolo Gentiloni, *Member of the Commission*. – This is always a point we refer to in all our papers and documents. And rightly so, in my view. In an ideal world, we should work to strengthen these independent bodies. In the real world, we have to do this taking into account the fact that their reality is rather unequal, country by country, and so that it is not easy to say, overall, that these bodies should have this specific role. There is, I think, a common understanding on the fact that the Commission is proposing to give to these bodies a stronger role, but we are not so much framing this from the legal point of view, taking into account exactly the fact that the reality is different country by country or from this independent body. So strengthen them, but not forgetting that they are quite different in their capacity and their level in their autonomy because they are independent – but yes, independence is a fight in some countries.

Irene Tinagli (S&D). – I want to go back on the investment issue and in particular on the national investments. I think this proposal is very positive, very good in a way that tries to find a better balance between the stability and the growth, and investments – national investments – are crucial to that end. The only thing that I wonder, in the legislative proposal that I'm confident will be presented very soon, I think that we will need a little bit more clarification on some aspects of these national investments: how they will be treated, which kind of investments, which conditions. I mean, I would like the Commission to elaborate a little bit more and to share with us some clarification on this matter.

Valdis Dombrovskis, *Executive Vice-President of the Commission*. – Indeed, so it's very clear that in coming years, we will need to deal with both issues. We will need a lot of investments for our green and digital transitions, for the resilience of our economies and, at the same time, we will also need to put current high levels of debt on a clear downwards trajectory.

So it's about finding the right balance. So one element in our intentions is about giving more space or allowing Member States to have more gradual debt-adjustment trajectories if they are performing, growth enhancing and fiscal sustainability, supporting reforms and investments.

So those are the two elements, that's the investments, which we want be supportive of growth and fiscal sustainability, and also responding to common European priorities and obviously also, of course, country-specific challenges. So we outline these elements as ones which we will take into account when deciding whether to allow Member States to have a more gradual debt-adjustment trajectory.

Irene Tinagli (S&D). – Let me be a little bit more specific. In the communication of 2015, the Commission provides a clear and specific region for certain investments, you know, that takes into account not only compliance with macroeconomic criteria, but also the type of investment. That's what I wanted to look into, with particular reference, but of course not limited to co-financed investments that are part of European projects. I think this is an important part. I would like to have clarification. Are you considering proposing something similar in the new governance as well? Because I think in the upcoming years, that would be very, very important and very valuable.

Valdis Dombrovskis, *Executive Vice-President of the Commission*. – Indeed, as I was mentioning, so there are elements on being supportive to growth and fiscal stability, but also responding to common European priorities. Obviously that can also be cross-border investments. So, investments which correspond to European priorities are clearly covered by the possibility of giving more fiscal leeway. That's exactly the idea. Well, there may be one horizontal point because sometimes we are getting in quite precise questions.

So the document which we put forward provides broad orientations. That's exactly what we want now – to get feedback, to get maybe some questions, which can lead to some clarifications, because then, based on those orientations and based on the feedback which we will be getting, we will be putting already concrete proposals and we consider it's likely legislative proposals will go out. So here, in a sense, with the orientations, we have some leeway for discussion and not everything is detailed to the last point, to the last detail because we are narrowing down the discussion with the orientations, but we are not quite there yet at exact concrete proposals.

Rosa D'Amato (Verts/ALE). – Signor Commissario, noi temiamo che la riforma del quadro di governance economica, proposta dalla Commissione, non sia sufficiente ad affrontare proprio i tempi di crisi sociale ed economica che stiamo vivendo.

I territori, il Comitato delle regioni, ma anche questo stesso Parlamento hanno chiesto che fosse introdotta una *golden rule* per gli investimenti verdi. Per anni i Comuni non hanno potuto investire nella transizione ecologica a causa di margini fiscali soffocanti. Ecco perché il cofinanziamento nazionale della politica di coesione va scorporato dal calcolo di deficit.

Poi sul sociale, dove sono gli stimoli necessari a massicci programmi di welfare sociale o investimenti nei servizi pubblici che ormai sono sottofinanziati da anni? Penso alla sanità, penso all'istruzione.

Infine, dov'è la risposta fattuale al gap di investimenti e al divario territoriale, che è crescente all'interno delle regioni dell'Europa, ma all'interno delle stesse nazioni? Penso al Mezzogiorno d'Italia.

Paolo Gentiloni, *Member of the Commission*. – Thank you for this question. Of course not everything that we have to address can be included in our fiscal rules. You were referring to, for example, cohesion policies, which is a great part of our programmes. I will stay to the fiscal rules and address especially your question about the golden rule and how to incentivise investment.

De facto, I think we are proposing a different way to address the same needs that is traditionally addressed with golden rules. Golden rules are not cancelling the debt of course. Golden rules are only allowing Member States a different accounting of some investments. This is exactly the same scope we are looking for with a different tool.

Yesterday, in a discussion with the ECON and BUDG Committees, I said it is not a golden rule it is a timing rule, a time advantage rule. The fact is that we are allowing Member States that are choosing to invest in our common priorities to have more time for the gradual reduction of their debt.

So it is again a fiscal tool different from the golden rule but with the same scope, more or less. Then we have to discuss which investments, which was also the discussion addressed by Ms Tinagli and Commissioner Dombrovskis.

Rosa D'Amato (Verts/ALE). – Signor Commissario, la proposta non tiene conto dei costi incalcolabili dell'inazione climatica. Quanto costa agli Stati membri rimandare di anno in anno gli investimenti necessari per fronteggiare la crisi climatica? Quanto costa non investire contro, ad esempio, il dissesto idrogeologico, il rifacimento delle reti idriche? È evidente: i costi per riparare i danni invece che prevenirli sono molto più alti.

Quindi, Commissario, c'è un'intenzione da parte della Commissione di spingere verso questo tipo di investimenti?

Paolo Gentiloni, *Member of the Commission*. – *(Start of speech off-mike)* … agree with you on the fact that the cost of inaction should be more and more considered at a global level and at the EU level. And I think this is one of the reasons why we are giving such a priority to all the green investment package in all our programmes. This is the case for the RRF. As you know, we have a high threshold of necessary investments on the green transition and we will have, according to our survey of the different national plans, something like 250 billion in green investments coming from these plans.

The same is, of course, at a different level, through our fiscal rules because we are encouraging, incentivising, giving fiscal advantage to Member States that will choose to give priority to investments. Which investments? For sure, the investments on green, on digital, on social resilience. And then I am sure that in the discussion with stakeholders and especially with Member States, we will also have a discussion on other investments. We already had some proposals coming from Member States. But for sure, our twin priorities will be there and, again, considering the cost of not acting is absolutely necessary.

René Repasi (S&D). – Let me please, first, take this opportunity to congratulate Commissioner Paolo Gentiloni on his birthday, being here with us in the room. Congratulations, happy birthday.

Now, to my question, I very much welcome the orientations that were presented by the Commission, coming up with a lot of good proposals, solving rules that are obviously not fit for purpose. And in particular this idea that we get an expenditure rule that has a corridor now between a debt reduction path and a 3 % deficit upper threshold. And in between we have open expenditure and that's much better than the currently medium-term budgetary objective.

What I am wondering is, given the discussion that we've already had here on investment, is this corridor that is getting, of course, smaller and smaller the higher a country is indebted, irrespective of its individual path, is this sufficient given the need to mitigate the crisis and the expenses for the green transition ? And, having that in mind – I am referring also to the question that Irene Tinagli was asking on the 2015 flexibility communication, which was on the investment and structural reform clause – is it the intention of the European Commission to also look at expenditure beyond this expenditure rules, so the investment in the structural reform clause, and to allow further public investment that is then dedicated to the green transition under the preventive arm of the Stability and Growth Pact?

Valdis Dombrovskis, *Executive Vice-President of the Commission*. – Thank you very much for this question. Well, indeed, one of the main aims of these orientations is to find a more flexible and more gradual debt reduction path for Member States. So that's why we are abolishing, or proposing to abolish, this so-called 1/20th rule, and changing it with more flexible arrangements, as you outlined.

But indeed, as you also outlined, there is a differentiation between high-debt countries and medium to low-debt countries in a sense. The further countries are from 60% of GDP debt level, which is referenced in the Treaty, the more effort we expect from those countries to adjust the debt. Because those fiscal sustainability concerns are also the ones which we need to take into account, especially now in a changing interest rate environment.

We see that the period of very accommodative monetary policy is coming to an end and there is a normalisation of monetary policy taking into account. This is reflected also in growing interest rates, something also which we need to consider when thinking of the right balance between debt sustainability and promotion of investment.

You mentioned a 2015 communication on best use of flexibility. At that time it was within the existing rules of the Stability and Growth Pact, as indeed are our investment and structural reform clauses. Well, now it's also in a sense reflected with the possibilities of Member States to have more gradual debt adjustment paths, if they implement growth-enhancing and fiscal sustainability, improving investments and reforms.

René Repasi (S&D). – To be one step more specific, an idea or an orientation in the paper that I found particularly interesting was introducing the relationship, or emphasizing the relationship, between the macroeconomic imbalance procedure and the fiscal rules. Here I am wondering to what extent expenditure that might be necessary to overcome macroeconomic imbalances has to be part of the expenditure rule or is taken outside the scope of the expenditure rule, because it is necessary that we get an equilibrium between the macroeconomic imbalances amongst the Member States.

Valdis Dombrovskis, *Executive Vice-President of the Commission*. – Well, indeed, one of the elements in the orientations is a closer link between the fiscal rules and macroeconomic imbalance procedures, and also some ideas outline how to improve the functioning and application of the macroeconomic imbalance procedure. But what we are proposing specifically on the expenditure side, the expenditure benchmark, which will be, so to say, the single operational indicator, and how we will assess Member States compliance with their medium-term fiscal structural plans, well this expenditure benchmark takes into account expenditure, so it's in a sense not starting to distinguish which expenditure is counted, and which expenditure is not counted. We allow for this additional flexibility through more gradual debt adjustment. So that's where the flexibility is built on. So we are not building on top of this the idea of accounting or not certain types of expenditure.

Gunnar Beck (ID). – Sehr geehrte Herren Kommissare! Die Eurozone hat mit Großbritannien die höchste Inflationsrate und die schlechtesten Wachstumsdaten und -prognosen der entwickelten Welt. Schuld daran, so die Kommission und die EZB, sei nicht die EU-Wirtschafts- und -Geldpolitik, sondern unglückliche Umstände: Covid, der Ukraine-Krieg, das Klima etc. etc. Deshalb sollen jetzt die Schuldenabbau-Leitlinien für Mitgliedstaaten flexibilisiert werden, das heißt, Schulden sollen langsamer abgebaut werden und einstweilen mehr Schulden gemacht werden.

Seit 2008 sind die Schulden der Mitgliedstaaten eskaliert, ohne Wachstumseffekt. Dennoch ist die Kommission zuversichtlich, mit mehr Schulden mehr Wachstum zu schaffen. Doch woher – meine Frage – nehmen Sie diese Gewissheit? Anders gesagt: Was haben Ihre Vorgänger und die nationalen Regierungen seit 2008, der großen Finanzkrise, falsch gemacht? Und was genau werden Sie jetzt richtig machen, was Ihre Vorgänger falsch machten? Immerhin waren Ihre Vorgänger sich genauso sicher wie Sie, mehr Wachstum mit mehr Schulden zu machen.

Paolo Gentiloni, *Member of the Commission*. – Well, indeed, the mechanism of common borrowing to respond to the COVID crisis, in my view, was not only a new tool and a very important new programme for the European Union, but it was also quite effective in relation to two risks. First, the risk in itself of COVID, lockdown, the fall in growth. Our economies recovered quite strongly and quite fast from this situation. Also, it was very useful in addressing a second risk, which in our language we call 'the risk of fragmentation': the risk that the differences among countries, especially countries sharing the same currency, would increase because of the different fiscal space facing a crisis. I think that this common programme was very important to avoid these two risks. The economy rebounded strongly and faster even than other players in the world economy and fragmentation was avoided.

Now we have to face a new crisis, and I think that this crisis is even more difficult to face than the previous one because we are facing it also with inflation. And for this reason, we are very cautious on fiscal expansion, fiscal stance, and we are suggesting fiscal neutrality to our Member States, which is very different from what we did after COVID.

Gunnar Beck (ID). – So, if I understand you correctly, you're saying that more debt hasn't exactly given rise to higher growth levels, but it's kind of helped us to avoid the very worst. So could I infer from this that there's something fundamentally wrong with the European Union now, that we can't grow any longer and we've got to incur more debt just in order to defer, shall I say, the worst of all possible worlds?

Paolo Gentiloni, *Member of the Commission*. – Well, my answer would be no, because I think, well first of all, we know that if we look at the global picture, the European Union is not at all the global actor with higher debt. We have global actor with much, much higher debt than the European Union.

And second, I think that we had an obvious increase of debt because of facing the COVID-19 crisis and what happened because of the COVID-19 crisis, so the lockdown, etc., etc., inevitably needed a universal response. If you have to support a large majority of companies, if you have to support jobs all over the countries, it is quite inevitable to have a higher level of debt. But this is not a recipe for our future. We are not proposing this emergency response to that crisis as the way forward, increasing debt to have growth.

To have growth, we need to invest in our priorities to strengthen European competitiveness, to confirm our leadership in the green transition. These actions will allow us to strengthen our growth. Look to our competitors at global level and we see that this competition is open, that we can play our role, that we are not so far from other competitors from this point of view.

Johan Van Overtveldt (ECR). – Voorzitter, budgettaire discipline blijft belangrijk. Sommigen lijken dat in de voorbije periode een beetje vergeten te zijn, maar het blijft belangrijk. De budgettaire situatie van de meeste landen in de schuldevolutie is van dien aard dat budgettaire discipline alleen niet meer zal volstaan om die situaties recht te trekken en onder controle te houden. Economische groei, volgehouden economische groei en natuurlijke economische groei, is daarvoor noodzakelijk en daarvoor zijn op hun beurt hervormingen noodzakelijk: ernstige hervormingen inzake arbeidsmarkt, inzake pensioenstelsels, inzake energiemarkten, inzake fiscaliteit en dies meer. In een aantal lidstaten, waaronder mijn eigen land België, is het gebrek aan dergelijke hervormingen nu al zeer problematisch. Mijn vraag is: hoe zwaar gaat de Commissie inzetten op die hervormingen? En is er een soort *trade-off* tussen die hervormingen en wat de begrotingscijfers dan concreet zijn? Met andere woorden: is er wat meer mogelijk op het vlak van begroting en begrotingstekorten, indien er op het vlak van hervormingen extra zeilen bijgezet worden?

Valdis Dombrovskis, *Executive Vice-President of the Commission*. – Well, yes, indeed. If you also look at our orientations for the review of the fiscal governance framework, the aim of ensuring fiscal sustainability, budgetary discipline, as you mentioned, is very much present. So what we are making, we are in a sense, making it more aligned with the real circumstances.

We know, for example, that currently there is a so-called 1/20 rule for debt reduction, but we also know that in practice, this rule is not really being applied. So we can continue to insist on 1/20 rule, which probably will continue not to be applied, or we can come forward with a different framework. So to give Member States more leeway for them to devise their own fiscal structural funds with their own debt-reduction pathways, of course, not giving carte blanche to Member States – because another element that is important is equal treatment of Member States.

So we will be providing, based on a common European methodology, each country with a reference debt-reduction pathway, so that all countries will be able to see and compare what reference each Member State should be achieving, and then Member States can come with their fiscal structural plans, taking these reference values into account. Indeed, there is a lever also concerning the structural reforms. We are already discussing that if Member States are implementing investments and structural reforms which improve growth prospects, which improve fiscal sustainability, then Member States can have more gradual debt-adjustment trajectories.

Johan Van Overtveldt (ECR). – Do the Commissioners think that they have sufficient instruments at their disposal to intervene to hurt countries that do not live up to what has been agreed upon, in terms of deficits as well as in terms of structural reforms?

Valdis Dombrovskis, *Executive Vice-President of the Commission*. – Well, in terms of the instruments, of course, already currently the Stability and Growth Pact provides for a possibility to apply sanctions in situations where Member States are not complying with the fiscal rules. As you know, when the Stability and Growth Pact was drawn up, the idea was that we would make sanctions so big that it was going to be unattractive to breach fiscal rules.

Probably what is closer to what's come out of this in practice is that it became too unattractive to apply fiscal rules. So, therefore, we on one hand propose that we actually go for lower and more elastic financial sanctions. So there is a trade-off, in which we are providing Member States with more leeway to set up their own debt reduction trajectories and this comes with stricter enforcement. So, for example, it means, kind of by default, starting excessive deficit procedures from a debt-based excessive deficit procedure for countries whose debt exceeds 60% of GDP and who are deviating from the adjustment path.

It also means that since we are now discussing, medium-term, Member States' plans, that we will be also assessing cumulative deviations. Because what we see now, often countries do just a little bit less than they should be doing. Then it's always a big dilemma. Do we now create a big problem out of this or do we somehow let it go? But if a country, year after year after year, errs in the same direction, we see that, cumulatively, the country is deviating and we can also apply these corrective measures.

José Gusmão (The Left). – Senhor Comissário, a Comissão agita com a flexibilização de algumas regras que se tinham demonstrado claramente impraticáveis e, portanto, o verdadeiro saldo desta nova proposta é a agilização e até a introdução de sanções, nomeadamente aquelas que ficam associadas às recomendações no âmbito do Semestre Europeu. Ou seja, essas recomendações vão deixar de ser apenas recomendações para passarem a ser imposições.

Ora, como muitas das recomendações que a Comissão Europeia tem feito ao longo dos tempos dizem respeito à redução da despesa com pensões, à redução da despesa com serviços públicos, à desregulação do mercado de trabalho – tudo isto competências dos Estados-Membros –, gostava de saber como é que a Comissão Europeia compatibiliza o respeito pelas competências nacionais, que decorre dos Tratados, com a ideia que tem sido propagandeada de que esta nova forma de governação económica terá maior respeito pelas opções democráticas dos governos nacionais.

Paolo Gentiloni, *Member of the Commission*. – Yes. Well, in my view, it's very clearly a balance or a trade-off. Starting point, I think it's quite obvious and I think almost universally shared. And the starting point is that a union needs to have common rules, especially a union having a single currency for most of their members.

But the common rules that we have are not realistic and not implementable, I think that this is more or less what we all understand and share, the decision of having this threshold of 60%. But, of course, we are not changing because we are not changing the Treaties. But in itself this decision was understandable.

It was the average debt of the country signing the treaties. It was not a Nobel Prize idea, this 60%, okay. We learned in these ten, 15 years that this rule of reaching the 60% is not implementable.

We try a balance. Why? The balance is important because the path of reduction of the debt, the means, the priorities are proposed by Member States and not imposed by the Commission or a rule. And in this case, if you have this what we call 'ownership', this stronger role for national politics, you can also ask to implement these rules because you are implementing the rules that your government, your parliament, have decided, not that someone imposed from afar to you.

This is the deal, and the balance we have to find.

José Gusmão (The Left). – Senhor Comissário, falou da evolução do défice e da dívida que, como sabemos, depende da evolução da despesa, mas também da receita. E, portanto, gostaria de perceber porque é que a Comissão opta por utilizar apenas como variável operacional a despesa pública primária líquida. Porque esta opção tem um enviesamento recessivo. Foi a opção, por exemplo, dos programas da Troica, que tiveram consequências desastrosas, não apenas no crescimento dos países afetados mas também na evolução do défice e da dívida. E é também um enviesamento ideológico, porque se torna num instrumento contra os serviços públicos, contra o investimento público, contra as políticas públicas em geral. E gostaria de saber a razão desta escolha tão parcial.

Paolo Gentiloni, *Member of the Commission*. – Well, I think, in my view, the primary net expenditure rule that, by the way, we already use it is already one of the …

The problem is that now we have several criteria in assessing the plans and one of these is the primary net expenditure. The advantage of this kind of rule is simplification and it is clearly observable. It is, of course, net of expenditure. Several expenditure are not included in this calculation to prevent it from being too procyclical. Of course, we will consider extreme extraordinary conditions both at European level and at national level. We are not following this rule with blind eyes. No, we are following it because it is simple, observable and, honestly, the other benchmarks that we used in the last 10 to 20 years where, if we look to them ex-post, they were a little bit, honestly, not always fit for purpose because they were based on projections, and projections are difficult in economy.

The evolution of the expenditure is a good and transparent tool to observe the evolution of the budgetary situation. Of course, this means that also we have to preserve the capacity to invest, because you are right that the trajectory of the debt is strongly dependent also on growth. We are not ignoring at all these points.

Stéphanie Yon-Courtin (Renew). – Joyeux anniversaire, Commissaire Gentiloni, Messieurs les Commissaires, à ce stade, les orientations de la Commission européenne vont dans le bon sens. Nous devons à la fois assurer la stabilité budgétaire et permettre la flexibilité nécessaire pour investir dans les objectifs de l'Union européenne qui ne peuvent plus attendre: les transitions verte et numérique et l'autonomie stratégique. Il s'agit donc de sortir d'une pure logique comptable pour passer à un pacte véritablement politique capable de s'adapter à la réalité des crises et des défis à relever par les États membres.

Le seul objectif annuel de réduction de la dette ne correspondait donc plus à la réalité des faits. La stabilité budgétaire se fera donc avec le consentement des États membres, de leurs peuples et en adéquation avec les objectifs que nous nous sommes fixés. L'approche personnalisée pour chaque État membre, qui devra indiquer comment il compte tenir son déficit et sa dette publique, sera aussi très importante.

Ma question est la suivante: comment en parallèle repenser et assurer, concrètement, nos indicateurs de suivi de nos politiques pour prendre davantage en compte les dimensions climatique, sociale et d'autonomie?

Valdis Dombrovskis, *Executive Vice-President of the Commission*. – Mr President, first of all, thank you for the support. A word on orientations which we are putting forward. Indeed, we are providing more leeway for Member States with what you called a personalised approach.

Of course, as I was mentioning before, it's important that it's within a common European framework. So that's why we are coming with those reference adjustment pass for each Member State based on a common European methodology. But then it's for Member States to come up with their fiscal structural plans and do some adjustments, including adjustments if they implement reforms and investments which are growth-enhancing, supporting fiscal sustainability, and also responding to common European priorities, including the green and digital transition, strengthening the resilience of the European economy, reaching the strategic aims of the EU.

So all of this is already reflected in the orientations which we are providing. And of course the way we are applying fiscal rules is to be seen also in a broader context, for example, of European Semester, where we are taking this broader approach, also looking at our strategic work directions, looking at sustainable development goals, other elements.

So we are not just looking at, one or two or three figures, there is this broader approach, not all of those elements are in our orientations. But if you look at the broader approaches you are having in European Semester and by the way, exactly today we are presenting the autumn European Semester cycle. Clearly, we are taking this wider view.

Stéphanie Yon-Courtin (Renew). – Sur l'approche personnalisée pour chaque État membre, qui nous semble plus réaliste: jusqu'à quel degré de personnalisation, d'individualisation faut-il aller? Parce qu'il faut en même temps assurer une cohérence de ces différents programmes économiques nationaux pour éviter – et vous l'avez dit – une fragmentation du marché intérieur.

Valdis Dombrovskis, *Executive Vice-President of the Commission*. – Well, once again, on this element, we will once again need to find the right balance because, on the one hand, we want to have more leeway for Member States. And Member States may choose different approaches. Some may indeed focus more on production; others may focus more on investments and structural reform. And this leeway is there. So we have not quantified this leeway in our orientations. If you look at our orientations, they are more like a qualitative description of how this mechanism would work. But clearly there are some limits, exactly as you outlined, to avoid the fragmentation of the single market and to ensure equal treatment of Member States.

So also there, I would say there will be some margin of appreciation also for the European Commission when assessing Member States' fiscal structural plans, whether it's close enough to the orientations which we are providing. At the end of the day, those fiscal structural plans are to be approved by the Council. So Member States will also be able to sort of do peer-to-peer control and see whether all Member States are getting equal treatment and whether the rules, including this additional leeway, are applied in a consistent way across the board.

Enikő Győri (NI). – Tisztelt Elnök úr! A reformok akkor jók, ha hatékonyak, kézzelfogható eredményt hoznak, és kevesebb terhet jelentenek. Én úgy ítélem meg, hogy a gazdasági kormányzás reformjával kapcsolatosan egyelőre több a kérdés, mint a válasz. Kérdezem, hogy mi a garancia arra, hogy az adósság-fenntarthatósági számítások megalapozottak lesznek, és hoznak-e egyszerűsítést? Kérdezem, hogy mi a garancia arra, hogy a beruházások és reformok végrehajtásának ellenőrzésére létrehozandó új eszköz segítségével a gazdasági és adósság-fenntarthatósági hatást majd megalapozottan tudjuk értékelni? És kérdezem, mint olyan képviselő, aki nem az euróövezet egyik országából érkezik, hogy a túlzottdeficit-eljáráshoz hogyan viszonyul majd ez az új eszköz?

Paolo Gentiloni, *Member of the Commission*. – Well, I hope we are not complicating the framework, which is rather famous to be a little bit complicated. One of the more qualified experts of our fiscal rules compared them to the Sagrada Familia. Well, once, a few years ago. And the Sagrada Familia, you know, it's wonderful but it is the result of successive edits. So in this case we are working to try to simplify and to be effective.

Were we effective in the last 10/20 years? I think we were effective in more or less one single thing, which was this 3 % threshold for the deficit. This was clear, understandable and, not always, but more or less respected. And it was a good leeway. Were we effective in the reduction of debt? No, honestly, we had this very ambitious 60 % debt rule, but not effective. Were we affect the on the quality of public expenditure investments? Well, we were not. After the financial crisis, unfortunately, public investment was going down and down.

So the fact that now we have a more realistic path of reduction of the debt and an incentive for investment, in our view, should work or at least it could work.

Enikő Győri (NI). – Hát kívánom, hogy Önnek igaza legyen, és csodálója vagyok Gaudi építészetének. De félek attól, hogy ez nem ad kellő garanciát arra, hogy kevesebb legyen a teher. Megköszönöm, ha kapok az előző kérdésemre választ, hogy ez a beruházások és reformok végrehajtásának ellenőrzésére szolgáló új eszköz hogyan fog viszonyulni a túlzottdeficit–eljáráshoz a nem euróövezeti országok érdekében? És hát van még egy olyan félelmem, hogy vajon nem válik-e túlzottan szubjektívvé ez az egész eljárás? A Bizottság hatásköre, az láthatóan megnövekedne. És kérdezem, hogyan várja el így a Bizottság, hogy a tagállamok jobban magukénak érezzék az egész eljárást?

Paolo Gentiloni, *Member of the Commission*. – Our goal is very clearly to strengthen the role of national governments and parliaments in this. Why? Because we are convinced of the fact that if these strategies of gradually putting the trajectory of the debt in a declining path, and of increasing the quality of public expenditure with a stronger role for investments, are to be successful, they need to be owned by national governments and national parliaments and not only dictated by a common threshold, a common mechanism.

The balance – and it will be very challenging and interesting to find this balance – is that this differentiated approach needs to be compatible with a common framework, and this is why we will provide a common reference at the start of the process. Reference does not mean prescription, it means a reference, meaning that the Member States will elaborate their own plans, taking into account this reference.

So I think the national role could be strengthened and this is a guarantee of effectiveness. I don't think that we will change substantially the differences that are there between euro area and non-euro area Member States in this framework.

President. – Before we continue I have two announcements. The first is to say that the speakers' list is now closed. The second is to ask you to put only one question now, so that I can give the floor to everyone that has requested it in this debate.

Agnes Jongerius (S&D). – I think we cannot underestimate the social consequences of the present economic crisis. So I will solely focus on how do these rules help us in this social crisis. And I would like to start by reading from the European Pillar of Social Rights, Pillar 20, which says 'everyone has the right to access of essential services of good quality, including water, sanitation, energy, transport, financial services and digital communications. Support for access to such services shall be available for those in need'.

My question would be how can the Commission push for implementation enforcement of these rights in the national action plans, taking into account the potential negative consequences of the measures you are presenting?

My second question would be on the action plan of the social pillar, because in Porto we promise that we would set concrete targets and measures to reduce inequality and tackle poverty. So my question would be, how will these new financial fiscal rules complement and maintain these goals?

Valdis Dombrovskis, *Executive Vice-President of the Commission*. – That probably brings us slightly out of, strictly speaking, the orientations we are discussing right now to some slightly broader questions on the European Semester, because indeed in the European Semester, over recent years, we have been constantly strengthening the social dimension.

If we look, for example, at country-specific recommendations – so to say, maybe, pre-general escape clause country-specific recommendations – clearly around a third of the recommendations were related to social and employment issues, and those recommendations were formulated clearly keeping in mind the European Pillar of Social Rights and the goals defined in the European Pillar of Social Rights.

How are we monitoring already now within the European Semester? We have a so-called social scoreboard where we are monitoring key social indicators. So from that point of view, I would see that the social dimension in the European Semester is going to be very present also following this review of the governance framework.

You mentioned negative consequences of these orientations. Well, if you look at these orientations, the general direction is clearly for more gradual debt adjustment paths, for more flexibility for Member States to determine those fiscal adjustment paths and so, correspondingly, also for more possibility to take social and other considerations into account when determining those. And I would expect an improvement in the situation thereafter, if those orientations are followed.

Rasmus Andresen (Verts/ALE). – Dear Commissioners, as Greens we warmly welcome that we are actually finally debating a reform of the Stability and Growth Pact and the fiscal rules. But some days ago we could see that the climate conference, the COP, ended with quite a disappointing result.

And I think nearly all of us agree that we need more investments, we need more climate investments. And looking at the figures and estimations the Commission has come with, we can see that we are actually missing 520 billion each year for green investments. And it's true, that's not just public investments, it's not just the European Union or the national level, but in general we are missing 520 billion to reach that goal.

So I would ask you much more concretely, what do you think is in your proposal to ensure that we will end up with more green investments, needed green investments, to reach our climate goals? I think that you are missing the green investment rules, and I would like to get a comment from you on why you haven't agreed to propose the green investment rule and what you think is the way forward for green investments.

VORSITZ: RAINER WIELAND

Vizepräsident

Paolo Gentiloni, *Member of the Commission*. – I will not repeat the mechanism that you know very well that we are proposing to incentivise investments. I think this mechanism, which is allowing especially countries with moderate fiscal space to gain time in the path of their debt reduction, if they concentrate their investments in the common priorities, this will be mostly targeted on green investments, of course.

But you are right I think – so this is the answer referring to our proposals, our orientation – on stressing the fact that we should never underestimate the amount of investment that is ahead of us. We frequently refer, and rightly so, to the amount of debt that we have to address and to reduce with the gradual and reasonable and effective path. But never forget that there is another mountain, which is the mountain of investment, if we want to keep our leadership on the green transition and if we want to keep our competitiveness in relation to our global partners or competitors.

Of course, the figures you were mentioning, the 500 and more pro year, will be mostly private investments, it is not thinkable that this is for public investment. But part of this will be because it's impossible not to be public and we have to guarantee a fiscal space for this. The new proposal of rules is allowing this much better than the present situation, in our view.

President. – Commissioner, please accept my best wishes on the occasion of your birthday.

Joachim Schuster (S&D). – Der Kommissionsvorschlag, der orientiert sich ja sehr stark auch an den positiven Erfahrungen, die wir mit dem Wiederaufbaufonds gemacht haben. Es soll länderspezifische Pläne geben, es soll gemeinsame Kriterien geben, und der Wiederaufbaufonds sieht ja auch ein Anreizsystem vor, damit die Länder auch williger sind, dieses zu tun.

Deswegen, bezogen auf die Analogie, hätte ich noch einmal die Bitte, es ein wenig zu konkretisieren: Nach welchen Kriterien soll eigentlich die Bewertung dann der länderspezifischen Programme genau vorgenommen werden? Wie wird sichergestellt, dass das transparent und vorhersehbar erfolgt und dass die gleichen Kriterien für alle Staaten gelten müssen? Es kann ja nicht sein, dass es ganz unterschiedliche Kriterien gibt. Und wie steht es mit dem Anreizsystem? Wäre es denn nicht sinnvoll zu sagen: Wir machen auch so etwas – sicherlich in der Dimension verringert – wie einen Fonds, dass wir Anreize dafür setzen, dass bestimmte Reformen auch in der Tat dann durchgeführt werden?

Valdis Dombrovskis, *Executive Vice-President of the Commission*. – Indeed, we had been drawing some inspiration from the functioning of recovery and resilience facilities that it is the Member States, which are setting up their national plans but within a clear European framework. And what we are now proposing in our orientation is more or less the same. Member States are setting up their medium-term fiscal structural plans within a clear European framework and taking into account reference fiscal adjustment paths, which the European Commission would provide based on the common methodology.

At the same time, countries have a possibility to diverge from those reference paths once again, not based on different criteria, it's based on common European criteria, but differentiated. So to put it simple, especially for countries with high debt and correspondingly higher debt sustainability risks, we would expect those countries to pursue more a debt reduction path. And for countries with lower sustainability risks, which are closer to 60% of GDP, a possibility to have a more gradual adjustment path. So there is a differentiation, but once again, based on clear criteria and there is this additional flexibility if Member States implement reforms and structural reforms and investments. In this case they can also have the possibility to have more gradual adjustment. So those are main elements. But indeed, as you noted, there is some inspiration taken from the Recovery and Resilience Facility.

Henrike Hahn (Verts/ALE). – Die Europäische Kommission hat die lang erwartete Reform der Schuldenregeln angestoßen, und das war mehr als überfällig. Wir haben zu Beginn der Pandemie in Solidarität den Stabilitäts- und Wachstumspakt ausgesetzt, und der Schuldenstand in der Eurozone hat sich erhöht.

Und gerade deswegen: Ein *One-size-fits-all*-Ansatz ist unrealistisch angesichts der unterschiedlichen Haushalts- und Strukturbedingungen der Mitgliedstaaten. Deswegen ist der Plan der Kommission, mittelfristige und mitgliedstaatenspezifische Schuldenpläne einzuführen, ein guter Vorschlag. Das wird auch nicht heißen, dass jeder haushalten kann, wie er will; das Regelwerk bleibt einheitlich und gilt einheitlich.

Wir brauchen aber jetzt massive Investitionen in den Klimaschutz, und dafür müssen neue Schuldenregeln den Spielraum in den Staatshaushalten schaffen. Die Integration der Haushaltspläne in die nationalen Energie- und Klimapläne ist deswegen ein Schritt nach vorne. Trotzdem: Bei Klimainvestitionen brauchen wir mehr Tempo und mehr Ehrgeiz. Der Ehrgeiz, der bei der COP 27 fehlte, bedeutet jetzt für die EU umso mehr eine Verpflichtung.

Und hier meine Frage: Wie können wir es schaffen, den Mitgliedstaaten finanziellen Raum zu schaffen, damit die Mitgliedstaaten in der Lage sind, erfolgreich gegen den Klimawandel zu kämpfen?

Paolo Gentiloni, *Member of the Commission*. – Mr President, thank you for your words, I've never had such a plenary birthday. I really appreciate your words and our orientation, but I understand the point you are making on the fact that yes, we have differentiated paths of these fiscal mid-term plans.

With this differentiated path we are also providing a common framework. We cannot have a sort of Europe à la carte, everyone choosing their own framework. But you are stressing the fact that we need also a further commitment on common investments, especially related to the climate transition.

I agree. I think we are working on this. We have a big programme now that is finalising the process of decision, which is RePowerEU and at the same time Commission services are working on the assessment of needs of investments. Because we are aware of what you were saying, we can address these needs of investments of course through our fiscal rules and this is the point we are discussing this afternoon, but also through other tools, strengthening our fiscal firepower, strengthening RePowerEU, finding new ways to support the common efforts, especially for countries that are at risk with their fiscal space.

So we are aware of this need. We know also that it is not easy to have further common tools on the table because of the fact that we are still working with NextGenerationEU and the RRF. But we are now assessing the needs, and I think this is the first step towards addressing the issue you were raising.

Maria Grapini (S&D). – Domnule președinte, domnilor comisari, sigur că atunci când facem o schimbare legislativă, ne gândim și la impact. Este foarte bine că ați explicat și la răspunsurile pe care le-ați dat, că ați vrut să lăsați o mai mare lejeritate pentru spațiu fiscal, în funcție de gradul de îndatorare al fiecărui stat.

Întrebarea mea este: v-ați gândit că noi avem în același timp de implementat o nouă strategie de reindustrializare a Uniunii Europene, o nouă strategie a IMM-urilor? Ați calculat un impact dacă cu această reformă legislativă a guvernanței comune în cele 27 de state avem un impact pozitiv, până la urmă, asta este important, cum traversăm crizele, cum reușim să nu afectăm pe cei mai slabi, adică IMM-urile, microîntreprinderile și cum putem să aducem o plusvaloare, că până la urmă și Uniunea Europeană s-a împrumutat din piața de capital și trebuie să dăm până în 2058 și banii înapoi.

Deci mă interesează dacă aveți un impact calculat.

Valdis Dombrovskis, *Executive Vice-President of the Commission*. – On the impact of what we are proposing, well clearly when we are discussing EU fiscal rules, a review of EU fiscal rules, our annual European Semester cycle, it's obviously first and foremost about the coordination of our fiscal and macroeconomic policies.

From that point of view, of course, we are assessing what impact the implementation of those policies has on the European economy, whether we are having the right policy mix, whether we are finding the right balance between debt reduction, between different investments and structural reforms which we need to be implementing.

So clearly we have all those elements in mind. The general direction of our proposal is to allow more flexibility and for more leeway for Member States to determine their debt reduction trajectories, their fiscal trajectories and, correspondingly, having more possibilities to finance a national investment, including for the areas which you mentioned, which are important for the productivity of the European economy.

Also, if you look at our current European Semester structure, for example, the Annual Sustainable Growth Survey, which we are publishing today, we are focusing on four dimensions of competitive sustainability. One of those dimensions is exactly related to productivity and, correspondingly, obviously also to the functioning of our industry and SMEs.

Marie Toussaint (Verts/ALE). – Merci de nous proposer cette réforme des règles fiscales qui s'appliquent aujourd'hui au sein de l'Union européenne. On a vu dans les dernières décennies à quel point ces règles étaient ineptes et inaptes – inaptes à préserver la dignité des peuples et la démocratie comme en Grèce; inaptes également à garantir l'impératif de justice sociale, cette prospérité partagée au cœur de la promesse européenne; inaptes finalement à protéger les services publics, les services sociaux et les travailleurs essentiels dont on a tant vu à quel point ils étaient nécessaires pendant la crise pandémique, et il nous manque aujourd'hui 142 milliards d'investissements chaque année pour préserver ces services publics.

Inaptes, enfin, parce que ces règles ne tiennent pas compte – et elles ne tiennent malheureusement toujours pas compte – des limites planétaires ni de l'impératif de lutte contre le dérèglement climatique. Elles ne tiennent même pas compte du fait que le dérèglement climatique pèsera sur les dettes et les finances publiques à l'avenir. Or, les lois de l'économie ne sont pas au-dessus des lois de la nature. La logique libérale et comptable ne peut se pourchasser elle-même, elle doit être mise au service d'un véritable objectif politique.

Ma question est donc: comment garantirez-vous le fait que ces règles visent effectivement la prospérité partagée et la préservation de l'environnement? Ne pensez-vous pas qu'il est grand temps de modifier ces règles en profondeur, par exemple à l'aide d'un traité environnemental qui tiendrait compte des plafonds sociaux?

Paolo Gentiloni, *membre de la Commission*. – Je pense qu'on ne peut pas demander à ces règles budgétaires de résoudre tous nos problèmes. Ce que ces règles budgétaires et nos propositions de réforme de ces règles budgétaires peuvent nous garantir est un mix entre une réduction de la dette beaucoup plus graduelle et flexible et un avantage pour les investissements communs, en particulier pour les investissements verts, mais pas seulement, pour d'autres priorités aussi.

Je pense que le processus d'inclusion de la dimension environnementale et sociale dans nos exercices de surveillance budgétaire a commencé depuis quelques années et il faut le poursuivre. Il est très important de prendre en considération le pilier social dans notre exercice budgétaire. Et nous allons présenter maintenant à la presse le Semestre européen, la session d'automne, et ce en accordant une attention particulière au pilier social. Et c'est également important pour la dimension environnementale et, de manière générale, pour les objectifs de développement durable.

Nous sommes en train de travailler, je pense, pas seulement avec les règles budgétaires, mais avec tout le processus de surveillance économique pour essayer d'aller au delà de la simple mesure du PIB et des règles macroéconomiques générales.

Estrella Durá Ferrandis (S&D). – Hace ahora un año, en una reunión conjunta de las Comisiones EMPL y ECON, aquí en el Parlamento, les decía que el Pacto de Estabilidad y Crecimiento no tiene ni la estructura ni la flexibilidad necesaria para hacer frente a la crisis.

En aquel momento hablábamos de la crisis económica y social de la pandemia. Ahora tenemos que añadir la de la guerra. Creo que es el momento realmente de avanzar hacia un nuevo modelo de gobernanza que ponga los derechos sociales al mismo nivel que los económicos y los medioambientales.

Se ha insistido aquí —desde la mayoría de los grupos políticos— y se ha preguntado sobre la regla de oro. Es verdad que necesitamos avanzar —y ustedes lo han planteado— poco a poco y de una forma individualizada para cada Estado miembro. Pero tenemos que llegar a ese punto de no retorno. No podemos ralentizar el proceso de una transición temporal y medidas temporales para volver al mismo punto de atrás.

Valdis Dombrovskis, *Executive Vice-President of the Commission*. – So first of all, I would like to underline that there is a flexibility inbuilt also in the current rules of the Stability and Growth Pact, and the very fact that we were activating the general escape clause during the pandemic and it's still activated and will stay activated next year, is within existing rule framework. And also earlier in the debate, some colleagues were referring to the January 2015 European Commission communication on best use of flexibility within the existing rules of the Stability and Growth Pact, which also outlined a number of flexibilities which exist within existing fiscal rules.

So what we are doing now, we are obviously making a step further, providing yet further flexibility for Member States to determine their adjustment paths, moving away from the so-called 1/20 reduction rule. So clearly what we are proposing in that orientation is heading towards more flexibility, towards more leeway for Member States to determine their fiscal adjustment paths.

But in any case, I wanted to thank all colleagues for your questions for this debate we had today. As I was saying at the beginning, those orientations are orientations. Now we are gathering feedback from the European Parliament, from the Member States, and if, on the basis of these orientations, we see that a consensus is possible, we will follow up with concrete proposals. Obviously, taking into account feedback we are having from the Member States, from the European Parliament and from other stakeholders.

Der Präsident. – Die Fragestunde ist damit beendet.

15. Delegierte Rechtsakte (Artikel 111 Absatz 6 GO)(Weiterbehandlung)

Der Präsident. – Ich habe zunächst zwei Mitteilungen.

In Bezug auf die vom ECON-Ausschuss eingereichten Empfehlungen für Beschlüsse, keine Einwände gegen zwei delegierte Rechtsakte zu erheben, die bei der Eröffnung der gestrigen Sitzung angekündigt wurden, haben zum einen die Fraktion Verts/ALE und die Fraktion The Left gegen die Empfehlung im Hinblick auf den Wert für den Clearing-Schwellenwert für Positionen in OTC-Rohstoffderivatekontrakten und sonstigen OTC-Derivatekontrakten Einwände erhoben und hat zum anderen die Fraktion The Left gegen die Empfehlung zu befristeten Sofortmaßnahmen in Bezug auf die Anforderungen an Sicherheiten Einwände erhoben.

Gemäß Artikel 111 Absatz 6 der Geschäftsordnung werden diese Empfehlungen daher in die Abstimmungen am Donnerstag aufgenommen.

16. Zusammensetzung der Ausschüsse und Delegationen

Der Präsident. – Die S&D-Fraktion hat der Präsidentin einen Beschluss über die Änderung von Ernennungen in einer Delegation übermittelt.

Dieser Beschluss wird im Protokoll der heutigen Sitzung aufgeführt und tritt am Tage dieser Ankündigung in Kraft.

(Die Sitzung wird um 16.35 Uhr unterbrochen.)

17. Wiederaufnahme der Sitzung

(Die Sitzung wird um 16.40 Uhr wieder aufgenommen.)

18. Fragestunde (VP/HV) – Auswirkungen des russischen Angriffskriegs gegen die Ukraine auf Drittländer in Bezug auf das Abkommen im Rahmen der „Schwarzmeer-Getreide-Initiative“

Der Präsident. – Als nächster Punkt der Tagesordnung folgt die Fragestunde (VP/HV) gemäß Artikel 137 der Geschäftsordnung. Ich begrüße Herrn Borrell zu dieser Fragestunde. Das Thema dieser Fragestunde lautet: Auswirkungen des russischen Angriffskriegs gegen die Ukraine auf Drittländer in Bezug auf das Abkommen im Rahmen der „Schwarzmeer-Getreide-Initiative“.

Die Fragestunde ist für 60 Minuten vorgesehen. Wir sind jetzt schon etwas spät dran. Die Redezeit ist normalerweise eine Minute für die Frage und zwei Minuten für die Antwort, 30 Sekunden für eine Zusatzfrage und zwei Minuten für die Antwort.

Ich weise Sie daraufhin, dass eine mögliche Zusatzfrage nur dann zulässig ist, wenn sie in einem engen Zusammenhang mit der Hauptfrage steht und keine neue Frage enthält.

Wenn Sie eine Frage stellen möchten, ersuche ich Sie, Ihren Antrag jetzt zu registrieren, indem Sie die Funktion Ihres Abstimmungsgeräts für spontane Wortmeldungen nutzen, nachdem Sie Ihre Stimmkarte eingeschoben haben. Während der Fragestunde erfolgen Wortmeldungen von Ihrem Sitzplatz aus, und ich ersuche alle Redner, die ihnen zugewiesene Redezeit einzuhalten.

Die Kolleginnen und Kollegen benötigen möglicherweise einige Augenblicke, um ihren Antrag, eine Frage zu stellen, über ihr Abstimmungsgerät zu registrieren. Daher ersuche ich Sie erneut, Ihren Antrag jetzt zu stellen, und wir beginnen mit der ersten Frage. Damit wir mit den vorgesehenen 12 Fragen auch rumkommen, behalte ich mir vor, anzukündigen, dass Zusatzfragen nicht mehr erlaubt sind.

Daniel Buda (PPE). – Domnule președinte, vă mulțumesc foarte mult pentru că avem posibilitatea de a avea o discuție legată de o chestiune foarte importantă, și anume transportul de cereale prin Marea Neagră. Domnule Înalt Reprezentant după cum bine știți, acest lucru este indispensabil pentru garantarea securității alimentare în diverse colțuri ale lumii, pe de o parte, și pe de altă parte, evident că se constituie într-un mecanism indispensabil în ceea ce înseamnă prevenirea fenomenului migraționist.

România, țara din care provin și eu, știți foarte bine că a asigurat tranzitul a peste 65 la sută din cerealele exportate din Ucraina în diverse colțuri ale lumii. Acest lucru a creat o presiune foarte mare pe ceea ce înseamnă infrastructura de transport de toate tipurile, cea fluvială, maritimă, dar și terestră și, în același timp, a creat dificultăți majore fermierilor din România.

Întrebarea mea pentru dumneavoastră este, domnule Înalt reprezentant, cum înțelege Comisia Europeană să sprijine statele membre astfel încât să poată asigura mai departe un flux de cereale către statele terțe, dar în același timp să fie protejați și fermierii din aceste state?

Josep Borrell Fontelles, *Vice-President of the Commission / High Representative of the Union for Foreign Affairs and Security Policy.* – Thank you. Yes, certainly, Solidarity Lanes has done a great job, but it has a limited capacity. I will focus exactly on the issue of the bottlenecks in these Solidarity Lanes. These bottlenecks are there and certainly the logistics costs are high. And that is why the European Commission – my colleagues from transportation, neighborhood and international partnerships – or rather the Commission budget will dedicate EUR 250 million in grants to sustain and further increase this capacity. In the short term, it will support quick improvements to reduce waiting times and to improve the movement through the border, at crossing points and the access roads.

To go further, we will mobilise EUR 1 billion by 2023 — certainly not from the European Union budget, as it's not so big, but using the European Investment Bank, which will lend EUR 300 million for these projects. The European Bank for Reconstruction and Development will lend another EUR 300 million and the World Bank will provide EUR 100 million to ensure liquidity for operators for repairs and capacity increases.

Also, we had to take care of agricultural activity in this region. But the main purpose of the Solidarity Lanes is to provide the infrastructure for the export of products from Ukraine that, in any case, would be exported by the Black Sea or by land through Romania to the Black Sea ports.

Nacho Sánchez Amor (S&D). – Señor presidente, señor Borrell, el resultado real de la operación por el mar Negro ha sido de diez millones de toneladas. Sin embargo, el resultado diplomático y de imagen para Turquía ha sido enorme. Aparece Turquía como el gran benefactor del tercer mundo, haciendo un papel que tiene unos réditos diplomáticos.

¿Cuál ha sido el resultado real de nuestros corredores de solidaridad? A pesar de ese coste que usted decía, a pesar de los cuellos de botella, hemos sacado quince millones de toneladas. Quince millones de toneladas por nuestras vías terrestres, diez millones por el mar Negro. Y, sin embargo, el rédito diplomático de esta enorme operación, con los costes que usted ha dicho, es mucho menor.

Es más, Rusia ha conseguido, al menos durante algún tiempo, meter la imagen de que los problemas en algunas partes, por ejemplo, de África, tenían que ver con nuestras sanciones y no con el hecho de la guerra. Por no hablar del margen que ha ganado Turquía para, seguramente, hacer una política exterior diferente.

Señor Borrell, ¿cómo es posible que una operación de este coste y de este beneficio no tenga la misma repercusión en términos diplomáticos que está teniendo la de Turquía?

Josep Borrell Fontelles, *vicepresidente de la Comisión / alto representante de la Unión para Asuntos Exteriores y Política de Seguridad.* – Señor presidente, señor Sánchez Amor, es una buena pregunta.

Tiene seguramente que ver con el hecho de que con la acción diplomática de las Naciones Unidas y de Turquía (a la que, por cierto, hemos contribuido mucho) se hacía saltar un bloqueo naval que era muy evidente (puertos cerrados, barcos de guerra bloqueando puertos). Es una imagen que trasciende mucho más que pasar por la puerta de atrás, facilitando mejoras en las infraestructuras y comunicaciones, aligerando los trámites burocráticos. Cosas que no son tan *«sexys»* como barcos de guerra bloqueando puertos y las Naciones Unidas negociando.

Por eso le agradezco su pregunta y les invito a todos, a todos, a todos los niveles, a explicar. A explicar que por la puerta de atrás hemos exportado quince millones de toneladas, mientras que, por la puerta frontal, el mar Negro, hasta el momento, solo diez. Probablemente con menor coste unitario y con mayores expectativas de aumentar este tráfico. Seguramente, porque desde allí han ido directamente por barco a zonas que son mucho más difíciles de alcanzar, por ejemplo Somalia. Cuatro grandes buques cerealeros han salido de los puertos del mar Negro con destino a Somalia. Eso es muy visible. De las toneladas que han salido por la apertura del bloqueo, el 27 % ha ido al norte de África y el 58 % a Asia.

Por lo tanto, el discurso ruso de que «bueno, a fin de cuentas, ese grano va a Europa», no es cierto. Las cifras son tozudas. A donde ha ido fundamentalmente es al llamado «sur global», el 27 % a Ucrania, perdón, al norte de África y el 58 % a Asia.

Nacho Sánchez Amor (S&D). – Señor presidente, señor Borrell, me viene muy bien esa última reflexión suya, porque hay que poner transparencia en el asunto de las reexportaciones. Porque a veces los datos indican el primer puerto donde recala ese barco cerealero y no sabemos si el cereal, transformado en harina o no, va a otros sitios. Ese es un mercado que hay que aclarar, porque a veces recibimos noticias confusas sobre Turquía, que acaba de decir que va a hacer una gran exportación de harina, no de grano, de harina, al tercer mundo y eso quiere decir que parte de ese grano va a reexportarse.

Yo creo que poner transparencia en la reexportación de ese grano por las dos vías sería importante.

Josep Borrell Fontelles, *vicepresidente de la Comisión / alto representante de la Unión para Asuntos Exteriores y Política de Seguridad*. – Sin duda, pero eso ya es bastante más difícil. Conocer el primer puerto en el que recala el grano, su conversión en un producto con valor añadido y dónde acaba yendo seguramente escapa a las estadísticas de comercio. Y hasta cierto punto es inevitable porque el gran barco descarga el cereal en un sitio donde, convertido en harina, después se reexporta a otros lugares en cantidades más parceladas, menores, haciendo una difusión en red que también contribuye a que el usuario final tenga acceso al producto.

Irène Tolleret (Renew). – Monsieur le Président, Monsieur le Commissaire, l'accord de la mer Noire est trop fragile. Il nous laisse à la merci du libre arbitre de Poutine. J'ai donc une série de questions pour la Commission pour que nous réussissions cet objectif visant à sortir de cette dépendance.

Tout d'abord, quelles sont les mesures que vous mettrez en place pour établir des corridors terrestres sécurisés et avec quel calendrier? Au delà de fournir à court terme des engrais indispensables pour les pays les plus fragiles, que pourrait faire l'Union européenne pour aider à rendre les systèmes agricoles, notamment ceux des pays africains, plus résilients, notamment en matière de numérisation? Troisièmement, seulement 1 % des terres arables africaines ont un système d'irrigation. La Commission a-t-elle prévu des plans d'investissement dans des infrastructures d'irrigation? La gestion de la sécheresse est essentielle. Enfin, la Commission a-t-elle prévu de travailler avec ses partenaires de l'Union africaine pour un plan pour les protéines végétales indigènes, comme le niébé, pour améliorer la sécurité alimentaire dans les pays les plus pauvres?

Josep Borrell Fontelles, *vicepresidente de la Comisión / alto representante de la Unión para Asuntos Exteriores y Política de Seguridad*. – Señoría, sus preguntas, si me permite, son un poco cósmicas. Porque pretende usted tratarlo todo y cuestiones de gran trascendencia. Pero tiene razón. Más que dar pescado, hay que enseñar a pescar. Y en África hay un problema de capacidad de producción agrícola. Y, por eso, aparte de hacer lo que estamos haciendo, he contestado una pregunta antes diciendo las inversiones que vamos a hacer o que se van a hacer en las infraestructuras de transporte por vía terrestre.

Ciertamente hay que aumentar la capacidad agrícola de los países africanos y suministrarles en primera instancia fertilizantes. Porque el fertilizante de hoy es la cosecha de mañana. El aumento de la capacidad agrícola es para pasado mañana en el mejor de los casos. Pero el fertilizante hoy es cosecha o no cosecha mañana. Y por eso hemos puesto especial énfasis en liberar las vías de suministro de fertilizantes.

El primer problema que hemos tenido es que la propia industria europea de fertilizantes ha disminuido su producción. Y la ha disminuido porque los precios del gas han sido tan elevados que muchos productores han dejado de producir. Por lo tanto, lo primero que tenemos que hacer es recuperar nuestra capacidad productiva para, a partir de ella, recuperar nuestra capacidad exportadora.

Luego, el Global Gateway, nuestro gran instrumento de acción internacional, prevé que se va a invertir mucho en la transición verde. Y la transición verde también tiene que ver con poner en producción tierras agrícolas para hacer a los países menos dependientes de la importación agrícola y con aumentar las prácticas agroecológicas y agrosostenibles. En África subsahariana, por ejemplo, el Paquete de Inversión de Global Gateway - Sistemas alimentarios sostenibles —su nombre lo dice todo— va a invertir en aumentar la producción sostenible en Níger, en Madagascar, en Costa de Marfil, en Ghana, en Togo, en Zambia… Tengo aquí la lista de los proyectos para la agricultura y la ganadería sostenible en Chad y en Sudán, las pesquerías en Senegal y en Somalia…

En total, se van a movilizar unos 600 millones de euros para apoyar a los países africanos y del Caribe —los países ACP — y 225 millones para la región de África del Norte y de Oriente Próximo. Y, desde luego, el suministro de fertilizantes será una prioridad.

Si sumamos todo, alcanzamos los 8 000 millones de euros hasta el año 2024. Usted me pide, con razón, que le ponga fechas a los flujos de recursos, porque muchas veces anunciamos grandes cantidades sin que detrás haya un calendario concreto de ejecución. Y es tan importante el cuánto como el cuándo. No solamente la cantidad, sino el calendario. Esos 8 000 millones para aumentar la seguridad alimentaria y la producción de alimentos deben ser gastados hasta finales de 2024.

Pero para ello necesitamos, por supuesto, que los bancos de inversión y reconstrucción europeos se comprometan y que evitemos un fenómeno de desplazamiento del sector privado a la hora de producir la alimentación imprescindible para África. La cifra que usted ha dado es muy determinante. Solo un 1 % de las tierras arables están en producción en un continente que tiene graves problemas para su seguridad alimentaria.

Irène Tolleret (Renew). – Monsieur le Président, Monsieur le Commissaire, merci beaucoup pour ces éléments. Je suis d'accord avec vous: les engrais c'est l'alimentation de demain. En revanche, on sait déjà depuis cet été que l'augmentation du CO_2 dans l'atmosphère et les températures extrêmes ont des impacts négatifs sur les rendements de nos récoltes. Nous avons donc besoin d'avoir de nouveaux outils de recherche, y compris pour les pays les plus pauvres.

Je regrette la lenteur des travaux pour la présentation d'un projet au niveau européen de ces nouvelles techniques d'édition génomique et je voulais savoir quand est-ce que la Commission comptait présenter ce texte dont nous avons tant besoin pour la recherche, pour manger après-demain?

Josep Borrell Fontelles, *vicepresidente de la Comisión / alto representante de la Unión para Asuntos Exteriores y Política de Seguridad*. – Pues no quisiera asumir unos compromisos que luego no se puedan cumplir. Pero, si no estoy mal informado, está previsto que sea la primera semana de diciembre.

Eugen Tomac (PPE). – Domnule Înalt Reprezentant, prin România au trecut 6,5 milioane de tone de grâne, preluate din Ucraina și transferate mai departe.

Chiar zilele trecute a fost inaugurat un nou punct de trecere al frontierei pe nordul țării, în relația cu Ucraina, tocmai pentru a-i putea ajuta și mai mult.

Însă întrebarea pe care o ridic este următoarea. Federația Rusă duce o campanie de dezinformare extrem de agresivă în foarte multe state din Orientul Mijlociu sau Africa, prin care ne pune într-o situație extrem de delicată. În condițiile în care noi ajutăm ca grânele din Ucraina să ajungă acolo unde este nevoie, la destinație, Rusia, totuși, duce o campanie de dezinformare, încercând să prezintă deformat realitatea și cred că aici este nevoie de mai multă comunicare pentru a putea explica că noi ajutăm, nu Rusia.

Josep Borrell Fontelles, *Vice-President of the Commission / High Representative of the Union for Foreign Affairs and Security Policy*. – Dear Member you are very much right: since the beginning of the Russian aggression against Ukraine it has been a big, big process of disinformation that goes together with the weaponisation of food and hunger.

And, apart from stepping up our disinformation, our strategic communication, on debunking Russia's disinformation process, we have to provide the concrete answers. It's not just enough saying 'you are lying' or 'that's not true', we have to provide concrete things that people can perceive on the ground.

This is a two-side battle: the battle against information manipulation and disinformation and the battle about delivering concrete support. You know that we have our channels: 'EU versus Disinformation' continues to increase awareness about which are the real facts. But Putin's propaganda machinery is very powerful there, and they have a real industry. From this point of view, our resources are not as big as they have.

Once again, this is a two-side problem. To participate on the fight of information against disinformation and practical and concrete things because people at the end don't eat news, they eat food. And the important thing is to provide them with food. Trying to explain where this food is coming from and why the food that's not coming is not coming.

Once again, we repeat that we do not target food and fertilisers in our restrictive measures. Let's call it sanctions. And we try to inform the economic operators, transport companies, insurance companies that they can personally participate on the trade from Russia if it is about food or fertilisers. There is nothing in our sanctions that prevent that from happening.

And this is a work of every day to debunk Russia's lies and provide information. Because every day I see in the networks Russian propaganda explaining the contrary. This is a long-running battle that has to be supported by concrete facts, because otherwise people will not know to whom believe,

But they think we are doing progress. And at Sharm el-Sheikh this debate was also there: who is guilty of what, and I think that our work produced the result. But we have to continue fighting the food insecurity in one side and Russia's lies in the other.

Mónica Silvana González (S&D). – Señor presidente, señor alto representante, la guerra de Rusia contra Ucrania está aumentando el hambre. Está claro. Y nada tienen que ver las sanciones que desde la Unión Europea hemos impuesto a Rusia. Datos de la FAO — de las Naciones Unidas— demuestran que en septiembre los precios estaban reduciéndose, con una caída del 1,4 % del cereal y del 5,1 % del trigo.

Como buena noticia, hace unos días se prorrogó el pacto de la exportación de grano por los puertos del mar Negro, pero debemos aclarar que su destino principal —más del 70 %— son países de renta media y renta media alta que dependen de este cereal ucraniano. Pero, ¿qué pasa con los países de renta media y renta media baja donde la hambruna se incrementa cada vez más?

¿Qué medidas adicionales está tomando la Comisión a medio y largo plazo que no dependan de acuerdos concretos, sino que permitan que millones y millones de personas no tengan que depender de prórrogas de estos acuerdos?

¿Servirán las inversiones de la iniciativa Global Gateway que usted acaba de anunciar para crear oportunidades y mitigar la hambruna? ¿Qué mecanismos de seguimiento tiene? ¿De qué fechas disponen estas inversiones?

Tomémonos en serio el hambre y su vínculo con las migraciones que seguirán llegando a Europa. Es necesario buscar soluciones a largo plazo para que no se cronifique la hambruna en el Sur Global.

Josep Borrell Fontelles, *vicepresidente de la Comisión / alto representante de la Unión para Asuntos Exteriores y Política de Seguridad*. – Señoría, antes de la guerra, la mitad de los alimentos que distribuía por el mundo el Programa Mundial de Alimentos procedía de Ucrania. Esto demuestra la importancia estratégica de este gran productor de alimentos.

Ahora, gracias a la Iniciativa sobre la Exportación de Cereales por el mar Negro y a los corredores de solidaridad, los precios están cayendo y podemos decir que estos dos mecanismos han contribuido a esa caída de precios del 15 %, como usted ha citado.

Quiero insistir en que la mayoría de los cargamentos que han salido de Ucrania han ido, y cito los países, a Turquía, a Egipto, a Irán, a India, a Sudán, Kenia, también a China. Como puede ver, hay países aquí de renta media. No todos son los más pobres de los pobres, sino países que han alcanzado cierto nivel de desarrollo e incluso un apreciable nivel de desarrollo. ¿Por qué? Pues porque el destino de lo que está saliendo de Ucrania también sigue las pautas de lo que ocurría antes de la guerra. Este mecanismo no está pensado para alterar las rutas comerciales anteriores a la guerra, sino para reconstituirlas.

Pero, como antes se ha preguntado, o se ha comentado, algunos de los productos que salen de Ucrania, antes de llegar a su destino final, recalan en países intermedios y, por eso, su destino alcanza a los países de renta baja y de renta media.

Podemos decir que lo que ha salido por la Iniciativa sobre la Exportación de Cereales por el mar Negro ha más que duplicado el transporte de productos alimenticios a los países menos desarrollados entre agosto y septiembre. Y la mayoría de ellos han acabado en los programas del Programa Mundial de Alimentos. Déjeme que le diga algunas cifras: tres cuartas partes del aceite de girasol, dos tercios del trigo, la mitad de todos los productos alimenticios han ido a los países en vías de desarrollo, algunos de renta media y otros de renta más baja. Pero, en general, todo el mundo se ha beneficiado del desbloqueo de las exportaciones desde Ucrania.

Anna Bonfrisco (ID). – Signor Alto rappresentante, grazie per le Sue parole chiarificatrici.

Volgendo lo sguardo al futuro, possiamo dire che la crisi alimentare potrebbe far morire più persone di quelle colpite dalla pandemia. L'insicurezza alimentare e la fame nel mondo hanno numeri scioccanti: in Afghanistan 20 milioni, nello Yemen 19 milioni, nel Sahel 18 milioni, nel Corno d'Africa 37 milioni.

Quello che l'Ucraina immetteva nel mercato globale prima della guerra erano milioni di tonnellate al mese, quindi stiamo solo intravedendo oggi i segni precursori del disastro che sta per avvenire.

Le chiedo quindi: nello sforzo di mettere insieme l'assistenza alimentare di emergenza, ci può dire quali modifiche del sistema di aiuti l'Unione si appresta ad apportare per migliorarlo, visto che era non sostenibile ancora prima della guerra?

Josep Borrell Fontelles, *vicepresidente de la Comisión / alto representante de la Unión para Asuntos Exteriores y Política de Seguridad*. – Sí, señoría, tiene usted razón. El hambre mata a más gente que las guerras, y el cambio climático no va a hacer la cosa más fácil. Porque el cambio climático también va a causar en algunas partes del mundo una mortandad asociada a sus consecuencias agrícolas.

Probablemente estemos ante eso que se llama una tormenta perfecta. Tenemos los efectos devastadores de la guerra alterando los circuitos comerciales, en particular los que dependen del grano y del fertilizante provenientes de Rusia y de Ucrania. Tenemos el efecto de la COVID-19, que ha tenido efectos económicos y sociales muy grandes. Tenemos el cambio climático. Ya he visto en Somalia los efectos conjugados del cambio climático, de la sequía, que es un efecto del cambio climático, y de la falta de recursos provenientes del exterior.

Y, según las estadísticas van a aumentar en 222 millones —no sé si se puede calcular con tanta precisión, millón más, millón menos, pero son más de 200 millones— las personas que van a ingresar en el grupo de los que sufren una aguda inseguridad alimentaria. Al menos, eso es lo que nos dice la Red Mundial contra las Crisis Alimentarias. Y esta gente vive en países del norte de África, de Oriente Próximo y del África subsahariana que son muy vulnerables desde el punto de vista climático y debido a su relación de dependencia de Ucrania y de Rusia.

Por eso, hemos lanzado el Mecanismo para la Alimentación y la Resiliencia, con el fin de apoyar a nuestros socios del sur. Se van a destinar 220 millones de euros a los que están en situación más grave.

La falta de fertilizantes también afecta a países de América Latina. A veces miramos solo a África o Asia. Yo acabo de estar en América Latina recientemente, y allí países como México, Perú, Brasil, Chile, Colombia y Argentina, grandes productores agrícolas, se quejan también de la falta de fertilizantes. Por eso, hemos de ayudarles a hacer un cambio hacia fertilizantes no contaminantes, es decir, de tipo ecológico.

Pero, sí, ciertamente, de igual manera que decimos que el invierno que viene será el más difícil desde el punto de vista de nuestra disponibilidad de gas, también tenemos que preguntarnos cuán difícil será la situación alimentaria en función de los rendimientos de la próxima cosecha. La próxima cosecha va a depender críticamente de que a la hora de sembrar se haya dispuesto de los fertilizantes necesarios.

Anna Bonfrisco (ID). – Signor Alto rappresentante, grazie della Sua risposta.

Per risolvere velocemente gli ostacoli della «Black Sea Grain Initiative», che ha delle peculiarità, ad esempio non contiene una disposizione per la risoluzione delle controversie, e che accorda al Segretario generale e alla Turchia un alto grado di indipendenza come mediatori, e mi pare questo il punto pratico più importante dell'accordo, l'Unione europea vorrebbe introdurre disposizioni o regole in tal senso?

Josep Borrell Fontelles, *vicepresidente de la Comisión / alto representante de la Unión para Asuntos Exteriores y Política de Seguridad*. – Señor presidente, señoría, ¿qué quiere que le diga? Si quiere que le dé una respuesta honesta: es que no lo sé. Haremos lo posible, pero no es una tarea fácil.

Witold Jan Waszczykowski (ECR). – Panie Przewodniczący! Panie Komisarzu! Chciałbym dopytać o Solidarity Lens. Dziękuję za informację o finansowaniu tej inicjatywy. Chciałbym zapytać o rozbudowę infrastruktury. Strona ukraińska proponuje zbudowanie rurociągu, którym transportowano by olej. Są inne potrzeby – cysterny, chłodnie na tory itd. Czy jest pomysł rozwoju? Następnie, czy jest pomysł, aby tę kwestię włączyć do Regionalnej Inicjatywy Trójmorza, która włączyła już Ukrainę i mogłaby rozbudowywać sieć transportu? I wreszcie, czy Komisja monitoruje przepływ żywności z Rosji? Czy Rosja używa w dalszym ciągu żywności jako instrumentu politycznego?

Josep Borrell Fontelles, *vicepresidente de la Comisión / alto representante de la Unión para Asuntos Exteriores y Política de Seguridad*. – Señoría, Rusia intenta instrumentalizar todo lo que puede y cuanto más, mejor: nuestra política alimentaria, nuestra política de infraestructuras, todo. Había un *pipeline* que no transportaba petróleo, sino que transportaba productos alimentarios líquidos desde Rusia hacia los puertos de Ucrania, que no ha visto interrumpido su funcionamiento y afortunadamente sigue funcionando.

Señoría, usted me pregunta si se pueden hacer mejoras en las infraestructuras. Creo que ya he contestado antes lo que se puede hacer por lo que he llamado la puerta de atrás, es decir, desde Ucrania hasta Rumanía y hacia el mar Negro. Y no es cuestión de anunciar más y más medidas, sino de ejecutarlas.

En lo que se refiere a las infraestructuras en la propia Ucrania, allí, desgraciadamente, lo que estamos viendo ahora es la destrucción de las infraestructuras existentes. Todas ellas necesitan electricidad para funcionar. Otro ataque masivo con drones como el que tuvo lugar hace unos días y el sistema eléctrico ucraniano estará completamente destruido y, por lo tanto, el transporte que consume electricidad —y casi todo consume hoy electricidad— se verá seriamente afectado.

Fíjese: una buena manera de garantizar la capacidad exportadora de Ucrania en este momento, aunque pueda parecer que no tenga nada que ver, es suministrar defensas antiaéreas a Ucrania, para evitar que su sistema eléctrico sea destruido completamente y, por lo tanto, deje de funcionar lo que en cualquier puerto sirve para cargar y descargar los barcos. Esas son también hoy infraestructuras críticas. Y allí está concentrando Rusia su capacidad destructiva. Hemos de evitar los efectos disruptores de estos ataques. Y seguir haciendo lo que estamos haciendo.

Pero, insisto, no esperen que en cada Pleno les anuncie nuevas medidas. Lo que hay que hacer ahora es aplicarlas. Porque cuando les hablo de centenares de millones, de aquí a que esos centenares de millones se hayan convertido en infraestructuras físicas que funcionen —créanme como exministro de Obras Públicas que soy—, pasa un cierto tiempo.

Witold Jan Waszczykowski (ECR). – Panie Komisarzu! Ja oczywiście nie oczekuję, żeby Pan robił za nas. Bo akurat kraj, który reprezentuję, Polska, w sąsiedztwie Ukrainy robi najwięcej. I między innymi dostarcza środki wojskowe, aby chronić ten transport. I również otworzyła granice. Nie tylko dla 7 milionów ludzi, ale i milionów ton zboża i innych towarów.

Chcę tylko przypomnieć o inicjatywie „Trójmorze". Czy Unia poprze te inicjatywy, które już są realizowane, między innymi przez Polskę?

Josep Borrell Fontelles, *vicepresidente de la Comisión / alto representante de la Unión para Asuntos Exteriores y Política de Seguridad*. – Señor presidente, señoría, en efecto: nunca se agradecerá bastante a Polonia el esfuerzo de solidaridad que su gobierno y su gente han hecho con Ucrania a todos los niveles y por todos los procedimientos, suministrando ayuda militar, acogiendo a los refugiados ucranianos, facilitando productos alimentarios. Creo que Polonia ha dado un ejemplo de lo que significa el apoyo a Ucrania en esos tiempos difíciles y la historia le será reconocida.

Stéphane Bijoux (Renew). – Monsieur le Haut Représentant, au moment où nous nous parlons, l'onde de choc de la guerre en Ukraine percute violemment le monde entier. Et quand Vladimir Poutine utilise la sécurité alimentaire comme une arme de guerre, bien évidemment, il faut protéger tous les Européens, mais aussi nos partenaires internationaux et notamment les îles éloignées.

Je viens d'une petite île européenne de l'océan Indien, La Réunion, et en tant que président de la délégation parlementaire CARIFORUM, j'entends aussi les messages d'alerte inquiétants des États insulaires de la Caraïbe et c'est une bombe humanitaire économique qui menace d'exploser.

Alors, Monsieur le Haut Représentant, je souhaite vous demander ce que l'Europe compte faire pour accompagner les territoires insulaires qui, au lieu de céder aux sirènes et aux promesses chinoises et russes, ont fait au contraire le choix d'un partenariat renforcé avec l'Europe?

Josep Borrell Fontelles, *vice-président de la Commission/haut représentant de l'Union pour les affaires étrangères et la politique de sécurité*. – Qu'est-ce qu'on peut faire? Eh bien, développer ce partenariat. Vous avez raison, il y a des pays qui ont fait le choix de rester à nos côtés, de ne pas écouter les offres des Chinois et des Russes. Il faut donc leur montrer notre appui. Dans une réponse précédente, j'ai déjà dit que nous allions essayer d'aider les pays ACP au moyen du programme de sécurité alimentaire, avec 600 millions d'euros additionnels. Et je ne peux rien vous dire de plus, sinon que ce partenariat doit être une priorité politique pour nous – parce que les vides se remplissent en politique, et si nous ne sommes pas présents, les autres le seront.

On parle beaucoup de l'Afrique subsaharienne, de l'Éthiopie, de la Somalie, mais il faut aller un peu plus loin et regarder les pays européens parce que finalement, il s'agit bien de départements français et de pays qui, sans être européens, attendent de nous un engagement plus fort dans le domaine alimentaire et aussi dans le domaine climatique.

On vient de le voir au sommet de Charm el-Cheikh, où mon collègue Timmermans a joué un rôle fondamental, «stellaire» dirais-je, pour montrer que l'Europe ne fait pas marche arrière dans ses engagements climatiques, tout au contraire, et qu'elle est le meilleur partenaire des pays qui sont menacés à la fois par la tourmente géopolitique et par la tourmente climatique.

Antoni Comín i Oliveres (NI). – Señor presidente, sin duda es una buena noticia para la seguridad alimentaria de muchos países en desarrollo que se haya restablecido plenamente el acuerdo de exportación de grano desde Ucrania a través del mar Negro. Sin duda esto ayudará a prevenir el peor escenario para estos países del sur global, que dependen de modo vital de las importaciones de grano ucraniano.

Con respecto a Turquía quisiera señalar que todos sabemos que el papel de mediación y de garante de cumplimiento de este acuerdo por parte de Turquía ha sido muy importante y, por tanto, la importancia geopolítica de Turquía para la Unión Europea se refuerza. Muy bien. Pero también sabemos que Turquía es un país que presenta factores de desestabilización. Por ejemplo, Turquía no ha adoptado las sanciones de la Unión Europea contra Rusia, tenemos indicios claros de que Turquía está ayudando a Rusia a evadir las sanciones de la Unión Europea sobre el petróleo, Turquía está manteniendo una postura abiertamente hostil hacia dos Estados miembros en el Mediterráneo oriental y Turquía muestra signos de planificar una invasión a gran escala en el Kurdistán sirio.

Por lo tanto, tres preguntas muy concretas: ¿qué propondrá el Consejo en relación con las sanciones contra las personas responsables de evadir las sanciones contra Rusia en caso que se demuestren? ¿Qué medidas propondrá el Consejo para defender la integridad territorial de los dos Estados de la Unión amenazados por Turquía? Y tres, ¿qué …

(El presidente retira la palabra al orador).

Der Präsident. – Vielen Dank, Herr Kollege Comín i Oliveres.

Herr Kommissar, bitte schön.

Josep Borrell Fontelles, *vicepresidente de la Comisión / alto representante de la Unión para Asuntos Exteriores y Política de Seguridad*. – Señor presidente, señoría, no he oído la tercera pregunta. Solo he oído dos.

Der Präsident. – Na ja, die dritte Frage, die kann der Kollege noch als Nachfrage formulieren, wenn er möchte.

Aber ich weise natürlich darauf hin, dass, wenn eine Frage zu 75 % zunächst aus einem Statement besteht, dann die Straße für die Fragen, die wir eigentlich hatten, natürlich ein bisschen kurz wird.

Deshalb, Herr Kommissar, können Sie sich gern auf die ersten beiden Fragen konzentrieren.

Josep Borrell Fontelles, *vicepresidente de la Comisión / alto representante de la Unión para Asuntos Exteriores y Política de Seguridad*. – Señor presidente, señorías, las tres preguntas se referían al papel de Turquía y ninguna, al menos no la de Kurdistán, a los temas que hoy abordamos, que son Ucrania y la seguridad alimentaria.

Se ha criticado a Turquía por el papel que se le atribuye para ayudar a circunvalar las sanciones europeas. Yo he hablado y discutido eso con mi colega Mevlüt Çavuşoğlu, recientemente en los Emiratos Árabes Unidos, donde me suministró información sobre los flujos de importación desde Europa hacia Turquía y de exportación desde Turquía hacia Rusia. Ciertamente, los datos que suministró Mevlüt Çavuşoğlu demuestran que sí ha habido un aumento importante de las exportaciones desde Turquía a Rusia, pero no, en cambio, un aumento significativo de las importaciones desde Europa hacia Turquía. Por lo tanto, la tesis de la triangularización (de que se exporta desde Europa a Rusia vía Turquía), de acuerdo con los datos que me suministró el ministro turco, no se confirma. Hay un aumento de las exportaciones de Turquía hacia Rusia.

Turquía no se ha alineado con las sanciones europeas y, por lo tanto, está en su capacidad de negociar, pero no parece que sea una reexportación de productos europeos.

Ciertamente hubiéramos preferido que Turquía se alinease con las medidas restrictivas que hemos tomado con respecto a Rusia y, en particular, en relación con el uso de los bienes de uso dual puesto que, a fin de cuentas, Turquía forma parte de la unión aduanera de la Unión Europea.

Le insisto en esa discusión que aprecié y en los datos que me suministró el ministro Mevlüt Çavuşoğlu sobre un claro aumento de las exportaciones hacia Rusia, pero no un claro aumento de las importaciones desde Europa.

No tengo tiempo, ni tampoco creo que sea el tema de hoy, para comentar la actuación de Turquía en Kurdistán, ya que no veo, francamente, qué relación tiene con el problema que nos ha convocado hoy, que es la seguridad alimentaria, las rutas de transporte seguras y la Iniciativa sobre la Exportación de Cereales por el Mar Negro.

Turquía es, y todo el mundo lo sabe, un actor fundamental en Oriente Próximo, y quiero aprovechar la ocasión, si usted me lo permite, y si me lo permite el presidente, para señalar que la posición europea con respecto a la situación en Siria es la de buscar una solución política en el marco de las resoluciones del Consejo de Seguridad.

Estamos trabajando en este sentido.

Antoni Comín i Oliveres (NI). – Señor presidente, sí, señor Borrell, le preguntaba también sobre el papel de Turquía en evadir las sanciones de la Unión Europea sobre las importaciones de petróleo. Por lo tanto, no solo el flujo de exportaciones de Turquía a Rusia, sino el flujo de importación de petróleo ruso desde Rusia hacia Turquía. Y la pregunta sobre el Kurdistán tiene relación y tiene justificación, porque lo que estamos preguntando es si el creciente rol geopolítico de Turquía… *(el presidente retira la palabra al orador).*

Der Präsident. – Herr Kollege Comín i Oliveres, es geht hier um die Schwarzmeer-Getreide-Initiative. Der Kommissar hat Sie bei der ersten Antwort schon höflich darauf hingewiesen, dass es um die Ukraine geht; Sie weichen jetzt auf Öl und die Türkei aus. Diese Zusatzfrage kann ich nicht zulassen.

Barry Andrews (Renew). – Mr President, Vice-President Borrell, last week I launched the Global Hunger Index with Welthungerhilfe, Concern Worldwide and ACT Alliance. It was the 2022 index, and naturally it was very negative.

It was based to a large extent on data from 2021, before Russia's war of aggression, and naturally the most insecure countries are the most reliant on Ukrainian and Russian imports and there is an anticipation of a worrying deterioration next year. That's why it's particularly worrying that in the EU's budget for 2023, the largest drop is in Heading 6, which includes humanitarian aid.

So I very much welcome the reinstatement and the extension of the Black Sea Grain initiative. My question relates to the memorandum of understanding that was signed on the same day in the same place between Russia and the UN on Russian exports of fertiliser and food.

The memorandum of understanding was signed on 22 July, and my question relates to the operation of that – if you could broadly brief Parliament on the operation of the MoU, with regard to whether or not reinsurance companies have come back in, whether or not export credit agencies and finance agencies have come back in.

Josep Borrell Fontelles, *vicepresidente de la Comisión / alto representante de la Unión para Asuntos Exteriores y Política de Seguridad*. – Señor presidente, señoría, le puedo explicar lo que hacemos nosotros, pero no lo que hacen los rusos. Me habla usted de un acuerdo entre Rusia y Turquía.

Barry Andrews (Renew). – Just for clarification, the memorandum of understanding is between the United Nations and the Russian Federation, and it is to allow for the exports of Russian fertiliser and food. And it's obviously really important for the importing countries, particularly the most food insecure. So I just wanted to know if you could brief the Parliament on the operation of this MOU, particularly whether or not insurance companies, maritime insurance companies and export credit companies are prepared to operate within the context of the MOU?

If you don't have that information, I'm happy to get it in written form.

President. – Thank you colleague, but you are on the corner of the question, of the issue of this Question Time.

Josep Borrell Fontelles, *vicepresidente de la Comisión / alto representante de la Unión para Asuntos Exteriores y Política de Seguridad*. – Señor presidente, señoría, nosotros no somos parte de este acuerdo. Como usted ha dicho, es un acuerdo entre las Naciones Unidas y Rusia. Pero las Naciones Unidas nos han pedido que aclaremos a todos los operadores de transportes y de seguros que pueden trabajar con Rusia y facilitar y participar en las exportaciones, en particular, de fertilizantes desde Rusia. No somos parte del acuerdo, pero las Naciones Unidas nos han pedido insistentemente que clarifiquemos, y creo que así lo hemos hecho por todos los canales, que ningún asegurador, ningún transportista, ningún agente logístico tiene que tener temor alguno a que, por participar en la exportación de grano y fertilizantes desde Rusia, vaya a verse afectado por nuestras sanciones. Lo hemos hecho dirigiendo cartas de intenciones a todos los operadores, contestando lo que llamamos «*frequent asked questions*» en nuestras páginas webs y dirigiéndonos, por todos los medios posibles, a los actores económicos involucrados.

Las Naciones Unidas han insistido mucho en que Rusia pedía y, más que pedía, exigía, para firmar esos acuerdos que por parte europea se aclarara y se hiciera prácticamente ver a todo el mundo que sus operadores o los operadores mundiales no se verían afectados por nuestras sanciones. Eso es lo que hemos hecho. Pero no le puedo dar más detalles.

Der Präsident. – Vielen Dank, Herr Kommissar! Der Herr Kollege Andrews hat keine Nachfrage. Also, wir halten uns jetzt hier nicht hundertprozentig sklavisch an die Vorgabe, aber ich rate jedem Kollegen, der sozusagen ein verwandtes Thema ansprechen möchte: Natürlich lebt diese Fragestunde vom Überraschungseffekt, und natürlich würde jeder gerne den Kommissar auf die Probe stellen; aber gerade wenn man so Randthemen hat, die nicht zwingend dazugehören, dann wäre es sicher hilfreich, wenn man dem Kommissar einen Hinweis geben würde, dass das Gegenstand der Frage ist. Dann tut es der Qualität der Antworten sicher auch gut.

Die Fragestunde zu diesem Thema ist damit geschlossen.

19. Beziehungen zwischen der EU und China (Aussprache)

Der Präsident. – Als nächster Punkt der Tagesordnung folgt die Aussprache über die Erklärung des Vizepräsidenten der Kommission und Hohen Vertreters der Union für Außen- und Sicherheitspolitik zu den Beziehungen zwischen der EU und China (2022/2900(RSP)).

Josep Borrell Fontelles, *Vice-President of the Commission / High Representative of the Union for Foreign Affairs and Security Policy*. – Mr President, honourable Members, this debate in the European Parliament about EU-China relations is very timely because we had a strategic discussion on China, the Foreign Affairs Council and the European Council. And also we have witnessed the 20th Chinese Communist Party Congress. All of this happening in this month. And the 20th Congress of the Chinese Communist Party has largely confirmed what we already knew, that President Xi Jinping's personal hold of the Chinese party, the state and people, even a stranglehold of the party on the state and in particular of public enterprises.

The growing ideological nature of the Chinese political system, with the development of both a Marxist-Chinese style or Chinese way, and heightened nationalist rhetoric. In the speech of Xi Jinping the word security was used 29 times. In the report of Xi, again, 18 times during the previous Congress.

So the last time we discussed EU-China relation here was on 5 April, right after the EU-China summit and addressing and changing China's ambiguous position on Russia's war in Ukraine was the main European Union objective. China was not too eager to listen, but talking through differences is what major partners must do.

Many months later the Russian aggression against Ukraine is still ongoing. And while we keep our focus on the war at our eastern borders, our attention to China has not decreased. China has not condemned yet the war of Russia against Ukraine and the atrocities that are happening there. But it has set out clear red lines and is increasingly concerned about the global consequences.

Red lines about the use of nuclear weapons. And in Bali, also sending a clear message about the global consequences and the concern they have about it. At the same time, it's not a secret that we and China, we have different political systems, that we view democracy and human rights differently, that we push different models of governance, that we have a different vision of multilateralism. But these differences should not and are not stopping us from engaging with each other.

China is becoming increasingly assertive and developing an increasingly vigorous competition. This is another reality, and I am afraid to announce you that it will remain the way it is in the coming years. And that's why we must have a clear, steady and sustained strategy towards China. And in our last paper, in our last position paper, we realised that the realistic approach that we adopted in 2019 has to be reaffirmed because it's neither naive, nor alarmist. Neither naive nor alarmist. It is rooted in the need to engage, to compete, and to stand up for our values, and I think it still remains valid.

If we are to defend our interests and to address global challenges – climate change, but also environment, health – we need to speak, we need to work, we need to trade and negotiate with China. And European Union leaders reconfirmed this at the European Council.

They also agreed on the fundamental importance of our unity across all aspects of the EU-China relationship. Without unity we will lose both credibility and leverage. Both vis-à-vis of China and also globally. That's why it's so important that in our approach to China, we try to get a synthesis of different points of view and to keep a strong unity.

I can tell you that European Union leaders also agreed that the EU needs to step up its work on reducing dependencies and strategic vulnerabilities, diversifying sources of supply and improving internal resilience. This applies to raw materials and semiconductors, both being critical for the green transition.

To counter cyber and hybrid threats is something that has to be also high in our agenda, and to step-up our engagement with both the like-minded and the non like-minded partners to better address them. In a nutshell, to be concrete and short, we need to extend the economic and political dimension of our partnership, proposing sustainable solutions to key challenges and proving that our cooperation, our offer of cooperation, is as valuable as our political partnership.

Political partnership is needed. Concrete offers – I said that before in questions I answered – are as important. And our Indo-Pacific strategy and our global gateway initiative are central to that offer coming from Central Asia. And I can tell you that the countries of Central Asia are looking at us, awaiting our partnership, awaiting our support, because they don't want to be squeezed between China and Russia. They want to have a more balanced foreign policy and this part of the world that some years ago that could be considered to be in the middle of nowhere, now it is in the middle of everything. And this is a good example of how we can increase our partnership with people who are not necessarily exactly our like-minded countries, but with whom we share a geostrategic interest.

And that's important. And that's why I count on this Parliament to support the work that we have been developing. And I hope this discussion today will bring some light to our work, insisting on the fact that we need at the same time to be part of a fierce competition, that we need cooperation in certain fields and we need to understand that in many others we will be engaged in a systemic rivalry.

That doesn't mean to be in a permanent rivalry in anything, in any field for everything, everywhere. Communication channels have to be open with Beijing. Not even the Americans are asking for decoupling of their economies, neither are we. But certainly the human rights issue will be very high in agenda.

We need to update our policy toward China in the light of the most recent developments, and in particular the very important American declaration of 7 October concerning the drastic reduction of China's access to American technology in the field of semiconductors. This is some decision that has to be very much taken into account because the technological battle will be absolutely fundamental for our immediate future.

Semiconductors are truly the most fundamental technological issue of the economic competition in the 21st century, and we have to develop also a dialogue with other countries that are in a similar situation to us – I'm thinking in particular of Japan – to keep a dialogue with the United States. This dialogue is going to take place next week. The Secretary-General of External Action Service and my team will travel to Washington to have this political high-level dialogue about China.

Certainly the US are our most important ally, but in some cases we will not be in the same position or in the same approach to China. But certainly we have to work together because what is going to happen in our relations with China will mark this century.

Radosław Sikorski, *on behalf of the PPE Group*. – Mr President, High Representative, colleagues, China accounts for a quarter of humanity. It's an ancient culture. It's our largest trading partner. We want to have a constructive relationship with it.

I proposed the paper, which was supported by this House some time ago, whose gist was that we should, with China, collaborate where possible, compete where needed and confront when necessary. I believe that's still the right policy.

On behalf of the EPP, Mr High Representative, I support the thrust of what you've just proposed. Personally, I think the Chinese leadership has made three big mistakes recently: dropping the ten-year rule, nationalising parts of the economy, and the aggressive wolf warrior diplomacy have not enhanced China's popularity or influence in the world.

The ten-year rule and the economy are internal Chinese matters, but on China's external relations, something could be done about it.

If China stopped threatening Taiwan, if China helped to resolve the war in Ukraine – and she can, because she has influence over Vladimir Putin – that would greatly help our relationship. We need to put the Europe-China relationship back on a pragmatic footing.

Pedro Marques, *em nome do Grupo S&D*. – Senhor Presidente, Senhor Alto Representante, Colegas, as relações entre a China e a União Europeia estão verdadeiramente numa encruzilhada.

Por um lado, a dimensão da China e o papel que tem e pode ter no mundo tornam importante cooperarmos relativamente a desafios comuns como a crise climática, a segurança alimentar mundial ou a promoção da paz e a segurança globais. Mas reiteradas violações de direitos humanos em Xinjiang, Tibete, Hong Kong, Macau não podem deixar de merecer o mais veemente repúdio por parte da União Europeia.

Acresce a tensão cada vez maior relativamente a Taiwan, que coloca em causa a paz e a estabilidade regional e que a Europa também não pode tolerar, sem esquecer, claro, as sanções impostas a deputados deste Parlamento, em total desrespeito pela Instituição e pelos princípios de funcionamento destas democracias.

Há um caminho para melhorar gradualmente, ainda assim, as relações entre a União Europeia e a China, mas é um caminho estreito, que a Europa está disponível a trilhar, como o Alto Representante aqui bem referiu. Esperamos que as autoridades chinesas estejam seriamente disponíveis também para esse percurso.

Hilde Vautmans, *namens de Renew-Fractie*. – Voorzitter, na de Europese top van oktober was ik opgelucht. Ik dacht, mijnheer Borrell: onze leiders hebben het eindelijk begrepen. Ze hebben eindelijk begrepen dat de vriendschap tussen China en Rusland gevolgen zou hebben voor ónze relaties met China. Ze hebben eindelijk begrepen dat we verenigd moeten zijn en dat we bepaalde afhankelijkheden moeten afbouwen. Maar dan, een paar dagen na de top en bijna dadelijk na het Chinese partijcongres, besluit de Duitse bondskanselier op zakenreis naar China te gaan. En hij gaat alleen. Op de koop toe ziet hij niet in waarom de verkoop van een deel van de haven van Hamburg aan China problematisch kan zijn. Is dit de *Zeitenwende* die kanselier Scholz bedoelde na de Russische invasie van Oekraïne? Zijn dit de lessen die we trekken?

Als we niet dezelfde fout willen maken als met onze relaties met Rusland, moeten we starten met het uitvoeren van een meer verenigd en assertief beleid ten aanzien van China. Dat is de strategie, meneer Borrell, waartoe dit Parlement vorig jaar in mijn verslag heeft opgeroepen. Ik sluit af. (De heer Borrell heeft ook ver over zijn spreektijd heen mogen gaan.) We kunnen alleen een Europa zijn met een stem in de wereld als we verenigd zijn. Doe dat ook ten aanzien van China.

Reinhard Bütikofer, *on behalf of the Verts/ALE Group*. – Mr President, Mr Borrell. To say it simply, Mr Borrell, I'm disappointed. I heard from you a lot of generalities, but very little indeed about the reality of EU-China relations.

Maybe there isn't so much to report. What kind of a relationship do we have after all? The April summit, as you said, was a dialogue of the deaf. At the G20, Xi didn't want to meet with the representatives of the EU. And at the COP 27, China stood squarely in the way of what we fought for.

There is no point in putting lipstick on a pig: EU China relations are at a very low ebb. China's attitude is characterised by arrogance, divisiveness and hegemonic ambition. Unfortunately, many of our Member States are not yet prepared to learn the Russian lesson fully and to apply the Russian lesson to China: that we should not allow ourselves to become dependent on an authoritarian regime.

Scholz, Macron, Meloni or Sánchez, they all prefer to put their narrow self-interest in the first place. I would have thought that the English proverb 'once bitten, twice shy' might apply. But some people may want to be bitten more often, and they will if their self-centred actions, instead of developing common European China policies, will continue. We have a lot of common talk, but very little common walk.

In this context, I would expect of you, Mr Borrell, to take the lead and lead towards unitary European action. What about taking the lead with regard to getting rid of the extradition agreements that we have, of trying to use the EEAS services to counter Chinese representatives spreading the Russian lies in the Global South?

There is so much you could do, but you don't take the lead.

Anna Bonfrisco, *a nome del gruppo ID*. – Signor Presidente, onorevoli colleghi, signor Alto rappresentante Borrell, diversi fatti ormai ci dicono che la Cina non cerca pace e tranquillità e mi domando: dov'è l'esempio di equilibrio e la reciprocità commerciale che la Commissione europea cerca di stabilire con la Cina sia a livello bilaterale che presso il WTO? Tutto ciò non si materializza ed ecco quindi che il nostro dibattito indica la chiara volontà politica di salvaguardare un ordine internazionale libero, multipolare, basato sulle regole.

Lei ha citato il tema cruciale dei semiconduttori. Ecco perché dobbiamo trovare il modo di consentire a Taiwan di continuare a esistere nello status quo attuale, espandendo le relazioni commerciali e politiche e rifiutando categoricamente la falsa narrativa della riunificazione proposta dalla Cina.

Così come dobbiamo opporci all'egemonia che il Partito comunista cinese tenta di estendere nel Mar Cinese orientale e meridionale sfidando la libertà di navigazione, sfidando quindi il mondo occidentale.

Anna Fotyga, *on behalf of the ECR Group*. – Mr President, after a somehow hasty completion of the CAI, we've had COVID-19, a crackdown on Hong Kong, intimidation of Taiwan, violence against Uighurs, probably genocide, and also coercion of Lithuania and Australia, not to mention other countries. Moreover, what happens internally in the PRC somehow resembles preparations by Russia to a war of aggression against Ukraine. I warned this chamber against naivety in its assessment of the PRC.

Manu Pineda, *en nombre del Grupo The Left*. – Señor presidente, señor Borrell, la Unión Europea tiene que decidir si apuesta por un mundo dividido en bloques, en una nueva versión de la Guerra Fría, o si defiende realmente un orden internacional multipolar.

La actual política de la Unión Europea respecto a China se caracteriza por la subordinación a las directivas del Consejo de Seguridad Nacional de los Estados Unidos y conlleva una batería de sanciones y provocaciones a China que evidencia que nuestro presunto alegato por un mundo multipolar no es más que una pose tacticista.

China no es un enemigo sistémico ni un rival comercial para ninguna nación del planeta. De hecho, es un socio comercial leal, con muchas posibilidades para superar los efectos de la crisis que sufrimos y que difícilmente se resolverán de forma aislada.

El intento de imposición de un sistema unipolar al servicio de los Estados Unidos es, simple y llanamente, el intento de mantener vivo un sistema que es un peligro no solo para los pueblos de la Unión Europea, sino para la supervivencia misma del planeta y de toda la humanidad.

Milan Uhrík (NI). – Vážený pán predsedajúci, Európe uteká vlak. Západ sa utápa v recesii, zatiaľ čo krajiny združenia BRICS naberajú na sile a pripravujú postupnú expanziu.

Poviem úprimne, nesúhlasím s tým, aby bola Čína označovaná za hrozbu pre Európu. Áno, za konkurenta, to áno, ale za hrozbu? Prosím vás, koľko vojen vo svete začala Čína? Alebo koľko štátov napadla Čína? Tak len pre porovnanie, Spojené štáty americké za 246 rokov svojej existencie boli s niekým vo vojne počas 231 rokov, to znamená 94 % času. A tí sú označovaní za mierotvorcov a Čína je označovaná niektorými za hrozbu.

Nepáči sa mi táto politika, kedy všetkých mimo tej západnej bubliny označujete za nedemokratické štáty, za totality alebo dokonca za hrozby či za nepriateľov. Ak chce Európa prosperovať, tak musí spolupracovať s východom, musí spolupracovať s východom.

Michael Gahler (PPE). – Herr Präsident, liebe Kolleginnen und Kollegen, Herr Hoher Beauftragter! Im Verhältnis zu China bleibt es im Grundsatz bei dem Dreiklang Partner, Konkurrent und systemischer Rivale.

Es wäre schön, wenn China als Partner bei der Verteidigung einer multilateralen, regelbasierten Weltordnung zur Verfügung stünde und nicht nur, wenn es ihnen passt. Ich hätte mir China als Partner bei Themen wie der Bekämpfung des Klimawandels gewünscht, in der Form, dass China seinen Anteil der Verantwortung übernimmt. Leider konnte ich das in Scharm El-Scheich nicht feststellen.

Gleiches gilt dort, wo wir als Konkurrenten auf dem Weltmarkt die WTO akzeptieren, als gemeinsamen Handlungsrahmen. Da muss künftig gelten: Chinesische Firmen dürfen nur das in Europa unternehmen, was unsere EU-Firmen auch in China dürfen. Und natürlich sind wir systemische Rivalen dort, wo die chinesische Diktatur die russische Diktatur de facto unterstützt und wo wir von China fordern, den Status quo gegenüber Taiwan nicht einseitig und nicht mit Gewalt zu verändern.

Nur gemeinsam können wir bei all den Themen China beeindrucken. Sagen Sie das, Herr Hoher Beauftragter, den Einzelkämpfern in all unseren kleinen Mitgliedstaaten!

Inma Rodríguez-Piñero (S&D). – Señor presidente, señor alto representante, entre la Unión Europea y China se sitúan dos verdades indiscutibles: China es nuestro mayor socio comercial, pero también es nuestro mayor rival debido a la diferencia, a la distancia entre nuestros sistemas.

El reto radica en que esta contradicción no nos paralice y nos haga un daño moral y económico contrario a los intereses de la Unión. No podemos quedarnos en un bucle. Debemos encontrar una salida.

La salida a esa contradicción es la que nos sugiere el alto representante, señor Borrell, y quiero agradecerle su liderazgo. Yo estoy de acuerdo con el liderazgo y la implicación que hace, y se lo agradezco, para conseguir una mayor autonomía estratégica, para influir en el complejo contexto internacional en el que vivimos.

La vía para poder convivir con China es ser más eficaces, estableciendo alianzas con terceros países, reforzando nuestra apuesta por el multilateralismo, perfeccionando los instrumentos de los que ya nos hemos dotado, y algunos que nos faltan, para alcanzar una mayor igualdad en las relaciones comerciales con China.

Y lo más importante y eficaz: la unidad de acción entre nosotros para que invertir, producir y hacer negocios en China deje de ser una aventura y sea una oportunidad.

Marie-Pierre Vedrenne (Renew). – Monsieur le Président, Monsieur le Haut Représentant, chers collègues, la Chine demeure un rival systémique. Un rival dans son modèle de gouvernance, avec la répression systématique des droits de l'homme. Un rival qui ne condamne pas fermement l'agression de l'Ukraine par Vladimir Poutine. Un rival dans ses actions à travers le monde, où elle utilise des systèmes d'aide opaques pour faire main basse sur des installations stratégiques et des matières premières. Un rival qui menace la souveraineté de Taïwan, une démocratie partenaire où nous nous rendrons avec plusieurs collègues. Un rival qui réprime la démocratie à Hong Kong et décime la minorité ouïghoure. Un rival dans sa manière d'appréhender l'unité européenne et en nous divisant et en rachetant des pans industriels majeurs de nos économies.

Monsieur le Haut Représentant, alors même que l'Union européenne parachève son instrument anticoercition, rappelons à tous les dirigeants européens qu'ils ne doivent pas céder aux avances de la Chine, mais bien agir pour garantir notre indépendance et notre souveraineté.

PŘEDSEDNICTVÍ: DITA CHARANZOVÁ

místopředsedkyně

Yannick Jadot (Verts/ALE). – Madame la Présidente, Monsieur le Haut Représentant, la question posée, c'est: peut-on avoir des relations normales avec un pays dont le régime opprime sa population et organise un génocide contre les Ouïghours? Il y a deux ans, la Commission européenne, la chancelière Merkel et le président Macron ont répondu oui en célébrant l'accord d'investissement avec la Chine. Il y a quelques jours, le chancelier Scholz a aussi répondu par l'affirmative en considérant que douze millions de voitures allemandes comptaient plus que douze millions de Ouïghours. Eh bien, ce n'est pas l'avis du Parlement européen.

Prenons l'exemple du travail forcé. Quand la Commission européenne propose une usine à gaz, dont on ne comprend pas si ça va être efficace contre le travail forcé, le Parlement européen réclame un embargo sur les produits issus du travail forcé. Le Parlement européen propose de considérer le travail forcé comme une politique d'État du régime chinois.

Alors, ce que nous demandons, nous Parlement européen, à la Commission européenne, c'est de faire aussi de la politique. Ce n'est pas de la naïveté, Monsieur le Haut Représentant, cela s'appelle de la cupidité quand on veut faire du commerce au détriment de nos valeurs. Alors, face au travail forcé, faisons un vrai embargo, y compris sur les produits issus du Xinjiang.

Bert-Jan Ruissen (ECR). – Voorzitter, de Chinese investeringen in de haven van Hamburg hebben ons met de neus op de feiten gedrukt. De agressieve investeringsagenda van president Xi met maar één doel: het machtigste land ter wereld te worden. Het brengt Europa in een bijzonder afhankelijke en daarmee kwetsbare positie. Europa wordt zo een wingewest van China, een totalitaire staat waar mensenrechten zoals godsdienstvrijheid met voeten worden getreden. De concentratie van macht tijdens het recente partijcongres van de Communistische Partij belooft wat dat betreft weinig goeds.

We moeten daarom nu in actie komen: ons niet langer door China uit elkaar laten spelen; een stop zetten op Chinese overnames van onze vitale infrastructuur, zoals landbouwgronden; veel kritischer zijn op onze grondstoffen.

Een Noordzee vol met windmolens die draaien op Chinese supermagneten vind ik wat dat betreft bepaald geen aantrekkelijke gedachte.

Helmut Scholz (The Left). – Frau Präsidentin, Herr Vizepräsident, liebe Kolleginnen und Kollegen! Henry Kissinger und Walden Bello, zwei sehr unterschiedliche Politiker, weit weg von uns hier – prophezeien den Krieg zwischen den Vereinigten Staaten und China.

Offene strategische Autonomie, Herr Borrell, muss deshalb eigenständige Handlungsfähigkeit zur Lösung von Sachverhalten formulieren, nicht das Abkoppeln von anderen Akteuren.

Worin also besteht das heutige Interesse Europas an den Beziehungen auch zu China? Klimawandel, zukunftssichernder Umbau der Wirtschaft mit guten Arbeitsplätzen, Frieden, Sicherheit, Menschenrechte gehören da sicherlich mit an erste Stelle, Verrechtlichung der internationalen Beziehungsgeflechte auch; und dies wird nicht in Konfrontation geschehen können – so unterschiedlich die Herangehensweisen sein mögen.

Das Wissen um die Geschichte spielt immer mit. Deshalb muss unser Interesse als Friedensnobelpreisträger der Dialog sein und bleiben, das Zuhören und das Überdenken eigener Positionen, gerade weil der sogenannte Rest der Welt den doch in Wahrheit mit Abstand größeren Teil der Welt ausmacht.

Europa kann China nicht mehr zwingen, Herr Außenminister. Wir müssen unsere Partner überzeugen, in Partnerschaft und im systemischen Wettbewerb zugleich, weil die gewaltigen Potenziale Europas und Chinas mobilisieren und gemeinsam zur Wirkung bringen und Synergien erzeugen müssen.

Miroslav Radačovský (NI). – Vážená pani predsedajúca, za 70 rokov zahraničnej, nedokonalej zahraničnej politiky Európskej únie sme dospeli k záveru, k akému sme dospeli, t. j. v Európe je vojna, je tu kríza, potravinová kríza, energetická kríza. A kríza, ktorá možno dovedie Európu k väčšiemu konfliktu, ako je.

Ja sa stotožňujem s tým, čo povedal pán Borrell. Treba sa vyvarovať takéhoto postupu vo vzťahu k Číne, netreba situáciu vyostrovať, treba Čínu chápať ako partnera, obchodného partnera a viesť s nimi rokovania na princípe „rovný s rovným". A pokiaľ sa týka niektorých tu, takých silných alebo chtivých europoslancov, ktorí si myslia, že Európa je asi stred vesmíru a že môžeme niekomu diktovať, ako má konať vo vlastnom štáte, čo má robiť, čo má pracovať, tak ja by som postavenie Európskej únie a Číny asi prirovnal k situácii, keď slon, *elephant and ant*, slon a mravec idú po moste a mravec hovorí: „Ale dupeme!"

Jednoducho, my si nemôžeme dovoliť konať tak, aby sme sa zbavili ďalšieho globálneho partnera obchodného, ktorý skutočne nikdy na nikoho nezaútočil, tak ako sme… *(predsedajúca prerušila rečníka)*… To je všetko.

David McAllister (PPE). – Madam President, High Representative/Vice-President, ladies and gentlemen, as a number of colleagues have pointed out in tonight's debate, the relations between the People's Republic of China and the European Union have been affected by so many different items – disproportionate counter-sanctions, cases of economic coercion and Chinese convergence with Russia, just to name a few.

China is the only country with both the intent to reshape the international order and the economic, diplomatic, military and technological power to actually do so. China will continue to be a major global player with whom the European Union must speak, work, trade and negotiate in areas of common and global interest.

Therefore, High Representative/Vice-President, for this reason, the European Union's engagement with China should be, as we have often pointed out, principled, practical and pragmatic. But at the same time, the European Union needs to stand firm in defending our values and interests. To reduce our vulnerabilities, to increase our resilience, to address our security concerns and to engage with our partners – from the more distant to the like-minded – are all important lines of action.

Tonino Picula (S&D). – Madam President, Mr High Representative, yes, it's high time we debate our relations with China, which are essential for the European Union, our role as a global actor and our future development. The most essential task is to unite the position of Member States on this, and we continue to see individual actions that affect us all. We should simultaneously work on our industry redeployment as we work on energy independence.

Members of this House are still sanctioned for speaking the truth about evident human rights violations. Moreover, we see reports on illegal Chinese policing in the European Union. Russian aggression in Ukraine is also testing our relations. It's essential to talk, open up a long list of difficult questions and stand firm in defending our stances. But while we can discuss with China global challenges and negotiate the rules on how we trade in goods, we should never trade our values.

Dragoș Tudorache (Renew). – Madam President, High Representative, dear colleagues, making choices in politics is never easy. We have indulged for decades in economic past dependencies. We pretended that ideologies do not matter, that half democracies are fine.

And look what we have achieved. Russia, our biggest energy trading partner, is bombing civilians every day. At our doorstep in China, our largest trading partner overall, is itself challenging the rule-based order we worked so hard to build.

I agree, High Representative, but we cannot afford total economic decoupling, and that there are areas where we must and can work together with China. But, we cannot continue to sell our ports to regimes that do not share our values. We cannot fly Chinese drones to inspect our critical infrastructure and we cannot pretend that Chinese technology is safe as long as it is state-controlled.

There is no piece of hardware or software, no matter how small or apparently insignificant, that cannot contain an embedded backdoor spy program. And there is no security audit invented that can guarantee a full check. The same stands true for raw materials, where the risk is not a direct security exposure but a threat to our critical supply chains.

So let us wake up High Representative, to this geopolitical reality and do something about it.

Juan Ignacio Zoido Álvarez (PPE). – Señora presidenta, señor alto representante, el Servicio de Acción Exterior de la Unión Europea ha definido a China como un socio estratégico, un rival sistémico y un competidor económico. La cooperación en asuntos estratégicos es, efectivamente, una responsabilidad compartida, pero para progresar tenemos que garantizar la reciprocidad en las reglas del juego.

Necesitamos seguir derribando las barreras comerciales unilaterales que mantiene China para nuestros productos, pero también, como hace Pekín, nosotros debemos ser muy cuidadosos con las inversiones en sectores críticos (como las tecnologías más avanzadas, la inteligencia artificial, los semiconductores o la industria de defensa), que son la base de nuestra autonomía estratégica. Si algo hemos aprendido tras la invasión de Ucrania es que las dependencias, tanto energética como tecnológica, pueden convertirse en nuestro talón de Aquiles.

Por eso, señor Borrell, ¿cree que las crecientes inversiones chinas en infraestructuras y empresas tecnológicas suponen un riesgo geopolítico para la Unión Europea? O, dicho en otras palabras, ¿son el puerto de Hamburgo e inversiones similares un nuevo Nord Stream 2?

Maria Arena (S&D). – Madame la Présidente, la Chine est un partenaire commercial de l'Union européenne. J'ai même envie de dire le partenaire commercial de l'Union européenne. Presque 600 milliards d'échanges avec la Chine, 20 milliards de plus que les échanges avec les États-Unis. En même temps, le régime chinois ne partage pas nos standards en matière de droits de l'homme. On a parlé travail forcé, régime de surveillance, sanctions à l'égard des opposants à Hong Kong et ce ne sont que des exemples. S'il ne nous appartient pas de changer le régime chinois – ce serait naïf de le penser –, nous avons la responsabilité de ne pas être complices de ce régime.

Donc, j'aurais quelques questions. Quelle est la position du Conseil en matière d'interdiction des produits issus du travail forcé chinois qui entrent sur le marché européen? Quelle est la position du Conseil sur un vrai mécanisme de *due diligence* des entreprises internationales qui travailleraient en Chine? Quel serait le mécanisme qui garantirait, dans le cadre d'un accord commercial ou d'un accord d'investissement, qu'il n'y a pas de violation des droits de l'homme? Enfin, quelle est la position, au niveau multilatéral, que nous avons sur le traité de *due diligence* pour lequel, aujourd'hui, la Commission n'a pas de mandat et où c'est la Chine qui négocie? Et, Monsieur le Haut Représentant, ne me dites pas que la solution, c'est le dialogue «droits de l'homme», parce qu'alors là, ce serait naïf.

Ivars Ijabs (Renew). – Madam President, Mr Borrell, EU-China relations are as much about securing the rules-based international order as about realistic assessments of Europe's strategic interests, not least in the areas of trade and investment.

Much has been said already about screening inbound investment in strategically important sectors from chips to ports, but equally important is a hard-nosed attitude towards outbound strategic investment. Some European governments have already taken case-by-case decisions not to issue guarantees to companies that might benefit from slave labour or massive human rights violations in China.

However, European rules are needed to tighten its investment regulations. We have export controls and a carbon border tax, so we have to make sure that foreign investment is not used to circumvent those export controls or to produce carbon leakage.

In this context, I am looking very much forward to the European Commission coming up with a revision of the EU's FDI screening and outbound investment control regulations. Naivety is not an option in relations with China and international relations in general.

David Lega (PPE). – Madam President, Mr Borrell, we promised never again. The European Union is founded on the values of human dignity, freedom, equality and human rights. I took the floor to remind the High Representative about the situation in Xinjiang: persecution, detention and forced labour, torture, rape and systematic sexual abuse, mass forced sterilisation and forced abortions.

So I would like to remind Mr Borrell that the CCP's crimes against the Uyghurs constitute crimes against humanity and a serious risk of genocide. So let me remind you that all signatories of the Genocide Convention are obliged to prevent and punish the crime of genocide. So please, Mr Borrell, if you cannot prevent the genocide, at least punish the abusers and sanction the monsters, because we promised never again.

René Repasi (S&D). – Frau Präsidentin, Hoher Vertreter, liebe Kolleginnen und Kollegen! Unsere Strategie gegenüber China ist eine große Herausforderung, weil sie uns vor die Frage stellt: Was wollen wir eigentlich selber sein als Europäische Union am Ende der Zeit der Turboglobalisierung durch Pandemie und Krieg? Wollen wir ein großer Markt sein mit reichen Verbraucherinnen und Verbrauchern, auf dem man seine Produkte billig absetzen kann? Oder wollen wir eine selbstbewusste Mittelmacht sein?

Vor dieser Entscheidung stehen wir auch und gerade gegenüber China. Dazu müssen wir unsere Hausaufgaben machen, denn meine Entscheidung geht für Zweiteres. Und Hausaufgabe heißt, dass wir im Inneren ein EU-Lieferkettengesetz brauchen, indem wir sehen, dass wir unsere Handelsbeziehungen diversifiziert bekommen, dass wir Zwangsarbeit verbieten, dass wir unsere Cybersecurity anpacken und wir dementsprechend für uns selber ein starker Raum sind.

Das bedeutet für unsere Verbraucherinnen und Verbraucher Kosten – Produkte werden weniger, und sie werden teurer. Aber das ist der Preis, den wir zahlen wollen, wenn wir strategisch autonom gegenüber China auftreten sollen. Diese Autonomie möchte ich hier verteidigen. Und ich möchte Sie hier als Hohen Vertreter dazu auffordern, für diese Autonomie zu kämpfen. Das bedeutet aber auch, im Gespräch mit China zu bleiben, aber bitte mit einer Stimme – ganz gleich, wer sie spricht.

Bart Groothuis (Renew). – Madam President, dear Commissioner, High Representative, some see intellectual property theft on an almost industrial scale as the second-oldest profession in the world.

What's new? Instead of the slow drainage of our economic competitiveness, some see unfair competition with state subsidies, non-reciprocal market access just as mere trade issues, technical, instead of a frontal attack on our prosperity. And some see Chinese disinformation or support for dictators worldwide or its relationship with Russia, its military build-up as merely an expression of the new multipolar world, 'get used to it', instead of an attack on the liberal world order.

Well, the EU, we respond to such threats with numerous pieces of legislation, critical entities, cybersecurity, foreign direct investment and what have you. But we do so with a country-agnostic, a country-neutral approach.

But, in practice, this significantly hampers the effectiveness of these measures. Country-specific problems need country-specific legislation. We might believe we live in peace with the world, but China dictates itself that is in conflict with us. So act accordingly and let's legislate accordingly.

Miriam Lexmann (PPE). – Madam President, it seems the European Union has not learned its lesson. Even with the terrible human and economic costs of COVID-19, the CCP's terror against all goods and people across China and growing aggression abroad, some EU leaders still think there can be business as usual with the CCP.

We have also discovered that the United Front, an arm of the CCP, has a network of offices across Europe, spreading the CCP's malign influence in our institutions and using them as *de facto* police stations to control the Chinese diaspora. I ask, what more does it take for us to wake up and understand what sort of regime we are dealing with?

I therefore call on those EU Member States who have not yet done so to launch formal investigations and ensure the immediate closing of these illegal police stations.

It is not merely disturbing that the totalitarian regime is allowed to engage in such illegal extra-territorial activities in the EU. Their presence poses a grave security risk, not only for the Chinese diaspora, but for the very foundations of our democracy.

Peter van Dalen (PPE). – Voorzitter, het is essentieel dat Europese lidstaten bij strategische zaken zoals technologie, zeldzame aardmetalen en cruciale infrastructuur zelfstandiger worden. We hebben gezien hoe Rusland Europa met energie heeft gechanteerd. Dat moet ons niet weer gebeuren met China. Strategische autonomie dient onze economische belangen, maar ook de rol van Europa als waardengemeenschap. Onder het regime van Xi vinden op grote schaal mensenrechtenschendingen plaats en genocide en orgaanroof en noemt u maar op. We moeten China verantwoordelijk houden voor deze misdaden. Grotere economische onafhankelijkheid van China bevordert de daadkracht en de geloofwaardigheid van onze stellingname. Ik hoop dat mijnheer Borrell toch heeft geluisterd.

Francisco José Millán Mon (PPE). – Señora presidenta, China es una gran potencia que, tanto por su tamaño como por peso político, económico y demográfico, no podemos ignorar. Está claro que necesitamos contar con China para hacer frente a retos globales.

Tenemos que coexistir con China. Una relación donde habrá cooperación, pero también competencia y rivalidad.

Hablando de cooperación, China, miembro permanente del Consejo de Seguridad, tiene que distanciarse abiertamente de Moscú y contribuir de forma activa al final de la agresión rusa.

No caben ambigüedades ni neutralidades. O no debieran caber.

Pero quiero referirme hoy al sector tecnológico: me preocupan los intercambios de tecnologías avanzadas. La Unión tiene que estar vigilante, especialmente con las susceptibles de uso militar.

Hemos visto como recientemente, el 7 de octubre, el Gobierno Biden (el alto representante se acaba de referir a esto) adoptó unas medidas restrictivas en materia de exportación de semiconductores avanzados a China. ¿Van a hablar de estas restricciones, señor Borrell, en el marco de la reunión del 5 de diciembre del Consejo de Comercio y Tecnología?

Por lo que veo, va a enviar a algunos de sus colaboradores la semana que viene. Hace usted bien. A mí me parece un tema importantísimo, de gran actualidad y creo, desde luego, que tiene que seguirlo con mucho interés.

El tema de los semiconductores es clave. No podemos ser dependientes, pero tenemos que tener cuidado con las exportaciones, que es donde está Washington.

Tendrán que reactualizar las relaciones con China, también teniendo en cuenta su actitud en relación con Moscú.

(Catch-the-eye procedure)

Henna Virkkunen (PPE). – Madam President, Vice-President, for decades Europe believed that strong economic ties and trade and multilateral cooperation would help to promote democracy and human rights in China. We now know that was not the case and that President Xi only used this to strengthen his own power.

Europe must learn from the mistakes we made with Russia. We were far too dependent on Russian fossil fuels, and now when we are boosting our green transition and digitalisation, we must not allow ourselves to become dependent on Chinese critical raw materials. We must find alternative suppliers and develop our own production capabilities.

This is why I welcome the Chips Act's objective of doubling Europe's share of semiconductors, and I look forward to the Commission's upcoming proposal on critical raw materials. Europe can't afford to neglect our own security of supply and resilience. Trade with China must be fair and also reciprocal.

Γεώργιος Κύρτσος (Renew). – Κυρία Πρόεδρε, ήθελα να πω ότι μου αρέσει η προσέγγιση του κυρίου Borrell διότι — εντάξει, όλοι καταδικάζουμε το καθεστώς και τα χαρακτηριστικά του στην Κίνα, αλλά αυτό δεν μας λύνει το πρόβλημα— είναι ένας πολύ ισχυρός ανταγωνιστής η Κίνα, έχει μια στρατηγική να επικρατήσει σε παγκόσμιο επίπεδο μέχρι το 2049 και δεν έχουμε, βέβαια, και την πολυτέλεια να κλειστούμε, να πάθουμε μια κρίση εσωστρέφειας —δηλαδή όχι στο εμπόριο, όχι στις επενδύσεις, κ.ο.κ.

Διότι σε όποια χώρα και να επισκεφτώ —πήγα πρόσφατα στην Αυστραλία, στη Χιλή, με αποστολή του Ευρωπαϊκού Κοινοβουλίου— βλέπω ότι οι Κινέζοι έχουν φύγει πολύ μπροστά και εμείς πρέπει να βρούμε τρόπους, τους οποίους δεν ξέρουμε ακόμα, για να γίνουμε πιο ανταγωνιστικοί και πιο αποτελεσματικοί. Επίσης, θεωρώ λάθος να συγκρίνουμε την Κίνα με τη Ρωσία, διότι η Ρωσία είναι μια μέτρια δύναμη. Μπορεί να είναι πυρηνική υπερδύναμη, αλλά η Κίνα είναι σίγουρη για τον εαυτό της και έχει μια μακροπρόθεσμη στρατηγική.

Τέλος, για να καταλάβουμε τι γίνεται στην Κίνα, καθώς έχουμε και το πρόβλημα της γλώσσας, προτείνω να κάνουμε δεξαμενές σκέψης όπου να συμμετέχουν εκπρόσωποι από την Ταϊβάν και από την Αυστραλία γιατί στις επισκέψεις μου σε αυτές τις χώρες είδα ότι αναλύουν την Κίνα, ξέρουν τη γλώσσα και ξέρουν περισσότερα από εμάς.

Silvia Sardone (ID). – Signora Presidente, onorevoli colleghi, l'Unione europea è sempre più sottomessa alla Cina.

Dal 2035, di fatto, ci sarà l'obbligo dell'auto elettrica, dipenderemo dalla Cina. Il mercato delle auto elettriche, dalle batterie alle materie prime, alle terre rare, è di fatto un monopolio del gigante asiatico. Passiamo dalla dipendenza dal gas della Russia a quello della Cina praticamente, a una dipendenza ulteriore dal gigante asiatico. Il tutto nascondendoci dietro al *green*, ma la Cina continua a inquinare e le sue emissioni di CO_2 rappresentano un terzo di quelle di tutto il mondo.

Ma chiudete gli occhi anche di fronte alle violazioni dei diritti umani imposti dalla dittatura comunista del governo cinese. Persecuzioni verso oppositori politici, minoranze etniche e religiose. Insomma, siamo stanchi della vostra sottomissione alla Cina.

Mick Wallace (The Left). – Madam President, there's a lack of seriousness when it comes to EU-China relations. We have real issues to address. Global warming, for example, areas that need respectful diplomacy and cooperation.

The repetition of the stream of baseless accusations that originate in Washington does nothing for the EU's standing as a respectful international partner and interlocutor. The Taiwan stuff is the most reckless US provocation in living memory, and we'd do well to distance ourselves from us. China wants to work with the EU.

We should not allow the US to undermine our relationship with China. Right now, the continuation of the US/NATO proxy war in Ukraine is decimating European industry. Factories are closing across Europe. Decent jobs are going where there's cheaper labour and gas. Europe has been hollowed out, with no apparent plan to fill the gap.

This is not a path towards a stable future for Europe, and we'd do well to show China a bit more respect. They do respect us.

Stanislav Polčák (PPE). – Paní předsedající, já jsem přesvědčen, že musíme jednat s Čínou, ale také podle principu rovného s rovným. Je nepochybné, že Čína je zásadním činitelem pro řešení globálních konfliktů a také globálních témat. Pro nás je důležité řešit s Čínou souladné zájmy v oblasti environmentální politiky. Ale také zjišťujeme, že pro Čínu jsou to mnohdy jenom slova, viz současný přístup Číny v egyptském Šarm aš-Šajchu. Jak dopadla konference? Bohužel, Čína nepodpořila naše úsilí, které my považujeme za důležité v oblasti udržení klimatických cílů. Mohl bych mluvit o otázce zdrojů surovin, které ještě Čína nemá pro Evropu otevřené tak, jak si představujeme my, ale také o nesouladných zájmech, kde je to oblast lidských práv, kde je to oblast ochrany menšin, potlačování práv náboženských menšin a Ujgurů. Toto jsou myslím všechno témata, která musíme do vztahů s Čínou promítnout.

Clare Daly (The Left). – Mr President, I have to say, I found this discussion quite depressing. Its tone has been largely arrogant and neo-colonial. And it's interesting that even Biden at his recent meeting with Xi at the G20, made the point that he does not seek a new Cold War with China. He has no intention of having a conflict with China. He doesn't want to contain China and that the US is committed to the one-China policy and does not seek to use Taiwan as a tool. Now, obviously none of this can be taken at face value. He's not exactly the most reliable statesman, but it must be remarked upon. And interestingly, it is radically less hawkish than some of the nonsense coming out of this chamber earlier in the discussion and over the last number of years. And given that many of you have been sucking up to Washington,

ramping up your anti-Chinese rhetoric and doing your best to sabotage EU ties with China, our largest trading partner, shooting ourselves in the foot, you might want to take note.

Rather than starting fires and burning bridges, we should recognise we have serious common challenges. We must engage. We must have dialogue. We must have cooperation and mutual respect.

(End of catch-the-eye procedure)

Josep Borrell Fontelles, *vicepresidente de la Comisión / alto representante de la Unión para Asuntos Exteriores y Política de Seguridad*. – Señora presidenta, señorías, en las notas que me habían preparado para cerrar el debate, los diligentes servicios decían que una vez más quedaba constancia de la amplia unidad del Parlamento Europeo en relación con nuestra relación con China. Pues no, pues no, francamente, no. Francamente, no. ¿Unidad? ¿Dónde está la unidad?

Aquí, he oído un amplio espectro de posiciones, desde que somos unos esbirros de Washington hasta que tenemos que ser más pragmáticos (no, no, más pragmáticos no, al contrario: tenemos que marcar más la diferencia con China).

Ha habido de todo, señorías. O sea que de unidad del Parlamento con respecto a nuestra relación con China, nada.

Bueno, es normal: es una relación compleja y ciertamente ideológicamente condicionada por muchas de las posiciones que aquí se han escuchado (la extrema izquierda, la extrema derecha, las distintas posiciones económicas y comerciales, la preocupación legítima más acentuada en unos que en otros sobre los derechos humanos y por el trabajo forzado).

El primer orador me ha pedido más pragmatismo en la relación con China. Y luego han venido otros diciendo «no, no, no, más pragmatismo no, todo lo contrario». Casi, casi, algunos han pedido que cortemos nuestras relaciones comerciales con China. Y alguno se ha alarmado de que tengamos relaciones normales con China.

Señorías, con China todos los días intercambiamos casi dos billones, billones estadounidenses, es decir, 2 mil millones de dólares en un sentido y en el otro. Eso, ¿como lo llaman ustedes? ¿Normal o anormal? En todo caso, muy importante.

Cuando se intercambian 2 mil millones diarios de bienes entre Europa y China, nuestra relación tiene la importancia que tiene y no entiendo por qué la visita del canciller alemán a China genera preocupación. ¿No es normal que el canciller alemán realice esta visita, ya que su país exporta a China el 3 % o más de su PIB? Además, ¿cuántas veces fue la canciller Merkel a China? ¿Cuántas veces fue la anterior canciller antes de que fuera el canciller Scholz? ¿Por qué antes era malo o era bueno y ahora resulta que es bueno o malo, según se mire?

Señorías, nuestra relación con China será una de las cosas más importantes y desafiantes a los que tengamos que hacer frente. Por eso el Consejo de Asuntos Exteriores se ha preocupado por redactar un nuevo texto que explica de qué manera abordaremos esta relación, que es lo que he intentado resumir aquí. Ya mi muy buen amigo Bütikofer le ha parecido trivial o banal o carente de contenido. Bueno, pues es lo que el Consejo de Asuntos Exteriores, después de larga cogitación de todos los ministros, ha producido al respecto. Son cuatro o cinco páginas que sintetizan la posición oficial del Consejo de Asuntos Exteriores con respecto a China. Y no me parece ni banal, ni trivial, ni hueco, ni irrelevante. Claro está que deja muchos cabos sueltos porque en cinco páginas no cabe la inmensidad ni la complejidad de nuestra relación con China, que seguirá siendo multifacética, seguirá siendo poliédrica, tendrá muchas caras.

Al mismo tiempo tenemos que considerar a China como lo hacemos: como alguien con quien hemos de cooperar, con quien hemos de competir. Somos rivales, socios. Los problemas del mundo no pueden resolverse sin una extraordinaria cooperación con China y, al mismo tiempo, China representa por sí mismo un cambio geopolítico trascendental frente al cual la disociación no es una opción. Ni siquiera los Estados Unidos se lo plantean.

Pero el señor Bütikofer tiene razón. Tenemos que estar seguros de que nuestras dependencias no se conviertan en vulnerabilidades, como nos ha ocurrido con la dependencia energética con respecto a Rusia.

Corresponde a China hoy un papel fundamental en muchas de las cadenas de valor en las que se asienta nuestra producción industrial. Puede ser que nuestra dependencia con respecto a China en materia de transición verde sea tan importante en el futuro como importante ha sido hasta hoy nuestra dependencia con respecto a los combustibles fósiles de Rusia. Por tanto, hemos de ser muy cuidadosos y que nuestra relación no se acabe convirtiendo en una dependencia vulnerable. Hoy China representa aproximadamente el 90 % de nuestra demanda de minerales raros. O, por ejemplo, el 90 % en el caso del magnesio o el 80 % de los paneles solares que usamos en Europa. Ocho de cada diez paneles solares han sido producidos en China. ¿Y han visto ustedes la evolución de la importación de paneles solares desde China desde que empezó la guerra en Ucrania? ¿Han visto la curva? ¿Han visto cómo la curva sube exponencialmente? ¿Les parece bien o les parece mal? A todo el mundo le parece bien que aumentemos la inversión en energías renovables y que pongamos muchos paneles solares. ¿Saben de dónde vienen? De China. Entonces, ¿qué es lo malo?, ¿tenerlos o importarlos? Un poco de realismo no nos vendría mal, señorías.

Tenemos que interactuar con China, sin duda, para hacer frente a los problemas globales y, al mismo tiempo, reforzar eso que llamamos la «economía estratégica abierta». Para eso tenemos mecanismos (no le den siempre patadas a la Comisión de la que me honro en ser vicepresidente, además de ser alto representante). La Comisión ha puesto en marcha un sistema para controlar las inversiones directas que se realizan en Europa, así como un Instrumento de Contratación Pública Internacional y una normativa en materia de subsidios extranjeros, que entrará en vigor la próxima primavera. Espero que se alcance pronto un acuerdo sobre el instrumento contra la coerción que será un instrumento fundamental, aunque no exclusivamente orientado a China. Y ciertamente tenemos que ser más fuertes en relación con la Ley europea sobre las materias primas fundamentales que anunció la presidenta Von der Leyen en el discurso sobre el estado de la Unión, que es parte de este esfuerzo. Como tenemos que diversificar nuestras relaciones con otros socios. Vengo de Asia Central y les puedo asegurar que allí tenemos un enorme trabajo que hacer para diversificar nuestros mercados de exportación y nuestras fuentes de importación de materias primas fundamentales.

Algunos de ustedes han hablado, en términos muy críticos, de qué manera abordamos el problema del trabajo forzado que plantea nuestra relación con China. Bueno, pues sí, es verdad. Este es un tema en el que se han hecho también cosas (¡es que parece que no se ha hecho nada!). Ya en febrero del 21 se hizo una revisión de nuestra política comercial. Desde entonces, la Comisión ha ido tomando iniciativas legislativas y no legislativas en esta materia. El 21 de abril del año pasado, la Comisión hizo una propuesta sobre una Directiva sobre información corporativa en materia de sostenibilidad para vigilar concretamente el tema de los derechos humanos y facilitar sistemáticamente análisis para hacer una lista de las empresas europeas que se ven afectadas por el problema del trabajo forzado. El 23 de febrero de este año, la Comisión propuso una propuesta de Directiva sobre la diligencia debida de las empresas en materia de sostenibilidad (es lo que algún diputado dice que no entiende lo que es), que trata de introducir instrumentos en materia de diligencia debida que deben aplicar las empresas europeas para identificar, prevenir, mitigar y tomar en cuenta los efectos adversos sobre los derechos humanos y el impacto medioambiental en sus operaciones en todas sus cadenas de valor. El 13 de julio de este año, la Comisión y el Servicio de Acción Exterior han dado a conocer una guía práctica sobre diligencia debida para todas las empresas europeas para que analicen el riesgo de que se utilice trabajo forzado en todas sus operaciones y en sus cadenas de valor. En septiembre pasado, la Comisión aprobó una propuesta de Reglamento por el que se prohíben en el mercado de la Unión Europea los productos realizados con trabajo forzoso. Este Reglamento está, señorías, pendiente de su aprobación, de la suya, y del Consejo. Espero que los diputados que han criticado a la Comisión sean conscientes de que está en sus manos la aprobación de este Reglamento. Por lo tanto, la pelota en muchos casos no me la manden a mi porque yo ya se le he mandado antes a ustedes. Con este Reglamento, las aduanas podrán y deberán identificar e impedir que productos fabricados sobre la base de la explotación laboral entren en el mercado de la Unión Europea.

Ciertamente es un gran tema, pero, por favor, no me digan que no se ha hecho nada. Les he hecho una larga lista de todo lo que se ha hecho. Esperamos que ahora el Consejo y el Parlamento cumplan con su labor de colegisladores.

Pero nosotros, a diferencia de los Estados Unidos, no tenemos una legislación específicamente orientada a China. Tratamos el tema con carácter general, sean chinos o no sean chinos los productos, ni la falta de cumplimiento con los reglamentos de la Organización Internacional del Trabajo, que, por cierto, China acaba de anunciar que ratificará dos de las más importantes convenciones de dicha Organización.

Como les digo, nuestra relación con China no puede ser resumida en una frase ni mucho menos en los diez minutos de esta intervención final. Pero también, sin ninguna duda, el cómo nos relacionamos con China marcará la historia de este siglo y la nuestra en particular. Porque hemos establecido con China —alguien lo ha dicho antes—, una relación comercial tan importante y nuestras empresas han invertido tanto en China, y los trabajadores chinos y del sudeste asiático con bajos salarios han contribuido tanto a controlar la inflación durante los años de expansión de la economía global que no podemos pensar que podamos construir un futuro sin tener en cuenta la enorme fuerza que tiene un país que está llamado a desempeñar en el mundo el papel que le corresponde por su dimensión, por su fuerza económica, independiente de que nuestro sistema político no sea el mismo que el suyo. Claro que no lo es.

Por eso tenemos esta relación compleja que a veces a alguno le cuesta aceptar y preferiría una dirección más unidimensional y, lo quieran o no, la complejidad está allí, está allí para quedarse.

Seguiremos trabajando para que esta relación no vaya en detrimento de la defensa que hacemos de nuestros principios y valores, de los derechos humanos y de las democracias representativas.

Pero me gustaría que en todas las consideraciones que he oído esta tarde aquí con respecto a nuestra relación con China se tome en cuenta la realidad de la vida. La complejidad de esta realidad. Y la necesidad de que el Parlamento Europeo contribuya también a ello.

President. – The debate is closed.

20. Zusammensetzung der Ausschüsse und Delegationen

President. – The PPE Group has notified the President of decisions relating to changes to appointments within committees and delegations. These decisions will be set out in the minutes of today's sitting, and take effect on the date of this announcement.

21. Reaktion der EU auf die zunehmende Unterdrückung von Protesten im Iran (Aussprache)

President. – The next item is the debate on the statement by the Vice-President of the Commission/High Representative of the Union for Foreign Affairs and Security Policy on the EU response to the increasing crackdown on protests in Iran (2022/2958(RSP).

Olivér Várhelyi, *Member of the Commission, on behalf of the Vice-President of the Commission / High Representative of the Union for Foreign Affairs and Security Policy.* – Madam President, honourable Members of the European Parliament, I would like to thank you once again for your continued attention to the domestic situation in Iran. Mahsa Amini was abused and died in custody at the hands of the morality police. There is only one word to describe this tragic event – outrage.

We have seen brave Iranian women and men taking to the streets to express their dissent. Women have emerged as a major driver of nationwide protest movements, calling for the full enjoyment of fundamental rights for all Iranians.

Despite our repeated calls for restraint to the Iranian security forces, the use of disproportionate force against protesters continues. And there is still no clarity from Iran on the number of people who have been killed or arrested during the protests. This is unacceptable.

Those responsible for the death of Mahsa Amini and all perpetrators of violence in the ensuing peaceful demonstrations must be held accountable. Recent calls by Iranian officials and lawmakers to impose the death penalty on protesters are a cause of extreme concern. The death penalty is, in all cases, an unacceptable denial of human dignity and integrity. The EU is a staunch supporter of its universal abolition.

We are appalled by the reports that some protesters have already received or will receive harsh sentences, including to death. The EU will not remain silent. We will continue to react and raise our concerns about the human rights situation in Iran, including with the Iranian Government at all levels.

This debate is a timely opportunity to recall the swift response to the EU and to reflect on the way forward. On 25 September, the High Representative Josep Borrell issued a strong declaration on behalf of the 27 EU Member States and, swiftly after the Foreign Affairs Council on 17 October and 14 November, the Council added 40 individuals and seven entities to the list of those subject to EU restrictive measures in the context of the Iran humanitarian rights sanction regime.

We took good note of the EP resolution of 6 October on the death of Mahsa Amini and the repression of women's rights protesters in Iran. It testifies to the quick and crucial reaction of this House to any attempt to crack down on fundamental rights and freedoms.

Let me reiterate that Iran's retaliatory measures, including on members of its parliament, are unacceptable as an attempt to sanction our democratic institutions and our core principles. Iran's measures are purely politically motivated and we reject them. High Representative / Vice-President Borrell has conveyed this message to his interlocutors in Iran, and his spokesperson reiterated this publicly.

Honourable Members, the EU welcomes the convening of a special session of the UN Human Rights Council in Geneva to address the deteriorating human rights situation in Iran. Strengthening accountability for human rights violations across the world is at the core of the EU's external policy actions.

David McAllister, *im Namen der PPE-Fraktion*. – Sehr verehrte Frau Präsidentin, Herr Kommissar, liebe Kolleginnen und Kollegen! Kommissar Várhelyi hat gerade die Situation in Iran beschrieben; dem ist nichts hinzuzufügen. Das islamistische Mullah-Regime setzt Repression als Mittel zum eigenen Fortbestehen ein. Aber angesichts dieser Entwicklung, die der Kommissar beschrieben hat, muss aus meiner Sicht die Europäische Union endlich ihre Iranpolitik auf den Prüfstand stellen und den Druck auf das Regime weiter erhöhen.

Der Iran steht möglicherweise vor den größten innenpolitischen und gesellschaftlichen Veränderungen seit 1979. Jetzt besteht die Chance, systematische Verbesserungen für die Lage der Frauen und einen gesellschaftlichen Wandel hin zu mehr Freiheit und Demokratie zu erreichen. Aber auf diesem Weg bedarf es der entschlossenen und tatkräftigen Unterstützung durch die Europäische Union.

Herr Kommissar, ich bitte Sie: Wir müssen als Europäische Union die Protestbewegung, die Zivilgesellschaft im Iran stärker unterstützen. Die EU-Sanktionen müssen auf alle Personen und Organe des iranischen Regimes ausgeweitet werden, die an der Unterdrückung der aktuellen Proteste beteiligt sind, und die sogenannten Revolutionsgarden müssen EU-weit auf die Sanktionsliste gesetzt werden.

Ich bin Präsidentin Roberta Metsola dankbar, dass sie einer Anregung der Koordinatoren im Ausschuss für auswärtige Angelegenheiten gefolgt ist, dass wir im Europäischen Parlament bis auf Weiteres keine direkten Kontakte mit offiziellen iranischen Gesprächspartnern werden stattfinden lassen. Das ist unsere Antwort auf die Sanktionierung von sechs Kolleginnen und Kollegen durch das Regime in Teheran.

Tonino Picula, *on behalf of the S&D Group*. – Madam President, Mr Commissioner, after the horrific tragedy of 22-year old Jina Mahsa Amini we are continuously witnessing inhumane actions in the Iranian regime. Iran is trying to suppress the fundamental right to protest in the most brutal way, including by issuing death sentences.

More than 400 protesters have been killed and around 17 000 have been arrested by the security forces. News coming from Iran is very disturbing, and unfortunately, the most vulnerable are not spared from the horrors. The fact that about 50 children have already been killed is bloodcurdling and shows the barbarism of this regime.

Yesterday we also saw the Iranian football players at the World Cup standing in solidarity with the protesters and refusing to sing the national anthem. The regime's response was expected – censorship, darkness, and ignoring.

Their brutal repression is trying to crush the protests, but it cannot break the spirit of freedom that has inspired many Iranian people to risk their lives for the common good.

We as the European Parliament have to send a strong message of support and put forward a decisive EU response to sanction the deeply compromised Iranian regime. It's our duty to those courageous people looking for their freedom.

Frédérique Ries, *au nom du groupe Renew.* – Madame la Présidente, j'ai envie de vous parler de Kian Pirfalak ce soir. Kian avait neuf ans, c'était un petit garçon qui construisait des voitures à pile, des bateaux en bois, qui rêvait de devenir ingénieur quand il serait grand, un jour. Seulement voilà, Kian ne sera jamais grand. Il a été tué par balle la semaine dernière par la police, alors qu'il revenait de l'école avec ses parents en voiture. Et son père est toujours grièvement blessé.

Kian est le plus jeune des 60 enfants – 60 enfants! – qui ont déjà été victimes de la répression terrible en Iran. Parce que l'Iran, aujourd'hui, c'est cela: c'est tirer à balles réelles sur les manifestants, sur les femmes, sur les enfants. C'est violer, c'est torturer et c'est aussi envoyer ses blindés pour réprimer la révolte dans le Kurdistan.

L'Iran, aujourd'hui, c'est l'horreur. Et l'honneur pour l'Europe, ce serait d'arrêter de tergiverser, arrêter d'agiter le bâton et la carotte. Les sanctions d'un côté, aussi, mais ces échanges commerciaux par exemple, qui ne cessent d'augmenter, nous le devons à toutes ces femmes au courage inouï. Car ce qui se passe en ce moment au pays des mollahs, ce n'est pas une révolte, pour paraphraser le duc de La Rochefoucauld, ce qui se passe en Iran, c'est une révolution.

Et j'ai envie de conclure avec l'expression favorite du petit Kian, au nom du «dieu des arcs-en-ciel», puisse ce pays magnifique, qui n'a jamais cessé de rêver de liberté, retrouver le parfum de ses libertés.

Hannah Neumann, *on behalf of the Verts/ALE Group.* – Madam President, schoolchildren burying their classmates shot by the regime, reduced liberties, electricity cut-off, people screaming, gunshots, and then, silence. It's always the same patterns: the regime shuts down the internet, it kills in darkness, and that is why it is our job to put the spotlight on what is happening in Iran.

There are even testimonies that the Revolutionary Guards picked the most beautiful protesters, boys and girls, and then raped them – so that others no longer dare to raise their voices. And colleagues, I want to know what happens, and I don't want those responsible for these atrocities to get away with it.

This Thursday – the day after tomorrow – the UN Human Rights Council will hold its first ever special session on Iran and it will vote on the establishment of an independent fact-finding mission. Colleagues, this is a key vote. We have to document the atrocities. We have to fight impunity. And I want us to make sure that it's the broadest possible majority coming out of this special session.

And then there will be 12 December-it's another Foreign Affairs Council. And the 227 Iranian members of parliament who asked for severe punishment are still not on the sanctions list. We have their names. We know their offence. And the colleagues pointed it out – how much more does this need to happen before we finally put the whole Revolutionary Guard on the sanctions list?

And maybe someone can send this message to Mr Borrell because, once again, he's not showing up in this debate.

I understand well, there's only so much we can do from the outside. But that is why it is needed that we fully dedicate ourselves to doing just so much. This is the least we owe to the brave protesters who stand up against that oppression in Iran every day.

Colleagues, our attention and our determination are the best protection we can give to them, and that is what we should do with all the energy we have.

Anna Bonfrisco, *a nome del gruppo ID*. – Signora Presidente, onorevoli colleghi, grazie anche a Lei, Commissario Várhelyi, per essere qui con noi questa sera, abbiamo chiesto, con diversi colleghi, all'Alto rappresentante e all'ambasciatore Olof Skoog, di agire presso le Nazioni Unite per rimuovere l'Iran dalla commissione sulla condizione delle donne, una risposta obbligata dell'Unione europea alla crescente repressione delle proteste in Iran. Grazie per quello che potrà fare, Commissario.

Anche oggi questo Parlamento aiuta a far risuonare la voce della protesta del popolo iraniano, che si sente defraudato della possibilità di vivere una vita sicura e in pace con se stesso e con il mondo. Il popolo iraniano chiede una sola cosa al supremo leader, agli ayatollah, al Presidente Raisi e alle forze armate. Chiede una cosa semplice: quella di abbandonare un pretestuoso stato mentale di rivoluzione permanente, basato solo su repressione, corruzione, inimicizia verso i Fratelli musulmani del Golfo, l'odio verso Israele e un profondo disprezzo per le democrazie liberali dell'Occidente. L'Iran proposto dall'ayatollah è solo intriso di cinismo assassino ed è una blasfemia dell'islam stesso.

Continuiamo noi ad aiutare il popolo iraniano e a tenere accesa la luce della speranza per loro e per noi.

Charlie Weimers, *on behalf of the ECR Group*. – Madam President, Commissioner Várhelyi, the regime in Tehran has murdered at least 402 protesters, including 58 children for protesting or merely being on the streets, as the families of the victims have told us. In Zahedan, they shot 17-year old Mohammad Iqbal in the back. They killed nine year old Kian Pirfalak, together with a 13-year old child in Izeh.

Commissioner, I welcome the European Union's growing recognition of the threatening geopolitical environment, but the EU has been asleep for decades. Sanctions were a step in the right direction, but we need to do more. We should reflect on the way forward you said. Well, yes, and in doing so, we should listen to the protesters. They want divorce, not counselling. And so should we.

Add the IRGC to the terror list and implore the Member States to recall their ambassadors and expel Iran's diplomats here in the European Union, close the embassies, period. The Islamic Republic is not a legitimate representative of the Iranian people.

Cornelia Ernst, *im Namen der Fraktion The Left*. – Frau Präsidentin! Mit Sorge schauen wir auf die Gewaltspirale im Iran, und ich verneige mich in tiefer Trauer vor den vielen, vielen Opfern – vor allem auch den Kindern –, den mehr als 400 Menschen, die bisher getötet wurden. Mein höchster Respekt gilt in der Tat den iranischen Frauen, die trotz allem aufbegehren, und all denen, die sie unterstützen, wie die iranische Fußballnationalmannschaft, die deutlich mehr als eine gelbe Karte riskiert, oder die Basketballerinnen, die den Hijab abgelegt haben. Was für eine großartige und mutige Zivilgesellschaft!

Und wenn wir irgendetwas machen können, dann ist es, sichere Kanäle zu dieser Zivilgesellschaft herzustellen, um diese Proteste tatsächlich sichtbar zu machen, ihnen mehr und mehr Gesicht zu geben. Und das ist nötig, weil die Brutalität des Regimes auf einer neuen Stufe angelangt ist, indem aus Rache irakische Kurdengebiete zerbombt werden – und im Übrigen macht man das gemeinsam mit Ankara, das auch syrische Kurdengebiete hier zerbombt.

Zum Vermächtnis von Jina Mahsa Amini gehört auch, dass wir hier in Europa geschlossen zeigen und geschlossen sind, jegliche Angriffe auf Kurdengebiete zu verurteilen – jegliche. Das ist das Mindeste, was ich vom Europäischen Parlament erwarte.

Und ich erwarte auch, dass wir alles dafür tun, dass dieses iranische Regime nicht in den Besitz von Atomwaffen kommt. Atomwaffen in dessen Händen sind eine existenzielle Gefahr für Frieden und Stabilität und auch ein Aufruf zu neuem nuklearen Wettrüsten. Daran haben wir kein Interesse. Ich finde, wir sollten das auch deutlich sagen. Und bei all dem, was wir ansonsten machen – da stimme ich meinen Vorrednern zu –, glaube ich, dürfen wir diesen Aspekt nicht vergessen.

Antoni Comín i Oliveres (NI). – Signora Presidente, onorevoli colleghi, dice un'anziana, è incredibile quante donne, soprattutto giovani, escano per strada senza velo.

La nostra è una rivoluzione, ma la nostra lotta non riguarda solo il velo. Vogliamo una democrazia laica. Stiamo combattendo per la libertà. Marhane, una delle migliaia di protagoniste di questa rivoluzione spiega che lo scopo del velo è quello di umiliare le donne, il segno esteriore che non sei un essere umano libero.

Ma dietro c'è tutto il resto. Le donne iraniane ereditano la metà degli uomini e le ragazze possono essere date in sposa dai genitori a partire dall'età di 13 anni. Abbiamo bisogno del permesso di nostro padre e di nostro marito per lavorare, per ottenere un passaporto, per viaggiare. Non possiamo nemmeno andare in bicicletta o in moto, questo spiega Marhane. Ecco perché la rivoluzione femminile iraniana non si ferma, nonostante la repressione.

Secondo Iran Human Rights, 342 manifestanti sono stati uccisi dalla polizia e secondo le Nazioni Unite, 14 000 persone sono state arrestate e almeno cinque di loro sono state condannate a morte. Una nuova generazione di iraniane, guidata da donne, ha deciso di sostituire il dolore con la rabbia, la paura con la determinazione. Ogni volta che una donna si toglie il velo mette a rischio la propria vita, ma lancia un messaggio di libertà al mondo e l'Unione fallirà nei suoi valori e nella sua missione se non sarà in grado di accompagnare questa rivoluzione fino in fondo.

Javier Zarzalejos (PPE). – Señora presidenta, este debate hoy es un acto de reconocimiento al coraje del pueblo iraní.

Es fácil jugar ahora la carta del escepticismo, a veces disfrazado de realismo, y pensar que la represión terminará por acallar las protestas. Pero las protestas se han extendido a todas las provincias. Las protestas continúan y los iraníes están plantando cara a la represión. No estamos, por tanto, ante un *déjà-vu*. El genio de la libertad ha salido definitivamente de la botella. El régimen teocrático tiene un problema muy serio y hay que esperar que este problema sea terminal. Que no nos engañen las apariencias: si la policía de la moralidad ha desaparecido de las calles es porque el régimen necesita más capacidad disuasoria y represiva de la que ofrecen los guardianes del velo.

El régimen iraní, además, es un riesgo grave que va más allá del ámbito regional, como demuestra el hecho de que Irán se ha convertido en el aliado clave de Rusia.

Seamos concretos: ¿es aceptable que los embajadores iraníes en la Unión Europea sigan apaciblemente instalados en sus residencias? ¿es aceptable que las fuerzas represivas del régimen iraní, empezando por la Guardia Revolucionaria, sigan actuando sin ser señaladas como lo que son, organizaciones desestabilizadoras de naturaleza terrorista?

Urge seguir dando respuestas.

Alessandra Moretti (S&D). – Signora Presidente, onorevoli colleghi, le notizie che arrivano dall'Iran sono terribili e spaventose: più di 300 morti, tra i quali 40 bambini, 14 000 arresti e almeno sei condanne a morte.

Tante delle donne che hanno dato il via alle proteste si trovano in prigione, detenute in condizioni atroci, vittime di torture e stupri. Eppure il coraggio delle donne, dei giovani, dei lavoratori, di tanti iraniani non si ferma e continua ad abbattere barriere, alimentando la determinazione delle proteste più prolungate degli ultimi decenni.

Di fronte a questo coraggio e alla richiesta straziata e straziante di libertà, l'Unione europea non può stare a guardare. Ho accolto con favore le sanzioni messe in campo, così come i ripetuti appelli a liberare le persone ingiustamente detenute, mettere fine alla repressione violenta, revocare le condanne a morte e garantire la libera circolazione delle informazioni, compreso l'accesso a Internet.

Tuttavia, ritengo sia importante per l'Europa farsi trovare pronta a fornire un sostegno vero e utile. Serve una politica estera europea coerente e concreta, che sappia agire tempestivamente rispetto ai regimi dittatoriali. Serve una strategia europea che applichi sanzioni, che isoli i governi autoritari e che allo stesso tempo sia vicina ai paesi che intraprendono un percorso nella direzione dello Stato di diritto e dei valori europei.

Saremo durissimi, ma saremo altrettanto solidali nei confronti della società civile, delle ONG, di chi vuole ricostruire un sistema economico, scolastico e sanitario che rispetti i diritti delle donne e delle minoranze e le libertà di tutti.

Donna, vita, libertà.

Women, Life, Freedom.

Hilde Vautmans (Renew). – Voorzitter, we hebben hier al gehoord over dat brute optreden tegen demonstranten in Iran met heel veel gewone mensen die opgepakt worden, kinderen die gedood worden. Zoals mevrouw Ries zei: het houdt eigenlijk niet op. En eigenlijk moeten we eerlijk zeggen: er is niets wat dat optreden van het Iraanse regime rechtvaardigt. Want vrouwen mogen opkomen voor hun vrijheid, vrouwen mogen protesteren tegen onderdrukking, iedereen heeft het recht de straat op te gaan tegen die onderdrukking. Ik moet zeggen: ik ben heel erg fier op de maatregelen die onze voorzitter van het Europees Parlement heeft genomen, Roberta Metsola, om te zeggen: geen officiële bijeenkomsten meer van het Europees Parlement met de Iraanse autoriteiten. Maar ook van u, mijnheer de commissaris, verwachten we nu toch wel heel duidelijke acties. We vragen dat u heel duidelijk een onafhankelijk onderzoek steunt. Ik denk dat daarmee alles begint. En zorg ook dat diegenen die mede die repressie aansturen onder gerichte sancties komen te staan.

Als vrouw breekt het mijn hart om te zien dat het in veel landen nog altijd heel gevaarlijk is om als vrouw, als meisje geboren te worden. Dat het gevaarlijk is om de straat op te gaan alleen omdat je vrijheid wilt. Wij moeten het tij keren.

Alice Kuhnke (Verts/ALE). – Madam President, police opening fire at civilians, children being killed, girls being raped in prisons by security guards to make sure that they are not virgins and, therefore, will not go to heaven when they die. Thousands upon thousands imprisoned and at risk of state-sanctioned executions.

For many, it is already too late. But it does not mean that it was all for nothing. If we want to be on the right side of history, we have no choice but to continue and to do more, much more. All other alternatives would mean that we let the murderous Islamic regime continue to dictate the terms.

So we have a choice: be silent or act in solidarity with the extraordinarily brave Iranian people who, day after day with their own life at stake, continue to fight for their freedom. Woman, life, freedom.

Christine Anderson (ID). – Madam President, here you all go again. In shock about Iran this time. All the while, carefully avoiding to call the devil by its name.

Masha did not die because of some fundamentalists abusing Islam. Masha died because she would not subdue to Islam. There is no such thing as Islamism. It is Islam, point blank. And now go ahead, call me Islamophobe all you want. Heck, have them issue a fatwa against me and see if I care.

The truth is, I am not afraid of Islam. The Islam apologists, the one patronising Islam, calling it the religion of peace, even. They are the ones afraid of Islam. Again, I am not afraid of Islam. I do, however, strongly object to this misogynistic, misanthropic and totalitarian ideology.

And if you truly cared about freedom, democracy and the rule of law, you would stop your bigotry and for once have the guts to acknowledge the true problem. It is called Islam.

Veronika Vrecionová (ECR). – Paní předsedající, už více než dva měsíce protestují Íránci proti své vládě. Protestují proti režimu, který je vězní a zabíjí nevinné. Proti režimu, který vyhrožuje jiným zemím zničením. Naším úkolem musí být na tyto činy ukazovat, nemlčet, ale těch, kdo se postavili na odpor, se zastávat. Můžeme sledovat stovky tisíc lidí, kteří protestují v ulicích, ale také statečné sportovce, kteří svými gesty dávají jasně najevo svůj odpor k íránské vládě. A to i přesto, že jsou nejvíce na očích a hrozí jim vězení. Musíme odmítnout snahy o vytváření obchodních vztahů s Íránem nebo dokonce omezování sankcí. Írán se nezměnil. Nesmí se změnit ani náš postoj k němu. Evropská unie musí pomáhat všem, kdo se režimu staví na odpor, a naopak odsuzovat všechny, kdo s ním jakkoli spolupracují.

Mick Wallace (The Left). – Madam President, last week we had MEPs and members of the European External Action Service, and even some world leaders, spreading disinformation and claiming the Iranian Government had decided to impose the death penalty on nearly 15 000 protesters. When the lie was exposed, the Canadian Prime Minister deleted this tweet, but he did not issue an apology.

There are peaceful protests. Many Iranians are unjustly imprisoned and should be released, and far too many have been killed by the aggressive crackdown. There has also been much violence and murders by some protesters – untold damage and destruction. It would not be tolerated anywhere.

John Bolton has confirmed that the Iranian opposition is now being armed with weapons entering Iran from Iraqi Kurdistan. Iran is under attack. The media assault is intense. The campaign of propaganda and destabilisation brings the Syrian regime-change operation to mind. Those who supported the so-called Syrian revolution say nothing today about Syria lying in ruins, illegally occupied, sanctioned to death with millions displaced and hundreds of thousands dead. Is this what you want for Iran?

Gheorghe-Vlad Nistor (PPE). – Doamnă președintă, domnule comisar, colegi, n-am să înșir acum încă o dată atrocitățile pe care regimul de la Teheran le comite zilnic în Iran, astăzi.

Este continuarea într-o formă aberantă și bolnavă a unor realități pe care deja le cunoaștem de mult mai multă vreme. Dar am să întreb această onorabila adunare de ce în cazul acesta nu ne gândim și noi aici la o soluție concretă, cum o facem în alte cazuri?

Zilele acestea am asistat, cu interes și nu cu reținere, la o dezbatere lungă în legătură cu declararea Rusiei, Federației Ruse sau a regimului de la Moscova, Guvernului Federației Ruse ca fiind teroriste. În cazul Iranului, lucrurile sunt evidente. Acțiunile teroriste ale acestui regim sunt foarte clare, aproape că multe dintre acțiunile lor se apropie de genocid. De ce nu discutăm în aceiași termeni lucrurile acestea oribile din Iran în Parlamentul European?

Thijs Reuten (S&D). – Voorzitter, het Iraanse volk is een niet te stoppen golf van pure moed geleid door vrouwen. Als legitieme overheid vermomde misdadigers hebben honderden vreedzame demonstranten gedood, 58 van hen kinderen, en duizenden gevangengezet. Maar wreedheid kan de vastberadenheid van het Iraanse volk niet breken. Commissaris, ik heb drie vragen.

1. Wanneer gaat de EU sancties opleggen aan alle 227 parlementsleden van de Iraanse Majlis die opriepen tot strenge straffen voor vreedzame demonstranten?

2. Maken de EU en lidstaten zich donderdag bij de speciale zitting van de VN-Mensenrechtenraad hard voor een internationaal rechtsmechanisme voor de Islamitische Republiek?

3. Welke beslissende stappen zal de EU nemen tegen de terreur van de Revolutionaire Garde? Wij hebben de plicht de dappere Iraniërs én de Iraanse EU-burgers die met hen meeleven te steunen. En ik verwacht actie. *Women, life, freedom, Jin, Jiyan, Azadi*.

Bernard Guetta (Renew). – Madame la Présidente, jamais il n'y aura de normalisation en Iran. Le retour au statu quo ante est désormais impossible car la contestation s'est trop généralisée et la répression trop durcie pour que ce régime puisse reprendre les choses en main.

La théocratie est à l'agonie, mais demain? Il n'est pas impossible que les scènes de fraternisation entre manifestants et policiers se multiplient et que ce pouvoir s'écroule brutalement. Le plus probable est cependant que l'on passe d'abord par une phase de militarisation du régime qui verrait les gardiens de la révolution prendre le pas sur le clergé. C'est l'hypothèse la plus vraisemblable, mais cette phase militaire n'aurait qu'un temps, car les pasdaran feraient alors face à la double opposition de la population et de la partie la moins obscurantiste du clergé qui voudra limiter le recul de la foi.

Une nouvelle page s'ouvre en Iran, celle des femmes, de la vie, de la liberté.

Paulo Rangel (PPE). – Senhora Presidente, caro Comissário, o regime dos *ayatollahs*, fundamentalista religioso teocrático, oprime todo o povo iraniano.

Desde os idos de 79 que as mulheres, à frente de todos, são as maiores vítimas do regime. Mas também os jovens, também os homens, também toda a sociedade civil, em todas as províncias e em todas as cidades. Nas escolas, nas ruas, nas universidades, gente de todas as profissões, estratos sociais e idades está a manifestar-se num ato de grande coragem, frente a um regime opressor e repressor. Decretam a sua morte. Mataram, sem olhar a meios, crianças, jovens, mulheres, homens.

Nós não podemos pactuar com esta situação. Não podemos pactuar com um regime opressor que, para além do mais, apoia a Rússia na sua agressão. Nós temos de dar apoio às mulheres, aos jovens, aos homens do Irão. Temos de o fazer com a mesma dignidade que os jogadores da seleção iraniana revelaram ontem, no Mundial do Catar. Esses, sim, são heróis.

Delara Burkhardt (S&D). – Frau Präsidentin, liebe Kolleginnen und Kollegen! Ich habe hier eine Minute, und ich möchte diese Minute Stimmen geben, von denen ich glaube, dass sie hier in diesem Europäischen Parlament gehört werden müssen:

Den beiden kurdischen Aktivistinnen Zeineb und Shahab. Sie sagen: „In den letzten zwei Monaten wurden mehr als 100 Kurdinnen und Kurden ermordet, darunter viele Kinder. Die iranische Regierung setzt mittlerweile verbotene chemische Waffen und Nervengase ein. Wie kann es sein, dass der militärische Angriff eines Landes gegen ein anderes als Kriegsverbrechen gilt, richtet der Angriff sich aber gegen die eigene Bevölkerung, sehen alle weg?“

Ein paar Sekunden für meine Freundin und iranische Künstlerin Nasanin. Sie sagt: „Eine Minute reicht nicht, um zu berichten, wie Menschen auf der Straße in Kälte, nach 65 Tagen immer noch hoffnungsvoll, mit nichts als der nackten Hand und der Freiheit im Herzen gegen ein voll bewaffnetes, blutrünstiges Regime für ihre Rechte kämpfen. Aber vielleicht reicht eine Minute, um Sie zu bitten: Schauen Sie hin! Wir brauchen Ihre Unterstützung – jetzt.“

Gerne würde ich meine Stimme noch viel mehr Menschen geben. Ich hoffe, wir können auch hier im Parlament einen Raum schaffen, wo diese Stimmen selber zu Wort kommen können. Hier im Europäischen Parlament ist eine Minute sehr wenig. Im Iran zählt jede Sekunde. Es kann die Sekunde sein, wo man noch mal schnell ein Bild von einem Ermordeten hochladen kann, wo man noch mal ein Video hochladen kann von einer Gräueltat. Jede Sekunde zählt, und hier muss sie das auch tun.

María Soraya Rodríguez Ramos (Renew). – Señora presidenta, las mujeres iraníes se merecen más. Y creo también que esperaban más de nosotros.

Se merecen más porque han tenido el valor de romper el silencio ante un régimen que utiliza brutalmente la pena de muerte. Antes de estas manifestaciones, Irán ya era país en el que se registraba el mayor número de ejecución de mujeres en un sistema sexista donde la seguridad jurídica para las mujeres no existe.

Se merecen más porque el grito de «Mujer, vida y libertad» ha movilizado a la mayoría de la sociedad iraní frente a la represión de este régimen. Se merecen más las seis personas condenadas a la pena de muerte.

Se merecen más los 20 000 detenidos en las manifestaciones. Se merecen que, ya que conocemos los nombres de los jueces que están dictando estas sentencias, les sancionemos. Se merecen que sancionemos a los por lo menos 227 parlamentarios que están pidiendo más represión contra los manifestantes. Se merecen que adoptemos más sanciones contra los miembros de la Guardia de la Revolución. Se merecen que repensemos nuestras relaciones bilaterales y que impulsemos a escala internacional un mecanismo de rendición de cuentas en las Naciones Unidas.

Ivan Štefanec (PPE). – Madam President, the current situation in Iran is extremely concerning. In the last three months, thousands of people have been arrested and more than 600 of them have been killed. And they've been killed just because of their fight for a free country and for their fundamental rights.

Let me express my deepest admiration to all of the Iranian citizens who continue to protest despite the horrible situation, mass arrests and extreme violation of their fundamental rights by the regime. Six of the arrested people have even been sentenced to death, and many others may face the same fate.

This uprising covers the whole country. While a brutal Iranian regime supports and supplies weaponry to the criminal Russian aggressors, all age groups and all sectors of society are now united in protest against the autocratic regime, together side by side.

It is therefore time to act, to express our full support and call for the protection of those whose only sin is a desire for democratic values of their free country. We should not call the current situation a protest; it is really a revolution.

Evelyn Regner (S&D). – Madam President, Commissioner, those strong and incredibly courageous women and all those who support them in Iran are heroes. And therefore the European Union must not be silent but act.

Since the beginning of the Islamic Republic, women have protested against the regime's ideology, often at great risk, while many think now it is a rebellion. I say we are witnessing of a revolution. When women take to the streets, it is a revolution. When women cut their hair, it is a revolution. When women take the hijab off their heads, it is called a revolution.

The revolution is against an incredibly patriarchal regime that will not back down from cruelty. We see it. Now the demands of Iranian women appear so simple and are yet so fundamental. Women. Life. Freedom.

Dear colleagues, when women march in the streets to fight for freedom, they must know that we, the European Union, will support them in their struggle for women's rights and simply for a free life, no matter what.

Dear brave Iranian women, we stand by and with you.

(Catch-the-eye procedure)

Stanislav Polčák (PPE). – Madam President, the huge protests of Iranians in recent weeks shows their will for freedom and democracy. Iranians have for long not supported the dictatorial regime of Khamenei's governments. This regime is punishing them with death, violence and oppression. What we see in these days in Iran is thousands of victims and imprisoned young people and women, just in the last few weeks. We must clearly condemn this state of violence.

Who are the Iranian regime's partners today? Only dictatorial regimes like North Korea, Russia and, recently, the Hungarian foreign minister is shaking hands with representatives of this regime.

We have to stress today that we are on the side of the Iranian people and every crime committed in Iran will be investigated and punished.

Juan Fernando López Aguilar (S&D). – Señora presidenta, no, no es la primera vez que este Parlamento Europeo discute la inaceptable situación de los derechos humanos bajo la República Islámica de Irán. Pero, reconozcámoslo, no habíamos visto nunca una explosión rebelde de coraje como la que hemos visto desde la muerte de Mahsa Amini a manos de la «policía de la moral» el pasado 16 de septiembre. Hemos visto manifestaciones. Hemos visto también un balance de más de trescientos muertos —de acuerdo con cualquier informe objetivo— y cerca de veinte mil detenidos, entre ellos, por cierto, dos españoles, un hombre y una mujer.

Una Resolución del Parlamento Europeo no va a acabar con el régimen iraní, ¿verdad? Pero sí que puede ser una llamada de atención, no solamente a la acción exterior de la Unión Europea, con toda su influencia —*hard power*—, y de los Estados miembros para que combinen fuerzas para exigir de inmediato la liberación de todas esas personas detenidas, la proscripción de toda forma de tortura y malos tratos y, por supuesto, de la pena de muerte que se inflige sobre esas personas que luchan por la libertad y que tienen todo el apoyo bajo esa consigna que hemos coreado esta tarde en inglés:

«Woman, life, freedom».

Irena Joveva (Renew). – Hvala. Iran je država s čudovito pokrajino. Lahko bi bila celo idilična, če le ne bi imela vlade, kot jo ima. Če le ne bi spremljali neprestanega zatiranja ljudi, kratenja temeljnih pravic, smrtnih kazni, arbitrarnih aretacij z mučenjem, umorov protestnikov.

Ampak ravno ta represija, ravno te tragične krute usode Mahse Amini in mnogih drugih so tokrat dosegle nasprotni učinek. Združile so Iranke in Irance v revoluciji. Združile so vse sloje, stare, mlade, etnične manjšine, zaposlene v naftni industriji, vrhunske športnike.

Iranski nogometaši so na prvenstvu bojkotirali nacionalno himno. S tem so pomen te revolucije postavili na svetovni oder. Jasno so se pridružili boju, ki so ga doslej v Iranu praviloma vodile ženske. Torej boju za pravice žensk, ki pravzaprav dobiva podporo z vseh koncev sveta, tudi iz te hiše. Prekinili smo stike z Iranom. In prav je tako.

Ženske! Življenje! Svoboda!

President. – Thank you, but I would just like remind you that Members must not display any banners in the Chamber.

Ana Miranda (Verts/ALE). – Madam President, all my support is with the bravery of Iranian women. Protests in Iran and around the world are fuelled by the murder of Kurdish Mahsa Amini, by the murder of children, by opening fire against civilians. No woman should be murdered for what she wears. Women, life, freedom! Control over women's clothing is an oppression of choice and a form of asserting power over women's bodies. The same patriarchy and autocratic forces are repressing women in all the world.

Ten days ago, I contacted Mr Borrell about the situation of Ana Baneira, a Galician activist arrested at a protest in Iran. Mr Borrell, can you tell me something about this person, about this Galician woman?

Silvia Sardone (ID). – Signora Presidente, onorevoli colleghi, le donne iraniane protestano, rischiano la vita, lo fanno con gesti plateali, possiamo dire. Sì, perché in Iran togliersi il velo o baciare il proprio fidanzato in piazza sono gesti considerati sovversivi e quindi vietati.

E l'Unione europea che cosa fa? Nulla, se non esprimere una vuota vicinanza, nessuna condanna reale al regime islamico iraniano, nessuna critica reale al sopruso del velo islamico obbligatorio, nessun sostegno concreto alla lotta delle donne che vogliono solo essere libere. La vostra posizione è timida, ma perché è timida? Perché per anni avete sostenuto e promosso, anche con soldi pubblici, l'idea del velo islamico come simbolo di libertà. Avete preso una cantonata e avete promosso un modello sbagliato. Il velo islamico è uno strumento di oppressione, come testimoniano le donne iraniane stanche della violenza e degli ordini della polizia religiosa.

Basta ipocrisia, l'Europa difenda il valore della libertà e i diritti delle donne.

Jan Zahradil (ECR). – Paní předsedající, i já jsem se ocitl na tom posledním sankčním seznamu Íránu jako jediný občan České republiky ještě s některými svými kolegy. To je samozřejmě spíš kuriozita, protože nám se nic neděje, ale desetitisícům lidí v Íránu se děje. Máme tady více než 600 protestujících, kteří už byli zabiti bezpečnostními složkami, 30 000 zadržených. A nejde jenom o to, jde také o riziko, které Írán představuje z hlediska globální bezpečnosti. Čili měli bychom jak z důvodu lidských práv, tak z důvodu toho, že Írán destabilizuje situaci v okolních zemích, v Iráku, v Libanonu, v Sýrii a i v Jemenu, přitvrdit. Měli bychom nejenom pokračovat v sankcích, měli bychom dát jasně najevo, že s Íránem nebudeme vyjednávat ani o tzv. jaderné dohodě. A měli bychom se skutečně začít chovat velmi principiálně.

ΠΡΟΕΔΡΙΑ: EVA KAÏLI

Αντιπρόεδρος

Hermann Tertsch (ECR). – Señora presidenta, está muy bien que tomemos estas medidas contra Irán. Hay que tomar muchas más. Tienen que tomarlas los Estados miembros. Pero desde luego tiene gracia, casi, ver las lágrimas y escuchar los lamentos de una serie de países y de una serie de actitudes que ha habido aquí. En 2019 hubo 1 500 muertos en Irán, cinco veces los que ha habido ahora. Y, sin embargo, a los dos meses estaba el señor Borrell dándole la mano al presidente iraní, buscando negocios. Hemos hecho auténtico lobby en favor de Irán aquí, en contra de los Estados Unidos durante años. Se ha estado protegiendo a Irán.

Me gustaría saber dónde está el Gobierno español, que todavía no ha condenado las sanciones y esa lista negra que ha hecho Irán contra parlamentarios europeos, entre ellos españoles. ¿Por qué será? Puede que tenga algo que ver con las conexiones que tienen el grupo Podemos, los comunistas y los socialistas españoles con Irán.

Clare Daly (The Left). – Madam President, of course, the people of Iran have a right to push for change in their own country and violent crackdown against them is wrong. But the conversation in here is always about what we should do rather than what we shouldn't do and what we should undo, because look at where that attitude has got us – hardliners here have nurtured hardliners there.

These protests are organic and legitimate. I don't believe they're a Western plot, but I also don't doubt that there are some bad faith actors, and that shouldn't surprise us. There are also deep-seated reasons why Iran, a country under existential threat, is hyper-vigilant about threats to its sovereignty.

But nothing the West is doing is helping that situation. Biden, fine – we're going to free Iran is not helping any Iranians. It's the worst possible thing to say, it's directly putting civilians in the firing line and hyping the external threat narrative.

How have sanctions helped? They've created widespread misery and crackdown has gotten harder. Draw the conclusion, this isn't working.

So what can we do? Relieve the pressure, drop the sanctions, pursue dialogue not regime change. Get it into your head. Iranians are protesting not for EU strategic interests. They're protesting for their own future. It should be left to them to decide.

(End of catch-the-eye procedure)

Olivér Várhelyi, *Member of the Commission, on behalf of the Vice-President of the Commission / High Representative of the Union for Foreign Affairs and Security Policy.* – Madam President, Honourable Members, thank you again for this exchange about the situation in Iran. You can rest assured that the EU and its Member States will continue to monitor the situation of the protests in Iran closely and we will continue to consider all available options, including further restrictive measures.

At the same time, High Representative / Vice-President Borrell will continue to use every opportunity in his direct contacts with the Iranian authorities to reiterate the EU's strong opposition to capital punishment at all times and under all circumstances, and to urge them to guarantee the full range of fundamental rights for all their citizens, including the rights to freedom of expression and peaceful assembly.

To Ms Miranda, my colleagues just told me that we have not received yet your request. But once we have it, of course, we will immediately provide you with a reply.

Fundamental rights must be respected in all circumstances. And I want to thank you for your attention.

President. – The debate is closed.

Written statements (Rule 171)

Theresa Muigg (S&D), *schriftlich*. – Wir zählen heute Woche 10 der Proteste im Iran. Tag für Tag riskieren die Menschen ihr Leben, sie kämpfen für ihr Leben. Sie kämpfen, weil sie es wollen – Freiheit, Leben, Selbstbestimmtheit und das Ende des unterdrückerischen Regimes, welches zudem versucht die Protestierenden brutal niederzuschlagen. Ich tue mir manchmal schwer mit dem Diskurs der Menschenrechte, wenn er zu eurozentrisch geprägt ist und das westliche Denken unreflektiert auf andere Gruppen übertragen wird. Aber hier sehen wir ganz klar, diese Proteste, dieser Widerstand, der Ruf nach Freiheit geht von den Frauen und den Iraner_innen aus. Und dann sind wir einmal mehr gefragt, zu reagieren, zu handeln und diese Bewegung mit all unseren Möglichkeiten zu unterstützen! Wir müssen Iraner_innen Mittel bieten, um die Internetzensur zu umgehen, Exil-Iraner_innen besonders schützen, sichere Fluchtrouten

ermöglichen und jegliche Abschiebungen in den Iran stoppen. Außerdem müssen alle Mitglieder der Revolutionsgarde sowie des Regimes und jegliche Profiteure auf die Sanktionsliste gesetzt werden – und zwar unmittelbar und ausnahmslos! Die Frauen in Iran, die diese Proteste anführen, haben es verdient, dass ihre Rufe gehört werden. Das ist unsere Aufgabe. Frau, Leben, Freiheit.

22. Förderung von regionaler Stabilität und Sicherheit in den Ländern des Nahen und Mittleren Ostens (Aussprache)

President. – The next item is the debate on the report by Manu Pineda on Promoting regional stability and security in the broader Middle East region (A9-0256/2022).

Manu Pineda, *ponente*. – Señora presidenta, este informe pone de relieve la necesidad de coherencia y responsabilidad en la política de seguridad y estabilidad de la Unión Europea hacia Oriente Próximo, en general, y hacia la región del Golfo, en particular. Esto es muy relevante ya que la actual situación regional se caracteriza por una creciente inestabilidad y una vulneración de los derechos humanos que a menudo es perpetrada por gobiernos armados y apoyados por la Unión Europea.

La falta de un enfoque autónomo y regional por parte de la Unión Europea ha sido muy problemática y ha contribuido a alimentar las tensiones, por lo que el informe plantea la necesidad de reevaluar las políticas, teniendo en cuenta una perspectiva de seguridad humana, tal y como lo definen las Naciones Unidas.

El Servicio Europeo de Acción Exterior publicó recientemente su Comunicación conjunta sobre una asociación estratégica con el Golfo, en la que se promueve la cooperación con todos los países del Consejo de Cooperación del Golfo, pero se queda corta en varios aspectos que destaca el informe.

La seguridad y la estabilidad en Oriente Próximo es interdependiente con la de Europa y, por lo tanto, necesitamos revertir las políticas fallidas que nos han llevado a la situación actual, garantizar un enfoque coherente, que no se base exclusivamente en la lucha antiterrorista que, a menudo, utiliza métodos represivos no conformes con el Derecho internacional, y tener en cuenta las fuentes de inestabilidad.

Cualquier forma de participación de la Unión Europea, incluso a través de la financiación, debe contribuir a garantizar el Derecho internacional, los Objetivos de Desarrollo Sostenible de las Naciones Unidas y el concepto de seguridad humana. Los problemas y los conflictos locales requieren soluciones locales. Las organizaciones regionales existentes deberían protagonizar los procesos de paz y diálogo en la región.

La Unión Europea debe reforzar el multilateralismo en la región, tanto con países como con organizaciones regionales, así como profundizar en nuestro compromiso interparlamentario. Debemos involucrarnos en el diálogo y no ir a una política divisoria en la región, entre los países percibidos como prosaudíes y los percibidos como proiraníes.

Debemos revisar y suspender, si procede, la asociación de la Unión Europea con aquellos países de la región que violan los derechos humanos.

Exigimos responsabilidad por los crímenes de guerra en Yemen y analizamos la participación de la Unión Europea en esa guerra. Es necesario un proceso político inclusivo para lograr la paz y que todas las partes participen en las conversaciones dirigidas por las Naciones Unidas.

Demandamos que se ponga fin a la actual ocupación de parte de Siria y que se encuentre una solución política al conflicto en curso basada en el diálogo, la democracia y la soberanía e integridad territorial del país.

Rechazamos las violaciones de la soberanía y la integridad territorial de Irak por parte de Turquía.

Condenamos la ocupación de Palestina, así como pedimos el levantamiento del bloqueo israelí a la Franja de Gaza. La política de expansión de asentamientos israelíes ilegales en Cisjordania y Jerusalén Este debe revertirse inmediatamente. Destacamos, al mismo tiempo, el impacto positivo del OOPS en toda la región y subrayamos la necesidad de garantizar una financiación adecuada.

Pedimos un mecanismo efectivo para que se respete la posición común de la Unión Europea que prohíbe la aportación de armas a los países que participen en conflicto. Demandamos que se establezca una zona libre de armas de destrucción masiva en la región, de acuerdo con la Resolución de la Conferencia de las Partes encargada del Examen y la Prórroga del Tratado sobre la No Proliferación de las Armas Nucleares de 1995. Y pedimos a Israel que firme el Tratado para revelar su estatuto nuclear.

Necesitamos que la Unión Europea se comprometa con la sociedad civil. Son imprescindibles criterios relacionados con los derechos de las mujeres, de los trabajadores, con la libertad de asociación, la libertad de prensa o la garantía de acceso a los derechos básicos. Y condenamos el uso masivo de programas espías, como el israelí Pegasus, en toda la región.

Pedimos que se aplique la cláusula democrática en los acuerdos de asociación con la Unión Europea cuando haya claras violaciones de derechos humanos.

Y, por último, pedimos a las autoridades regionales que respeten la prohibición de la tortura en cualquier circunstancia y que supriman la pena de muerte.

Señora presidenta, señorías, este es un informe que, aunque lo impulsé yo al ser ponente, desde luego no es el informe que yo hubiera escrito si dependiera solo de mí, ni el informe que hubiera escrito ninguno de los aquí presentes. Este es un informe fruto del compromiso y de la responsabilidad, principalmente de siete grupos que han sido capaces de apostar valientemente y generosamente por un informe que ayude a mejorar la relación de la Unión Europea con los países de la región para tener una relación en la que se apueste por el respeto de los derechos humanos, en la que apueste por el respeto de la soberanía y la independencia de esos países y en el que se descarte una visión injerencista, una ambición colonialista con la que vayamos a esos países a decirles lo que tienen que hacer.

Desde luego, quiero dar las gracias a los otros grupos, que han participado de forma generosa en la elaboración de este informe y, por supuesto, quedo a su disposición para lo que sea necesario.

Olivér Várhelyi, *Member of the Commission, on behalf of the Vice-President of the Commission / High Representative of the Union for Foreign Affairs and Security Policy.* – Madam President, honourable Members, the broader Middle East region remains of fundamental interest to the EU. Let me therefore thank you for this timely debate and for your focus on this important and very diverse region. We cannot afford turning a blind eye. Our future prosperity, stability and security depends too much on how we manage our relations with our wider neighbourhood, including the southern neighbours and the near and Middle East. This is why the EU has presented a new agenda for the Mediterranean last year and a new strategy for the Gulf this year, both concerning the wider Middle East.

I would like to take this opportunity to thank you, honourable Members, again for your strong support for the Gulf strategy. We are already implementing, working actively to increase and strengthen our engagement with partners in the region at all levels. Among the most visible examples, in November alone, President von der Leyen participated in the Manama Dialogue in Bahrain. High Representative/Vice-President Borrell met numerous regional foreign ministers who, like him and Vice-President Schinas also visited Kuwait, Qatar and the United Arab Emirates.

This week, High Representative/Vice-President Borrell will co-chair the Ministerial with our Southern neighbours and the Union for the Mediterranean in Barcelona, where I will also be representing the Commission.

The objective of such exchanges is clear – implementing the various work strands of those two new initiatives, in particular the Green transition and climate change, energy trade and economic diversification and socio economic recovery, while we continue our engagement on pre-existing dialogues, including on human rights.

In the case of the Southern neighbourhood, we hope that the economic and investment plan will contribute to spur challenges that go from the most urgent humanitarian needs to the longer-term socio-economic challenges – development, regional stability and global security, to name only a few.

Still, as for any other region, there is no one-size-fits-all. The breadth of areas we are mentioning also reflects the diversity of countries in the region – some enduring conflicts since decades, others stable and with thriving economies.

Our cooperation with the Middle East region in its broad sense, has become even more relevant since the Russian attack on Ukraine. The region is suffering the consequences of the Russian aggression against Ukraine, particularly when it comes to food security. But this region plays a key role as well in countering and mitigating the consequences of the Russian war, be it as a major provider of energy for the EU or as a donor and supporter of the countries particularly affected.

Our engagement across the region also aims to contribute to the Abraham Accords. Ultimately, we aim to support the Arab-Israeli reconciliation and peace. We are actively engaged in sectors where opportunities for new partnerships exist or will arise. For instance, we are advancing well to cooperate with Israel and Morocco in the field of water management.

Europe should not only start understanding the new regional dynamics since the Abraham Accords, but it should also learn to speak this language, let alone seize the new opportunities for business people, trade and travel and security. The EU is catching up quickly with the Gulf region. In this new world, we need strong allies and the Gulf is an important one of the EU.

We welcome the decision of this Parliament to also intensify contacts with partners. We welcome the fact that the AFET Chair and colleagues will be travelling to the region soon. In your visits, you will be able to see at first-hand that this is a region in full transformation, including in the field of human rights. All Gulf states now have regular human rights dialogues with the EU. It is telling that in the last four years we have gone from two human rights dialogues to six, one with each of the GCC countries.

Of course there are challenges. Therefore, we engage and continue to encourage further reforms. We also need to bring our populations closer. This is why we have proposed to start exempting the Gulf countries from the visa requirement, and we strongly encourage you to support this initiative.

Another issue on which we intend to step up cooperation with the Gulf is regional security. Also in this regard, we thank you for your support, in particular for what we call the EU's issues-oriented confidence-building approach. High Representative/Vice-President Borrell will soon propose to appoint an EU Special Representative for the Gulf who will play a central role in this.

With regard to security, we just mentioned in our previous exchange that international oversight on Iran's nuclear program remains a priority. It is in the interest of peace and security of the region and even if the way ahead is not so easy – indeed, other important issues, including UN human rights or Iran's contribution to the Russian aggression against Ukraine, remain of our utmost concern and certainly have to be addressed.

Before concluding, let me touch briefly on a few other important issues in the region. The Israel-Lebanon delineation agreement is a positive development as well as normalisation agreements. We also need to remain fully committed on the Middle East peace process.

On Lebanon, the EU is keeping up the pressure, calling the government to organise presidential elections and deliver on the reforms required by the IMF, which are extremely urgent.

On Syria, where the situation is worse than ever, the EU remains one of the leading actors. We are already working towards the seventh Syria conference next year.

Counter-terrorism remains a key challenge in Syria and the entire region. The EU Strategic Compass for Security and Defence presents a new, broader framework for engagement.

Last but not least, on Yemen, we keep on supporting the efforts of the UN Special envoy, Hans Grundberg.

Time is limited and I will stop here as I am looking forward to our exchange. Thank you for your attention.

Antonio López-Istúriz White, *en nombre del Grupo PPE*. – Señora presidenta, señor comisario, suscribo totalmente sus palabras y agradezco mucho el esfuerzo que está haciendo la Comisión Europea diplomáticamente, al igual que muchos Estados miembros, de cara a una estabilidad que es absolutamente necesaria para la seguridad de Europa en Oriente Próximo.

Ha hablado el comisario de intereses. Tenemos intereses en la zona. ¿Pasa algo? ¿Por qué no podemos reconocerlo? Tenemos que decirlo. Europa en estos momentos tiene intereses.

Este informe ha sido, como decía el ponente, un informe consensuado. Efectivamente, porque hemos logrado frenar a la extrema izquierda de esta Cámara, que, como siempre, se dedica a insultar a países que en estos momentos mantienen una relación estratégica con esta Unión Europea.

Están sucediendo cosas increíbles en la zona, que pueden crear prosperidad, como los Acuerdos de Abraham, que se han citado, el acuerdo marítimo entre el Líbano e Israel, el acuerdo entre Egipto, la Unión Europea e Israel. Ya está bien de esa obsesión enfermiza con el único país democrático de la zona que es Israel.

Seamos claros: Europa tiene un papel que desempeñar, y ya no de antigua potencia colonizadora, ni tenemos que estar dando aquí demostraciones a nadie ni lecciones a nadie. Lo que tenemos que tener es la mejor de las relaciones con estos países y hemos de mantener, indudablemente, la defensa de nuestros principios y valores, basados también en las relaciones que Europa debe mantener con todos ellos.

Sven Mikser, *on behalf of the S&D Group*. – Madam President, stability and security in the broader Middle East is critical for global security. And on the other hand, instability and ongoing inter-state conflicts in the region have a negative spill-over effect for security and stability in all regions in the world, including Europe. In this light, I want to welcome the Commission's strategic initiatives with regard to the Mediterranean and the Gulf. The Joint Communication on the Strategic Partnership with the Gulf rightly focuses on a number of key policy areas from global security to energy security to climate change and clean transition.

But I would like to highlight one thing. While our cooperation with regional actors seeks to resolve the outstanding conflicts both within and between states, with a very strong focus on sustainable human security and protection of human rights and the respect of international law, there are other outside actors whose interference in conflicts in the region is driven by far more sinister motives. Therefore, at this very moment, when the rules-based international order is being challenged by Russia's unprovoked and unjustified war of aggression against Ukraine, a truly strategic partnership for the Middle East is only possible through alignment on this critical issue.

A couple of examples: While the EU's Iran policy and our support for upholding the JCP way is driven and continues to be driven by the need and our determination to keep nuclear weapons out of the hands of the Tehran regime, we cannot close our eyes to the fact that this regime is today supporting Russian aggressors in Ukraine with attack drones that are being used to destroy critical civilian infrastructure, or to the fact that the same regime is brutally cracking down civil unrest at home. Also, for years, Russia has been supporting Bashar al-Assad's murderous regime in Syria, both directly as well as through its proxies, notably the so-called Wagner Group, a terrorist organisation that is today also killing innocent people in Ukraine.

Or on a different front, while the many members of the upper class may have had legitimate and self-interested reasons for the recent decision to cut positive action, it is clear that the decision also works in the interests of Russia and helps to fill its war chest. So while we absolutely need to pursue a strategic partnership, mutually beneficial strategic partnerships with the broader Middle East and have a big stake in helping to maintain stability in the region, our efforts must be guided by our commitment to preserving and strengthening the rules based international order and limiting the influence of those actors who want to destroy it.

Salima Yenbou, *au nom du groupe Renew*. – Madame la Présidente, le Parlement européen avait grand besoin d'actualiser sa position sur la situation au Moyen-Orient pour pousser une politique européenne plus cohérente et ambitieuse dans la région. Je me réjouis des passages importants sur les droits humains, les droits des femmes et des communautés LGBT, la liberté de la presse, la nature envahissante des technologies de surveillance de masse, etc. Ces préoccupations primordiales doivent être au cœur des relations de l'Union européenne avec les pays du Moyen-Orient pour promouvoir une stabilité durable et solide dans la région.

Stabilité. Qu'est-ce que cela veut dire? Depuis mon arrivée en 2019, je questionne cette stabilité brandie comme un objectif sans que personne n'y entende la même définition, voire une quelconque définition. Je me réjouis d'avoir enfin établi dans cette résolution un lien positif et direct entre la stabilité, d'une part, et la démocratie et le respect de l'état de droit, d'autre part. Et je voudrais souligner que la démocratie va avec l'état de droit.

Monsieur le Commissaire, j'espère pouvoir compter sur vous pour mettre véritablement en œuvre une coopération avec les pays de la région basée sur la sécurité des peuples et le respect des droits humains et du droit international.

Jordi Solé, *on behalf of the Verts/ALE Group*. – Madam President, let me start by thanking the rapporteur, Manu Pineda, for his job with this file, as well as the collaboration from the other shadow MEPs. I think we will reach a good, balanced and interesting outcome.

The vast region covered by this report across the Middle East has undergone profound changes over the last decade. We have been witnessing, for instance, the rise of the Gulf States as engines of regional development. We've seen growing rivalries between big players like Saudi Arabia and Iran, and an authoritarian restoration across the region following the years of the Arab Spring uprisings from 2011 onwards, with severe negative implications for fundamental rights and freedoms.

In the light of the many conflicts and deep divisions that affect the region, and given its importance for the EU due to its geographical location but also the common ties that we have, we have a stake in contributing to the progress and stability of the whole region. And there are areas of collaboration that need to be explored more intensively. For instance, partnerships in the field of clean energy, taking into account the region's large renewable energy capacity.

However, any deepening of the collaboration must be based on the demand for respect for human rights in accordance with international law. Severe and pervasive state repression against human rights defenders, activists, journalists, dissidents throughout the region has to be condemned. In this regard, the EU has to make engagement with civil society a priority and aim at concrete commitments at the respective regular human rights dialogues with countries in the region.

Finally, more engagement is needed from our side in the region's forgotten conflicts like the war in Yemen or protracted ones like the Israel-Palestine conflict.

Thierry Mariani, *au nom du groupe ID*. – Madame la Présidente, l'action de l'Union européenne au Moyen-Orient se résume en deux mots: idéologique et catastrophique. Au Liban, vous vous ingérez dans la vie politique en ne proposant aucune solution au marasme économique qui afflige le pays. En Égypte, vous insultez un État qui combat les Frères musulmans et a brillamment organisé la COP 27. En Syrie, vous refusez de tirer les conséquences de la victoire de Bachar el-Assad et punissez le peuple syrien pour ne pas s'être jeté dans les bras de la rébellion islamiste. Vous voulez maintenant revenir sur nos accords avec Dubaï. Vous exaspérez autant l'Iran que l'Arabie saoudite. Et je ne parle même pas des chrétiens d'Orient, que vous défendez mollement et qui sont les grands oubliés de votre politique.

L'Union européenne a un génie. Elle dépense l'argent du contribuable sans compter et elle n'arrive qu'à se faire des ennemis. Quelles que soient la confession religieuse, l'orientation géopolitique et la nature institutionnelle de nos partenaires orientaux, leur réponse est toujours la même: l'UE est arrogante, aveugle et irréaliste.

Hier, la France pouvait négocier la paix au Liban. Elle pouvait émouvoir le monde en refusant de s'associer à l'intervention en Iraq. Elle pouvait proposer des voies de conciliation en Palestine. L'UE est le tombeau de la politique étrangère française. Sa montée en puissance correspond à notre disparition en Afrique et à notre éclipse au Moyen-Orient. Une politique qui remontait à Saint Louis, François Ier, Napoléon III et jusqu'au général de Gaulle, a été liquidée en quelques années pour faire place à la structure technocratique bruxelloise.

Votre diplomatie n'a qu'un visage, celui des sanctions. Votre bilan n'a qu'une mesure: le rythme de la disparition de la France de ses zones d'influence.

Hermann Tertsch, *en nombre del Grupo ECR*. – Señora presidente, bueno, se trata de un informe —con todo afecto, señor Pineda— que firma alguien de este Parlamento que tiene fotografías con prácticamente todos los grupos terroristas de Oriente Próximo, lo que choca en un principio.

Pero, desde luego, refleja bien lo que es el sectarismo manifiesto de este Parlamento y de la Unión Europea respecto a Oriente Próximo. Y explica también por qué en Oriente Próximo no pintamos prácticamente nada. Por ese sectarismo, por esa parcialidad que nos ha llevado a seguir financiando a organizaciones que tienen mucho que ver con la desestabilización y que, por ejemplo, aquí no haya habido en su momento ningún tipo de interés en apoyar el grandísimo éxito estadounidense del presidente Trump que fueron los Acuerdos de Abraham, que son los que abren la puerta a la estabilidad real, a lo que es la prosperidad y la apertura dentro de Oriente Próximo para abrir una nueva era de cooperación en aquella región.

Eso es lo que tenemos que mirar: por qué Europa no pinta nada. Y es por estas cosas.

João Pimenta Lopes, *em nome do Grupo The Left*. – Senhora Presidente, a perigosa situação no Médio Oriente é inseparável de décadas de política, de ingerência, sanções e agressões a países na região, com os Estados Unidos da América, a NATO e a União Europeia como principais protagonistas, e seus aliados, como Israel ou a Arábia Saudita, responsáveis por guerras no Iraque ou na Síria e recentes desenvolvimentos, que semearam a morte e o sofrimento entre os povos da região.

Aqui condenamos a cruel guerra da Arábia Saudita e outros países do Golfo contra o Iémen, com a participação direta das grandes potências da NATO, provocando uma das maiores catástrofes humanitárias dos nossos dias.

Aqui condenamos a impunidade da brutal ação de Israel contra a Palestina e a sua população, a sistemática agressão e violação do direito internacional, só possíveis com a conivência e apoio objetivo dos Estados Unidos da América e da União Europeia.

Aqui deixamos a solidariedade de sempre ao povo palestiniano, ao povo sírio, aos restantes povos do Médio Oriente, saudando a sua resistência e luta pelos seus direitos, independência, soberania e emancipação.

Kinga Gál (NI). – Tisztelt Elnök Asszony, Biztos Úr! Még soha nem volt ennyire szükségünk a Közel-Kelet államaival való szoros együttműködésre, hiszen a háború és az energiaszankciók következtében drasztikusan átalakul a globális nyersanyagkereskedelem. A térség energetikában már globálisan is vezető szereppel bíró országai nemcsak az európai energiaválság megoldásában, hanem a megújuló energiaforrások terén is nélkülözhetetlen partnereink. Ugyanakkor a térségben oda kell figyelnünk az egyre kiszolgáltatottabb helyzetben élő keresztény kisebbségek védelmére, hogy az ne legyen, és nem lehet politikai alku tárgya, ezért segítenünk kell a régióban üldözött kereszténységeket.

Mindnyájan tudjuk, hogy biztonságunk záloga a Közel-Kelet békéje és stabilitása, ezért fontos minden stabilitást ösztönző megállapodás, így például az Ábrahám-megállapodások is. Üdvözlendő minden stabil kormányzás, ezért üdvözlendő az izraeli választások eredménye, amely stabil kormányzást garantál.

Andrey Kovatchev (PPE). – Madam President, Commissioner, dear colleagues, we should demonstrate again our constructive role the EU wants to play in the Middle East as a key partner and a credible mediator. I welcome the positive developments in the region, as has been mentioned: the normalisation of democratic relations between some Arab countries and Israel through the so-called Abraham Accords, the agreement between Lebanon and Israel on their maritime border, the decrease in the number of attacks around the Gaza Strip, the signature of the Israel-Egypt Memorandum of Understanding on Energy, among others.

However, there are also quite a few remaining and very concerning challenges: the difficult economic, political and financial situation of Lebanon, fuelled by Iranian proxies there, the lack of positive change in Syria and the continued challenges posed by refugees in the whole region.

I believe we need to acknowledge our strong cooperation with this vital-for-us region. The Commission and High Representative's Joint New Agenda for the Mediterranean provides a solid basis to continue and build on our good relations. I also insist that security and prosperity in the Middle East must include the effective fight against terrorism and extremism.

The EU and our southern neighbours are facing the same challenges. The war in Ukraine, which is Europe's biggest political threat today, has also affected the Middle East heavily, from food and energy insecurity to Russian disinformation campaigning through the region. The EU needs to take into account the diverse impact of the war in the region, while also encouraging our southern neighbours to take a strong position to condemn the Kremlin's aggression.

Isabel Santos (S&D). – Senhora Presidente, é evidente a importância de fortalecer o nosso diálogo e envolvimento com os parceiros do Médio Oriente. Mas esse envolvimento e esse diálogo não pode ser mantido a qualquer preço. Tem que ser mantido no mais integral respeito pelo Estado de direito, pela democracia e pelos direitos humanos. Só assim será, de facto, um diálogo e uma cooperação como se deseja.

E, neste contexto, quero manifestar aqui a minha profunda preocupação com a instabilidade que se vive na região, em especial com a situação que se vive no Líbano, que ameaça transformar-se em mais um Estado falhado. A União Europeia não pode dar-se ao luxo de permitir que se instale uma situação de Estado falhado em mais um país desta região.

E porque a situação na Síria é deveras preocupante, cada vez mais preocupante, sem que se encontre uma solução, quero aqui dizer, Senhor Comissário, que o papel da União Europeia não se pode remeter única e exclusivamente ao papel da ajuda humanitária. É preciso fazer mais, e é preciso fazer já, pondo um travão à intervenção do Senhor Erdogan, movida por interesses puramente eleitorais, no norte da Síria, que periga criar maior instabilidade.

José Ramón Bauzá Díaz (Renew). – Señora presidenta, muchas cosas han cambiado en los últimos años en los países de Oriente Próximo. Ha pasado desapercibido, pero ¿saben ustedes quién acompañaba en primera línea al emir de Qatar durante la inauguración del Mundial? Pues era Mohamed bin Salmán, príncipe heredero de Arabia Saudí, y no hace ni dos años tan solo que Arabia Saudí lideraba el mayor bloqueo conocido en la región contra Qatar.

Los Acuerdos de Abraham han acercado el mundo árabe y el judío como nunca antes se había producido. Y aquellos que no han firmado esos Acuerdos mantienen negociaciones semanales con Israel. En solo dos años ya vemos resultados espectaculares, así que imagínense si el Parlamento los apoyara y se extendiera al resto de los países árabes.

Hablamos de un verdadero cambio de paradigma en la región. Oriente Próximo está cambiando. Se abre una ventana nueva de oportunidad para la estabilidad. Arabia Saudí, los Emiratos Árabes Unidos, Qatar, Kuwait, Israel, Marruecos, Egipto: todos ellos lo saben. Y el Parlamento Europeo debería verdaderamente facilitar ese cambio.

Así que, si de verdad queremos estabilidad en la región, la Unión Europea debe acompañar, apoyar e impulsar. El futuro de Yemen, de Siria o de Palestina pasa por lograr la cooperación entre todos los países de Oriente Próximo y ahí es donde nos tienen que encontrar: apoyándoles.

Mounir Satouri (Verts/ALE). – Madame la Présidente, chers collègues, Salah Hamouri est franco-palestinien. C'est un avocat du droit israélien engagé à défendre les prisonniers palestiniens. Oui, mais depuis des mois, Salah est lui-même prisonnier en détention administrative, sans jugement, sur des périodes de six mois renouvelables indéfiniment. Et pour quelle faute? La non-allégeance à l'État d'Israël. Mais de quoi parle-t-on?

Depuis des années, Salah Hamouri est harcelé par les autorités israéliennes. Lui, mais aussi son épouse, ses enfants qui n'ont pas le droit de mettre le pied en Palestine. Rien n'y fait: grève de la faim qui lui a valu l'isolement, mobilisation incessante de son épouse, conférences, tribunes, mentions de son nom, rencontres entre dirigeants… Salah est toujours en prison. Pire, il risque d'être exilé en France contre son gré. Mais que font les autorités françaises? Que faisons-nous, nous parlementaires européens? Quand cesserons-nous de regarder les bras croisés les emprisonnements politiques, les évictions, les exactions du gouvernement israélien? Nous sommes incapables de prendre des mesures.

Pour les Palestiniens, le deux poids, deux mesures ne peut plus être compris. Et sur ce sujet, cette résolution n'est malheureusement pas à la hauteur. Quand prendrons-nous des sanctions claires pour que le droit international, tout simplement, soit respecté, enfin?

Adam Bielan (ECR). – Madam President, Commissioner, the American withdrawal from the Middle East, the resurgence of Iran as a rogue state and the expansion of local terrorist groups must be addressed to prevent further destabilisation globally. The current lack of stability in the region has been leading to the involvement of Syrians, Afghans and Iranians in the war against Ukraine to the benefit of the terrorist state of Russia.

Equally, Russia has been worryingly extending its power to harm the European Union and its neighbouring countries through the Wagner Group's activities in the Middle East, as well as in Africa. This is something expected to increase with the potential agreement on the USD 17 billion arms contract with Algeria.

For these reasons, the EU needs to find sustainable solutions, such as strengthening the EU's role in assuring food supply in the broader MENA region during the unprecedented global food crisis.

Λουκάς Φουρλάς (PPE). – Κυρία Πρόεδρε, μιλάμε για σταθερότητα στην ευρύτερη περιοχή της Μέσης Ανατολής, μια περιοχή στην οποία πατρίδα μου, η Κύπρος, αποτελεί το ακρινό ευρωπαϊκό σύνορο. Γνωρίζω καλά, λοιπόν, τη σημασία της σταθερότητας και ασφάλειας στην περιοχή μας, αλλά και τη σημασία να υπάρξει ενεργότερη ευρωπαϊκή εμπλοκή προς την επίτευξη αυτού του στόχου.

Ας μην κρυβόμαστε πίσω από το δάχτυλό μας. Η σταθερότητα δεν είναι κάτι το αυτονόητο όταν έχεις να κάνεις με γείτονες που δεν ασπάζονται τις ίδιες με εμάς αρχές και αξίες. Περίμενα, κύριε εκπρόσωπε του κυρίου Borrell, να αναφέρετε μία χώρα την οποία δεν αναφέρατε κατά περίεργο τρόπο: την Τουρκία, η οποία απειλεί καθημερινά με πόλεμο, πραγματοποιεί αεροπορικές επιθέσεις στη Συρία και το Ιράκ, προκαλεί συνεχή ένταση στην περιοχή με παράνομες γεωτρήσεις σε ευρωπαϊκή αποκλειστική ζώνη.

Με αυτά τα δεδομένα δεν μπορεί να υπάρξει ούτε ασφάλεια, ούτε σταθερότητα. Για ακόμα μία φορά θέλω να θυμίσω κάτι που ίσως κάποιοι δεν θέλουν να θυμούνται: αυτή η χώρα, η Τουρκία, είναι υποψήφια για ένταξη στην ευρωπαϊκή μας οικογένεια. Αυτή η Τουρκία κατέχει ευρωπαϊκό έδαφος. Η Τουρκία, χάρη στην πολιτική μας των δύο μέτρων και δύο σταθμών, θα συνεχίσει να υπονομεύει την ειρήνη στην ευρύτερη περιοχή.

Evin Incir (S&D). – Madam President, colleagues, while the first feminist revolution in the Middle East and the world continues to demand what should be a fact in Iran – democracy and human rights – while the brave women, girls and allies shout enough is enough, there are still many actions to demand from the international community.

Sanction the murderous regime in Iran, including their families. Expel their so-called diplomats and let us all call things for what it is: the IRGC is a terrorist organisation. The feminist revolution is, however, a part of a long, ongoing democratic revolution. Ask the Kurds in Iran, they know it unfortunately too well. Right now they are under severe attack by the IRGC. The regime bombs have even been falling down on them in the city of Koya, in the Kurdistan region of Iraq, where the Kurdish-Iranian opposition KDPI has its base.

Simultaneously, Turkey bombed the Kurdish PYD, YPG, YPJ in the Rojava region of Syria. Remember those fighting for our freedom and sacrificing their lives in the fight against the terrorist organisation ISIS? Unfortunately, it doesn't even stop here. Turkey also bombed different parts of the Kurdistan region of Iraq. All across the world people are shouting Jin, Jiyan, Azadi – Women, Life, Freedom. Let me remind us all of where the cradle of this slogan started – Kurdistan.

Colleagues, let us show that human rights and security also means Kurdish rights and security.

Lukas Mandl (PPE). – Madam President, Commissioner Várhelyi, ladies and gentlemen, colleagues, security in the Middle East is of utmost importance for the security of Europe and the entire world actually. I don't agree with everything we state in the resolution we will vote on tomorrow, but let's see the positive sides and let's follow up. With whom? with our strongest ally, the only democracy and rule of law-based state in the Middle East – Israel. Israel has opened historic opportunities with the Abraham Accords and with its partners there.

That's the one side. The other side is the Iranian threat, which is not only contributing to the terrorism of Hezbollah and of Hamas, and supporting the malicious powers in Syria and misusing the Syrian soil for proliferation, but is also supporting Putin's Russia in its war of aggression, its brutal war crime-oriented aggression, and in its hybrid warfare against the free world, against the political west.

So let's see who are our allies. Let's follow up with our ally in the Middle East. Let's contribute from our side for security in the Middle East, because this will pay back for our security as well and also for our values.

Catch-the-eye procedure

Hannah Neumann (Verts/ALE). – Madam President, and because a number of colleagues have spoken about the role of women in the region, allow me to read out a small list to you, who are the EU heads of EU delegations in the region.

Israel: Mr Dimiter Tzantchev, Syria: Mr Dan Stoenescu, Lebanon: Mr Ralph Tarraf, Libya: Mr Jose Antonio Sabadell, Egypt: Mr Christian Berger, Yemen: Mr Gabriel Munuera Viñals, United Arab Emirates: Mr Andrea Matteo Fontana, Saudi Arabia and Bahrain: Mr Patrick Simonnet, Qatar: Mr Christian Tudor, Kuwait: vacant for a change, Iraq: Mr Ville Varjola, Turkey: Mr Nikolaus Meyer-Landrut, and the new special Envoy to the Gulf, well, maybe Mr Luigi Di Maio – for sure it will be another man.

And there's just one little surprise I have for you, Ambassador to Jordan: Maria Hadjitheodosiou.

And it may be worth noting that the ambassadors of Jordan and Oman to the European Union are women and so will be the new ambassador of Saudi Arabia to the European Union. So maybe we should also start to walk our own talk dear colleagues.

President. – Hopefully the Member States did better than us.

Ana Miranda (Verts/ALE). – Señora presidenta, en primer lugar, quiero felicitar al ponente, a pesar de las críticas que le hace la extrema derecha de esta Cámara, que no está presente, por cierto. Vienen, escuchan, sueltan su rollo y luego no se quedan cuando hay que quedarse por respeto a los debates y a todas las ideologías aquí presentes.

Así que, en primer lugar, valoramos positivamente reforzar el multilateralismo en la región y la estabilidad. Pero mientras hablamos aquí, está pasando una cosa. Turquía está bombardeando Rojava, está bombardeando a personas civiles que han luchado contra el terrorismo del ISIS. Mientras estamos aquí, en Palestina se vulneran derechos. Yo lo sé bien porque fui secuestrada por Israel en la flotilla internacional. Señores del PPE que acaban de intervenir: Israel no es un Estado de Derecho. Israel es un Estado que practica una ocupación ilegal.

Precisamos, por tanto —y me dirijo a la Comisión—, cláusulas democráticas en los acuerdos y respeto total por los derechos humanos. Derechos humanos que se siguen violando en la región, violando en Yemen, violando en Palestina, violando en el Golfo. Precisamos cláusulas democráticas claras en estos acuerdos. Si no, no tendrán nuestro acuerdo.

Clare Daly (The Left). – Madam President, the main agents of instability in the so-called Middle East are Europe and its overgrown colony in North America. Since the Crusades, people there have every reason to be sick of the sight of us. Britain and France built instability into the region when Sykes and Picot drew its borders. It was Britain that planted the seeds of Israel's apartheid regime in Palestine – divide and rule, just as they did in Ireland – and the West never had any qualms about backing dictators as long as they protected our interests.

So how did overthrowing Mosaddegh promote stability? Was the Iran-Iraq war good for security? Did backing the Mujahideen cover us in glory? Every so-called Western intervention – the occupation of Iraq, the disaster of Afghanistan, the NATO bombing of Libya, the backing of Islamist extremism in Syria, Saudi's genocidal assault on Yemen – all produced seismic waves of instability that tremor down for decades, leaving broken countries, hobbled economies, violence, trauma and permanent conflict.

And at the end of that, we stroke our chins, pretend we have nothing to do about it and ask how we – *we* – are going to promote stability in the region. You have got to be joking.

(End of catch-the-eye procedure)

Olivér Várhelyi, *Member of the Commission, on behalf of the Vice-President of the Commission / High Representative of the Union for Foreign Affairs and Security Policy.* – Madam President, thank you very much for this exchange. The comprehensive report on the Middle East that you are presenting today testifies to your strong interest in the region. Rest assured that we will thoroughly analyse and consider all recommendations included in your report.

It is timely that the Chair of the Committee on Foreign Affairs (AFET) and colleagues will soon follow up on it with a mission to the region. During your visit, you will be able to see first-and that this is a region in full transformation, including in the field of human rights. Parliamentary democracy is paramount to the success of our foreign policy.

Finally, to Ms Neumann, let me give you just one figure. In the last cycle of appointments, we appointed women to 46% of all head of delegation positions. Only 20% of all the applicants were women, so we are working on this task, and this is not going to come about within just one year.

Manu Pineda, *ponente*. – Señora presidenta, quisiera pensar que, en el grueso de las intervenciones, si bien algunos diputados han puesto el acento más en una cosa y otros en otra, mayoritariamente siempre se ha apostado por lo positivo. Comparto algunas denuncias, como, por ejemplo, la que ha hecho la compañera del Grupo Verts/ALE, de que es verdad que hablamos mucho de cuestiones de género, pero, al final, cuando tenemos que decidir, decidimos u optamos principalmente por hombres. Es verdad.

Desgraciadamente voy a tener que responder a dos personas que no están aquí. Y me resulta triste. Me resulta triste porque me gustaría poder decir las cosas con la gente delante.

En primer lugar, me dirijo al señor López-Istúriz. El señor López-Istúriz viene a reivindicar Israel como única democracia y viene a descalificar el trabajo que se ha hecho en la comisión para llegar a este documento. Pero es que resulta que el señor López-Istúriz ni estaba ni se le esperaba en la comisión. No sabe nada de lo que ha pasado ahí. No se ha tenido que parar a ninguna extrema izquierda, ni derecha, ni de en medio, porque es que no ha sido así. Los compañeros que han estado, que han participado en el debate, han podido ver que, salvo en el caso de dos grupos, ha habido un clima totalmente constructivo, en el que algunos han apostado más, otros menos, pero siempre desde la generosidad de saber que teníamos que salir adelante con una propuesta constructiva. Y decir que Israel es la única democracia de la zona… bueno, yo no lo sé. Cada uno que llame democracia a lo que quiera. Estar asesinando niños constantemente no es democracia. Estar bombardeando constantemente la Franja de Gaza no es democracia. Estar bombardeando Siria no es democracia. Estar utilizando la Franja de Gaza como un laboratorio de pruebas armamentísticas no es democracia. Eso, en mi opinión, y no lo digo ahora como ponente, sino que lo digo como Manu Pineda, eso se llama terrorismo. Y con esos terroristas yo no me he hecho ninguna foto.

Quiero responder también al señor Tertsch. En primer lugar, quiero decir que esa épica que plantean algunos fascistas de que somos fascistas pero valientes, en el caso del señor Tertsch, no funciona. Es fascista, pero cobarde. Ha venido aquí, ha soltado la bomba y ha salido corriendo como las ratas. Bueno, yo voy a responder al señor Tertsch. Su partido ha sido financiado por una organización terrorista iraní. Eso es público y notorio. Y ahora que venga aquí a contar las milongas que le dé la gana. Pero la organización que ha sido apoyada por el terrorismo iraní ha sido el partido VOX, al que pertenece el señor Tertsch.

President. – It's a very interesting topic, Mr Pineda, thank you for your work.

That concludes the debate.

Written statements (Rule 171)

László Trócsányi (NI), *írásban*. – Európa stabilitása szorosan összefügg a tágabb értelemben vett Közel-Kelet országainak biztonságával. Ezért nem lehetünk közömbösek azzal kapcsolatban, hogy mi történik a térségben. A Közel-Kelet országaival való kapcsolatainkat a kölcsönös érdekek, a konstruktív együttműködés és az egyenlőség mentén kell alakítanunk. Mindeközben arról sem feledkezhetünk meg, hogy a szóban forgó országok mindegyikének megvannak a saját hagyományai, kultúrája, értékrendje: nekünk ezeket tiszteletben tartva, kellő óvatossággal kell eljárnunk. Az Európai Unió nem veheti fel az ideológiai köntösbe bújt tanár szerepét, ahogy ezt a jelentés számos ponton megteszi.

Egy országot külön is említenék. Választási megfigyelő voltam a májusi parlamenti választások alkalmával Libanonban. A cédrusok országa sokat szenvedett, most rendkívül súlyos politikai és gazdasági válsággal szembesül. Nekünk kellő segítséget kell nyújtanunk, és diplomáciai eszközökkel is elő kell segítenünk az ország stabilitásának előmozdítását. Ez a Libanonban lévő menekültek saját országukba való hazatérése miatt is kulcsfontosságú. Emellett azt is mindenkor szem előtt kell tartanunk, hogy Libanon ad otthont a Közel-Kelet legnagyobb lélekszámú keresztény lakosságának.

23. Neue Strategie der EU für die Erweiterung (Aussprache)

President. – The next item is the debate on the report by Tonino Picula, on behalf of the Committee on Foreign Affairs, on a European Parliament recommendation to the Council, the Commission and the Vice-President of the Commission / High Representative of the Union for Foreign Affairs and Security Policy concerning the new EU strategy for enlargement (2022/2064(INI)) (A9-0251/2022).

Tonino Picula, *rapporteur*. – Madam President, Commissioner, dear colleagues, thank you for the opportunity to present recommendations of the House on the new enlargement strategy. Thank you also for entrusting me with this important task at a time when enlargement becomes geopolitically strategic policy after 10 years of fatigue.

The Russian aggression in Ukraine has had a tectonic impact on many of our policies. We all agree that a new impetus is needed to re-energise the enlargement process, ensuring its continuity, efficiency, credibility, and impact. Council conclusions, the agreement on the candidacy status for Ukraine and Moldova, and the recognition of the European perspective for Georgia are strong political signs of support. With this decision, the scope of the enlargement policy was officially extended to the Eastern Partnership countries. Therefore our internal administrative structures and external financial instruments will need to be adjusted accordingly.

In the context of the before-mentioned conclusions and the expectations from the Western Balkans, I wish to highlight one of the main messages of the draft text. Each enlargement country should be judged on its own merits. As the EU, we should overcome the enlargement gridlock by revamping the accession process both as a political goal and methodology. For that, we believe we need a new EU strategy for enlargement in which we have to define clear and transparent policy objectives and implement the necessary and timely institutional reforms.

The reform processes of the enlargement policy and internal reforms of the EU should go hand in hand. In fact, the enlargement process can encourage much-awaited EU reforms.

The rule of law should be at the centre of the process. We should strategically apply targeted conditionality based on clear progress benchmarks. That means timely rewarding reforms and reacting on the regression or a persistent lack of progress.

In the same context, we must emphasise the alignment of accession countries with the EU's common foreign and security policy. EU membership means more than just EU funds and transport corridors. Before anything, it represents a set of values and principles to share and respect.

I would also like to briefly present several novelties that are proposed in this document.

Clear deadlines for concluding negotiations with the accession countries, and these negotiations should finish by the end of this decade.

Qualified-majority decision on the start of the negotiations, and opening and closing of individual chapters. The final decision would still be unanimous, but I believe this would be a leap of trust in the process that some issues can be solved through negotiating. We cannot lose time once again, like in the case of North Macedonia and Albania.

Chief negotiator from the EU side for each country: this could benefit the transparency of the process, primarily when we communicate with the citizens of candidate countries.

Establishing a framework for effective cooperation between the European Public Prosecutor's Office and the accession countries to facilitate close cooperation and the prosecution of the misuse of EU funds.

A formal assessment of accession countries under the EU's rule-of-law mechanism and report, and the EU Justice Scoreboard, using the same indicators that apply to the Member States to prevent a persistent lack of progress, severe deficiencies and regression.

The creation of a special dedicated rule-of-law task force to be entrusted with developing more substantial and effective support to candidate and potential candidate countries. This goes along with the active involvement of judges and prosecutors from the Member States.

Phasing-in of candidate countries to respective EU policies, initiatives and the single market, including access to EU funds in the respective areas. This will enable citizens to experience the benefits of accession throughout the process and not only upon its completion to reward sustainable progress.

This House was always a prominent supporter of enlargement. With our joint work and by adopting solid recommendations on how the future enlargement policy should be implemented, we can once again set the tone and standards to enable the Union to grow and prosper.

Olivér Várhelyi, *Member of the Commission*. – Madam President, honourable Rapporteur, honourable Members. Firstly, I would like to thank the rapporteur, Tonino Picula, for his report and this House for your continuous interest and support for our enlargement policy. The report addresses important challenges, but also confirms enlargement being, and I quote, 'the most effective EU foreign policy instrument'.

The report also points out that enlargement, and I quote, 'remains a strategic investment in stability and prosperity on the European continent,' and I couldn't agree more. Therefore, an enlargement policy based on clear criteria and standards and the own-merit principle remains in our geostrategic interest. Before replying to your questions, let me quickly summarise the important decisions taken in the past few months to frame our discussion today.

In June 2022, EU leaders recognised the European perspective of Ukraine, the Republic of Moldova and Georgia. They granted the candidate status to Ukraine and Moldova and affirmed that they would grant candidate status to Georgia once the priorities specified in the Commission's opinion have been addressed. At the same time, EU leaders also reconfirmed the full and unequivocal commitment to the EU membership perspective of the Western Balkans. The European Council called for acceleration of the accession process and for further advancement of the gradual integration between the EU and the Western Balkans.

In July, we held the first intergovernmental conferences with Albania and North Macedonia. This was a major and long-awaited breakthrough. We immediately started the explanatory screening process, which is well on track. Two weeks ago, we started the bilateral screening with both countries. To continue the list of major decisions, one of the most important elements of this year's enlargement package is the Commission's recommendation to grant candidate status to Bosnia and Herzegovina. The Commission recommends granting candidate status on the understanding that the critical set of reforms from the 14 key priorities are made.

The proposal is the same formula as was followed in the case of Ukraine and Moldova. This recommendation is an important opportunity, demonstrating our commitment to the European perspective of Bosnia and Herzegovina and, above all, a message to its citizens. Next week I will be travelling to Bosnia and Herzegovina to discuss the EU reforms and the next steps.

Further, Europe has responded with strength and unity to Russia's invasion of Ukraine. But we need the mutual support of our closest allies, our neighbours. The Common Foreign and Security Policy (CFSP) has become more important following the war. However, according to our enlargement methodology and negotiating frameworks, the speed of the accession negotiations and the financial support to our regions remain based on progress in the fundamentals. It depends on the progress our partners make. Therefore, we certainly believe that more and not less engagement is needed.

Finally, at the Berlin Process Summit that took place in the beginning of this month, we announced a substantial energy support package of EUR 1 billion for the Western Balkans. This will help the region to mitigate the increase of energy prices and their impact on the vulnerable households and SMEs over the immediate term.

The package will support the energy transition and security in the Western Balkans over the short and medium term. We are convinced that, together with the implementation of the EUR 30 billion Economic and Investment Plan, this package will help the Western Balkans in addressing the immediate consequences of the energy crisis and build resilience and independence. It is a clear proof of our dedicated support, an unambiguous commitment in these difficult times, and the confirmation of our alliance.

Andrius Kubilius, *on behalf of the PPE Group*. – Madam President, dear colleagues, we have a good report on the significance of enlargement. The report is very clear in its most important message. Enlargement is the most effective EU foreign policy instrument, and enlargement should be brought back to an ambitious and dynamic track like it was with enlargement towards Central Europe.

The later so-called enlargement fatigue, especially to Eastern Partnership region, was a big mistake, and one of the reasons why Putin decided that he can start a war against Ukraine. It's good that the EU leadership started to learn the lessons from the mistakes of the past. Josep Borrell recently in this House openly recognised that until the war the EU had no proper policy towards Ukraine because that policy was subordinated to the policy towards Russia, and policy towards Russia was absent because the EU was very heavily dependent on Russian gas. Now this dependency is gone.

It's good that recently we have heard ambitious statements about enlargement towards Ukraine, Moldova and Western Balkans, made by Ursula von der Leyen and Josep Borrell and Olaf Scholz. It would be even better if such ambition would be demonstrated also by EU institutions and by Member States. I do not understand the reasons why the EU could not start negotiations with Ukraine and Moldova in the middle of next year.

Let us bring back the hope to our neighbours that the EU was able to wake up from its geopolitical laziness and I am absolutely sure that those neighbours will deliver major reforms of their countries. That is how enlargement can bring peace and prosperity for the whole European continent.

Andreas Schieder, *im Namen der S&D-Fraktion*. – Frau Präsidentin, Herr Kommissar, werte Kolleginnen und Kollegen! Ich möchte dem Kollegen Picula gratulieren zu diesem Text, denn es ist dringend notwendig und ein ganz wichtiger und guter Text. Wir müssen flexibler werden, wir müssen transparenter werden und vor allem: Wir müssen schneller werden im Erweiterungsprozess der Europäischen Union – und vermutlich auch strenger bezüglich der Einhaltung unserer Werte, der Umsetzung der Reformen und der grundsätzlichen Orientierung der europäischen Außenpolitik.

Der Balkan braucht ein klares Zeichen von der Europäischen Union. Die Bürger und Bürgerinnen des Balkans erwarten sich schon lange ein ganz klares Zeichen von der Europäischen Union. Ich habe das schon oft hier gesagt, und wir haben es auch schon oft hier im Europäischen Parlament diskutiert. Aber die jüngsten Ereignisse, auch die geopolitischen Ereignisse, zeigen einmal mehr: Es ist höchste Zeit – höchste Zeit für einen dynamischen und starken Erweiterungsprozess.

Dacian Cioloș, *în numele grupului Renew*. – Doamnă președintă, domnule comisar, extinderea este o parte a ADN-ului Uniunii Europene. Uniunea este ceea ce este astăzi și datorită politicii de extindere, datorită viziunii, ambiției și hotărârii generațiilor trecute de politicieni europeni, statele europene sunt mai puternice astăzi, mai stabile și mai prospere datorită apartenenței la Uniunea Europeană.

Însă, de mai bine de zece ani, politica de extindere a fost, din păcate, pusă pe hold. În contextul geopolitic actual, cu crize succesive, interesul unor state partenere din Balcani și din vecinătatea estică de a deveni membri ai Uniunii Europene a crescut.

Uniunea trebuie să rămână un pol de stabilitate și pentru aceasta este nevoie de o viziune strategică, de o abordare clară, fără echivoc, față de statele interesate de proiectul european.

Și raportul pe care îl dezbatem astăzi vine cu propuneri pragmatice, realiste, ambițioase, pentru a asigura succes extinderii către țările din Balcanii de Vest și vecinătatea estică. Însă, în paralel cu așteptările noastre de reformă pentru țările candidate, este necesar ca și Uniunea Europeană să se pregătească din timp pentru a primi noi membri.

Tineke Strik, *on behalf of the Verts/ALE Group*. – Madam President, dear Commissioner, Russian aggression has led to a revived appetite to enlargement and rightfully so. Without our neighbouring countries, we will not achieve strategic autonomy and regional stability. But the region has been neglected for too long. Promises have been broken, in particular towards the Western Balkans.

Parliament has now made a strong proposal and I thank the rapporteur and my co-shadows. I invite the Council and Commission to take this report as a basis for a renewed approach and I mark three points here.

First, put the rule of law, democracy and fundamental rights at the core of the enlargement process as they form the foundations of our Union. Make funding conditional and increase assistance for those reforms – and that also means a critical stance on Serbia, as long as President Vučić refuses to condemn Russia and to protect the rights of LGBTIQ people in his country.

Second, enhance the EU's credibility by ensuring that assessments are merit-based and not polluted by bilateral issues. And that means an end to the vetoes on interim decisions.

And third, we need to find ways to intensify our cooperation while the accession process is still ongoing. More benefits and more involvement will stimulate the process.

It's time to start delivering our promises for our own stability, but first and foremost – as you also said, Commissioner – because the citizens deserve the required reforms and concrete perspective to accession.

Philippe Olivier, *au nom du groupe ID*. – Madame la Présidente, chers collègues, ce débat sur l'élargissement traduit votre incapacité à tenir compte du réel et à évaluer les politiques que vous mettez en œuvre. Vous n'arrivez pas à travailler à 27 et vous voulez encore élargir. Vous êtes dans une fuite en avant. Avec Schengen, que vous voulez étendre, vous avez fait de l'Europe un continent passoire, qui, de l'agence d'accueil de migrants Frontex à l'Ocean Viking, montre chaque jour ses défaillances dans le contrôle des flux migratoires.

L'extension que vous nous proposez est une extension sans fin, caractéristique d'un empire, un empire qui a pour nom l'Union européenne. Or, qui dit empire dit impérialisme, c'est-à-dire l'idée d'une soumission des peuples à un ordre supérieur, à une autorité centrale, un empereur qui est en l'occurrence une nébuleuse technocratique au service d'une idéologie marchande.

Mais les promesses d'éternité dont se parent toujours les empires se heurtent immanquablement à l'instinct de survie des peuples. Il en a toujours été ainsi dans l'histoire. L'UE n'échappera pas à cette loi d'airain.

Adam Bielan, *on behalf of the ECR Group*. – Madam President, Commissioner, I believe the enlargement process should be accelerated. This is crucial as the loss of credibility of the European Union in the Western Balkans threatens to increase foreign influence in Europe, notably given Russia's and China's interest in the region.

In addition, our enlargement policy has become strategically crucial in the face of Russia's aggression against Ukraine and destabilising actions of non-EU actors, including Russia, in candidate countries.

In this context, I welcome the Commission's annual enlargement package presented in October. I also welcome the acknowledgement in Mr Picula's report of the need for the European Union to enhance credibility, effectiveness and predictability of its enlargement policy. Full alignment with the common foreign and security policy, including sanctions policy, should be considered a priority and should be applied to individual candidates on an equal basis.

I believe that in a world of fragile alliances, this enlargement could be a further guarantee of proper development, stability and peace on our continent.

Στέλιος Κούλογλου, *εξ ονόματος της ομάδας The Left*. – Κυρία Πρόεδρε, είναι πολύ θετικό το γεγονός ότι όλες σχεδόν οι παρατάξεις είναι υπέρ της διεύρυνσης, όπως προτείνει και ο εισηγητής. Υπάρχει και μια εξαίρεση των ιμπεριαλιστών της άκρας δεξιάς —δεν είναι εδώ, έφυγαν τώρα—, αλλά οι υπόλοιποι συμφωνούμε ότι πρέπει να προχωρήσουμε με σταθερά τα κριτήρια της Κοπεγχάγης και με ανανεωμένη διάθεση να γίνει διεύρυνση. Και πρέπει, σε αυτή την προσπάθεια, να ξεπεράσουμε τον εθνικισμό και τους εθνικούς εγωισμούς και να προχωρήσουμε όλοι μαζί.

Με την ευκαιρία, κύριε Επίτροπε, θέλω να πω ότι μια συμφωνία-σταθμός ήταν η συμφωνία των Πρεσπών ανάμεσα στην Ελλάδα και τη Βόρεια Μακεδονία και από τη συμφωνία αυτή απομένουν να εγκριθούν τρία μνημόνια παραπέρα συνεργασίας, αλλά η ελληνική κυβέρνηση δεν τα φέρνει για ψήφιση στο ελληνικό κοινοβούλιο. Παρακαλώ, να ζητήσετε να προχωρήσει και να τα φέρει για ψήφιση.

Kinga Gál (NI). – Tisztelt Elnök Asszony, Biztos Úr! Az Európa békéjét veszélyeztető fenyegetések rávilágítanak a bővítés geopolitikai jelentőségére. Az Unió nem késleltetheti tovább a stratégiai jelentőségű nyugat-balkáni bővítési folyamatot. Hiteles alternatívát kell kínálnia, ami lehetőség és felelősség is egyben. A térség az energiaellátás hosszú távú biztosítása és migrációs válságok kezelése szempontjából is kulcsrégióvá vált Európa számára. A nyugat-balkáni útvonalon súlyosbodik az illegális migrációs krízis, amit a térség és annak kulcsszereplője, Szerbia integrációjával lehet megoldani. Ezért üdvözlendő a múlt héten Belgrádban kötött szerb-osztrák-magyar szándéknyilatkozat az illegális migránsok visszafordításáról a külső határokon.

Ebben a jelentésben a feltételrendszer átpolitizált szigorítása rossz üzenet, elbizonytalanítja például a csatlakozásra váró Szerbiát is. Számunkra ugyanakkor elfogadhatatlan az egyhangú döntéshozatal eltörlésére vonatkozó javaslat, hiszen a többségi döntésekkel a kisebb tagállamok politikai szuverenitása kerülne súlyos veszélybe. Különösképpen a külpolitikai döntésekben.

Андрей Ковачев (PPE). – Г-жо Председател, Европейският съюз трябва да удвои или утрои своите усилия за присъединяването на страните от Западните Балкани, особено в сегашната геополитическа обстановка. Това трябва да е един от основните ни приоритети. Ще се спра обаче конкретно на Сърбия, защото нейната политика има влияние в много страни от бивша Югославия. В интерес е както на сръбските граждани, така и на Европейския съюз, тази страна да стане колкото се може по-бързо част от Европейския съюз.

Обаче, като възприемем всички елементи от нашата политика, включително и по отношение на Русия, за съжаление в този момент Сърбия действа в подкрепа на руските интереси на Балканите. Това има много негативно влияние върху съседните страни. Тъжно е, че Северна Македония все още не предприема мерки по отношение на говора на омразата и дискриминацията срещу гражданите, които се идентифицират като българи. Срамният акт от преди няколко дни, когато беше нападнат клуб на българската общност, трябва да бъде осъден от политическата класа на тази страна и тя трябва да положи усилия това да не се повтаря.

Г-н Пицола, колеги, това не е двустранен въпрос, а основна демократична ценност, която не е даденост, а трябва да се отстоява всеки ден както в Европейския съюз, така и в страните, които искат да се присъединят.

И тук един друг въпрос – винаги съм отстоявал това, че по отношение на външната политика и политиката за отбрана Европейският съюз трябва да има гъвкавост и бързо да се адаптира в геополитическата среда около нас. Затова там трябва да има квалифицирано мнозинство за вземане на решения. Но политиката по разширяване не е външна политика. Когато решаваме с кого да бъдем заедно в едно семейство, това не е външна политика и затова там трябва да остане единодушното вземане на решения.

Marina Kaljurand (S&D). – Madam President, Commissioner, first of all I would like to thank and congratulate the rapporteur, Tonino Picula, for this timely and comprehensive report. I fully agree that enlargement is the most effective EU policy instrument and one of the Union's most successful policies. It was so in 2004 — when my country, Estonia, acceded to the EU – and is even more today, when after Russian aggression EU membership has become a hope and guarantor of survival and independence for some of our eastern partners.

It is our political and moral duty not to let down the states that see their future in the EU. It does not mean lowering of EU standards. On the contrary, the Copenhagen criteria are and should remain the cornerstone of enlargement. But there are steps that we have to take on our part, including comprehensive reflection on enlargement policy, overcoming current political impasses and enlargement fatigue. Only then can we ensure the continuity, consistency and credibility of the EU enlargement policy, and that is what our citizens and partners want.

Илхан Кючюк (Renew). – Г-жо Председател, г-н Комисар, поздравления към г-н Пицула, който прави един опит да осъвремени една много важна политика на Европейския съюз, а именно политиката по разширяване. Смятам, че тази политика има основания да бъде наричана най-успешната външна политика на Европейския съюз, но заедно с това трябва да бъде погледнато много по-сериозно на нея – и като подход, и като отношение. Комисията прави правилните неща, давайки много категорични аргументи, че чрез новата методология процесът ще бъде много по-адекватен. Той ще отговаря на очакванията най-вече на страните от Западните Балкани и, заедно с това, дава достатъчно гаранции за това, че страните, които са вече част от Европейския съюз, ще припознаят процеса като такъв.

Много е важно в тази криза, както беше в кризата с пандемията, така и в кризата с енергийните ресурси, европейските граждани да не бъдат ревниви към Западните Балкани, а наистина да осигурят необходимата подкрепа, и като Европейски съюз в този процес, защото е изключително важно да почувстваме подкрепата, ако искаме да живеем в един Съюз, който е солидарен не само към собствените си граждани, но и към страните, които са се устремили да бъдат част от него.

Dominique Bilde (ID). – Madame la Présidente, pas plus qu'au sujet des précédentes vagues d'adhésion, les Français ne seront consultés sur un éventuel élargissement aux Balkans – 59 % d'entre eux y sont d'ailleurs opposés, et à juste titre.

Parlons économie d'abord, puisque le salaire minimum albanais de 250 euros est le plus bas d'Europe, avec à la clé un dumping inacceptable, par exemple pour le secteur textile qui amorce une timide renaissance dans les terres du Grand Est qui me sont chères. En matière de sécurité, ensuite, un rapport récent d'Europol rappelle l'infiltration islamiste, aggravée par le retour des djihadistes. Enfin, cette fuite en avant ne pourra que rouvrir des plaies jamais refermées. Ainsi, on impose à la Serbie, plus ou moins explicitement, la reconnaissance du Kosovo comme préalable à une adhésion. Et d'après les échos qu'on en a, la récente proposition de Paris et de Berlin frôlerait sur ce point le marchandage le plus indigne.

Ne nous enferrons donc pas dans un projet aussi impopulaire qu'irresponsable et propre à remettre le feu à la poudrière des Balkans.

Εμμανουήλ Φράγκος (ECR). – Κυρία Πρόεδρε, η ελληνική εθνική μειονότητα Βόρειας Ηπείρου διώκεται. Τα σπίτια κατάσχονται και οι εκκλησίες και τα μνήματα γκρεμίζονται. Και η Ευρώπη σιωπά. Μετά από τους φρικτούς διωγμούς του Χότζα και των απαράδεκτων έως και δολοφονικών επιθέσεων μετά το 1991, σήμερα έχουμε νομικά εμπόδια για τους Βορειοηπειρώτες μας.

Ας το πούμε ανοικτά: η αλβανική κυβέρνηση είναι ένα τουρκικό ενεργούμενο. Αν τις ίδιες συμφωνίες που έχει κάνει με την Τουρκία τις είχε κάνει με τη Ρωσία, γνωρίζουμε ότι το ΝΑΤΟ θα την είχε βομβαρδίσει όπως έκανε και με τη Σερβία. Και το πλέον τραγελαφικό είναι που το γραφείο της Ευρωπαϊκής Επιτροπής στην Αλβανία τα βρίσκει όλα ρόδινα. Μιλήστε με τις οργανώσεις των Βορειοηπειρωτών για να μάθετε την αλήθεια. Ο δρόμος από τα Τίρανα στις Βρυξέλλες πρέπει να περνάει από το Αργυρόκαστρο, από την Κορυτσά και από την Χειμάρρα. Αλλιώς, ας αφήσουμε τα κριτήρια της Κοπεγχάγης και ας μιλήσουμε μόνο για τη γραμμή της Ουάσινγκτον.

Clara Ponsatí Obiols (NI). – Madam President, we spend a lot of time discussing the rule of law standards for new members, but once they are in it seems that they can ignore those same standards, because they become members of the club and it's the club of Member States. It's mostly a system of cover-ups.

President Metsola went to Barcelona over the weekend. I hope she found good weather there in my beloved hometown, a city where I have not been able to set foot in the last five years. Because if I did, I would suffer an arbitrary arrest.

So what's the credibility about rule of law? We only look at it for the candidates or for some of the members, depending on their power. In any case, I do hope that Ms Metsola does not help Spain in their political persecution. I'm happy that she denied that she was planning to strike four Members of this Parliament of our rights as representatives of more than two million people that elected us to this Parliament.

Vladimír Bilčík (PPE). – Madam President, Commissioner, colleagues, EU enlargement has been one of the most successful policies of the Union. It has transformed the continent, established democracies, modernised economies, and united us in diversity.

As we face Russia's attack against Ukraine, the EU must focus on its foundations. European enlargement must be based on shared goals and principles, respect for the fundamental rights of individuals and the rule of law for all. European values have real political meaning. All of us inside the European Union, must once again become serious about enlargement. Our commitment to a European future for Ukraine and Moldova must transform our internal discussion about a wider Europe. We must do all it takes to help Ukraine win its just war, and even more importantly, to win a lasting and prosperous peace based on European policies and institutions.

We must equally deliver on our long-term commitment to the Western Balkans. We expect our partners in the region to stand with us, not to bypass us. We expect true reforms, not lip service paid to Europe. But this is also our task. As Russia continues to pursue its hybrid warfare across the Western Balkans, we, as Europeans, must be politically clear. We will do what it takes to make Europe prevail in this region, to make democracy trump authoritarianism, to bring a European way of life to all people of the Western Balkans.

It's time to believe that enlargement can become one of our greatest achievements again, dear colleagues.

Isabel Santos (S&D). – Senhora Presidente, permitam-me que saúde o meu Colega Tonino Picula por este relatório tão claro na defesa daquele que é um dos mais bem-sucedidos e importantes instrumentos da nossa política externa.

O quadro político ditado pela guerra e as decisões tomadas este verão, em matéria de alargamento, trazem a este documento uma especial importância estratégica. Cabe-nos, neste momento, trabalhar na garantia da continuidade da linha de sucesso, retirar as lições dos passos menos bem-sucedidos, porque também os há, e criar condições que permitam evitar frustrações e descontentamentos produzidos pelo arrastar dos processos.

É fundamental que se garanta a efetiva progressão na adesão, segundo o mérito, nas reformas implementadas, o grau de comprometimento com os valores da UE e o alinhamento em matéria de política externa evidenciados por cada país.

Mas é também fundamental que façamos o nosso trabalho de casa, aqui dentro da União Europeia, e que procedamos às reformas ao nível institucional, orçamental e dos mecanismos de decisão em matéria de adesão para que não acabemos, invariavelmente, reféns dos interesses de um e de outro Estado-Membro.

Nathalie Loiseau (Renew). – Madame la Présidente, posons-nous la question: combien y a-t-il d'espaces politiques auxquels des pays souverains souhaitent adhérer sans y être contraints? La réponse est simple: un seul, l'Union européenne. Les Ukrainiens se battent au sens propre pour la rejoindre et nous avons bien fait d'accueillir leur candidature. La Moldavie tremble face aux pressions russes et espère que nous la prenions sous notre aile. Faisons-le.

Au cœur de notre continent, les pays des Balkans sont déjà européens par la géographie, l'histoire et la culture. Ils ont vocation à nous rejoindre, mais pas n'importe quand ni n'importe comment. J'ai ainsi beaucoup de mal à comprendre que la Commission veuille accepter la candidature de la Bosnie-Herzégovine au moment où, loin de progresser, la situation politique du pays empire. J'ai beaucoup de mal à constater qu'on ne s'inquiète pas davantage de la Serbie au moment où la crise entre Belgrade et Pristina prend une tournure très préoccupante, où les autorités serbes multiplient les signes d'amitié vis-à-vis du Kremlin et où Russia Today ouvre un bureau en Serbie.

Nous devons croire à l'Europe, soutenir l'élargissement et le faire sérieusement, les yeux ouverts, pas la tête dans le sable.

Cristian Terheș (ECR). – Madam President, dear colleagues, dear Commissioner, 'the enlargement policy is the most effective EU policy', states the report that we are debating right now and the statement is correct. Through the enlargement policy, the European project has managed to create economic growth for European citizens and to keep peace through prosperity in Europe since the Second World War.

Moldova, along with Ukraine, is a country that recently received a candidate status to EU. The finalisation of the accession process in the EU can take some time though, but we don't have to wait for the whole process to finish in order for the people of Moldova to feel closer to the other Europeans. One simple and concrete step to reinforce the fact that the country is on the right path is for the EU to have a roaming agreement with Moldova. Signing such a roaming agreement is not a big effort for the EU, but it will make the world of difference for the people of Moldova, enabling easier and affordable communication between the people of Moldova and those family members who have left home, will help strengthen European integration long before any political decision does.

I therefore call on all the EU institutions to work closely with the authorities from Moldova to include the country in the roaming agreement, a benefit that will help both EU and the people of Moldova.

Andor Deli (NI). – Tisztelt Elnök Asszony, Biztos Úr! Kezdem még egyszer. *Can I start again? Sorry, my throat is a little bit sore*. Tisztelt Képviselőtársaim! Elérkezett annak az ideje, hogy az Unió bővítési folyamata ténylegesen felgyorsuljon. Európa nem engedheti meg magának azt a luxust, hogy tovább hallogassa a Nyugat-Balkán országainak csatlakozását. Sokan azt állítják, hogy az EU befolyása meggyengült a térségben. Sajnos azt kell mondanom, hogy az elmúlt pár évben az Európai Parlament határozatai révén aktívan hozzájárult ahhoz, hogy ez így legyen, és ez a jelentés is ilyen. Nem lehet bizalmat és befolyást növelni oly módon, hogy folyamatosan szigorítjuk a feltételrendszert.

Az uniós kondicionalitási mechanizmusokat mi, magyarok, jól ismerjük, téves logikán alapulnak. Hiba lenne a csatlakozásra váró országokra is kiterjeszteni ezeket befolyásolási eszközként. Szerbiának és a nyugat-balkáni térség országainak nem ilyen határozatokra, hanem őszinte támogatásra és csatlakozási időpontra van szükségük. Az ilyen határozatok nem segítik, hanem inkább hátráltatják a bővítést és azt a munkát, amit a Bizottság is végez.

Željana Zovko (PPE). – Poštovana predsjedavajuća, poštovani povjereniče Várhelyi, (Please I will speak Croatian.) u jednoj minuti teško je reći što bi ova strategija trebala da znači za zapadni Balkan, ali evo, fokus je kao i uvijek na onome što se nije učinilo, a što se treba učiniti.

Moja poruka za Bosnu i Hercegovinu jest čestitam, vidim da se koalicije prave. Želim da buduća koalicija konačno izmijeni izborni zakon i napravi ustavne promjene koje će Bosnu i Hercegovinu staviti da bude predvodnica zapadnog Balkana u Europskoj uniji. Vremena nema. Vrijeme smo izgubili. Ovo je zadnji trenutak kada se ljudi mogu urazumiti i umjesto iseljavanja onoga što najbolje Bosna i Hercegovina ima, ostaviti je da gradi zemlju, zemlju mira, zemlju stabilnosti, zemlju koja će se proširiti i koja će povući zapadni Balkan naprijed.

A za sve ostale, poštujte manjine, poštujte sve one koji nisu drukčiji i koji su manji i slabiji od vas jer će vas samo to dovesti do Europe. Čestitam.

Alessandra Moretti (S&D). – Signora Presidente, onorevoli colleghi, Stato di diritto, diritti umani, parità di genere, diritti delle minoranze, allineamento a una politica di sostenibilità ambientale, una politica estera comune: pilastri, questi, sui quali l'Europa non può trattare e sui quali non farà passi indietro, perché questo è il punto di partenza per una politica di allargamento solida, credibile e lungimirante.

Gli ultimi mesi, nei quali abbiamo visto a rischio la pace in Europa, ci hanno ricordato che la politica di allargamento è uno strumento determinante per l'Unione europea. Aprire la nostra famiglia condividendo valori e responsabilità rafforzerà l'Unione, accrescendo la sua centralità nel quadro geopolitico internazionale.

Non facciamo sconti a paesi in attesa di aderire, in particolare quando si parla di valori, democrazia e diritti. Tuttavia, invito l'Europa a rafforzare la propria credibilità di fronte ai paesi coinvolti. Accorciamo i tempi per evitare che i cittadini perdano le speranze, come sta accadendo in Serbia, dove la percentuale di cittadini favorevoli all'adesione cala di mese in mese ed è già inferiore al 50 %. Introduciamo il voto a maggioranza qualificata per evitare che ripicche regionali mettano a rischio il progetto. Facciamo sentire ai cittadini i vantaggi di essere parte dell'Europa durante il processo di adesione, non solo alla fine.

Allo stesso tempo invito i paesi candidati a dimostrare la loro determinazione nel diventare membri dell'Europa attraverso l'adozione e l'implementazione di riforme che garantiscano lo Stato di diritto e, in questo difficile momento, l'allineamento alla politica estera e di sicurezza europea.

Klemen Grošelj (Renew). – Spoštovani! Vprašajmo se, kaj je cilj širitve danes? Ali je orodje geopolitičnega odvračanja Kitajske, Rusije, Turčije? Ali je cilj krepitev stabilnosti demokracije ter blagostanje na evropskem kontinentu in njegove dokončne integracije?

Kaj je dejanski cilj širitve? Odgovor na to vprašanje pa žal v EU ni enoten. Ni enotnega odgovora, niti v tej hiši, niti v Komisiji, niti v Svetu EU.

Zato postaja dogajanje okoli širitve bolj kot proces s ciljem odzivanje na aktualno dogajanje v Evropi, kjer države postajajo kandidatke brez pogojev. Hkrati drugim državam za isti položaj, kot je recimo Bosna, postavljamo skoraj nedosegljive pogoje. Na eni strani pri kandidatkah, kot je primer Srbije, toleriramo zdrse v avtoritarizem, hkrati pa ne moremo nagraditi kandidatk, kot je recimo Severna Makedonija, ki napredujejo.

Nasprotno, s svojimi dejanji in še pogosteje nedejavnostjo ustvarjamo pogoje za krepitev nedemokratičnih sil v njih. Širitev je tako postala kakofonija interesov, ki zagotavljajo status quo, kjer se zdi, da se širitev dogaja, hkrati pa se nič bistvenega ne spremeni oziroma ne zgodi.

Potrebujemo jasno definirano politiko širitve z jasno postavljenimi pogoji za vstop v proces in za članstvo v Evropski uniji, skupaj z mehanizmi, ki bi doseganje ciljev širitve tudi zagotavljali.

Александър Александров Йорданов (PPE). – Г-жо Председател, г-н Комисар, г-н Пицула, докладът е убедителен в общите положения, но за съжаление е неубедителен в редица детайли. Тезата за премахване на единодушието при вземането на решения по политиката на разширяване е твърде спорна.

Член на семейство се става с общо съгласие. Не е ли ясно, че Сърбия има поведение на втора руска държава на Балканите? В доклада се говори за двустранни спорове, но правата на българите в Северна Македония не са двустранен, а европейски въпрос. Правата на човека са общоевропейска ценност. Тази страна обеща да впише българите в конституцията си, но вместо това комунистическата интерпретация на миналото продължава да бъде нейна официална политика. Основен език е омразата срещу европейска България. Договорът с България не се изпълнява. Затова ви призовавам: нека да мечтаем, но и да бъдем реалисти.

Hildegard Bentele (PPE). – Frau Präsidentin, sehr geehrter Herr Berichterstatter Picula, sehr geehrter Herr Kommissar! Ich glaube, eine neue Strategie für die Erweiterung braucht vor allem zwei Dinge: Ehrlichkeit und echten Willen zum Erfolg. Und ich glaube, in beiden Bereichen ist Ihre Vorlage, Herr Picula, verbesserungswürdig.

Einmal Ehrlichkeit: Die Kooperation, die Präsident Vučić und die serbische Regierung mit Russland aufrechterhält, ist einfach inakzeptabel und widerspricht unseren Werten, und wir sehen keine Abkehr, und wir sehen auch kein Schuldbewusstsein. Also sind alle unsere Aufrufe, die Sie auch hier getätigt haben, einfach nicht zureichend.

Größere Sorge macht mir aber die Lage in den serbischen Medien. Sie sind offen prorussisch und bejubeln die ukrainischen Niederlagen. Wie soll in einem solchen Umfeld eine Zustimmung zur EU gedeihen? Ich sehe das nicht.

Das führt mich zum zweiten Punkt. Wir müssen die Bürgerinnen und Bürger ansprechen und für Europa begeistern. Sie müssen den Mehrwert der EU konkret erfahren. Sie haben Gott sei Dank konkrete Projekte im Energiebereich genannt. Wir brauchen Investitionen in diese Region, wir brauchen gute Arbeitsplätze. Also insofern – das fehlt in Ihrem Bericht, und ich glaube, nur so können wir wirklich vorankommen.

Bei der zukünftigen Erweiterung, lieber Herr Picula, müssen wir genauer hinschauen und uns mehr engagieren. Davon bin ich fest überzeugt.

Liudas Mažylis (PPE). – Gerbiama Pirmininke, Komisijos nary, kolegos. Seniai, vos ne nuo didžiosios 2004-ųjų metų plėtros, kalbama apie plėtros nuovargį. Dabar jau aš konstatuočiau nuovargį nuo „neplėtros“. Jau turbūt išnaudotas visas išradingų siunčiamų signalų arsenalas Europos užribyje paliktoms valstybėms, kad jūs „artėjate“, bet „dar pabūkit“ kandidatės statuse. Pasaulio kantrybė nėra beribė, o tada mes stebimės, kodėl pasaulis darosi euroskeptiškas, gravituoja link tokių pavojingų žaidėjų kaip Rusija ar Kinija. Kandidačių statuso suteikimas Ukrainai ir Moldovai buvo teigiamas žingsnis, aiškesnę perspektyvą reikia nurodyti Sakartvelui, o svarbiausia, trūksta tempo, suteikiant joms prieigą prie vieningos rinkos, neapsiribojant politine, bet teikiant veiksmingą finansinę paramą, taikant IPA instrumentą, siūlant ekonomikos ir investicijų planus, pagrįstus skaitmeniniu ir tvariu perėjimu, inovacijomis. Rusijos vykdomas agresyvus karas Ukrainoje nėra argumentas atidėlioti plėtros procesą, o priešingai, verčia plėtros politiką atnaujinti, padaryti lankstesne ir dinamiškesne.

Sunčana Glavak (PPE). – Poštovana predsjedavajuća, kolegice i kolege, politika proširenja najvažniji je test vjerodostojnosti Europske unije i naših vrijednosti. Dok taj proces ima neopisivu važnost i dodanu vrijednost za države koje su u postupku pristupanja Europskoj uniji, istodobno se na razini Unije pojedine države članice, nažalost, ponašaju kao da je to nekakav, za europske interese nebitan i sporedan proces koji bi bilo najbolje zaboraviti.

Naša promišljanja oko toga treba li s državama pokrenuti pregovore o pristupanju otvorila su put snaženju utjecaja drugih globalnih i regionalnih aktera, od kojih neki imaju otvorena protueuropska stajališta.

Izvješće uspješno identificira ključne probleme pristupnog procesa, transformativnu ulogu, transparentnost i dosljednost. Međutim, pogledajmo zapadni Balkan, što se događalo primjerice u Sjevernoj Makedoniji i Albaniji, pogledajmo što se događa s Kosovom. Vlada Srbije mora se uskladiti prije svega s vanjskopolitičkim stajalištima Europske unije i mislim da to jasno još jednom moramo podcrtati. Hitno trebamo osvijestiti da je za države članice, odnosno koje žele postati članice, Europska unija i dalje atraktivna zajednica.

Kolegice i kolege, svjesni smo činjenice krhkosti mira i geopolitičkih previranja, stoga pozdravljam napore koji se čine, a nadu daju pomaci u Bosni i Hercegovini koja svoj put mora europski, naravno, nastaviti nakon izbora. Proces proširenja mora dobiti novi zamah koji će mu vratiti integritet!

Catch-the-eye procedure

Tomislav Sokol (PPE). – Poštovana predsjedavajuća, proces proširenja Europske unije je u zastoju poradi izostanka političke volje pojedinih država članica EU-a. Glavni razlog tome što su neke zemlje kandidati, poput Srbije, u europskom smislu napravile nekoliko velikih koraka unatrag.

Ponovne napetosti između Srbije i Kosova, srpsko neusklađivanje sa sankcijama Unije protiv Rusije, masovna propuštanja migranata prema EU-u ukazuju na to da je Srbija glavni faktor nestabilnosti na području jugoistočne Europe. Zbog toga Unija mora jače iskoristiti vlastite gospodarske i političke instrumente kako bi sankcionirala Srbiju ukoliko se ona nastavi ponašati suprotno europskim vrijednostima.

Povezan s time je primjer Crne Gore koja je destabilizirana od strane onih političkih snaga koje je žele vratiti pod okrilje Srbije i Rusije. Tome se moramo snažno suprotstaviti, zadržati Crnu Goru u zapadnoj sferi utjecaja, što je trenutno u velikoj opasnosti.

Zaključno, pozdravljamo odluku visokog predstavnika za Bosnu i Hercegovinu gospodina Schmidta kojom je spriječio izbacivanje legitimnih predstavnika hrvatskog naroda iz izvršne vlasti. Nadam se da će se nakon formiranja nove vlasti pristupiti završnom dijelu izborne reforme kako bi se onemogućila uzurpacija hrvatskog mjesta u predsjedništvu BiH od strane ekstremističkih bošnjačkih političara, što je trenutno slučaj.

Ladislav Ilčić (ECR). – Poštovana predsjedavajuća, poštovani kolege, izrazito cijenim napore kolege Picule u ovom važnom pitanju i svakako podržavam proširenje Europske unije.

No, ne slažem se s predloženom reformom koja bi omogućila da se odluke o proširenju donose kvalificiranom većinom, a ne konsenzusom, jer bi na taj način neki od hrvatskih susjeda, poput recimo Srbije, mogli ući u Europsku uniju bez da se Hrvatska složi s tim, a na taj bi način ostala otvorena brojna pitanja koja Hrvatska ima sa svojim susjedima i koja bi dugoročno opterećivala i Hrvatsku, a time i Europsku uniju.

Druga stvar, jasno je da kao zastupnik Hrvatske, dakle zemlje koja je posljednja ušla u Uniju, smatram da je proširenje Europske unije uspjeh za Europsku uniju, no mislim da nije dobro previše poistovjećivati uspješnost Europske unije s proširenjem jer ako je to najuspješnija europska politika, što će se dogoditi kada se Europska unija proširi do kraja? Kada dođemo do granica Europe, onda će nastati kolaps.

Dakle, smatram da uspješnost Europske unije treba tražiti unutar same Europske unije, jačajući supsidijarnost, pravu demokratičnost, pluralnost i realan pristup politici.

(End of catch-the-eye procedure)

Olivér Várhelyi, *Member of the Commission*. – Madam President, honourable Members, dear Mr Picula, I just want to remind all of us that this Commission was the Commission who put back enlargement on the table. The beginning of the mandate of this Commission, we have adopted a revised enlargement methodology which makes the enlargement process more credible, more transparent and more dynamic, and ensures a better political steer over it.

We have put a much stronger focus on the fundamental reforms – as this has become the core issue of the whole enlargement process – as the key goal of the transformation power of the enlargement. We have made it possible to move faster for candidate countries if they deliver faster, for example by the introduction of the cluster system. We have made it possible to integrate our candidate partners into EU policies even before accession.

The last months have demonstrated that the EU enlargement policy is living a new momentum. So I don't think we need new procedures, but we need political will, both from the EU and from the candidate countries. Enlargement is a geopolitical priority for us and for our allies, therefore. The idea of joining the EU is interlinked with a need for reform, freedom, security and stability. We have seen with the new applicants it is our responsibility to live up to these expectations to further strengthen the enlargement policy based on strict but fair conditionality, and the principle of own merits will have to continue.

Tonino Picula, *rapporteur*. – Madam President, Mr Commissioner, thank you all once again all of you for your remarks and contributions. I want to thank first of all the shadow rapporteurs for our excellent cooperation throughout the process. Of course, thank you all colleagues who took part in the debate with ideas, contributions, hopes and in some cases scepticism.

As my introductory remarks were mostly focused on what the EU should do to accelerate the enlargement process, now I wish to focus more on the countries aspiring to become members. The success of the enlargement process also depends on them, as you said Mr Commissioner, it's true. It is a twofold process and a partnership.

Excluding Ukraine, which is fighting for its freedom, we see persistent political crises these days, tensions between the countries, and foreign interference.

However, we need good news and positive examples of development and cooperation. We need to see that you follow our principles and values in practice. Moreover, we need to see political consensus in your countries on the EU accession that would be above internal political differences.

A European future is what your citizens support and deserve. Europe is where you belong.

President. – Thank you for your report, Mr Picula.

That concludes the debate. The vote will be held tomorrow.

Written statements (Rule 171)

Urmas Paet (Renew), *kirjalikult*. – Unarusse jäänud laienemispoliitika vajab uut tõuget, sest see on tõhus geopoliitiline relv Euroopa rahu ja julgeolekut üha tõsisemalt ohustava Venemaa vastu. Oma usaldusväärsuse taastamiseks peab EL reformima otsustusprotsesse ja loobuma uute liikmete vastuvõtmisel ühehäälsuse nõudest. Samuti peavad liikmesriigid täitma Lääne-Balkani ja idapartnerlusriikide ees võetud kohustused ning mitte pakkuma kandidaatriikidele täieõigusliku ELi liikmesuse asemel alternatiivlahendusi. EL peab pöörama rohkem tähelepanu sellele, et kandidaatriikide elanikel oleks parem ülevaade liidu toetusest ja selle abil saavutatud tulemustest. Samuti tuleb teha rohkem, et hoida ära kolmandate osapoolte sekkumist kandidaatriikide poliitilistesse, demokraatlikesse ja valimisprotsessidesse. Veel peaks EL karistama – ja kiiresti – riike, kus ühinemiseks vajalikud reformid on seiskunud või tagasi pööratud, ning premeerima kestlikke edusamme teinud kandidaatriike, näiteks tagades neile kiirendatud pääsu ühtsele turule.

24. Lage in Libyen (Aussprache)

President. – The next item is the debate on the report by Giuliano Pisapia, on behalf of the Committee on Foreign Affairs, on a European Parliament recommendation to the Council, the Commission and the Vice-President of the Commission / High Representative of the Union for Foreign Affairs and Security Policy on the situation in Libya (2021/2064(INI)) (A9-0252/2022).

Giuliano Pisapia, *Relatore*. – Signora Presidente, Signor Commissario, onorevoli colleghi, la raccomandazione sulla Libia è frutto di un lavoro intenso di mesi. Ringrazio da subito i nostri interlocutori delle istituzioni e della società civile per i proficui scambi di opinione, un grazie particolare ai relatori ombra per la collaborazione e per il contributo.

La situazione della Libia è sempre più drammatica e il rinvio delle elezioni ha infranto le speranze di pace e democrazia del popolo libico. La Libia è diventata una polveriera dove nuovi attori si aggiungono ai vecchi, senza fare passi in avanti sui temi della democrazia, della giustizia e della riconciliazione nazionale a cui i libici aspirano da anni, se non da decenni.

Negli ultimi decenni sono molti i soggetti che hanno bloccato il processo di democrazia e sviluppo della Libia. L'Unione europea può e deve diventare protagonista di pace anche in Libia, dopo un periodo, diciamolo con coraggio e con verità, di silenzio spesso assordante. Anche per questo è necessario che l'Unione europea nomini al più presto un rappresentante speciale per la Libia che supporti il lavoro di mediazione avviato dal nuovo rappresentante speciale dell'ONU.

Serve la nostra assistenza tecnica per una nuova tabella di marcia che porti finalmente ad elezioni credibili, inclusive e democratiche. Per contribuire al processo elettorale, nella raccomandazione si propone l'invio di una missione elettorale dell'Unione europea e tutto il necessario supporto tecnico.

Dobbiamo aiutare con la forza della ragione, ma non solo con la forza della ragione, le autorità libiche e porre fine alla violenta repressione delle organizzazioni della società civile e alla situazione vergognosa dei campi di detenzione. Ben venga quindi l'utilizzo dei fondi UE per sostenere, tra gli altri, il rafforzamento dello Stato di diritto, l'eguaglianza di genere, l'inclusione sociale, le comunità locali.

Le milizie locali e straniere si arricchiscono sulla pelle dei migranti e dei richiedenti asilo. Le violazioni dei diritti sono sistemiche e l'impunità regna sovrana. Anche per questo serve un'autorità centrale che si assuma la responsabilità di garantire i diritti, e i doveri, di tutti. Una Libia stabile e prospera potrebbe contribuire significativamente ad abbattere la disoccupazione regionale e a evitare che tantissime persone siano vittime di trafficanti di esseri umani.

Nella raccomandazione vi sono punti, temi molto importanti che non possiamo dimenticare: i diritti delle donne e dei minori, la tragedia degli sfollati, le minoranze religiose ed etniche, il contrasto alla violenza sessuale di genere, il problema gravissimo delle mine, la proliferazione delle armi, l'abolizione della pena di morte.

Credo che abbiamo fatto un buon lavoro. Il mio auspicio, quindi, è che le raccomandazioni che voteremo domani non rimangano solo sulla carta, ma siano attuate e non ignorate, come purtroppo è avvenuto in passato.

Abbiamo bisogno che tutte e, ripeto, tutte le istituzioni europee si impegnino a dare il proprio contributo affinché la Libia abbia maggiore attenzione nelle nostre agende, nei nostri pensieri, nel nostro impegno. Lo dobbiamo al popolo libico e al suo desiderio di pace.

Olivér Várhelyi, *Member of the Commission*. – Madam President, honourable Members, first, I would like to thank the rapporteur, Giuliano Pisapia, and those who have contributed to this report.

We very much agree with your recommendations. Active and positive engagement in and with Libya and stepping up work towards a comprehensive political solution that addresses all challenges on the ground is crucial.

After the hope and the progress we saw thanks to the Berlin Process in 2021, Libya is again in a dangerous political stalemate. There is a large consensus that the only sustainable way forward is to encourage a consensual and inclusive solution, Libyan-led and Libyan-owned. This is in the best interests of the Libyan people, who deserve a stable, peaceful and prosperous country.

The new UN Special Representative for Libya took up his duties in Tripoli. We sincerely hope that this will create a new positive dynamic for all Libyan actors to work together. Now that the mandate of the UN support mission has been extended for one year, Mr Bathily can focus on establishing a strategy to resume a political framework for negotiations, which has been missing for too long. He will require our strong joint support to build a meaningful and coherent umbrella for the political process.

As the European Union, along with the other international partners, which are particularly active in Libya, we can make a difference by proactively supporting the mediation efforts, and we intend to do so. We must encourage the different Libyan actors from all sides to enhance dialogue and reach consensus. The call for foreign forces to withdraw from Libya must also be translated into practice.

I would also like to stress that your report sends a strong message of support to the Libyan people – the approximately 3 million Libyans who had registered to vote last year. As you know, the European Union had considered sending an election observation mission for parliamentary and presidential elections. This offer still holds, although we do not feel encouraged by the fact that there is no indication of a possible agreement on elections anytime soon, unfortunately. We must therefore support the work of the UN Special Representative and Libyan stakeholders to build a new, shared roadmap towards elections.

As you know, efforts to contribute to stability and prosperity in Libya have always been high on the EU's agenda. Libya is on the agenda of the Foreign Affairs Council regularly, and the EU's joint priorities for Libya are set and clear. The EU delegation was among the first to return to Tripoli last year, and since then the head of our delegation and team have been working relentlessly on the ground. Our engagement is not only political. It is also related to economic development and humanitarian assistance, complemented by our common security and defence policy missions, namely Operation IRINI and the European Union Border Assistance Mission. The Libyans must own the process towards a durable political solution. We will continue standing by them in the team Europe spirit to help them achieve this objective.

Thank you very much for your attention.

Anna-Michelle Asimakopoulou, *εξ ονόματος της ομάδας PPE*. – Κυρία Πρόεδρε, με φόντο το διπλωματικό επεισόδιο την περασμένη εβδομάδα, όπου η Υπουργός Εξωτερικών της υπηρεσιακής κυβέρνησης της Λιβύης προσπάθησε με την παρουσία της στο αεροδρόμιο να επιβάλει στον Έλληνα συνομόλογό της να συναντηθεί μαζί του, καλωσορίζω την παρούσα έκθεση, η οποία αναφέρει ξεκάθαρα ότι το τουρκολιβυκό μνημόνιο του 2019 για την οριοθέτηση των θαλάσσιων περιοχών στη Μεσόγειο παραβιάζει τα κυριαρχικά δικαιώματα της Ελλάδας και της Κύπρου, δεν συμμορφώνεται με το Δίκαιο της Θάλασσας και δεν έχει νομικές συνέπειες για τρίτα κράτη. Η έκθεση, μάλιστα, ορθώς παροτρύνει τις λιβυκές αρχές να προβούν στην ακύρωση του τουρκολιβυκό μνημονίου και να μην εφαρμόσουν καμία ρήτρα της συμφωνίας για τους υδρογονάνθρακες.

Η Ελλάδα, αγαπητοί συνάδελφοι, είναι ένας πόλος σταθερότητας και ασφάλειας στη Μεσόγειο και σέβεται το διεθνές δίκαιο. Η υπηρεσιακή κυβέρνηση της Λιβύης όχι μόνο δεν κάνει εκλογές, αλλά υφαρπάζει την παραμονή της, εκμεταλλευόμενη κατά το δοκούν τους πόρους της χώρας και υπογράφει και με τους Τούρκους. Οπότε, όπως είπε εύγλωττα ο Υπουργός Εξωτερικών της Ελλάδας, Νίκος Δένδιας: «ε, δεν γίνεται».

Margarida Marques, *em nome do Grupo S&D*. – Senhora Presidente, a Líbia é hoje um país profundamente dividido, com enorme instabilidade política, social e económica. É um país debaixo de uma enorme pressão de cidadãos que tentam chegar à Europa. Mas a Líbia é também um ator fundamental no Mediterrâneo, pela sua dimensão, posição geográfica, pelos seus ativos.

O relatório de iniciativa do meu Colega Giuliano Pisapia é, por isso, de uma total pertinência e oportunidade. Temos trabalhado, com o apoio das Nações Unidas, para que as autoridades líbias levem a cabo um verdadeiro processo de reconciliação nacional que permita a estabilidade e a segurança. Mas não podemos parar a ajuda humanitária. A situação dos migrantes e refugiados, detidos arbitrariamente na Líbia, choca-nos, em nome da dignidade e respeito pelos direitos humanos.

No orçamento para 2023 conseguimos um reforço de 70 milhões de euros para a parceria Sul e a mobilidade na região é uma prioridade. Novas medidas foram anunciadas pela Comissão Europeia: a reforma do sistema de asilo e proteção na União Europeia. Estas medidas, a irem no bom sentido, contribuirão seguramente para a estabilização do processo político na região e no país.

Γεώργιος Κύρτσος, *εξ ονόματος της ομάδας Renew*. – Κυρία Πρόεδρε, στη Λιβύη έχουμε μια στρατηγική αποτυχία της Ευρωπαϊκής Ένωσης. Συμβάλαμε στην πτώση του Καντάφι χωρίς να ασχοληθούμε σοβαρά με την επόμενη ημέρα. Το αποτέλεσμα είναι πολύ αρνητικό και επικίνδυνο. Προτείνω δύο βήματα προς τη σωστή κατεύθυνση, χωρίς φυσικά να αποτελούν συνολική λύση.

Πρώτον, να ασκήσουμε πίεση στην Τουρκία για να σταματήσει να εξοπλίζει την κυβέρνηση της Τρίπολης και να αποσύρει μισθοφόρους και drones από τη Λιβύη. Διαφορετικά, δεν πρόκειται να υπάρξει ειρήνευση. Δεύτερον, να δοθεί ρόλος στην Ελλάδα στη διαδικασία αναζήτησης λύσης για τη Λιβύη. Είναι μία παράλειψη της καγκελαρίου Merkel. Ήταν τότε η Διαδικασία του Βερολίνου που πρέπει να καλυφθεί και γιατί αμφισβητούνται κυριαρχικά δικαιώματα της Ελλάδας μέσω της συνεργασίας Τρίπολης και Άγκυρας. Ξέρω ότι αυτά που ζητάω δεν είναι εύκολα, τα θεωρώ όμως αναγκαία.

Mounir Satouri, *au nom du groupe Verts/ALE*. – Madame la Présidente, chers collègues, je m'exprime ce soir au nom de mon collègue Alfonsi, qui s'excuse de ne pas être parmi vous.

Je salue le rapport de notre collègue Pisapia, car il prend des positions fortes et utiles sur la situation en Libye: tout d'abord sur l'absence de gouvernement unifié, légitime et démocratique qui puisse bénéficier d'une reconnaissance internationale, mais aussi sur la crise profonde du droit humain, notamment concernant les migrants. Nous appelons à cesser toute collaboration avec les parties prenantes libyennes sur lesquelles pèsent des soupçons de violations graves des droits humains et de trafic des êtres humains. Nous dénonçons également les interventions extérieures incessantes qui entravent la recherche d'une solution politique démocratique et durable et les discriminations contre les femmes dans les processus de réconciliation.

Même si mon groupe soutiendra ce rapport, je tiens à dénoncer ici le soutien implicite aux garde-côtes libyens et l'externalisation du contrôle de nos frontières. Ces politiques sont mises en place sans aucun respect des droits humains en Libye. Elles déshonorent notre Europe.

Enfin, permettez-moi de saluer les avancées en France après dix ans d'information judiciaire du procès pour complicité de torture contre les dirigeants d'une entreprise, Amesys, ayant livré des outils de surveillance qui ont servi à traquer, à torturer. Nous devons nous aussi en Europe traduire en justice celles et ceux qui bafouent les droits des Libyens.

Susanna Ceccardi, *a nome del gruppo ID*. – Signora Presidente, onorevoli colleghi, oggi parliamo di una relazione importantissima, perché la questione libica è una bomba a orologeria geopolitica, energetica e migratoria.

Purtroppo a innescare quella bomba che ci esplode ora tra le mani sono state le stesse potenze europee che hanno abbattuto e rovesciato la dittatura di Gheddafi, senza avere però un piano su come ricostruire la Libia dopo. A distanza di molti anni nessun attore internazionale ha ancora un'idea di come risolvere il problema libico e la comunità internazionale si accontenta, sulla pelle dei libici, di aver cristallizzato una guerra civile.

La Libia è esattamente al confine meridionale dell'Europa e della NATO. Mentre l'Europa è giustamente impegnata a difendere il fronte nord-orientale, stiamo tralasciando il fronte sul Mediterraneo. Le potenze straniere come Russia e Turchia stanno prendendo il controllo della Libia e purtroppo anche qui l'Europa arriva per ultima a capire e risolvere questioni che geopoliticamente sono strategiche per il nostro continente.

Abbiamo già visto in altri contesti come l'immigrazione sia usata come arma di ricatto. Vogliamo permettere che il principale porto di partenza dell'immigrazione illegale verso l'Europa sia controllato da altri? Noi più di chiunque altro avremmo bisogno di proteggere il versante meridionale del nostro continente.

Parlare di Libia in quest'Aula significa parlare di temi come stabilità politica, il ruolo degli idrocarburi e l'immediato stop ai flussi migratori. L'Italia non può sobbarcarsi da sola l'impegno di fermare l'immigrazione clandestina verso l'Europa, come stanno già facendo i ministri Piantedosi e Salvini, servono centri di identificazione in Libia gestiti da organizzazioni internazionali e serve finanziare Frontex affinché combatta i trafficanti di esseri umani.

Rivendichiamo un ruolo da protagonisti nel Mediterraneo. Fermare i trafficanti sulle spiagge non mette in pericolo nessuno, se non il business dei trafficanti stessi e dei loro protettori a tutti i livelli.

Forse è arrivato il momento che tutta la comunità internazionale, anche l'Europa in primis, vada una buona volta in Libia a sistemare il pasticcio che ha combinato.

Anna Fotyga, *on behalf of the ECR Group*. – Madam President, Commissioner, Colleagues, the world is better without dictators. Yet, 11 years after the Arab Spring and fall of Muammar Gaddafi, we have to step up our efforts in order to help Libyans bring stability and peace to the country. We have to support, with all our might, the efforts of the UN Special Representative, who is already in Tbilisi, and also support the acceleration process of coming to presidential and parliamentary elections, as well as a referendum that is to adopt the constitution and thus abandoning the constitutional covenant still in and in power. We also have to use necessary financial resources supporting Operation IRINI and the EU Border Control Mission.

Özlem Demirel, *im Namen der Fraktion The Left*. – Frau Präsidentin! „Europa ist ein Garten, umzingelt von einem Dschungel", sagte Herr Borrell kürzlich in einer Rede.

Er meinte damit, die EU wäre ein Garten, der geschützt werden muss vor den Wilden des Dschungels. Doch mit Waffenexporten, Knebel- und Handelsverträgen plündern Herrschende des Gartens hier seit Jahrzehnten die Raubtiere, die Schätze des afrikanischen Kontinents. In alter und neuer Kolonialmanier nehmen sie den Menschen in Afrika die Luft zum Atmen, die Meere zum Fischen, das Brot zum Essen weg. Sie schaffen permanente Fluchtursachen.

Es waren die NATO-Bomben, die Libyen zu einem Brandherd des Bürgerkrieges gemacht haben. Es sind EU-Gelder, mit denen die brutale libysche Küstenwache aufgebaut wurde, die illegale Pushbacks organisiert und brutale Menschenrechtsverletzungen verantwortet. Genannt wird das ganze „Externalisierung der Grenzen".

In unzähligen Anfragen habe ich feststellen müssen, dass die EU Afrika und Libyen zu einem Testfeld neuer Abschottungstechnologie gemacht hat – eine Politik, die die EU eben nicht so rein und schön dastehen lässt, wie Herr Borrell behauptet, sondern verkommen und wild. Solange sich diese politische Ökonomie nicht ändert, bleibt also die Frage im Raum, wo die wahren Raubtiere sitzen.

Andrea Cozzolino (S&D). – Signora Presidente, onorevoli colleghi, in Libia noi europei paghiamo serissimi errori e nostre profonde divisioni.

Altri nel frattempo hanno occupato uno spazio lasciato vuoto: Turchia, Russia, Egitto, paesi del Golfo. Il rischio che corriamo come istituzioni europee, Commissione, Stati membri, Parlamento, è la nostra fondamentale irrilevanza. Per recuperare un nostro ruolo occorrono credibilità, unità e determinazione dell'Unione europea, come ci indica la relazione di Pisapia, sottoposta alla nostra discussione e al confronto.

Occorre lavorare politicamente per una nuova Berlino, per assicurare un futuro libero e unitario alla Libia, unitario, che tenga unita la Libia, garantire un processo democratico per eleggere un nuovo Parlamento e un nuovo esecutivo, liberare il territorio dalla presenza di troppe armi ed eserciti privati stranieri, chiedere di chiudere gli indegni centri di detenzione e liberare gli immigrati, privati di qualsiasi diritto di cittadinanza, assicurare, insieme a tutto questo, un programma economico, sociale e infrastrutturale di ricostruzione della Libia. È questo il compito che dobbiamo svolgere adesso.

Barry Andrews (Renew). – Madam President, Commissioner, colleagues, the previous EU policy on search and rescue attracted criticism for incentivising human trafficking. Unfortunately, the current EU policy on search and rescue promotes torture in captivity. One injustice has replaced another, and the stories that are emerging from reception centres in Libya are truly chilling – so much so that the United Nations fact-finding mission has concluded that these stories are so widespread and so compelling as to be suggestive of crimes against humanity. And this is a phrase, of course, that is not used lightly.

As regards search and rescue, sometimes, in my view, the intrinsic rightness of something is impossible to ignore. It's impossible to consider the secondary consequences. And I would have thought, uncontroversially, that rescuing somebody from the sea is intrinsically the right thing to do. So I would urge the European Union to restore search and rescue. I would urge the European Union to legislate for the Migration and Asylum Pact, and I would urge the European Union to cooperate with NGOs.

Rosa D'Amato (Verts/ALE). – Signora Presidente, onorevoli colleghi, io devo ringraziare il collega Pisapia e i colleghi che hanno lavorato a questo documento, perché per negoziare raccomandazioni efficaci, malgrado i tentativi delle destre di inserire messaggi fuorvianti, di criminalizzare la solidarietà e quindi il lavoro in mare delle ONG spacciandole come un fattore di attrazione, c'è voluto un grande lavoro e un grande coraggio.

Con il voto di domani deve essere chiara qual è la nostra posizione. Le cosiddette guardie costiere libiche sono responsabili delle intercettazioni di imbarcazioni di migranti e rifugiati e della loro detenzione illegale. Si indaghi sulle atrocità e sui meccanismi di monitoraggio e responsabilità e poi dobbiamo smettere di finanziare e cooperare con chi in Libia è accusato di gravi violazioni e di coinvolgimento nella tratta degli esseri umani.

Jordan Bardella (ID). – Madame la Présidente, guerre civile ouverte, déferlement migratoire, trafic d'êtres humains, esclavage moderne. Depuis sa destruction en 2011, à la suite d'une désastreuse campagne militaire franco-otanienne, la Libye peine à se redresser et provoque des secousses dans toute la région et jusqu'à notre continent.

La géopolitique ayant horreur du vide, c'est la Turquie en tête qui, en Libye depuis plusieurs années, abat ses cartes l'une après l'autre. En 2019, profitant d'une partition politique et militaire du pays, elle a arraché un accord lui offrant des zones maritimes appartenant à deux pays membres de l'Union européenne, la Grèce et Chypre. Le 3 octobre dernier, Ankara récidivait en signant avec Tripoli un mémorandum lui attribuant des zones de forage illégales en Méditerranée orientale. En clair, Erdoğan et ses stratèges instrumentalisent le chaos libyen pour se constituer une zone d'influence et de puissance en Méditerranée orientale, au mépris du droit de la mer et du respect des traités internationaux.

Il est indispensable pour nos amis et alliés grecs et chypriotes et pour la stabilité régionale que de tels accords ne soient jamais entérinés et que leur dénonciation fasse partie des conditions de reconnaissance d'un futur régime légitime, indépendant et durable. La Libye n'est plus une province ottomane depuis plus d'un siècle. Il en va de la sécurité de l'Europe et de toute la Méditerranée qu'elle ne le redevienne pas.

Carlo Fidanza (ECR). – Signor Presidente, signor Commissario, onorevoli colleghi, la Libia deve essere stabilizzata, ne va della nostra sicurezza, ma, per arrivare a una stabilizzazione anche politica, l'Europa deve giocare un ruolo da protagonista, riparando al tragico errore del 2011.

Non possiamo più permetterci di avere sulla sponda sud del Mediterraneo un paese costantemente diviso, in cui governi deboli, condizionati da Turchia, Russia e altri attori regionali, lasciano il campo a milizie armate, non di rado infiltrate da jihadisti, che gestiscono i traffici illegali verso l'Europa, a partire da quelli migratori.

Certo, le condizioni dei centri di detenzione libici sono orribili e lì dobbiamo portare le organizzazioni internazionali, ma questo non può farci accettare che siano dei trafficanti di esseri umani, spesso con la benevola complicità delle ONG, a decidere chi può e chi non può entrare in Europa.

In Nord Africa dobbiamo portare investimenti in cambio di impegno concreto nel contrasto all'immigrazione illegale, con il pattugliamento delle coste, distruzione dei barconi degli scafisti e tutto quanto sarà necessario per porre fine a questo traffico vergognoso, che non fa altro che arricchire le organizzazioni criminali che stanno tenendo in scacco la Libia e tutti noi.

Pietro Bartolo (S&D). – Signora Presidente, onorevoli colleghi, Commissione, la conosco bene la situazione in Libia, e non per sentito dire, ma perché ho toccato con mano gli orrori di chi è arrivato a Lampedusa.

Di queste persone ho raccolto storie disperate, ho visto i segni di violenze inaudite. Corpi mutilati, scuoiati vivi addirittura, violentati, li ho visti con i miei occhi, li ho toccati, li ho curati, donne, uomini, bambini e bambine annientati, molti di loro senza vita. In Libia la vita delle persone, soprattutto quelle di colore, vale meno di zero.

Con questa risoluzione chiediamo al Consiglio e alla Commissione di prendere impegni concreti a salvaguardia dei diritti umani, di garantire attività di ricerca e soccorso lungo la rotta del Mediterraneo centrale. Chiediamo di bloccare le detenzioni arbitrarie e salvaguardare i diritti dei migranti, parliamo di persone. La Convenzione di Ginevra deve essere firmata e ratificata subito.

L'Unione c'è se ci sono i diritti. Memorandum come quello rinnovato dall'Italia non hanno motivo di esistere e di conseguenza non possono essere ammessi. Nessuna impunità per chi non rispetta i diritti umani.

Bernhard Zimniok (ID). – Frau Präsidentin! Illegale Migration zu legalisieren, wie hier für Libyen gefordert, ist keinesfalls eine Lösung – im Gegenteil wird das Migrationsproblem nur weiter verschärft.

Dabei gäbe es eine einfache Lösung, die ich kurz ausführen möchte. Erstens: die private Seenotrettung, diesen verlängerten Arm der Schlepper, schlicht verbieten. Zweitens: temporär eine staatliche Seenotrettung etablieren, die jeden Migranten an den Ursprungsort zurückbringt. Drittens: von dort aus sichere Rückführung in die Heimatländer. Viertens: zusätzlich massiv Kampagnen in den Herkunftsländern schalten, um zu zeigen, dass sich die Reise nicht lohnt. Fünftens: Zentren vor Ort einrichten, in denen regulär Asyl beantragt werden kann.

Die Vorteile sind offensichtlich: Die Todeszahlen der Migranten sinken auf null, der Sozialstaat wird massiv entlastet, die Kriminalität sinkt, es gibt weniger Morde, Vergewaltigungen und Anschläge. Und Afrika wird endlich in die Pflicht genommen, sich mit dem selbst verschuldeten Problem des Bevölkerungswachstums auseinanderzusetzen.

Im Gegensatz zu Ihren Plänen wäre mein Vorschlag ein Gewinn, und zwar für alle Seiten.

Κώστας Μαυρίδης (S&D). – Κυρία Πρόεδρε, καταρχάς συγχαρητήρια στον εισηγητή για την έκθεση και στους συναδέλφους. Η διέξοδος από το συγκρουσιακό αδιέξοδο στη Λιβύη είναι μία: ελεύθερες και δίκαιες εκλογές. Δυστυχώς, όμως, η προσωρινή κυβέρνηση στην Τρίπολη, της οποίας η θητεία έληξε, αρνείται να συνεργαστεί και για αυτό θα συνεχίσουμε να βλέπουμε εγκλήματα, ατιμωρησία και ξένες παρεμβάσεις, ιδιαίτερα από Ρωσία και Τουρκία. Μάλιστα, όπως καταμαρτυρούν αρμόδιοι οργανισμοί της Ευρωπαϊκής Ένωσης που εμπλέκονται στην επιχείρηση IRINI για εφαρμογή του εμπάργκο όπλων στη Λιβύη, όπως αποφασίστηκε από τον ΟΗΕ, η Τουρκία περιφρονεί το εμπάργκο όπλων μέχρι και σήμερα.

Σε σχέση με το τουρκολιβυκό μνημόνιο για τη λεγόμενη οριοθέτηση των θαλάσσιων περιοχών στη Μεσόγειο Θάλασσα, η έκθεση αυτή είναι πολύ συγκεκριμένη: η συμφωνία αυτή παραβιάζει τα κυριαρχικά δικαιώματα τρίτων κρατών, ιδιαίτερα των ευρωπαϊκών κρατών Κύπρου και Ελλάδας, δεν συνάδει με το διεθνές δίκαιο, δεν έχει οποιεσδήποτε νομικές συνέπειες και για αυτό καλούμε την προσωρινή κυβέρνηση στη Λιβύη να ακυρώσει αυτό το μνημόνιο, γιατί δεν έχει καμία νομική αξία.

Olivér Várhelyi, *Member of the Commission*. – Madam President, honourable Members, the recommendations included in your report and our exchanges today are important to inspire further joint efforts by the EU and our main international partners to help the Libyans find a durable solution to the crisis.

We will take note of your recommendations as a very good basis to coordinate the international support to the efforts of UN Special Representative Bathily. This is essential for the Libyan people and overall important for northern Africa, the Sahel region and for Europe.

Giuliano Pisapia, *Relatore*. – Signora Presidente, onorevoli colleghi, signor Commissario, ringrazio per questo scambio di opinioni, che in ogni caso è interessante ed importante.

Mi sembra chiaro, e mi sembra che sia emerso anche dal dibattito, che non ci si debba occupare di Libia solo per fermare i flussi migratori a tutti i costi, anche ignorando il rispetto dei diritti umani e del diritto internazionale. La gestione dei flussi non implica che l'UE e gli Stati membri non debbano mantenere i loro obblighi internazionali, tra cui l'accoglienza dei rifugiati e la valutazione delle richieste d'asilo.

Però non possiamo dimenticare chi sono i corresponsabili di questa situazione, è già stato detto e lo condivido. Questa raccomandazione va, per fortuna, oltre questo tema. Tenta di fare e cerca di fare un ragionamento di ampio respiro e di proporre proposte concrete volte a garantire stabilità a un paese che da troppo tempo vive in una situazione drammatica.

Sono convinto che il nostro obiettivo non potrà essere raggiunto se prima non supporteremo la mediazione ONU per il riavvio del processo di riconciliazione nazionale e poi con le elezioni democratiche.

Ecco, ci sono divisioni, opinioni diverse, ma chiedo ai colleghi di sostenere la raccomandazione nel voto di domani e chiedo al Consiglio e alla Commissione di impegnarsi maggiormente, anche se molto stanno facendo, sui temi di cui abbiamo parlato.

President. – The debate is closed.

The vote will be held tomorrow.

25. Erklärungen zur Abstimmung

(no oral explanations of vote were delivered in the Chamber)

26. Tagesordnung der nächsten Sitzung

President. – The next sitting will start tomorrow at 9.00.

The agenda has been published and is available on the European Parliament's website.

27. Genehmigung des Protokolls der laufenden Sitzung

President. – The minutes of this sitting will be submitted to Parliament for approval tomorrow after the vote.

28. Schluss der Sitzung

(The sitting closed at 22.03)

Mittwoch, 23. November 2022

AUSFÜHRLICHE SITZUNGSBERICHTE VOM 23. NOVEMBER 2022

(2023/C 240/03)

Inhalt Seite

1. Eröffnung der Sitzung . . . 201

2. Notwendigkeit einer europäischen Lösung für Asyl und Migration einschließlich Suche und Rettung (Aussprache) . . . 201

3. Wiederaufnahme der Sitzung . . . 235

4. Abstimmungsstunde . . . 235

4.1. Entwurf des Berichtigungshaushaltsplans Nr. 5 zum Gesamthaushaltsplan 2022 — Zusätzliche Maßnahmen zur Bewältigung der Folgen des Kriegs Russlands gegen die Ukraine – Aufstockung des Katastrophenschutzverfahrens der Union – Kürzung der Mittel für Zahlungen und Aktualisierung der Einnahmen – Sonstige Anpassungen und technische Aktualisierungen (A9-0280/2022 - Karlo Ressler, Damian Boeselager) (Abstimmung) . . . 235

4.2. Haushaltsverfahren 2023 — gemeinsamer Entwurf (A9-0278/2022 - Nicolae Ștefănuță, Niclas Herbst) (Abstimmung) . . . 235

4.3. Eigenmittelsystem der Europäischen Union (A9-0266/2022 - Valérie Hayer, José Manuel Fernandes) (Abstimmung) . . . 235

4.4. Einstufung der Russischen Föderation als dem Terrorismus Vorschub leistender Staat (RC-B9-0482/2022, B9-0482/2022, B9-0483/2022, B9-0485/2022, B9-0486/2022, B9-0487/2022) (Abstimmung) . . . 236

4.5. Neue Strategie der EU für die Erweiterung (Artikel 118 GO) (A9-0251/2022 - Tonino Picula) (Abstimmung) . . . 236

4.6. Lage in Libyen (Artikel 118 GO) (A9-0252/2022 - Giuliano Pisapia) (Abstimmung) . . . 236

4.7. Förderung von regionaler Stabilität und Sicherheit in den Ländern des Nahen und Mittleren Ostens (A9-0256/2022 - Manu Pineda) (Abstimmung) . . . 236

4.8. Vorbeugung von, Umgang mit und bessere Versorgung bei Diabetes in der EU anlässlich des Weltdiabetestags (B9-0492/2022) (Abstimmung) . . . 236

5. Wiederaufnahme der Sitzung . . . 236

6. Genehmigung des Protokolls der vorangegangenen Sitzung . . . 236

7. Ein wirklich verflochtener Energiebinnenmarkt, damit die Preise niedrig und die Unternehmen wettbewerbsfähig bleiben (Aussprache über ein aktuelles Thema) . . . 236

8. Beseitigung der Gewalt gegen Frauen (Aussprache) . . . 253

9. Änderung der Verordnung (EU, Euratom) 2020/2093 des Rates vom 17. Dezember 2020 zur Festlegung des mehrjährigen Finanzrahmens für den Zeitraum von 2021 bis 2027 — Änderung der Verordnung (EU, Euratom) 2018/1046 im Hinblick auf die Festlegung einer diversifizierten Finanzierungsstrategie als allgemeine Methode für die Mittelaufnahme - Instrument zur Unterstützung der Ukraine im Jahr 2023 (Makrofinanzhilfe+) (Aussprache) . . . 271

10. Ein Rahmen für die biologische Vielfalt für die Zeit nach 2020 und die COP 15 des VN-Übereinkommens über die biologische Vielfalt (Aussprache) . . . 283

11. Rechtlicher Schutz für Regenbogenfamilien, die ihr Recht auf Freizügigkeit ausüben, insbesondere der Fall von Baby Sara (Aussprache) . . . 292

12. Künftige europäische Finanzarchitektur zur Förderung der Entwicklung (Aussprache) . . . 299

Mittwoch, 23. November 2022

Inhalt Seite

13. Zusammensetzung des Parlaments . . . 307

14. Zusammensetzung der Ausschüsse und Delegationen . . . 307

15. Die Menschenrechtslage in Ägypten (Aussprache) . . . 307

16. Aussprache über Fälle von Verletzungen der Menschenrechte, der Demokratie und der Rechtsstaatlichkeit (Aussprache) . . . 312

16.1. Die Menschenrechtslage in Afghanistan, insbesondere mit Blick auf die Verschlechterung der Frauenrechte und die Anschläge auf Bildungseinrichtungen . . . 312

16.2. Die anhaltende Unterdrückung der demokratischen Opposition und der Zivilgesellschaft in Belarus . . . 318

16.3. Vertreibung von Menschen infolge des eskalierenden Konflikts im Osten der Demokratischen Republik Kongo . . . 323

17. Schutz der Viehwirtschaft und der Großraubtiere in Europa (Aussprache) . . . 328

18. Erklärungen zur Abstimmung . . . 341

18.1. Eigenmittelsystem der Europäischen Union (A9-0266/2022 - Valérie Hayer, José Manuel Fernandes) . . . 341

18.2. Einstufung der Russischen Föderation als dem Terrorismus Vorschub leistender Staat (RC-B9-0482/2022, B9-0482/2022, B9-0483/2022, B9-0485/2022, B9-0486/2022, B9-0487/2022) . . . 341

18.3. Neue Strategie der EU für die Erweiterung (A9-0251/2022 - Tonino Picula) . . . 343

18.4. Lage in Libyen (A9-0252/2022 - Giuliano Pisapia) . . . 343

18.5. Förderung von regionaler Stabilität und Sicherheit in den Ländern des Nahen und Mittleren Ostens (A9-0256/2022 - Manu Pineda) . . . 344

18.6. Vorbeugung von, Umgang mit und bessere Versorgung bei Diabetes in der EU anlässlich des Weltdiabetestags (B9-0492/2022) . . . 344

19. Tagesordnung der nächsten Sitzung . . . 345

20. Genehmigung des Protokolls der laufenden Sitzung . . . 345

21. Schluss der Sitzung . . . 345

AUSFÜHRLICHE SITZUNGSBERICHTE VOM 23. NOVEMBER 2022

VORSITZ: OTHMAR KARAS

Vizepräsident

1. Eröffnung der Sitzung

(Die Sitzung wird um 9.02 Uhr eröffnet)

2. Notwendigkeit einer europäischen Lösung für Asyl und Migration einschließlich Suche und Rettung (Aussprache)

Der Präsident. – Als nächster Punkt der Tagesordnung folgt die Aussprache über die Erklärungen des Rates und der Kommission zur Notwendigkeit einer europäischen Lösung für Asyl und Migration einschließlich Suche und Rettung (2022/2950(RSP)) – ein Thema, das uns alle in allen Mitgliedstaaten bewegt, und ich darf die Vertreter der Kommission, Vizepräsident Schinas und Frau Kommissarin Johansson, und den Vertreter des Rates, Herrn Minister Bek, ganz herzlich in unserer Mitte willkommen heißen und darf Sie, Herr Minister, bitten, Ihre Ausführungen zu beginnen.

Mikuláš Bek, *President-in-Office of the Council.* – Mr President, honourable Members, Commissioners, dear Minister Roswall, first of all let me begin by stressing that any loss of life on the irregular migration routes to Europe is not acceptable. Recent developments in the central Mediterranean have brought this issue again to the forefront. Providing assistance to people in distress at sea is a humanitarian imperative and a duty of all states and shipmasters under international law. It is crucial that all actors respect applicable international and European rules and that the nearest safe port for disembarkation is provided without delay.

We are putting all our efforts in implementing the Solidarity Declaration agreed upon in June. This mechanism was designed precisely to relieve the pressure on the frontline Member States. While it has taken some time to get the mechanism up and running, we are confident that further progress can be made soon. It is also important to underline in this context that the increased number of arrivals, whether by sea, air or land, affect our reception and asylum systems and we need to address them jointly.

Reception and asylum systems in many Member States are already stretched to the maximum as a consequence of the almost 4 million persons that have fled Ukraine. Given the above and increasing migratory pressure on all EU Member States, the Presidency has decided to organise an extraordinary meeting of the home affairs ministers that will be held on 25 November. The ministers will discuss the situation along all migratory routes and a joint way forward.

We also look forward to the discussion on the Commission's action plan presented this week, which proposes concrete measures to be taken to accelerate the Union's collective work along the central Mediterranean route.

Besides the short-term, urgent actions which the ministers will discuss on Friday, we also need to continue focusing on a long-term solution providing a robust and well-functioning EU asylum and migration policy to be agreed and implemented by all Member States.

The Pact on Migration and Asylum is the European solution to these challenges. Therefore we need to continue our legislative work, which we have advanced under our Presidency. The agreement on the roadmap that was signed with the Parliament is an important step in this direction. It is a clear demonstration of the political willingness of both co-legislators to work on all asylum files with a view to their adoption at the latest by the end of the term of this Parliament. We look forward to starting negotiations with the European Parliament on the Eurodac and on the screening regulations, and to resuming work on other asylum files.

Discussions on the solidarity concept developed since the beginning of our Presidency will continue until the December Justice and Home Affairs Council and should then be quickly pursued in the form of legislative work on the Asylum and Migration Management Regulation and the Crisis Regulation.

We will also continue to support and work with all our partners in third countries of origin and departure to build their capacities to ensure prevention of irregular migration and disruption of smugglers' networks and overall work towards sustainable migration management in a safe and orderly manner, and in accordance with fundamental rights.

Thank you very much for your attention.

Margaritis Schinas, *Vice-President of the Commission*. – Mr President, honourable Members, in recent weeks, of course, the spotlight has been on the Central Mediterranean route, where over 90 000 migrants and refugees arrived only this year. These were departures mainly from Libya and Tunisia, and they were originating primarily from Egypt, Tunisia and Bangladesh. The increase on the Central Med route was over 50% compared to last year, and most of these arrivals reached the European Union after hazardous journeys, search and rescue operations at sea under difficult conditions.

At the same time, other routes such as the Turkey-Eastern Mediterranean route and the Western Mediterranean-Atlantic route also continue to face ongoing pressure – and in particular the Western Balkans route, which has seen a dramatic increase in numbers this year. Only yesterday, 500 people were rescued from a small fishing boat near Crete by the combined operation of a Greek navy frigate, coast guard ships of the Hellenic Coast Guard, a tanker, two cargo ships and two Italian fishing boats, all working together.

Honourable Members, all this shows that there will always be challenges and why our responses must not be *ad hoc*. We cannot continue working event by event, crisis by crisis, ship by ship. The time has now come for a sustainable, comprehensive, holistic European asylum and migration framework. Since two years ago, since September 2020, with my colleague, Commissioner Johansson, we have put on the table a comprehensive set of proposal that provides a response to these challenges: the EU Pact on Migration and Asylum.

It is ironic that we have everything we need at our fingertips, but just seemingly out of reach. It is like having a parachute but choosing to jump out of the plane without it. It is the Pact that will improve our Member States' ability to manage migration on a system based on EU law and the Community method – and if we have learned anything in recent years and this succession of crises, it is that flying solo is not an option. We now need a European agreement on the Pact.

This debate is therefore a great occasion to renew our call, on Parliament as well as on the Council, to advance on the roadmap towards the adoption of all the pending proposals of the Pact, starting most urgently with the Qualifications and Resettlement Framework Regulations and Reception Conditions Directive, where we already have political compromises as well as the screening and Eurodac proposals, where we already have Council mandates and where trilogues should now begin in earnest.

But in the meantime we cannot afford to wait to address the difficult situation at sea. Assistance to people in distress at sea is a legal obligation for EU Member States under international and EU law, regardless of how people ended in that situation. Everybody needs to work together on a common response, with saving lives being priority number one.

This Monday, we proposed an action plan with 20 specific actions to address the immediate challenges in the Central Mediterranean. First of all, we need to work with partner countries and international organisations who will never be able to sustain an EU migration policy in isolation. We will support Tunisia, Egypt and Libya to ensure better border management and migration management. We will boost the fight against migrant smuggling, step up our diplomatic engagement on returns and improve legal pathways to the EU. We will maximise the impact of all these actions by launching a Team Europe initiative before the end of this year. Other than working with partners, we also need a more coordinated approach on search and rescue, with stronger cooperation between our Member States and all actors involved.

Precisely in our Pact, we have put in place a European Contact Group on search and rescue. Let's use it. We have also asked Frontex to assess the situation and to see whether we need to devote more resources and assets at Community level, and we will keep working closely with the UNHCR and the IOM on potential regional approaches while at the same time promoting discussions with the International Maritime Organisation.

Last, but certainly not least in this chapter, we need to make full use of the voluntary solidarity mechanism that we agreed under the French Presidency. We agreed a solidarity declaration in June. That was a big success of our French friends, and thousands of relocation places are already available. Of course, this is a temporary mechanism, but it is also possible bridge to the future permanent system grounded on EU law that we want to see under the Pact.

Frankly, we do not need to reinvent the wheel here. We have the tools, Member States have to use them. The Commission will continue to fully support. Honourable Members, history does not repeat itself often, but it often rhymes. We have to learn the lessons of the past when it comes to migration. We have first to enact immediate operational and practical measures to address the situation along all migratory routes, and the Extraordinary Home Affairs Council on Friday will allow Member States to achieve fast results. However, it will not remove the need for long-term binding solutions.

We are in much stronger position now to cope with migration challenges than in 2015-2016. We have a strong European Border and Coast Guard and a fully-functioning asylum agency. We have resources, we have instruments and we have the political will, and we cannot wait any longer to equip ourselves with a future-proof migration framework.

This is not a debate about one ship, one route or one part of the sea. It is a debate about our ability as Europeans to manage migration in a spirit of trust and solidarity. We will inform the Ministers on Friday of the latest developments and we will give them the necessary tools for solutions and we will call on them, like we call on you today, to secure an agreement on the Pact. Action plans, emergency meetings and emergency debates are useful but not sufficient, when we have the permanent solutions. The solutions are here at our fingertips. We can do it and we shall do it.

Manfred Weber, *im Namen der PPE-Fraktion*. – Sehr geehrter Herr Präsident, sehr geehrter Herr Vizepräsident, Frau Kommissarin, liebe Ratsvertreter, liebe Kolleginnen und Kollegen! Wir schlafwandeln in eine nächste große Migrationskrise hinein. 280 000 illegale Migranten sind dieses Jahr angekommen. Wir stehen mitten in der nächsten Migrationskrise Europas. Die Zahlen sind auf Rekordhöhe wie 2015 und 2016. Speziell der westliche Balkan mit 42 000 ist eine Hauptroute. Die bestehende Migrationspolitik –das ist der Startpunkt dieser heutigen Debatte –, die bestehende Migrationspolitik Europas hat versagt, und wir sind bisher nicht in der Lage, eine Antwort zu geben. Europa schaut sogar weg.

Deshalb ist die Diskussion heute so notwendig, ist die Diskussion heute so wichtig. Und ich bedanke mich bei allen Kolleginnen und Kollegen, dass sie den EVP-Vorschlag, diese Debatte zu führen, aufgegriffen haben.

Was sind die Teile, die uns jetzt umtreiben? Der erste Teil ist, dass wir Grenzen sichern müssen. So, wie ich in meiner privaten Wohnung entscheide, wen ich reinlasse, wenn ich die Tür öffne, hat auch der Staat das Recht, an der Außengrenze zu sagen: Wen lasse ich rein und wen lasse ich nicht rein? Wir stehen deshalb als EVP hinter unseren Beamten an der Grenze, den Grenzschutzbeamten, auch den Frontex-Beamten, die einen schwierigen Job machen, die jeden Tag versuchen, die Balance zu finden und Recht durchzusetzen. Der Staat entscheidet, wer nach Europa kommt, und nicht die Mafia entscheidet, wer nach Europa kommt.

Und im Süden, speziell über die Südrouten, haben wir über 50 % von Menschen, die eben kein Bleiberecht haben, die illegale Immigranten sind. Da muss auch sichergestellt werden, dass wir an der Außengrenze schnell entscheiden, wer darf bleiben, und es muss auch schnell wieder rückgeführt werden.

Das wäre meine erste Bitte an die Kommission: Wir brauchen bessere Rückführungsabkommen. Wir sind die letzten Jahre in dieser Situation nicht vorangekommen, dass wir mit afrikanischen und asiatischen Staaten wirklich besser geworden wären.

Ich möchte ausdrücklich auch noch einmal sagen, dass wir für die Beamten Klarheit brauchen. Die Beamten an der Außengrenze werden immer wieder mit den Pushback-Vorwürfen konfrontiert. Und Recht muss durchgesetzt werden – keine Frage. Pushbacks sind verboten – keine Frage. Aber wir haben an der Landgrenze sehr klare Definitionen von Pushbacks, aber an der Seegrenze ist es nicht so klar. Wir hatten die Vorfälle im Juni 22 in Melilla beispielsweise, wo 17 Flüchtlinge umgekommen sind, an der spanisch-marokkanischen Grenze. Dort fand die Grenzsicherung auf der See statt. Die Grenzsicherung dort ist deutlich schwieriger als auf der Landgrenze. Deshalb brauchen wir Rechtsklarheit, was einen Pushback darstellt, damit die Beamten nicht in Unsicherheit arbeiten.

Und wir dürfen uns nicht erpressen lassen. Die Türkei, auch Lukaschenko, Weißrussland, hat Migration zur politischen Waffe erklärt. Da muss Europa geeint sagen: Nein, wir erlauben nicht, dass Migranten als politische Waffe eingesetzt werden. Ich möchte, liebe Iratxe, durchaus auch Vorschläge aus dem sozialistischen Camp aufgreifen: Die dänische Regierung hat beispielsweise vorgeschlagen – die sozialistische Regierung in Dänemark –, dass wir Aufnahmezentren in Afrika einrichten; zu überlegen, wie wir es denen, die wirklich Flüchtlingsstatus bekommen können, ermöglichen, dass sie schon in Afrika einen Antrag stellen; dass wir es nicht erzwingen, dass sie dann den mühsamen Weg über das Mittelmeer gehen wollen. Nach wie vor ist das Abkommen zwischen der Türkei und der Europäischen Union das Rohmodell, an dem wir arbeiten können.

Der zweite Pfeiler – neben der Entschiedenheit an der Grenze – ist die Solidarität im Inneren und die Hilfe für die wirklich Bedürftigen. Und wir haben es doch bewiesen, die Ukraine hat uns doch gezeigt: Es ist machbar. Wir haben die Türen geöffnet. Wir haben den Menschen, die Hilfe brauchen, großzügig Hilfe angeboten. Ganz Europa hat Hilfe angeboten, und es funktioniert. Deshalb ist doch das ein Beweis dafür, dass der zweite Pfeiler – Europa – genauso stark praktiziert werden kann.

Ich möchte ausdrücklich sagen:

For Italy, for the southern dimension, and they are having this year 100 000 arrivals, then it is clear that it is not an Italian problem, it is a European challenge and that is why solidarity is so urgently needed. We need now actions and not words like the Vice-President and all the Council representatives told us. The newspapers are full now with the French-Italian dispute, and that was the reason for the debate also on the extraordinary Home Affairs Council meeting next Friday.

But it is not about one NGO boat. It is part of a systematic challenge like Margaritis Schinas told us. The reality is that we had promise from France and Germany for 8 000 places about voluntary relocation, and finally they delivered 117, in reality. That's Europe today. So all promises didn't work. That's why Italy, Malta, Cyprus – socialist government in Malta, EPP government in Cyprus – sent a letter: „Please help us. Please let us not alone. We need solidarity on European level".

And the last point I want to mention is that Europe needs an Africa and Middle East strategy, because the reason, the background why people are fleeing, why people are leaving their home, is fundamental, it is our interest to solve it. The European Union as a whole is the biggest donor in all these areas, and we have to use it in an effective way to really help people. That is what we need now, solutions, and that's why we fully support the idea that we need a migration pact. We need a migration pact now, dear friends.

Iratxe García Pérez, *en nombre del Grupo S&D*. – Señor presidente, «necesidad de una solución europea para el asilo y la migración, incluida la búsqueda y salvamento»: es un título muy necesario. Podríamos ser incluso más precisos y audaces y hablar de la necesidad de solidaridad y responsabilidad compartida, en particular en lo que se refiere a las llegadas de personas en operaciones de búsqueda y salvamento desde el prisma de los derechos humanos y el Derecho internacional.

Los hechos que vienen sucediendo en los últimos años en el canal de la Mancha, en el Mediterráneo, así como en Lesbos, Lampedusa o Lanzarote, por citar algunos ejemplos trágicos, dan testimonio de la magnitud de lo que aquí estamos hablando. No es la primera vez que debatimos este asunto en esta Cámara y que lo debatimos, además, sin resultados concretos.

Según las cifras de este año, nueve de cada diez inmigrantes llegan a las costas europeas sin la ayuda de las ONG y no tengamos ninguna duda de que, sin su ayuda, estas personas también habrían llegado, de una forma o de otra. Y por eso el mensaje es tan claro: basta de criminalizar a quienes salvan vidas.

A los grupos de esta Cámara que comparten la necesidad de una política europea les tiendo la mano. Se la tiendo con generosidad, pero, también, sin intentar hacer un uso de ello o provocando la división en este sentido. Seamos generosos todos, señor Weber. No intentemos utilizar algunas palabras y algunas frases para provocar también lo que pueden ser grietas en la necesidad de ese acuerdo. Tiendo la mano a todos los grupos de esta Cámara que consideran importante una política europea en este sentido, para emprender acciones que den resultados concretos, sostenibles y sin tener en cuenta cuáles son las cuestiones que algunos se están planteando desde el punto de vista nacionalista o intergubernamental.

No nos equivoquemos, la inmigración puede contribuir decisivamente a resolver algunos de los retos más importantes que tenemos en Europa: un continente envejecido, un continente que en estos momentos tiene grandes retos. Y, por ello, insisto en que la inmigración no puede ser un problema; hay que tratarlo como un reto y como una oportunidad.

El tiempo apremia y las muertes no cesan. La dignidad de la vida de las personas debe ser nuestra guía para adoptar un Nuevo Pacto sobre Migración y Asilo. Este es el espíritu de la Convención de Ginebra, pero tenemos que hacer que sea una realidad. No puede ser solo una responsabilidad de los países del sur. Pretender que el fenómeno migratorio sea exclusividad, responsabilidad del país al que llegan es negar la existencia de una frontera común europea. Creemos en el principio de responsabilidad compartida.

Los recientes sucesos apelan a que avancemos, sobre todo, en el pilar solidario del Nuevo Pacto, precisamente con más solidaridad europea. No solo en momentos de mayor presión migratoria, sino también para hacer frente a situaciones de crisis como las que nos hemos encontrado con la guerra de Ucrania o con Afganistán.

Para conseguir nuestros objetivos debemos también reforzar la cooperación con los países de origen y de tránsito. Sin embargo, esta cooperación debe estar basada en el respeto mutuo. No podemos externalizar de ninguna manera las políticas migratorias. De igual a igual, solamente así lograremos que el Mediterráneo se convierta en un puente de cooperación, ayuda al desarrollo y entendimiento.

Nuestra propuesta es clara. Búsqueda y salvamento es una responsabilidad europea común, es una constante, sobre todo en un mundo tan globalizado que necesita de una categoría específica común europea, en línea con el Derecho internacional. Tengamos en cuenta una cosa: ¡cada vida cuenta!

Señorías, en esta legislatura hemos demostrado estar a la altura de las circunstancias y que somos capaces de responder a grandes desafíos. Demostremos que también somos capaces de hacerlo con el fenómeno de la migración antes del final de este mandato. Es una demanda y casi una súplica: trabajemos sin descanso para avanzar unidos y conseguir una respuesta a la altura del reto. Para ello, ¡cuenten con nosotros!

Mittwoch, 23. November 2022

Stéphane Séjourné, *au nom du groupe Renew.* – Monsieur le Président, Madame la Commissaire, Monsieur le Commissaire, le pacte sur la migration et l'asile est malheureusement le grand oublié des débats nationaux sur l'asile et l'immigration en ce moment dans nos États membres respectifs. Nos concitoyens ignorent largement le travail titanesque que fait actuellement ce Parlement européen pour arriver à une solution européenne. L'échec de la précédente mandature y est pour beaucoup, mais c'est le rôle de ce débat de remettre ce thème au cœur des discussions, Monsieur le Commissaire. L'objectif de tout le monde ici est d'aboutir à un consensus, à une réforme sur ce sujet.

Mon groupe y prendra toute sa part. Nous proposons d'ailleurs une réforme qui allie les deux principes que chacun d'entre vous, au PPE et au S&D, avez également évoqués qui sont la solidarité et la responsabilité. Mais autant savoir ce qu'on met derrière la responsabilité et la solidarité. La solidarité: les pays d'arrivée doivent pouvoir compter sur l'ensemble de l'Union européenne. Nous sommes favorables à une solidarité financière, mais également à une solidarité humaine entre les États membres. La responsabilité: oui, il y a trop de migrants en situation irrégulière et il faut pouvoir raccompagner rapidement ceux qui ne remplissent pas aujourd'hui les critères relatifs à l'asile et à l'immigration. Pour cela, mon groupe demande des données harmonisées: vérifications essentielles et procédures identiques basées sur des critères communs. Tout cela évidemment dans le respect absolu des droits de l'homme. Nous irons évidemment dans ce sens pour avoir des critères de vérification qui le permettent. Mais cela ne suffira pas.

Il faut aller plus loin en intensifiant nos efforts, notamment avec les pays tiers et une bonne coordination du sauvetage en mer, cela a été dit par la présidente Iratxe García Pérez. La politique d'asile et d'immigration est et sera tributaire de nos efforts sur le climat, sur la politique de développement, sur nos actions à l'international. Limiter les causes de l'exil reste la meilleure solution pour éviter cette crise.

Alors, chers collègues, je ne me cache pas derrière les chiffres. D'ailleurs, vous avez tous les deux, que ce soit au PPE ou au S&D, évoqué une augmentation significative de 70 % du nombre de demandes d'asile par rapport à l'année dernière. Nous approchons des chiffres de la crise migratoire de 2015. Notre diagnostic commun et nos solutions doivent être mises en avant, mais mon groupe demande une dynamique positive, discrète et réelle pour arriver à un accord sur cette réforme. J'appelle donc les groupes pro-européens à discuter de nos propositions pour aboutir rapidement. Ne laissons pas les hommes et les femmes être otages des calculs électoraux et des contingences nationales. Et oui, il nous faudra établir des règles pour qui peut vivre en Europe et qui ne peut pas vivre en Europe, mais ces règles doivent être européennes, justes et fidèles à nos valeurs.

Nous savons déjà que nous ne pouvons pas compter sur les députés de l'extrême droite de l'hémicycle pour nous aider. Ils brillent par leur absence dans le travail parlementaire du quotidien. Ils préfèrent les tribunes aux solutions et ils savent très bien, chers collègues, que si nous arrivons à relever ce défi de la migration, ils perdent le principal carburant électoral pour leurs futures élections. Je doute également de la volonté des députés de l'extrême gauche de jouer collectif. Pour eux, la question même de l'évocation d'un garde-frontière est un problème. Et on n'arrivera pas à une solution commune en partant de cette logique et de cette affirmation. Nous arriverons en Européens à trouver probablement un chemin, en tout cas je l'espère, pour mettre la pression également sur le Conseil, pour mettre la pression sur le capital. Chacun doit pouvoir comprendre qu'il faut faire un pas vers l'autre dans les partis pro-européens pour arriver à un accord.

J'espère d'ailleurs que Varsovie et Budapest se souviendront que nous avons agi ensemble pour l'accueil des réfugiés ukrainiens. Le seul accord à 27 que nous ayons obtenu depuis 20 ans sur l'asile et la migration. J'espère que Rome et M[me] Meloni arrêteront également une position – que je ne connais pas aujourd'hui – sur ce texte.

Alors, assez de spectacle, assez de polémiques pour deux ou trois points de sondage. Au travail. C'est notre devoir de colégislateur et un devoir politique et humanitaire.

Philippe Lamberts, *au nom du groupe Verts/ALE.* – Monsieur le Président, chers collègues, depuis 2015, les chefs d'État et de gouvernement de l'Union se montrent incapables de s'accorder sur une réponse commune à ces humains qui cherchent refuge sur notre territoire. Cette absence d'accord cache de plus en plus mal un accord de fait qui consiste à faire de l'Union européenne une forteresse impénétrable.

Nos gouvernements ont, délibérément ou par inaction, choisi la politique du refoulement et de la violence, de préférence à distance et à huis clos. Et ce, au mépris des engagements juridiques auxquels ils ont librement souscrit, notamment au titre de la Convention de Genève relative au statut des réfugiés et du droit maritime international. Et, comble d'indignité, alors même qu'ils bafouent le droit, ils choisissent de jeter l'opprobre, voire de criminaliser les ONG qui, envers et contre tout, tentent de sauver l'honneur de l'Union européenne.

Sans la moindre preuve, certains gouvernements accusent ces ONG de complicité avec les trafiquants d'êtres humains. Au contraire, ce sont l'Union et ses États membres qui financent un système prédateur et mortifère. Car en donnant les clefs de notre politique d'asile et de migration à des pays comme la Libye, nous nous rendons complices de la violence, de la torture, des viols et des rançons. La Libye est un État failli et ses soi-disant garde-côtes sont des gangs armés en uniforme, des uniformes payés par l'Union européenne.

Face à ce déni des valeurs sur lesquelles est construite l'Union européenne, nous attendrions de la Commission qu'elle rappelle aux États membres leurs responsabilités. Madame Johansson, Monsieur Schinas, nous voudrions vous entendre dire aux États membres: combien de temps encore allez-vous reléguer votre responsabilité humanitaire à des bateaux de commerce et à des ONG? Quand respecterez-vous la loi en ouvrant le port le plus proche pour sauver des vies en danger à leur bord? Quand comprendrez-vous que la seule solution réside dans l'organisation de voies sûres et dans une répartition solidaire de l'accueil entre les États membres?

Et plutôt que d'en faire la complice de fait de cette politique de refoulement – je vois que ça vous intéresse, Madame Johansson –, nous attendrions de votre part de mettre au pas votre propre agence Frontex et faire en sorte qu'elle respecte le droit européen et international. Au lieu de cela, que propose la Commission en réalité? *More of the same*. Autrement dit, un accompagnement timoré de cette démission collective.

Pendant ce temps, le sinistre compteur des morts à nos frontières n'arrête pas de tourner. Et à ce jour, 29 000 personnes ont payé le prix ultime de la lâcheté européenne. Alors, chers collègues, ceux qui ont fait de l'Europe forteresse leur fond de commerce électoral, Monsieur Bardella, affirment vouloir défendre ainsi la civilisation européenne. La réalité, c'est que vous en êtes les fossoyeurs. Car en traitant des êtres humains de la sorte, l'Union européenne en saborde les fondements, à commencer par la défense de la dignité humaine comme valeur cardinale.

L'agression de l'Ukraine par Vladimir Poutine a permis à l'Union européenne de démontrer qu'elle était capable de prendre toute sa part dans l'accueil de nos voisins en détresse. Ce qui fait donc défaut en Méditerranée, dans les Balkans ou en mer du Nord, ce n'est pas la capacité, c'est la volonté.

Jordan Bardella, *au nom du groupe ID*. – Monsieur le Président, mes chers collègues, bon, je vous préviens, ça va trancher un peu avec les discours des orateurs précédents.

L'Europe ne peut se laisser dicter sa politique d'immigration depuis la mer par des trafiquants d'êtres humains, qu'ils portent le nom d'ONG ou de mafias de passeurs. L'Europe ne peut non plus s'en remettre à une solidarité qui consisterait à répartir les populations du monde sur notre sol, en violation de la volonté exprimée par nos concitoyens. Nous devons considérer que notre politique migratoire commence sur la mer, que nos frontières sont aussi maritimes, que nul ne peut donc prétendre accoster sur notre sol sans y être autorisé.

Votre projet consiste à accueillir et répartir. Le nôtre consiste à secourir et reconduire. Pour dissuader les tentations de départ, les demandes d'asile doivent s'effectuer dans les ambassades et consulats des pays de départ. Pour protéger les réfugiés de guerres réelles, s'il y en a, des camps humanitaires sécurisés doivent être mis en place dans les régions de départ sous l'égide du Haut-Commissariat et sous l'égide des Nations Unies.

Parce qu'elle dissuade de risquer sa vie pour un eldorado fantasmé, cette fermeté est probablement la politique la plus humaine qui soit. La politique qui sauve des vies est celle qui dissuade de venir. Voici les clefs d'une protection de nos frontières. Cette volonté, la Commission européenne ne l'a pas. Le président Emmanuel Macron non plus. Les idéologies les en empêchent, mais la naïveté également, celle de croire que les flux migratoires vont se tarir d'eux-mêmes et qu'il ne s'agit que d'une crise temporaire.

Les lois de la démographie sont pourtant implacables. Sans reprise en main de notre destin, sans prise de conscience générale, la ruée vers l'Europe nous attend. Lampedusa, Ceuta ou la Porte de la Chapelle pourrait être notre futur.

Assita Kanko, *on behalf of the ECR Group*. – Mr President, dear Commissioner, dear colleagues, we have all kind of opinions about each other in this Parliament, but at the end of the day we are all good people with good intentions and just different ideas. We must remember this when we speak about difficult topics, we must recognise together that until now none of our actions solved the migration crisis. Instead, they have allowed more and more people to die in the sea. They have allowed human smugglers to get richer. They have fed false hope and led innocent people to cursed roads.

I am ashamed when I see these results. We have abandoned the real refugees. We have given power to human smugglers. We have turned our shores into silent cemeteries of people's children, mothers or fathers and their dreams. This must change. False compassion and actions that actually lead to a worse situation are not enough. The open borders and the current chaos are a threat to Schengen and an invitation to die. The question is not how to save a boat in Italy, the question is why could this boat even depart from the first harbour? The question is also why some NGOs act like ferries for the human smugglers in the Mediterranean Sea.

We must be clear, we must be firm and we must be fair. We must be strict with illegal migrants with no need of protection and fair to actual victims. Only then can we implement true solidarity with migration policy that is aligned with our sense of humanity. To achieve this, we must face reality. We need partnerships with neighbouring countries, even if we sometimes hold our nose. We need to go back to the idea of external processing of asylum requests. We need an information campaign that shows the truth to young people, we need to address the problem of returns, and we need to help Italy and Greece. We can do this if we leave ideology and face reality, speak frankly with each other.

Manon Aubry, *au nom du groupe The Left*. – Monsieur le Président, «Qu'il retourne en Afrique», au singulier comme au pluriel, que l'on s'adresse à un député ou aux exilés, le problème reste le même. Cette phrase, elle a fait polémique en France, mais ce qui se dit ici plus poliment au Parlement européen ne vaut pas mieux. Qui aurait osé dire aux réfugiés de Boutcha fuyant les crimes de guerre de Poutine qu'ils retournent en Ukraine?

Dans cet hémicycle, j'ai pourtant entendu parler, à l'instant encore, d'invasion pour évoquer le drame humanitaire de l'Ocean Viking. Des mots que je n'ai heureusement pas entendus au moment de l'arrivée de millions d'Ukrainiens que nous devions accueillir. Mais de quoi parle-t-on en réalité avec l'Ocean Viking? De l'accueil de 234 êtres humains pris au piège pendant trois semaines dans des conditions catastrophiques, 234 naufragés dont la vie était en péril et qui ont été présentés comme une menace vitale pour notre Union européenne qui compte 450 millions d'habitants.

Alors je voulais vous lire les témoignages de ceux que l'extrême droite nous présente comme des envahisseurs sanguinaires: «Notre embarcation a chaviré, neuf personnes sont mortes devant nous. Ma fille se réveille encore la nuit, effrayée. Nous essayons de l'aider à oublier». Un autre témoignage: «Nous sommes des êtres vivants qui voulons être libres. Il y a des gens qui sont malades, des femmes, des enfants. Nous sommes dans l'eau. Fini! Fini! Aidez-nous, s'il vous plaît, aidez-nous. Nous sommes en train de mourir. Nous sommes dans la mer. Dedans. Dedans. Il fait froid». Alors, l'extrême droite et Monsieur Bardella, j'ai envie de vous poser une question: qu'auriez-vous fait? Auriez-vous fermé les yeux? Les auriez-vous laisser périr en mer?

Je voulais aussi vous partager les récits glaçants des sauveteurs qui les ont secourus: les naufragés montrent des signes d'épuisement, de déshydratation et souffrent de multiples brûlures dues au carburant. Certains présentent des traces évidentes de tortures et de violences subies en Libye.

L'accueil des naufragés de l'Ocean Viking aurait pu être notre fierté collective. Leur abandon pendant trois semaines au gré de jeux diplomatiques sordides restera notre honte, tout comme notre incapacité à sauver les 25 000 personnes disparues en mer depuis 2014. Alors cessons de céder aux intimidations de l'extrême droite. Faisons un choix simple, durable, évident: accueillons.

Κώστας Παπαδάκης (NI). – Κύριε Πρόεδρε, δεν συμβιβαζόμαστε με τα ναυάγια-τραγωδίες ξεριζωμένων στο Αιγαίο και τη Μεσόγειο, με τα πλοιάρια τους να γίνονται άθλιο μπαλάκι μεταξύ κυβερνήσεων. Άλλη μια «βέλτιστη» πρακτική της Ευρωπαϊκής Ένωσης…

Δεν συνηθίζουμε με τη βάρβαρη καταστολή σε βάρος τους, τον πολύμηνο εγκλωβισμό τους σε υπερδομές-φυλακές και απαράδεκτες συνθήκες στα νύχια κυκλωμάτων. Καταδικάζουμε την εργαλειοποίηση από την πλευρά της αστικής τάξης της Τουρκίας για να προωθήσει τις διεκδικήσεις της στον ανταγωνισμό με την ελληνική αστική τάξη και με κοινό παρονομαστή την απαράδεκτη δήλωση Ευρωπαϊκής Ένωσης-Τουρκίας. Για την Ευρωπαϊκή Ένωση όλοι πλην των Ουκρανών προσφύγων είναι παράτυποι μετανάστες. Όμως, η πλειοψηφία των αιτούντων άσυλο είναι από το Αφγανιστάν και τη Συρία, χώρες εξίσου ιμπεριαλιστικών πολέμων και επεμβάσεων. Το ευρωενωσιακό κεφάλαιο επιδιώκει να έχει πάμφθηνο εργατικό δυναμικό. Να γιατί μόνο αυτό βαφτίζεται νόμιμη μετανάστευση.

Απέναντι στη σύμπνοιά σας για ένταση καταστολής, απελάσεων, επαναπροωθήσεων με ρόλο χωροφύλακα στον αμαρτωλό Frontex, απαιτούμε υπηρεσίες ασύλου στην Τουρκία με ευθύνη Ευρωπαϊκής Ένωσης και ο ΟΗΕ με ανθρώπινη φιλοξενία και πλήρη δικαιώματα για να πάνε οι κατατρεγμένοι των δικών σας πολέμων στις χώρες πραγματικού προορισμού τους.

Paulo Rangel (PPE). – Senhor Presidente, Senhor Ministro, Senhor Vice-Presidente, Senhor Comissário, os valores fundamentais da democracia europeia implicam sempre, em qualquer circunstância, o respeito pelos direitos humanos. Cada pessoa, independentemente da sua origem, etnia ou religião, merece proteção.

Não há dúvida que essa proteção exige soluções equilibradas. E que o desafio das migrações e dos refugiados não é feito com demagogia nem com populismo. São precisas soluções responsáveis, com apoio aos Estados de onde vêm os migrantes no sentido de fixar o máximo número de pessoas, combater completamente o tráfico de seres humanos, não incentivar esse tráfico através de medidas populistas, mas, ao mesmo tempo, ser capaz de salvar todas as pessoas que chegam às nossas costas e de ter um mecanismo de partilha e de solidariedade entre todos os Estados. Não pode ser Chipre, ou a Grécia, ou a Itália, ou a Espanha ou Malta a terem todo o peso desta política humanitária de abertura e de responsabilidade sobre os seus ombros. Todos os outros Estados têm de cooperar.

And I would like now to say that it was very good to see that today both S&D and Renew and also EPP leaders were so constructive today. What I would like to ask you is that when we are drafting legislation, we are capable of this same spirit of cooperation, and then we can deliver and give to the Council also the sign that we have a responsibility and humanitarian policy towards these migration costs.

Birgit Sippel (S&D). – Herr Präsident! Gemeinsame solidarische Lösungen für Asyl und Seenotrettung – lassen Sie mich aus der Allgemeinen Erklärung der Menschenrechte zitieren: „Jeder hat das Recht, in anderen Ländern vor Verfolgung Asyl zu suchen und zu genießen." Dieses Prinzip sollte Leitgedanke unserer Debatten sein.

Auch Grenzkontrollen im Einklang mit Grund- und Menschenrechten sind sowohl Bestandteil eines funktionierenden Schengenraums als auch verpflichtend für die Mitgliedstaaten. Unsere Verträge sind da eindeutig. Die Politik im Bereich Grenzkontrollen, Asyl und Einwanderung muss dem Grundsatz der Solidarität und der gerechten Aufteilung von Verantwortungen folgen. Für mich heißt das konkret: Insbesondere bei Seenotrettung brauchen wir einen verlässlichen Verteilmechanismus, klare Regeln, mit denen sich die Mitgliedstaaten unterstützen, anstatt sich gegenseitig anzuklagen.

Eine freiwillige Solidaritätsbekundung erreicht das offensichtlich nicht. Es braucht Gesetzgebung, deren Umsetzung von einer starken Kommission eingefordert und kontrolliert wird. Die Ratspräsidentschaft versichert, dass sie an einem Solidaritätskonzept arbeitet. Der Rat kann nun zeigen, dass er die Grund- und Menschenrechte nicht nur respektiert, sondern positiv fortschreibt. Und ich hoffe, dies wird die Grundlage für gemeinsame solidarische Entscheidungen für Asyl und Seenotrettung.

Malik Azmani (Renew). – Mr President, dear Commissioners, dear representatives of the Council and colleagues, Frontex estimates the number of illegal entries into the EU this year already at more than 280 000. This is up by 77% from last year and the highest figure since 2016. This high number is posing fast challenges for the EU and some Member States in particular.

In the Netherlands, Belgium and Austria we have seen severe consequences, with overburdened asylum systems forcing asylum seekers to spend the night outside. There is a real risk the citizens lose faith in the EU's ability to control migration. And I repeat again: our citizens expect that we are in control. The Commission's focus on the benefits of legal migration in the State of the Union in September is therefore also out of place.

Colleagues, as standards are becoming lower, we risk facing an immigration policy doom loop. We can break the cycle by focusing on the external dimension. Pressure on external borders should be alleviated by engaging with third countries to counter irregular migration.

Colleagues, migration should be the top of our mind. First, a Commission Vice-President should be fully dedicated to address the external dimension of migration on a day-to-day basis and by using also all relevant policy areas needed. Second, we need to break the race to the bottom among Member States because no solidarity can be expected when secondary movements remain unaddressed. That means also enforcement of the current legislation. And third, we should be pragmatic in our negotiations and adopt new legislative files, including also the Screening Regulation, Eurodac and a revision of the Schengen Borders Code. This is how we must make progress.

We cannot let another parliamentary mandate pass without having real results to show our citizens. No new plans or fancy words, but actions and results are what our citizens expect from us.

Jordi Solé (Verts/ALE). – Señor presidente, el debate sobre mecanismos de búsqueda y salvamento de personas en el mar —de personas— es un tanto paradójico porque no acierta el enfoque. En vez de exigir a los Gobiernos que dejen de poner en riesgo vidas humanas, poniendo trabas absurdas al desembarque y no cumpliendo con sus obligaciones que derivan, sobre todo, del Derecho internacional marítimo, culpamos a ONG por hacer lo que otros deberían hacer, que es rescatar migrantes y demandantes de asilo en alta mar y conducirlos a puerto seguro.

Y, además, algunos se dedican a desprestigiarlas y, en algunos casos, hasta les ponen querellas, normalizando el discurso irresponsable e inmoral de la derecha extrema y de la extrema derecha en temas de migración y asilo.

Estas ONG estarían encantadas de dejar de hacer su trabajo en alta mar si hubiera una política pública para salvar vidas de migrantes y refugiados que respetara el derecho al asilo y principios básicos como el de no devolución. Pero, desgraciadamente, esto no solo no es así, sino que vemos como algunos Gobiernos, como el italiano, pretenden implantar un selectivismo a la hora de decidir quién puede desembarcar en sus costas y quién no, contraviniendo clarísimamente sus obligaciones legales.

Estamos ante un estrepitoso fracaso de la solidaridad europea: solidaridad externa, pero también interna entre Estados. Necesitamos un mecanismo europeo de búsqueda y salvamento, una operación civil europea con implicación proactiva de los Estados para que salgan a rescatar, con un mandato bien definido y alineado con la legislación europea e internacional vigente.

Annalisa Tardino (ID). – Signor Presidente, onorevoli colleghi, signori Commissari, nella generale vacuità delle parole spese sul tema, ve ne sono alcune inaspettate, dense invece di significato, quelle del capogruppo del PPE, il collega Weber, che cito: «Se non si riesce a distinguere tra migranti illegali, richiedenti asilo e rifugiati, allora non si riesce ad aiutare chi ha davvero bisogno». E ancora: «Penso che sia necessario proteggere le frontiere e uno Stato deve poter decidere chi arriva e chi non è il benvenuto nell'Unione europea». Le ha pronunciate Weber, tedesco, del Partito popolare europeo, avrei potuto dirle io.

Ma per aiutare davvero chi ha bisogno e difendere i confini c'è un'unica soluzione, che il PPE però non sostiene: creare dei centri di identificazione in Africa, con gestione e personale dell'Unione europea. Ciò consentirebbe di rispettare il diritto internazionale e comunitario, eliminare i fattori di attrazione alla migrazione illegale e aprire le porte a una definizione veramente condivisa del problema. Troppi i fallimenti europei finora e la richiesta congiunta di Malta, Cipro, Grecia e Italia ne sono una testimonianza. Numeri spaventosi di arrivi, quando riescono ad arrivare, in assenza di tragedie.

Siate, per una volta, determinati, riempite di significato le parole politiche del capogruppo del PPE, se non le nostre. Andiamo a fondo e rendiamo certi i rimpatri, definiamo normativamente il modus operandi delle ONG, in troppi casi conniventi con i trafficanti, secondo Frontex. Trasparenza e responsabilità dello Stato battente bandiera devono essere le parole d'ordine.

Per trovare una soluzione europea sull'immigrazione, come chiedete, dovreste solo ascoltarci, perché noi che viviamo il problema sulla nostra pelle abbiamo le idee molto chiare.

Vincenzo Sofo (ECR). – Signor Presidente, onorevoli colleghi, l'Africa è un continente da un miliardo e 200 mila persone, mezzo miliardo delle quali vivono sotto la soglia di povertà.

Parliamo di metà degli affamati di tutto il mondo, gente che, non avendo futuro nella propria terra, progetta di cercare fortuna in Europa, convinta dalla propaganda dei trafficanti di uomini di poter trovare l'eldorado. Solo che noi l'eldorado non lo siamo affatto, abbiamo una povertà in continua crescita e un cittadino su cinque che fatica ad arrivare a fine mese. Immaginare dunque di essere meta potenziale per mezzo miliardo di poveri africani, quanto l'intera popolazione europea, è utopia folle e inumana.

Ecco perché non possiamo permetterci di appaltare le nostre politiche migratorie a ONG che fanno dell'«accogliamoli tutti» il loro *core business*. Ecco perché gli Stati che concedono loro bandiera e finanziamenti devono assumersi la responsabilità del loro operato. Ecco perché non si può prescindere da accordi con paesi di partenza per la creazione di hotspot esterni, ma anche per politiche serie di sviluppo, che consentano a questa gente di vivere dignitosamente nella propria terra.

È assurdo, infatti, pensare che la soluzione sia semplicemente la redistribuzione, perché il problema non è quale paese debba accogliere gli immigrati che giungono in Europa illegalmente, ma impedire a questi di arrivare in un posto che non potrà offrire loro il benessere che sperano di trovare.

Grazie alla determinazione del governo Meloni e il piano di azione per il Mediterraneo centrale appena annunciato, la Commissione europea sembra forse iniziare a recepire quanto noi ripetiamo da anni, cioè che l'Unione europea inizia a operare come comunità unita nella difesa delle sue frontiere e non più come agenzia di collocamento per chi le oltrepassa illegalmente.

Miguel Urbán Crespo (The Left). – Señor presidente, un nuevo Gobierno de extrema derecha en Italia y nuevo cierre de puertos ilegal en Italia. Un Gobierno que aplica las mismas políticas neoliberales de Draghi y que parece que lo único que le queda para diferenciarse es la xenofobia. La xenofobia del cierre de puertos ilegal.

¿Y qué? ¿Cómo responde la Unión Europea? Pidiendo nuevas normas para las ONG de búsqueda y rescate en el Mediterráneo. Miren, las ONG cumplen el Derecho internacional marítimo, que es la norma a la que se tienen que someter. Lo que necesitan las ONG de búsqueda y rescate es que se las escuche.

Señores comisarios, los tienen ahí arriba, pueden hablar con ellos y pueden ver justamente el trabajo que están haciendo.

Necesitan que no se les criminalice ni se les estigmatice por salvar vidas. Porque salvar vidas nunca puede ser un delito. Y lo tenemos que repetir más porque nuestra política migratoria está convirtiendo el Mediterráneo en una gran fosa común y lo que necesitamos es cambiar justamente eso. Necesitamos pasajes seguros. Necesitamos normas vinculantes de acogida. No necesitamos solidaridad. Necesitamos derechos. Derechos que se puedan exigir y cumplir. Y menos hipocresía.

¿Alguien piensa que si el barco que ha tenido que desembarcar en Francia, y al que no se dejó desembarcar en Italia, llevara refugiados ucranianos, alguien le hubiera puesto algún problema? No. Eso se llama xenofobia. Se ha mirado el color de piel y no la necesidad de estas personas.

Y yo creo que Ucrania ha sido un gran ejemplo. Un gran ejemplo de que se pueden hacer las cosas de una forma diferente. Que hay capacidad de acogida, que no hay problemas técnicos, que lo que falta es justamente voluntad política para poder acoger y dejar de convertir el Mediterráneo en esa gran fosa común. Lo que se necesita aquí —como han dicho muchos— es menos palabras y más voluntad política.

Nicolas Bay (NI). – Monsieur le Président, l'Ocean Viking, ce sont 234 clandestins, dont seulement 23 femmes, hébergés dans un hôtel aux frais des Français. 123 se sont déjà vu refuser le droit d'asile, mais presque tous sont aujourd'hui en liberté car le gouvernement français est incapable de les expulser. 26 des 44 prétendus mineurs isolés, qui ne sont le plus souvent ni l'un ni l'autre, se sont également évanouis dans la nature. Et maintenant, combien d'entre eux vont commettre des délits ou des crimes dans le pays qui les a accueillis généreusement? Vous me direz que 234, c'est une goutte d'eau. Oui, mais une goutte en plus des 6 400 000 migrants venus en Europe depuis 2014. Plus que le Danemark tout entier. Sans parler de ceux qui sont entrés clandestinement.

Macron n'a pas seulement trahi la France, il a trahi toute l'Europe. Il est devenu le relais des ONG, elles-mêmes étant le relais, parfois les complices, des trafiquants d'êtres humains. Alors que l'Italie et Malte tiennent bon, Macron donne un signal terrible: l'Europe cède toujours et s'ouvre à l'invasion migratoire.

Il n'y a qu'une seule façon d'arrêter les flux et donc les noyades, c'est la méthode australienne. Faire pression sur les pays de départ, refouler les migrants, obliger les ports africains à respecter le droit de la mer, se donner les moyens d'expulser tous les clandestins, faire la guerre aux mafias de passeurs et sanctionner les ONG complices. C'est ainsi, collectivement, par une volonté politique réelle et assumée, que nous pourrons relever ce défi de civilisation.

Jeroen Lenaers (PPE). – Voorzitter, we waarschuwen al maanden dat we richting een nieuwe migratiecrisis aan het slaapwandelen zijn. Bijna 300 000 mensen zijn dit jaar al illegaal onze buitengrenzen overgestoken. Dat is het hoogste aantal sinds 2016, het crisisjaar. Maar het erge is dat ook ons Europees asielbeleid nog steeds in 2016 zit, ondanks alle goede voorstellen van de Europese Commissie. Maar het werkt nog steeds niet. Daarom moeten deze getallen een *wake-upcall* zijn, zeker voor de migratieministers die vrijdag bijeenkomen voor crisisberaad.

Alleen door irreguliere migratie effectief aan te pakken, houden we ruimte en draagvlak om echte vluchtelingen op te vangen. Dat is een Europees vraagstuk, want migratie is al lang geen nationaal vraagstuk meer. Het is keiharde geopolitiek. In Oekraïne is het aanjagen van vluchtelingenstromen naar Europa onderdeel van Poetins strategie. Ook vanuit Belarus en Turkije worden migranten actief de grens over geduwd. Als we geen speelbal willen zijn van autoritaire machthebbers, moeten we zelf kunnen bepalen wie toegang krijgt tot ons grondgebied. Dan moeten we vanuit Europa serieus zijn over het beschermen van onze buitengrenzen, inclusief het financieren van fysieke infrastructuur aan die grenzen. Dan moeten we Frontex echt uitrusten om zijn taak te doen, Eurodac eindelijk op orde brengen en het Europees migratiepact, inclusief screening aan de buitengrenzen, eindelijk afronden. Eenduidig en effectief Europees asielbeleid is nodig, want het kan niet zo zijn dat in een land als Nederland het inwilligingspercentage van asielverzoeken onverklaarbaar veel hoger is dan in andere landen. Grip op migratie vraagt om daadkracht en het wordt hoog tijd die eindelijk te tonen.

Juan Fernando López Aguilar (S&D). – Señor presidente, vicepresidente Schinas, comisaria Johansson, migración, asilo, salvamento y rescate tienen un denominador común. Son, efectivamente, una cuestión europea que requiere una respuesta europea y solo cabe una respuesta europea, una solución europea, como sugiere el título de este debate. Está a nuestro alcance dársela. Al Nuevo Pacto sobre Migración y Asilo —cinco Reglamentos—: estamos trabajando y podemos conseguir completarlos en esta legislatura. Para eso hemos establecido la hoja de ruta.

Pero este Parlamento ha suscrito una y otra vez una visión completa, holística —la llamamos—, comprehensiva del problema, que incluye salvamento y rescate y *legal pathways*, vías legales y seguras.

Salvamento y rescate es una obligación del Derecho internacional, no solamente del Derecho internacional humanitario, que por supuesto, sino del Derecho internacional del mar codificado en Montego Bay en 1982. Y, por tanto, no puede ser pasado por alto que un Estado miembro incumpla sus obligaciones de Derecho internacional, que son fuente del Derecho europeo, porque eso va contra el Derecho europeo, incluido el desembarco en puerto seguro.

Pero dicho esto, hay, además, por supuesto, que asegurar vías legales porque es la mejor manera de salvar vidas en el mar. Es cierto que el Mediterráneo y el Atlántico son, efectivamente, fosas comunes, pero también lo es el desierto del Sáhara y, por tanto, la apertura de vías seguras es una forma de desmantelar el modelo de negocio de los traficantes de seres humanos. Es una forma, también, de salvar la visión negativa que ha caracterizado hasta ahora a la Unión Europea.

Y este es el último punto que me gustaría compartir con ustedes. Hay que cambiar la mirada. Este Parlamento lo ha exigido. A la Unión Europea se la llama viejo continente. La amenaza no es la migración. La amenaza es ser un continente viejo. La migración puede ser parte de la solución si somos capaces de cambiar la mirada y tener una actitud más positiva, que es lo que exige una y otra vez este Parlamento Europeo.

Sophia in 't Veld (Renew). – Mr President, colleagues, the joint Parliament and Council roadmap gives reason for cautious optimism. It gives us a chance to move forward together. And this Parliament, as always, will do everything within its power to deliver before the end of term. But it can only fly if the Council takes its responsibility and agrees on an instrument for a truly common European policy.

But colleagues it's not only about policies, it's also about language. Can we please, when we talk about migration, have a bit more temperate and less apocalyptic language, because xenophobic rhetoric has not brought the solution any closer. Dehumanising migrants has done nothing to deflect migration flows. It has mainly served to sow division in society and it has created tragedies unworthy of our common values.

Migration has always existed and it will always exist, and there is a degree of irony in this debate because many of us here in this room, and other colleagues who are elsewhere in the building, have a family history of migration. Their parents or grandparents migrated within, to or from Europe. Let's keep that in mind.

The Ukraine refugee crisis has shown that Europe is capable of managing big challenges. So let's draw the lessons from that. Be pragmatic. Adopt real solutions. Because Europe can do it.

Erik Marquardt (Verts/ALE). – Herr Präsident! Herr Weber, ich wollte am Anfang kurz auf Sie eingehen, weil Sie gesagt haben, dass Sie ja auch an Ihrer Haustür entscheiden, wer reinkommt, und genauso muss das an den europäischen Außengrenzen passieren. Ich glaube ehrlicherweise, dass solche Sprachbilder auch ein Ausdruck von Wohlstandsverwahrlosung sind, die wir uns in diesem Haus eigentlich nicht erlauben können. Ich glaube – und ich hoffe –, dass vor Ihrer Haustür niemand nachts erfriert, und ich hoffe, dass vor Ihrer Haustür auch nicht tausende Menschen im Jahr ertrinken. Und ich glaube, wenn wir uns klarmachen, wie die Realität aussieht und dass es natürlich an Ihrer Haustür nicht um Rechtsstaatlichkeit geht, die uns ausmacht als Europäische Union – sondern natürlich ist es Ihre Entscheidung, zu Hause, wer reinkommt und wer nicht –, aber an den Außengrenzen, da gelten doch ganz andere Regeln, das können Sie doch nicht einfach verkennen.

Ich glaube, dass wir aufhören müssen, mit seltsamen Reden die grausame Realität unserer Asylpolitik zu verkennen. Ich sage Ihnen mal, wie die Realität aussieht: Wenn man auf dem Mittelmeer in Seenot ist, gerade aus Libyen kommt und man ruft in Malta in der Seenotrettungsleitstelle an, dann geht dort wahrscheinlich niemand ran; und wenn jemand rangeht, dann schickt die Person keine Boote. Und wenn Frontex über dem Mittelmeer fliegt und ein Boot in Seenot sieht, dann informiert Frontex nicht etwa die Boote im Umfeld und sagt: „Dort ist ein Boot in Seenot" – nein, man informiert libysche Milizen, islamistische Milizen, die dann dafür sorgen, dass die Menschen wieder zurück nach Libyen kommen, wo die Frauen – und zwar alle Frauen auf diesen Booten – vergewaltigt werden und Männer misshandelt werden.

Ich glaube, wenn wir uns klarmachen, dass so eine Realität nicht Teil der Lösung sein kann, sondern etwas ist, was wir lösen müssen – und da kann man neue Gesetze machen, aber die braucht man gar nicht, wenn man ein bisschen Anstand hat –, da kann man sich einfach klarmachen, dass es am Ende nicht darum geht, die NGOs dafür zu kritisieren, dass sie das machen, was eigentlich unsere Aufgabe wäre, sondern dass wir jetzt endlich dafür sorgen müssen, dass man Geld in Seenotrettung steckt, dass man eine ordentliche Verteilung hinbekommt und dass man den Anstand, der Europa ausmachen sollte, so nutzt, dass wir ein Europa bauen, das auch in der Migrationspolitik nicht peinlich gegenüber allem ist, was uns eigentlich ausmachen sollte.

Nicolaus Fest (ID). – Herr Präsident, Herr Kommissar! Herr Weber! Herr Marquardt mochte Ihre Rede offensichtlich nicht so – ich fand sie gut. Es sind nämlich genau die Vorschläge, die die AfD seit Jahren macht. Und mir ist auch klar, warum Sie diese Rede gehalten haben – lassen Sie mich ausreden.

Sie kommen aus Bayern, und in Bayern ist es so wie in allen Bundesländern jetzt: Die Asylzentren sind voll, die Städte und Gemeinden bitten um Hilfe. Sie sagen: Wir können nicht mehr, unsere Containerdörfer sind voll, wir wissen nicht mehr, wohin mit den Migranten. Und genauso geht es ja auch in NRW und in anderen Ländern. In NRW haben gerade die Bürgermeister – viele sozialdemokratische Bürgermeister – einen Appell an die Bundesregierung gerichtet, ihnen zu helfen, weil sie nicht mehr wissen, wohin. Und deshalb sind auch alle Appelle an Solidarität sinnlos: Wenn die Leute keine Möglichkeiten mehr haben und die Kosten auch durch die Decke gehen, können Sie nicht noch weiter Solidarität einfordern. Das geht nicht.

Und hier im Raum steht ja ein großer rosa Elefant, den vor allem die Sozialdemokraten nicht ansprechen wollen; Sie haben das schon getan – das ist nämlich die dänische Asyl- und Migrationspolitik. Die dänischen Sozialdemokraten haben sehr klar gesagt, sie wollen keine Einwanderung mehr; ihr klares Ziel ist die Remigration, Asyl gibt es nur noch in Ausnahmefällen, und Asylcamps sollen im Ausland gegründet werden, wo jeder Asylantrag zuerst geprüft wird, bevor man nach Europa einreisen kann. Das haben Sie im Grunde genommen auch schon angeregt, und das ist der richtige Weg.

Dass die Sozialdemokraten, wie Frau Bischoff hier, diese dänische Lösung seit Monaten oder seit Jahren totschweigen, hat natürlich Gründe. Aber dennoch sollte dieses Haus sich mit diesem politischen Handeln der Dänen mehr befassen.

Charlie Weimers (ECR). – Mr President, Commissioner, Mr Bek, Commissioner Schinas, I agree that the EU right now operates as firefighters. As illegal migration decreases in the western Med, it soars in the central Med: almost 300 000 illegal entries into the EU this year alone. As the Commissioner pointed out, right now we see economic migrants from Bangladesh, Egypt and Tunisia. But Commissioner, do you honestly believe that the migration pact will solve the problem?

The UN predicts Africa's population will triple from 1.4 billion to 4 billion within this century. From 2000 to 2050 the Middle East population is estimated to increase by 329 million. The current migratory pressure fades in comparison to what will come. The migration pact is not designed for migration of that magnitude. Why? Because the EU will be overwhelmed by economic migrants using asylum as a means to enter our territory. And relocation won't solve that.

Commissioner, strict measures are a necessity. Illegal entry must mean forfeiture of the right to asylum. The EU must start financing border barriers. The Danish asylum plan must be recognised as a serious attempt to safeguard social cohesion – our European way of life.

Sira Rego (The Left). – Señor presidente, cada seis horas muere un ser humano en el mar tratando de llegar a Europa. Miles de personas, sin haber cometido ningún delito, viven retenidas y hacinadas en campos de refugiadas con sus derechos suspendidos. Frontex ha perpetrado sistemáticamente devoluciones en caliente en el mar. Regalamos miles de millones de euros a regímenes antidemocráticos para custodiar nuestras fronteras. Hay kilómetros y kilómetros de frontera exterior de la UE sin un solo punto físico donde pedir asilo. La tragedia de Melilla ha ocasionado decenas de muertos.

Todo esto y más es la política migratoria de la UE. No es un plan arbitrario ni fruto de la improvisación. Es una decisión colectiva y consciente de incumplir con leyes internacionales y europeas que, de aplicarse, evitarían muertes y dolor. Es un inmoral juego de equilibrios entre Macron, lavándose las manos, Meloni, dejando a personas a la deriva en el mar, y la propuesta de la Comisión de convertir el relato de la extrema derecha en ley. Si los derechos humanos son un problema, cambiemos la ley para que dejen de serlo.

Por eso, desde la izquierda, creemos que hay que acabar ya con el negocio de la política migratoria, que es un negocio de muerte, y poner el dinero europeo a defender la vida y los derechos.

En Lesbos, en Melilla, en Canarias, etcétera, menos Frontex y menos militarización y más recursos para impulsar programas de acogida y servicios públicos de calidad y empleo para los que están y para los que llegan.

Debemos dotarnos de una unidad de salvamento civil pública y europea para el rescate en el mar, habilitar vías legales y seguras para que nadie se juegue la vida buscando un futuro digno, llevar a cabo un reparto vinculante y solidario de las personas que migran entre todos los países de la UE para evitarnos la vergüenza de esos campos de detención, y, en definitiva, erradicar el racismo de la política migratoria europea.

Laura Ferrara (NI). – Signor Presidente, onorevoli colleghi, l'Europa si trova ad affrontare una crisi migratoria dopo l'altra, senza riuscire a trovare una soluzione perché manca la volontà politica.

Sebbene si invochi un approccio europeo, ogni paese continua infatti a ragionare in termini intergovernativi, concentrandosi sugli interessi strettamente nazionali. Da sempre chiediamo che la questione migratoria sia governata dal principio di solidarietà ed equa ripartizione delle responsabilità, così come previsto dall'articolo 80 del trattato.

È indispensabile una revisione del regolamento di Dublino e l'introduzione di un meccanismo di ricollocamento che sia obbligatorio e permanente, così come è necessaria l'istituzione di un'operazione europea di ricerca e salvataggio, perché il mero coordinamento lasciato alla volontarietà degli Stati membri non sempre funziona.

Chi, come Giorgia Meloni, ha invocato il blocco navale definendo il ricollocamento dei migranti tra tutti i porti europei un'invasione, ha dimostrato di fare solo propaganda, oltre che una grande incompetenza.

Per risolvere la questione migratoria serve un diritto d'asilo europeo e un sistema centralizzato, in grado di non far ricadere oneri sproporzionati su pochi paesi europei e tutelare i diritti fondamentali dei migranti.

Dolors Montserrat (PPE). – Señor presidente, la defensa de nuestras fronteras, la defensa de nuestra seguridad no se entendería y no sería posible sin el duro y sacrificado trabajo de nuestras fuerzas y cuerpos de seguridad del Estado.

Los agentes merecen nuestro apoyo, pero también refuerzo con más personal, recursos y mejores materiales de protección, como ellos mismos reclaman. Nuestros cuerpos de seguridad no pueden verse desbordados por falta de agentes frente a entradas masivas.

Hay que aumentar la coordinación europea, evitar efectos llamada, perseguir con planes específicos, tanto nacionales como europeos, a las mafias que usan el drama de la inmigración y, también, continuar con el apoyo en cooperación y desarrollo a los terceros países.

La frontera de España es la frontera de Europa. Defender Ceuta y Melilla es defender no solo a España, sino también defender la Unión Europea. Por eso exigimos al Gobierno de España que sea transparente y diga la verdad sobre lo ocurrido en la valla de Melilla el 24 de junio. ¿Qué oculta el ministro del Interior de Pedro Sánchez? Es inadmisible que el ministro se niegue a acudir al Parlamento Europeo para dar explicaciones por la tragedia de la valla de Melilla. Ni transparencia ni ejemplaridad. Estamos ante el Gobierno de la opacidad. El que calla, oculta. Los ciudadanos merecemos conocer siempre la verdad y no merecemos un Gobierno que nos mienta.

Estamos ante otra crisis migratoria. Se puede desbordar la capacidad de acogida de las ciudades autónomas de Ceuta y Melilla. Nuestros cuerpos de seguridad pueden sufrir más agresiones. La Unión Europea no puede mirar hacia otro lado. Ante las avalanchas migratorias, todos estamos obligados a llegar a un acuerdo en el Nuevo Pacto sobre Migración y Asilo, poniendo siempre en valor los principios de solidaridad y responsabilidad. Si no actuamos ya, fracasaremos.

Gabriele Bischoff (S&D). – Herr Präsident! Ich glaube, angesichts der Debatte hier ist es gut, dass wir uns noch einmal daran erinnern, was uns die Bürgerinnen und Bürger der Zukunftskonferenz zum Bereich Migration ins Stammbuch geschrieben haben.

Die haben gesagt, wir sollen entschiedener handeln und endlich eine gemeinsame Migrationspolitik hinkriegen, und ich glaube, der Migrationspakt, das ist das Beweisstück, was wir schaffen müssen, um dem zu folgen. Und die haben uns noch mal gesagt, sie wollen eine Reform des europäischen Asylrechts auf der Grundlage der Grundsätze der Solidarität und der gerechten Verteilung der Verantwortlichkeiten, und sie empfehlen uns, gemeinsame EU-Vorschriften für die Verfahren zur Prüfung von Anträgen auf internationalen Schutz sicherzustellen, die einheitlich auf alle Asylbewerber anzuwenden sind, und dass diese den Verfahren der Menschenwürde und dem Völkerrecht Rechnung tragen müssen.

Sie wollen auch, dass wir das Dublin-System überprüfen – Solidarität und eine gerechte Verteilung der Verantwortlichkeiten in den Mitgliedstaaten. Und wenn sich grundlegend nichts ändert, dann werden weiter populistische Aktionen wie in Italien Europa spalten, das Klima vergiften und die Bürgerinnen und Bürger zweifeln lassen; und auch hier: handeln statt populistischer Spielchen.

Nicola Danti (Renew). – Signor Presidente, onorevoli colleghi, Signor Commissario, se dovessimo fare un bilancio tra le parole spese a discutere di migrazione in quest'Aula dal 2015 a oggi, e i risultati ottenuti, non potremmo che certificare il fallimento dell'Europa o meglio il fallimento degli Stati nazionali, che hanno scelto gli interessi elettorali e l'ideologia e non la razionalità e i valori europei.

Eppure, Presidente, le soluzioni le conosciamo tutti: servono canali di migrazione legale che tolgano ai trafficanti di uomini il monopolio nel Mediterraneo; serve rafforzare il coordinamento delle operazioni di ricerca e soccorso, così come delle procedure di gestione delle richieste di asilo; serve una vera politica di rimpatri e di cooperazione con gli Stati nordafricani, oggi più che mai vista la crisi alimentare causata dalla Russia, e serve, soprattutto, un meccanismo di ricollocazione dei migranti vincolante e solidale.

La tabella di marcia per l'adozione del Patto europeo sulla migrazione e il meccanismo di solidarietà volontaria sono piccoli faticosi passi avanti, che rischiano però di essere resi vani da quel populismo sovranista al quale il governo italiano sembra rispondere. Passa la linea Salvini, insomma, di chi urla e sbatte i pugni sul tavolo, abbandonando la politica e scegliendo la demagogia, senza ottenere alcun risultato.

Una strada che non possiamo permetterci di intraprendere, cari colleghi. Chiudere gli occhi, accecati dalla propaganda, significa perdere la capacità di gestire un fenomeno strutturale insito nella nostra natura e con essa perdere anche la nostra umanità.

Damien Carême (Verts/ALE). – Monsieur le Président, Monsieur le Commissaire, Monsieur le représentant du Conseil, hier, nous avons célébré ici même en grande pompe les 70 ans de ce Parlement européen. Il a été largement rappelé que ce qui a fondé notre communauté, ce sont des valeurs européennes, mais en réalité, en Méditerranée, dans la Manche, à toutes nos frontières, ces valeurs sont piétinées.

Face à la détresse de 234 exilés, la France et l'Italie ont fait honte à ces valeurs. Les vies humaines valent pourtant beaucoup mieux que ces postures politiciennes. Les gouvernements dits républicains en Europe ne doivent pas emboîter le pas de l'extrême droite, mais bien au contraire, ils doivent s'unir, forts et sûrs de nos valeurs, pour combattre ses idées, ses procédés ignobles et certainement pas en utilisant sa rhétorique, Monsieur Weber.

Je vous rappelle les chiffres de l'Office international des migrations: 87 % des migrations dans le monde se font dans le pays voisin de celui qui est fui. Nous ne devons accueillir collectivement qu'une infime partie de ces personnes. Or, depuis des années, l'Union européenne a traité les questions migratoires principalement par une surenchère sécuritaire. Et c'est une défaite totale. Pire, une défaite morale.

Et, sommet de l'indignation: certains irresponsables politiques accusent aujourd'hui les ONG qui effectuent le sauvetage en mer, parce que nous ne sommes pas capables de l'organiser, de complicité avec les passeurs. Cessons de criminaliser l'action des ONG, des bénévoles. Il est vraiment temps de se ressaisir et de proposer des solutions, un pacte à la hauteur de l'exigence humanitaire.

Jaak Madison (ID). – Mr President, Commissioner, in your speech, you mentioned that we need a long-term solution and sustainable framework for migration policy. And in some ways I agree with that. Absolutely. But now is the question about solutions and the ways how we can go.

The first point, what we haven't done is how to guarantee the external borders of the third countries in the Middle East and northern Africa to guarantee that there will be zero boats that will sink and there will be zero deaths on the Mediterranean Sea. That's the first thing. And to take away the resources for the human traffickers.

The second thing, European taxpayers are paying millions of euros every year for Frontex to guarantee the external borders of the EU, and that's their work to do, to guarantee that our borders are protected.

And the third point is how to help the people who need international protection, who are really refugees, who are escaping from the war. And in this case, I would never say, but I agree with the Social Democrats from Denmark: very good solution. To screen and to have a background. Amazing idea. And if you need a good example of the migration policy, and I think you know it very well, how in Lithuania and Poland we're dealing with illegal migration. And last year in December, where they had thousands of migrants from Iraq who had just both the tickets to Belarus and tried to enter the EU. And they said, no, the border is closed. You are not refugees, you're illegal migrants who are tried to enter the EU and there is no right for that. And in three weeks the problem was solved. Absolutely solved.

And of course, if we really need solidarity and if you're so open minded and with open hearts, please open your doors. You can how many migrants you want in your own home. Please show really good solidarity for the European nations.

Nicola Procaccini (ECR). – Signor Presidente, onorevoli colleghi, sull'immigrazione, fino ad oggi, si è fatto ciò che ha preteso la sinistra.

Il risultato qual è stato? Traffico di esseri umani, migliaia di morti in mare, migliaia di immigrati illegali sui nostri territori, lavoro in nero con salari da fame e nessun diritto garantito, manodopera a disposizione della criminalità organizzata, perdita di sicurezza nelle nostre città, uno squallido e politicizzato business dell'accoglienza alimentato dai soldi europei.

A fronte di questo fallimento, il centrodestra europeo, finalmente unito, propone un altro modello. Vogliamo contrastare le partenze illegali, realizzare centri di accoglienza nei paesi di origine e transito dove esaminare le domande di ingresso in Europa e dove stabilire chi ha diritto alla protezione internazionale perché fugge da guerre e persecuzioni, e chi invece no.

In questo modo diventerebbe possibile anche stabilire dei flussi legali e contenuti di migranti economici, funzionali allo sviluppo delle nostre città. Ai migranti legali dobbiamo garantire un viaggio sicuro e di potersi integrare con le nostre popolazioni. Nei confronti di tutti gli altri possiamo solo impegnarci nel favorire lo sviluppo delle nazioni da cui si origina la migrazione.

La nostra proposta è impregnata di buon senso e vera solidarietà, ma già so che verrà avversata dalla parte sinistra di questo Parlamento con le solite parole furiosamente ideologiche.

Ciò che alcuni qui dentro chiamano sprezzantemente fortezza Europa, noi chiamiamo, semplicemente, Europa.

Κωνσταντίνος Αρβανίτης (The Left). – Κύριε Πρόεδρε, για μία ακόμη φορά σήμερα μιλάμε για χιλιάδες ζωές που έχουν χαθεί στη Μεσόγειο —για αυτούς που γνωρίζουμε, γιατί είναι και κάποιοι χιλιάδες αγνοούμενοι που δεν γνωρίζουμε. Και ενώ μαίνεται η εγκληματική επίθεση της Τουρκίας στην Ουκρανία, πριν μερικές ημέρες είχαμε τη στρατιωτική επίθεση της Τουρκίας στη Συρία.

Η Πρόεδρος κυρία Metsola μίλησε για αυτοσυγκράτηση. Ποιων; Της Τουρκίας, των νεκρών, των αγνοουμένων ή των νέων προσφύγων; Τα αίτια, λοιπόν, είναι το πρώτο θέμα. Το δεύτερο είναι το δικό μας αφήγημα. Ευρώπη-φρούριο και προώθηση του ευρωπαϊκού τρόπου ζωής. Πόσο νόμιμο είναι αυτό; Πόσο δίκαιο και πόσο ρεαλιστικό; Η ποινικοποίηση, λοιπόν, της βασικής αρχής διάσωσης, της θεμελιώδους αρχής της προστασίας της ζωής σε κατάσταση ανάγκης; Όπως ανακοίνωσαν οι τέσσερις Υπουργοί;

Και εδώ υπάρχει ένα θέμα που δεν το βλέπουμε πρώτη φορά. Εθνικές πολιτικές ή κατά μόνας ή διακρατικές, που προσπερνούν την κοινή ευρωπαϊκή θέση και στάση. Είμαστε σίγουροι, λοιπόν, ότι σε λίγο δεν θα ποινικοποιηθεί και το δικαίωμα αίτησης στο άσυλο; Νομίζω, λοιπόν, ότι όσο δεν γίνεται απεμπλοκή της Ένωσης από τη δημιουργία αιτιών που προανέφερα, όσο δεν υπάρχουν νόμιμες και ασφαλείς οδοί για να μπορέσουν αυτοί οι άνθρωποι να αιτηθούν άσυλο και προστασία, αυτό το έγκλημα θα συνεχίζεται.

Dino Giarrusso (NI). – Signor Presidente, onorevoli colleghi, la parola che dovrebbe risuonare oggi in questo palazzo parlando di immigrazione è una sola: vergogna.

Vergogna, *shame, honte, vergüenza*.

Perché è vergognoso che ancora oggi sia il paese di primo approdo, l'Italia, a dover affrontare da solo un fenomeno epocale che riguarda tutta l'Europa. Il Canale di Sicilia è il confine fra Africa ed Europa, non un confine italiano. Eppure l'Italia da sola impegna navi, uomini, soldi, mezzi.

I sindacati di polizia, SEAP in testa, denunciano da anni come molti dei nostri agenti migliori siano costretti a lasciare sguarnite le nostre città, perché l'Italia da sola deve gestire decine di migliaia di arrivi. Parlare di ricollocamenti è un modo ipocrita per sviare l'attenzione, è prima che servono soldi, mezzi e uomini di tutti i paesi europei.

Presidente von der Leyen, Le abbiamo dato fiducia perché ha promesso di cancellare gli accordi di Dublino. Dopo tre anni e mezzo non è stato fatto nulla. Bisogna combattere i trafficanti di uomini, salvare le vite umane, ma va fatto come Europa, non scaricando tutto sull'Italia.

Parlare di Europa unita sarà una vergognosa ipocrisia finché non sarà unita nell'affrontare l'immigrazione di massa. E fino ad allora la parola da dire sarà solo una: vergogna.

Tomas Tobé (PPE). – Mr President, Commission and the Council, Europe is at a crossroads. Either Member States continue to act more and more independently when it comes to migration or we find a common European approach. That is basically the choice that we have to make.

And for me, it is clear that, yes, we need a system that provides control of the external borders. Yes, we need a system that will provide protection to refugees and, yes, that is firm to those who are not. That is why we urgently need the migration pact. And the EPP Group is committed to having the pact in place before the end of this mandate. And this is possible, but it will require pragmatism and constructiveness from all of us.

We must also do more to address the root causes and the drivers of migration. For this reason, we must deepen our cooperation also with third countries. The events of last week have highlighted the urgency of a predictable, operational and truly common approach to asylum and migration.

This House has been waiting for the Council to get ready. The Council is finally now actually coming more and more together. It is time also for this House to make sure that we now come together and take this opportunity, because we have a choice to make and that is to have a European approach to migration.

Pietro Bartolo (S&D). – Signor Presidente, signor Commissario, nel mio paese, in Italia, continua la campagna di criminalizzazione contro le ONG impegnate in attività di soccorso e salvataggio in mare, accusate di agire come fattori di attrazione, accusate di fare il gioco degli scafisti, accusate anche quando cercano riparo in un porto sicuro.

Questa strumentalizzazione dell'obbligo del soccorso in mare e, sottolineo, dell'obbligo giuridico e morale di prestare assistenza in mare è vergognosa e deve finire. Così come dobbiamo superare lo stallo della solidarietà su base volontaria, che non funziona, l'abbiamo visto. La politica migratoria necessita di strategie condivise e risposte comuni, come abbiamo fatto con l'Ucraina.

Non possiamo accontentarci di un piano di azione sostanzialmente incentrato sulla prevenzione della migrazione a tutti i costi. Abbiamo bisogno di aprire canali regolari di immigrazione legale, combattendo la retorica dell'invasione. Abbiamo bisogno di una riforma del sistema di asilo che venga incontro ai bisogni dei paesi di primo ingresso. Abbiamo bisogno di risposte europee che non ci rendano corresponsabili delle continue tragedie, non solo nel Mediterraneo, ma anche in tutte le altre rotte migratorie.

Abbiamo sentito qualcuno che ha detto che l'Africa è un continente con più di un miliardo di persone, ma che abbiamo scambiato per un ipermercato dove prendere tutto gratis e poi ci chiediamo perché queste persone partono. Dobbiamo renderci conto di quello che noi facciamo e le nostre responsabilità di quello che si fa in Africa.

PREDSEDÁ: MICHAL ŠIMEČKA

podpredseda

Jan-Christoph Oetjen (Renew). – Herr Präsident, liebe Vertreter der Kommission und des Rates, verehrte Kolleginnen und Kollegen! Eigentlich bin ich es leid, diese Debatten zu führen; ich sage das hier mal an dieser Stelle ganz deutlich. Wir haben nichts Neues, über das wir hier debattieren. Der Rat trägt uns eine lauwarme Rede vor, die nicht einmal die Redezeit ausnutzt, weil Sie nichts zu sagen haben. Die Kommission präsentiert uns ein 20-Punkte-Programm – das ist aber eigentlich nur alter Wein in neuen Schläuchen.

Verehrte Kolleginnen und Kollegen, wir haben kein Erkenntnisproblem; wir haben ein Handlungsproblem, und das ist doch das, was wir hier an dieser Stelle mal ansprechen müssen. Dann gibt es den Antrag von der EVP, hier die Debatte zu führen, und der Rat ist ganz weinerlich und sagt: Ja, wir müssen endlich mal Fortschritte machen beim Migrationsrat. Ja, natürlich brauchen wir Fortschritt beim Migrationspakt, natürlich brauchen wir den Pakt.

Aber es liegt doch nicht an diesem Europäischen Parlament, dass wir im Bereich der Migration, des Asyls überhaupt nicht weiterkommen, sondern es liegt daran, dass im Rat keine Mehrheiten dafür sind, dass konstruktive Politik gemacht wird. Das ist doch das Problem. Und Sie könnten doch handeln. Warum haben wir denn Nichtregierungsorganisationen, die im Mittelmeer Seenotrettung machen? Das liegt daran, dass wir keine staatliche Seenotrettung im Mittelmeer machen. Und die Malta-Seenotrettungszone funktioniert nicht mal richtig; da ersaufen die Leute, während wir hier diskutieren.

Ich bin es leid, diese Debatten zu führen. Ich bin es leid, darauf zu warten, dass es im Rat endlich Fortschritt gibt. Und, verehrte Kolleginnen und Kollegen, Sie können handeln im Rat. Sie können Fortschritte machen, denn wir haben sogar Punkte, wo wir uns einig sind. Setzen Sie sie endlich in Kraft! Setzen Sie sie endlich in Kraft, dann haben wir Fortschritt.

Und eins zum Abschluss: Wenn wir es nicht schaffen, wenn der Rat es nicht schafft, einen Solidaritätsmechanismus zu finden und dafür im Rat Mehrheiten zu organisieren, dann werden wir beim Migrationspakt überhaupt keine Fortschritte machen.

Alice Kuhnke (Verts/ALE). – Mr President. Why? Why are you discussing how to criminalise people and organizations that save lives; instead of putting the pressure on the EU governments that shy away from their responsibilities? And how dare so many of you define yourself as Christians and repeat that you are defending Christian values when your ideas and your actions are proof of the opposite. There is no doubt about responsibility when it comes to saving lives at risk at sea. Thank God for the ones that do what needs to be done. We need to discuss how we shall do what they are doing.

Filip De Man (ID). – Voorzitter, de asielcrisis is terug van nooit weggeweest. In België komen er tegenwoordig 40 000 asielzoekers per jaar binnen, in heel Europa om en nabij één miljoen. Dat is onhoudbaar en ik heb dus een resolutie ingediend, een resolutie die ertoe strekt om de zaak definitief op te lossen. Het voorstel is om het Protocol van New York uit 1967 op te zeggen. Daarmee zouden wij nog uitsluitend vluchtelingen uit Europa opvangen, wat we trouwens nu doen met de talloze Oekraïense vluchtelingen. Dat was trouwens de bedoeling van het Vluchtelingenverdrag in 1951 na de Tweede Wereldoorlog: de vele miljoenen Europese vluchtelingen een veilige haven bieden. Maar in 1967 heeft men dus met dat protocol die begrenzing opgegeven en worden wij nu geacht de hele wereld hier te verwelkomen. Dat moet stoppen. Het toelaten van miljoenen migranten zal onze samenleving ontwrichten en onze sociale zekerheid doen imploderen. Ik vraag dus uw steun voor deze resolutie.

Jorge Buxadé Villalba (ECR). – Señor presidente, señores comisarios, mientras Frontex alerta de que más de 280 000 personas han entrado ilegalmente en el territorio de la Unión, ustedes miran a otro lado. Mientras todos los días tenemos noticia de una nueva agresión, violación, tiroteo o asesinato a manos de inmigrantes ilegales, ustedes miran a otro lado.

Todos ustedes saben que la solución pasa por blindar las fronteras exteriores y acabar con el modelo de negocio de las mafias de tráfico de seres humanos, pero miran a otro lado. No es ignorancia, es complicidad y encubrimiento. Complicidad, porque siguen apoyando a esas ONG que colaboran con las mafias y echan pulsos a los Gobiernos legítimos como el de Georgia Meloni. Y encubrimiento, porque tratan de perpetuar un sistema que permite a los ilegales eludir la acción de la justicia con su doctrina de las fronteras abiertas y su inventado concepto de los rescatados.

Ni siquiera las evidencias de los contactos entre esas organizaciones y las mafias para recoger a los inmigrantes en las aguas de terceros países como Libia y traerlos a Europa o sus opacas fuentes de financiación sirven para que este Parlamento ponga un poco de sentido común y deje de atacar a quienes defienden la frontera.

Lo repito: fronteras seguras, calles seguras; fronteras abiertas, sociedades indefensas.

Si ustedes no saben, dejen paso. Nosotros estamos preparados y dispuestos.

Márton Gyöngyösi (NI). – Mr President, dear colleagues, dear Commissioner, migration is the EU's greatest challenge and the gravest social crisis of all times. It is shocking to see thousands of people dying on the sea and outrageous to see smuggler networks benefiting and profiting from migration.

The Commission's proposal is far from ground-breaking, but it does help us to focus our conversations – guidelines for NGO boats, coordination with African and Asian countries to return migrants, and the push to implement voluntary relocation within the bloc are the right priorities. However, the EU should also make it very clear that it will sanction and not provide any aid or funds to any government that openly or tacitly cooperates with smugglers or is unwilling to interrupt their activities. Smugglers conduct slave trade. They are terrorists and they should be treated as such.

Also, Frontex should be developed into a classic border policing and border protection organ under a united command, financed from a common budget. Without a common border protection mechanism, the EU will not be able to tackle migration.

Βαγγέλης Μεϊμαράκης (PPE). – Κύριε Πρόεδρε, τι άλλο πρέπει να ακούσουμε για να αφυπνιστούμε τελικά; Πόσους απελπισμένους ανθρώπους που αναζητούν μια ανθρώπινη ζωή και ένα καλύτερο αύριο πρέπει να διασώσει το ελληνικό Λιμενικό από τη θάλασσα για να δράσουμε πιο αποτελεσματικά; Έχει χαθεί πλέον ο αριθμός που μαρτυρά τη σοβαρότητα αυτού του προβλήματος. Στη χώρα μου, την Ελλάδα, μόλις προχθές σημειώθηκε άλλο ένα ναυάγιο ανοικτά της Κρήτης, με περίπου 500 ανθρώπινες ψυχές να παλεύουν με τα κύματα —θύματα των λαθροδιακινητών, οι οποίοι δρουν ανεξέλεγκτα στα ευρωπαϊκά σύνορα, εκμεταλλευόμενοι τους ανθρώπους αυτούς.

Πρέπει να βάλουμε ένα τέλος εδώ. Και αυτό θα γίνει μόνο μέσω στοχευμένων ευρωπαϊκών δράσεων και πρωτοβουλιών. Έχει δίκιο ο Αντιπρόεδρος, ο κύριος Σχοινάς: δεν είναι αντιμετώπιση μεμονωμένων γεγονότων σε διάρκεια χρόνου, αλλά πρέπει να βρεθεί ένα άλλο πλαίσιο αντιμετώπισης του ζητήματος. Τώρα περισσότερο από ποτέ είναι ανάγκη η αλλαγή του υπάρχοντος πλαισίου. Πιο συγκεκριμένα, σαφώς ενίσχυση της φύλαξης των ευρωπαϊκών μας συνόρων, με παράλληλη ενίσχυση του Frontex, του οποίου ο ρόλος, τελικά, είναι να φυλάει τα σύνορα και όχι να υποδέχεται απελπισμένους ανθρώπους που εγκατέλειψαν την τύχη τους στους λαθροδιακινητές.

Στο πλαίσιο αυτό, λοιπόν, η Ευρωπαϊκή Ένωση πρέπει να επιβεβαιώσει την αλληλεγγύη της και όλες οι χώρες να αναλάβουν το μερίδιο που τους αναλογεί χωρίς διακρίσεις. Το θέμα είναι ανθρωπιστικό. Δεν μπορεί κατά κύριο λόγο οι πρώτες χώρες υποδοχής να επωμίζονται όλο το βάρος του μεταναστευτικού και να συζητάμε εδώ τόσα χρόνια χωρίς αποτέλεσμα. Το θέμα ξεπερνά τις κομματικές γραμμές. Πρέπει να βρούμε λύσεις. Πρέπει να υπάρξει σύμφωνο με συνολική λύση —λύση ευρωπαϊκή. Για αυτό και στηρίζουμε την άποψή σας.

Sylvie Guillaume (S&D). – Monsieur le Président, combien de fois nous sommes-nous retrouvés dans cet hémicycle pour évoquer les sauvetages en mer et déplorer leurs drames? Bien trop souvent, pour le peu de changements tangibles.

Ces dernières semaines, nous observons une énième crise diplomatique et, en réaction, la Commission propose un nouveau plan d'action. C'est une tentative louable, mais sa lecture est frappante, car c'est l'empilement de mesures déjà existantes à réactiver. Est-ce à dire qu'elles n'étaient plus mises en œuvre et pour quelle raison alors? Ou alors si elles étaient encore actives, en quoi ce plan va-t-il changer le statu quo actuel où les États membres font valoir leurs divergences politiques pour bloquer le pacte sur l'asile et la migration?

Par ailleurs, le plan se concentre sur la Méditerranée centrale, et c'est nécessaire. Mais avec plus de 42 000 arrivées au Royaume-Uni depuis janvier, combien de personnes ont subi le sort des naufragés et des morts de la Manche en novembre 2021, auxquels les secours français et britanniques n'ont pas porté l'assistance nécessaire?

Il y a urgence. Oui, c'est celle de rétablir un véritable mécanisme de recherche et de sauvetage sous égide européenne, fiable, coordonné, dans toutes les eaux de l'Union.

Fabienne Keller (Renew). – Monsieur le Président, Monsieur le Ministre représentant la présidence tchèque, Monsieur le Commissaire, cher Margaritis Schinas, Madame la Commissaire, chère Ylva Johansson, en refusant le débarquement de l'Ocean Viking quelques semaines après sa nomination, Giorgia Meloni rappelle ce que c'est que l'extrême droite au pouvoir: le mépris des vies humaines, le désordre plutôt que le respect des règles. Face aux responsabilités, les populistes préfèrent les coups de comm' aux solutions réelles.

Or, tout au contraire, la réponse au défi migratoire se trouve dans la coopération européenne. Au Parlement européen, nous travaillons d'arrache-pied pour construire une politique européenne d'asile et de migration équilibrée entre nos valeurs humanistes d'assistance aux plus démunis et un contrôle effectif de nos frontières extérieures; pour bâtir un mécanisme de solidarité efficace et juste entre tous les États membres, en particulier pour aider les pays de première entrée comme l'Italie; pour réformer et simplifier nos procédures d'asile et accélérer les procédures pour les demandes des personnes manifestement non éligibles; enfin, pour offrir une protection et une intégration réussie aux réfugiés sur notre sol.

Dans ces négociations, chers collègues, l'extrême droite est absente. Voilà le bilan des populistes. Ils se nourrissent des tensions, les alimentent, mais ne cherchent pas les solutions. En Européens, nous nous engageons, avec mon groupe Renew Europe, pour une réforme ambitieuse, pour des solutions concrètes et fidèles à nos valeurs.

Tineke Strik (Verts/ALE). – Mr President, dear Council, Commissioners, when persons are in distress at sea, every minute counts. Yet coastal states refuse to fulfil their international obligation to rescue them and disembark them in their ports. They instrumentalise people whose life is at risk in a cynical attempt to push for solidarity.

Yes, we urgently need a fair distribution of asylum seekers, we've called for that for years, but the lack of it can never be an excuse to play with people's lives. And how cynical is it that NGOs filling this gap and saving lives are criminalised, whereas the states violating their obligation enjoy impunity.

The new action plan doesn't change that. It repeats what we already know isn't working. We don't need more migration deals that lead to the containment of people in hell: look at Libya. Instead, we must prioritise saving lives and upholding the right to seek asylum. And I call on the Commission to act as a real guardian of the Treaty: design a common response to end the brutal death zone; fund and coordinate a state-led search-and-rescue mission; and force Member States to take their responsibility.

And none of this, of course, will be successful without fair responsibility-sharing and mandatory relocation. I once again urge Member States to prioritise solidarity and end this deadly race to the bottom.

Teuvo Hakkarainen (ID). – Arvoisa puhemies, loputtomaan laittomaan tulijatulvaan on olemassa vain yksi ratkaisu: rajat kiinni. Se on ainoa ratkaisu siihen asiaan. Luulisi viimein järjen tavoittavan EU-parlamentinkin. Jatkuva jaarittelu tästä asiasta vain kiihdyttää Eurooppaan tulevaa väestönvaihtoa. On ryhdyttävä tekemään eikä vain puhumaan. Väestöräjähdyksen vuoksi valepakolaisten eli nuorten miesten muukalaisvyöry ei koskaan lopu. Siksi väylät on suljettava. Eurooppaan tunkeutuminen ei ole mikään ihmisoikeus.

Välimerestä tulijat on käännytettävä takaisin lähtöpaikkaansa ja alueella päivystävien humanitäärisen avun nimissä toimivien ihmiskauppiaiden alukset takavarikoitava. Kun tieto Euroopan rajojen sulkemisesta leviää, tulijavirta loppuu itsestään. Näin yksinkertainen ja ainoa toimiva on lääke tähän tautiin.

Beata Kempa (ECR). – Panie Przewodniczący! Pani Komisarz! Koleżanki i Koledzy! Dyskusja o migracji jest zawsze pełna emocji, szczególnie tu, na tej sali, bo z jednej strony mamy uciekających przed głodem i biedą ludzi, niczemu i nikomu winnych, ale z drugiej strony musimy też ważyć bezpieczeństwo naszych obywateli.

Szczególnie ważne jest to w kontekście bardzo agresywnej polityki Rosji i Turcji, a także znaczącego wzrostu aktywności organizacji terrorystycznych, a zwłaszcza organizacji, które zajmują się przemytem ludzi. Musimy wiedzieć, że oni nas obserwują i będą czerpać korzyści z naszej naiwności. Całkowite otwarcie granic i ułatwienie migrantom wjazdu do Unii Europejskiej to jest jednak ślepa uliczka i naiwne podejście zagrażające bezpieczeństwu naszej Wspólnoty.

Ale mamy też bardzo dobre działania. To jest właśnie ta alternatywa. To jest stabilizacja makroekonomiczna państw będących źródłem imigracji oraz pomoc humanitarna i rozwojowa, którą jako Unia Europejska świadczymy na miejscu w Afryce, na Bliskim Wschodzie, w wielu, wielu krajach. To jest bardzo realna pomoc, alternatywna wobec naiwnej polityki otwartych granic.

I ostatnie zdanie: nie możemy zapomnieć o instrumentalnym, cynicznym wykorzystywaniu migrantów przez reżimy w Moskwie i na Białorusi. A to w tej chwili dzieje się na granicy Polski i Unii Europejskiej.

Jérôme Rivière (NI). – Monsieur le Président, chers collègues, alors que les peuples des nations européennes ne sont jamais consultés, la Commission et la majorité au sein de ce Parlement poussent à une arrivée massive de migrants – oui, poussent. Il y a dix jours, M. Borrell affirmait sur une télévision française: l'hiver démographique de l'Europe est comblé par les apports du reste du monde. Voilà qui éclaire votre pseudo-réforme de l'asile politique.

Pourquoi prétendre qu'un recul démographique est inéluctable alors qu'une politique nataliste volontariste permet, comme le démontre la Hongrie, un printemps démographique? Qu'il est curieux de vouloir financer ce que pudiquement vous baptisez des «apports» quand il s'agit d'un mouvement massif bien plus semblable par sa composition – des hommes jeunes, mais bien peu de femmes et d'enfants – à une véritable invasion. Financer sa propre submersion est une première dans l'histoire des civilisations.

Ce parti-pris pour l'immigration traduit une volonté de déconstruction systématique de notre civilisation commune et c'est ce à quoi nous nous opposons. Ce faisant, vous brisez tout espoir d'unité européenne tant les réactions des peuples sont divergentes entre ceux qui souffrent, une majorité, et les profiteurs de la mondialisation que vous défendez sans discernement.

François-Xavier Bellamy (PPE). – Monsieur le Président, ce matin, nous parlons de secours en mer et de politique d'asile. Bien sûr, bien sûr, il faut sauver les gens qui se noient. Personne ne le conteste ici. Mais le mieux, c'est encore d'éviter qu'ils risquent leur vie.

Qu'est-ce qui est endeuille aujourd'hui la mer Méditerranée? C'est notre impuissance collective qui fait que si quelqu'un arrive à entrer illégalement en Europe, il est certain d'y rester toujours. C'est la démission de gouvernements, dont le gouvernement français, dont la décision d'accueillir ce bateau est la publicité dont rêvaient les réseaux de passeurs. C'est la complicité de certaines ONG, dont il est avéré qu'elles sont en contact étroit avec ces filières de traite d'êtres humains. C'est le détournement de nos principes par des jurisprudences abusives qui rendent impuissantes nos lois. C'est l'acharnement de ceux qui, à la Commission, parfois, ou au Parlement, ont attaqué sans relâche la direction de Frontex – non parce qu'elle ne faisait pas son travail, mais parce qu'elle faisait son travail. Nous ne faisons même plus semblant de combattre ces réseaux de passeurs, la mafia la plus criminelle du monde, qui gagne des milliards d'euros grâce à notre passivité.

Ce n'est pas d'abord parce qu'ils fuient la guerre ou la misère que les gens se noient en Méditerranée. Ceux qui partent sont ceux qui ont déjà assez de moyens pour payer la traversée. Mais nous, nous n'avons pas le droit, même si nous les comprenons, nous n'avons pas le droit au cynisme caché derrière les beaux discours qui compte sur les forces vives des pays en développement pour faire chez nous le travail que nous ne voulons plus faire ou que nos entreprises ne veulent plus payer comme il faut.

L'Europe est une société vieillissante, avez-vous dit, Madame la Commissaire. L'Europe a besoin de personnes de tous niveaux de qualifications et, je vous cite, l'Union européenne élargira les possibilités de migration. Mais cette logique utilitariste, derrière les grandes leçons de morale qui prétendent s'inquiéter de la souffrance des plus lointains, n'écoute pas la souffrance des plus proches, des plus pauvres, des plus vulnérables dans nos propres pays, ceux qui vivent directement les tensions terribles nées du déni de cette politique migratoire irresponsable. La solidarité européenne doit consister à répondre ensemble à ce défi, non pas en gérant notre impuissance, mais en y mettant enfin fin.

Isabel Santos (S&D). – Senhor Presidente, sete anos volvidos sobre o drama vivido em 2015, e depois de mais de 25 000 vidas perdidas no Mediterrâneo, estamos aqui, mais uma vez, a discutir a necessidade de implementar uma efetiva política de migração e asilo e de criar um mecanismo de busca e salvamento.

Não será, por certo, com a repetição de soluções como a cooperação reforçada com a Líbia, um vasto terreno de violações de direitos humanos, constante do plano de ação apresentado há dois dias, que faremos com que algo mude. Necessitamos, sim, de desenvolver uma abordagem sustentável e holística, assente na solidariedade obrigatória entre todos os Estados-Membros, na partilha das suas responsabilidades à luz do direito internacional, seja, ainda, na matéria de salvamento, seja na matéria de proteção internacional.

E não sejamos ingénuos: o salvamento de vidas, a gestão de movimentos migratórios e o combate ao tráfico só serão efetivamente possíveis com a criação de corredores humanitários e canais legais que permitam movimentos seguros e ordenados, com integral respeito pelos direitos humanos. Não com as soluções que avançamos hoje.

Maite Pagazaurtundúa (Renew). – Señor presidente, señorías, llevamos siete años dejando pudrirse el paquete de asilo y migración. Y en siete años, se ha intoxicado y polarizado nuestra mirada.

Al no resolver un problema común, se han generado problemas sociales que algunos pretenden solucionar a las bravas, contra nuestras propias leyes, mientras otros viven en un mundo de sueños voluntaristas. Y quienes deben ser pragmáticos y liderar —los Gobiernos— no dan la cara, no suficientemente, no lideran, no dicen con claridad hasta dónde pueden llegar juntos. Comisarios, me consta que hacen lo que pueden, pero la voluntad que falta está en el Consejo. La no voluntad.

Y la incoherencia del no sistema, de no tener un sistema, está alimentando división social y frustración. Y sigue muriendo gente. Hemos dado asilo a muchas personas —es cierto—, pero también hemos perdido miles de oportunidades de gestionar mejor, de mejorar muchos de nuestros pueblos y ciudades. Y al no gestionar correctamente, hemos dejado que se equipare a personas que solo quieren una oportunidad y trabajan duro, muy duro muchas de ellas, con quienes están abusando del sistema.

Quiero pensar que el plan para el Mediterráneo puede ayudar a que el Consejo piense, pero tengo mis dudas.

Damian Boeselager (Verts/ALE). – Mr President, Commissioner, Minister, Maite has just said it has been seven years since we started with the first proposal – since you started with the first proposal on the common European asylum system. And since then, year by year we have been discussing and not much has happened. We have failed more or less to come up with such a system. And every day the right-wingers in this House are very, very happy about this because they can instrumentalise this to grow.

And we have seen this. How did Lega get big? How did the AfD get big? How did Marine Le Pen get big? It's all by capitalising on the fears of migration. This, for me, was one of the reasons of founding a European movement, because I feel that we have not found a system to actually take decisions to solve this issue. And what happens instead is that we have a system of basically deterrence by suffering. We fund Libyan coastguards, we fund billions for border controls, we criminalise NGOs, but we have not found a solution yet.

So I would urge you once again, please set up a European search-and-rescue mission. Please ensure that we have mechanisms to embark asylum seekers and please make sure that maritime law is upheld and NGOs are safeguarded.

Mittwoch, 23. November 2022

Harald Vilimsky (ID). – Herr Präsident! Meine Damen und Herren, ich kann das Klagen der politisch Grünen und Linken gar nicht mehr hören, die seit vielen Jahren als Lobbyisten für Massenmigration tätig sind und die Probleme, mit denen Europa heute konfrontiert ist, erst so richtig verursachen. Ich bin seit 2014 Mitglied dieses Hauses, und 2015 haben wir das bislang stärkste Jahr an Migrationsproblemen erlebt, und von Jahr zu Jahr ist es schlimmer geworden.

Heute, 2022, stehen wir vor der Situation, dass es die schlimmste Situation überhaupt ist – mehr als 2015. Seit 2015 haben sechs Millionen Menschen hier den Weg nach Europa gesucht, und zwei Drittel davon haben nicht den Status als Konventionsflüchtling und drei Viertel davon sind weder subsidiär noch humanitär schutzberechtigt. Sie bleiben aber alle hier in Europa, und genau das macht das Problem aus. Hier versagt Europa; es versagt das Schengen-Abkommen, es versagt das Dublin-Abkommen.

Was wir benötigen, ist ein effektiver Außengrenzschutz. Was wir benötigen, ist, Schengen zu sistieren, bis die Probleme gelöst sind. Und wir brauchen Hilfe für die Menschen vor Ort, ihnen in der Region zu helfen, anstatt sie alle nach Europa zu bringen.

Robert Roos (ECR). – Voorzitter, de illegale immigratie naar Europa bereikt recordhoogtes. Dit verandert het karakter van ons continent en niet per se ten goede. We moeten het nu een halt toeroepen. Deze drie dingen kan de EU vanaf vandaag al doen:

1. Frontex moet immigranten niet naar Europa meenemen, maar ze terugbrengen naar het land vanwaar ze zijn vertrokken. Pushbacks moeten EU-beleid worden.

2. Net als Denemarken moeten we akkoorden sluiten met derde landen zoals Rwanda. Asielzoekers die in Europa aankomen, sturen we naar die derde landen. Daar wachten ze hun asielprocedure af. Wie Europa toch illegaal betreedt, is nooit meer welkom. Dit zal de toestroom sterk doen afnemen.

3. Help lidstaten die de immigratie willen bestrijden. Ik denk bijvoorbeeld aan de moedige Italiaanse regering van premier Meloni. Dit kan vandaag al. Ga ermee aan de slag.

En tot slot omdat sommigen het nog in de oren moeten knopen: de illegale immigratie witwassen door dezelfde mensen voortaan legaal te laten komen, is geen oplossing van het probleem.

Balázs Hidvéghi (NI). – Monsieur le Président. Monsieur le Ministre, Madame et Monsieur les Commissaires, chers collègues, sur les 234 migrants qui sont arrivés en France à bord du navire de l'ONG Ocean Viking, seules six personnes sont encore sous le contrôle des autorités françaises, ou peut-être quatre aujourd'hui. Les autres ont été libérées et – quelle surprise! – ont immédiatement disparu en France. Voilà le résultat terrifiant d'une politique d'ouverture des frontières: des centaines de personnes sans papiers, errant librement en Europe, représentant on ne sait quelle menace pour la sécurité des citoyens européens.

Le message envoyé par cette affaire est désastreux pour l'Europe. Plus nous autorisons de navires à accoster, plus les navires suivront. Viktor Orbán et Matteo Salvini ont prouvé il y a des années que les frontières peuvent être défendues – sur terre et sur la mer aussi – s'il y a une volonté politique de le faire. La Première ministre italienne, Giorgia Meloni, a raison: la seule solution commune est la défense des frontières de l'Union européenne, le blocage des départs des bateaux de migrants et l'ouverture des hotspots en dehors de l'Europe.

Soyons clairs: les portes de l'Europe ne sont pas ouvertes pour tout le monde et pour n'importe qui. Il faut rétablir l'ordre et la sécurité.

Salvatore De Meo (PPE). – Signor Presidente, onorevoli colleghi, il dibattito di questa mattina conferma ancora una volta che quando si parla di immigrazione si rischia di essere fraintesi.

E purtroppo c'è una diffusa percezione distorta che vede da una parte i buoni, coloro che integrano e accolgono vite umane, e dall'altra i cattivi, quelli che stanno solo cercando di governare i processi migratori. Io credo che non può esserci una visione così semplicistica e categorica, ma devono esserci un approccio e una risposta comuni, ma soprattutto europei.

Tutti, anche in quest'Aula, rivendichiamo e siamo fieri dei valori europei, tra cui la solidarietà, ma a quanto pare la interpretiamo verso l'esterno, ma non la applichiamo verso l'interno. Non posso ignorare come questa tematica tocchi in modo particolare il mio paese e pochi altri e non posso non sottolineare le difficoltà e l'impegno che stiamo mettendo per gestire al meglio questa difficoltà.

Non esiste una questione migranti per l'Italia, né per ogni singolo Stato, esiste una questione migranti per l'Europa. Le coste italiane, così come altre frontiere, sono una parte dei confini dell'Unione europea, ma l'Italia non può farcela da sola, così come non può farcela nessun altro da solo. C'è bisogno di una strategia europea che coinvolga tutti e in cui ognuno faccia la propria parte.

Abbiamo bisogno di una proposta che impedisca l'immigrazione illegale e il traffico di esseri umani, bisogna attivare i corridoi umanitari, bisogna prevedere una ricollocazione obbligatoria e non volontaria, ma soprattutto un piano straordinario economico per l'Africa e per tutti quei paesi dove il problema va affrontato alla radice, per evitare che si creino le condizioni per non far scappare queste persone.

Le migliaia di morti nel Mediterraneo sono una sconfitta e un fardello per tutti noi, nessuno escluso. E allora non possiamo tornare indietro, dobbiamo soltanto andare avanti per evitare di appesantire ulteriormente questo fardello.

Elena Yoncheva (S&D). – Monsieur le Président, Monsieur le Commissaire Schinas, Madame la Commissaire Johansson, il y a près de dix ans, l'Europe a été témoin de la tragédie de Lampedusa. C'était un signal d'alarme pour nous tous. C'était un signal d'alarme pour la solidarité et pour une meilleure coordination. Près de 5 000 personnes ont trouvé la mort en Méditerranée depuis 2014 et nous continuons à compter, nous enregistrons des tragédies et nous nous cachons derrière des excuses. Nous débattons, mais nous ne changeons rien.

Nous devons gérer collectivement les opérations de recherche et de sauvetage. Nous ne pouvons pas laisser certains États membres seuls et les punir pour leur situation géographique. Nous ne pouvons pas effacer, bien sûr, les tragédies, mais nous pouvons les arrêter à l'avenir. Et la réponse est très simple: faire passer l'unité européenne avant la politique nationale. Notre politique migratoire et d'asile ne peut plus être otage des populistes et nous devrons cesser de compter constamment sur les solutions ad hoc, mais toujours réagir à une tragédie. Nous devrons empêcher tout cela de se produire, arrêter de débattre et commencer à travailler.

Ilhan Kyuchyuk (Renew). – Mr President, dear Commissioners, Dear representative of the Council, Dear colleagues, we have been discussing the need for a European solution on an asylum and migration for years now. The need for a common solution has, meanwhile, become an imperative. First and foremost, we need to find a clear system of rules that corresponds to the current realities. This is why the commitment of the European Parliament and upcoming Council Presidencies to finalise the reform of legislation on asylum and migration is pivotal. Secondly, as corresponds to our values, we need to ensure that saving human lives is a primary consideration. The legal obligation of sea rescue is a clear and unequivocal. A step forward is the – agreed under the French Presidency – Voluntary Solidarity Mechanism, taking up commitments for relocation from the countries confronted with disembarkment and heavy migration flows. But here too, we need a permanent system applied to all. it is time for solidarity. it is time for action.

Rosa D'Amato (Verts/ALE). – Signor Presidente, onorevoli colleghi, signor Commissario, l'11 novembre una motovedetta della Guardia costiera tunisina ha speronato una barca con dei migranti a bordo: sono morti 3 bambini, annegati.

Nel 2020, uno dei capi della Guardia costiera libica è stato arrestato dalle autorità di Tripoli: era uno dei boss del traffico di esseri umani. E sono solo due casi.

Ed è con i soldi dei contribuenti europei che finanziamo le guardie costiere del Nord Africa: in Tunisia, in Libia, in Egitto. E con che risultati: sale il numero dei morti.

Cari colleghi, questo è un nostro fallimento: finanziamo noi i trafficanti di esseri umani o le famigerate carceri libiche. Ma non discutiamo di questo fallimento, no, noi discutiamo delle navi delle ONG. Qualcuno ritira fuori la fantomatica teoria del *pull factor*. Dov'è questo *pull factor*? Dov'è questo falso report di Frontex che conosce il ministro Tajani in Italia, ma che noi non conosciamo e che non abbiamo diritto di vedere?

Si mette in dubbio la legalità delle attività delle ONG. Ma sono tutte accuse smentite dal diritto internazionale e nei fatti. Le ONG operano nel pieno rispetto del diritto marittimo internazionale. Chi non lo fa sono i governi che respingono i barconi, che li lasciano alla deriva in mare per settimane, come il mio governo in Italia.

Le ONG fanno l'unica cosa possibile in coerenza con i valori europei: salvare vite umane.

Jean-Paul Garraud (ID). – Monsieur le Président, selon Frontex, le nombre d'entrées illégales dans l'Union européenne a augmenté de 73 % entre janvier et novembre 2022 par rapport à l'année précédente, atteignant le niveau le plus élevé depuis 2016. Des ONG, en lien avec des passeurs, organisent ce trafic en armant des bateaux-taxis de clandestins directement depuis les côtes nord-africaines. Des ONG qui sont parfois subventionnées par l'Europe, certains États et des collectivités territoriales comme la Ville de Paris.

Pourtant, la Commission européenne a annoncé lundi dernier qu'il fallait accentuer la coopération avec ces ONG et procéder à une meilleure répartition des migrants dans les États membres. Ce plan est parfaitement relayé en France, où M. Macron se prépare à accueillir ces migrants sur tout le territoire. En faisant cela, vous encouragez le phénomène migratoire et vous envoyez à la mort des milliers de malheureux qui périssent en Méditerranée. Il faut bien au contraire reconduire ces bateaux dans leur port de départ, les confisquer s'ils arrivent sur nos côtes et supprimer toute subvention en leur faveur. Vous voulez accueillir et répartir les migrants partout en Europe. Nous voulons les secourir et les reconduire chez eux.

Ангел Джамбазки (ECR). – Г-н Председател, колеги, преминаване на държавна граница е престъпление. Това престъпление трябва да бъде разследвано, преследвано, обвинено, съдено и осъдено.

Вместо да се случва това обаче, тази зала подкрепя такива престъпления. Много често в нея се говори за върховенство на закона. Какво върховенство на закона, когато подкрепяш нарушаването на закона и престъпленията? Окупираната от крайната левица – екстремистката левица – зала на този Европейски парламент е съучастник в трафика на хора, е съучастник в редица престъпления, свързани с този трафик на хора. Работите заедно с трафикантски организации, подпомагате трафикантски организации, които продават хора като стока и вие ги подкрепяте и трябва да се срамувате за това.

Подкрепящите нелегалната миграция са пряко отговорни и виновни за смъртта на български гранични и полицейски служители, които загинаха и продължават да страдат и да търпят щети, престрелки с нелегални имигранти и турски контрабандисти. Говорите за солидарност – някой от вас обади ли се на семействата на тези хора, за да изрази пред тях солидарност? Не, разбира се, че не сте и не би трябвало, защото трябва да се срамувате. Решението е едно и то трябва да бъде едно европейско: единна твърда позиция, защита на външните граници, екстрадиция на нелегалните мигранти, съд и затвор за контрабандистите и позор за тези, които ги подкрепят.

(Ораторът приема да отговори на изказване „синя карта“)

Rosa D'Amato (Verts/ALE), *intervento «cartellino blu»*. – Lei sta accusando noi progressisti di essere complici e degli scafisti. Allora aspettiamo una Sua denuncia. Se Lei accusa noi di essere complici degli scafisti, ci aspettiamo una Sua denuncia presso qualche Corte di giustizia, Corte europea, nazionale, italiana.

Ci deve accusare con degli atti e con dei fatti ben precisi. Deve anche dirci se ci sono delle ONG che sono state condannate da qualche Corte europea di giustizia, da qualche giudice, perché complici degli scafisti e complici delle morti in mare. Ha questa contezza? Ha dei dati? Sa se ci sono delle condanne penali per le navi delle ONG? Altrimenti sta facendo soltanto propaganda e accuse inutili.

Ангел Джамбазки (ECR), *отговор на изказване „синя карта“*. – Разбира се, уважаема колега, всеки, който подкрепя и насърчава преминаването незаконно на държавна граница, е политически съучастник на тези, които правят трафика на хора.

Има организации, които насърчават трафика на хора, които организират трафика на хора, които получават пари за трафика на хора, а тук, в тази зала, има хора, които адвокатстват на трафика на хора. И аз се учудвам, но всъщност не се учудвам, защото когато окупираната от залата и доминираната в залата левица подкрепя нелегалната миграция, тя го прави по своите политически причини. Но всеки от вас, който подкрепя незаконното преминаване на държавна граница, би трябвало да се срамува от това, защото по същество става съучастник в престъпни деяния. Точно толкова е просто.

Angelika Winzig (PPE). – Sehr geehrter Herr Präsident, geschätzte Damen und Herren! Die Europäische Union steht abermals vor einer Migrationskrise. Das kleine Land Österreich hat in diesem Jahr schon mit 100 000 Asylanträgen mehr als im Rekordjahr 2015. Und obwohl wir ein Binnenland sind, wurden 75 % unserer Flüchtlinge in keinem anderen EU- bzw. Schengen-Land registriert.

Daher ist es höchste Zeit für eine gemeinsame Migrationspolitik, die eine klare Unterscheidung zwischen Migranten und Wirtschaftsflüchtlingen vornimmt, die eine effektive Grenzkontrolle der Außengrenzen gewährleistet, die mit voller Härte gegen Schlepper und deren Milliardengeschäft vorgeht, und, *last but not least*, die auch die Verteilung von Flüchtlingen ohne Pull-Faktor auf die Reihe bekommt.

Rat und Parlament haben sich verpflichtet, die Vorschläge des Asyl- und Migrationspaktes der Kommission umzusetzen. Das sollte jetzt oberste Priorität bei uns sein, denn unsere Bürgerinnen und Bürger sind ohnedies aufgrund der vielen Krisen verängstigt. Und ich glaube, wir wollen alle nicht, dass diese leeren Reihen voller werden – dort in der rechten Seite.

Javier Moreno Sánchez (S&D). – Señor presidente, quería decirle a la señora Monserrat, pero se ha ido, que utilizar la tragedia de Nador para atacar desde esta Cámara al Gobierno de España me parece patético y lamentable —patético y lamentable—, y espero que se lo traslade.

Dicho esto, señorías, hace unos meses hemos activado en un tiempo récord una Directiva europea que llevaba veinte años durmiendo para acoger y proteger a los ciudadanos y las ciudadanas que huían de la guerra de Putin, algo que no hicimos ni en 2015 con la guerra de Siria, ni en 2021 con la crisis afgana. Quiero decir con esto que cuando hay voluntad y valentía política somos capaces de dar respuestas europeas eficaces a los grandes desafíos.

Si hemos sido capaces de acoger a cuatro millones y medio de personas en pocos meses, ¿por qué no somos capaces de gestionar con dignidad los 200 000 migrantes que tratan de llegar por mar y por tierra cada año?

Por eso necesitamos la voluntad política, la solidaridad y la confianza entre los Estados miembros para llevar a cabo definitivamente el Pacto sobre Migración y Asilo con una reubicación obligatoria, canales humanitarios y un mecanismo europeo de salvamento marítimo que llevamos reclamando desde hace años y que las fuerzas de derecha europea rechazan. Y, al mismo tiempo necesitamos, señora comisaria, señor comisario, desarrollar todos los instrumentos de inmigración legal.

Róża Thun und Hohenstein (Renew). – Mr President, not a long time ago, someone who moved on our continent from country to country was a migrant, a stranger. But even someone who moved, say, from Hessen to Bavaria and had a different accent, wore different clothes, ate Handkäse mit Musik and not white sausage with sweet mustard, was a migrant, was a stranger. This has changed. Today, migrants we call those who come on our continent from different continents. But also this will change.

I'm sorry that we heard so many times in this debate words like smugglers, invasion, danger, costs, mafias, etc. Dear colleagues, led by fears and xenophobia we will never cope well with migrations. And the question: is a person who is drowning in the sea illegal? A person who is freezing to death in the forests and swamps between Poland and Belarus: is this person illegal? Nobody should die at our European borders. This is the most important.

Lena Düpont (PPE). – Herr Präsident, liebe Kollegen! Die Debatte heute hat vieles noch einmal auf den Punkt gebracht. Erstens: Wir streiten leidenschaftlich, mit Emotionen, mit guten und weniger guten Argumenten.

Zweitens: Wir haben kein Erkenntnisproblem – wir haben ein Umsetzungsproblem. Wir alle kennen die Positionen der nationalen Delegationen, wir kennen die Positionen der Fraktionen, wir kennen die Positionen der Institutionen.

Drittens: Zur Wahrheit gehört auch: Vereinbarungen haben bisher wenig Bestand gehabt, weil sich Mitgliedstaaten untereinander nicht mehr vertrauen, weil Zusagen nicht verlässlich waren, weil nationale Entscheidungen getroffen werden, die nicht zuerst das eigene Land, sondern die ohnehin schon belasteten Mitgliedstaaten an der Außengrenze treffen.

Viertens: Wir können es uns schlicht und ergreifend nicht mehr leisten, uns von Notlösung zu Notlösung zu hangeln. Wir brauchen ein logisches, ein effizientes, ein krisensicheres System, keine formschönen Lösungen, sondern Verbesserungen in der Realität.

Wir hier, insbesondere hier im Haus, haben es in der Hand, den Deadlock ein für alle Mal zu durchbrechen. Bisher war es für das Parlament relativ leicht – der Rat hat blockiert. Ich möchte nicht, dass die Erzählung in der nächsten Legislaturperiode heißt: Das Parlament hat blockiert.

Wir haben gestern hier 70 Jahre Europäisches Parlament gefeiert, und vielleicht sollten wir uns das Video öfter vor Augen halten. Nichts davon wäre ohne Mut, ohne Politiker, die Verantwortung großschreiben, möglich gewesen, und ich weigere mich zu akzeptieren, dass wir das für den Bereich Asyl und Migration nicht auch schaffen können. Deswegen ist die Entscheidung heute hier eigentlich eine ziemlich einfache: Gehören wir zum Team Verantwortung oder gehören wir zum Team Mutlosigkeit? Und meine Position dabei ist vollkommen klar.

Matjaž Nemec (S&D). – Gospod predsednik. Dovolite mi, da bo moje sporočilo jasno in glasno.

Kot je bilo danes že rečeno, je v Sredozemlju od leta 2014 umrlo čez 25 000 ljudi, od tega samo letos 2 000. Reševanje življenj torej ni zločin. Pri tem vprašanju se začne in konča naša človečnost. Evropa si pred tem izzivom ne more več zatiskati oči. Sprejem nesrečnih prebežnikov v varni pristan ne more biti odvisen od vsakokratne milosti te ali one države.

Res je, da Evropa ne more sprejeti vseh beguncev tega sveta, a mora prevzeti svoj del odgovornosti. Gordijski vozel nedelujočega migracijskega sistema moramo nujno presekati. Zato pa potrebujemo učinkovito migracijsko in azilno politiko. Ta mora temeljiti na solidarnosti in pravičnem deljenju bremen. Prav tako mora biti pravična in dostojanstvena. Potrebujemo – nujno – migracijski dogovor in to zdaj. Hvala lepa.

Karlo Ressler (PPE). – Poštovani predsjedavajući, u vrijeme brutalnog rata na europskom kontinentu Europa pruža sigurno utočište za milijune ukrajinskih izbjeglica od ruskih razaranja i granata i još jednom pokazuje našu zajedničku ljudskost.

Istodobno svjedočimo drastičnom i perfidnom povećanju ilegalnih prelazaka granice od gotovo 300 000 kroz ovu godinu, osobito na takozvanoj zapadnobalkanskoj ruti. Prihvatni centri diljem Europe su prepuni, a vanjske granice opet su pod pritiskom stihijskih migracija i tisuća i tisuća nepoznatih ljudi koji pod okriljem noći, bez službenih identifikacijskih dokumenata i izvan graničnih prijelaza pokušavaju ilegalno prijeći naše europske granice. Tome doprinosi i Srbija koja beskrupuloznom zloupotrebom viznog režima nagrađuje zemlje koje ne priznaju Kosovo i tako povećava pritisak.

Pod hitno nam je potrebno zajedničko, sustavno europsko rješenje koje počinje od učinkovite stroge zaštite vanjskih granica te odlučnog instrumentaliziranja migranata u geopolitičkim igricama koje ne smiju postojati.

Sve to također pokazuje da nam je potreban i još snažniji Schengen, a ne njegovo podrivanje u ovim osjetljivim geopolitičkim trenucima. Jasno, s uključenom Hrvatskom koja je dokazala da može učinkovito štititi europsku granicu i tako pružiti dodatnu sigurnost svim državama članicama i svim europskim građanima.

Cyrus Engerer (S&D). – X'ipokresija, Sur President, illi dawk il-pajjiżi li staġnew bil-kolonizzazzjoni ta' diversi pajjiżi Afrikani, illum jittrattaw liċ-ċittadini ta' dawn il-pajjiżi bħala nies li totalment jistgħu jinsewhom, totalment jarmuhom. X'ipokresija, Sur President, illi dawk il-pajjiżi illi qegħdin igawdu minn fondi ta' solidarjetà, fondi Ewropej illi qegħdin igawdu minnhom huma, m'għandhom l-ebda solidarjetà mal-pajjiżi tal-Mediterran li qegħdin jaffaċċjaw kriżi kbira fissalvar ta' numru ta' immigranti li qegħdin jaslu fl-Ewropa tagħna. X'ipokresija wkoll, Sur President, illi għandek numru ta' pajjiżi, illi ma jridux jaċċettaw illi jsalvaw nies illi ġejjin mill-Afrika, illi fl-istess ħin qegħdin ibigħu l-armamenti lil dittaturi Afrikani.

Din hi r-realtà tal-Unjoni Ewropea llum. U Sur President, hawnhekk għandna Parlament Ewropew illi għandu pożizzjoni b'saħħitha dwar is-solidarjetà, pożizzjoni b'saħħitha dwar x'għandu jsir mill-immigranti irregolari li jidħlu fl-Ewropa tagħna.

Imma l-Kunsill fejn qiegħed? Meta ħa jqum mir-raqda, il-Kunsill?

Ελισσάβετ Βόζεμπεργκ-Βρυωνίδη (PPE). – Κύριε Πρόεδρε, κύριε Αντιπρόεδρε, κυρία Επίτροπε, η σημερινή συζήτηση είναι μια καλή ευκαιρία να δούμε πού βρισκόμαστε σε σχέση με το μεταναστευτικό. Το 2022 διαπιστώθηκε πάλι αύξηση των παράνομων εισόδων στην Ένωση μετά την πανδημία. Μεταξύ άλλων, καλούμαστε να διαχειριστούμε τις υβριδικές απειλές της Τουρκίας με την εργαλειοποίηση απελπισμένων ψυχών ως μέσο πίεσης στην Ευρωπαϊκή Ένωση.

Ως Ελληνίδα, επικεντρώνομαι στις προκλήσεις που εξακολουθεί να αντιμετωπίζει η χώρα μου, παρά την αξιοσημείωτη πρόοδο που έχει καταφέρει στο πρόβλημα η ελληνική κυβέρνηση την τελευταία τριετία. Η Τουρκία συνεχίζει τις προκλήσεις στο Αιγαίο περιφρονώντας κάθε έννοια δικαίου, και όχι μόνο δεν ελέγχει τα δίκτυα των διακινητών ως οφείλει από το 2016, αλλά αντιθέτως τους παρέχει άμεση ή έμμεση στήριξη, ενώ εξακολουθεί να αρνείται αναιτιολόγητα επιστροφές από τα ελληνικά νησιά στο έδαφός της.

Συνάδελφοι, η Ελλάδα έχει καταφέρει να φυλάσσει αποτελεσματικά τα εξωτερικά ευρωπαϊκά σύνορα, να αντιμετωπίζει τις απειλές του Προέδρου Erdoğan και να διασώζει σχεδόν καθημερινά ανθρώπινες ζωές που ωθούνται από εγκληματίες στον θάνατο. Ωστόσο, ζητούμενο παραμένει ακόμα η ευρωπαϊκή αλληλεγγύη, για αυτό πρέπει να οριστεί ως υποχρεωτική.

Σε περιόδους κρίσης, ειδικότερα, πιστεύω ότι είναι μονόδρομος ένας μηχανισμός υποχρεωτικής μετεγκατάστασης αιτούντων άσυλο σε όλη την Ευρωπαϊκή Ένωση, καθώς και η δίκαιη κατανομή της ευθύνης για τη διάσωση ανθρώπων στη θάλασσα, όπως ζητεί, σήμερα κιόλας, με κατεπείγουσα επιστολή του ο Έλληνας Υπουργός Μεταναστευτικής Πολιτικής, κύριος Μηταράκης.

Łukasz Kohut (S&D). – Panie Przewodniczący! Pani Komisarz! Tydzień temu rosyjscy zbrodniarze przeprowadzili największy od początku agresji atak rakietowy na Ukrainę, atak na infrastrukturę krytyczną. Cel terrorysty z Kremla jest jasny: złamać ducha dzielnych ludzi broniących swojej ziemi, złamać ducha ich rodzin.

Wkrótce wiele Ukrainek stanie przed wyborem: ponowna tułaczka z dziećmi albo pozostanie w zimnych domach. Jako Unia, musimy być gotowi na każdy scenariusz. Musimy odrobić lekcję z przeszłości. Musimy zarówno być gotowi zapewniać wsparcie na miejscu, jak i być gotowi na ponowne przyjęcie uchodźców.

Ponad pół roku temu mieszkańcy Polski pokazali, czym są wartości europejskie, czym jest solidarność w praktyce. Przyjęli uchodźców. Dali im jeść. Odziali ich. Ogromną rolę odegrali samorząd, organizacje pozarządowe i obywatele. Dlatego sami widzicie, jak ważny jest szeroki mechanizm wsparcia, wsparcia bezpośredniego, tak aby pomoc trafiała jak najbliżej ludzi, tak abyśmy zawsze byli przygotowani.

Michaela Šojdrová (PPE). – Pane předsedající, slyšíme zde velké odhodlání dohodnout se na azylové legislativě. Já očekávám, že tato dohoda zohlední realitu a postaví bezpečnost na první místo. Bezpečnost, odpovědnost a solidarita je přece přístup, který se jasně osvědčuje i v pomoci Ukrajině. Pomáháme Ukrajině ubránit se agresorovi, a tedy bezpečnost a mír dáváme na první místo a pomáháme solidárně i ukrajinským uprchlíkům. Nechceme, aby lidé prchali ze svých domovů a umírali na moři. To přece nechce nikdo. Ale vidíme jasné příčiny. Diktátorům, jako je Bašár al-Asad a další, na Blízkém východě a v Africe vůbec nevadí, že jejich občané musí prchat před násilím a hladem. Putin a Lukašenko toho využívají jako nástroj v boji proti jednotě EU. A proto musíme tuto situaci řešit nyní, teď a s nástroji, které máme k dispozici, a nemůžeme čekat. Dohody se třetími zeměmi, konec pašeráckých mafií a především ochrana vnější hranice před nelegální migrací musí být naši prioritou, to je úkol pro členské státy i pro Evropskou komisi.

Není možné kritizovat Českou republiku za to, že na svých hranicích zavedla posílené kontroly a uprchlíky ze třetích zemí zadržuje a vrací. Pokud nebude vnější hranice stoprocentně chráněna, pokud nebudou uprchlíci zadrženi v registračních centrech okamžitě po vstupu do EU, budeme muset střežit tuto vnější hranici. Frontex je nástrojem, který má pomáhat. A já chci ještě na závěr poděkovat všem, kteří si tuto svoji roli plní, tisícům policistů i dobrovolníků, kteří lidem prchajícím na útěku pomáhají.

Brando Benifei (S&D). – Signor Presidente, onorevoli colleghi, in Italia il nuovo governo di destra di Giorgia Meloni è in carica da un mese e invece di occuparsi dei problemi reali del paese si è già accanito contro le navi umanitarie Geo Barents, Humanity, Ocean Viking, un'azione vergognosa, con il solo obiettivo di lanciare un messaggio a parte dell'elettorato sulla pelle degli esseri umani. Tutto ciò è controproducente.

Oggi serve invece una soluzione condivisa a livello europeo. Il piano d'azione per il Mediterraneo è una proposta importante, ma si deve fare di più per coordinare le operazioni di ricerca e salvataggio. Occorre eliminare il criterio del primo paese d'arrivo e rafforzare la solidarietà e la responsabilità degli Stati membri, non puntando soltanto sui rimpatri. Il collega italiano Bartolo sta facendo un grande lavoro in questo senso, anche a nome del nostro gruppo politico.

La migrazione è un fenomeno globale e come tale deve essere affrontata. I paesi dell'Unione otterranno risultati solo se sapranno cooperare, con soluzioni condivise, a partire da quelli che sono più pronti a portarle avanti. Dobbiamo andare avanti in questa direzione insieme.

Stanislav Polčák (PPE). – Pane předsedající, Evropská unie čelí v posledních letech řadě výzev a zvýšená migrace patří k těm nejvýraznějším. Současný systém přitom nefunguje, ovšem členské státy nejsou schopny již po léta najít dohodu, jak by měla být reformována migrační a azylová politika. Některé státy nesou obrovské břemeno a ruská agrese ukázala, že uprchlický nápor může postihnout v krátkém čase skutečně každou zemi EU. I má země hostí statisíce ukrajinských uprchlíků. Co bylo dříve pro východoevropské země nepředstavitelné, miliony uprchlíků na jejich územích, se stalo realitou ze dne na den. I já jsem hlasoval pro dočasná opatření v minulém období ve prospěch Itálie a Řecka, a to s nadějí, že se podaří najít vyvážené celounijní řešení. To se však až doposud skutečně nestalo.

Naším cílem by mělo být upustit od provizorních řešení a zavést předvídatelný systém, díky kterému bude možné řízení migrace. Samozřejmě chránit schengenský prostor, ale také zvýšit diplomatické úsilí a uzavírat readmisní dohody, zřizovat hotspoty i mimo naše území. Co prožíváme v současnosti, může být nic ve srovnání s pohybem stovek milionů klimatických uprchlíků v půlce tohoto století. Ti lidé se již narodili a budou muset opouštět své domovy kvůli extrémnímu počasí, přírodním katastrofám. Už teď je jejich počet srovnatelný s počtem běženců, kteří prchají před válkami. Migrační vlny zasáhnou celou planetu. Naše jediná šance je si to uvědomit co nejdříve a využít čas k reálné přípravě. Snad si to uvědomuje i Rada. A také doufám, že dohoda bude uzavřena co nejdříve.

Theresa Muigg (S&D). – Herr Präsident! In der Debatte rund um Asyl reden wir viel zu selten darüber, worum es wirklich geht: nämlich um Menschen, die Schreckliches erlebt haben, Menschen, die vor Krieg flüchten, die vor Verfolgung flüchten, die auf dem Weg in die Sicherheit ihr Leben lassen.

Und nicht nur, dass dies in der Debatte meist fehlt, sondern aus Gründen des Populismus werden diese Menschen dann auch noch als Bedrohung dargestellt, werden als illegal bezeichnet, obwohl das Menschenrecht eindeutig ist: Jeder Mensch hat das Recht, einen Asylantrag zu stellen. Jeder Mensch hat das Recht, dass dieser nach rechtsstaatlichen Kriterien geprüft wird.

Als europäischer Gesetzgeber haben wir die Verantwortung, ein Regelwerk zu schaffen, in dem Menschenrechte respektiert und eingehalten werden. Und dies darf nicht scheitern an nationalstaatlicher Kleingeisterei; das darf nicht scheitern an der Hetze auf dem Rücken der Schwächsten. Wir können das Sterben im Mittelmeer beenden, wir können die Pushbacks an den Außengrenzen beenden, wir können die Menschen aus den Elendslagern holen.

Sorgen wir durch gemeinsame europäische Lösungen, durch Solidarität und Humanität dafür, dass wir als Europäische Union unserer Verpflichtung nachkommen! An den Rat geht unsere Botschaft: Boykottieren Sie das nicht!

Delara Burkhardt (S&D). – Herr Präsident, liebe Kolleginnen und Kollegen! Wenn man über Suchen und Retten spricht, muss man eigentlich nicht das Problem suchen, denn es geschieht ja direkt vor unseren Augen – gut dokumentiert von der Küstenwache, von der Zivilgesellschaft, ja sogar von Frontex. Wir schreiben uns in Europa Freiheit und Menschenrechte zwar auf die Fahne, hissen sie aber auf See nicht. Menschenrechte muss man sich nicht verdienen, wir besitzen sie alle von Geburt an.

In welcher Realität – das müssen wir uns doch fragen – leben wir eigentlich, in der regelmäßig Menschen ertrinken und wir dann sogar noch die bestrafen, die versuchen, sie zu retten? Das ist eine Realität, in der Neofaschos diktieren, wie unsere Solidarität aussieht. Und wir müssen uns dann eben auch fragen: Wie sieht unsere Antwort darauf aus? Und das ist etwas, was ich nicht verstehe, weil wieder keine eigene *Search-and-Rescue*-Mission zur Debatte steht, sondern wir darüber diskutieren, die Kapazitäten der libyschen Küstenwache zu stärken – einer Bande aus verschiedenen Milizen, die mit Menschenschmugglern und Menschenhändlern zusammenarbeiten. Und es muss uns doch eigentlich klar sein, dass kein Hafen in Libyen sicher ist.

Wenn wir dort Menschen wissentlich im Stich lassen und dahin zurückbringen, dann können wir lange nach unseren Werten suchen – dann sind diese nämlich nicht mehr zu retten.

Carina Ohlsson (S&D). – Herr talman! Det märks att kommissionen arbetar hårt för att komma framåt med en europeisk lösning för asyl och migration. Att vi inte har kommit längre i förhandlingarna sedan flyktingkrisen 2015 är ett underbetyg för medlemsstaterna. Vi behöver säkerställa ett värdigt och humant mottagande för människor som söker asyl i Europa.

Alla som söker asyl och söker sig till Europa har inte rätt till asyl, men vi har ändå en skyldighet att organisera ett ordnat mottagande, att få till ett solidariskt mottagande mellan medlemsstaterna, och att behandla asylansökningarna i enlighet med Genèvekonventionen.

Vi vet att kvinnor och barn på flykt är särskilt utsatta när de befinner sig i klorna på människosmugglare och även kan vara utsatta för människohandel. Detsamma gäller de livsfarliga resorna över Medelhavet. Därför behöver vi enas i EU om en gemensam migrationspolitik för att förhindra att detta sker. Det är dags nu.

Vystúpenia podľa postupu prihlásenia sa o slovo zdvihnutím ruky

Tomislav Sokol (PPE). – Poštovani predsjedavajući, svjedoci smo činjenice da migranti učestalo zloupotrebljavaju pravo na azil kako bi zaobišli redovitu proceduru i tako se domogli teritorija Europske unije. Učinkovita je i sigurna europska migracijska politika, stoga mora osigurati praktično razlikovanje međunarodnog statusa izbjeglice od statusa migranta.

Europska unija ne može i ne treba primiti na svoj teritorij svakoga tko to želi samo zato što je u Europi viša kvaliteta života nego u zemlji iz koje dolazi. U ovakvim okolnostima ključno je zaustaviti nezakonite migracije i ojačati zaštitu schengenskog prostora.

Vezano uz to, želim pohvaliti hrvatsku policiju koja u skladu s europskim i međunarodnim pravom čuva najdulju kopnenu granicu Europske unije. Hrvatska je ispunila najstrože kriterije i njezin ulazak u Schengen jamac je zaštite vanjskih granica EU-a i učinkovite borbe protiv ilegalnih migracija. Zato pozivam Vijeće da u prosincu donese političku odluku o ulasku Hrvatske u schengenski prostor. Ona je to zaslužila!

Maria Grapini (S&D). – Domnule președinte, stimate domnule comisar, stimată doamnă comisar, dezbatem de șapte ani această problemă legată de o soluție unică în Uniunea Europeană pe problema migrației.

Eu sunt sceptică și am motive să fiu. S-a vorbit aici despre Europa unită, solidaritate, umanitate, drepturi, dar avem un blocator de serviciu care este Consiliul.

Și dau un exemplu pentru a fi bine înțeleasă. Dacă țara mea de 11 ani este ținută la porțile spațiului Schengen, despre ce unitate, despre ce solidaritate vorbim? Dacă avem un regulament votat de Parlament, votat de Comisie și nu este aplicat pentru că blocator este Consiliul.

Pentru că un stat membru sau două, pe interese meschine, naționale, invocă diverse motive care nu au legătură cu regulamentul. Cum să cred că vom avea un pact pe migrație agreat de toate statele membre?

Și da, cred foarte bine că țara mea, cetățenii mei, au acumulat frustrare, supărare, pierdere economică. Da, Uniunea Europeană crește în scepticism. Și de aici cer Consiliului să facă intrarea în Schengen a României.

Ana Miranda (Verts/ALE). – Señor presidente, cuánto cinismo y, sobre todo, cuánta hipocresía en esta Cámara. Cuando yo me fui, en el año 2019, pensé que se había mejorado algo, y tres años después seguimos igual o quizás peor. No existe un protocolo europeo de desembarco, no existen vías legales y seguras, se sigue criminalizando a las ONG y, sobre todo, no se ha eliminado el criterio del primer puerto de desembarque. Eso es totalmente inmoral.

Yo he tenido la suerte de haber estado en un barco de rescate. Y digo la suerte, porque he visto la tragedia en primera línea. He visto cómo la guardia de costas de Libia disuadía al barco *Open Arms* cuando nosotros estuvimos vagando durante diez días, hasta que el Estado español dio la autorización para entrar en el puerto de Barcelona después de haber sido negada en los puertos de Malta y en los puertos de Italia, con un Gobierno populista en Italia, y todavía más populista es el de ahora.

Por lo tanto, estos discursos que tiene esta gente de la extrema derecha son inmorales y tenemos que decirlo así, señor comisario. No se puede permitir que, tanto la Comisión como el Consejo, fracasen en este nuevo intento y que se siga criminalizando a quien salva vidas, un trabajo digno y que merece nuestro respeto.

Kinga Gál (NI). – Tisztelt Elnök Úr! A migrációs válságot nem kezelni, hanem megelőzni kell. Magyarország déli határa gyakorlatilag migrációs ostrom alatt áll. Csak ebben az évben mintegy 250 ezer illegális határátlépési kísérletet akadályoztak meg a hatóságok. Az illegális migránsok és az embercsempészek sokszor erőszakosan támadnak a határvédőkre. 2015 óta Magyarország 650 milliárd forintot fordított a déli határ védelmére. Ennek mindössze két százalékát biztosította az Európai Unió. Mindeközben olyan nem kormányzati szervezeteket támogat, amelyek elősegítik a tengeren vagy szárazföldön történő illegális migrációt. Azért, hogy a migránsok ne a szerb-magyar határon torlódjanak fel, Ausztria és Magyarország további intézkedésekről állapodott meg Szerbiával a nyugat-balkáni útvonalon az Unióba irányuló illegális migráció megfékezéséről, mert az EU menekültügyi rendszere láthatóan megbukott.

(Ukončenie vystúpení podľa postupu prihlásenia sa o slovo zdvihnutím ruky)

Ylva Johansson, *Member of the Commission*. – Mr President, Minister Bek, honourable Members of this House, together with Vice-President Schinas I have been listening to this long and intense debate. Of course, there's been a lot of emotions, and that is very understandable because we see men, women, children in very dangerous situations, also losing their lives in the Mediterranean or in a sealed lorry along the Western Balkan routes. So it's understandable that we are emotional, because saving life is always our first responsibility.

There's also been a lot of focus on the problems and challenges that we have. I'm dealing with this on a daily basis. We have huge challenges. We have seen an increase of irregular arrivals along both the Western Balkan routes and the Central Med route. We have seen also that in nationalities this increase is not caused by more people that are fleeing prosecutions or in need of international protection.

We see an increase of nationalities that are probably not in need of international protection. We have seen an increase along the Western Balkan routes of Pakistanis, Cubans, Indians, Turks. We have seen an increase on the West Med route of Bangladeshis, Tunisians, Egyptians.

Of course this needs to be addressed. That's why I was in Bangladesh, in Pakistan last week, to discuss with them the swift return of those not eligible to stay, but also legal pathways and help for the returnees. That's why we are presenting and launched a new anti-smuggling partnership with all the Western Balkan partners. That's why we presented last Monday a 20-point action plan to counter the Western Balkan route. That's why we will have an extraordinary Council on Friday to discuss this.

So the challenges are huge, and of course irregular arrivals has to be addressed. This is not a proper way to come to the European Union. But I would like to use this opportunity to talk about some other issues, actually, that some of you, many of you, have been calling for – a European solution on asylum and migration.

We are so strong when we work together. When we are united and tackle challenges together we can do a lot. Let me just remind you that we managed the situation where Lukashenko tried to sell tickets, instrumentalising migrants into the European Union. We managed that together and, together with third countries, we have managed to decrease the irregular arrivals through the Western Mediterranean route and Atlantic route, thanks to good cooperation also with our African partners.

We managed last year to give humanitarian admission for 35 000 Afghans fleeing the situation in Afghanistan. We are managing right now a situation with more than 4 million Ukrainian refugees by activating the temporary protection directive.

We can do so much more when we work together. I heard somebody call that it's time to stop debating and start working. The good news is that work is ongoing. The negotiations on the new pact on migration and asylum that we presented two years ago is really taking big steps forward. There is a very good momentum in the Council. Thanks to the Czech Presidency, but also thanks to the previous French Presidency, we are working intensively together with the Member States and are reaching new steps almost while we are speaking.

Also here in Parliament, good progress has been made on all the files and Parliament and Council has agreed on a roadmap, and I think this is a unique situation. There is a real good opportunity that we can make the decision on the whole pact on migration and asylum during this mandate.

But time is running so we have to start the real negotiations and trilogues now to be able to finalise all the files during this mandate, to show everybody that migration is not a threat. Migration is something that we need, but we need to manage migration and we need to welcome people on legal ways, but we need to prevent irregular arrivals and the risk of people's lives.

Mikuláš Bek, *President-in-Office of the Council.* – Mr President, Vice-President Skinner, Commissioner Johansson, Honourable Members, I wish to thank you for this very timely and important debate today. These discussions are not easy, but they contribute to finding appropriate responses to the current challenges. There is no doubt that the situation in the Mediterranean and at our external land borders must be addressed in an effective and timely manner, in accordance with European and international law. And we need to avoid at all costs loss of lives. As I have already stressed, both improved cooperation with third countries and progress on the negotiations on the Migration and Asylum Pact remain the only sustainable way to achieve a better and more robust migration and asylum system that will serve all Member States well. The Presidency and the Council remain committed to work intensively with our partners, both to address urgent short term measures, as well as to advance to work on a systemic solution in line with the roadmap on migration and asylum that combines responsibility and solidarity, as a number of you have recalled here today. This requires a positive political environment, which will allow our institutions to move forward together.

President. – That concludes the debate.

Written statements (Rule 171)

Milan Brglez (S&D), *pisno.* – Vse od leta 2015 dosledno opozarjam na nujnost evropske rešitve na področju azila ter migracij. Sedem let od vrhunca begunske in migrantske krize v Evropi smo žal še vedno priča političnim blokadam rešitev, ki bi zagotovile resnično solidarnost med državami pri upravljanju z migracijami namesto ohranjanja mejnih nadzorov na notranjih mejah schengenskega prostora, medsebojnega obtoževanja ter prelaganja bremen med najbolj obremenjenimi državami članicami, še posebej na južni in jugovzhodni zunanji meji EU.

Pomanjkanje politične volje koristi zgolj organiziranemu kriminalu, ki se okorišča s tihotapljenjem ter preprodajanjem ljudi v nadaljnjo verigo zlorab na evropskem kontinentu. Nedopustno je, da si države članice zatiskajo oči pred tovrstnimi zlorabami in še naprej dopuščajo, da ljudje umirajo na pragu EU ter pri nezakonitem prestopanju državnih meja, ker jih v to sili odsotnost urejenih migracijskih poti.

Evropska in nacionalna politika nosi soodgovornost za številna prezgodaj izgubljena življenja, kakor je ta teden tragično preminula enaindvajsetletna Nepalka, ki je onemogla na Primorskem.

Pozdravljam akcijski načrt Evropske komisije za upravljanje migracij na območju osrednjega Sredozemlja, vendar pa ta ne more nadomestiti reforme dublinskega sistema EU, ki bi zagotovila bolj solidarno porazdelitev bremen ter kolektivno odgovornost držav članic, evropskih institucij ter pristojnih agencij za dosledno spoštovanje vseh človekovih pravic.

Λουκάς Φουρλάς (PPE), *γραπτώς*. – Η συμμαχία των προθύμων δεν γίνεται να δίνει λύσει προσωρινά στο ευρωπαϊκό αδιέξοδο. Στη χώρα μου, την Κύπρο, αυτή τη στιγμή 6,5% του πληθυσμού είναι αιτητές ασύλου. Δεν μιλάμε για πολιτικούς πρόσφυγες. Πολλές φορές, μιλάμε για παράνομους μετανάστες οι οποίοι εισβάλλουν ανεξέλεγκτα στις ελεύθερές περιοχές από τα κατεχόμενα. Η ΕΕ δεν μπορεί να ακούει απλά και να επεξεργάζεται λύσεις. Με έναν ευρωπαϊκό πληθυσμό να βράζει, μια ολιστική προσέγγιση είναι αναγκαία για την αντιμετώπιση του προβλήματος.

Janina Ochojska (PPE), *na piśmie*. – Jako obywatele Unii Europejskiej jesteśmy zobowiązani do przestrzegania zasady humanitaryzmu i praw człowieka wobec osób poszukujących bezpieczeństwa na terenie Europy – ofiar konfliktów zbrojnych, prześladowań, przemocy, ubóstwa i zmian klimatycznych. W Parlamencie Europejskim pracujemy nad stworzeniem sprawiedliwszej europejskiej polityki azylowej, opartej na solidarności i dzieleniu się odpowiedzialnością. Państwa członkowskie, będąc sygnatariuszami Konwencji Genewskiej, Europejskiej Konwencji Praw Człowieka, Europejskiej Karty Praw Podstawowych, Konwencji o prawie morza oraz innych instrumentów ochrony praw człowieka, są zobowiązane do udzielenia pomocy osobom w niebezpieczeństwie, do ratowania życia, prowadzenia akcji poszukiwawczych i ratunkowych oraz do przestrzegania zasady zakazu stosowania push-backów wobec osób składających wniosek o ochronę międzynarodową, a także do indywidualnego rozpatrzenia każdego wniosku. Niestety Morze Śródziemne, a szczególnie szlak z Libii do Europy nadal pozostaje szlakiem migracyjnym z największą na świecie liczbą ofiar śmiertelnych, a masowe push-backi to dramat tysięcy uchodźców na morskich i lądowych granicach UE. Państwa członkowskie nie ponoszą żadnych konsekwencji łamania praw człowieka mimo tego, że przepisy wymagają od nich wypełniania zobowiązań w zakresie ochrony życia osób, które znalazły się w ich jurysdykcji. Jednocześnie, w przypadku uchodźców z Ukrainy, widzimy, że Unia Europejska potrafi działać solidarnie, koordynować pomoc, dzielić się odpowiedzialnością i właśnie w tym kierunku powinna zmierzać wspólna europejska polityka migracyjna.

Christian Sagartz (PPE), *schriftlich*. – Die momentane Asylkrise lässt niemanden kalt. Insgesamt wurden heuer über 280.000 Personen in Europa aufgegriffen. Davon zwei Drittel der Personen in Österreich, die meisten davon im Burgenland. Man kann sich daher vorstellen, welcher Druck hier auf der Bevölkerung lastet. Unfälle in Grenzgemeinden als Resultat von wilden Verfolgungsjagden der Polizei und der Schlepper stehen mittlerweile auf der Tagesordnung. Es kam auch schon zu Schießereien. Soldaten und Polizisten riskieren im Einsatz an der Grenze ihr Leben, und das mitten in Europa. Flüchtlinge sterben beim Versuch, nach Österreich zu kommen. Ich möchte nur an das Jahr 2015 erinnern, wo über 70 Menschen in einem LKW in Parndorf entdeckt wurden. Erst letztes Jahr starben wieder 2 unter ähnlichen Umständen in Siegendorf. Und fasst man die Schlepper, kommt es zum kaltblütigen Mord im Ausland bevor der Gerichtstermin überhaupt startet. Kein Wunder, dass mittlerweile viele Einwohner im Burgenland Angst haben, alleine das Haus zu verlassen und am Feldweg spazieren zu gehen. Hier müssen wir endlich tätig werden. Das geht nur durch einen lückenlosen Schutz der EU-Außengrenzen und Hilfe vor Ort. So schaffen wir die Grundlage für Perspektiven in den Ausreiseländern.

Alfred Sant (S&D), *in writing*. – The root difficulty in implementing a viable policy on asylum and migration is that we proclaim the values of human rights and solidarity, while not delivering the crucial elements that would make them operational and fair to Member States where irregular migration occurs. There has been little progress on relocation and in the fight against people smuggling. This week's EU action plan for the Central Mediterranean by the Commission illustrates the problem: it has nothing 'new' to say about relocation and even less about people smugglers who thrive. Yet the document says a lot about search and rescue, admittedly an important topic. However, it must be pointed out that S&R operations, organised by largely unsupervised and unregulated NGOs, are increasingly being perceived by electorates in border countries as a pull factor for irregular migration and as allies of people smugglers. Such views cannot just be brushed aside until majorities emerge in favour of 'populist' policies. Voters have noted that rightly, there were no relocation problems with regard to refugees and immigrants from the Ukraine. Until a real relocation policy is in place, those who stay on the side-lines have little right to throw stones at governments of border states which are left alone to handle dangerous and delicate crises.

(The sitting was suspended at 11.48)

PRESIDENZA: ROBERTA METSOLA

President

3. Wiederaufnahme der Sitzung

(The sitting resumed at 12.01)

4. Abstimmungsstunde

President. – The next item is the vote.

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

4.1. Entwurf des Berichtigungshaushaltsplans Nr. 5 zum Gesamthaushaltsplan 2022 — Zusätzliche Maßnahmen zur Bewältigung der Folgen des Kriegs Russlands gegen die Ukraine – Aufstockung des Katastrophenschutzverfahrens der Union – Kürzung der Mittel für Zahlungen und Aktualisierung der Einnahmen – Sonstige Anpassungen und technische Aktualisierungen (A9-0280/2022 - Karlo Ressler, Damian Boeselager) (Abstimmung)

4.2. Haushaltsverfahren 2023 — gemeinsamer Entwurf (A9-0278/2022 - Nicolae Ștefănuță, Niclas Herbst) (Abstimmung)

— *After the vote:*

Mikuláš Bek, *President-in-Office of the Council.* – Madam President, there was some debate whether it is appropriate for me to step in, but well, I congratulate you for concluding your vote on the budget of the European Union for the financial year 2023. I note with satisfaction that the European Parliament confirmed the agreement reached at the Conciliation Committee meeting on 14 November.

I take this opportunity to thank once again the Chair of the Committee on Budgets, Johan Van Overtveldt, and the rapporteurs Nicolae Ștefănuță and Niclas Herbst, as well as all other Members of the European Parliament who participated in the budgetary procedure for their constructive approach.

President. – Thank you very much, Minister Bek.

The joint text agreed by the Conciliation Committee on 14 November 2022 has now been approved by both Parliament and the Council. The budgetary procedure for the financial year 2023 can thus be deemed to have been completed. The Union's general budget for the financial year 2023 is definitively adopted and we will now sign the budget, as happens every year.

(The President of Parliament signed the general budget of the European Union for the financial year 2023.)

4.3. Eigenmittelsystem der Europäischen Union (A9-0266/2022 - Valérie Hayer, José Manuel Fernandes) (Abstimmung)

Mittwoch, 23. November 2022

4.4. Einstufung der Russischen Föderation als dem Terrorismus Vorschub leistender Staat (RC-B9-0482/2022, B9-0482/2022, B9-0483/2022, B9-0485/2022, B9-0486/2022, B9-0487/2022) (Abstimmung)

4.5. Neue Strategie der EU für die Erweiterung (Artikel 118 GO) (A9-0251/2022 - Tonino Picula) (Abstimmung)

4.6. Lage in Libyen (Artikel 118 GO) (A9-0252/2022 - Giuliano Pisapia) (Abstimmung)

4.7. Förderung von regionaler Stabilität und Sicherheit in den Ländern des Nahen und Mittleren Ostens (A9-0256/2022 - Manu Pineda) (Abstimmung)

4.8. Vorbeugung von, Umgang mit und bessere Versorgung bei Diabetes in der EU anlässlich des Weltdiabetestags (B9-0492/2022) (Abstimmung)

President. – That concludes the vote.

(The sitting was suspended for a few moments)

VORSITZ: EVELYN REGNER

Vizepräsidentin

5. Wiederaufnahme der Sitzung

(Die Sitzung wird um 12.33 Uhr wieder aufgenommen)

6. Genehmigung des Protokolls der vorangegangenen Sitzung

Die Präsidentin. – Das Protokoll der gestrigen Sitzung und die angenommenen Texte sind verfügbar. Gibt es Einwände? Das sehe ich nicht. Damit ist das Protokoll genehmigt.

7. Ein wirklich verflochtener Energiebinnenmarkt, damit die Preise niedrig und die Unternehmen wettbewerbsfähig bleiben (Aussprache über ein aktuelles Thema)

Die Präsidentin. – Als nächster Punkt der Tagesordnung folgt die Aussprache über ein aktuelles Thema (Artikel 162 GO) – Ein wirklich verflochtener Energiebinnenmarkt, damit die Preise niedrig und die Unternehmen wettbewerbsfähig bleiben (2022/2961(RSP)).

Ich weise die Mitglieder darauf hin, dass es bei dieser Aussprache keine spontanen Wortmeldungen gibt und dass keine blauen Karten akzeptiert werden.

Maria da Graça Carvalho, *author.* – Madam President, dear Commissioner, dear colleagues, we are discussing here the status of energy and the solutions for the energy crisis. For the EPP, a strong internal energy market is one of the solutions. We need to complete our interconnections inside the EU and the links between the EU and neighbouring countries.

We really need to look at the interconnections – gas and electricity – that connect the Iberian Peninsula and France, but also the South and East of Europe. We need the floating storage regasification unit involving Finland, Estonia and Latvia. We need a second LNG terminal in Poland. Gas infrastructure reinforcement to increase export capacity from Belgium to Germany. Additional LNG terminals in Germany. Expansion of the capacity of an LNG terminal combined with the Croatian transmission grid towards Slovenia and Hungary. Expansion of the interconnector for Greece and Bulgaria.

As you can see, it is also a question of investment. We really need to make sure that we are the proper continent to invest, and to invest in energy. Our crisis is also a crisis of energy supply, and we solve that by giving better conditions for investment, both for the private sector and also the public sector.

And we need fast-track procedures for our projects – both the interconnections, but also the renewable projects. We cannot afford it to take years still to have all the licences for projects to start. That is something that is of utmost importance: to have a speedy way for our projects to start, so investment and the directives and the regulations in place that will allow a speedy start for our projects.

Second point: if we want a hydrogen society, and I think we all do, as an important vector for Europe, we really need to have a plan: a plan for infrastructure, for the production of the clean energy, for the transmission, for the transport of this hydrogen, for the delivery of the hydrogen, and all that to cover Europe. It cannot be concentrated only in some regions in the centre of Europe. We need to have coverage for all the regions of Europe.

And again, we need a plan. We need the investment plan. We need a calendar. Also for mobility – again to fulfil our Fit for 55 – to have supplies for mobility and hydrogen for our mobility between 60 kilometres and 150 kilometres. It is the case for mobility and for hydrogen. We really need the huge investment that we need to plan. So we need to have all these conditions for the private sector and the public sector, and to start immediately.

On the question of the energy market, we are of the opinion in the EPP that we should intervene as little as possible in the market. We should allow the market to work, and all the intervention should be temporary and very well justified. And we are in certain times where we probably need interference for a short time and temporarily on the market.

But having said that, we also need to have more general governance for our energy – a multilevel, multisector level that links the gas market, the electricity market, hydrogen, heating and cooling that also takes into consideration the decentralisation and the digitalisation of the energy system that is going on. We need to connect all that. But that needs to be very well studied and we need to look carefully at the consequences. We look forward to the proposal from the Commission on this topic.

Mikuláš Bek, *President-in-Office of the Council*. – Madam President, honourable Members, Commissioner, let me begin by thanking the European Parliament for the interest it takes on this particular issue and for the contribution to the debate which brought the Hemicycle to adopt an important resolution in October.

As many of you know, 20 years ago the European energy market was characterised by fragmentation and monopolistic national models. Energy import, production, storage, distribution and trade was often in one hand. Monopolies charged their prices individually, and sometimes they were unjustifiably high, with direct repercussions on the whole economy.

Progressively, the EU changed its picture by unbundling monopolies and moving towards market integration. Three legislation packages were introduced, followed more recently by the Clean Energy Package. Greater integration of the gas and electricity markets produced important benefits in terms of prices and increased security of supply.

This year, another factor added complexity to the challenges of setting up an integrated market, respecting the environmental commitments of the Union: Russia's war of aggression against Ukraine and its dramatic impact on energy markets. The surge in energy prices jeopardised the EU's economic development already at risk because of the COVID-19 pandemic, with severe repercussions for the most vulnerable components of our societies.

The EU and its Member States reacted to this new situation by seeking solutions to address the current crisis, while at the same time advancing the integration of our energy sectors in the long run. This has been a major objective for the Council – one that we share with the Commission and the European Parliament.

A platform for joint purchases has been set up to buy energy from EU trusted partners, and measures to contain energy demand and enhance energy efficiency in consumption were introduced. To act swiftly and effectively, the Czech Presidency has already convened three extraordinary Energy Councils in addition to the regular one in October.

Tomorrow, during the fourth extraordinary Energy Council, the Ministers should agree on legislation that will make the energy platform operational, strengthen solidarity among Member States in the field of energy, tame price volatility and speed up deployment of renewables. We are also planning to start discussing the most recent proposal on the market correction mechanism that has been delivered by the Commission on request from the October European Council.

So far, the EU has proved to be able to act swiftly and with a common political vision. However, much remains to be done. As we can read in the latest ACER report, national authorities need to fully transpose the Electricity Directive, defining proper national legal frameworks for new and small players.

We also need to act to harmonise the features of the capacity mechanisms and speed up the rollout of smart meters and, lastly, to design new measures for further energy policy integration. Let me recall the 2020 EU strategy for energy system integration to optimise and modernise the EU's energy system as a whole. This strategy links the various energy sectors and carriers for electricity, heat, cold, gas, and solid and liquid fuels with each other and with the end-use sectors, reducing inefficiencies to achieve an optimal use of energy.

The crucial moment in this effort will be the proposal to reform the electricity market design announced by the Commission for the beginning of next year.

Let me conclude by saying that, in spite of the current crisis, the EU needs to keep a long-term vision for developing offshore renewable energy, hydrogen, carbon capture and storage, energy research and development. These are key areas to ensure the long-lasting prosperity and development of our societies and respect for the environment.

Thank you very much for your attention.

Kadri Simson, *Member of the Commission*. – Madam President, honourable Members, thank you for inviting me to today's debate.

Just yesterday, the Commission adopted the emergency temporary intervention proposal. The best way to explain why we need such a proposal is to offer a very frank assessment of where we are in this energy crisis.

We are now many months since Russia has begun using energy supplies as a weapon. Our effort of disengaging from Russia as our main gas supplier has worked better than we expected. We have replaced entirely the gas no longer delivered from Russia with LNG or additional pipeline gas from reliable sources. Diversification, demand reduction, a common storage policy and our REPowerEU actions are making a difference.

We are in a broadly adequate security of supply situation for this Winter. But this is coming at a cost. Prices remain high. Yesterday's proposal therefore is an intervention to protect the EU markets against significant price spikes.

Several Member States in the Energy Council called on us to present a legal proposal on a price correction mechanism as swiftly as possible. Yesterday, that proposal came to life. We turned the elements we set out in Article 23 of the October proposal into a self-standing legal initiative.

The proposed market correction mechanism combines static and dynamic elements: we set a maximum upper ceiling to the value of the month-ahead TTF, that we propose to set at EUR 275, and we set a minimum divergence of the TTF prices from the LNG prices in Europe at EUR 58. Both thresholds need to be met for a certain period of time.

I believe the trigger levels we propose are high enough to minimise risks, and they are consistent with our intention to have an instrument that deters episodes of very high price spikes.

But, of course, many argue that we are creating an instrument outside the classic market economy toolbox. We have always recognised the risks this entails, and their importance. That's why in the proposal we follow closely all the safeguards that we have listed in our October proposal and are repeated in the European Council conclusions. Gas demand reduction across the Union is an integral part of our approach to reduce risks.

Moving on, I would also like to touch on permitting today. As you know, the Commission has also been working to address the short-term bottlenecks of the energy transition and to speed up the permitting process.

On 9 November the Commission adopted a regulation to accelerate the deployment of renewable energy. The proposal simply includes the least controversial parts of the REPowerEU that can lead to a meaningful acceleration of renewable power generation. This regulation is therefore aimed to act as a bridge until the Renewable Energy Directive is agreed by the co-legislators and implemented in the national legal systems.

Forward-looking proposals such as these on permitting and market correction must be matched by other efforts to create safe, secure infrastructure across the EU.

A decade into implementing our European infrastructure policy, Member States' energy grids are now better interconnected thanks to projects of common interest in gas and electricity.

In electricity, key interconnectors ended Member states' isolation, strengthening their grids and allowing for the expected scale-up in offshore and onshore renewables.

In the South-West of Europe, the Biscay Bay project will connect the Iberia Peninsula and France.

In the Northern Seas region, the Celtic Interconnector will provide a first connection between Ireland with the rest of the EU. The North Sea Wind Power Hub will help develop hybrid offshore wind capacity and related offshore and onshore infrastructure.

In the Baltic Sea region, the commissioning of electricity interconnections between the Baltic Region and its European neighbours and in particular Finland, Sweden and Poland has already allowed ending the isolation of the Baltic region and the coupling of the Baltic and Nordic electricity markets. The synchronisation of the electricity grids of Baltic States, with financing of over EUR 1.2 billion from the EU remains the priority.

Let us also not forget the interconnectors between Malta and Italy and the EuroAsia interconnector which links Cyprus with the rest of Europe. These are all important projects that will enhance the security of supply.

In gas, only this year, key diversification projects like the gas interconnection between Poland and Lithuania, the Poland-Slovakia interconnector, the Baltic Pipe between Poland and Denmark and Norway and the Greece-Bulgaria pipeline will be adding significant gas transmission capacity.

All these projects combined simply mean that we are better prepared for any possible disruption, and Member States can rely on each other to enhance the security of supply.

Honourable Members, this is the broad overview from my side. I am looking forward to the debate.

Andreas Schwab, *im Namen der PPE-Fraktion.* – Frau Präsidentin, Frau Kommissarin, liebe Kolleginnen und Kollegen! Wir haben heute das Thema eines einheitlichen Energiebinnenmarkts auf die Tagesordnung gebracht, weil wir glauben, dass das, was wir bisher haben, nicht ausreicht, um unsere Mitgliedstaaten gemeinsam stärker, resilienter für Herausforderungen zu machen, wie wir sie in den vergangenen Monaten gesehen haben.

Das bedeutet: Das, was wir in den 90er Jahren in Europa begonnen haben, was wir Energiebinnenmarkt genannt haben, ist de facto ein unvollständiger Binnenmarkt, denn es bleiben eben die Mitgliedstaaten dafür zuständig, grenzüberschreitende Interkonnektoren zu bauen. Auch wenn sie notwendig sind, können Mitgliedstaaten bestimmte Verbindungen nicht bauen; auch wenn die Europäische Kommission bis zu 70 % Zuschüsse gibt für derartige für das Gesamtsystem wichtige Verbindungen, können Mitgliedstaaten sich entscheiden, nicht zu bauen. Und das kann auf Dauer nicht gut gehen, und deswegen brauchen wir mehr Vollgas im Binnenmarkt, wir brauchen mehr Druck, dass wir tatsächlich das Gesamte in den Mittelpunkt stellen und nicht die Individualinteressen.

Das zweite Argument: Ich glaube – und es ist ja schon deutlich geworden, Frau Kommissarin, da brauchen wir auch von Ihrer Seite mehr Leadership –, ein europäischer Energiebinnenmarkt kann in den nächsten zehn Jahren bis zu 300 - Milliarden Euro sparen, weil wir eben auf Synergieeffekte zwischen den Mitgliedstaaten setzen. Darauf wird es ankommen, weil wir, wenn wir nicht handeln bei den Mitgliedstaaten, dringend mehr europäische Initiative von der Europäischen Kommission brauchen.

Das ist nicht ganz einfach. Aber wenn wir es gemeinsam versuchen, dann, glaube ich, haben wir auch eine Chance. Deswegen freue ich mich, dass wir darüber heute sprechen können.

Dan Nica, *în numele grupului S&D*. – Doamnă președintă, Doamnă comisară, domnule ministru, scopul acestei comunicări a Comisiei ar trebui să fie unul foarte clar, și anume să țină facturile pentru cetățenii europeni la un nivel acceptabil, suportabil și firmele din Uniunea Europeană să poată să traverseze iarna asta și să producă ceva.

Măsura principală care este plasa de siguranță sau declanșarea mecanismului de siguranță se face doar dacă prețurile TTF pentru două săptămâni vor avea o creștere mai mare de 275 de euro și, deci cumulativ, dacă prețul LNG pe 10 zile față de prețul de referință are o creștere mai mare de 58 de euro.

Doamnă comisară, ori cei care fac speculații au scris această chestiune, idee, ori e o greșeală de dactilografie. Pentru că dacă e cu „și" ce înțelegem: că dacă e 1000 de euro la gaze și doar 57 de euro creșterea în lege rămâne așa, nu avem plasă de siguranță. Probabil că această chestiune trebuie să o luați ca fiind o avertizare extrem de serioasă.

Nu pot să nu să existe măsuri de siguranță care să nu fie puse sau să poată să fie aplicate niciodată. Pe de altă parte, dacă e urgență, cine a pus 1 ianuarie? 1 decembrie e peste două săptămâni; nu începe iarna? sau poate la Bruxelles se face frig după 1 ianuarie, dar în toată Uniunea Europeană iarna începe la 1 decembrie.

Și această chestiune arată că nu vom avea și nu vom putea atinge obiectivul nostru: oamenii să aibă facturi suportabile, firmele să poată să supraviețuiască, brutarii să facă pâine.

Astăzi, când vorbim, sute și sute și mii de firme din Uniunea Europeană își închid porțile și sute de mii de oameni intră în șomaj. Acestea nu sunt măsuri de siguranță și nu sunt măsuri urgente.

Și vă cer să-i transmiteți doamnei Ursula von der Leyen că aceste măsuri de corectare trebuie luate imediat și să avem măsuri care să poată să intre în funcțiune acum, până nu este prea târziu.

Morten Petersen, *for Renew-Gruppen*. – Fru formand! Energikrisen, som vi er midt i, viser med al ønskelig tydelighed, hvor stort et behov vi har for et ægte indre marked for energi, netop for at kunne reducere vores afhængighed og for at forøge vores energisikkerhed. Og Europa er jo allerede i dag måske det største forbundene marked med mere end 400 interconnectorer. Men medlemslandene har altså meget mere at gøre for at kunne nå frem til den 70 procentsmålsætning, som vi vedtog i fællesskab i sidste mandatperiode. Må jeg minde om, at vi vedtog elektricitetsmarkedsforordningen i sidste mandatperiode, hvor ambitionen var, at 70 procent af den eksisterende kapacitet skulle kunne udnyttes til at udveksle energi over grænser. Og der har vi altså lang vej at gå endnu, før vi er, hvor vi skal være. Må jeg minde om, at Det Europæiske Energiagentur, ACER, som vi også valgte at styrke i sidste mandatperiode, jo netop gerne skulle have muskler til at håndhæve denne her målsætning. Og deres rapporter viser med al ønskelig tydelighed, at medlemslandene er tilbageholdende med at åbne grænserne med hensyn til at udveksle elektricitet. Og det er skidt. Vi skal have mere håndhævelse af de regler, vi sådan set allerede har vedtaget. Ud over det åbenlyse behov, der er for at investere store summer i forhold til at få flere interconnectorer etc. Tilbage står, at vi kun kan gøre det her sammen. Vi er nødt til at hæve samarbejdet og øge samarbejdet på tværs af grænser for at få et indre marked. Vi er nødt til at have mere gang i offshore-energi, som kommissæren også siger. Vi er nødt til at få fat i det her med tilladelser, fordi det alt sammen vil give os lavere priser og større sikkerhed og dermed også integration af vedvarende energi. Det er kun om at komme i gang.

Ciarán Cuffe, *on behalf of the Verts/ALE Group*. – Madam President, the energy crisis is pushing millions into energy poverty around Europe. And instead of writing blank checks to energy companies that are making billions out of this crisis, we need to help the most vulnerable. More targeted social support is needed for those who are suffering in this crisis. And on top of this, there's so much we can do to smooth out the price volatility and protect people from price shocks. Our first response during this crisis should be to increase the connectivity between the energy markets. I know it's not rocket science. You know, Commissioner, it is very challenging, though, to do this. And we need a truly interconnected energy market in Europe. And this can deliver cheaper electricity prices. It can help increase the amount of renewables on the grid. And it can increase and support better welfare for all. And that's what the experts at ACER are telling us. So in practice, this means building huge interconnectors between our national energy grids and increasing cross-border energy trade. And in 2021, this trade delivered EUR 34 billion in benefits. So with more interconnectors, we could see solar energy from Spain powering the energy grid in Ireland. We could see wind energy from Ireland powering homes in France. We can see geothermal energy from Central Europe helping everyone in the entire European Union. So an integrated union increases competition between providers. It lowers energy bills and allow us and allows us to transition to a renewables based economy. It smoothens out the price volatility and leaves us less vulnerable to price shocks. So we need a truly integrated energy union to protect consumers and the vulnerable.

Gerolf Annemans, *namens de ID-Fractie*. – Voorzitter, als het niet zo ernstig was, dan zou ik het belachelijk kunnen noemen: de manier waarop u hier, dames en heren van de politiek correcte meerderheid in het Europees Parlement, bij iedere crisis allemaal collectief op het toneel springt om te roepen dat de enige oplossing voor de crisis meer macht voor de Europese Unie is. We zien dit nu in feite al sinds het begin van de eeuw. Hebben we een bankencrisis of financiële crisis? Hopla, de *Capital Market Union*. Hebben we een migratiecrisis? Hopla, het migratiepact met de open grenzen van de Europese Unie. Hebben we een coronacrisis? Hopla, een eengemaakte bevoegdheid voor volksgezondheid.

Zelfs de verdragen en de afspraken tellen niet meer. En altijd maar meer en meer. Nooit eens minder. Nooit een terugkeer van macht naar de lidstaten. Het is in uw hoofden een religieus dogma geworden. Zelfs vandaag, bij een energieprijzencrisis die u grotendeels door groene dogma's en naïviteit inzake Rusland zelf hebt veroorzaakt, moet die crisis dienen voor de *truly interconnected Energy Single Market*. Ik zeg het nog eens: als uw machtshonger niet zo dramatisch was voor de vrijheid van onze lidstaten en het welzijn van onze burgers, zouden we die belachelijk noemen. Stop daarmee.

Zdzisław Krasnodębski, *w imieniu grupy ECR*. – Pani Przewodnicząca! Wszyscy się zgadzamy, że połączenia wzajemne na rynku energii przyczyniają się z założenia do większego bezpieczeństwa, niższych cen i mniejszych emisji. Długo pracowaliśmy też z panią komisarz nad TEN-E, wytycznymi dotyczącymi transgranicznych sieci energetycznych, więc jako sprawozdawca tego projektu w Parlamencie z pewnością nie będę przeczył, że ten cel jest niezwykle ważny.

Niemniej jednak dopiero dzisiaj, w sytuacji głębokiego kryzysu, którego nie przewidywała żadna europejska strategia, widać, jak ważna jest również samowystarczalność poszczególnych państw. Jest oczywiste, że w sytuacjach kryzysowych każdy operator sieci będzie przede wszystkim dbał o bezpieczeństwo odbiorców krajowych. I musimy się pogodzić z rzeczywistością, realizm nakazuje, żebyśmy to uznawali.

W związku z tym, w obliczu kryzysu energetycznego musimy sobie zdawać sprawę, że dotychczasowe priorytety unijnej polityki energetycznej są w dużej mierze nieadekwatne. Będziemy musieli się zmierzyć z sytuacją niedoboru i wysokich cen przez dłuższy okres czasu. No i są bardzo negatywne przykłady polityki, np. Francja, która ufając zintegrowanemu rynkowi, ostatnio z eksportera stała się importerem energii elektrycznej.

Ale chciałbym powiedzieć jeszcze o jednej rzeczy. Otóż jednolity rynek to przede wszystkim wspólne reguły i pewne zasady równego traktowania wewnątrz Unii, czego strażnikiem ma być Komisja. Jednak wczorajsza propozycja w sprawie pułapu cenowego na rynku gazu, to sytuacja, w której jesteśmy kolejny raz świadkiem decyzji wymuszanej przez najsilniejsze państwo członkowskie, wbrew ukonstytuowanej w Radzie większości państw, domagającej się od Komisji ograniczenia spekulacji i windowania cen w warunkach prowadzonej w Europie wojny. I myślę, że ta wczorajsza decyzja naprawdę spowodowała wielkie oburzenie i zaniepokojenie wśród naszych obywateli, ale też w think tankach.

Mittwoch, 23. November 2022

Marina Mesure, *au nom du groupe The Left.* – Madame la Présidente, chers collègues, ce matin, j'entendais à la radio qu'Enedis, le gestionnaire de réseau électrique français, se prépare à des délestages. Autrement dit, nous devrions faire face cet hiver à des coupures d'électricité, faute d'avoir assez d'énergie pour répondre à la demande. Ainsi, en cas de grand froid, le chauffage des foyers et l'alimentation électrique des entreprises devraient être interrompus. Ce sont aussi nos services publics, comme les écoles et les centres de soins, qui pourraient être privés d'électricité. Ce constat est dramatique et le fait de mauvais choix politiques.

Alors oui, il est évident qu'une meilleure connexion entre les réseaux électriques européens permettra de mieux faire face à la crise énergétique. C'est le principe même de la solidarité européenne dont nous avons besoin. Néanmoins, encore faut-il avoir les capacités d'alimenter ces réseaux, car la libéralisation du secteur de l'énergie a entravé les investissements nécessaires dans notre capacité de production électrique. Il y a donc urgence à sortir du marché européen de l'énergie et à retrouver le contrôle de nos production et distribution énergétiques afin de protéger les ménages, les collectivités et les entreprises européennes de la pénurie comme de la flambée des prix.

Madame la Présidente, seule la sortie de ce marché nous permettra une planification à long terme du secteur de l'énergie pour assurer une sécurité d'approvisionnement, des tarifs régulés et notre pleine souveraineté énergétique.

Viktor Uspaskich (NI). – Gerbiama pirmininkaujanti, gerbiami kolegos, prieš neeilinį energetikos vadovų susitikimą, noriu atkreipti kolegų dėmesį. Mes smarkiai vėluojame. Jau neseniai atšventėme septyniasdešimt metų Europos Sąjungos parlamentarizmo. Todėl tema šitą nėra nauja, nes dar dvidešimtais metais aš teikiau rezoliuciją anksčiau, iš nacionalinės tribūnos ir taip toliau. Mes turim kuo skubiau padaryti, kad būtų vieninga Europos Sąjungos energetinė sistema. Nesvarbu, iš kokių šaltinių tai būtų. Pirma, tai užtikrintų energetinį saugumą, nepriklausomybę ir atsparumą nuo įtakos. Antra, ženkliai sumažintų kainas. Skaičiavimai rodo, kad jeigu sujungti tik elektros tinklus į vieną sistemą, Europos Sąjunga sutaupytų per metus 40 milijardų eurų. Prie dabartinių kainų būtų dar daugiau. Trečia, reikia paspartinti leidimų išdavimą energetikos projektams iš atsinaujinančių šaltinių ir prisijungimą prie tinklų, supaprastinti procedūras bei sumažinti biurokratines kliūtis. Raginu Komisiją, vadovus ir visą Parlamentą užtikrinti centralizuotą, net, galima pasakyti, įvesti išskirtinę federalinę tvarką, kontrolę šiuo klausimu pasiekti ir negailėti tam pinigų.

Jerzy Buzek (PPE). – Pani Przewodnicząca! Pani Komisarz! Dokładnie dziesięć lat temu Komisja Europejska przedstawiła komunikat w sprawie uruchomienia wewnętrznego rynku energii. Byłem wtedy sprawozdawcą w tej sprawie. Sprawozdanie przyjęliśmy ogromną większością. Wezwaliśmy kraje Unii do pilnego wdrożenia rynku, również poprzez inwestycje w infrastrukturę, zwłaszcza połączenia transgraniczne dla gazu, np. połączenia zwrotne, których wcześniej nie było. Dziś, dekadę później, mamy największy w historii kryzys energetyczny wywołany rosyjską wojną i spadek dostaw z tego kierunku z 40 do dziewięciu procent. Mimo to mamy pełne magazyny gazu w Unii Europejskiej. Gdyby jeszcze nie to, że brak nam połączeń transgranicznych, np. Hiszpania, Francja, nasi obywatele mogliby być jeszcze bezpieczniejsi, bo ci wrażliwi odbiorcy są bardzo zabezpieczeni w Unii.

Wnioski na przyszłość – w kontekście moich obecnych prac nad rozszerzeniem unijnego rynku energii na zielone gazy, a także wodór. Po pierwsze bezpieczeństwo dostaw i dywersyfikacja są kluczowe. Bez tego załamują się ceny. Konieczny jest więc wiążący cel dywersyfikacji dostaw energii z państw trzecich. I drugi wniosek, nie będzie dywersyfikacji bez infrastruktury. Ważne jest zatem zdefiniowanie tu jasnych celów, by uchronić główne korytarze wodorowe i uruchomić je w Unii Europejskiej, określone w planie REPowerEU. Bez takich korytarzy nie będzie rozwoju nowego pola energetycznego i bezpieczeństwa energetycznego w Europie.

Pedro Marques (S&D). – Madam President, Commissioner, Members of the Council, let me start by thanking EPP colleagues for raising this important point. It has got the attention from the Parliament for months now, demanding concrete action. And also let me also kindly thank EPP for the free publicity for our S&D 'Bring the Bills Down' plan. By the way, since we are talking about it, you could even consult bringthebillsdown.eu, which is the website of our campaign with our proposals – I would say Commissioner-friendly, it could even inspire you, I hope. And Commissioner, I say so because we are waiting for concrete action for too long; concrete results are not to be seen yet. Finally, the Commission proposed a long-awaited price cap. We recognise it is a step in the right direction for the sheer fact that we have a proposal, but we need it to be fine-tuned and I would say quite a bit. Experts are telling us that the chances for this price cap proposal to be triggered anytime are almost the same of a tree being hit by a lightning bolt in the middle of the ocean. And the speculation on the TTF market is not even addressed, Commissioner. And the decoupling of gas and electricity prices is also not to be found yet. In the Iberian Peninsula, as you well know, it is already saving around 15% on electric electricity prices to consumers. What are we waiting for in the rest of Europe? Commissioner, being this a debate on keeping the bills down, I would say that the Commission is still missing a central piece of action.

We need direct support to the families most affected by energy poverty. The S&D leader will present a long-awaited plan before the next Council – a proposal for a fund of EUR 100 billion to support European families for the winter. A true winter solidarity package. We can do it with the resources we have and the proceeds of a strong windfall-profits tax. We can do it. It's just fair that we do it.

Christophe Grudler (Renew). – Madame la Présidente, il y a 70 ans, la première assemblée de la CECA se tenait ici à Strasbourg, autour d'un désir commun de paix, pour unir nos forces autour de l'acier et du charbon. Car oui, sans énergie et sans industrie, une société démocratique moderne ne peut pas prospérer.

C'est historique, face à la crise, il nous faut repenser notre système énergétique, qui doit être interconnecté, intégré et décarboné. Pour cela, utilisons notre argent public européen à bon escient. Finançons de l'énergie renouvelable et non fossile, produite aux niveaux local et régional, accompagnée d'infrastructures qui nous permettront de la transporter à travers l'Europe.

J'appelle la Commission à reconsidérer son idée d'utiliser la nouvelle banque de l'hydrogène pour financer l'importation d'hydrogène. Ne sponsorisons pas la production d'hydrogène à l'autre bout du monde, concentrons nos efforts sur notre propre potentiel d'abord.

Jutta Paulus (Verts/ALE). – Frau Präsidentin, Frau Kommissarin, meine Damen und Herren! Ganz Europa spürt gerade schmerzlich, was Abhängigkeit von fossilen Importen bedeutet. Und während unsere Bürgerinnen und Bürger, unsere Industrie, unsere Handwerksbetriebe unter den hohen Preisen leiden, beklagen ausgerechnet diejenigen, die gerne alles und jedes dem Markt überlassen würden, ein Marktversagen. Dabei folgt der Markt genau den Modellen. Er bildet nämlich Knappheiten ab, und zwar unerbittlich.

Ich bin durchaus der Ansicht, dass wir das Marktdesign ändern müssen. Wir brauchen eine viel stärkere Verknüpfung aller Arten der Energienutzung: Strom, Wärme, Mobilität; es muss bessere Anreize geben für Sektorkopplung und für Speicher; und es braucht eine einheitlichere Bepreisung der Netze in den Mitgliedstaaten.

Die aktuelle Studie der Netzbetreiber zeigt ganz deutlich, dass die Netzentgelte so unterschiedlich sind, dass von einem echten Binnenmarkt im Strombereich keine Rede sein kann. Und es ist absurd, wenn die Stromkunden im Exportland die Kosten tragen müssen für den Stromtransport ins Importland. Deswegen freue ich mich auf die gemeinsame Arbeit an einem neuen Marktdesign.

Isabella Tovaglieri (ID). – Signora Presidente, signora Commissaria, onorevoli colleghi, è finito il tempo in cui l'Europa poteva sbandierare unità e solidarietà senza doverlo dimostrare nei fatti. Oggi la crisi energetica, vero banco di prova per l'Unione europea, richiede iniziative concrete e condivise, che però tardano ad arrivare, lasciando invece spazio a divisioni ed egoismi, che ci fanno perdere la faccia sul piano internazionale e che minano i capisaldi del mercato unico.

Bruxelles non può consentire che la Germania falsi la competizione interna e globale con uno scudo di 200 miliardi contro il caro bollette. Tutta la manifattura europea deve essere salvata perché è la sola che potrà portarci fuori da questa crisi, ripagando con gli interessi il sostegno economico delle istituzioni europee.

L'Europa non può fare piccole guerre di bottega di fronte a un crocevia della storia. Abbiamo *competitor* che scommettono sulle nostre divisioni e sulle nostre debolezze e per questo dobbiamo dimostrarci più forti e più grandi per dare un segnale al mondo che l'Europa è pronta a raccogliere le sfide di questo tempo.

Alexandr Vondra (ECR). – Paní předsedající, dámy a pánové, ano, zaznělo tu mnoho dobrého. České předsednictví ve dne v noci pracuje, už třetí mimořádná energetická rada tak, aby tady byl alespoň nějaký krátký *relief*. Dobře, Evropská komise podporuje interkonektory, ale ten hlavní problém je cena plynu teď a tady. A jasně, ano, přišli jste se stropem, konečně, když po tom voláme už celé měsíce. Ale ten strop je stále ještě pět a půl krát vyšší, než byla cena před dvěma lety, a pětkrát vyšší než je dnešní cena ve Spojených státech. Čili řešení jsou dlouhodobé kontrakty na plyn, které ovšem některé státy bohužel odmítají, protože nechtějí levnou cenu plynu. Prostě s Amerikou, s Katarem, s Ázerbájdžánem, ne samozřejmě s Ruskem. To by bylo řešení, protože investoři budou mít jistotu v danou chvíli. Čína uzavřela na 27 let kontrakt s Katarem, tak proč my neděláme totéž? Když to neuděláme, tak se ty velké energeticky náročné firmy všechny odstěhují do Číny nebo do Ameriky. A to přeci nechceme.

Sabrina Pignedoli (NI). – Signora Presidente, onorevoli colleghi, nel mese di settembre il prezzo medio del gas americano venduto in Europa era di 57,8 dollari, negli Stati Uniti di appena 8 dollari.

Le imprese europee pagano il prezzo dell'energia fino a sette volte in più dei loro diretti *competitor* americani e asiatici. Che cosa stanno facendo in concreto le istituzioni europee per difendere le nostre imprese e la nostra economia? Niente.

Dopo mesi di discussioni infinite, vertici, tavoli di lavoro sul tetto al prezzo del gas, sull'Energy Recovery Fund, sul *decoupling* del mercato energetico, sugli acquisti comuni per lo stoccaggio europeo, sulla tassa sugli extraprofitti delle compagnie energetiche, bene, dopo mesi di discussione non è stato fatto nulla.

Per il Movimento 5 Stelle bisogna seguire due strade: un tetto al prezzo del gas che sia reale e non fittizio, come quello proposto dalla Commissione, e investimenti massicci nelle energie pulite e rinnovabili. Grazie al sole e al vento le nostre aziende, le nostre famiglie possono pagare meno l'energia. Facciamolo.

Seán Kelly (PPE). – Madam President, the crisis we find ourselves in is mainly driven by our overreliance on imported fossil fuels and exacerbated by the terrible situation in Ukraine caused by the terrorist state of Russia. I believe our upcoming work on market design should focus on targeted improvements as opposed to widespread changes. We can provide investor certainty and protect consumers by incentivising long-term contracts such as contracts for difference and power purchase agreements. This both removes the risk for investments and also protects consumers from price hikes. We should ensure that markets incentivise the development and roll out of energy storage technologies and green hydrogen to provide the backup to the system currently provided by fossil fuels. Targeted measures to support the growing number of vulnerable consumers is absolutely vital, and these will grow in number – and next winter, because next winter is probably going to be much worse than this winter. In the meantime, I welcome what Commissioner Simson made reference to – the development of interconnectors. I welcome the construction of the Celtic interconnector between Ireland and France. Interconnectors like these across the EU will shield us from crises in the future and make renewable energy more reliable and cheaper for consumers. In the meantime, we must act now to help those vulnerable consumers.

Elisabetta Gualmini (S&D). – Signora Presidente, signora Commissaria, onorevoli colleghi, il dramma di oggi sono i costi dell'energia e l'inflazione.

Mi spiace, ma la Commissione europea ci prende in giro mettendo un tetto al prezzo del gas di 275 euro per megawattora che non si è mai visto, mai, neanche nei momenti peggiori. Abbiamo ritrovato l'anima dell'Europa con NextGenerationEU e ora la stiamo perdendo con misure tardive e del tutto illusorie. Serve uno SURE 2.0, un REPowerEU molto più potente.

D'altro canto, anche i governi nazionali deludono, vedi la destra italiana che non ha fatto nulla per le bollette se non copiare e incollare le misure del governo Draghi e, più che una manovra, ha pensato di inaugurare una guerra tra poveri, abolire il reddito di cittadinanza perché la povertà è una colpa e, come nell'Inghilterra vittoriana, chi non lavora non deve mangiare e chi se ne frega.

È la destra che fa bonus e taglia le accise invisibili, che pensa di aumentare il contante fino a 5 000 euro e appiattisce le tasse a favore di chi sta meglio. La destra che spende moltissimo per le pensioni e zero per i giovani, forte con i deboli e debole con i forti, la nuova ricetta, ma noi non staremo certo zitti.

Nicola Danti (Renew). – Signora Presidente, signora Commissaria Simson, onorevoli colleghi, dopo mesi e mesi di richieste, ieri la Commissione ha finalmente proposto il meccanismo di correzione del mercato del gas, ma quello sforzo straordinario a cui gli Stati europei erano chiamati, come molte volte Mario Draghi aveva ribadito, non sembra essere stato tradotto in pratica. Che la proposta sarebbe arrivata fuori tempo massimo lo sapevamo, ma che fosse così debole, quasi da essere inutile, è stata una sorpresa.

Il meccanismo, infatti, se effettivamente adottato, potrebbe essere applicabile di fatto solo a condizioni molto peggiori di quelle vissute nei mesi scorsi, e ovviamente questo non ce lo auguriamo. Attendiamo ora la discussione dei ministri dell'Energia di domani, ci auguriamo che la proposta venga modificata in maniera sostanziale, in modo che possa avere davvero un effetto deterrente sui comportamenti speculativi.

Quando l'Europa è poco coraggiosa dobbiamo dirlo e in questo caso l'Europa sono gli Stati membri; è a loro e alla Commissione, forse troppo timida, che dobbiamo chiedere conto delle mancate risposte.

Jean-Lin Lacapelle (ID). – Madame la Présidente, en septembre ici, à cette même place, j'osais alerter sur les conséquences dramatiques de la situation énergétique de l'Union européenne. Rien n'a changé. Les rationnements se multiplient, les pénuries s'installent. On maltraite nos enfants en bloquant les températures à 19 degrés dans leurs écoles. Et le Premier ministre français ne peut plus cacher que les coupures de courant auront inévitablement lieu.

Dans ce contexte, quelles solutions nous recommandez-vous? Le marché unique de l'énergie. Quelle incompétence! Car c'est précisément à cause de ce marché que l'électricité est si chère. Un marché qui harmonise les prix de l'énergie augmente les plus bas et abaisse les plus hauts. L'Union européenne n'a eu de cesse de saboter la source d'électricité la plus abordable, le nucléaire, en imposant la libéralisation de l'électricité et le démantèlement d'EDF. Sans oublier la responsabilité de Macron, qui a fermé Fessenheim et mis à l'arrêt la moitié du parc nucléaire français. Mais aussi parce que les sanctions européennes suicidaires ont fait crever le plafond des prix du fioul et du gaz.

Ce marché européen de l'énergie n'est pas une solution, mais une cause de la catastrophe. Il faut en sortir d'urgence, comme l'ont déjà fait sagement plusieurs pays européens. Je vous avais prédit que nous terminerions dans le froid et dans le noir. Cette prédiction est en train de devenir réalité. Si nous n'abandonnons pas l'idéologie à laquelle nous sacrifions nos conditions de vie élémentaires, nous allons revenir à un Moyen Âge énergétique, tous éclairés par un petit objet. Ce petit objet, ça s'appelle une bougie.

Beata Szydło (ECR). – Pani Przewodnicząca! Szanowna Pani Komisarz! Szanowni Państwo! Każda nasza decyzja, którą podejmujemy w tej Izbie, i każda decyzja, którą podejmuje Komisja Europejska, musi być uwarunkowana świadomością tego, dla kogo pracujemy i w czyim imieniu pracujemy. My reprezentujemy interesy obywateli Europy, my reprezentujemy interesy tych, którzy powierzyli nam mandat, aby w Parlamencie Europejskim i Komisji Europejskiej zajmować się ich sprawami, żebyśmy zabezpieczali interesy Europejczyków.

Dlatego każda decyzja, która jest podejmowana w tej chwili w kontekście bezpieczeństwa energetycznego, musi uwzględniać przede wszystkim interes obywateli państw członkowskich. Musimy myśleć o infrastrukturze, o dostawach źródeł energii, musimy myśleć o przyszłości. Ale dzisiaj musimy myśleć o tym, co jest najistotniejsze, o cenach gazu, o cenach energii. To jest najważniejszy priorytet i dlatego, Pani Komisarz, Szanowni Państwo, trzeba w tych decyzjach uwzględniać uwarunkowania poszczególnych państw członkowskich.

Tom Berendsen (PPE). – Voorzitter, beste commissaris, beste collega's, in een veranderende wereld zijn mensen op zoek naar zekerheid. Het is onze verantwoordelijkheid als politici om die zekerheid daar waar mogelijk te bieden. Ook op het gebied van energie is die zekerheid belangrijk. Energie is een publiek belang dat we de afgelopen jaren veel te veel aan de markt hebben overgelaten. Voor mij zijn er daarom nu drie dingen belangrijk.

Ten eerste: laten we alleen maatregelen nemen die die zekerheid ook vergroten. Een Europees prijsplafond op gasinkoop is daarom ook een slecht idee, want het brengt onze leveringszekerheid in gevaar. We zien dan ook in het voorstel van de Commissie tussen de regels door dat de Commissie daar zelf ook huiverig voor is.

Ten tweede: laten we betere Europese samenwerking zoeken bij de productie van energie en bij de inkoop. Laten we betere onderlinge verbindingen maken. En laten we ook duidelijk maken dat de eigen keuze in het ene land om bijvoorbeeld een kerncentrale te sluiten effect heeft op de energiezekerheid in een ander land. Er kan geen solidariteit zijn zonder dat ieder land ook zijn eigen verantwoordelijkheid neemt in het gemeenschappelijk belang.

En ten derde: laten we ervoor zorgen dat we niet van de ene afhankelijkheid in de andere rollen. Rusland gebruikt energie als wapen tegen ons. Laten we ervoor zorgen dat dat wapen van die afhankelijkheid nooit meer in handen komt van een ander.

Jens Geier (S&D). – Frau Präsidentin, Frau Kommissarin, Herr Minister Bek, verehrte Kolleginnen und Kollegen! Seit Russland die Energieversorgung als Waffe einsetzt, stellt sich eine Frage neu: Wie funktioniert die Energieversorgung vor allem mit Erdgas für die wenigen Jahre, bis ausreichend erneuerbare Energie zur Verfügung stehen wird?

Ja, es wird kurzfristig zusätzliche Gasinfrastruktur geben müssen, und unerledigte Aufgaben fallen uns in der EU jetzt vor die Füße. Kommissarin Simson, Sie haben auf eine Reihe neu entstandener Interkonnektoren hingewiesen, und Sie haben ganz leise hinzugefügt, dass Mitgliedstaaten jetzt die Abschottung ihrer Energiemärkte aufgeben.

Das ist gut so, und das war lange überfällig, denn jetzt sind die Aufgaben größer und drängender als der Schutz der eigenen Märkte. Die Mitgliedstaaten müssen sich gegenseitig versorgen und unterstützen können, wenn es zu Energieengpässen kommen sollte. Aber wichtig ist, dass die neue Gasinfrastruktur, die entsteht, bereit sein muss für den Transport von Wasserstoff, denn sonst werden diese Investitionen in wenigen Jahren obsolet sein. Daher sollte es nur dann öffentliche Mittel geben, wenn die neue Infrastruktur auch für Wasserstoff geeignet ist.

Claudia Gamon (Renew). – Madam President, dear Commissioner, tomorrow we will be able to observe a jubilee, because I counted and our Energy Ministers will meet for the 10th time since the start of Russia's invasion of Ukraine. In February, views were exchanged, and there was a discussion in June at some point – the energy crisis wasn't even on the agenda. At another meeting REPowerEU was welcomed, and at some point there was at least a commitment to reduce gas demand. In September and October, at multiple meetings, we again had lots of discussions and proposals.

I'm sorry, but it is bloody November and some people might even be wondering: 'what are they actually doing for a living?' Our citizens and our businesses demand more. They want solutions. They want actions. So obviously, I guess we all wonder what will happen tomorrow – proposing to propose another proposal by the proposing entity? At this point, I don't think we can even afford any more to have a debate about pros and cons in certain models, but the best model would probably be the one that we can agree on to finally move on, for actions that our citizens and businesses desperately need.

Angelo Ciocca (ID). – Signora Presidente, signora Commissaria, onorevoli colleghi, il titolo dell'ordine del giorno è «Un mercato unico dell'energia realmente interconnesso per contenere i costi delle bollette», chi legge questo titolo legge un titolone, quasi da premio Oscar.

Però nel titolone da premio Oscar ci sono la realtà e i fatti concreti che mancano purtroppo all'istituzione europea, un'istituzione europea che non perde occasione per non essere rispettosa, per non essere seria, per non essere concreta davanti alla preoccupazione, al dramma del caro bollette delle nostre famiglie e delle nostre imprese.

Se pensiamo che in Italia ben cinque milioni di persone hanno almeno una bolletta arretrata, possiamo renderci conto di un dramma reale. Se pensiamo che la bolletta del gas media di una famiglia a ottobre, novembre e dicembre 2022 sarà il doppio rispetto all'anno precedente, possiamo capire quanto è importante che l'Europa dia risposte concrete. E purtroppo le risposte non arrivano, mentre arriva la speculazione, le risposte non arrivano neanche sul tetto del gas che, come ben sapete, è una presa in giro, sui tempi e sulle dimensioni di applicazione.

Penso davvero che, ancora una volta, l'Europa abbia perso una grande occasione di tendere la mano ai cittadini.

Geert Bourgeois (ECR). – Voorzitter, collega's, het is eigenlijk triest dat we vandaag dit debat moeten voeren. Mijn partij dringt al jaren aan op het voltooien van de interne markt, met inbegrip van de energiemarkt. Dat dit niet gebeurd is, komt tegen een heel hoge prijs. Onze bedrijven lijden eronder. De Europese Unie de-industrialiseert. Er is een exodus naar de Verenigde Staten en de EU antwoordt altijd maar met meer regels, met meer administratieve lasten, in plaats van in te zetten op groei en nog eens groei. Die kan komen van de voltooiing van de interne markt met een groei van 9 %. We zien vandaag ook de gevolgen van het ontbreken van de energiecorridors. Koortsachtig moeten terminals en pijpleidingen gebouwd worden, terwijl groene stroom al heel lang van zuid naar noord en van oost naar west had kunnen stromen. Tot slot wil ik beklemtonen dat het onaanvaardbaar is dat wij stoppen met de stabiele energievorm die kernenergie is.

Pernille Weiss (PPE). – Fru formand! Vi har opfundet så mange dybe tallerkner i EU. Også mange nye energiteknologier, som er bedre for klimaet og miljøet. Vi har bare ikke nok af dem. Af mange årsager. Alt for mange årsager. For vi roder rundt med enkeltstående projekter, der ikke hænger sammen med resten af energisektoren. Både i medlemslandene, men også på tværs af dem. Vi roder med alt for lav hastighed på godkendelse af kritisk infrastruktur, og vi roder med politiske signaler, lovgivningsmæssig ustabilitet og størrelserne af de mulige investeringsprojekter i en sådan grad, at selv europæiske investorer hellere lægger deres penge uden for EU, når det gælder grønne investeringsprojekter. Det gør helt ondt at sige det!

Så kære Kommission og Råd gør nu som min kollega, Maria Carvalho, sagde i begyndelsen af debatten: »Lav en plan og kom i gang!« For hvad nytter det at have store parker af kæmpe vindmøller, anlægge grupper af energiøer, bygge store Power-to-X-anlæg osv., hvis den rene og den vedvarende energi, der kan produceres, ikke kan komme ud på markedet i hele EU via rigeligt med rørlægninger, læringsmuligheder, havne og andre transportveje? På den måde får vi jo aldrig energipriserne ned og forsyningssikkerheden op.

Det er så banalt. Altså, ryd op, sæt tempoet op og sæt i gang nu!

Nicolás González Casares (S&D). – Señora presidenta, señora comisaria, parece que el mercado único de la energía es un edificio en construcción en el que poner cada ladrillo cuesta una barbaridad. La falta de interconexiones es el mejor ejemplo y vamos muy por detrás de los objetivos marcados. Y eso hace difícil compartir los beneficios que pueden producir las renovables en términos de precio y descarbonización.

En esta crisis, por ejemplo, a España y Portugal nos ha protegido la excepción ibérica. Pero desde luego preferiríamos estar interconectados a continuar siendo una isla energética. Queremos ayudar. Por ejemplo, el acuerdo sobre el BarMar, ese gasoducto que pretende transportar hidrógeno verde de la península ibérica al resto Europa, nos parece un paso adelante.

Pero no nos olvidemos de los ciudadanos, que son los que están sufriendo los altos precios de las facturas. Creo que la propuesta de la Comisión va a ser inaplicable. No tiene la más mínima ambición, ese tope al precio del gas no es realista, no es real, y no va a servir absolutamente para nada. Por lo tanto, para este viaje no hacían falta estas alforjas, como decimos en España. Estamos esperando que esta propuesta mejore, pero no debemos seguir por este camino.

Dita Charanzová (Renew). – Madam President, I think the message from all of us here is very simple: time is running out. The last time when I spoke on this same issue here in the Chamber, my message was very simple: speed up! Since then, what we have seen is just a ping-pong – ping-pong between the Commission and the Council, without any result. The Commission is still stuck on the gas price cap. The Council has not yet agreed on the joint purchasing of gas. There are no clear rules on state aid either. Companies in one state will have a competitive advantage over others, threatening the key principle of the single market.

We need to have a European solution so that we urgently help the citizens struggling with high bills and at the same time have a fair level playing field for all companies in the European internal market.

Nicola Procaccini (ECR). – Signora Presidente, onorevoli colleghi, questo dibattito sulla crisi energetica rischia di essere uguale a tutti quelli già fatti finora e rischia di avere lo stesso risultato dei dibattiti precedenti: il nulla.

Sappiamo che se fosse stato introdotto il tetto al prezzo del gas, su cui si forma il prezzo di tutta l'energia elettrica, quando lo chiese la maggioranza degli Stati europei, ci saremmo risparmiati una sanguinosa emorragia economica per le famiglie e le imprese dell'Unione, oltre che per i 27 bilanci nazionali.

Soltanto ieri la Commissione si è degnata di prendere una posizione, proponendo un tetto assurdo a 275 euro per megawatt/ora, che scatta solo in condizioni impossibili da verificarsi, che non sarebbe entrato in vigore neppure nell'agosto scorso quando il prezzo del gas era arrivato a 350 euro. Non è un caso che gli speculatori ad Amsterdam ieri abbiano festeggiato con un rialzo improvviso.

Mi spiace dirlo, ma questa proposta della Commissione è offensiva, per quanto è stupida e irrealistica. Francamente, potevate risparmiarvela.

Hildegard Bentele (PPE). – Frau Präsidentin, meine sehr verehrten Damen und Herren, liebe Kolleginnen und Kollegen! Wie können wir mit einem tatsächlich integrierten europäischen Energiebinnenmarkt erreichen, dass Energierechnungen bezahlbar und unsere Unternehmen wettbewerbsfähig bleiben?

Drei kurze Antworten darauf: Es müssen schnellstens, das heißt durch schnelle Genehmigungsverfahren, alle noch notwendigen grenzüberschreitenden Verbindungen gebaut werden. Die Krise hat gezeigt, zu welchen Beschleunigungen wir in der Lage sind, wenn wir müssen. Ich fordere die Mitgliedstaaten auf, die zur Verfügung stehenden EU-Mittel schnellstens abzurufen und umzusetzen und sie insbesondere auch in die Energieinfrastruktur der Zukunft zu investieren, in die für Elektrizität und für Wasserstoff.

Zweitens können wir die Energiepreise herunterbekommen, wenn wir als EU auf dem Weltmarkt auftreten und gemeinsam einkaufen. Mit geballter Konsumentenmacht und langfristigen Verträgen könnten wir bessere Konditionen und mehr Sicherheit erzielen. Insofern, sehr geehrte Kommissions- und Ratsvertreter, überwinden Sie die Egos, werden Sie strategisch! Wir brauchen eine echte europäische Energiediplomatie.

Und drittens: Wir diskutieren aktuell verständlicherweise eine Gaspreisbremse. Ganz entscheidend für den Industriestandort Europa wird vor allem aber der Strompreis sein – für diesen brauchen wir eine echte Lösung, damit Unternehmen eine Zukunftsperspektive in Europa sehen.

Цветелина Пенкова (S&D). – Г-жо Председател, комисар Симпсън, министър Бек, за да се справим с множеството кризи има само едно решение. Трябва да действаме единно и бързо. Трябва да действаме като едно цяло, за да защитим най-уязвимите в нашите общества сега и веднага. Нужни са конкретни мерки, за да се справим с предизвикателствата на енергийната криза: в краткосрочен план – промяна на ценообразуването на електроенергията, за да намалим сметките на гражданите и индустрията. Пестене на енергия и ясна дефиниция за енергийно бедните домакинства, за да може да насочим публичните ресурси и усилия именно към тях; в средносрочен план – работа за общи доставки на енергийни суровини и инвестиции в енергийна ефективност; в дългосрочен план – трябва да продължим да развиваме новите технологии и инфраструктура, за да изградим един истински свързан европейски енергиен пазар.

Трябва да инвестираме повече във възобновяеми източници на енергия и базови енергийни мощности като ядрената енергетика. Само така ще гарантираме трайно намаляване на сметките на домакинствата и индустрията.

Susana Solís Pérez (Renew). – Señora presidenta, señora comisaria, la confianza empresarial se ha desplomado y un tercio de las mayores empresas en Europa prevén detener o reducir su producción por los altos precios de la energía.

Avanzar hacia un mercado único de la energía es ahora más necesario que nunca. Y para ello necesitamos dos cosas: una reforma del mercado e interconexiones.

Las intervenciones del mercado son indeseables, pero lo es más dejar a los ciudadanos desamparados y a empresas paradas. Hoy en día se están perdiendo las señales de precio y, además, tenemos el inmenso reto de crear una red eléctrica que absorba toda la potencia renovable que instalaremos en la próxima década. Seamos valientes para cambiar lo que no funciona.

Respecto a las interconexiones, vamos tarde, por detrás de los objetivos que teníamos y, además, parece que no hemos aprendido. Acabamos de abandonar el MidCat y ahora lo sustituimos por un proyecto mucho más costoso y que no permitirá que transportemos ni gas ni hidrógeno renovable hasta 2030, lo que no nos sirve para la crisis actual.

Señora comisaria, la tarea que tenemos por delante es enorme. Es urgente tomar medidas. Pongámonos a la obra, porque nuestros ciudadanos y nuestras empresas no pueden esperar más.

Anna Zalewska (ECR). – Pani Przewodnicząca! Pani Komisarz! W Europie jest wojna, kryzys energetyczny i gospodarczy, a ludzie żyją w ubóstwie energetycznym. Dlatego jesteśmy winni Europejczykom uczciwość i informację, że działania, które podejmuje Komisja Europejska, są niestety pozorowane, gdyż nie zmniejszymy cen energii, jeżeli nie zatrzymamy ETS-u. A my nie robimy nic innego, jak rozszerzamy ETS, sięgając głęboko do kieszeni Europejczyków.

Jednocześnie Komisja Europejska nie ma odwagi powiedzieć, że zamroziła do marca dyrektywę o opodatkowaniu energii, gdzie ceny energii z węgla mają wzrosnąć jeszcze od 100% do 300%, a ceny ciepła i ceny energii z gazu od 300% do 500%. Jednocześnie blokuje się możliwość obniżania VAT-u w poszczególnych krajach członkowskich. Polska musi z tego zrezygnować, bo są to przecież środki własne Komisji Europejskiej. Przestrzegam przed platformami. Już mieliśmy wspólne zakupy, m.in. szczepionek. Do dzisiaj Komisja Europejska nie wytłumaczyła się z kontraktów, które zawarła z firmami farmaceutycznymi.

Ivan Štefanec (PPE). – Vážená pani predsedajúca, situácia na trhu s energiami nám ukazuje, že dôsledky ruskej zločineckej agresie znášame všetci v Európskej únii, najmä cez vyššie ceny energií a tovarov. O to viac musíme držať spolu, o to viac sú dôležité spoločné európske riešenia, o to viac je dôležitý fungujúci európsky energetický trh. Je to dôležité aj pre lepšiu energetickú bezpečnosť a lepšie ceny energií.

Dnes viac ako inokedy potrebujeme pre zníženie cien znižovať dopyt. Uvedomme si, že všetky úsporné opatrenia, všetky úsporné opatrenia majú význam a každým šetrením prispievame k zníženiu ceny. Na druhej strane potrebujeme zvyšovať dopyt. Je potrebné uvoľniť ceny energií aj tak, že sa uvoľnia pravidlá pre tých, ktorí tvoria energiu, malých výrobcov energie, osobitne z obnoviteľných zdrojov. Platí to pre malé firmy, osobitne pre domácnosti pri inštalácii fotovoltických panelov.

Dnes potrebujeme viac ako inokedy odstrániť prekážky na spoločnom trhu, investovať do energetickej infraštruktúry a mať aj nové trhové pravidlá pre oddelenie cien plynu od cien elektriny. Spoločné nákupy, samozrejme, môžu pomôcť. Tá situácia sa rýchlo mení. Závislosť od ruských fosílnych palív sa zmenšuje, čo je dobrá správa, a je potrebné dnešné časy využiť naozaj na zmenu v prospech občanov, konkurencieschopnosti firiem aj lepšej ochrany prírody.

Carmen Avram (S&D). – Doamnă președintă, domnule comisar, în anii 80, care au fost cei mai crunți ai comunismului, 23 de milioane de români, inclusiv eu, am trăit în umilință zilnică din cauza lipsurilor elementare de hrană, căldură și electricitate.

Ne erau date puțin și rar, cât să vedem că ele există, dar noi nu aveam dreptul să le avem. Patru decenii mai târziu, deși trăiesc în inima democrației, milioane de europeni riscă să experimenteze aceleași umilințe. Acești oameni au dreptul fundamental la o viață decentă, dar nu și-o mai pot permite.

În pandemie, Comisia s-a mobilizat rapid și miliarde de euro au plecat spre mari companii ca să le ajute să supraviețuiască. Azi însă, cumva, Comisia nu reușește să convingă mari companii că și cetățenii au dreptul să supraviețuiască, deși ele au făcut profituri gigant (istorice) pe spatele europenilor. E nevoie de sprijin direct pentru consumatori, acum, iarna e aici.

Comisia ne oferă un mecanism nerealist, care vine târziu, are doar efecte pe termen lung și e foarte neclar. E pentru oameni, pentru IMM-uri sau pentru speculanți? Poate mai studiază comisia Campania PSD „Jos facturile!" pentru că pare că s-a inspirat din ea, dar nu suficient.

Mittwoch, 23. November 2022

Izabela-Helena Kloc (ECR). – Pani Przewodnicząca! Szanowni Państwo! Wszyscy jesteśmy zaniepokojeni rachunkami za prąd i słabnącą konkurencyjnością unijnych firm. Żyjemy wręcz w przededniu wielkiego buntu społecznego. Ale kto jest winny tej sytuacji? Pomijam w tej chwili wojnę. Większość z nas jest zwolennikami agresywnej polityki klimatycznej, która jest główną przyczyną chaosu na dzisiejszym rynku energetycznym w Europie.

Pani Komisarz! Panie i Panowie! Powiem bez ogródek: Europa potrzebuje taniej i stabilnej energii. Same odnawialne źródła energii absolutnie tutaj nie wystarczą. Nigdy nam nie zapewnią stabilności.

Jeśli ktoś myśli inaczej, ten popełnia fatalny i brzemienny w konsekwencje błąd. Nie walczcie z tym, co podpowiada logika i zdrowy rozsądek. Nie ma żadnych racjonalnych powodów dzisiaj, aby rezygnować z gazu, atomu i węgla. Jeśli naprawdę chcemy obniżyć rachunki za prąd i zwiększyć konkurencyjność unijnej gospodarki, zróbmy to, co jest oczywiste. Uznajmy, że paliwa kopalne i jądrowe muszą być częścią planów energetycznych i klimatycznych na następne 30, a nawet 50 lat. Nie łudźmy się, że będziemy klimatycznymi zbawcami świata.

Massimiliano Salini (PPE). – Signora Presidente, onorevoli colleghi, nella crisi energetica abbiamo avuto due strategie a confronto: da un lato chi ha proposto di imporre un tetto al prezzo del gas, e mi pare che questa soluzione non sia sostanzialmente stata accolta dalla Commissione, dall'altro c'è chi adotta una strategia differente, a mio modo di vedere altrettanto complessa e probabilmente ancora più pericolosa per il mercato, cioè puntare sulla riduzione della domanda di energia e sovvenzionare, con le risorse disponibili all'interno del paese, per compensare questa riduzione della domanda di energia. Questo secondo modello sta producendo delocalizzazioni industriali.

Purtroppo la riduzione della domanda di gas e di energia in questo momento non è determinata da un efficientamento, ma dal fatto che si decide di spostare la produzione altrove. E su questo la Commissione, io credo, dovrà essere molto vigile e non sostenere questo modello.

Dall'altro c'è il tema delle infrastrutture. L'integrazione va garantita, i flussi tradizionali erano da est verso ovest e da nord verso sud, in futuro saranno da sud verso nord e da ovest verso est, e questo è un elemento di novità che nell'integrazione infrastrutturale dovrà diventare un punto di riferimento per la Commissione europea.

Marek Paweł Balt (S&D). – Pani Przewodnicząca! Pani Komisarz! Reakcja na obecny kryzys energetyczny musi być kompleksowa i pokazywać, jak zjednoczona jest cała Europa w obliczu rosyjskiego ataku poprzez wykorzystanie surowców energetycznych.

W tej wojnie mamy trzy równie ważne bitwy, które jako Europa musimy wygrać. Musimy przede wszystkim zapewnić Unii Europejskiej zaspokojenie potrzeb energetycznych na tę i następną zimę, która będzie jeszcze trudniejsza. Nie możemy też zapomnieć o naszych europejskich sojusznikach, takich jak Ukraina czy Mołdawia, które są teraz w jeszcze trudniejszej sytuacji niż my.

Druga walka toczy się ze spekulantami na wspólnym rynku. Wspólne zakupy są ważne nie tylko po to, aby zapewnić nam energię, ale także po to, aby cena nie była zawyżona przez walczące ze sobą o dostęp do paliw nasze własne kraje i nasze własne firmy. Taka wewnętrzna konkurencja jest niszcząca. Wszyscy w Unii Europejskiej muszą mieć dostęp do tanich źródeł energii, niezależnie od kraju czy miasta, w którym mieszkają.

Kolejnym kluczowym instrumentem, który musi zostać wdrożony, są akceptowalne społecznie ceny energii i surowców energetycznych. Ostatnim, ale nie mniej ważnym elementem jest dalsza integracja naszych możliwości za pomocą interkonektorów, które muszą równolegle przygotować nas do przyszłych możliwych kryzysów oraz na wykorzystanie przyjaznych dla środowiska źródeł energii, takich jak wodór.

Μαρία Σπυράκη (PPE). – Κυρία Πρόεδρε, αγαπητοί συνάδελφοι, Επίτροπε Simson, η πλήρης ενιαία κοινή αγορά ενέργειας είναι πλέον επείγουσα προϋπόθεση για να συνεχίσει η Ευρωπαϊκή Ένωση να έχει κοινωνίες με συνοχή. Η κοινωνική συνοχή απειλείται και τα μέτρα των κρατών μελών δεν επαρκούν.

Στη χώρα μου, την Ελλάδα, έχουν ήδη διατεθεί περισσότερα από 5 δισεκατομμύρια ευρώ για πολίτες και επιχειρήσεις — συνολικά πάνω από το 3,6% του ΑΕΠ— σε μέτρα στήριξης και δεν επαρκούν. Η ανακοίνωση της πρόθεσης της Ευρωπαϊκής Ένωσης να θέσει ανώτατη τιμή στο υγροποιημένο φυσικό αέριο έφερε μείωση των τιμών στις αγορές, αλλά η ίδια η δημοσιοποίηση του μηχανισμού διόρθωσης, μόλις χθες, εγείρει πολλές αμφιβολίες για την αποτελεσματικότητα και την εφαρμογή της. Οφείλετε, Επίτροπε, να δώσετε συγκεκριμένες διευκρινίσεις προκειμένου το μήνυμα να είναι σαφές: ο μηχανισμός θα εφαρμοστεί προς το συμφέρον των Ευρωπαίων πολιτών. Οι πολίτες μας χρειάζονται έργα διασύνδεσης των υποδομών με συνδυασμό δημοσίων και ιδιωτικών επενδύσεων.

Ο αγωγός Ελλάδας-Βουλγαρίας, το FSRU στην Αλεξανδρούπολη, η ηλεκτρική διασύνδεση της Ελλάδας με την Αίγυπτο είναι έργα πρώτης προτεραιότητας, όπως πρώτη προτεραιότητα είναι και η εγκατάσταση των ανανεώσιμων πηγών ενέργειας, μειώνοντας άμεσα και δραστικά τα εμπόδια. Η Ευρωπαϊκή Ένωση οφείλει να σταθεί άμεσα αλληλέγγυα στους πολίτες μας πριν η ευρωπαϊκή κρίση αποτελέσει βόμβα στα θεμέλια των κοινωνιών μας.

Robert Hajšel (S&D). – Vážená pani predsedajúca, cením si úsilie Komisie prichádzať s návrhmi na zníženie vysokých cien energie, ktoré mnohé podniky a domácnosti nedokážu znášať. Návrhy idú dobrým smerom, ale dnes nestačia.

Treba si uvedomiť, že dôvodom vysokých cien je dnes hlavne nedostatok ponuky, a ten súvisí s výpadkom viacerých stabilných jadrových zdrojov, či už vo Francúzsku alebo v Nemecku, ktoré nevieme vykompenzovať fotovoltikou alebo veternými turbínami. Návrh Komisie na cenový strop 275 EUR/MWh na mesačné kontrakty je kompromis, ktorý, žiaľ, neprinesie želaný efekt. A to, cena plynu dostatočne neklesne a s ňou ani cena elektriny. Pokiaľ bude v Únii dominovať dovoz LNG plynu, tak jeho cena nemá šancu a ani vlastne nemôže klesnúť výrazne, lebo LNG tankery si nájdu zákazníkov v Ázii a Európa ostane bez dostatku plynu.

Obávam sa, že k výraznému zníženiu ceny plynu dôjde, iba ak sa posilní domáca ťažba a zvýšia sa dodávky potrubného plynu najmä z Ruska. Čo si ale dnes vzhľadom na situáciu nevieme predstaviť, a preto teraz potrebujeme najmä priamu kompenzáciu, priamu podporu aspoň pre zraniteľné domácnosti a podniky.

Kadri Simson, *Member of the Commission*. – Madam President, honourable Members of Parliament, thank you very much for that very needed and valuable discussion today and I really am happy to have the opportunity to exchange in these difficult times we are facing today.

The Commission has come a long way to address the current energy crisis, starting with the energy prices toolbox already last October: the Gas Storage and Gas Demand Reduction regulations, RePowerEU, the revenue cap on cheap electricity producers and the solidarity contribution of fossil fuel producers. More recently the Commission has also proposed the operationalisation of joint purchasing of gas and a return to gas benchmarks, the emergency regulation on permitting and the latest market correction mechanism.

Cumulatively this work is contributing to the relatively good state of our energy system. Save for exceptional circumstances, we are well prepared for this winter from the energy-security perspective. The question is where do we go from here?

The full focus right now is on the electricity market design. The Commission has committed to deliver the electricity market design in the first quarter of 2023. This entails a public consultation with stakeholders before coming forward with a legislative proposal. In any event the Commission intends to present its ideas before the end of the year to get the feedback on what we would plan to propose, to improve it and to ensure a wider agreement and support, and Parliament's view in this respect will be of course crucial.

In the meantime it is important to continue the work on energy demand reduction. Energy demand reduction works much better when applied in coordination with national partners, therefore the Commission has launched together with the International Energy Agency the 'playing my part' initiative. It outlines simple actions that are within everyone's reach but which can make a huge difference.

We also remain committed to work with the Energy Efficiency Hub, a global platform for collaboration on energy efficiency. The energy demand reduction continues to be crucial to keep the energy prices in check and to prepare already for the next winter. We need to ensure that the EU gas storage will not be empty by the end of this heating season.

And my final point to you is that in a crisis like this we need to stand together and mutually support each other in our work. Individually each Member State would be in a very difficult situation, but thanks to the joint work of the European Parliament, the Council and Commission over the years together we have developed a solid legal framework that made our energy markets stronger and more resilient. We are far better interconnected, and today all Member States can rely on each other in the crisis. We need to continue this important work. Only together are we strong enough to face the enemy that is trying to undermine us.

Mittwoch, 23. November 2022

Mikuláš Bek, *President-in-Office of the Council*. – Madam President, honourable Members, Commissioner, thank you for this timely and pertinent exchange. I think many of us agree that while much has already been done both at the EU and national levels, considering the current situation much more effort is needed. The amplitude of the challenges ahead of us is clear: climate change; the need to boost our economy at a time of high inflation and potential stagnation; a difficult geopolitical scenery and the necessity to cut our dependence on Russia.

Many, if not all of you, have emphasised once again the importance of a coordinated European solution both in terms of short-term emergency measures and medium- and long-term adjustments to the market framework.

The Council for its part will keep the situation on the energy markets under constant review and react swiftly. Let me assure you the Czech Presidency is determined to do its utmost to provide effective responses to people and businesses.

Ladies and gentlemen, the EU has always shown great resilience and political unity when facing difficult situations. I think that this time it will not be any different. We put in place a set of tools that already proved successful, lowering significantly the volatility of energy prices and enhancing security of supply. A further integrated energy market will prove efficient and stronger when undergoing shocks, and will be a useful tool in the fight against climate change.

Die Präsidentin. – Die Aussprache ist damit geschlossen.

Schriftliche Erklärungen (Artikel 171)

András Gyürk (NI), *írásban*. – Európa az elviselhetetlen energiaárak miatt súlyos válságba jutott – tönkremenő iparágak, recesszió felé tartó gazdaság, csökkenő életszínvonal. Az ok egyértelmű: a baloldal és a brüsszeli bürokraták által követelt, rosszul megalkotott szankciós politika. Ennek a felárát fizetik minden nap az emberek. A megoldás első lépése a szankciók gyökeres átalakítása kell, hogy legyen. Nem veszélyeztethetjük a családok megélhetését, nem hagyhatjuk sorsukra vállalatainkat. Olyan politikát kell folytatnunk, ami megvédi a munkahelyeket és az európai ipar versenyképességét. Az egyre súlyosabb válságból ugyanis csak egy stabil lábakon álló erős európai gazdaság tud kilábalni.

Ezért is elfogadhatatlan, hogy ebben a súlyos helyzetben a baloldal újabb és újabb szankciókat követel. Itt az idő, hogy az érintettek beismerjék – a szankciós politika kudarcot vallott, most az emberek és vállalatok segítésére van szükség.

Valdemar Tomaševski (ECR), *raštu*. – Vienas iš pagrindinių Europos Sąjungos energetikos politikos tikslų dabartinės ekonominės krizės, kurią sukelia vykstantis karas, metu, turėtų būti bendros elektros vidaus rinkos sukūrimas. Be to, pagrindinis šios politikos tikslas turėtų būti neigiamo elektros kainų poveikio paprastiems žmonėms ir namų ūkiams, kuriuos labiausiai veikia kainų augimas, apribojimas. Taip pat svarbu užtikrinti energijos tiekimo saugumą, kas šiandien kamuoja daugelį Europos šalių. Bendros elektros vidaus rinkos sukūrimas ES yra svarbus visų pirma dėl galimybės sumažinti elektros kainas, kurios sudaro didelę kintamųjų sąnaudų dalį daugelyje pramonės šakų. Todėl veiksmai, kurių imamasi kuriant šią rinką, turėtų padėti ginti ES ekonomikos poziciją, su kuria vis sunkiau konkuruoti ekonomikai iš ne ES šalių. Europos Komisija įvertino, kad ES elektros rinkos integracijos laipsnis yra nepakankamas. Europos Komisijos nuomone, tai daugiausia lėmė du veiksniai – žemas tarpvalstybinės elektros prekybos lygis ir išlikę dideli elektros kainų skirtumai tarp ES valstybių narių rinkų. Todėl Komisija turėtų sutelkti dėmesį į tarpvalstybinės elektros prekybos palengvinimą ir stabilaus energijos tiekimo visose šalyse užtikrinimą.

Edina Tóth (NI), *írásban*. – Az orosz–ukrán háború kitörése utáni napokban az Oroszország elleni első szankciós csomag előkészítésekor Brüsszelben arról beszéltek, hogy ennek két eredménye is lehet: egyrészt térdre kényszeríti az orosz gazdaságot, másrészt gyorsan véget vet a háborúnak. Azonban a konfliktus már nyolc hónapja tart, és erőteljesebb, mint bármikor, az európai gazdaság pedig nehézségekkel küzd, a szankciós infláció miatt egyre kevesebbet ér az emberek pénze. Európa az elviselhetetlen energiaárak miatt súlyos válságba jutott – tönkremenő iparágak, recesszió felé tartó gazdaság, csökkenő életszínvonal jellemzik ma az Uniót. Az ok egyértelmű: a baloldal és a brüsszeli bürokraták által követelt, rosszul megalkotott szankciós politika.

Ennek a felárát fizetik most minden nap az emberek. A válságkezelés első lépése a szankciók gyökeres átalakítása kell, hogy legyen. Nem veszélyeztethetjük a családok megélhetését, nem hagyhatjuk sorsukra vállalatainkat. Olyan politikát kell folytatnunk, ami megvédi a munkahelyeket és az európai ipar versenyképességét. Az egyre súlyosabb válságból ugyanis csak egy erős európai gazdaság tud kilábalni. Ezért is elfogadhatatlan, hogy ebben a súlyos helyzetben a baloldal újabb és újabb szankciókat követel. Itt az idő, hogy beismerjék – a szankciós politika kudarcot vallott, most az emberek és vállalatok segítésére van szükség!

Carlos Zorrinho (S&D), *por escrito*. – A União Europeia não tem hesitado no seu apoio ao povo ucraniano cuja soberania e segurança têm vindo a ser barbaramente agredidas pela Federação da Rússia. Não há guerra sem custos, mas estes não devem ser imputados aos mais vulneráveis. Várias medidas de caráter solidário e colaborativo têm vindo a ser aplicadas, mas é preciso ir mais longe.

Numa tomada de posição pública, que subscrevi e subscrevo, o Grupo dos Socialistas e Democratas propôs linhas de intervenção para que o mercado único da energia seja mais interconectado e transparente, permitindo controlar melhor os preços e assegurar a competitividade das empresas. Deve ser aplicado um limite máximo para o preço de importação de gás e o preço do gás deve ser desligado da formação do preço da eletricidade, permitindo regular esse preço até à revisão das regras do mercado. É também proposto um modelo de procura conjunta, para conseguir melhores preços e maior diversificação de fornecedores, e defendida a aposta no investimento no reforço das interconexões elétricas e dos corredores verdes. Estas medidas abrem caminho para continuar a poder apoiar o povo ucraniano, sem esquecer nunca a justiça social e a competitividade empresarial no espaço da União.

PRESIDENZA: ROBERTA METSOLA

President

8. Beseitigung der Gewalt gegen Frauen (Aussprache)

President. – Dear colleagues, I wanted to come in at this stage because I know how personal this debate is to so many of us here and around our Member States.

I just want to say: stop killing women, stop beating women, stop abusing women.

Ilbieraħ f'Malta, Bernice Cassar, mara ta' 40 sena, omm ta' żewġt itfal żgħar, inqatlet b'tiri li għaddew minn windscreen tal-karozza tagħha. Dan huwa eżempju wieħed biss tal-abbuż u l-qtil ta' nisa fl-Ewropa, sempliċiment għaliex huma nisa. Għal xhur sħaħ, Bernice talbet l-għajnuna, talbet għall-protezzjoni, imma la għajnuna u lanqas il-protezzjoni, qatt ma waslu.

Thalliet waħidha.

Stop killing women. No more excuses. Protect women. We need action now. We need proper protection frameworks. We need more convictions of those who prey on females. And we need to end the remaining institutional blindness to the endemic violence against women. We need the urgent ratification of the Istanbul Convention in all Member States.

Bernice should have arrived at work yesterday. She should have been able to go home and play with her children. She should not have been forced to live in fear. She should have been safe. She should have been free from torment. She should not have been killed.

None of the horrific examples of violence against women we are forced to endure should take place in our Europe. We are not talking about victims: these are our fallen warriors. Women deserve to live free from fear everywhere. Stop killing women.

Mittwoch, 23. November 2022

VORSITZ: EVELYN REGNER

Vizepräsidentin

Die Präsidentin. – Damit kommen wir nun zu der Aussprache über die Erklärungen des Rates und der Kommission zur Beseitigung der Gewalt gegen Frauen (2022/2951(RSP)).

Mikuláš Bek, *President-in-Office of the Council.* – Madam President, honourable Members, Commissioner, thank you very much for this opportunity on the occasion of the soon coming International Day for the Elimination of Violence against Women to discuss progress made at EU level on different initiatives.

Violence has no place in a civilised society in the 21st century, yet the problem persists in Europe. Indeed, we know that in some cases domestic violence even increased during the COVID pandemic when people were confined to their homes. Meanwhile, new forms of violence, including online violence, have created a need for effective responses.

But not only in Europe: across the world women and girls suffer from sexual and gender-based violence including conflict-related sexual violence offline and online. Armed conflicts continue to have a disproportionate effect on women and girls worldwide, including in Afghanistan, Colombia, Ethiopia, Myanmar, Sudan, Syria, Ukraine and Yemen.

The ongoing violent crackdown in Iran against protesters, including women and children, is yet another reminder of the urgency of our work for the cause of gender equality and human rights.

Coming back to our work, let me refer to the most recent steps taken in the Council in this regard.

In the first place this regards the Istanbul Convention. Following the recent Court of Justice Opinion 1/19, the Council has been working on the amendments needed to reflect the appropriate legal basis as decided by the Court.

Secondly, the Council is currently analysing the proposal for a directive on combating violence against women and domestic violence, which aims to reinforce the protection of women and step up the fight against violence against women by criminalising a series of behaviours and strengthening the rights of the victims. During both the French and Czech presidencies, intensive work has taken place which enabled the completion of the first reading of the proposal. The work on the proposal will continue during the terms of the incoming Presidency with a view to the swiftest possible progress.

Thirdly, our debate today is also an opportunity to recall the long-standing cooperation between the European Parliament and the Council in the field of gender equality more generally. Following the agreement on the directive on improving the gender balance among directors of listed companies reached between the Council and the Parliament in June, we can now finally proceed with the formal signature of this important instrument. All aspects of gender equality are inter-related. By making sure that board members are selected through a procedure that is transparent and fair, we have decisive action against the problem of vertical segregation. This is part of our long campaign to empower women and to ensure real equality.

Finally, for many years the EU has been actively engaged with its partners to advance and implement the United Nation's women, peace and security agenda. The pillars of this agenda – participation, protection, prevention, and relief and recovery – are intrinsically linked. This was also reflected in the Council conclusions on women, peace and security, adopted in a timely manner on 14 November 2022.

Let me say once more that the European Parliament and the Council share the same concern about the persistent violence against women and are close allies in this struggle.

Helena Dalli, *Member of the Commission*. – Madam President, Minister, honourable Members, we mark the International Day for the Elimination of Violence against Women on 25 November annually, as violence against women and girls remains a pervasive violation of human rights around the world. It would have been good had there been more men in this Chamber, because here it seems I will be speaking to the converted.

Yesterday in my home country, as you heard from the President earlier, Bernice Cassar was killed in broad daylight on her way to work as a result of three gunshots hitting her face and her chest. At this stage, the only suspect in this murder is her estranged husband. And we all know about tragedies like this one, as they are happening daily across Europe and around the world. Despite their frequency, however, they remain one of the least prosecuted forms of crime, and citizens can become desensitised unless we speak up and make sure that women stop being murdered in silence.

Addressing this matter with due attention is a prerequisite to tackle gender-based discrimination, make progress on women's rights and equality, and safeguard the common values of the Union, as well as to advance our democracy.

I thank this House for being a strong ally in keeping the eradication of violence against women and girls high on the EU political agenda. Since the adoption of the gender equality strategy, we have been working to transform our political commitments into concrete and meaningful action. All our measures have been driven by the aim of making a difference in the lives of diverse women and girls, in particular of those facing gender-based violence and domestic violence.

In March, the Commission adopted a legislative proposal to combat all forms of violence against women and domestic violence. The proposal covers the criminalisation of certain offences amounting to violence against women, the protection of support and access to justice for victims of violence against women and domestic violence and the prevention of such forms of violence. It is modelled on the Council of Europe's Istanbul Convention, which has proven to be a comprehensive legal instrument in this domain, but which sadly has not been ratified yet by the European Union.

The proposal calls on strengthening the work of and support for the different services and practitioners who are devoting their professional lives to supporting victims. In this spirit, I will mark the International Day for the Elimination of Violence against Women by standing together with victims and survivors while calling for a bigger push to end this violation of human rights. I will visit the care centre for sexual violence in Brussels, which addresses gender-based violence and provides services ranging from medical and psychological care to help from the judicial and police department, as well as support and follow-up brought together in one place. I will meet different stakeholders involved in the process, all of whom are specifically trained to work with and offer specialised support to victims.

In the context of this day, the Commission is adopting and implementing a decision to set up a European uniform number for a dedicated helpline for victims of violence against women and domestic violence, as announced in the proposal. Looking further ahead and complementing our legislative proposal, we will present in the coming months a recommendation to prevent and combat harmful practices against women and girls. We will encourage Member States to take a number of actions to address in an effective way female genital mutilation, forced and child marriages, honour-related violence, forced abortion and forced sterilisation and other harmful practices that affect mainly women and girls.

We cannot achieve the aim of eliminating violence against women alone. We are therefore also cooperating with key stakeholders beyond our borders. In the G7 setting, the EU contributed to the strengthening of the accountability of the leaders' political commitment and to ensure gender-mainstreaming is a cross-sectoral principle in the G7 activities.

We also continue to be fully engaged as co-leaders of the Generation Equality Forum Action Coalition on Gender-based Violence and UN Women. In this framework we are working with organisations from every part of society to catalyse progress, advocate for change and take action together.

Let us continue to stay together to fight violence against women and domestic violence.

President. – Thank you very much, Commissioner, for your clear words and for your work.

Mittwoch, 23. November 2022

Ελισσάβετ Βόζεμπεργκ-Βρυωνίδη, *εξ ονόματος της ομάδας PPE*. – Κυρία Πρόεδρε, κάθε χρόνο, με αφορμή την Παγκόσμια Ημέρα για την Εξάλειψη της Βίας κατά των Γυναικών, εξετάζουμε την εικόνα του φαινομένου στην Ευρωπαϊκή Ένωση και σε ολόκληρο τον κόσμο.

Η έμφυλη βία εντός και εκτός διαδικτύου είναι βαθιά ριζωμένη στις διαρθρωτικές ανισότητες της κοινωνίας και παραμένει αθόρυβη, αποτελώντας βάναυση παραβίαση των ανθρωπίνων δικαιωμάτων. Στη σημερινή ψηφιακή εποχή, η επικοινωνία των πολιτών, οι συναλλαγές και αλληλεπιδράσεις στους ψηφιακούς αγνώστους χώρους έχουν αναδείξει το έγκλημα της διαδικτυακής έμφυλης βίας, που συνεχώς λαμβάνει ανεξέλεγκτες διαστάσεις, αν αναλογιστεί κανείς ότι, ενδεικτικά, μία στις δέκα γυναίκες έχουν βιώσει παρενόχληση μέχρι τα δεκαπέντε χρόνια τους, ενώ μία στις πέντε νεαρές γυναίκες στην Ένωση δεκαοκτώ ως δεκαεννέα ετών αναφέρουν διαδικτυακή σεξουαλική παρενόχληση.

Εννοείται ότι δεν αναφέρομαι στις συχνές γυναικοκτονίες που αποτελούν —νομίζω, όλοι συμφωνείτε— τη σύγχρονη μάστιγα της ανθρωπότητας.

Η Επιτροπή Δικαιωμάτων των Γυναικών και Ισότητας των Φύλων και προσωπικά ως αντιπρόεδρος προτρέψαμε την Ευρωπαϊκή Επιτροπή να εντάξει την έμφυλη βία στα μείζονα εγκλήματα βάσει της νομοθεσίας της Ένωσης και να εκπονήσει πρωτόκολλο στήριξης των θυμάτων, ιδιαίτερα σε περιόδους κρίσης.

Αγαπητοί συνάδελφοι, έχουμε ήδη καθυστερήσει. Η Επιτροπή παρουσίασε νέα πρόταση για νομοθεσία και πρέπει άμεσα να ολοκληρωθεί. Οφείλουμε να ανταποκριθούμε στο αίτημα όλων των Ευρωπαίων πολιτών. Πιστεύω ότι όλοι συμφωνούμε πως η έμφυλη βία δεν προσβάλλει μόνο τις αρχές και τις αξίες της Ευρωπαϊκής Ένωσης, αλλά αποτελεί κορυφαίο θέμα ανθρωπίνων δικαιωμάτων και πολιτισμού.

María Soraya Rodríguez Ramos, *en nombre del Grupo Renew*. – Señora presidenta, estamos aquí de nuevo, un 25 de noviembre más, para conmemorar el Día Internacional de la Eliminación de la Violencia contra la Mujer. Tenemos que señalar que, un año más, las víctimas han aumentado. Y aquellos que niegan la existencia de la violencia de género también aumentan.

Hoy es necesario decir que la violencia de género existe porque se funda en causas de discriminación estructurales contra las mujeres. Las víctimas tienen género. Las víctimas tienen nombre.

En mi país, desde el anterior debate en esta tribuna, precisamente sobre la violencia de género, hay cuatro víctimas más. Permítanme que las nombre: Irina, 38 años, asesinada junto a su hija Mariya, de 6 años; Leslie, 69 años, asesinada con más de veinte puñaladas; Imane, 30 años, asesinada delante de uno de sus hijos; Adoración, 27 años, degollada.

Permítanme que le diga al Consejo que ante este drama es una vergüenza que ustedes no hayan ratificado el Convenio de Estambul. Permítanme que les diga que necesitamos la modificación de los Tratados para introducir la violencia de género como un eurodelito.

A todas las mujeres este Parlamento hoy les tiene que hacer llegar un mensaje. Estamos con ellas. Podéis salir de la violencia.

Iratxe García Pérez, *en nombre del Grupo S&D*. – Señora presidenta, celebramos hoy el debate sobre las mujeres víctimas de violencia de género y me van a permitir en esta ocasión que haga una intervención quizá diferente a las que solemos hacer en este hemiciclo y que me permitan poner nombre a las cifras.

Teresa Rodríguez era una joven de 23 años, con muchos sueños, con ilusiones y con proyectos. Teresa vivía en mi ciudad, Valladolid. Y viajó a Bélgica. Viajó a Bruselas para trabajar como enfermera, con muchos proyectos, con muchas ilusiones, con muchos sueños. Proyectos, sueños e ilusiones que se han visto truncados cuando su expareja, un asesino machista, viajó a Bélgica y asesinó a Teresa. Esta es una realidad.

La violencia de género no tiene fronteras. Los machistas asesinos no encuentran ninguna barrera. Y hay mujeres en Europa y en el mundo que son asesinadas por el mero hecho de ser mujeres.

Teresa no es un número más. Teresa vio truncada su vida y ha dejado a unos padres, a un hermano, a una familia y a unos amigos devastados por esta tremenda realidad. Y esa familia quería que hoy, aquí, habláramos de Teresa Rodríguez, y por eso el compromiso de todas y todos los que estamos aquí tiene que ser acompañar y seguir la petición de la familia de Teresa, que nos dice: no dejéis de trabajar en esto. Hagamos y pongamos fin a la violencia de género, acabemos con el machismo que asesina y no permitamos que haya más Teresas en Europa.

Es indispensable tener una legislación europea que pueda determinar qué es víctima de violencia de género, porque Teresa es igual de víctima en España que en Bélgica o que en Polonia. Y necesitamos una legislación europea que pueda proteger a todas las mujeres, vivan donde vivan, estén donde estén: una directiva europea contra la violencia de género que pueda prevenir estas situaciones. Es necesario que podamos trabajar en el ámbito de la formación, de la educación, de la prevención…

No permitamos que se siga de brazos cruzados. No podemos resignarnos y pensar que esta es una realidad que no podemos cambiar, porque en nuestras manos está cambiarla. Tenemos una gran responsabilidad.

Y permítanme que termine diciendo que hoy tenemos una gran obligación moral de poner nombre a esos números; de entender que detrás de cada una de esas mujeres hay trágicas realidades, que no podemos permitir que esas vidas, que esos sueños, que esos proyectos se vean truncados.

Teresa merece que sigamos trabajando para que no haya más mujeres jóvenes como ella. Tenemos una gran responsabilidad. No nos resignemos. Trabajemos. Está en nuestras manos.

Terry Reintke, *on behalf of the Verts/ALE Group*. – Madam President, colleagues, in patriarchal societies, violence against women has always been widespread. It is not only based on the belief that women matter less, it is actually based on the assumption that women are not fully equal and self-determined human beings, that they somehow need to be disciplined to be controlled. We are battered. We are raped. We are abused. Our choices are being restricted because we do not matter enough. But also because patriarchy tells us that we had to, that we have to be kept in check. That includes also the denial of our right to choose over our own bodies.

Forcing a woman to go through with a pregnancy against her own will is a form of violence against women. That is true for the ten-year-old rape victim who had to travel from Ohio to Indiana to get an abortion. That is true for the 31-year-old Savita, who died in Ireland in 2012 after being denied abortion care when she was miscarrying. And that is also true for already six women who died in Poland after not receiving very much needed abortion care because of the inhumane *de facto* abortion ban.

Whenever a woman dies because she did not receive the abortion care she needed to be saved, society sends a message to all of us that even in moments of absolute vulnerability, they will not help us because our lives do not matter enough. They will actually let us die. They will let us die because a fundamentalist ideology matters more than our lives.

Honestly, I do not want to live in a society like this, and definitely I do not want to get pregnant in a society like this. So, colleagues, let us end all forms of violence against women. Let us end these inhumane abortion bans.

Stefania Zambelli, *a nome del gruppo ID*. – Signora Presidente, signora Commissaria, onorevoli colleghi, il tema sulla violenza contro le donne mi sta particolarmente a cuore.

In questi anni, in prima persona mi sono attivata in una serie di iniziative per cercare di aiutare le donne che denunciano il proprio carnefice, il proprio aggressore. Purtroppo i dati in Europa sulla violenza contro le donne sono a dir poco allarmanti. Si stima infatti che una donna su tre abbia subito violenza fisica o sessuale.

Anche in Italia i numeri ci dimostrano una situazione molto negativa. Pensate che nel 2021 le donne uccise sono state 116, una ogni tre giorni. Gli aggressori troppo spesso si nascondono dietro la perizia psichiatrica, molto spesso quando escono dal carcere per buona condotta, poi commettono lo stesso reato. C'è bisogno di pene esemplari.

L'Europa deve dare segnali precisi, ma soprattutto aiuti concreti a queste famiglie distrutte, famiglie che molto spesso si trovano con la mamma uccisa e il padre in carcere. Ai figli di queste famiglie dobbiamo garantire un futuro e non solo tante belle parole.

Margarita de la Pisa Carrión, *en nombre del Grupo ECR.* – Señora presidente, señora comisaria, Consejo, señorías, la violencia es un drama con el que todos querríamos acabar, por supuesto. Las leyes penales deben ser eficaces para perseguir el delito y proteger a la sociedad.

El pasado 7 de octubre entró en vigor en España la llamada ley de «solo sí es sí», que borra la distinción entre violación y abuso sexual, alterando el rango de las penas y disminuyendo la duración de las mismas. Esto responde a la mentalidad de ser muy duros con el hombre en general, pero muy blandos con los criminales más peligrosos para las mujeres.

No es la primera vez que sufrimos las injustas consecuencias de las leyes ideológicas. Si quieren protegernos, deberían procurar que los verdaderos agresores estén lejos de sus víctimas.

Pido a los grupos políticos que colaboran con la ideología de género que despierten y vean la perversidad del concepto «violencia de género» y sus consecuencias al contaminar las leyes. Nos enfrentan al hombre y a la mujer y no combaten la delincuencia. Vistos están los resultados. Cambiemos de estrategia.

Eugenia Rodríguez Palop, *en nombre del Grupo The Left.* – Señora presidenta, señora comisaria, hace cuarenta años, el movimiento feminista latinoamericano eligió el 25 de noviembre para recordar el asesinato de las hermanas Mirabal. Y, desde entonces, cada año recordamos las múltiples violencias que sufren las mujeres en todo el mundo.

En Polonia, Justyna, víctima de violencia institucional, condenada por auxiliar a quienes necesitaban interrumpir su embarazo de forma segura. En El Salvador, Lesly Ramírez, condenada a cincuenta años de cárcel por un aborto espontáneo. En España, María Sevilla, víctima de violencia vicaria, una de las madres protectoras condenada por denunciar la violencia sexual que sufren o sufrían sus hijos e hijas, o Beatriz Zimmermann, madre de Olivia y Anna, asesinadas por su padre y arrojadas al mar. En la República Checa, Elena Gorolavá, una de las mujeres gitanas que en distintos países de Europa han sufrido esterilizaciones forzadas. En México, Debanhi Escobar, feminicidio, desaparecida durante meses, a la que se encontró finalmente asesinada en una cisterna. En Afganistán, Helena Hofiany, jueza, hoy refugiada, que arriesgó su vida combatiendo el fundamentalismo misógino. En Irán, Mahsa Amini, torturada hasta la muerte por no llevar el velo adecuadamente.

Por todas ellas, por todas las mujeres y las niñas torturadas, violadas, masacradas, asesinadas en cualquier rincón del mundo, siempre en pie, siempre en lucha.

Laura Ferrara (NI). – Signora Presidente, signora Commissaria, onorevoli colleghi, il 25 novembre ci ricorda come le forme di violenza visibile e invisibile contro le donne rimangano tra le più diffuse violazioni dei diritti umani nel mondo.

Le storie drammatiche riportate dalla cronaca quotidiana risvegliano le nostre coscienze sui comportamenti violenti e discriminatori che hanno conseguenze fisiche, psicologiche ed economiche, pregiudicando la piena ed equa partecipazione nella società.

L'Unione europea deve perseguire ogni azione legislativa, sociale e culturale per consentire alle donne di difendersi, di superare la paura di denunciare, di essere giudicate e soprattutto di rimanere sole. È intollerabile che alcuni Stati membri si rifiutino ancora oggi di ratificare e attuare la Convenzione di Istanbul.

Rafforzare la protezione e l'assistenza delle vittime perseguendo i colpevoli è solo un aspetto della battaglia da combattere. Dobbiamo fermare la violenza prima che si verifichi, con politiche di prevenzione in grado di affrontare le cause strutturali del fenomeno e promuovere un'effettiva uguaglianza di genere.

PRZEWODNICTWO: EWA KOPACZ

Wiceprzewodnicząca

Frances Fitzgerald (PPE). – Madam President, this is such an upsetting and disturbing debate when the President of this Parliament has to come in and say, 'stop killing women'. And yet this is the reality, as we've heard from the personal stories here. Why do we allow it to continue? Because we are in the midst of a shadow pandemic where domestic violence, sexual assault and FGM are commonplace in all our societies across Europe.

We absolutely have to have a unified and comprehensive response, just like we did with the COVID crisis. Some 850 000 women's lives are lost every 10 years. Cities the size of Marseille, Amsterdam or Zagreb disappear from this Earth. Just imagine that. Just think about those cities disappearing. That's the number of women that are murdered every 10 years, that die. The Council has to think about this, they have to take action. If the Member States had ratified the Istanbul Convention 10 years ago, think about how many lives could have been saved.

Some of you will remember Ashling Murphy, a young Irish woman who was out jogging. She was brutally murdered in broad daylight in January of this year. She represents the thousands of victims we're speaking about here this morning.

As co-rapporteur on the directive on violence against women, I am working to ensure women with you across the Union are fully protected, working with my colleague Evin Incir. This will protect many, many women. We have to do this. We need male champions. We desperately need male champions to eliminate violence against women, to work with us, as this is a human rights issue.

As International Day for the Elimination of Violence against Women is marked this week, I am calling on all political leaders, all in society, to fight for protection for women like Ashley and the millions of victims of violence against women that she represents.

Evin Incir (S&D). – Madam President, all across Europe and beyond women and girls are victims of gender-based violence. Still, in the year 2022, it seems to be a crime to be born female, because otherwise why would our freedom be violated and why would we need to pay the ultimate price, with our lives?

Frankly, I am tired of us women and girls needing, year after year, to demand an end to the deadly violence. In the home, even in politics, at schools, in the streets and squares, in war but also in peace, women and girls are subjected to violence – sexual, physical, psychological, financial and digital.

In our modern Europe, a feminist Europe should not be a dream. It should be a reality. However, the patriarchy should be confined to the dustbin of history. As a co-rapporteur for the directive on combating violence against women and domestic violence, together with my colleague Frances Fitzgerald we are doing our best in order to strengthen the directive presented by the Commission, which we welcome very much.

The ongoing pandemic which is gender-based violence has been going on for years and years, for decades and decades. Colleagues, I must say that I am ashamed that we even have six EU Member States refusing to ratify the Istanbul Convention until now – namely Bulgaria, Hungary, Latvia, Lithuania, Slovakia and, unfortunately, even the Presidency itself, the Czech Republic.

I'm not standing here to beg anyone to understand. I'm standing here to demand that everyone acts. Human rights are not only for men and boys to enjoy, human rights are also for women and girls. It is our duty to women and girls to end this heinous violence!

Sylvie Brunet (Renew). – Madame la Présidente, Madame la Commissaire, Monsieur le Ministre, mes chers collègues, je voulais vraiment saluer une nouvelle fois le travail accompli, Madame la Commissaire, sur cette proposition de directive extrêmement importante pour nous toutes et nous tous.

En France, depuis le début de l'année, 118 femmes sont décédées sous les coups de leur conjoint ou de leur compagnon. C'est une situation absolument atroce. Je voulais vous dire aussi que je vais particulièrement insister sur le sujet des violences faites aux femmes sur les lieux de travail, puisque nous allons travailler à ce sujet en commission de l'emploi et des affaires sociales. Cela me semble un point majeur, car comment les femmes peuvent-elles briser le plafond de verre si elles ne sont pas en sécurité sur leur lieu de travail, où elles passent des heures?

Enfin, je voulais vous dire que j'ai eu la chance la semaine dernière de rencontrer la directrice des programmes aux Nations unies, à l'ONU Femmes, sur l'égalité des genres et que le monde attend beaucoup de nous, de l'Europe, de nos propositions en matière de lutte contre les violences faites aux femmes. Et, Monsieur le Ministre, on attend aussi beaucoup de votre présidence pour faire avancer le sujet.

Diana Riba i Giner (Verts/ALE). – Señora presidenta, piensen en tres mujeres de entre sus madres, tías, hijas o compañeras de trabajo. Una de ellas ha sido o será agredida física o sexualmente. La imagen es escalofriante.

Apenas hace un año en esta Cámara, una mayoría votaba a favor de incorporar las violencias de género en la lista de eurodelitos. Aun así, seguimos esperando.

La intención de avanzar es clara por parte del Parlamento. Pero necesitamos, o más bien exigimos, que la Comisión y el Consejo hagan su parte. Sin una estrategia compartida entre las distintas instituciones, no conseguiremos avanzar con la urgencia que la situación requiere.

Ponemos en valor la propuesta de Directiva de la Comisión, pero debemos ser más ambiciosos. Porque, si queremos combatir todas las violencias —la física, la sexual, la económica, la emocional, la obstétrica, la psicológica…—, tenemos que ir un poco más allá.

El reto es mayúsculo y el tiempo es escaso porque lo que está en juego son nuestras vidas. No tenemos alternativa, hay que avanzar a pasos de gigante.

Guido Reil (ID). – Frau Präsidentin, liebe Kolleginnen und Kollegen! Wir reden heute über den Internationalen Tag zur Bekämpfung der Gewalt gegen Frauen. Und wie immer – es ist alles viel schlimmer geworden. Und wie immer wollen wir nicht über die echten Ursachen dieser Probleme reden.

Zur Situation in Deutschland: Die häusliche Gewalt hat 2013 um 50 % zugenommen. Die Frauenhäuser sind völlig überfüllt, und 70 % der Frauen in den Frauenhäusern sind keine Deutschen. Sie kommen aus Syrien, der Türkei, Afghanistan und dem Irak.

Genitalverstümmelung – ein besonders widerwärtiges Verbrechen. Auch hier gab es eine Steigerung seit 2017 von 40 %. Die Opfer kommen aus Eritrea, Somalia und dem Irak.

Gruppenvergewaltigung – eigentlich ein Phänomen, das wir vor 2015 überhaupt nicht kannten. Alleine 2020 gab es 704 Fälle von Gruppenvergewaltigung, und die Täter kommen aus Afghanistan, Syrien und dem Irak.

Das sind nur Beispiele. Ich könnte noch die Zahlen nennen für die Tötungsdelikte, für Zwangsehen, für Zwangsprostitution – immer die gleichen Täter. Und jetzt sagt dazu die ehemalige SPD-Familienministerin Giffey: Wir wissen, dass wir durch Zuwanderung mit einem Frauenbild konfrontiert werden, das nichts mit gleichwertiger Behandlung und gewaltfreien Beziehungen zu tun hat. Das sagt die SPD-Familienministerin.

Und wenn wir das denn alles wissen, warum handeln wir nicht? Wenn wir Frauen schützen wollen, müssen wir endlich konsequent abschieben, und wir müssen die illegale Masseneinwanderung von jungen Männern aus der frauenfeindlichsten Kultur dieser Erde endlich beenden.

(Der Redner ist damit einverstanden, eine Wortmeldung nach dem Verfahren der „blauen Karte" zu beantworten.)

Karen Melchior (Renew), *blue-card speech*. – Thank you very much for your intervention.

I think it's important that we look at the facts, and the European Agency for Fundamental Rights had a 2012 survey that showed that 33% of all women have experienced violence against them based on their gender. Do you claim that this is only from refugees, or should we look at where the violence against women comes from – that it is an integral part, unfortunately, of all parts of our society?

Guido Reil (ID), *Antwort auf eine Wortmeldung nach dem Verfahren der „blauen Karte"*. – Es ist ganz überwiegender Bestandteil der Kulturen aus den Ländern der Menschen, die hier zu uns gekommen sind. Und das ist der Irak, Nigeria, Afghanistan, das ist Eritrea, Somalia; und immer wieder Syrien – immer wieder die Länder, aus denen die Menschen herkommen, die bei uns Schutz suchen.

Diese Menschen fallen immer wieder auf mit unglaublich abscheulichen Gräueltaten gegenüber Frauen. Und damit muss endlich Schluss sein. Und das sind Zahlen des Statistischen Kriminalamts.

Jadwiga Wiśniewska (ECR). – Pani Przewodnicząca! Szanowni Państwo! Każda forma przemocy jest przestępstwem. Czy to jest przemoc fizyczna, czy to jest przemoc psychiczna, czy to jest wykorzystywanie seksualnie, czy to jest przemoc ekonomiczna, czy też ta przemoc, której doświadczamy najczęściej, cyberprzemoc.

Przymusowe małżeństwa małych dziewczynek w Unii Europejskiej są ciągle normą. Czy od ostatniej debaty w ubiegłym roku, Pani Komisarz, coś w tej kwestii zostało zrobione? Okazuje się, że nie. Dochodzi do takich sytuacji. Nie chronimy nawet małych dziewczynek. Czy zrobiliśmy znaczący progres, jeśli chodzi o zakaz przymusowego okaleczania narządów płciowych kobiet? Również nie. Oprócz wzniosłych haseł i głośnych deklaracji dzieje się niewiele.

A tymczasem chciałabym Państwu powiedzieć, że ta dyskusja powinna być formą wymiany dobrych praktyk. Otóż chcę Państwu powiedzieć, że w Polsce, którą się tak Państwo interesujecie, jest obowiązek natychmiastowego odseparowania ofiary od sprawcy przemocy. Myślę, że to polskie rozwiązanie, powinno być stosowane w każdym państwie członkowskim.

Malin Björk (The Left). – Madam President, there are many forms of violence against women and girls, and there is too little being done to stop it. One cruel form of violence is to deny a woman the right to decide freely over our bodies and our sexuality. Forced pregnancies and a lack of access to abortion care are still a reality in Europe in 2022.

We have countries here like Poland, where we have an abortion ban and where women can die even when they are in hospital, like Izabela Sajbor. And we have Malta, which also has a total abortion ban. And in both countries, of course, those who help women to get access, to get the right to decide over their bodies, those people that help, they are persecuted and criminalised. Shame on you! Shame on you, patriarchal, inhuman politicians that persecute those who help.

It is time to step up our action. It is time to end forced pregnancies. Every woman in Europe and beyond, of course, must have the right to decide over her body, over her sexuality. It is time for every woman to have the right to free and legal abortion care.

Maria Angela Danzì (NI). – Signora Presidente, signora Commissaria, signor Ministro, onorevoli colleghi, in Europa ogni sei ore una donna viene uccisa e questo avviene spesso per mano del suo partner.

Questo fenomeno, che non si arresta, è stato affrontato con misure giudiziarie repressive non sufficienti. Secondo l'OMS molti autori di questi delitti sono persone malate, affette dal disturbo narcisistico della personalità e spesso a loro volta vittime di abusi nella loro infanzia. La Commissione affronti un piano che contenga obiettivi di riduzione della violenza di genere. Serve una ricerca su questa patologia e cure appropriate per un problema che è anche sanitario.

Le vittime vanno aiutate con misure di sicurezza, di supporto psicoterapeutico e devono essere messe nella condizione di andare via di casa senza perdere la custodia dei loro figli. Devono poter riconoscere la patologia del partner, la tossicità di quella relazione e i segnali dell'escalation violenta.

Aiutiamo le donne a combattere i meccanismi di manipolazione e ad essere consapevoli che le cause delle violenze risiedono nella personalità del partner e non in loro stesse.

Angelika Winzig (PPE). – Sehr geehrte Frau Präsidentin, Frau Kommissarin, geschätzte Kolleginnen und Kollegen! Es ist wirklich traurig, dass wir im 21. Jahrhundert noch das Thema Gewalt gegen Frauen diskutieren müssen.

Gewalt an Frauen ist in erster Linie eine schreckliche Schwäche, die eine nicht unbeträchtliche Gruppe von Männern aufweist. Daran gibt es nichts zu beschönigen. Das ist mit Sicherheit kein Kavaliersdelikt, das ist einfach nur kriminell. Das gehört bestraft, psychologisch aufgearbeitet. Aber auch die Gefährder müssen eigenverantwortlich gegen ihr Versagen ankämpfen.

Jetzt gilt es, die Gesetzeslücken beim Rechtsschutz zu schließen. Aber es müssen auch noch einige Länder die Istanbul-Konvention unterzeichnen.

Ich wünsche mir auch auf europäischer Ebene eine Kampagne, um das Bewusstsein in der Bevölkerung zu stärken und um die Zivilcourage zu erhöhen. Nur schwache Männer schlagen Frauen; starke stehen gleichberechtigt an ihrer Seite.

Pina Picierno (S&D). – Signora Presidente, signora Commissaria, onorevoli colleghe e colleghi, è stato appena ricordato: ogni 6 ore in Europa una donna è vittima di violenza.

Una donna ogni 6 ore. Questi numeri, queste storie parlano di ognuna di noi perché ognuna di noi, direttamente o indirettamente, ha avuto esperienza di questa violenza. Ma quello che dobbiamo ricordare qui è che non si tratta di una tragedia naturale, non si tratta di un'alluvione, di un terremoto, di qualcosa che avviene indipendentemente dalle nostre volontà: le donne muoiono ammazzate e muoiono ammazzate perché ci sono dei criminali che le uccidono.

Però questo crimine dobbiamo ricordarlo, anche qua, ancora una volta, ha qualcosa di particolare: le vittime sono tutte donne e gli assassini sono tutti uomini. E allora questi uomini violenti vanno fermati, certo, anche con l'aiuto, e da quest'Aula chiediamo ancora una volta aiuto agli uomini che violenti non sono. Va fermata la radice di questa violenza che l'alimenta e che ha un nome preciso: si chiama patriarcato.

E allora le ferite, le lacrime delle nostre sorelle che abbiamo portato qui, in quest'Aula, attraverso i nostri interventi, attraverso il nostro lavoro quotidiano, devono essere un monito, devono essere un monito a non abbassare la guardia. Noi continueremo a farlo tutte insieme, tutti insieme, perché non ci sarà un'Europa giusta ed equa finché la violenza non sarà eradicata.

Samira Rafaela (Renew). – Voorzitter, het is onbeschrijflijk dat wereldwijd één op de drie vrouwen te maken heeft met fysiek, psychisch of seksueel geweld. In Nederland, in mijn eigen lidstaat, sterven er elke dag acht vrouwen door geweld. Dat zijn niet alleen statistieken, dat zijn mensenlevens. Denk aan de 16-jarige Humeyra die is doodgeschoten op school. 28 keer belde zij samen met haar zussen de politie in de laatste zeven maanden van haar leven. Clarinda, een 34-jarige vrouw die in Den Bosch doodgestoken is door haar ex-partner. Een 45-jarige vrouw, Debora uit Mijdrecht, die meermalig aangifte heeft gedaan tegen haar ex en uiteindelijk is vermoord door hem thuis.

We hebben het hier over een epidemie van femicide, en vrouwen die aan de bel trekken worden niet geholpen of in ieder geval niet tijdig. Het is klaar met die onzichtbare strijd. Het is echt onacceptabel. Er moet nu een voorstel komen waardoor vrouwen daadwerkelijk worden beschermd. Het kan niet meer zo zijn dat ze geen melding durven te doen of dat als ze een melding doen, dat er dan niet direct wordt opgetreden. Zoiets kan gewoon nooit meer gebeuren als ik het heb over de voorbeelden die ik net genoemd heb. Ik hoop dat we ons hier samen bewust van zijn dat vrouwen dit elke dag en elke seconde nog meemaken. Het is nu de tijd om in te grijpen.

Sandra Pereira (The Left). – Senhora Presidente, é imperativo combater todas as formas de violência contra as mulheres. Não pode haver mais desculpas. Diariamente, e em todo o mundo, milhões de mulheres e raparigas são sujeitas a alguma forma de ofensas e violência física, psicológica, moral ou sexual, em casa, no trabalho, em público.

O tráfico de seres humanos e a prostituição continuam a atingir níveis alarmantes nesta União Europeia. Exigem-se outras políticas económico-sociais, serviços públicos de qualidade e medidas eficazes que resolvam os problemas da pobreza e da exclusão social.

O combate às violências contra as mulheres exige a aposta em medidas de efetiva autonomia e emancipação das mulheres e é, por isso, inseparável da melhoria das condições de trabalho e de vida.

Reafirmamos o nosso compromisso de não ceder um milímetro no combate em defesa dos direitos das mulheres, na luta pela igualdade entre mulheres e homens, no mundo do trabalho, na sociedade, no combate diário contra todas as formas de violência e discriminação contra as mulheres.

Não pode haver mais desculpas.

Rosa Estaràs Ferragut (PPE). – Señora presidenta, la violación contra la mujer es una violación atroz de los derechos humanos. El 25 de noviembre tendrá lugar el Día Internacional de la Eliminación de la Violencia contra la Mujer.

El Gobierno de España aprobó una ley, la ley del «solo sí es sí», que entró en vigor el 7 de octubre. Las consecuencias son las siguientes: Madrid, hombre condenado por obligar a una mujer con 65 % de discapacidad a realizar sexo oral, en libertad; hombre condenado por abuso sexual hacia su sobrina de cuatro años, en libertad; profesor condenado por abusos sexuales a cuatro alumnos, en libertad.

Baleares, dos hombres condenados por agresión sexual, en libertad. La víctima está humillada, está hundida, ha explicado que ha revivido con esa libertad todo el proceso.

Galicia, hombre condenado por agresión sexual con acceso carnal, en libertad; hombre condenado por penetrar a su hijastra de trece años, rebaja de condena; hombre condenado por violar a una amiga en su casa, rebaja de condena.

La Audiencia de Barcelona acaba de dictar, en relación con una violación, una sentencia en la que reconoce que tiene que rebajar la pena para ajustarse a la nueva ley.

Esa norma desprotege a los más vulnerables: a las mujeres, a las niñas y a los niños, a la infancia. Se está cometiendo un daño irreparable. Fueron avisados, advertidos por los jueces de España, advertidos por innumerables dictámenes. No escucharon. La respuesta ha sido atacar a los jueces: no es el camino. La Asociación Europea de Jueces también ha criticado este tema.

Hace dos años tuvimos aquí el debate de La Manada. Ese sí que se podía tener y era un debate español. Este no se ha querido tener. Hoy las mujeres españolas están en una situación muy complicada. Dijeron ustedes que no estamos solas. Demostrémoslo. Por favor, solicito a la Comisión, solicito al Consejo y a las mujeres y hombres de este Parlamento que hagan un llamamiento al Gobierno de España para cambiar esa ley.

Łukasz Kohut (S&D). – Pani Przewodnicząca! Pani Komisarz! Kilka dni temu polska posłanka Katarzyna Kotula dała świadectwo. Powiedziała swoją historię, historię o drapieżcy, który miał ją krzywdzić. Polityczka dała odwagę innym ofiarom. My, jako mężczyźni w polityce, musimy także mieć odwagę – odwagę występowania przeciwko tym, którzy kobietami poniewierają, przeciwko tym, którzy je szkalują. Ale także musimy mieć odwagę do stanowienia prawa, prawa antyprzemocowego i prawa wspierającego ofiary. Taka jest nasza rola.

Jednym z instrumentów chroniących kobiety jest konwencja stambulska. Przygotowałem na ten temat sprawozdanie wraz z europosłanką Arbą Kokalari. Walczyłem, by w projekcie znalazło się wezwanie do zapewnienia wsparcia finansowego wszelkim organizacjom, które zajmują się przeciwdziałaniem przemocy ze względu na płeć. Bo wiemy, jakie pisowcy mają priorytety. Wiemy, że wydają z naszych podatków na inwigilację opozycji, na podsłuchiwanie Krzysztofa Brejzy zamiast na wsparcie ofiar przemocy domowej. Dosyć tego! Odwagi, Europo!

Karen Melchior (Renew). – Madam President, Commissioner, we need a policy based on facts. We need a policy based on science and we need a policy of prevention. The European Council of Fundamental Rights had a survey in 2012 that showed that 33% of European women have experienced violence – 52% of Danish women. Now we are filling the gaps of knowledge, but only with a survey in eight countries. We need more facts on violence against women. We also need prevention.

There are seven steps, which can warn us before the murder of women, before the final step of a murder of a woman. We also need to recognise the problem. The Danish general public, in 2014, refused the facts because they didn't believe that we had such violence against women in Denmark. And we need concrete action from Member States, from our authorities, to protect women so that we can prevent murders.

Finally, we need to talk about the violence that we experience. Warriors in the fight against violence against women walk between us. I am one of these warriors. In 2009, I managed to leave an abusive relationship. We must stop romanticising psychological violence. We must stop the killing of women.

Luisa Regimenti (PPE). – Signora Presidente, signora Commissaria, onorevoli colleghi, circa una donna su tre in Europa è vittima di violenza fisica o psicologica, è quindi evidente che le leggi che abbiamo non bastano.

Prevenire la violenza e proteggere le vittime è quanto abbiamo chiesto a gran voce in questo Parlamento con la relazione sull'impatto della violenza domestica, di cui sono stata correlatrice, e la relazione per inserire la violenza di genere tra gli eurocrimini. Oggi possiamo finalmente lavorare alla prima direttiva europea in tema di violenza sulle donne e non possiamo perdere questa occasione.

La violenza di genere non potrà mai essere sconfitta se non si mette la donna in condizione di denunciare e ciò significa mettere al sicuro se stessa e i propri figli e avere tutela legale e avere indipendenza economica. Non potremo prevenire la violenza se le sentenze non saranno effettive e rapide, le pene certe e i tribunali preparati ad affrontare questo fenomeno con personale specializzato e interscambio tra il giudice penale e il giudice civile e finché in tutte le scuole non si lavorerà alla cultura del rispetto, a partire dalle prime classi.

Le donne non potranno mai sentirsi al sicuro se i punti di prima accoglienza, le forze dell'ordine e il personale di pronto soccorso non saranno pronti a proteggerle. Questa lotta non deve avere sosta, ma deve vederci tutti uniti verso l'unico obiettivo.

Robert Biedroń (S&D). – Pani Przewodnicząca! Ofiary przemocy, kobiety, mają swoje imiona i nazwiska. Dzisiaj kilka z tych imion usłyszeliśmy po raz kolejny z tej mównicy. Ja powiem o kolejnej, o Izabeli z Pszczyny, 30-letniej Polce, która straciła życie tylko dlatego, że grupa barbarzyńskich polityków w Polsce doprowadziła do tego, że Izabela nie mogła dokonać bezpiecznej, legalnej aborcji.

Takich kobiet jak Izabela z Polski czy Teresa z Hiszpanii, o której dzisiaj tutaj słyszeliśmy, są w Europie setki tysięcy, jeśli nie miliony. Każdego dnia słyszymy o nich w mediach. I co my, jako Unia Europejska, zrobiliśmy? Niewiele. Nadal w przypadku praw kobiet nie mamy jednego standardu. Polki dzisiaj mają mniej praw, niż kiedy Polska wstępowała do Unii Europejskiej.

Standaryzujemy wszystko, co się da. Standaryzujemy banany, marchewki. Ba! Będziemy mieli jeden standard, jeśli chodzi o ładowarkę. A jeśli chodzi o ochronę kobiet przed przemocą, nadal nie mamy jednego standardu. Taka jest rzeczywistość. I to jest wstyd.

Dlatego z tego miejsca, Panie Ministrze, Pani Komisarz, dzisiaj musi paść jedna podstawowa deklaracja: nigdy, przenigdy nie będziecie szły same. Unia Europejska zawsze będzie po Waszej stronie. I tę deklarację kobiety muszą z tego miejsca dzisiaj usłyszeć.

Izaskun Bilbao Barandica (Renew). – Señora presidenta, señora comisaria, artículo 36 del Convenio de Estambul: «Las Partes adoptarán las medidas legislativas o de otro tipo necesarias para tipificar como delito, cuando se cometa intencionadamente: a) la penetración vaginal, anal u oral no consentida, con carácter sexual del cuerpo de otra persona, con cualquier parte del cuerpo o con un objeto; b) los demás actos de carácter sexual no consentidos sobre otra persona; c) el hecho de obligar a otra persona a prestarse a actos de carácter sexual no consentido con un tercero. El consentimiento debe prestarse voluntariamente como manifestación del libre arbitrio de la persona considerado en el contexto de las condiciones circundantes». Solo sí es sí.

Pongamos la máxima diligencia para conseguir que estos principios se recojan en los códigos penales de todos los Estados miembros. Porque en algunos se llegó a escribir en una sentencia que se observaba jolgorio y regocijo en la víctima de una violación grupal, un contexto, como cualquiera puede imaginar, idóneo para la expresión del libre arbitrio.

Y asumamos que, por mucho que se legisle, mientras estereotipos y prejuicios campen a sus anchas en las conciencias de muchos, estos seguirán creyendo que, a su sí, no hay un no.

Desarmar estos esquemas mentales es la primera prioridad para acabar con la violencia contra las mujeres.

Theresa Muigg (S&D). – Sehr geehrte Frau Präsidentin, sehr geehrte Frau Kommissarin! Jede dritte Frau in der Europäischen Union erfährt in ihrem Leben Gewalt. Ich bin eine davon, eine von 62 Millionen Frauen in der Europäischen Union – und da haben wir noch nicht auf den Rest der Welt geschaut. Der Unterschied ist, dass 62 - Millionen Frauen heute nicht die Möglichkeit haben, hier vor diesem Parlament zu sprechen und für Maßnahmen gegen Gewalt an Frauen hier an dieser Stelle zu kämpfen. Deshalb seien wir uns dieser Verantwortung heute hier bewusst.

Gewalt gegen Frauen ist ein strukturelles Problem; es ist ein Problem des Patriarchats; es sind keine Einzelfälle, es sind keine unglücklichen Umstände, es sind keine Eifersuchts- oder Beziehungstaten. Wissen Sie, wie vielen Frauen nach Erlebnissen von Gewalt nicht geglaubt wird? Wie oft es an Ernsthaftigkeit, Empathie oder am rechtlichen Rahmen fehlt? Ich bin es leid, dass wir uns bemühen, gegen Gewalt an Frauen zu kämpfen. Ich bin es leid, dass wir mit Lippenbekenntnissen abgespeist werden.

Gegen Gewalt an Frauen zu kämpfen bedeutet, rechtliche Grundlagen zu schaffen, die keine Diskussion zulassen; bedeutet, das Problem in seiner gesamtgesellschaftlichen Dimension anzuerkennen; bedeutet, gegen das Patriarchat aufzustehen und für ein feministisches Europa – jeden einzelnen Tag und in jeder einzelnen Situation.

Nathalie Colin-Oesterlé (PPE). – Madame la Présidente, Madame la Commissaire, Monsieur le Ministre, en Europe, sept femmes meurent chaque jour sous les coups de leur partenaire ou de leur ex-partenaire. C'est un véritable fléau. Pour l'éradiquer, nous devons nous inspirer du modèle espagnol de lutte contre les violences faites aux femmes.

La future directive européenne sur laquelle nous travaillons doit être exclusivement centrée sur la protection des femmes et des enfants victimes. Ne nous éparpillons pas. Évitons les positions idéologiques et travaillons ensemble sur quatre axes essentiels: la prévention, avec des campagnes de sensibilisation à grande échelle, particulièrement à l'égard des plus jeunes; l'accompagnement, avec la création partout en Europe d'un numéro d'appel unique et de guichets uniques pour une prise en charge globale des victimes avec du personnel formé, des policiers, des magistrats spécialisés; la protection des femmes et des enfants victimes, avec partout en Europe la délivrance rapide d'ordonnances de protection, de téléphones «grave danger» et de bracelets anti-rapprochement; enfin, des sanctions harmonisées. Ce qui est considéré comme un viol ou un mariage forcé dans un État membre doit également l'être dans l'État voisin et sanctionné sur des bases communes.

Mobilisons-nous, car il y a urgence.

Carina Ohlsson (S&D). – Fru talman! Mäns våld mot kvinnor är den yttersta konsekvensen av ett ojämställt samhälle. Det drabbar flickor, kvinnor och barn varje dag, överallt i hela världen. Kvinnor mördas för att de är kvinnor. Dödsorsak: kvinna. Alltför många barn växer upp med våldet som sin vardag. Jag har mött många av dessa barn som aktiv i en kvinnojour. Våld, det går att förebygga, men det krävs politisk vilja.

Det är bra att EU-kommissionen nu presenterar förslag till direktiv om att bekämpa mäns våld mot kvinnor. Nu måste vi se till att få direktivet på plats och kräva att det efterlevs. Vi har också Istanbulkonventionen som alla länder borde ratificera. Vi socialdemokrater kommer inte att ge oss förrän mäns våld mot kvinnor har upphört. Tillsammans måste vi ta kampen för att kvinnor och män ska ha samma makt att forma samhället och sina egna liv.

Magdalena Adamowicz (PPE). – Pani Przewodnicząca! Pani Komisarz! Przemoc, której doświadczają kobiety, jest naruszeniem podstawowych praw i wolności człowieka. Światowa Organizacja Zdrowia alarmuje, że 30% kobiet na świecie doświadcza przemocy fizycznej i seksualnej. To nie są pojedyncze przypadki. To jest pandemia przemocy. Jeden, dwa, trzy, jeden, dwa, trzy… To co trzecia z nas, tylko dlatego, że jest kobietą. Tego nie mówię ja, to mówi WHO. Pamiętajmy o grupach kobiet szczególnie narażonych i wrażliwych: kobiet z niepełnosprawnościami, które są bardziej narażone niż kobiety pełnosprawne, kobiet uchodźczyń z Ukrainy, kobiet na granicy polsko-białoruskiej i kobiet z innych krajów, kobiet młodych, dziewczynek. Z przemocą wobec kobiet nie radzimy sobie ani systemowo, ani mentalnie. Konsekwencje przemocy wykraczają poza ból i cierpienie. Mają często wymiar ekonomiczny. Prowadzą do utraty dochodu. Dobrze, że głośno mówimy o przemocy wobec kobiet. Dobrze, że coraz wyraźniej na nią reagujemy. Dzielmy się swoimi doświadczeniami, by skończyć z wyciszeniem i bezkarnością wobec przemocy. Nie zwlekajmy, by na reakcję nie było za późno. Stwórzmy ramy prawne, które ochronią nas, kobiety, dziewczynki.

Camilla Laureti (S&D). – Signora Presidente, signora Commissaria, signor Ministro, onorevoli colleghi, per me è un onore prendere per la prima volta in quest'Aula oggi la parola a pochi giorni dal 25 novembre, la giornata internazionale contro la violenza sulle donne.

La violenza nei confronti delle donne, alla cui base sono radicati sessismo e discriminazione, è legata a doppio filo a un'insostenibile divario in termini sociali, lavorativi, salariali e culturali e, cari colleghi, è una tra le più gravi violazioni dei diritti umani.

Dalle proteste delle donne iraniane e afghane e di tutte quelle donne che si ribellano a regimi illiberali e situazioni di conflitto per i loro diritti ci arriva una lezione di coraggio. Ora sta a noi, dobbiamo lavorare da qui, dall'Europa, dalla casa della democrazia, per eliminare barriere e ostacoli e vincere la sfida della parità di genere, fondamentale per contrastare la violenza sulle donne.

Ogni giorno, ogni minuto, ogni secondo in cui noi rimanderemo il nostro impegno contro la violenza sarà comunque troppo lungo perché potrà incidere negativamente su migliaia di donne nel mondo e spesso, purtroppo, costare loro la stessa vita. Non dimentichiamolo.

Arba Kokalari (PPE). – Madam President, one of the greatest rights of freedom is to live a life free from violence. But still every third woman is affected by it. In a world like this, the EU must lead the way to stop violence against women, to stop the oppression.

For far too long, violence against women has been neglected in the Member States. This has to change now. I believe that we now have the great opportunity to make a real impact for freedom of women in Europe by criminalising violence against women. As the rapporteur for the Istanbul Convention, I know that we have the right toolbox to implement the Istanbul Convention. Together with a new law on gender-based violence, we will be able to deliver. This is the international gold standard to protect women from violence.

So what are we waiting for? The Parliament is ready. Where is the Council? It's time to deliver for women, for freedom, for the whole security and freedom of Europe.

Zgłoszenia z sali

Isabella Adinolfi (PPE). – Signora Presidente, onorevoli colleghi, i casi di violenza sulle donne non accennano a diminuire.

Nella mia città negli ultimi giorni una donna è stata uccisa a coltellate dal marito e un'altra è stata ferita gravemente perché sempre il marito le ha dato fuoco. Queste notizie sono all'ordine del giorno in tutti i paesi dell'Unione europea, questo perché l'odio e la violenza non conoscono confini, non hanno differenza di età, non hanno differenza di estrazione sociale, hanno solo delle vittime.

Ora, per la prima volta nella storia della Repubblica italiana, abbiamo un presidente del Consiglio donna. E che cosa è successo? Che dopo pochi giorni che era stata nominata è dovuta volare al G20 ed è stata molto attaccata. Perché è stata attaccata? Per le sue idee politiche? Per le parole che ha detto? No, semplicemente perché aveva portato con sé la figlia di sei anni. Un gesto banale, ma che evidentemente nel mio paese è ancora rivoluzionario. Quello che mi dispiace è che mi sarei aspettata dalle altre colleghe degli altri partiti dei cenni di solidarietà, dei messaggi di solidarietà, e invece questo non è accaduto.

Ora, Presidente, io voglio soltanto dire che noi dobbiamo essere unite. Se non cominciamo noi a essere unite, niente cambierà.

Milan Brglez (S&D). – Gospa predsednica. Ta teden je Evropski parlament storil tudi en dober korak pri enakosti spolov in pravicah žensk. Zato moram čestitati kolegicama Evelyn, Lari in drugim pri sprejemu direktive o uravnotežene zastopanosti spolov med neizvršnimi direktorji družb, ki kotirajo na borzi.

Toda to nikakor ne pomeni, da smo naredili vse, kar je treba. In ravno tema ničelne tolerance pri nasilju nad ženskami, otroci je nekaj, kjer bi se morali oglasiti vsi. Oglasiti se moramo vsi poslanci in poslanke, tako pri tem, da bomo ratificirali Istanbulsko konvencijo tudi na ravni Evropske unije. Pri tem, da bomo podprli Komisijo pri tem, da bo tudi evropsko zakonodajo uskladila s to Istanbulsko konvencijo. Zlasti pa se moramo oglasiti zato, da bodo žrtve vedele, da niso same. In da jim lahko pomagamo. Mi smo zato tukaj, da naredimo vse, kar je v naši moči. Hvala.

Sylwia Spurek (Verts/ALE). – Pani Przewodnicząca! Chcę zwrócić się do przewodniczącej Komisji. Od objęcia przez Panią stanowiska polska policja zarejestrowała zgłoszenia 185 318 kobiet, które padły ofiarą przemocy w rodzinie. Ale kobiety bardzo często nie zgłaszają przemocy, bo nie ufają instytucjom państwowym. Według szacunków organizacji pozarządowych podczas Pani kadencji przemoc w rodzinie dotknęła ponad dwa miliony Polek.

Co Pani zrobiła jako przewodnicząca Komisji, żeby temu zapobiec? Od razu powiem: nie wystarczy dyrektywa antyprzemocowa. Potrzebujemy całościowego systemu przeciwdziałania przemocy wobec kobiet, którego fundamentem jest konwencja stambulska. Zresztą 16 lipca 2019 r. sama mówiła Pani, że ratyfikacja konwencji stambulskiej jest dla Komisji priorytetem. Ile jeszcze kobiet musi być bitych, gwałconych, ile musi zostać zamordowanych? Ile musi na co dzień doświadczać przemocy psychicznej i ekonomicznej, żeby podjęła Pani bardziej stanowcze działania?

Katrin Langensiepen (Verts/ALE). – Frau Präsidentin! Ich möchte heute auf die Situation der Mädchen und der Frauen mit Behinderungen aufmerksam machen. Sie sind eine Gruppe, die nicht sichtbar ist – vielleicht eine Schattengruppe in der Europäischen Union.

In Deutschland ist es so: Jede zweite Frau/Mädchen ist Opfer von Gewalt – Mädchen mit Behinderung, Frauen mit Behinderung. Und da reden wir über eine sehr vielfältige Form von Gewalt; da geht es um psychische Gewalt, körperliche Gewalt, sexualisierte Gewalt. Und häufig wird diesen Frauen, den Mädchen nicht geglaubt. Aussagen sind häufig: Sei froh, dass dich überhaupt jemand anfasst. Willst du dich von deinem Mann trennen? Wo willst du denn hin?

Wenn man den Frauen und den Mädchen mit Behinderungen von Anfang an in Sonderwelten, in Sondereinrichtungen, in der Familie erzählt: Du bist nichts, du kannst nichts, du kannst dankbar sein, dass jemand dich heiratet, dass du versorgt wirst – und das ist der Urgedanke, der so tief in dieser Gesellschaft in der Europäischen Union sitzt: der des Versorgtseins.

Was wir brauchen, ist ein Auslaufenlassen von Einrichtungen für Menschen mit Behinderungen. Wir brauchen einen klaren Plan für den Schutz von Frauen und Mädchen mit Behinderung: Aufklärung, Barrierefreiheit, barrierefreier Zugang für Arztpraxen, Polizei. Polizei und die entsprechenden Einrichtungen müssen geschult werden, damit man den Frauen und den Mädchen mit Behinderungen glaubt.

Έλενα Κουντουρά (The Left). – Κυρία Πρόεδρε, η έμφυλη βία κατά των γυναικών και των κοριτσιών είναι παγκόσμια μάστιγα. Είναι μια ηθική προσβολή για όλες τις γυναίκες. Είναι σημάδι ντροπής και αποτυχίας για όλες τις κοινωνίες και ένα σημαντικό εμπόδιο για την ανάπτυξη της Ευρωπαϊκής Ένωσης. Μία στις τρεις γυναίκες έχει βιώσει τον εφιάλτη της έμφυλης βίας και μία στις είκοσι έχει πέσει θύμα βιασμού, συχνά χωρίς δικαίωση, στήριξη ή προστασία.

Στον πυρήνα της, η έμφυλη βία είναι η εκδήλωση έλλειψης σεβασμού, υποτίμησης, απαξίωσης και υπονόμευσης της γυναίκας από τους άντρες που δεν αναγνωρίζουν την εγγενή τους ισότητα και πιστεύουν ότι η ζωή της γυναίκας δεν έχει την ίδια αξία με τη δική τους. Αντανακλά και αναπαράγει πατριαρχικά πρότυπα και στερεότυπα που κυριαρχούν ακόμα και σήμερα στην Ευρώπη και πρέπει να εξαλειφθούν.

Πρέπει να συμπεριλάβουμε την έμφυλη βία ως έγκλημα στο άρθρο 83 της Συνθήκης και πρέπει ως ύψιστη πολιτική και κοινωνική προτεραιότητα να τη χτυπήσουμε στη ρίζα της. Οι γυναίκες και οι άνδρες, ναι, είναι διαφορετικοί, αλλά είναι ίσοι. Η οδηγία που θα υιοθετηθεί θα πρέπει να είναι ολιστική και φιλόδοξη.

(Koniec zgłoszeń z sali)

Helena Dalli, *Member of the Commission*. – Madam President, Minister, this International Day is, of course, an important occasion to take stock of what has been done to end such violence against women and domestic violence. But more importantly, it gives us the opportunity to assess what still needs to be done.

Now more than ever, we need the support of all stakeholders to ensure the smooth adoption of our two main proposals – the Directive on combating violence against women and domestic violence and the EU's accession to the Istanbul Convention. Of course, the latter would be the ideal road to take, but we also know that some Member States continue to refuse this ratification.

We also need your continued support to raise awareness of the disproportionate impact of gender-based violence on society at large. So while legislation and policy are necessary, so I would say is a change in attitudes. So, also importantly, as Katrin pointed out, is the training for stakeholders such as the police, such as the judiciary, all those involved, because many Member States have strong legislation in place and still we continue to see this tragedy of women being killed every day.

So really, we must also work a lot on this patriarchal culture, on the attitudes of how women are treated for the simple reason that we are women. So, immediate and long-term physical, sexual and mental consequences for women and girls are, of course, devastating and can limit women's and girls' participation in society and on the labour market. So women and girls can only lead and thrive if they are free from violence.

So, let us continue to work together to achieve a Union of equality, free from any kind of violence, but in this case, especially of gender-based violence.

Mikuláš Bek, *President-in-Office of the Council*. – Madam President, honourable Members, Commissioner, I wish to thank you for this important debate today. First of all, let me apologise for not having been able to follow it in its entirety as I had a duty to sign several legislative acts, together with President Metsola.

This debate is important and timely in the most unfortunate sense of the word, in light of yesterday's tragic killing of Bernice Cassar in Malta, as evoked by President Metsola and Commissioner Dalli in their opening remarks. Sadly, we see these events occurring every day.

Let me be absolutely clear. The prevention and elimination of violence against women and girls is a must that requires joint, constant and unwavering efforts from all of us, including the co-legislators. I will repeat it again. We are allies. That also means that we are stronger together and we can achieve more together.

I am sure I speak for us all when I say we will not give up this struggle until we see violence against women and girls eradicated from Europe and the world. Thank you very much once again for your attention.

Przewodnicząca. – Zamykam debatę.

Oświadczenia pisemne (art. 171)

Атидже Алиева-Вели (Renew), *в писмена форма*. – Въпреки че е постигнат значителен напредък в борбата за равенство между половете, насилието, основано на пола, продължава да бъде основен проблем за гарантирането на човешките права. Независимо от расовата, етническата и религиозната принадлежност, нито от възрастта, това насилие засяга една от всеки три жени и момичета в Европа.

Проблемът има и друго измерение, което засяга най-невинните – децата. Заради своята уязвимост децата, които са свидетели на насилието над жени или на домашно насилие, са изложени на преки емоционални вреди, които се отразяват на развитието им. Поради това такива деца следва да се считат за жертви и да се ползват от целеви мерки за защита.

Искам за пореден път да подчертая, че насилието няма място в Съюза. Когато става въпрос за равенството между половете и насилието срещу жените, съм сигурна, че всички ние сме един отбор и че всеки може да допринесе за пълното премахване на този феномен.

Ключово в този аспект е образованието – както за жените, така и за мъжете. Заедно с това държавите членки следва да гарантират, че се предприемат превантивни мерки, като например кампании за повишаване на осведомеността. Ще продължа да подкрепям политиките в тази посока, докато нито една жена не се свени да застане срещу насилника си и да даде гласност на тормоза, на който е подложена.

Bartosz Arłukowicz (PPE), *na piśmie*. – Za dwa dni obchodzić będziemy światowy dzień eliminowania przemocy wobec kobiet i młodych dziewcząt. Fakt, że w trzeciej dekadzie XXI w. wciąż takie dni musimy obchodzić, to oczywiście porażka nas wszystkich. Bo to niestety oznacza, że do tej pory świat nie uporał się z tym problemem, nie znaleźliśmy wspólnych mechanizmów, by skończyć z barbarzyństwem minionych wieków. Jako politycy bardzo często spotykamy się z przypadkami niesprawiedliwości, z przypadkami całkowitej bierności służb państwowych wobec przemocy domowej, przemocy wobec kobiet. A przecież ochrona obywateli to ich, zdawałoby się, główne powołanie. To prawda, że istnieją mechanizmy wsparcia i reagowania, brak jest natomiast wrażliwości, zrozumienia i zaufania dla osób pokrzywdzonych. Musimy wspólnie położyć kres bezkarności sprawców przemocy domowej, przemocy wobec kobiet. W komisjach LIBE i FEMM powstaje sprawozdanie w sprawie przystąpienia UE do konwencji stambulskiej, którego jestem sprawozdawcą cieniem z ramienia PPE. Mamy bardzo dobry projekt tego sprawozdania i zrobimy wszystko, żeby UE stała się częścią konwencji. Ubolewam, że w Polsce rząd rozważa wyjście z tej umowy międzynarodowej. To kolejny dowód na ignorowanie przez rząd oczekiwań polskich obywateli.

Josianne Cutajar (S&D), *in writing*. – Estimates published by WHO indicate that about 1 in 3 women in the world have been subjected to either physical or sexual intimate partner violence or non-partner violence, including inter-generationally between parents and children, in their lifetime. The femicides we are assisting are also the direct result of the inequalities we are still tolerating, from the gender pay gap, to women traditionally being caretakers, to the insensitivity certain law enforcement authorities still show towards domestic violence complaints. While we focusing our efforts on the crises we face, we must keep in mind the increasing inequalities, including those hidden from the public eye and attracting stigmatisation. We must strive to empower women to leave abusive environments through adequate support, such as safe shelters and access to help services through diverse channels including the digital ones, easily accessible for all. At the same time, we must strengthen the training and resources for the judiciary, law enforcement officers, and healthcare and social service providers. Moreover, the stereotypes and misogyny women face must be addressed at societal level through better educational programmes.

Estrella Durá Ferrandis (S&D), *por escrito*. – Para los y las socialistas, es indispensable una ley europea contra la violencia de género, una legislación europea homogénea que permita avanzar en la erradicación de la lacra que es la violencia de género, que abarque desde la prevención y la protección de las mujeres hasta la punición de los agresores. Es imprescindible disponer de una definición común y datos sobre la violencia ejercida contra las mujeres, con la que sea posible dimensionarla y combatirla.

La igualdad y la lucha contra la violencia de género es un compromiso que se lleva a la practica con voluntad, políticas y presupuestos.

se lleva a la practica con voluntad, políticas y presupuestos.

Lina Gálvez Muñoz (S&D), *por escrito*. – Para los y las socialistas, es indispensable una ley europea contra la violencia de género, una legislación europea homogénea que permita avanzar en la erradicación de la lacra que es la violencia de género, que abarque desde la prevención y la protección de las mujeres hasta la punición de los agresores. Es imprescindible disponer de una definición común y datos sobre la violencia ejercida contra las mujeres, con la que sea posible dimensionarla y combatirla.

La igualdad y la lucha contra la violencia de género es un compromiso que se lleva a la practica con voluntad, políticas y presupuestos.

Isabel García Muñoz (S&D), *por escrito*. – Para los y las socialistas, es indispensable una ley europea contra la violencia de género, una legislación europea homogénea que permita avanzar en la erradicación de la lacra que es la violencia de género, que abarque desde la prevención y la protección de las mujeres hasta la punición de los agresores. Es imprescindible disponer de una definición común y datos sobre la violencia ejercida contra las mujeres, con la que sea posible dimensionarla y combatirla.

La igualdad y la lucha contra la violencia de género es un compromiso que se lleva a la practica con voluntad, políticas y presupuestos.

Javi López (S&D), *por escrito*. – Para los y las socialistas, es indispensable una ley europea contra la violencia de género, una legislación europea homogénea que permita avanzar en la erradicación de la lacra que es la violencia de género, que abarque desde la prevención y la protección de las mujeres hasta la punición de los agresores. Es imprescindible disponer de una definición común y datos sobre la violencia ejercida contra las mujeres, con la que sea posible dimensionarla y combatirla.

La igualdad y la lucha contra la violencia de género es un compromiso que se lleva a la practica con voluntad, políticas y presupuestos.

César Luena (S&D), *por escrito*. – Para los y las socialistas, es indispensable una ley europea contra la violencia de género, una legislación europea homogénea que permita avanzar en la erradicación de la lacra que es la violencia de género, que abarque desde la prevención y la protección de las mujeres hasta la punición de los agresores. Es imprescindible disponer de una definición común y datos sobre la violencia ejercida contra las mujeres, con la que sea posible dimensionarla y combatirla.

La igualdad y la lucha contra la violencia de género es un compromiso que se lleva a la practica con voluntad, políticas y presupuestos.

Adriana Maldonado López (S&D), *por escrito*. – Para los y las socialistas, es indispensable una ley europea contra la violencia de género, una legislación europea homogénea que permita avanzar en la erradicación de la lacra que es la violencia de género, que abarque desde la prevención y la protección de las mujeres hasta la punición de los agresores. Es imprescindible disponer de una definición común y datos sobre la violencia ejercida contra las mujeres, con la que sea posible dimensionarla y combatirla.

La igualdad y la lucha contra la violencia de género es un compromiso que se lleva a la practica con voluntad, políticas y presupuestos.

Cristina Maestre Martín De Almagro (S&D), *por escrito*. – Para los y las socialistas, es indispensable una ley europea contra la violencia de género, una legislación europea homogénea que permita avanzar en la erradicación de la lacra que es la violencia de género, que abarque desde la prevención y la protección de las mujeres hasta la punición de los agresores. Es imprescindible disponer de una definición común y datos sobre la violencia ejercida contra las mujeres, con la que sea posible dimensionarla y combatirla.

La igualdad y la lucha contra la violencia de género es un compromiso que se lleva a la practica con voluntad, políticas y presupuestos.

Sirpa Pietikäinen (PPE), *kirjallinen*. –Vietämme perjantaina naisiin kohdistuvan väkivallan lopettamisen päivää. Naisiin ja tyttöihin kohdistuvaa väkivaltaa esiintyy systemaattisesti edelleen järkyttävän isossa mittakaavassa. Se on vakava ihmisoikeusrikkomus, ja tämä on saatava loppumaan. Naisiin ja tyttöihin kohdistuu fyysistä, seksuaalista, henkistä, taloudellista, digitaalista ja rakenteellista väkivaltaa. Matkamme on pitkä naisiin kohdistuvan väkivallan poistamiseen. Ratkaisuja kuitenkin on. On sanomattakin selvää, että jokaisen EU-maan on ratifioitava Istanbulin sopimus viipymättä, ja EU:n pitää vaatia sitä jäsenmailtaan. EU-tasolla vain 21 jäsenmaata on ratifioinut sopimuksen. Me parlamentissa olemme toistuvasti vaatineet EU:ta liittymään täysimääräisesti Istanbulin sopimukseen, ja nyt on aika sille, että näin myös tapahtuu. Istanbulin sopimus määrittelee naisiin kohdistuvan väkivallan laajasti. Sen mukaan naisiin kohdistuva väkivalta on naisiin kohdistuva ihmisoikeusloukkaus ja syrjinnän muoto, ja se käsittää kaikki sellaiset sukupuoleen perustuvat väkivallanteot, jotka aiheuttavat tai voivat aiheuttaa naisille ruumiillista, seksuaalista, henkistä tai taloudellista haittaa tai kärsimystä, mukaan lukien tällaisilla teoilla uhkaaminen, pakottaminen tai mielivaltainen vapaudenriisto joko julkisessa tai yksityiselämässä.

Tarvitsemme unionissa myös vahvan direktiivin naisiin kohdistuvan väkivallan torjuntaan. Komissio on antanut esityksensä direktiiviksi, ja odotan parlamentilta vahvaa kantaa, jota puolustamme myöhemmin jäsenmaiden kanssa käytävissä neuvotteluissa. Tämä direktiivi on yksi tärkeimmistä lainsäädäntöhankkeista, jotka on saatava loppuun ennen vaalikauden loppua, ja siihen on sisällyttävä myös Istanbulin sopimuksen mukainen laaja määritelmä naisiin kohdistuvasta väkivallasta.

Marcos Ros Sempere (S&D), *por escrito*. – Para los y las socialistas, es indispensable una ley europea contra la violencia de género, una legislación europea homogénea que permita avanzar en la erradicación de la lacra que es la violencia de género, que abarque desde la prevención y la protección de las mujeres hasta la punición de los agresores. Es imprescindible disponer de una definición común y datos sobre la violencia ejercida contra las mujeres, con la que sea posible dimensionarla y combatirla.

La igualdad y la lucha contra la violencia de género es un compromiso que se lleva a la practica con voluntad, políticas y presupuestos.

9. Änderung der Verordnung (EU, Euratom) 2020/2093 des Rates vom 17. Dezember 2020 zur Festlegung des mehrjährigen Finanzrahmens für den Zeitraum von 2021 bis 2027 — Änderung der Verordnung (EU, Euratom) 2018/1046 im Hinblick auf die Festlegung einer diversifizierten Finanzierungsstrategie als allgemeine Methode für die Mittelaufnahme - Instrument zur Unterstützung der Ukraine im Jahr 2023 (Makrofinanzhilfe+) (Aussprache)

Przewodnicząca. – Kolejnym punktem porządku dziennego jest debata łączna na temat oświadczenia Rady i Komisji w sprawie pomocy finansowej UE dla Ukrainy: zalecenia dotyczące zmiany rozporządzenia Rady (UE, Euratom) 2020/2093 z 17 grudnia 2020 r. określającego wieloletnie ramy finansowe na lata 2021-2027 (COM(2022)0595 - 14471/2022 — C9-0386/2022 - 2022/0369(APP)) oraz sprawozdanie dotyczące zmiany rozporządzenia (UE, Euratom) 2018/1046 w odniesieniu do ustanowienia zróżnicowanej strategii finansowania jako ogólnej metody zaciągania pożyczek (COM(2022)0596 - C9-0374/2022 - 2022/0370(COD)), oraz sprawozdanie dotyczące instrumentu wsparcia dla Ukrainy na 2023 r. (pomoc makrofinansowa +) (COM(2022)0597 - C9-0373/2022 - 2022/0371(COD)).

Mikuláš Bek, *President-in-Office of the Council*. – Madam President, honourable Members, Commissioner, I am pleased to be here today and to be working with this Parliament and with the Commission towards finding a structural solution to help the brave people of Ukraine in 2023.

Delivering financial support to Ukraine in 2022 has proven an exercise more difficult than originally foreseen. With the EU budget lacking the resources to provide the full guarantees for the loans to Ukraine, we required national guarantees, and this presented operational and financial drawbacks.

I am happy that, with this package, the EU shows it is united and strongly committed to supporting Ukraine. So today, you will be discussing the method to offer Ukraine the remaining EUR 3 billion from 2022 and a further EUR 15 billion in loans for 2023. These loans will have a grace period of ten years, and the Member States will cover the interest costs. This makes the loans highly concessional and will not put any burden on Ukraine.

Ukraine will therefore be able to concentrate on fighting off the invader, as well as on repairing its energy and other crucial infrastructure that the invader has been destroying on purpose, with the sole objective of inflicting further hardships on the people of Ukraine as winter approaches.

I can only imagine that this Parliament would have liked more time to discuss, negotiate and amend the two legislative files for which you are co-legislators, and also to scrutinise further the amendment to the Multiannual Financial Framework, for which the Council is requesting your consent.

Let me reassure you in the Council we felt the same, but I trust that the Parliament will rise to the challenge. I hope that the votes you will be casting tomorrow on the package will allow us to proceed with a speedy delivery of support to Ukraine. Thank you very much for your attention.

Virginijus Sinkevičius, *Member of the Commission*. – Madam President, Minister, honourable Members, I would like to start this debate by reaffirming the EU's solidarity with Ukraine. While Russia continues its brutal war, killing Ukraine's citizens and destroying infrastructure, the EU stands with Ukraine as long as it takes. The EU remains steadfast in its support for Ukraine's independence, sovereignty and territorial integrity and its inherent right of self-defence against Russia's aggression, as enshrined in the UN Charter. Russia must stop its illegal war of aggression, which has taken a heavy human toll and deeply damaged Ukraine's society and economic potential.

The destruction of physical capital and infrastructure is immense. By the end of May, it is estimated to have cost reconstruction and recovery costs of USD 349 billion; almost 14 million people have been forced to leave their homes. It is an extremely challenging context. Ukraine's funding needs will continue to be acute in 2023.

The EU, its Member States and the European financial institutions under the Team Europe approach are fulfilling their promise to provide sizeable support to Ukraine. In total, almost EUR 20 billion have been mobilised in 2022, in addition to military assistance. And I would like to thank the European Parliament for its unwavering support for Ukraine and its continuous cooperation. This includes the Parliament's support under the urgency procedure for the legislative proposal made by the Commission.

Yesterday we disbursed another EUR 2.5 billion of exceptional macro-financial assistance to Ukraine. This brings the Union's macro-financial assistance to Ukraine since the beginning of the war to EUR 6.7 billion: emergency MFA of EUR 1.2 billion disbursed in March, exceptional MFA of EUR 1 billion disbursed in August and an exceptional MFA of EUR 4.5 billion disbursed in October and November. We expect to disburse another EUR 500 million of exceptional MFA to Ukraine in December, once the authorities have shown that they have met the conditionality agreed in the related memorandum of understanding. So far there has been satisfactory progress with implementation and we are confident that the Ukrainian authorities will meet their commitments.

Based on the enhanced reporting requirements linked to the exceptional MFA designed to ensure the transparency and efficiency of the use of funds, Ukraine has reported that the funds have been used to repay maturing domestic liabilities. In that sense, the Union's support has effectively contributed to limit Ukraine's recourse monetary financing of its government. That way, the Union's MFA has achieved its goal of maintaining macro-financial stability and preserving the stock of official international reserves of Ukraine, which stabilised at above USD 25 billion since September. Estimates of Ukraine's funding gap in 2023 are exceptionally uncertain, ranging from EUR 3 to 4 billion per month, notably depending on the length of the war and the inflicted damage.

To help Ukraine cover its sizable funding gap in 2023, on 9 November the Commission presented a proposal for a new instrument: Macro-Financial Assistance Plus. It aims to channel up to EUR 18 billion in highly concessional loans to Ukraine in 2023 in a predictable, continuous, orderly and timely manner. Such an unprecedented amount will allow Ukraine to ensure macroeconomic stability and restore critical infrastructure destroyed by Russia.

To ensure maximum concessionality, the loans provided under the MFA+ instrument should have long maturities and there will be no repayment of principal before 2033. To secure the funds for the loans, the Commission proposes to borrow on capital markets using the diversified funding strategy via a targeted amendment of the Financial Regulation and this would enable the Commission to use the full portfolio of funding instruments to secure market funding on the most advantageous terms.

To guarantee this borrowing for Ukraine, the Commission proposes to use the headroom of the 2021-2027 EU budget in a targeted manner for Ukraine, limited in time, and this will be done via a targeted amendment of the MFF Regulation. The headroom is the difference between the own reserve ceilings – so the maximum amount of resources that the Commission can ask Member States to contribute in a given year – and the funds that it actually needs to cover the expenses envisioned in the budget. The EU will also cover the interest-rate costs of Ukraine to be financed by voluntary contributions from Member States in the form of external assigned revenue, and the scale of the required interest payments under the proposed MFA+ funding will depend on the rate at which the Commission raises the funds on the capital markets within its diversified funding strategy.

Current market extrapolations point to estimated interest-rate costs of less than EUR 600 million per year. These costs will only come into effect from 2024 onwards because there will be no interest payments related to these funds in 2023. Allocation of the costs across Member States will be done on the basis of the GNI key. Financial support for Ukraine in 2023 will entail conditionality to be negotiated with Ukraine in a memorandum of understanding. Obviously, implementing a structural reform agenda in a country at war is not an easy task and it puts a premium on relevance and feasibility. This conditionality will feature reforms to further enhance the rule of law, good governance, anti-fraud and anti-corruption measures. And this is essential for the country's future reconstruction and for supporting Ukraine on its path to EU accession, as well as ensuring the financial interests of the Union.

The Commission intends to negotiate the memorandum of understanding without delay once the MFA+ instrument is legally in place, and we are confident that this will allow us a swift disbursement to be made in January 2023. It is important that the emergency financial assistance for Ukraine from all other international partners, both bilateral and multilateral, should continue in 2023 as it was in 2022. The Commission is in regular contact with the international financial institutions and also in the G7 framework to ensure cooperation and coordination.

But honourable Members, macro-financial assistance is only one element of the Union's support for Ukraine. Since the beginning of the Russian invasion, the overall Team Europe assistance pledged to Ukraine amounts close to EUR 20 billion. This combines the support enabled by the European Union budget. In addition to the financial assistance, the Union has also made military equipment available through the European Peace Facility, plus over EUR 100 million of CSDP support for training missions, as well as in-kind assistance under the Union's civil protection mechanism.

On humanitarian assistance, the EU, together with its Member States, have mobilised more than EUR 1.5 billion, of which about EUR 500 million comes from the EU budget. The EU's comprehensive humanitarian and civil-protection assistance is far from being a short term deal. The EU is with Ukraine for the long haul.

Honourable Members, once again, I would like to thank the European Parliament for the urgency and priority that it has given to this file. It is vital for our Ukrainian friends that this entire package goes through quickly. It is also vital for Europe's credibility as a whole.

Jan Olbrycht, *w imieniu grupy PPE*. – Pani Przewodnicząca! Panie Komisarzu! Dyskusja nad pomocą makroekonomiczną przebiega tak naprawdę w dwóch płaszczyznach. Pierwsza płaszczyzna to oczywiście niezbędna pomoc Ukrainie w utrzymaniu stabilności makroekonomicznej, w podtrzymaniu funkcjonowania państwa we wszystkich jego funkcjach. To nie są pieniądze na odbudowę Ukrainy. To są pieniądze na podtrzymanie stabilności funkcjonowania państwa. To ważne, żebyśmy ten element podkreślali, bo oczekiwania są bardzo duże.

Zgodnie z wyliczeniami propozycja, którą dzisiaj mamy na stole, mówi o tym, żeby przekazywać w formie pożyczek półtora miliarda euro co miesiąc, przez cały rok 2023, począwszy od stycznia. W sumie razem 18 miliardów euro. To wymagało zmian, jeżeli chodzi o kwestie legislacyjne. I to ten drugi wymiar. Jesteśmy w Unii Europejskiej w zupełnie innej sytuacji. Pewien przełom nastąpił w sytuacji funduszu odbudowy. Jest zgoda na zaciągnięcie kredytów na rynku kapitałowym. To, że fundusz został pozyskany z sukcesem, otwiera drogę również dla tego typu działania. Ważne, żebyśmy o tym pamiętali, bo to jest zupełnie inny typ funkcjonowania Unii Europejskiej. I dla nas jako Parlamentu jest ważne, że my w trybie nagłym zgadzamy się na przeprowadzenie zmian legislacyjnych po to, żeby ułatwić ten typ działania na rynkach kapitałowych. Jest to niezbędnie potrzebne. Ale to jest również element wskazujący na przyszłe działania budżetu europejskiego.

Margarida Marques, *em nome do Grupo S&D*. – Senhora Presidente, Senhor Ministro, Senhor Comissário, estamos hoje prontos para discutir, em urgência, o pacote de apoio financeiro à Ucrânia já para 2023, a um mês do início do ano…

Apoio financeiro este que está a vencer dois habituais «tabus» nestas lides: a alteração ao Quadro Financeiro Plurianual e a contração de dívida em nome da União.

Este pacote passa por uma alteração ao Regulamento QFP! Decisão que requer unanimidade no Conselho e a aprovação do Parlamento Europeu. O que é a prova provada do ditado «*if there is a will there is a way*». É esta alteração ao Regulamento QFP que permitirá à Comissão emprestar à Ucrânia, também através de um novo acordo de assistência macrofinanceira, o MFA PLUS, 18 mil milhões de euros em 2023. Exatamente nos mesmos moldes em que empresta já aos Estados-Membros da União Europeia.

E isto só é possível porque antes vencemos o tabu e criámos um instrumento, o Fundo *NextGenerationEU*, ancorado no orçamento da União Europeia. Com este novo MFA PLUS, continuamos totalmente comprometidos com a estabilidade de longo prazo da Ucrânia, incluindo a financeira. Este MFA PLUS permitirá a continuação dos serviços públicos e ajudará na reconstrução e em projetos de infraestruturas, mas serve, também, para impulsionar reformas democráticas. Por isso é essencial assegurar o controlo democrático por parte do Parlamento Europeu.

Por fim, Senhor Comissário, deixe-me concluir que esta alteração ao QFP sublinha, mais do que nunca, a óbvia necessidade de revisão do QFP 21-27 já no próximo ano.

Precisamos de um orçamento da União Europeia revisto, mais forte, mais ágil e precisamos de um instrumento permanente que nos permita responder a crises, como agora estamos a fazer. E podemos fazê-lo, como disse, só porque existe o *NextGenerationEU*.

Valérie Hayer, *au nom du groupe Renew.* – Madame la Présidente, Monsieur le Commissaire, Monsieur le Ministre, chers collègues, l'appel du président Zelensky est sans équivoque. Pour ne pas s'effondrer, l'Ukraine a besoin de 3 à 4 milliards d'euros par mois. Sans cet argent, ce sont tous les services publics, des hôpitaux aux écoles, qui risquent de disparaître. Ce sont les infrastructures détruites par les bombes russes – les ponts, les routes, le réseau électrique, les stations d'épuration – qui ne pourront pas être réparées faute de moyens. Bref, c'est tout le pays qui serait en black-out, les vies humaines en danger, la vie économique et administrative bloquée.

Chers collègues, si les Ukrainiens ne sont pas soutenus, les conséquences seront graves. Elles seront graves non seulement et avant tout pour les Ukrainiens, mais aussi pour le reste de l'Europe. Car une Ukraine abandonnée, c'est une Russie renforcée, c'est une Union européenne affaiblie. Alors je me tourne ici vers l'extrême droite, vers le Rassemblement national et ses amis pro-Poutine. Si vous votez contre ou si même vous vous abstenez sur cette aide de 18 milliards d'euros, ne dites plus jamais que vous êtes pour la liberté des nations.

Rasmus Andresen, *im Namen der Verts/ALE-Fraktion.* – Frau Präsidentin! „Sie wollen uns erfrieren lassen und unsere Strom- und Wärmeversorgung zerstören." Mit diesen Worten beschreibt Kiews Bürgermeister Klitschko Putins brutale Strategie für diesen Winter. Er beschreibt exemplarisch die Befürchtungen vieler Menschen in der Ukraine, mit denen wir neun grüne Abgeordnete am Wochenende in Kiew Gespräche geführt haben.

Der ukrainische Winter wird hart. Wir Grüne unterstützen deshalb uneingeschränkt die 18 Milliarden Euro Finanzhilfe, über die wir hier morgen abstimmen. Die ukrainische Kriegswirtschaft steht vor enormen Herausforderungen. Das Bruttoinlandsprodukt ist mit 37 % eingebrochen, die Inflation liegt bei 27 %. Während eines brutalen Kriegs kann sich ein Land ökonomisch nicht erholen.

Die Finanzhilfe ist wichtig, um die Ukraine am Laufen zu halten. Aber es geht jetzt auch darum, die Grundlagen für den Wiederaufbau zu legen. Der Wiederaufbau muss nachhaltig werden, die Zivilgesellschaft einbeziehen und alle Demokratie- und Antikorruptionsbestimmungen erfüllen. Die Ukraine kann sich auf uns verlassen: Solidarität mit der Ukraine.

Joachim Kuhs, *im Namen der ID-Fraktion.* – Frau Präsidentin, Herr Minister, Herr Kommissar, werte Kollegen! Ich möchte eigentlich zu diesem Punkt drei Fragen stellen. Die erste Frage betrifft den Europäischen Rechnungshof. Der Europäische Rechnungshof hat seine Stellungnahme abgegeben, aber er schreibt darin, er habe nur zwölf Tage Zeit gehabt, diese Stellungnahme abzugeben. Was ist da passiert? Und wieso konnten wir sie erst gestern bekommen und können jetzt nicht mehr darüber debattieren, über die guten und sinnvollen Vorschläge, die er gemacht hat? Ich verstehe das nicht.

Eine zweite Frage betrifft diese direkte Finanzierung des Haushaltes der Ukraine. Wenn wir im CONT-Ausschuss, wo ich auch bin, so was sehen, dass Geld direkt in den Haushalt eines Staates fließt, dann sind wir immer sehr hellhörig und sehr wachsam und versuchen, rauszubekommen: Was passiert hier, was läuft hier ab? Und ich habe große Bedenken, dass dieses Geld, wenn es hier in die Ukraine fließt, in den korruptesten Staat unseres Kontinents – das ist nun mal ein Fakt –; wenn dieses Geld jetzt in diese Kriegswirtschaft fließt, ist das wirklich gut angelegt, ist das wirklich richtig? Wird dann wirklich den Menschen in der Ukraine geholfen? Das ist die Frage.

Und die dritte Frage ist die: Wissen wir eigentlich, wissen Sie eigentlich, wie viel Geld wir diesen Menschen dort hinschicken? Ich habe hier 50-Euro-Scheine, zusammen ist das einen halben Zentimeter hoch. Und dieses Geld, wenn man das mal hochrechnet auf einen Turm, dann sind die 18 Milliarden ein Turm von 40 Kilometer Geld. Wollen wir das wirklich?

Johan Van Overtveldt, *namens de ECR-Fractie.* – Voorzitter, commissaris, beste collega's, de Europese Unie moet er alles aan doen om Oekraïne en zijn burgers te steunen. Dat zijn we hen en onszelf verschuldigd in het belang van onze gemeenschappelijke waarden en normen. Alhoewel ik niet de minste twijfel heb over de toekenning van deze middelen, wil ik er toch voor pleiten om een goede opvolging van de effectieve besteding van deze middelen zeker niet uit het oog te verliezen. Volgende stap is natuurlijk de nodige financiën mobiliseren voor de wederopbouw. Hier moet volgens mij in eerste instantie gekeken worden in de richting van de op dit moment naar schatting 80 miljard aan geblokkeerde Russische tegoeden. Als de Russische elite niet in staat is om de verantwoordelijkheid te nemen voor wat er wordt aangericht, dan moeten we hen daarbij op een krachtige manier helpen. Ik ben me ervan bewust dat dit juridisch een complexe operatie kan en zal zijn, maar ik vertrouw erop dat de Commissie het nodige zal doen om dit grondig te analyseren en ook uit te voeren.

Ivan Vilibor Sinčić (NI). – Poštovana predsjedavajuća, na početku pozvat ću još jednom na prekid vatre i zaključenje mira u Ukrajini. Moj interes je onaj hrvatskih građana i zanima me gdje završava ta pomoć koja ide prema vladi Zelenskog.

I prije ovog rata brojna sredstva su otišla tamo, ali prema nalazima Revizorskog suda ne znamo za što su točno potrošena. Ove godine, 2022. Zapad je dao 90 do 100 milijardi dolara pomoći Ukrajini, što je jedan do dva godišnja vojna proračuna države Rusije.

Unatoč velikoj pomoći, situacija u Ukrajini je jako loša i sve gora. Oko 50 % energetske infrastrukture je uništeno, uključujući brojne elektrane. Prema WHO-u, još 2-3 milijuna ljudi će napustiti Ukrajinu zbog velikih hladnoća koje dolaze. 60 % ukrajinskog proračuna za 2022. dolazi iz stranih donacija. Čemu se narod Ukrajine u takvoj situaciji uopće može nadati? Vrijeme je da Ukrajina počne razgovarati o miru, a na to ih je pred par dana pozvao čak i Pentagon.

I na sve ovo, sada imamo ovaj prijedlog zaduženja na međunarodnom tržištu naših građana za još 18 milijardi eura, ili jednu i pol milijardu mjesečno, za krpanje proračuna Ukrajine. Kako to objasniti, recimo našim hrvatskim građanima, kada Hrvatska pogođena s dva potresa nije obnovila niti tri kuće svojim građanima, koje još uz sve to muči i inflacija?

Michael Gahler (PPE). – Frau Präsidentin, liebe Kolleginnen und Kollegen! Herr Kollege Kuhs, Sie arbeiten sich ja an der Ukraine ab als angeblich dem korruptesten Staat der Welt. Wir könnten schon eine Ecke weiter sein in der Bekämpfung dieser Korruption, hätten wir nicht hier mit Russland den verbrecherischsten Staat Europas, der seinen Krieg gegen die Ukraine hier durchführt.

Today we have with a huge majority labelled Russia as what it is: a state sponsor of terrorism and a state that uses means of terrorism. We have illustrated in detail the amount of destruction and suffering that this inhuman, criminal regime has caused and continues to inflict on its peaceful neighbour and its innocent citizens. That is why, as standing rapporteur on Ukraine, I am deeply grateful to all EU institutions and Member States that we continue to stand firm also in our financial support. And I wouldn't like to forget all those other bodies and civil society that are firmly supporting Ukraine, also financially. EUR 18 billion – that is EUR 1.5 billion per month – is only part of the dire needs to keep the country running, to pay the salaries and so on.

And I think – and that has been alluded to also by my colleague Van Overtveldt – given the amount of money and given war-related problems in the amount of transparency and all that, it requires a better role for the Parliament. We need to set up a working group together with the Commission from the Budget Committee and Foreign Affairs to supervise and to accompany the payments of what is going to Ukraine.

So that is my suggestion to the Commission: to accept this idea, to involve us closely as a Parliament in administering this huge amount of money.

Slava Ukraini!

Mittwoch, 23. November 2022

Victor Negrescu (S&D). – Madam President, dear Commissioner, dear minister, dear colleagues, the war in Ukraine cannot be won and people's lives cannot be saved without European support and commitment. This implies providing Ukrainians with the necessary resources to protect their population, resist during the winter, keep schools open, help the reconstruction, and maintain the activity of their public services and institutions. That is why the European Parliament is in favour of the proposal of the Commission for a support package for Ukraine of up to EUR 18 billion through concessional loans to be repaid in the course of maximum 35 years, starting in 2033.

In a further expression of solidarity, the EU will cover the interest-rate costs, and of course Member States can also contribute with additional funds. This instrument will imply reforms to help Ukraine advance on its European path. But also, of course, we have to mention anti-corruption and judicial reforms, respect for the rule of law, good governance and modernisation of the national and local institutions. I also hope that EU minorities' rights will also be included there, in particular referring to Romanian minorities.

Ukraine is fighting for its freedom and its independence, but is also fighting for our values. This is why we need to show solidarity and approve this proposal and of course make sure that reforms are put into place.

Petras Auštrevičius (Renew). – Madam President, Commissioner, Minister, dear colleagues, who may deny that our excellent decision – I mean to call on Russia as a state-sponsor of terrorism. Our IT systems are down. I think it's a very clear message. Moscow is watching us, following and making some conclusions. Good luck for you. You will be down, not us.

Today, colleagues, more than ever, Ukraine is facing a greater need for extensive support from its partners. Russia's war of aggression is destroying Ukraine's economy and pushing its population into energy and social poverty, terrorising its people, with more than 25% being internally displaced and 7 million fleeing abroad. Ukraine has mobilised all its financial resources to fight for its survival and the protection of its population.

I congratulate the European Union and its Member States, as well as the outstanding commitment of civil society to help Ukraine through this difficult time. We must realise that by supporting Ukraine and its people we are reaffirming the meaning of European solidarity.

Slava Ukraini!

Alexandra Geese (Verts/ALE). – Madam President, we stand with Ukraine, with our hearts, our minds, and EUR 18 billion. We stand with Ukrainian people, who will never give up fighting because they have seen how Putin's troops have raped, tortured and murdered innocent civilians. We stand with the Ukrainian teachers, the nurses, the mayors, the technicians and the construction workers who are rebuilding their country every day after every attack. And we stand with the Ukrainian soldiers who save human lives by stopping bombs and retaking occupied territories. We stand with the families, with the children who are in the cold, without heating, without electricity, without water, because Russian bombs target civilian energy infrastructure. And this is happening right now, while we are speaking, in Kyiv.

We stand with the Ukrainian people who are fighting every day to protect not only their own country, but our democracy and freedom. And I can tell you, EUR 18 billion is not a high price because the really high price is paid by the Ukrainian people. We stand with Ukraine.

Matteo Gazzini (ID). – Signora Presidente, signor Commissario, onorevoli colleghi, a seguito dello scoppio della guerra in Ucraina, l'Unione europea, gli Stati membri e le istituzioni finanziarie europee hanno fornito fino a questo momento un sostegno pari a 19,7 miliardi di euro. Adesso il nuovo strumento prevedrà un'erogazione di ulteriori 18 miliardi di euro.

Ritengo giusto sostenere l'Ucraina, ovviamente, ma ritengo altrettanto importante vigilare in maniera rigorosa su come questi denari verranno spesi e da chi verranno spesi. In questo momento di oggettiva difficoltà nella gestione delle problematiche interne da parte del governo ucraino, si corre il rischio che una parte di questi aiuti possa essere intercettata da organizzazioni o singoli aventi finalità diverse rispetto all'esclusivo e doveroso sostegno al popolo ucraino colpito dalla catastrofe della guerra.

Questo nuovo strumento consente che le condizioni politiche e le modalità di erogazione siano meno dettagliate, oltre a prevedere un preoccupante ruolo minore del Parlamento per quanto riguarda la sua funzione di controllo di bilancio. Ma siamo sicuri che le istituzioni europee dispongano di mezzi adeguati per controllare in maniera effettiva questi finanziamenti? Siamo sicuri di non correre il rischio che questo nuovo strumento sia solo il primo di una lunga serie di prestiti?

Mi auguro che questi aiuti possano fungere da leva per arrivare finalmente alla pace e porre fine ad una guerra che ha devastato l'Ucraina e danneggiato gravemente l'Europa intera.

Dominik Tarczyński (ECR). – Madam President, this debate is not about money. It's not about EUR 18 billion. It's not about USD 350 billion. This debate is about our humanity, Mr Commissioner. It's about our responsibility. It's about history. Because history will judge us, just like history judged those who decided to fight against Hitler. I can't see many differences between Putin and Hitler.

I just came back from Izium in Ukraine. I could see graves – holes, actually – where over 400 bodies were found. It's completely different when you smelled the air there. When you see these holes. When you talk to the people who are starving to death. So I would like to encourage you, if you feel strong enough, to visit Ukraine and see Izium, Bucha, Mariupol and other places. Because it's worth to go and see. Because history will judge us.

So remember, it's not about money. It's not about euros. It's about our humanity.

Tamás Deutsch (NI). – Tisztelt Elnök Asszony! Magyarország határozottan elítéli az orosz agressziót. Kiállunk Ukrajna függetlensége és területi épsége mellett. Segítjük az ukránokat. A magyar humanitárius segélyprogram keretében egymillió háborús menekültet fogadtunk be, és 31 milliárd forintot fordítottunk Ukrajna támogatására.

A mi álláspontunk elvi álláspont: nem támogatunk semmilyen újabb uniós közös hitelfelvételt, ezért nem fogadjuk el, hogy az EU közös hitelfelvételből finanszírozza Ukrajnát. 2020-ban kizárólag a mediterrán országok kérésére, precedenst nem teremtő egyszeri és rendkívüli kivételként fogadtuk csak el a közös hitelfelvételt. Tragikus tapasztalataink vannak ugyanis. Előbb a kommunisták adósították el Magyarországot, 2002 után pedig a baloldali kormányok vertek újra adósságba minket.

Mi nem akarjuk gyermekeink jövőjét eladósítani, nem akarjuk, hogy az EU egy adósságközösséggé változzon. Nem a közös eladósodás jelenti a közös európai jövőt. Magyarország kész segíteni Ukrajna újjáépítését az ukránokkal kötött kétoldalú megállapodás alapján, a nemzeti költségvetésből biztosítani a ránk eső pénzt.

José Manuel Fernandes (PPE). – Senhora Presidente, caras e caros Colegas, não basta anunciar a solidariedade ou pregá-la. São necessárias ações concretas, que traduzam a solidariedade referida por Schuman, a solidariedade da verdade, a solidariedade que nós temos de concretizar.

E, por isso, aquilo que eu tenho aqui a referir é que nós praticámo-la com estas ações concretas e esta aprovação rápida, urgente, para possibilitarmos que a Ucrânia use 18 mil milhões de euros em termos de empréstimos cedidos pela União Europeia, pela garantia do orçamento.

Mas eu queria pedir ao Conselho para que não tenha dúvidas, para que não se aceite que líderes que estão no Conselho usem a Ucrânia, e por vezes até a enganem, quando aceitam a sua adesão como país candidato, e depois começam a dizer que não há as melhores condições ou não há condições para poder aceitá-la. Líderes que não têm o nome de líderes, e que deviam ter o nome de governantes, porque, no fundo, o que eles têm é medo de perder os fundos agrícolas e os fundos da coesão.

Para além disso, eu espero que não se use a chantagem da unanimidade em relação à Ucrânia para se ter ganhos noutros dossiês, como é o caso do dossiê *Rule of law*. Será inaceitável no Conselho que se utilize a regra da unanimidade que é necessária para se fazer chantagem noutros dossiês.

Mittwoch, 23. November 2022

PREDSEDÁ: MICHAL ŠIMEČKA

podpredseda

Bogusław Liberadzki (S&D). – Panie Przewodniczący! Panie Komisarzu! Panie Ministrze! Debatujemy o państwie, które jest kandydatem do Unii Europejskiej. Tak jak pan minister Bek był uprzejmy powiedzieć, debatujemy o państwie, które broni się, broni się nadzwyczaj dzielnie – i należy bardzo wyraźnie to podkreślić.

Mamy trzy obszary pomocy finansowej, o których musimy mówić. Pierwszy, to jest funkcjonowanie państwa. Przecież Ukraina musi zapewnić służbę zdrowia, musi zapewnić edukację, musi zapewnić funkcjonowanie podstawowego aparatu państwowego, a także musi zapewnić sprawność infrastruktury w powszechnym użytkowaniu. Drugi obszar to jest naprawa wyrządzonych szkód wojennych, zwłaszcza infrastruktury krytycznej. A potem będziemy rozmawiać o planie odbudowy.

Mamy następujący dylemat, moim zdaniem – mianowicie pytanie: co się da zrobić za 18 mld euro, to to zrobimy i koniec, i niewiele nas więcej interesuje albo – jeżeli chcemy wygrać tę wojnę wraz z Ukrainą – to jest pytanie: a może należy skumulować te środki, wesprzeć intensywniej po to, żeby wcześniej zakończyć? I mamy zatem strategię możliwą: rozkładać systematycznie półtora miliarda euro co miesiąc albo skumulować środki, pomóc Ukrainie, szybciej zakończyć tę wojnę. Pamiętajmy, że celem zasadniczym jest minimalizacja szkód, wyzwolenie Ukrainy, a nie kontrolowanie każdego euro.

Vlad Gheorghe (Renew). – Domnule președinte, când ajutăm Ucraina, de fapt ne ajutăm pe noi. Poate că din Olanda sau din Austria războiul pare ceva departe.

Poate că anumiți politicieni nu văd lucrurile așa cum sunt, că de fapt războiul este la granița noastră, la granița Europei Unite și nu există cetățean european care să nu simtă la buzunar urmările șantajului energetic al lui Putin sau care să nu fi simțit vreodată campaniile lui de fake news, fie că sunt cetățeni din Olanda sau Austria, fie că sunt cetățeni din România.

Doar să trecem iarna nu este de ajuns și nu poate să fie de ajuns. Rusia este un stat terorist. Tocmai am votat chestia asta. Nu mai putem permite excepții de la sancțiuni care ne pun în postura de a face business cu acest stat terorist. Nu mai putem avea guverne prietene sau care fac chiar lobby aici, în Parlamentul European, pentru un stat terorist.

Ajutorul dat Ucrainei și pe viitor reconstrucției acestei țări, candidate la aderare și care apără acum granițele Europei, trebuie să vină din banii oligarhilor și trebuie să vină din banii lui Putin.

Markéta Gregorová (Verts/ALE). – Mr President, dear colleagues, Minister, Commissioner, I welcome this proposal, and especially now that we are discussing – or we already discussed – Russia as a state sponsor of terrorism, and this package for Ukraine. We are being cyber-attacked by a pro-Russian hacker group – they already admitted it – so I think we do not really have to discuss here very thoroughly why we are doing it and why it is important that we continue our swift and efficient support to Ukraine.

But also I do have some concerns about this proposal and I would like to voice the criticism. Firstly, I think it would be really better to also support Ukraine in the form of some grants, not only loans. So we help them ultimately to alleviate the debt burden they have. Additionally, I also encourage the Commission to focus on internal structural reforms in Ukraine to their objectively capable extent.

And lastly, I urge the Commission to at least inform the European Parliament, the co-legislator, ahead of time, notably given the limited time to consider the proposal.

Kosma Złotowski (ECR). – Panie Przewodniczący! Szanowni Państwo! Ukraina potrzebuje naszego wsparcia z wielu powodów: jako sąsiad, ofiara agresji oraz partner, który powinien w najbliższej przyszłości stać się członkiem Unii Europejskiej. Rozpętana przez Rosję wojna generuje ogromne koszty ekonomiczne, które odczuwamy wszyscy. Ale to ofiara tej barbarzyńskiej agresji ponosi najwyższe straty.

Nie możemy dopuścić do tego, żeby plan Putina się powiódł, a u naszych granic pozostanie państwo zrujnowane gospodarczo i niestabilne politycznie. Powinniśmy nadal być arsenałem demokracji i pokoju, wspierając funkcjonowanie ukraińskich instytucji publicznych, które mierzą się z coraz większym kryzysem humanitarnym. Rosja z premedytacją niszczy i dewastuje infrastrukturę, szkoły czy szpitale, licząc, że kolejna fala uchodźców osłabi naszą determinację. Wsparcie finansowe dla Kijowa będzie najlepszym dowodem na to, że taki scenariusz nigdy nie stanie się realny.

Márton Gyöngyösi (NI). – Mr President, dear colleagues, Hungary is a neighbour of Ukraine, and while the battle front is far, we see thousands of refugees fleeing their country every day. Throughout its history, Hungarians experienced what it's like to be exposed to the aggression of mighty empires. For 150 years our ancestors defended Europe from the Ottoman Empire, determined to conquer Europe. Now it's Ukraine defending our civilisation from yet another aggressor.

Ukraine needs our support and solidarity. Hungarians understand this and stand by Ukraine. The Orbán regime, the representatives of which do not hold Russia to be a state sponsor of terrorism, as we found out from their voting attitude earlier today, like to speak on behalf of our nation. But they are not representative of our entire people. Our nation stands on the side of democracy and freedom, as in 1956, and as we ultimately won against the aggressor, so will Ukraine.

Andrius Kubilius (PPE). – Mr President, dear colleagues, we in the European Union need to understand we also are at the war, that is why we need to move from ad hoc decisions to systemic decisions. You cannot win the war without weapons and without war finances, properly and systemically established.

We are still not able to deliver finances what we promised at the beginning of this year and that is shameful for the European Union. In the EU we cannot finance war finance from the regular normal multiannual budget. We need special arrangements, including on EUR 18 billion for 2023.

Today it is important for to push for, first of all, a significant first disbursement in January. Second, to fix EUR 18 billion as our clear promise, not just 'up to EUR 18 billion'. Third, we need to ask the Commission to coordinate with international partners to cover the rest, as fiscal deficit of Ukraine for 2023 is 38 billion.

And the last point, on reconstruction, the EU has to establish its own resource similar to Next Generation 2.0 for Ukraine and to push for Russian assets confiscation to cover the increasing needs for Ukraine's recovery, which are approaching one trillion euros.

Catharina Rinzema (Renew). – Mr President, Commissioner, dear colleagues, let me start by saying that the brave Ukrainian men, women and children are the victims of this brutal war waged by President Putin. The number of people killed, the millions of women and children fleeing and the level of destruction in the country are devastating. As the cold winter season has now started, many are left in the cold, including many children. That is why it's important that we as the EU give this financial support to Ukraine. We must help rebuild Ukraine.

The Dutch Government proposed to see whether it can adopt the city of Kherson; how great it would be if every EU Member State adopted one city, town or region of Ukraine. Step by step, Europe would be rebuilding Ukraine. War has been raging for nine months now. I want to make one thing clear by quoting the first verse of the Ukrainian anthem: 'Ukraine has not yet perished, nor her glory, nor her freedom'. Nor will it perish, because our common values of freedom and democracy are stronger than any despicable act of aggression by Russia.

Ukraine, Europe is with you until this end of this war, and Europe will be with you once the war will be over.

Francesca Donato (NI). – Mr President, the EU has taken too many financial risks on Ukraine. That is what the European Court of Auditors has stated in its last report on European Union budget. In 2022 the Union has committed EUR 7.2 billion of loans to Ukraine. European borrowing operations funding this support involve serious risks: Ukraine's default first, fraud and misuse of money as the second.

Nobody knows how the war in Ukraine will end, and if in the future the country will be able to repay its long-term loans. The IMF predictions for Ukrainian economy are baleful. In case of default there is not enough room in the budget of EU to absorb losses if Member States refuse to step in. In such a case, massive cuts to all EU programmes will be unavoidable.

Nevertheless, the Commission now is proposing an MFA+ instrument to provide Ukraine for 2023 with up to EUR 18 billion in loans in 12 months. If the Commission wants to gamble, let us not forget that is handling taxpayers' money, and in case of losses, we all will be held accountable, not the Commission.

Angelika Winzig (PPE). – Sehr geehrter Herr Präsident, geschätzte Damen und Herren! Die russische Invasion in der Ukraine stellt eine Zäsur in der europäischen Geschichte dar und verursacht unvorstellbares menschliches Leid. Daher ist die Europäische Union gefordert, neue Lösungswege zu beschreiten.

Ich unterstütze daher den Vorschlag der Kommission, der Ukraine Darlehen in der Höhe von 18 Milliarden Euro zu gewähren. Ich möchte aber auf zwei Themen der Haushaltskontrolle eingehen.

Erstens: Die Idee der diversifizierten Finanzierungsstrategie ist sehr sinnvoll; allerdings fehlen dem Parlament noch Informationen zu Transparenz, Steuerung, Risikomanagement und Methodologie. Ein delegierter Rechtsakt würde eventuell hier Abhilfe schaffen.

Zweitens: Wer wird die Zinsbelastung nach 2027 tragen, falls Mitgliedstaaten nicht mehr zahlen können oder wollen?

Natürlich stimme ich für den Vorschlag der Kommission, aber ich bin überzeugt, intern haben wir noch einige Dinge zu klären.

Seán Kelly (PPE). – *A Uachtaráin*, despite recent victories in Kherson, Ukrainians are facing a bleak and bitterly cold winter. Russia is hammering Ukraine with missile fire, targeting critical infrastructure with one of its heaviest waves of attacks since Putin launched his brutal invasion nearly nine months ago.

We in the EU are providing financial, military and humanitarian support to Ukraine. But it is also Ukraine that is supporting us. We see the tremendous resilience and bravery of the Ukrainian people as they fight every day to defend our shared European values. It is for this reason that I welcome the Commission's proposal for an 18-billion-euro Ukraine support package for 2023.

It is essential that we streamline our financial assistance to Ukraine and ensure that we are providing the economic support needed in an effective and responsive manner. The next months and years are unpredictable and I welcome the flexibility this proposal provides. We must do everything we can to support Ukraine.

Slava Ukraini!

Eugen Tomac (PPE). – Domnule președinte, doamnă comisară, exact în această clipă observăm cum saitul Parlamentului European nu mai funcționează. La doar câteva ore după ce am votat această rezoluție prin care am declarat Rusia drept stat sponsor al terorismului.

Nu cred în coincidențe, sper să fie așa, însă este extrem de grav dacă nu înțelegem că ceea ce face Putin astăzi, dacă nu-l oprim la momentul potrivit și nu-i susținem până la capăt pe ucraineni, poate însemna o pierdere mult mai mare, mai târziu.

Acești oameni au omorât în ultimele luni cel puțin 22.000 de cetățeni la Mariupol, oraș cu peste jumătate de milion de cetățeni, unde au distrus totul în proporție de 95%. La această oră, când noi dezbatem în Parlament, Ucraina este atacată, toată infrastructura energetică este atacată.

Cred că nu avem nevoie de mai multe argumente pentru a merge până la capăt și pentru a-i susține și, evident, sprijini reconstrucția acestei țări afectate de un stat care susține terorismul.

Liudas Mažylis (PPE). – Gerbiamas Pirmininke, Komisijos nary, kolegos, Rusijai tęsiant agresyvų karą Ukrainoje, nebeliko abejojančių, kad Ukrainoje ilgai bus reikalinga didelė ir nuolatinė finansinė parama. Juolab, kad Rusijai ir toliau barbariškai ir kryptingai naikinant Ukrainos kritinę infrastruktūrą, dar net neprieiname prie šalies atstatymo klausimo, o tik prie bent jau minimalių gyvybinių poreikių palaikymo. Todėl manau, kad makrofinansinės paramos priemonė yra sveikintina, reikalinga. Tikiuosi, kad visi būtini žingsniai ne tik bus atlikti skubiai, o to dabar labiausiai reikia, bet bus rasta tęstinė struktūra stabiliai finansinei paramai užtikrinti. Žinoma, parama turėtų būti neatsiejama nuo skaidrumo vertinimo, kuris ne tik padėtų Ukrainai toliau stiprinti teisinę valstybę, gerą valdyseną, bet dar ir paskatintų prie paramos

prisidėti kuo daugiau tarptautinių partnerių. Turime išlaikyti savo vienybę ir nestabdyti paramos – tiek finansinės, tiek humanitarinės, nepamirštant ir karinės, nes tik taip galėsime pasipriešinti Rusijos vykdomam terorui.

Helmut Scholz (The Left). – Herr Präsident, Herr Kommissar, Ratsvorsitz! Die Ukraine wurde auf Befehl von Wladimir Putin in einen furchtbaren Krieg gezwungen. Die Zerstörungen sind katastrophal. Das Leid der Bevölkerung nimmt mit jedem Tag des beginnenden Winters zu. Eine politisch-diplomatische Lösung und Beendigung des Krieges ist nicht in Sicht.

Vor diesem Hintergrund ist es vollkommen klar, dass sich die Fraktion der Linken im Europäischen Parlament an die Seite der Bevölkerung stellt und sich nicht gegen die Bewilligung von 18 Milliarden Euro zur Unterstützung der Menschen wenden wird.

Warum ist das aber keine echte Hilfe, sondern eine Reihe von Darlehen, für die Zinsen anfallen, die sich zu einem gewaltigen, kaum rückzahlbaren Schuldenberg auftürmen werden? Und landet das Geld tatsächlich bei den Menschen, für die es gedacht ist?

In Friedenszeiten haben wir präzise Kriterien hinsichtlich der Gewährung von Makrofinanzhilfen formuliert. Meine Fraktion hat dabei immer ausdrücklich auf sozialen und demokratischen, rechtsstaatlichen Fortschritt einschließlich des Schutzes von Gewerkschaften und Arbeitsrechten gedrungen. Ist die Kommission nun willens, diese Prinzipien auch so zu stützen mit diesem neuen Package? Ist die regelmäßige parlamentarische Kontrolle dieser Maßstäbe gewährleistet?

Gerade mit der Perspektive des EU-Kandidatenstatus der Ukraine: Der Krieg darf nicht als Grund herhalten, weshalb die Regierung Selenskyj nun schon die gewerkschaftlichen Rechte und weitere Rechte von Beschäftigten und Unternehmen beschneidet, Journalismus darf nicht eingeschüchtert werden, und auch im Notstand muss weiter gelten, Oppositionsparteien nicht einfach zu verbieten. Erinnern Sie die Partner in Kiew daran!

Vystúpenia podľa postupu prihlásenia sa o slovo zdvihnutím ruky

Billy Kelleher (Renew). – *(start of speech off mic)* shrank by 35%. It is running a budget deficit of about 4 to 5 billion per month. So we do welcome this MFA+ to try and ensure that the very state and the functions of the state of Ukraine survive during this particular war. This particular fund will assist in keeping hospitals going, keeping the infrastructure going, paying basic salaries. But let us be very clear: Ukraine is on financial life support and we will need an awful lot more in the short and medium term to ensure that the state itself can function while it is fighting the war against Russia.

There is no doubt: we all want to see an outcome that is peaceful, that there is a settlement. But until such time as Russia withdraws from Ukrainian territory, accepts the integrity of Ukraine as a country, well then we will have a situation where the war will continue. And Europe has to support Ukraine in every way it can, both in terms of the immediate financial package that's here before us, but also into the medium term and the longer term with regard to construction.

We have to say confidently that we will stand with Ukraine for as long as it takes for Russia to withdraw and for us to rebuild Ukraine.

Clare Daly (The Left). – Mr President, billions in EU assistance going to Ukraine are not free; they are loans which Ukraine will default on, and they come with neoliberal strings attached. If you listen to the economists, Ukraine is marked for a nightmare round of shock therapy, a sell off of public land, deregulation of labour, sale of public assets, and on it goes. The country's future is being sold to finance a proxy war that's tearing it apart.

Of course, the loans have preconditions that Ukraine must uphold democracy and rule of law, but since the tap was turned on, Zelenskyy has banned most opposition parties, shut out the media, printed kill lists of dissidents, and attacked trade unions and workers' rights. Yet, the billions keep flowing. Our Court of Auditors has said that this is a country accused of grand corruption, and on it goes, while the EU policy seems designed to prevent peace and keep the war going at all costs, as long as ordinary people pay. Between Russian tanks and European banks, there will be little left of Ukraine when this is over. Don't forget: war is a racket, and there's going to be hell to pay for this one.

(Ukončenie vystúpení podľa postupu prihlásenia sa o slovo zdvihnutím ruky)

Virginijus Sinkevičius, *Member of the Commission*. – Mr President, Minister, honourable Members, let me first of all sincerely thank you once again for your support for Ukraine, for Parliament's solidarity and for the urgency and priority that Parliament has given to this file. I would also like to thank you for your interventions and comments, to which I have listened very carefully. I would like to reply just to a couple of questions which require a very clear answer.

One Member has asked whether we really want to send all this money to Ukraine. Our clear answer is 'yes'. Because, as many of you have said today, it's about solidarity, it's about humanity and about standing on the right side of history.

I also heard questions as to whether we know where all this money goes. Again, I can reply with a clear 'yes'. This money goes to the budget for immediate needs – pensions, salary, rebuilding critical infrastructure, which we have seen destroyed by Russian bombs, and actually it's being destroyed right now while we are discussing it. Ukrainians, they are left without water, electricity, heating, hospitals.

Finally, some of you have seen a risk and point to corruption and the need to scrutinise well the money spent. So let me stress again that we are ready to work with Ukraine on a memorandum of understanding to include areas for conditions to strengthen the rule of law and fight against corruption. We aim to sign this memorandum of understanding as soon as we get approval for our proposal by the European Parliament and Council.

Dear Members of the Parliament, once again thank you. Thank you for the overwhelming majority of Members who supported our proposal in today's debate. It's vital for our Ukrainian friends that the entire package goes through quickly, and we will of course keep this House duly informed about future developments.

Slava Ukraini!

Mikuláš Bek, *President-in-Office of the Council*. – Mr President, honourable Members, Commissioner, I wish to thank you for this very useful debate today. I have listened with interest to your arguments, and let me confess that in the Council we have heard several of the technical questions you presented as regards the legislative proposals on the table. But as many of you made clear in your interventions, what is at stake is far greater than changes in the way the Union will borrow for Ukraine from now on, or then how we guarantee the borrowing. It is about humanity, as Mr Tarczyński said.

I said earlier in my intervention that I trust this Parliament is ready to rise to the historic challenge before us. The Presidency will strive to ensure that the Council will also live up to its responsibilities. If you give a positive vote on the package tomorrow, we will do our utmost to green-light the legislative package at the Ecofin Council of 6 December. In this way, the legislation would apply as of 9 December, allowing to make the first disbursement to Ukraine at the beginning of January. Thank you very much once again for your attention.

Predsedajúci. – Rozprava sa skončila.

Hlasovanie sa uskutoční vo štvrtok [24.11.2022].

Písomné vyhlásenia (článok 171)

Joachim Stanisław Brudziński (ECR), *na piśmie*. – Ukraina, państwo bezpośrednio sąsiadujące z Unią Europejską, kraj kandydujący do przystąpienia do tej wspólnoty został zbrodniczo napadnięty przez Rosję. Działania zbrojne szybko przerodziły się w akty terroru, wymierzone w szczególności w ludność cywilną i krytyczną infrastrukturę Ukrainy. Od wielu już miesięcy Ukraina cierpi w sposób niewyobrażalny. Naszym moralnym obowiązkiem jest wspierać to państwo w każdy możliwy sposób. Polska niezmiennie i w pełni popiera działania pomocowe UE na rzecz Ukrainy realizowane w ramach instrumentów polityki zewnętrznej UE, w tym w formie pomocy makrofinansowej. Opowiadamy się za szybkim przyjęciem pakietu pożyczek makrofinansowych na 2023 r. Popieramy propozycję szerszego, strukturalnego instrumentu wsparcia finansowego dla Ukrainy na cały 2023 r. W miarę kontynuowania wojny jesteśmy przekonani, że niezbędne jest przewidywalne i stałe wsparcie UE. Z niepokojem odnotowujemy, że nie zostały wypełnione zobowiązania Rady Europejskiej dotyczące wypłaty 9 mld EUR w 2022 r. Uznajemy, że rozwiązaniem tej sytuacji będzie wypłata zwiększonej kwoty w styczniu 2023 r. To tylko kilka propozycji pomocy narodowi i państwu ukraińskiemu. Historia potwierdza, że warto słuchać Polski. Bardzo blisko nas giną ludzie, cywile, czekając na realne i przemyślane wsparcie. Dajmy im w realny sposób odczuć, że mogą liczyć na naszą pomoc.

Benoît Lutgen (PPE), *par écrit*. – L'aide macro-financière dont nous discutons aujourd'hui et un symbole de la solidarité indéfectible que nous témoignons à nos amis et futurs concitoyens ukrainiens. L'invasion barbare de la Russie détruit des infrastructures et des habitations. Elle a vu des atrocités innommables envers les populations civiles.

Mais elle a aussi des effets destructeurs sur la viabilité financière de l'État ukrainien: les recettes ont chuté et les dépenses explosé. Nous ne pouvons permettre la faillite de l'Ukraine. Nous donnons ainsi une aide de 18 milliards pour l'ensemble de l'année 2023, en parallèle avec le soutien accordé par nos alliés américains. Pour nos amis ukrainiens, ce soutien international donne une perspective leur permettant d'établir leur budget 2023 dans de meilleures conditions.

Enfin, les conditions accompagnant ce soutien , notamment en matière de lutte contre la corruption, de réforme judiciaire, ainsi que de respect de l'État de droit, de bonne gouvernance et de modernisation des institutions, permettront de garantir une bonne utilisation de ces montants malgré les circonstances difficiles de cette guerre atroce. Chers collègues, je vous invite à tous soutenir cette assistance macro-financière. Pour le peuple Ukrainien. Pour la paix de notre continent.

10. Ein Rahmen für die biologische Vielfalt für die Zeit nach 2020 und die COP 15 des VN-Übereinkommens über die biologische Vielfalt (Aussprache)

Predsedajúci. – Ďalším bodom programu je vyhlásenie Rady a Komisie o Globálnom rámci pre biodiverzitu po roku 2020 a Dohovore OSN o biologickej diverzite COP15 (2022/2959(RSP)).

Mikuláš Bek, *President-in-Office of the Council*. – Mr President, honourable Members, Commissioner, let me start by thanking you for this opportunity to discuss such an important topic ahead of a very crucial conference for the conservation and sustainable use of biodiversity for the next decade and beyond.

As you very well know, the race to protect the natural world and its biodiversity reaches a critical milestone this December. The upcoming COP in Montreal is extremely timely. We are now living in an age of extinction, with biodiversity loss ranked as one of the biggest threats facing humanity. The Intergovernmental Science-Policy Platform on Biodiversity and Ecosystem Services showed that, unless action is taken, around 1 million species are threatened with extinction.

We are thankful to the European Parliament for consistently supporting stronger measures for biodiversity protection. Biodiversity and climate change are inseparably linked and need to be addressed together. We must step up our efforts to limit global warming to below two degrees and mitigate climate change, as well as to develop strategies and set targets to halt biodiversity loss.

The Council expects the following at the upcoming COP15: the parties will adopt an ambitious and comprehensive framework, which is matched by the resources needed for its implementation; clear and measurable targets to address overexploitation, pollution, fragmentation and unsustainable agricultural practices; a plan that safeguards the rights of indigenous peoples and recognises their contributions as stewards of nature; finance for biodiversity, and the alignment of financial flows with nature to drive finances towards sustainable investment.

Just a month ago, the Council adopted conclusions setting the general political framework of the EU negotiating position. In these conclusions, the Council stressed the need to include in the global biodiversity framework: the effective conservation of at least 30% of global land and at least 30% of oceans; the restoration of 3 billion hectares of degraded land and freshwater ecosystems and 3 billion hectares of ocean ecosystems; the elimination of all illegal, unsustainable or unsafe harvest, trade and use of wild species; the halting of human induced extinctions of known threatened species; the harnessing of the full potential of nature-based solutions; the reduction of the levels and risk of pollution from all sources; the prevention of the introduction and establishment of all priority invasive alien species; the implementation of practices for the sustainable use of biodiversity, and the need to address land and sea use change negatively affecting biodiversity in all ecosystems.

As you can see, the list of actions is long and the task ahead challenging. Let me assure you about the Presidency's commitment and determination, together with the Commission and the Member States, to make COP15 a success.

Mittwoch, 23. November 2022

Virginijus Sinkevičius, *Member of the Commission*. – Mr President, Minister, honourable members, the UN biodiversity COP – COP 15 – is almost upon us. A successful COP, one that adopts an ambitious post-2020 global biodiversity framework, is a key priority for the Commission and for me personally. Protecting the health of people and the planet are central elements of the European Green Deal, and we must reverse the trend of biodiversity loss and we must do this urgently. One million species are at risk of extinction. We need nature for food security, disaster risk reduction, sustainable jobs, poverty, education and health. We need a framework that credibly addresses the biodiversity crisis. And let me remind you, we will never solve the climate crisis if we do not help nature, our best ally, offering us so many nature-based solutions.

The finishing line is approaching and a huge number of issues are still to be resolved. There are large divides on key issues. Last week in Sharm El Sheikh I had several meetings with ministers, including a high-level event organised by China and Canada. Many of the discussions at COP 27 were important stepping stones towards COP 15. They reaffirmed the importance of tackling the nature crisis. COP 27 confirmed loud and clear that there is no way to limit global warming to 1.5°C without taking action to protect and restore nature, including a first-ever mention in the cover text of tipping points and nature-based solutions.

As I'm sure you recall, we have several key priorities for the post-2020 global biodiversity framework. Let me start with targets to ensure sustainable use of biodiversity. We need strong targets to eradicate illegal, unsustainable and unsafe exploitation of species, targets to ensure that all areas under agriculture, forestry and fisheries are managed sustainably. Integrating biodiversity across policies and sector is a key priority for Europe. We also need ambitious targets to address the direct drivers of loss, not only for the sake of nature, but also for sustainable livelihoods and poverty eradication. This is because pollution is also a health issue. Invasive alien species threaten food security, and so on.

We need nature for so many different reasons. We need to restore 3 billion hectares of terrestrial and 3 billion hectares of marine ecosystems. This corresponds to roughly 30% of degraded terrestrial ecosystems and 10% of degraded marine ecosystems. This target is best expressed in hectares because parties have diverging views on how many areas are degraded. The 3 + 3 billion hectares may seem ambitious, but let us keep in mind that this target focuses on bringing areas under restoration and not about completed restoration.

We need to protect 30% of land and oceans – the 30 by 30 target. In our engagement with other parties, we should underline that protection goes well together with economic activities that don't jeopardise the conservation objectives. Moreover, the target can be achieved by establishing protected areas and other effective conservation measures if they offer the same level of protection. And these other measures can, for example, be land-managed by indigenous people. This creates flexibility for implementation.

Similarly, not all marine protected areas have to be no-take zones, or not all the time. Some fisheries activities are compatible with conservation objectives. When we implement this target, it will be crucial to respect and safeguard the rights of indigenous peoples and local communities. They are essential stewards of biodiversity. We are aware that some of them fear being expelled from their lands and indeed there have been terrible examples of this in the past. But the 30-by-30 target can and must be achieved while safeguarding the rights. In fact, we expect the 30-by-30 target to bring them significant benefits. Lastly, 30-by-30 target should focus not only on protecting a percentage of lands and oceans, but also on qualitative aspects. We must protect the areas most important for biodiversity and ecosystem services. We also need to ensure effective management and connectivity. We do not want paper parks.

But we also have other priorities which are equally important. We must ensure solid biodiversity outcomes by the middle of the century. That includes halting human-induced extinction, increasing ecological integrity and connectivity, and increasing the area of natural ecosystems by 20%. We need a significant reduction of our ecological footprint by 2030 to bring it within planetary boundaries by 2050. We want clear and operational provisions on financing of implementation. This is absolutely essential and without it, there will be simply no agreement.

We must align all financial flows with biodiversity objectives and eliminate or repurpose harmful subsidies. The ECB estimates that those subsidies are around USD 800 billion. For each dollar that we spend on biodiversity funding, we currently spend 8 dollars harming biodiversity. It will not be possible to achieve our goals when taking one step forward, we then take eight steps back. We need to mobilise resources from all sources. That starts with domestic sources and we need to involve the private sector. However, we also know that a significant increase of international public biodiversity financing will be needed. President von der Leyen has pledged a doubling of our international biodiversity funding to EUR 7 billion over the period of 2021-2027. This money is targeted primarily at the most vulnerable countries. Germany and France have pledged similar increases. And let me underline we need all EU Member States, as well as other public and private donors, to contribute.

In addition, we are fully committed to the third objective of the Convention on Biological Diversity on access and benefit-sharing. We constructively engage in the discussions on this matter and are ready to contribute to a positive solution. And we should not repeat the mistakes we found with the Aichi framework. The global biodiversity framework will only make a difference if it includes both a strong monitoring framework and much stronger mechanisms for review of implementation. And this should include a regular reviewing cycle. All parties should report national targets within one year from COP 15 as a basis for a global analysis of collective ambition. And this is kind of global gap report to see where the collective ambition stands. All parties should use the same headline indicators so we can measure collective progress.

National reports and scientific evidence would feed into a stocktake, and this would assess progress towards the global goals and targets based on an assessment of national reports and the relevant scientific evidence. And this stocktake should be followed by a transparent process during which parties indicate where they step up ambitions or implementations. This monitoring framework should be adopted at COP 15, together with the first set of indicators. We cannot postpone this if we want the parties to start reporting and it is not necessary to postpone this. There has been good progress on identifying the indicators. Of course, the work will continue towards COP 16, where additional indicators should be adopted.

Our policies will not succeed without sound science. The EU provides funding for a significant research programme on nature and nature-based solutions. We are also putting in place a global knowledge centre for biodiversity, a science service for all to be launched at COP 15. This knowledge centre aims to help developing countries to build capacity for monitoring and reporting and to make data collection easier.

The EU and Member States' preparations are in full swing. In October, the Council adopted conclusions setting out the key elements of our positions. The details are being finalised and I am really grateful to the Czech Presidency for the effective steering of our preparations.

Dear Members of the Parliament, I am also very happy that a sizeable delegation from the Parliament will join the EU delegation in Montreal because your support will be very welcome, and I look forward to meeting you there and to staying in close touch with you during the negotiations. Thank you for your attention.

Stanislav Polčák, *za skupinu PPE.* – Pane předsedající, vážený pane ministře, vážený pane komisaři, náš osud je neoddělitelně spjat s osudem zbytku přírody. Mezivládní vědecký panel pro biologickou rozmanitost a ekosystémové služby již v roce 2019 varoval, že ztráta přírody se zrychluje bezprecedentním tempem s vážnými dopady na kvalitu života na Zemi a že milion druhů čelí vyhynutí. Proto je mimořádně důležité, aby se nadcházející jednání uskutečnilo a aby proběhlo úspěšně. Jeho cílem je mimo jiné přijmout nový plán na záchranu života na Zemi. A tento nejnovější plán obsahuje čtyři dlouhodobé cíle pro rok 2050 a 22 cílů již pro rok 2030. Ty čtyři cíle se zaměřují na ochranu, udržitelné využívání biodiverzity a také rozšiřování např. chráněných oblastí, snižování znečištění a také i zajištění udržitelné produkce potravin a postupné zrušení veřejných dotací v řádu miliard dolarů v případech, kdy poškozují přírodu.

Někteří rovněž navrhují, aby byla vrcholovým cílem stanovena otázka udržení 1,5° C podle Pařížské dohody. Tento cíl já považuji za jeden z těch možných, ale myslím si, že by mohl být doplněn o např. posouzení celkového stavu biologické rozmanitosti anebo globální míry vymírání, tzn. stanovit si i další cíle. Jedním z dalších témat, kterým by se měli vyjednavači na COP 15 věnovat, je také digitální ukládání informací o genetických sekvencích. A předmětem jednání by měla být rovněž mobilizace zdrojů, jinými slovy, jak financovat aktivity spojené s implementací globálního rámce. Egyptské neporozumění mezi klíčovými zeměmi by se nemělo opakovat. Doufám, že COP bude úspěšný.

Mittwoch, 23. November 2022

César Luena, *en nombre del Grupo S&D*. – Señor presidente, ministro Bek, comisario Sinkevičius, a mí me gusta siempre aclarar que no solo vivimos una crisis climática, sino que también vivimos una crisis de biodiversidad, es decir, de extinciones, de desaparición de especies. El planeta se calienta, pero no solo; además, las especies desaparecen.

Me ha gustado escuchar al comisario Sinkevičius en su intervención. Porque le iba a hacer una pregunta, pero en parte la ha respondido. ¿Para qué vamos a Montreal? ¿Para que vamos dentro de dos o tres semanas a Montreal? Y es verdad, vamos porque queremos conseguir un acuerdo que sea dos cosas a la vez: vinculante y ambicioso. Con objetivos de recuperación de protección de al menos el 30 % para 2030, que también incluya metas concretas, indicadores, plazos para que podamos cumplir. Por tanto, debemos liderar en la Conferencia un acuerdo global vinculante para la biodiversidad.

En relación con este tema me voy a referir rápidamente a la ley de restauración de la naturaleza: a la vez debemos conservar y restaurar, para 2030, al menos el 30 % de la tierra, de los océanos, de los ecosistemas. Por tanto, señorías —para los que estamos aquí esta tarde—, este Parlamento tiene que ayudar, no tiene que entorpecer. Así que dicho queda, porque es un Reglamento muy importante.

Y unas últimas palabras para el fundamento de todo —como decía el marqués de la Ensenada, «el fundamento de todo es el dinero», y es verdad—. Me gusta escuchar aquí a la Comisión Europea, también al ministro Bek, pero sobre todo a la Comisión Europea, hablar de financiación, porque necesitamos un mecanismo concreto de financiación para proteger y para conservar la biodiversidad.

Por tanto, creo que, si queremos asegurar unos niveles ambiciosos de restauración de la naturaleza, necesitamos financiación. Por tanto, señorías, ambición, un acuerdo global y financiación.

María Soraya Rodríguez Ramos, *en nombre del Grupo Renew*. – Señor presidente, señor comisario, tras la decepcionante cumbre de la COP27, ahora la mirada está puesta en esta COP15. Esperemos que nos salga un poco mejor. Creo que nos podemos encontrar ante un momento histórico si convertimos esta cumbre en el «París» para la naturaleza.

Y la razón es clara. La crisis de la biodiversidad es una emergencia planetaria. Y ninguno de los objetivos de la Cumbre de París, sobre el calentamiento del planeta, puede ser conseguido si no somos capaces de restaurar nuestros sumideros naturales.

Ya se ha dicho, un millón de especies se enfrentan a la extinción. Están en riesgo de extinción. Más del 40 % de la población ya, ahora, se está viendo afectada en su salud, en su desarrollo económico, en su alimentación, por el deterioro del planeta. Y tenemos, por lo tanto, que actuar con ambición. 2030: protección del 30 % de nuestro territorio.

Pero, para ello, usted lo ha dicho, tenemos que tener un seguimiento claro, una evaluación eficaz, un monitoreo exigente, y tenemos que movilizar recursos. Todas las fuentes de recursos. Pero, por favor, tenemos que eliminar los incentivos perjudiciales para la biodiversidad, reduciéndolos, al menos, en 500 000 millones anuales.

Espero verle en la cumbre y creo que la presentación de la ley de restauración de la naturaleza es una buena carta de presentación de la Unión Europea en esta cumbre.

Jutta Paulus, *im Namen der Verts/ALE-Fraktion*. – Herr Präsident, Herr Kommissar, meine Damen und Herren! 69 %: Um 69 % sind die Populationen wild lebender Vögel, Fische, Amphibien und Reptilien weltweit in den letzten 50 Jahren zurückgegangen. Diese Zahlen sind dramatisch, und das Artensterben ist noch bedrohlicher als die Klimakrise, denn die Biodiversität auf unserem Planeten sichert uns trinkbares Wasser, saubere Luft und fruchtbare Böden.

Die anstehende Weltbiodiversitätskonferenz muss einen Wendepunkt markieren. So wie das Pariser Abkommen 2015 endlich die Notwendigkeit des globalen Klimaschutzes festgeschrieben hat, brauchen wir ein Montrealer Abkommen für den Schutz der biologischen Vielfalt.

Die wichtigste Ursache für das Artensterben ist aber der Verlust von Lebensräumen. Es gilt nicht nur, Schutzgebiete einzurichten, es gilt nicht nur, zu renaturieren, sondern wir müssen die Hauptursache angehen: die Umwandlung von Feuchtgebieten, von Urwäldern, von Grasland in Ackerland, um den stetig wachsenden Fleischkonsum zu füttern.

Herr Sinkevičius, Herr Minister Bek, werden Sie sich nicht nur für Maßnahmen zum Schutz von mindestens 30 % der Land- und Meeresfläche einsetzen, sondern auch für die Regulierung von Tätigkeiten, die den Verlust der biologischen Vielfalt weiter befeuern?

Aurélia Beigneux, *au nom du groupe ID*. – Monsieur le Président, après l'échec de la COP 27 sur le climat, principalement lié aux demandes exorbitantes et hors-sol de l'Union européenne, les grands dirigeants se retrouveront au Canada pour la COP 15 sur la biodiversité. Alors que les gouvernants nous rabâchent les efforts nécessaires pour freiner la détérioration rapide de notre biodiversité, on apprend qu'une grande partie des chefs d'État ne sera pas présente à Montréal. La protection de notre environnement s'arrête donc aux querelles géopolitiques. Mais ne nous inquiétons pas, car les lobbies, eux, seront bien présents, comme Greenpeace par exemple, financé par le lobby des éoliennes, dont on connaît pourtant l'absence d'efficacité et les répercussions sur notre environnement.

L'Union européenne considère que nos citoyens doivent porter seuls le fardeau du changement climatique. Outre-Atlantique, les puissances américaines font primer leurs économies, tandis que la Chine et la Russie ont clairement d'autres priorités. Rajoutons à cela un refus absolu de remettre en cause les néfastes traités de libre-échange et les dogmes de la mondialisation. Comme pour la COP 27, les millions investis pour cette conférence auraient été beaucoup plus utiles aux professionnels sur notre territoire.

Alexandr Vondra, *za skupinu ECR*. – Pane předsedající, dámy a pánové, COP 15 v Montrealu je důležité jednání. Všichni chceme chránit přírodu a biodiverzitu. Všem nám leží na srdci budoucnost pralesů, čistota vod a ochrana půdy. Planeta je jenom jedna a svět musí v této věci spolupracovat a Evropa má jít příkladem. Ale varuji Evropskou unii, aby neopakovala chybu, které se dopustila na COP 27. Prosím, nereprezentujme navenek jako závazné cíle ty, které nemáme doma ještě vůbec schválené. Mnohé oblasti, např. využívání půdy nebo územní plánování, jsou stále ve výlučné kompetenci členských států. Stejné je to i s jejich financováním. Evropská komise zatím předložila pouze návrh, pouze plán a nic víc. Přijímání jakýchkoli závazků jménem Evropské unie je proto předčasné, v tomto smyslu nerozumné a právně i nepřijatelné.

Silvia Modig, *The Left -ryhmän puolesta*. – Arvoisa puhemies, luonnon monimuotoisuus on paitsi itseisarvo myös välttämätön elementti, jotta selviämme ilmastonmuutoksen edetessä. Mitä vahvempi luonnon monimuotoisuus on, sitä parempi on planeettamme sopeutumiskyky väistämättä edessä olevan lämpenemisen edessä. Käynnissä on kuudes sukupuuttoaalto ja lajeja menetetään nyt ennennäkemättömän nopeasti. Sillä on negatiivinen vaikutus niin ruoantuotantoon kuin ihmisten terveyteen. Suunnanmuutos on siis välttämätön.

EU:lla oli tavoite lopettaa luontokato vuoteen 2020 mennessä. Epäonnistuimme täysin. Lajikato vain kiihtyy. Onkin aika hyväksyä, että vapaaehtoiset toimet eivät riitä, vaan me tarvitsemme sitovia ja mitattavia tavoitteita. On täysin välttämätöntä, että me saamme aikaan sitovan kansainvälisen sopimuksen lopettaa biodiversiteetin heikkeneminen Pariisin sopimuksen hengessä.

Hyvät kollegat, me käymme nyt kilpajuoksua aikaa vastaan. Maailman on vihdoin herättävä siihen, että luontokato on samanlainen kriisi ja hätätila kuin mitä ilmaston lämpeneminen meille on.

Pierre Karleskind (Renew). – Monsieur le Président, Monsieur le Ministre, Monsieur le Commissaire, nous sommes donc maintenant rentrés dans ce qu'il est convenu d'appeler la sixième extinction massive d'espèces sur Terre. La cinquième, la précédente, c'est celle qui a conduit à l'extinction des dinosaures.

Pendant plusieurs années, la crise du changement climatique a couvert – si je puis m'exprimer ainsi – la prise de conscience de la crise de biodiversité qui est en cours. Au fond, d'ailleurs, ces deux crises sont liées, vous l'avez rappelé, Monsieur le Commissaire. Ces deux crises, celle du changement climatique et celle de la biodiversité, s'autoalimentent, s'alimentent entre elles. Autant sur le changement climatique, j'allais dire que ce n'est pas compliqué. Quand on voit les difficultés que nous avons à avancer, en fait, c'est compliqué. Mais au fond, on connaît bien les causes, on connaît bien les conséquences. Nous pouvons agir sur la biodiversité. C'est très compliqué et cela nécessite que nous nous mobilisions d'autant plus.

Il y a quelques années, à l'invitation de la Commission européenne, j'avais participé à une conférence qui s'appelait HOPE. J'aime bien le rappeler parce qu'elle dit tout: «Healthy Oceans – Productive Ecosystems». Eh bien, je me dis qu'en pensant de cette façon, en nous mettant dans une situation gagnant-gagnant, en comprenant que le développement de nos activités, le développement de l'humanité peut et doit se faire dans un environnement sain, nous comprenons que nous sommes dans une situation où il faut avancer sur cette question de la biodiversité.

Vous l'avez rappelé, Monsieur le Commissaire, il convient aussi de nous assurer que les populations autochtones, qui seront les premières à gagner si nous faisons des efforts, doivent être incluses. C'est la convention d'Aarhus à laquelle nous sommes attachés. Nous avons fait, à travers M[me] von der Leyen, le pari justement que l'Union européenne serait le territoire du monde le plus en avance sur ce sujet-là. Eh bien, Monsieur le Commissaire, nous comptons sur vous à Montréal pour porter ce message et nous avons pleine confiance en vous.

Bas Eickhout (Verts/ALE). – Mr President, thank you to all my colleagues, to the Commissioner and to the Minister for all these warm words about the importance of biodiversity and protection of our biodiversity. But people, colleagues, we are not here only in words, we really need to act on it. There it quite often goes wrong, to be very honest. For example, we need to make sure we have our House in order on the protection of biodiversity and to halt the loss of biodiversity, which we promised for 2010, which we promised for 2020, and which we are probably now promising for 2030. We are still losing biodiversity on a daily basis. That's what is at stake at this COP.

We should also learn then from what happened in Sharm El Sheikh. You said that you were there, so you also know that the only way for success if it's Europe not only pushing for ambition, but also reaching out to the hand of developing countries, because they are suffering the most, most of the time from Western companies encroaching on their biodiversity.

We need to make sure that we are not only helping them financially, but that we are also making sure that there is a fair mechanism for the sharing of the benefits of digital sequence information. These are the things that need to be tackled, and I maybe also look at the Council. The good words are there, but really, if I look at the mandate of the Council, it needs to be improved. Don't do it on the last day, as you did in Sharm El Sheikh.

Sylvia Limmer (ID). – Herr Präsident! Es ist schon erstaunlich: Man predigt Biodiversität, beschimpft Landwirte wegen angeblicher Umweltverschmutzungen und will Schutzgebiete ausweiten, die am Ende keinen Pfifferling wert sind, weil man fröhlich eine „grüne" Wende mit massenhaftem Zubau von Windenergie propagiert, auch in den Schutzgebieten.

Gerade erst hat die Kommission eine Dringlichkeitsverordnung vorgeschlagen, die den Umweltschutz samt Vogelschutz-Richtlinie vollends aussetzt, wenn es um die „Erneuerbaren" geht. Bodenversiegelung mit Tausenden Tonnen Stahlbeton ist dann plötzlich kein Thema mehr. Für einen einzigen läppischen Vogel- und Insektenschredder werden 0,5 Hektar vollversiegelt. Macht allein in Deutschland 15 000 Hektar mit Betonpfeilern, die mehr als 60 Meter tief reichen – Tendenz steigend. Im Reinhardswald müssen 195 Jahre alte Bäume Windrädern weichen.

Ihr Möchtegern-Biodiversitätsschutz ist nicht nur verlogen, sondern findet in einem kollektiven Anfall von Klima-Schizophrenie schlicht nicht statt.

Krzysztof Jurgiel (ECR). – Panie Przewodniczący! Panie Komisarzu! Ochrona różnorodności biologicznej jest konieczna dla zapewnienia możliwości życia ludzi na Ziemi, dla zapewnienia bezpieczeństwa żywnościowego. Szereg działań Unii Europejskiej w tym zakresie budzi niepokój, ponieważ brak jest jasno wypracowanych definicji. W unijnych dokumentach brakuje informacji o źródłach finansowania tych ambitnych planów, jak również analiz społeczno-ekonomicznych skutków proponowanych zmian. Największe wyzwania ochrona bioróżnorodności stawia przed sektorem rolnym i obszarami wiejskimi. Występują na nich liczne zależności międzysektorowe.

Apeluję zatem do wszystkich stron grudniowej konferencji w Montrealu, aby przyjmowane rozwiązania miały na uwadze stabilność ekonomiczną naszych gospodarstw rolnych, aby nie prowadziły do obniżania konkurencyjności europejskiego rolnictwa na zewnątrz, ale przeciwnie, aby zwiększały ambicje i standardy przede wszystkim w państwach trzecich, które obecnie mają nad naszymi rolnikami nieuczciwą przewagę konkurencyjną.

Luke Ming Flanagan (The Left). – Mr President, in the new CAP Strategic Plan Regulation, the production of public goods is now recognised as an agricultural activity. Now you can get paid for producing not just meat, dairy, grains and greens, but also butterflies, bees, bugs, clean water and carbon sequestration. When it comes to funding for biodiversity, CAP offers many opportunities. But are they being taken? I don't think they are, because the old idea still persists that producing bugs, butterflies, doing something for carbon sequestration isn't real and producing beef is real.

In Ireland's CAP Strategic Plan, we proved that even though you don't have to have a stocking rate, our country is insisting that you do. The reason why is that they still don't believe it's as important to produce biodiversity as it is to produce meat.

Grace O'Sullivan (Verts/ALE). – Mr President, colleagues, in Irish mythology, the wild Irish salmon was an ancient symbol of knowledge and wisdom. Unfortunately, its wisdom has not been enough to save it from people. Latest figures show Irish Atlantic salmon populations are in dire condition due to overfishing, ocean warming and the destruction of our rivers. The stark reality is that we have lost 70% of all wildlife since 1970. So since my childhood, we are witnessing a complete ecological breakdown.

So it's high time to act. We need urgent leadership at the COP15 Conference in Montreal in December. We need a global ocean treaty; marine protected areas to cover a third of the world's seas, and an ambitious restoration law backed by all EU governments. This is our last chance. Otherwise, in a few years from now, many creatures, such as the wild Irish salmon, will be nothing but the stuff of legend.

Marie Toussaint (Verts/ALE). – Monsieur le Président, Monsieur le Commissaire, chers collègues, un million d'espèces à risque de disparition, 70 % des animaux sauvages déjà disparus depuis 1970. Il faut comprendre que nous ne faisons qu'un avec le vivant et que le détruire, c'est aussi nous détruire nous-mêmes. Dès lors, il est effectivement impératif que nous ratifiions enfin un accord sur la biodiversité.

Mais je veux attirer l'attention sur deux points. D'abord, on n'a jamais protégé la nature en bafouant les droits humains. L'histoire européenne est jalonnée de pillages et d'asservissement des peuples, qui ont parfois pris hypocritement comme prétexte la protection de la nature. Cela ne doit plus jamais se reproduire. Ensuite, il y a urgence à protéger le vivant de l'accaparement, de la financiarisation et donc, in fine, de la destruction. Or, les termes de *nature-based solutions*, de solutions fondées sur la nature, sont aujourd'hui utilisés afin même de poursuivre cette logique d'accaparement et de maintenir ouverte la possibilité de détruire, à travers un marché de titrisation. Nous devons résister à ces logiques libérales.

Protéger la nature, c'est d'abord reconnaître ses droits et les devoirs qui sont les nôtres à son égard. Prenons donc enfin ce chemin.

João Albuquerque (S&D). – Senhor Presidente, como afirmou António Guterres, Secretário-Geral das Nações Unidas, o mundo está numa autoestrada em direção ao inferno climático e com o pé bem a fundo no acelerador.

Apesar dos inúmeros esforços em curso, a biodiversidade continua em declínio global, com o incumprimento de vários objetivos definidos no Plano Estratégico para a Biodiversidade 2010-2020, e é mais do que certo que o cenário será de agravamento desta situação nos próximos anos. O tempo é cada vez mais curto e os olhos estarão, uma vez mais, colocados nos decisores políticos em dezembro em Montreal na próxima COP15.

À semelhança do que conseguimos alcançar, à tangente, na COP27, é fundamental que sejamos audazes e asseguremos a proteção efetiva das terras e dos oceanos, onde espero que o Brasil, com Lula da Silva, possa voltar a ser um parceiro essencial para a preservação da Amazónia. Um uso sustentável dos recursos e uma partilha equitativa dos benefícios e dos custos, sendo para isso essencial envolver as comunidades de primeira linha, que dependem de e estão em sintonia com os seus ecossistemas, bem como aceitar as suas exigências e preocupações. Ir além da proteção dos ecossistemas e avançar também na sua restauração, cumprindo a meta dois do acordo preliminar existente e, por fim, assegurar a adoção de um acordo de ação.

A COP15 tem de servir para concluir as negociações em curso e adotar um novo quadro inclusivo pós-2020. A Humanidade não compreenderia se falhássemos esses objetivos e é por ela que nos devemos bater.

Anna Deparnay-Grunenberg (Verts/ALE). – Mr President, dear colleagues, we are facing a serious problem. At the climate COP 27, the global community failed to make concrete steps to stay within the 1.5 degree pathway. Allowing the climate crisis and the biodiversity loss to continue is not an option. Allowing the climate crisis and biodiversity loss to go further and further is not a solution. Insurance to compensate loss and damages were an important first step at the COP, but it will not be sufficient.

Speaking of insurance, saving biodiversity is our best insurance to combat climate change. The greater the biodiversity of our ecosystems, the more options for adaptation are left for our future. In the EU, we already practice ecological forestry methods in only one third of our forests. We must transform our entire forest management towards more biodiversity.

Commissioner Sinkevičius, Minister Bek, will you ensure that the EU pushes for the best possible result at the COP15 and at the same time take serious steps for sustainable ecological forestry at home? Let's keep the birds in forests singing today and tomorrow.

Vystúpenia podľa postupu prihlásenia sa o slovo zdvihnutím ruky

Sara Cerdas (S&D). – Senhor Presidente, a emergência climática não pode ser separada da crise da biodiversidade, em que verificamos a degradação de ecossistemas e a extinção acelerada das espécies.

Para uma cimeira que tem sido continuamente adiada é a hora de a comunidade internacional demonstrar compromisso com o nosso planeta e a sua proteção, ao contrário da COP27, que ficou além do que era necessário.

Precisamos, assim, de um acordo que seja vinculativo contra a degradação e a favor da restauração, reconhecendo o valor de áreas de intensa biodiversidade, como são na União Europeia as regiões ultraperiféricas e cuja biodiversidade se liga a setores como o turismo, a agricultura e as pescas, entre outros.

Daí a importância em garantirmos uma estratégia e financiamento que promova o desenvolvimento sustentável destas regiões e o reconhecimento de um dos seus maiores ativos: a biodiversidade.

Mick Wallace (The Left). – Mr President, at COP15 in Montreal we will hopefully come up with a global agreement to effectively protect at least 30% of global land and oceans. Some people find this a bit too much. How can we ever allow nature to thrive in 30% of the planet? Well, there's a simple answer: it's called de-growth.

Economic growth contributes to biodiversity loss, but doesn't necessarily contribute to our well-being. If we got smart about it, we'd be able to drastically reduce resource use and lift a massive amount of pressure off the planet. De-growth is nothing to be scared of unless you're a billionaire capitalist engaged in an economic activity that has no social benefit. It's about de-scaling unnecessary production and consumption in a way that actually increases our well-being and enhances ecological conditions. In such an unequal world, surely this is something that we should all want.

Capitalism is based on perpetual growth, and capitalism has done untold damage to the planet. How long more before we realise that we cannot fix the climate crisis with capitalism?

(Ukončenie vystúpení podľa postupu prihlásenia sa o slovo zdvihnutím ruky)

Virginijus Sinkevičius, *Member of the Commission*. – Mr President, Minister, honourable Members, thank you very much for this rich debate and for your comments and interventions, of which I took good note, and thank you very much for your great support. Let me come back just to a couple of points that some of you raised.

First of all, of course, resource mobilisation. Yes, this will be a key point in the negotiations. The package must cover the means of implementation in the broad sense. We need to scale up financing from all sources, and in particular domestic finances. We also need to remove, redirect or repurpose environmentally harmful subsidies and incentives, and we need to increase positive incentives and align all financial flows with biodiversity objectives.

We want clear and operational provisions on mobilising resources from all sources. Without this, the framework would be a dead letter. Because I have also heard some of you drawing parallels to what have happened in Sharm el-Sheikh, let me also mention that without any significant increase in official development assistance, it will be very difficult, if not impossible, to strike an ambitious deal. Combined efforts by EU Member States, as well as from a wider range of donors, will be necessary to achieve full impact.

At COP11, the parties agreed on doubling biodiversity-related international financial resource flows to developing countries. The EU has delivered on this commitment, and the Commission will double again its financing over the period 2021-2027. France and Germany also made significant pledges. We are pushing other donors to come up with similar increases.

We will need a very practical and pragmatic conversation if we want to identify solutions that can work for all. The EU and Member States certainly want to avoid to agree on a pledge that at the end of the day cannot be delivered. We should avoid a situation, as for climate, where perceived lack of financing becomes a political stumbling block for full implementation.

Last, Ms Paulus, let me say that based on assessment by the IUCN, we have a clear list of species that are at risk of extinction. We need urgent action by 2030 to save these species. However, the vast majority of species is unknown to us, and yet the IPPS global assessment in 2019 estimated that one million species is at risk of extinction. The 2050 goal should be to save all the species, bringing the rate of extinction back to the natural background level.

Dear colleagues, Members of the Parliament, let me use very clear words. Our biodiversity life on Earth is in danger. We are part of that biodiversity. We too are in danger. So we must stop biodiversity loss and restore nature. Therefore, our key priority is a successful COP. The negotiations in Montreal are our chance to adopt a framework that credibly addresses biodiversity crisis.

Mikuláš Bek, *President-in-Office of the Council*. – Mr President, honourable Members, Commissioner, I would like to thank all Members for their interventions. They confirm the strong and continued interest of this Assembly in the protection of biodiversity and the desire for the EU to play a leading role at the UN Biodiversity Conference.

The Council adopted its conclusions on 24 October. We are now working on fine-tuning our positions on the issues on the agenda of the conference, with the aim to provide the negotiators with a solid, but at the same time flexible mandate. Please allow me to conclude by reaffirming the Presidency's commitment to do its utmost to defend the EU's ambitions in Canada to adopt an ambitious, comprehensive and transformative post-2020 global biodiversity framework that includes the long-term 2050 goals, 2030 intermediate outcomes and action-oriented 2030 targets, to effectively and simultaneously address the direct and indirect drivers of biodiversity loss.

Predsedajúci. – Rozprava sa skončila.

Písomné vyhlásenia (článok 171)

Rovana Plumb (S&D), *în scris*. – Consider că a 15-a Conferință a Organizației Națiunilor Unite privind biodiversitatea va fi o conferință menită să schimbe paradigma. Liderii lumii se vor reuni pentru a conveni asupra protecției la nivel mondial a biodiversității noastre.

PE a solicitat adoptarea unui cadru global post-2020 pentru biodiversitate ambițios, cuprinzător și transformator, care să includă obiective pe termen lung pentru 2050, rezultate intermediare și obiective orientate spre acțiune pentru 2030, care să combată cu eficiență și în mod simultan, atât factorii direcți, cât și pe cei indirecți ai declinului biodiversității. Acest cadru global trebuie finanțat.

De aceea consider imperios necesar și susțin alocarea a 10 % din fondurile europene pentru conservarea naturii. Susțin crearea unei coaliții a părților interesate, atât din sectorul privat, cât și din cel public, pentru a realiza cadrul global pentru biodiversitate post-2020. În acest sens, subliniez utilitatea „Agendei soluțiilor" dezvoltate în cadrul Acordului de la Paris pentru elaborarea unei agende pozitive destinate tuturor părților interesate care prezintă interes pentru Convenția-cadru a Națiunilor Unite asupra schimbărilor climatice și solicit includerea unor acțiuni similare în cadrul post-2020 pentru biodiversitate.

Nacho Sánchez Amor (S&D), *por escrito*. – El último informe de la plataforma IPBES advierte que la biodiversidad está disminuyendo a un ritmo sin precedentes a nivel mundial, y la tasa de extinción de especies se está acelerando, así como de las probabilidades de graves impactos en las personas de todo el mundo.

En ese marco, el acuerdo global por la naturaleza que se adopte en la COP15 del Convenio sobre la Diversidad Biológica en Montreal es la oportunidad que tenemos de cambiar el rumbo para conseguir un futuro justo y equitativo y unos ecosistemas sanos y resilientes.

Por ello, pedimos que ese marco global para la biodiversidad sea vinculante, como lo es el Acuerdo de París, con metas e indicadores específicos, con plazos de cumplimiento, con un mecanismo de implementación sólido y un mecanismo de revisión, y con objetivos vinculantes mundiales de recuperación y protección de al menos el 30 % de nuestras tierras y océanos para 2030.

A su vez, consideramos que la ambición del acuerdo debe ir acompañada de financiación suficiente para su implementación, por lo que pedimos que la restauración de los ecosistemas degradados y la protección de la biodiversidad cuenten con el suficiente respaldo presupuestario.

11. Rechtlicher Schutz für Regenbogenfamilien, die ihr Recht auf Freizügigkeit ausüben, insbesondere der Fall von Baby Sara (Aussprache)

Predsedajúci. – Ďalším bodom programu je rozprava o otázke na ústne zodpovedanie pre Komisiu o Právnej ochrane dúhových rodín uplatňujúcich právo na voľný pohyb, najmä prípad malej Sáry, ktorú predkladajú Marc Angel, Terry Reintke, Pierre Karleskind, Malin Björk, Maria Walsh, Fabio Massimo Castaldo, Matjaž Nemec, Olivier Chastel, Diana Riba i Giner, Gabriele Bischoff, Tilly Metz, Irène Tolleret, Dietmar Köster, Frances Fitzgerald, Karen Melchior, Sophia in 't Veld, Marianne Vind, Karima Delli, Hilde Vautmans, Magdalena Adamowicz, Sylwia Spurek, Francisco Guerreiro, Karin Karlsbro, Vera Tax, Sandro Gozi, Malte Gallée, René Repasi, Robert Biedroń, Radka Maxová, Giuliano Pisapia, Aurore Lalucq, Marisa Matias, José Gusmão, Anna Deparnay-Grunenberg, Rosa D'Amato, Andreas Schieder, Catharina Rinzema, Chris MacManus, Alice Kuhnke, Saskia Bricmont, Silvia Modig, Sirpa Pietikäinen, Michal Šimečka a Grace O'Sullivan (O-000045/2022 – B9-0031/22) (2022/2954(RSP)).

Marc Angel, *author*. – Mr President, first the Coman-Hamilton case in 2019, and now the Baby Sara case. How many European Court of Justice cases do we need to guarantee the mutual recognition of administrative documents and parenthood between Member States? How many court decisions will be needed for children's rights to be respected in Europe?

This is not merely another LGBTIQ question, but concerns the rights of children and European citizens, which are openly flouted by some of our governments. And despite the adversarial stance of these nationalist and populist governments, the reaction of the European Commission, which is responsible for protecting the core values of the EU, has been rather weak.

'Human rights apply to all EU citizens in all their diversity', this is, in short, the tenet that the Commission has promised to defend since the beginning of this mandate. These words must be translated into legislative texts and into sanctions against those who choose to undermine them.

And when I see the relentless fight of rainbow families for the respect of their rights, I am both inspired and I am mad. Inspired for the fortitude for these families who persevere through their struggle, even though their struggle often looks like a battle between David and Goliath. And mad because our institutions do not adequately support them in the fight for their rights.

When I entered politics, I made a pledge to myself: I will always stand by the most vulnerable groups, no matter how much time and energy I will have to expend for their causes. In this battle, you can count on me. I'm happy to see that, as a co-chair of the LGBTI Intergroup, but also as an S&D member of this House, I am not alone. I can count on the Queer community, but also on our allies in the Parliament and beyond.

Here are my questions: is the Commission ready to use legal tools to ensure enforcement of free movement law? What actions will the Commission take to ensure that a national measure does not preclude implementation of judgments and to make sure EU law is not violated?

Dear Council and Commission, on which side of the fight do you want to be? Recognising diverse families benefits everyone, and it takes no one's existing rights away. Europe must guarantee all children to see their family acknowledged and validated by law. By the way, baby Sara is not a baby any more – she will turn three years old, and is still undocumented.

Helena Dalli, *Member of the Commission*. – Mr President, honourable Members, I thank you for your questions on the legal protection for rainbow families exercising free movement.

I start by recalling that, in recent years, the Court of Justice of the EU has issued three landmark decisions on the rights of rainbow families exercising free movement, namely Coman, V.M.A. or the Baby Sara case, and K.S. In this context, the Court delivered major clarifications.

It held that while Member States are allowed not to provide in their national legislation for marriages and parenthood of same sex couples, this situation cannot justify a refusal to accept for the purpose of the exercise of rights, derived from EU law, marriages and parenthood established in another Member State, regardless of sexual orientation.

You have inquired about the Commission's action to ensure that EU free movement law is enforced, and that this case law is respected. The implementation of EU law, as interpreted by the Court of Justice, is a Commission's priority. As stated in the LGBTIQ Equality Strategy, the Commission will continue to ensure the correct application of free movement law, including to address specific difficulties preventing LGBTIQ people and their families from enjoying their rights.

The Commission is monitoring the implementation of the Court's judgment on rainbow families in free movement, and is in dialogue with Member States in this regard. If necessary, the Commission will take legal action. Nonetheless, legal action is neither the only nor the fastest way to achieve results.

Furthermore, in the 2020 Citizenship Report, the Commission announced the review of its 2009 guideline guidance for better transposition and application of the Free Movement Directive. The updated Guidance, the drafting of which is at an advanced stage, will take into account the diversity of families and, therefore, help all families exercise their free-movement-related rights.

More particularly, the Commission intends to integrate in the updated Guidance relevant elements of the case law on rainbow families in free movement. For instance, that the term 'spouse' is gender neutral and includes all spouses and marriages and registered partnerships without exception.

As regards children of same-gender parents, exercising free movement rights, where one parent is an EU citizen, all Member States have to recognise the parent-child relationship as established on the birth certificate drawn up by a Member State for purposes related to EU law, regardless of the status of such a relationship in the other Member States.

So a Member State must accept certificates attesting to a family relationship issued by the competent authorities of the other Member States. For the purpose of the Free Movement Directive and the exercise of the rights derived from EU law, this acceptance does not require, and cannot be made conditional to, formal recognition by the other Member.

As regards the specific situation in Bulgaria, the Commission is monitoring the implementation of the V.M.A. judgment, and is in contact with the Bulgarian authorities, both regarding the individual national proceedings concerning the Baby Sara case, and more generally, the relevant Bulgarian legislation and practice.

When it comes to the issues of registration and receipt of a personal identification number, the Commission is analysing the situation in Bulgaria and will ensure any appropriate follow-up.

In relation to your question on the issue of mandatory transcription, the Court has made it clear that the Member State of nationality of the child must issue an identity card or a passport, regardless of whether the birth certificate issued by another Member State for the child has been transcribed into the National Register of civil status.

In general, national requirements cannot be relied upon to impede the exercise of the rights derived from EU law by same-gender couples and their children.

Additionally, it should be stressed that the Commission has already made use of its available tools, from dialogue to infringement, where its attention has been drawn to national requirements creating difficulties for EU citizens in having their marriage certificates accepted in the context of the exercise of their free movement rights.

Finally, it must be clarified that under the existing EU *acquis*, Member States are not required to recognise the parenthood of a child as established in another Member State for purposes other than the rights derived from EU law in the context of free movement.

On that aspect, as announced in the LGBTIQ Equality Strategy, as well as in the 2021 EU strategy on the Rights of the Child, the Commission will present in the coming weeks a proposal for a regulation harmonising the Member States' rules for the establishment of parenthood in cross-border situations, and for the recognition in a Member State of the parenthood established in another Member State. This will further improve the rights of rainbow families, without taking away the rights that the child already enjoys under Union law, in particular on free movement, including the Directive and the case law which I have referred to earlier.

Maria Walsh, *on behalf of the PPE Group*. – Mr President, Commissioner, colleagues, the love of a family knows no borders. In her State of the Union address in 2020, our Commission President, Ursula von der Leyen, affirmed to us all: if you are a parent in one country, you are a parent in every country. But sadly, the freedom of movement of rainbow families is not guaranteed. It is a time now that the Commission and the Council act to ensure the legal protection for rainbow families exercising their fundamental right to free movement, and that the Baby Sara judgment is implemented. Any Member State that infringes on the values of human dignity, human rights, freedom and equality should be held accountable.

In my own Member State of Ireland, despite the legalisation of same-sex marriage in 2015, rainbow families still face a variety of struggles, especially concerning the legal parenthood of children. The choice of donors affects same sex parents' legal relationship to their children. In particular, the system leaves gay men and our trans-community and others having children in legal limbo. Every child deserves to have their parents' name on their birth certificate, and as my colleague Marc Angel shared, no child deserves to be stateless.

In striving to build a Union of equality, let us make sure that all rainbow families can enjoy the rights that every other family in the EU holds dear.

Maria-Manuel Leitão-Marques, *em nome do Grupo S&D*. – Senhor Presidente, Cara Comissária, a liberdade de circulação de pessoas na União Europeia é um direito de todas as crianças, incluindo aquelas que são filhas de famílias arco-íris. Mas como se demonstra no caso da bebé Sara, já decidido pelo Tribunal de Justiça, as autoridades de certos países recusam-se a reconhecer a relação parental de filhos de casais do mesmo sexo, mesmo quando esta já foi reconhecida em outro Estado-Membro.

Isto cria enormes problemas à vida destas famílias e afeta gravemente estas crianças. Pais ou mães podem, por exemplo, estar impedidos de acompanhar os seus filhos a um hospital ou até de os autorizar a ir numa simples excursão da escola.

Em casos extremos, se um dos membros do casal morre num Estado-Membro que não reconhece a relação parental, a criança pode perder não uma, mas as duas figuras parentais.

A proposta legislativa sobre o reconhecimento transfronteiriço da parentalidade, que espero a Comissão apresente rapidamente, deve garantir a proteção da liberdade de circulação das crianças destas famílias, assegurando que as relações parentais e os direitos a elas associados são reconhecidos para todos e respeitados em toda a União.

Na União Europeia, nenhuma criança pode perder os seus direitos apenas por mudar de um Estado-Membro para outro.

Pierre Karleskind, *au nom du groupe Renew*. – Monsieur le Président, Madame la Commissaire, chers collègues, il faut le dire, la famille est en danger. Elle est attaquée de toutes parts par ceux qui souhaitent nous imposer leur vision idéologique. Les droits de l'enfant sont en danger, bafoués par les caprices de ces mêmes idéologues qui veulent priver les enfants de leurs origines, quitte même à les nier.

Chers collègues, évidemment, ici je veux parler de Sarah, cet enfant dont nous parlons, et de sa famille. Sarah est née en Espagne. Elle a une maman de Gibraltar et une maman de Bulgarie. La Bulgarie, justement, qui lui refuse la transcription de son acte de naissance depuis plusieurs années, malgré un arrêt de la Cour de justice de l'Union européenne. Sarah a trois ans. Elle n'a pas de nationalité. Elle n'a jamais pu quitter le pays où elle est née et elle n'a jamais pu voir ses grands-parents, qui sont trop âgés pour pouvoir voyager. Sarah est la victime d'un acharnement d'idéologues autoproclamés défenseurs de la famille.

Alors ici, il ne va pas falloir se tromper. La preuve est faite que les véritables défenseurs de la famille, c'est nous. Les véritables défenseurs des droits de l'enfant, c'est nous. Alors, Madame la Commissaire, nous comptons sur vous. Ne nous décevez pas. Faites-nous cette proposition de loi de reconnaissance mutuelle des liens de filiation. Soyez du côté de la famille, soyez du côté des enfants.

Kim Van Sparrentak, *on behalf of the Verts/ALE Group*. – Mr President, what we want as the LGBTI community is equality: to be treated as equals in our society and to be equal by law. Whilst this may be portrayed by some conservatives as the end of the world, for us these are lifesaving laws. Imagine your child needs a lifesaving operation, but you as a parent are not allowed to give consent for this operation, because you travelled to another country that doesn't recognise your parenthood.

Today, the LGBTI Intergroup had the honour to hear first-hand a horror story of two mothers who can't make their baby girls meet their grandfathers because of discriminatory administrative hurdles. And the European Court of Justice has already ruled that Bulgarian authorities have to give baby Sara a birth certificate. But now, while she's almost three, it still hasn't happened.

That's why we urge the European Commission to take action. We need to make sure national authorities listen to these rulings of the European Court of Justice and get children out of this administrative limbo, but we also need to move fast on new legislation for the baby Saras of this world and all our rainbow families, because what we want is equality.

Ангел Джамбазки, *от името на групата ECR*. – Г-н Председател, чета Конституция на Република България, член 46, алинея първа: „Бракът е доброволен съюз между мъж и жена. Законен е гражданският брак." Няколко реда по-надолу в следваща алинея: „Децата, родени извън брака, имат равни права на родените в брака." Това, колеги, доказва всичко, което сега тук обсъждате, заблуждавате се сами едни други и се опитвате да правите политическа пропаганда.

Да, може би ви изненадваме, но ние българите в България чрез нашата Конституция сме приели брака за съюз между мъж и жена. Ако детето е родено извън такъв брак, то има равни права и няма проблем да му бъде издаден документ на името на майката. Единен граждански номер веднага може да се издаде на името на майката. Така че няма никакъв проблем с това нещо.

Това, което правите вие обаче тук е пропаганда, с която се опитвате да промените нашето общество и нашия начин на живот. И ние не сме съгласни с него. Ние не казваме да разрешавате или да забранявате или да приемате форма на брака във вашите държави. Не ви казваме как да поддържате вашите общества. Ние ви казваме, че няма да допуснем да променяте нашето, защото за разлика от вас ние мислим, че бракът е между мъж и жена биологични родители. И мисля, че трябва да се съобразите с тази наша воля, защото това е демокрацията.

VORSITZ: RAINER WIELAND

Vizepräsident

Malin Björk, *on behalf of the The Left Group*. – Mr President, my two children have two mothers. We belong together as a family, with love, of course, but also legally speaking. It took some years, some painful judicial and administrative procedures, but we are lucky to be recognised as a family with two legal parents, two mothers.

This is not the case for Baby Sara. She's turning three this December, and she's stateless in Europe in 2022. So why is she deprived of a nationality? Because she has two mothers. And Bulgaria, despite being convicted in the European Court of Justice, has not corrected this. And this is not an isolated case. Rainbow families all over Europe are having to deal with a patchwork of legislation and administrative procedures in order to get our families recognised, safe – safe for parents and safe for children.

It is time for the EU to recognise all children's rights, all families' rights, and adopt laws that will make us safe. Our families belong together not only in love, but also legally speaking.

Tiziana Beghin (NI). – Signor Presidente, onorevoli colleghi, il 16 settembre 2020, in quest'Aula, la Presidente della Commissione Ursula von der Leyen affermava «Se sei genitore in un paese europeo, sei ovviamente genitore in un altro paese europeo» e annunciava un'iniziativa sul riconoscimento dei figli delle coppie omosessuali nell'Unione europea.

Sono passati due anni e questa promessa non è ancora stata mantenuta. Deve intervenire la Corte di giustizia per riconoscere i diritti delle famiglie arcobaleno in Europa.

In Italia viviamo una situazione analoga: il decreto Salvini impone, nei documenti e nei moduli riferiti ai minori, delle diciture che escludono e discriminano le famiglie omogenitoriali. Questo decreto può rallentare o addirittura impedire il rilascio di un passaporto e pertanto viola il diritto alla libertà di movimento sancito nei trattati.

Presidente, nei giorni scorsi ho ricevuto la lettera di una donna che è mamma insieme alla sua compagna, mi scriveva: «'Madre' è la parola più bella del mondo, a meno che non sia ripetuta due volte».

Basta discriminazioni, facciamo vincere il diritto e l'amore.

Petar Vitanov (S&D). – Mr President, Commissioner, LGBTI people living together and creating families raise a number of situations that our juridical system is not prepared for, from the right to free movement across different EU countries, taxation, social policies, the right to inheritance of your parents' property and so on. And very often we forget about the juridical aspect of the debate. It's not just about whether we like it or not, whether you approve it or not. We are talking about a real-life situation involving real people, and these situations are happening right now, not at some undefined moment in the future. The conservatives like to present the debate as a normal status quo versus the unknown new future.

But the truth is that this status quo, as we have, it's not stable, it's not perfect; there are so many gaps in the current juridical system. People getting married in one country, they may be moving to another or having a child together, and they're separating. These are trivial things happening to millions of people in the EU every day. Yet when we talk about LGBTI people in this situation, we really realise how incomplete and discriminatory our current juridical system is. It's not about granting privileges, it's about safeguarding children's rights: the right to live in a loving family, to travel and the ability to see your relatives. So please, stop discrimination.

Sophia in 't Veld (Renew). – Mr President, Madam Commissioner, I don't think that we are here today to try and convince you of the rights of LGBTI people and rainbow families, because we know that you are convinced. However, we are talking here about applying the law. And I have to say, I find that the Commission is too timid in enforcing case-law. The von der Leyen Commission generally, but certainly in these kinds of cases, puts the burden of litigating on the shoulders of individuals and civil society.

There are two rulings by the European Court of Justice, the baby Sara case and the Coman case. The Coman case is four and a half years old. I mean, you say the Commission is monitoring, the Commission may start infringement proceedings if necessary, but how much longer will the Commission wait? Because, you know, there isn't limitless time. Baby Sara is growing up. Will she be 18 before this is settled? Will she have voting rights by then?

So I really, really urge the European Commission to start an infringement proceeding and impose sanctions on those countries and make sure that citizens can count on the Commission.

Sergey Lagodinsky (Verts/ALE). – Mr President, I wonder if anyone from Bulgarian authorities ever looked into the child's eyes – into child Sara's eyes or into eyes of other children who are affected like the one we've heard the story today as well, who is risking to end up as orphan because one parent is terminally ill and the other parent is not even recognised as a parent across the EU just because they are of same sex.

Have you ever looked into children's eyes? If you did, you would see children stripped of their rights, of their origin, of their childhood, of their families; parents discriminated beyond imaginable because they're stripped of the most natural – of the ability and right to raise their children.

It's not just LGBTIQ community rights, it's children's rights and it's parents' rights. The European Court of Justice said this on multiple occasions, and I urge the Commission to start acting now and to be ambitious in the law that it will propose to the Parliament. We in the Legal Affairs Committee are waiting for this law and we will be ambitious ourselves.

Vincenzo Sofo (ECR). – Signor Presidente, onorevoli colleghi, due donne, una bulgara e una inglese, decidono di avere un figlio con fecondazione assistita in Spagna, dove la legge consente di riconoscerle come genitrici.

Poi vanno in Bulgaria per far trascrivere anche lì l'atto di nascita, scontrandosi però con la legislazione nazionale che non riconosce le due donne come genitori della bambina. Ecco allora la sinistra agitare subito il vessillo del diritto alla libertà di circolazione, mostrando per l'ennesima volta quanto sia capace di essere subdola nello storpiare principi apparentemente lapalissiani, come appunto la libera circolazione dei cittadini europei, per scardinare normative nazionali, non avendo il consenso per cambiarle democraticamente.

L'obiettivo, infatti, è far sì che una legislazione favorevole di qualche Stato membro riguardo a temi cari all'agenda LGBT, come adozioni gay, utero in affitto, cambi di identità di genere senza operazioni e via dicendo, possa essere imposta automaticamente con la scusa dell'area Schengen ad altri Stati con legislazioni non gradite alla sinistra, disconoscendone la sovranità normativa.

Insomma, una vera e propria truffa giuridica alle nostre democrazie, che mi chiedo come possa essere accettata da un Parlamento che della democrazia fa una bandiera. Ad ogni modo, di sicuro non saremo noi ad accettarla.

Mario Furore (NI). – Signor Presidente, onorevoli colleghi, siamo di fronte a una tragica situazione, dove la burocrazia non riconosce la realtà nella nostra società.

È paradossale che, nonostante i diritti riconosciuti nei trattati, in Unione europea non si riesca ancora a intervenire in modo efficace per tutelare i cittadini, incluse le famiglie arcobaleno.

La vita, la famiglia e l'amore nascono e si creano al di là degli schemi ideologici che certi politici vogliono imporre ed è nostro dovere che abusi e discriminazioni come quelli avvenuti in Bulgaria e in Polonia non avvengano mai più. E attenzione, in Italia non andiamo meglio, perché con i decreti Salvini abbiamo esattamente gli stessi problemi e ci troviamo nella situazione in cui i tribunali devono intervenire per riconoscere i diritti delle famiglie arcobaleno.

È ora che l'Unione europea si doti di regole comuni sul riconoscimento delle unioni e della genitorialità, non possiamo permetterci che esistano cittadini discriminati, a cui viene impedito il diritto di viaggiare, di avere una copertura sanitaria comune o, addirittura, la cittadinanza europea.

Viviamo in un'Europa libera dove i diritti di ciascuno contano, facciamolo davvero e in fretta.

Cyrus Engerer (S&D). – Mr President, dear Sara, to us you have two mothers whose parenthood we see, recognise and value; two mothers who have fought for their place in this world and for yours in this Union. You might find it contradictory to call this place a Union when parts of it have refused to recognise a union as beautiful as your family. And so this is why we are here today, to remind not only this House but all Member States that this Union and what it is aspires to be a Europe that leaves children stateless three years after their birth because the family they are born into is not one we want to form part of.

Dear Sara, you are one of us. You are European. We welcome you into this European family, and we promise you to tirelessly work so that those who have sat idle for far too long will welcome you too. Because these are our values. We value equality. We value freedom of movement of all families within our Union. And above all, we value love: the love your family has given you, and the love that the majority of this Parliament gives you and all other children born within and outside our Union.

Catharina Rinzema (Renew). – Voorzitter, nog nooit je opa en oma hebben gezien omdat ze in een ander land wonen. Geen paspoort. Een valse start. Dit is de huidige realiteit voor het bijna driejarige meisje Sara, dat geen geboortecertificaat krijgt van de Bulgaarse autoriteiten en feitelijk stateloos is. Alleen omdat ze twee moeders heeft. Iets wat andere kinderen simpelweg krijgen bij hun geboorte is Sara ontnomen. Wat de VVD betreft, kan dit in 2022 niet meer. Een kind mag nooit de dupe worden. Ik roep dan ook de Commissie en u, commissaris Dalli, op om snel met een goed wetsvoorstel te komen. Regenboogfamilies verdienen het ook om gewoon een familie te zijn. Want een ouder in het ene land blijft een ouder in het andere land.

Moritz Körner (Renew). – Herr Präsident, Frau Kommissarin, liebe Kolleginnen und Kollegen! Gerade in der Debatte hat man die ganze Absurdität gemerkt. Die Rechten und Konservativen, die sonst immer von der Familie reden, die geschützt werden muss, von der Keimzelle der Gesellschaft – die Kinder müssen geschützt werden. Orbán hat sogar ein Gesetz zum Schutz der Kinder vorgelegt.

Es geht immer um die Kinder, es geht um die Familie. Und hier sehen wir die ganze Absurdität: Was hat es mit dem Schutz von Familie, mit dem besonderen Schutz für Kinder zu tun, wenn man ein Kind staatenlos macht? Was bringt es dem Schutz der Familie, wenn man Eltern dazu zwingt, vor Behörden mit Bürokratie zu kämpfen, sogar vor Gerichte ziehen zu müssen, statt Zeit mit der Erziehung ihres Kinds zu verbringen? Nichts. Gesamte absurde Ideologie, weil Sie der Meinung sind, dass nicht sein darf, was nicht sein darf.

Das wird an dieser Stelle deutlich. Familie ist da, wo Kinder sind, wo Menschen füreinander Verantwortung übernehmen. Und Eltern in einem Land sind auch Eltern im anderen Land.

Spontane Wortmeldungen

François-Xavier Bellamy (PPE). – Monsieur le Président, en fait, à travers cette réglementation, la Commission veut simplement imposer à tous les États membres un changement qui ne relève en rien de sa compétence: décider de la définition de la famille, de la reconnaissance de la filiation. Aucun traité n'a donné cette responsabilité, aucun traité n'a confié ce pouvoir aux institutions européennes. Respecter l'état de droit, c'est peut-être d'abord respecter nos démocraties et nos propres traités.

Ce projet reviendrait dans les faits à obliger tous nos pays à reconnaître la gestation pour autrui. Parce que oui, chers collègues, derrière toutes les belles paroles échangées ce soir, il y a en fait une industrie qui fait du profit en exploitant les femmes les plus vulnérables. Quel étrange progressisme que celui qui justifie la pire des régressions, celle qui consiste à faire de nouveau d'une vie humaine l'objet d'un contrat marchand?

Oui, derrière tout cela, vous l'avez dit, il y a des enfants. Et moi je suis très étonné, chers collègues, que vous ayez tous ici plaint Sarah de ne pas avoir de passeport. Moi, je plains Sarah d'abord de ne pas avoir de papa.

Juan Fernando López Aguilar (S&D). – Señor presidente, comisaria Dalli, ¿de qué hablamos cuando pedimos que la Comisión adopte una iniciativa para proteger jurídicamente a las familias arcoíris? De que adopte un reglamento de filiación y un reglamento de reconocimiento de familias fundadas por personas del mismo sexo.

Porque estamos hablando de derechos fundamentales. El primero, libre circulación y elección de residencia —artículo 45 de la Carta de los Derechos Fundamentales de la Unión Europea—, pero sin discriminación, prohibida por razón de sexo, orientación sexual o identidad de género en los artículos 20 y 21 de la misma Carta de los Derechos Fundamentales de la Unión Europea. Prohibición especialmente exigente cuando se trata de derechos de los niños, que en ningún caso pueden ser discriminados por su origen ni por su filiación.

Por tanto, es urgente reclamar que todos los Estados miembros protejan a los niños sin discriminación en su Derecho interno y les garanticen, por tanto, el acceso a una identidad y acaten las sentencias del Tribunal de Justicia, que son terminantes: 2018, reconocimiento de los matrimonios del mismo sexo y su derecho a circular libremente sin discriminación, y 2021, derecho a la filiación de los menores sin ninguna discriminación.

(Ende der spontanen Wortmeldungen)

Helena Dalli, *Member of the Commission*. – Mr President, honourable Members, I want to reassure you that it is a Commission priority to ensure that the rights of rainbow families and free movement are respected and that we are monitoring the implementation of the EU free movement *acquis* as interpreted by the European Court of Justice, including in relation to the rights of rainbow families. And the Commission is also in dialogue with Member States in this regard.

I understand, Sophie, totally the impatience, but the Commission has asked every single Member State through dedicated questionnaires whether any legislative or administrative changes would be needed following both the Coman and the V. M.A. judgment. Where necessary the Commission has engaged in a dialogue with relevant Member States to further discuss their implementation of these judgments, and some of these dialogues are still ongoing, and in some cases I can say that positive developments can be expected in the mid-term.

The Commission's focus includes careful analysis of the Member States' legislation and practices, in particular in the fields covered by recent court judgments. And in addition, the updated guidance intends to integrate the relevant elements of the case-law, reflecting the diversity of families, and this will facilitate Member States in implementing EU law and therefore help avoid situations where an infringement procedure becomes necessary.

But that said, rest assured that the Commission will not shy away from legal action should it be deemed to be the most efficient way to ensure the protection of the rights of rainbow families and free movement. And the parenthood initiative will address the recognition of the parenthood of a child as established in another Member State for purposes other than the rights derived from EU law. It will further improve the rights of rainbow family members without taking away the rights that a child already enjoys under Union law on free movement, including the directive of 2004 and the relevant case-law.

Sophia in 't Veld (Renew). – Mr President, just very briefly, in this Hemicycle we do not tolerate racist statements, anti-Semitic statements, sexist statements. And I would just like to say for the record that we should not tolerate homophobic statements either. The remark made just now by our French EPP colleague is profoundly homophobic. I find it regrettable to hear that kind of language in this Hemicycle. And I would really like the leadership of this House to take its distance. And we're also going to ask for clarification whether our colleague here represents the views of the EPP Group.

Der Präsident. – Frau Kollegin in 't Veld, ich habe in der ganzen Aussprache jedem zugehört, und ich persönlich habe entschieden, dass ich den Kollegen dafür nicht zur Ordnung rufe, weil ich das nicht für eine homophobe Äußerung gehalten habe. Nachdem Ihre Beurteilung eine andere ist, legen wir das gerne der Präsidentin vor.

Die Aussprache ist damit geschlossen.

12. Künftige europäische Finanzarchitektur zur Förderung der Entwicklung (Aussprache)

Der Präsident. – Als nächster Punkt der Tagesordnung folgt die Aussprache über den Bericht von Charles Goerens im Namen des Entwicklungsausschusses über die künftige europäische Finanzarchitektur zur Förderung der Entwicklung (2021/2252(INI)) (A9-0270/2022).

Mittwoch, 23. November 2022

Charles Goerens, *rapporteur*. – Monsieur le Président, au Niger, un jeune homme veut se lancer dans une entreprise de construction. Il est sans moyens financiers et si un emprunt lui est refusé, il doit abandonner son projet. Dans un autre pays en développement, il est impératif de réduire les inégalités. Créer un système de protection sociale pourrait y remédier. Mais si on manque de tout, il devient impossible de démarrer le projet. Nous voulons améliorer l'accès aux soins de santé en Afrique, où on manque partout d'hôpitaux, de laboratoires, de facultés de médecine.

L'argent n'est pas tout, mais sans argent, beaucoup de projets deviennent illusoires. L'architecture financière du développement tend à y remédier. L'Union européenne, il est vrai, consacre 80 milliards d'euros à ces fins entre 2020 et 2030. Même si l'aide publique au développement européenne représente 46 % des contributions des États membres de toute l'OCDE, on s'aperçoit vite qu'il faut un multiple de ce montant pour réaliser les objectifs du développement durable. Comment faire?

C'est là que l'architecture financière de développement entre en jeu pour permettre au candidat entrepreneur nigérien de réaliser son rêve. Il est perdu si la banque locale ne lui donne rien. Le lancement d'une sécurité sociale à grande échelle ne peut aboutir que si un minimum d'infrastructures administratives et de communications informatiques sont disponibles, pourvu qu'au départ des conditions politiques indispensables à sa réalisation soient remplies.

L'architecture financière de développement se promet d'y remédier, disais-je. Disons-le d'emblée: la plupart des instruments existent. Parmi eux, les ministères de développement, la Commission, les banques et institutions financières du développement. On attend de ces institutions financières qu'elles mobilisent les capitaux privés pour combler les déficits publics en matière de financement. Cet écart est estimé à 4 200 milliards de dollars par an pour réaliser les objectifs du développement durable. Ces institutions financières existent. Sur le plan européen et national, elles s'appellent: Banque européenne d'investissement, Banque européenne pour la reconstruction et le développement, AFD française, KfW allemande, pour n'en citer que quelques-unes, auxquelles s'ajoutent bien entendu les institutions néerlandaise, suédoise, italienne et j'en passe. Bref, une multitude d'acteurs actifs dans le même domaine. Le Parlement européen aimerait les voir s'organiser afin de réduire les doubles emplois, les incohérences en matière de politique de développement, en vue de privilégier la complémentarité des acteurs, en vue d'inscrire leur action dans une démarche globale de l'Union européenne, guidée en cela par le principe du *policy first*.

L'année 2022 révèle l'urgence de mettre en place cette nouvelle architecture financière. La guerre en Ukraine nous fait perdre un temps précieux et la reconstruction de ce pays, une fois la guerre terminée, va rendre nécessaire la mobilisation de gigantesques montants financiers. D'un côté, il y a déjà un gouffre financier énorme et, d'un autre côté, l'effet combiné de la guerre en Ukraine et l'impact de la crise de la COVID ont augmenté d'un tiers les besoins en capitaux au cours des trois dernières années. Nous n'avons plus le droit de gaspiller un seul euro, tant sont importants les besoins pour réaliser les ODD.

L'architecture financière fait un pari sur l'avenir. Elle se promet de respecter dans son action les droits de l'homme, les droits sociaux, les impératifs de l'accord de Paris sur le climat, les engagements pris à Addis-Abeba dans le cadre du financement de l'aide au développement, les principes de gestion saine, le principe du partenariat, le principe de l'appropriation. Bref, on aura rarement vu autant d'exigences, voire d'engagements réunis en une seule démarche.

Ce rapport est le fruit du travail collectif de la Commission. Il est le fruit du travail et des contributions des rapporteurs fictifs, mais aussi le fruit de l'engagement de mon assistante, M[me] Simoes. Je remercie tout le monde d'avoir réussi à faire voter à l'unanimité ce rapport au sein de la commission du développement, et j'espère que nous pourrons également trouver une très large majorité ici au sein de cette assemblée.

Angelika Winzig, *Verfasserin der Stellungnahme des mitberatenden Haushaltsausschusses*. – Sehr geehrter Herr Präsident, Herr Kommissar, Kolleginnen und Kollegen! Zunächst einmal vielen Dank an den Berichterstatter Charles Goerens und seine Schattenberichterstatter im Entwicklungsausschuss für die Übernahme wichtiger Punkte aus der Stellungnahme des Haushaltsausschusses zur neuen europäischen Finanzarchitektur zur Förderung der Entwicklung. Gezielte Hilfe und Bekämpfung von Fluchtursachen in den Herkunftsländern sind doch das beste Mittel, die sich anbahnende Migrationskrise unter Kontrolle zu bringen. Durch die Schaffung von wirtschaftlichen Perspektiven vor Ort verringert sich auch der Zustrom von Wirtschaftsflüchtlingen in die Europäische Union. Es ist daher unabdingbar, die Entwicklungshilfe mit ausreichenden Mitteln auszustatten.

Damit jeder Steuer-Euro so effektiv wie möglich eingesetzt wird, liegt es nun an der EBRD, der EIB und den nationalen Entwicklungsbanken, Doppelgleisigkeiten zu vermeiden und gemeinsam an einem Strang für die Erreichung der europäischen Ziele in der Entwicklungshilfe zu ziehen.

Janez Lenarčič, *Member of the Commission*. – Mr President, honourable Members, I would like to thank, also on behalf of my colleague, Commissioner Urpilainen, the Rapporteur, and the Committee on Development, for putting forward this very useful report on the European financial architecture for development.

I agree with many of the considerations outlined in this report and its conclusions. European financial architecture for development is an important building block of our more effective and more impactful cooperation with partner countries. We are confronted today with multiple crises – the consequences of COVID-19, the Russian aggression against Ukraine, debt pressure, food insecurity, energy costs and climate change. All of these exacerbate the gap in finances needed to achieve the sustainable development goals.

To make the best possible use of scarce resources and to achieve sustainable impact, we need a joint European response combining all relevant instruments and actors. Following a system-wide review of the European financial architecture for development already in 2019, the Commission adopted its timely roadmap for an improved effort last March.

The roadmap is organised around four different areas. First, providing a strong policy steer to strengthen alignment with EU policy objectives. Two, enhancing coordination and providing incentives to work together. Three, making the architecture more inclusive, and four, raising the visibility of EU actions.

Since then, significant progress has been made in all these four areas. Let me briefly mention some examples.

On strategic steering, all investment operations financed from the EU budget are scrutinised to ensure that they comply with programming documents, that they align with team Europe initiatives and the EU's global policy priorities, such as delivering on the global gateway strategy and the Green Deal, and also mainstreaming gender and environmental aspects.

We aim to make use of our various EU tools and development actors in smart and flexible ways. For instance, the European Investment Bank will benefit from the dedicated guarantee windows, but will also be able to use the private sector guarantees under EFSD+ open architecture. The Commission is currently assessing the outcome of the call for proposals.

I share your views on the importance of inclusiveness. In principle, all EU pillar assessed financial institutions are eligible to use the open architecture guarantee. This includes multilateral institutions and regional development banks, while also relying, whenever possible, on European financial institutions.

Under the EFSD+ open architecture, we received guarantee proposals from 20 potential implementing partners – exceeding expectations. Several new partners submitted proposals for the first time from within the EU and outside. For instance, the Caribbean Development Bank.

We will be able to select those proposals which offer a strong development impact and best fit our strategic policy priorities. I fully agree that efforts should improve the EU's visibility and impact of its development finance. Many EU delegations report that the Team Europe Initiative's design process has significantly increased cooperation with European development finance institutions on the ground.

You also call for effective governance of the global gateway strategy. The Commission and Member States agreed to set up a global gateway board to provide strategic steering, and we propose that the European Parliament is of course involved as observer, and a dedicated business advisory group to exchange with European businesses. This will allow strong strategic guidance on our collective ambitions.

Isabel Santos, *relatora de parecer da Comissão dos Assuntos Externos, dos Direitos Humanos, da Segurança Comum e da Política de Defesa*. – Senhor Presidente, caros Colegas, quero começar por saudar o Colega Goerens pela orientação assumida neste relatório.

Como relatora de parecer da Comissão dos Assuntos Externos, quero salientar a importância da revisão agora introduzida na arquitetura financeira europeia para o desenvolvimento, face às múltiplas exigências que o presente nos coloca e àquelas que se vislumbram face ao futuro, abrindo esta arquitetura à participação de todos os Estados-Membros e à junção de esforços do setor público e privado.

Defendemos que a arquitetura financeira europeia para o desenvolvimento assuma um caráter que lhe permita funcionar como um veículo da promoção da visibilidade e dos valores da União Europeia. Mas tal só pode ser atingido através do fortalecimento da orientação das decisões desta arquitetura e da consistência e coerência das mesmas com a atuação política da União Europeia através da *Team Europe*, utilizando-a na implementação de iniciativas como a *Global Gateway* ou o *Green Deal*.

Finalmente, sublinho que consideramos essencial o envolvimento e escrutínio do Parlamento Europeu, como foi sublinhado pelo Senhor Comissário.

György Hölvényi, *a PPE képviselőcsoport nevében*. – Tisztelt Elnök Úr! Mindenekelőtt szeretném megköszönni kollégámnak, Charles Goerens képviselőtársamnak a jelentés elkészítéséért végzett, mondjuk úgy, hogy erősen összetett munkát. Az Európai Unió évente 70 milliárd eurót fordít nemzetközi fejlesztésre, mégis egyre nagyobb nehézségekkel nézünk szembe. Közel 700 millió ember él mélyszegénységben, 350 millió éhezik, 31 milliós háborús menekült Afrikában egyetlen év alatt. Látnunk kell, Afrikában a biztonság és az oktatás hiánya aláássa az uniós befektetések egy jó részét, erősíti a migrációs hatást, végső soron akadályozta a fenntartható fejlődést. Az Európai Unió az uniós fejlesztési bankokkal és a magánberuházásokkal együttesen 500 milliárd eurót mozgósít fejlesztési projektek megvalósítására.

Érdemi eredményekhez azonban hatékonyabb koordinációra van szükség az Európai Beruházási Bank, valamint a tagállami nemzetközi fejlesztési szereplők között. A Beruházási Banknak pedig közvetlen, valódi párbeszédet kell folytatnia az afrikai partnereivel. Emellett világos célkitűzésekre van szükség, ezek a biztonság, az oktatás és a munkahely.

Udo Bullmann, *im Namen der S&D-Fraktion*. – Herr Präsident, Herr Kommissar, werte Kolleginnen und Kollegen! Hunderte von Millionen Menschen hungern. Um die Nachhaltigkeitsziele der Vereinten Nationen zu erreichen, fehlen 130 Billionen bis 2030. Das ist unsere Aufgabe, das ist unsere Herausforderung.

Ja, es ist richtig – niemand gibt international mehr Geld für Entwicklungspolitik aus als die Europäische Union und ihre Mitgliedstaaten; aber die Zahlen sagen uns: Wir müssen klarer werden, wir müssen überzeugender werden in unserer Strategie. Und wir müssen auch unsere Partnerländer gewinnen – im Englischen sagt man *ownership*, es zu ihrer eigenen Sache machen.

Und deswegen ist es richtig, was Kollege Goerens sagt. Ich gratuliere ihm zu seinem Bericht, er weist den richtigen Weg: Nachhaltigkeit unterstützen, Menschen gewinnen, dass sie auch ihre eigenen Wege gehen können, um ihre Länder stark zu machen, um eine nachhaltige Zukunft zu bauen.

Ein letzter Satz an alle diejenigen, die aufgerufen sind, an die Finanzakteure, an die Kommission, an die Mitgliedstaaten: Die Richtung der Politik entscheidet dieses Parlament. Das ist auch ein wichtig…

(Der Präsident entzieht dem Redner das Wort.)

Erik Marquardt, *im Namen der Verts/ALE-Fraktion*. – Herr Präsident, Herr Kommissar! Auch dem Berichterstatter möchte ich erst mal danken und gratulieren zu diesem Bericht. Ich glaube, es ist ein wichtiger Bericht, und ich glaube auch, dass er genau zum richtigen Zeitpunkt kommt. Wir haben ja eine Situation, in der die Welt, aber auch Europa wirklich mit beispiellosen Krisen konfrontiert ist. Da kann man über die globale Erwärmung reden, man kann über den Angriffskrieg auf die Ukraine reden, man kann über die Ernährungssicherheit auf der Welt reden, aber auch darüber, dass mehr als 100 Millionen Menschen auf der Flucht sind. Und natürlich wollen wir nicht in einer Welt leben, in der Menschen erst nach Europa fliehen müssen, um irgendwo Schutz und Sicherheit, eine Zukunft, eine gute Perspektive zu finden.

Deswegen ist es besonders in diesen Zeiten besonders wichtig, dass wir dafür sorgen, dass Menschen anderswo auch Zukunftsperspektiven haben, und ich glaube, dass die EU auch in dieser Frage eine Führungsrolle übernehmen muss, um der Agenda 2030 und dem Ziel gerecht zu werden, niemanden zurückzulassen, dass aber auch klar ist, dass wir besser zusammenarbeiten müssen, besser zusammenarbeiten zwischen den EU-Institutionen, den Mitgliedstaaten, den Finanzierungsstrukturen der Mitgliedstaaten, und auch mit den Nichtregierungsorganisationen kann man besser zusammenarbeiten.

Nur so werden wir den Bedürfnissen unserer Partner im globalen Süden gerecht, und nur so können wir dann auch neue Partner gewinnen; das ist ja besonders in dieser Zeit auch sehr wichtig. Ich denke deswegen und hoffe auch, dass dieser Bericht als Baustein in der Strategie dienen wird, mehr Harmonie in die Arbeit der EIB, der EBWE, aber auch der nationalen Entwicklungsfinanzierung zu bringen. Ich hoffe auch, dass er dazu beitragen wird, dass wir als Europäisches Parlament eine zentralere Rolle bei der Gestaltung und auch Überprüfung der EU-Ausgaben in der Entwicklungszusammenarbeit haben, und bedanke mich deswegen zum Schluss noch einmal bei Herrn Goerens.

Dominique Bilde, *au nom du groupe ID*. – Monsieur le Président, je ne peux pas m'associer à un texte qui fait un énième appel à l'augmentation d'une aide internationale qui est toujours assurée de façon disproportionnée par l'Europe et les États-Unis. De même, toute discussion sur l'endettement devrait, au premier chef, impliquer la Chine, détentrice d'environ 21 % de la dette du continent africain, souvent au travers de prêts adossés à des conditions draconiennes.

Les politiques de développement ne peuvent se résumer à l'aide publique. D'autres ressources doivent être mises à profit. Nous avons tous à l'esprit l'estimation de la CNUCED, qui évaluait à 88,6 milliards de dollars les fuites illicites de capitaux en Afrique, une ressource précieuse qui permettrait d'atteindre les objectifs de développement durable. Les transferts de fonds des particuliers, qui surpassent désormais l'aide publique comme recettes extérieures pour la plupart des pays à revenu faible ou intermédiaire, ne pourraient-ils pas également être mieux exploités?

Une stratégie efficace repose avant tout sur une confiance réciproque entre donateurs et bénéficiaires. À cet égard, la conditionnalité de l'aide, en particulier au retour des migrants, constitue une exigence non négligeable. Notre souhait serait que l'accord post-Cotonou soit l'occasion d'un nouveau départ pour une vraie politique de développement.

João Pimenta Lopes, *em nome do Grupo The Left*. – Senhor Presidente, a política de cooperação e desenvolvimento promovida pela União Europeia tem sido expressão dos interesses geoestratégicos das potências europeias e dos lucros do grande capital europeu, mais do que uma abordagem de efetiva cooperação com vista à capacitação e consolidação da independência dos países em desenvolvimento.

A materialização de uma Europa global vem dar robustez a essa instrumentalização da cooperação internacional para o domínio geopolítico e controlo de recursos, insistindo numa abordagem neocolonial.

Assim se plasma neste relatório a crescente financeirização da ajuda pública ao desenvolvimento, oferecendo mais dívida aos Estados visados no quadro de uma crescente condicionalidade política, em aberta confrontação às opções e estratégias soberanas dos países em desenvolvimento com interesses de países terceiros.

A crescente militarização e agressividade de uma política externa ao serviço das potências europeias e dos grandes grupos económicos deixa um rasto de dependência, desigualdades, guerra, ao arrepio dos interesses dos povos. É urgente uma genuína política de cooperação e ajuda ao desenvolvimento dotada dos meios adequados e assente numa efetiva solidariedade.

Mittwoch, 23. November 2022

Ádám Kósa (NI). – Tisztelt Elnök Úr! Az EU és az EU 27 tagállama együttesen a fejlődő országok legnagyobb adományozói a világban. Sajnos tartok attól, hogy miután a szankciós politika negatív hatással van az EU-s tagállamok gazdaságaira, ez a fenntartható fejlesztési célok végrehajtását is veszélyezteti, ezért mindenekelőtt békére van szükség. A jelentés számos helyes megállapítást tartalmaz, ebből egyet szeretnék kiemelni: a segítséget házhoz kell vinni. A helyi közösségek megerősítése és a szülőföldön való boldogulás a legfontosabb cél. Már nem halat adunk a szegényeknek, hanem megtanítjuk őket halászni. Tegyünk még egy lépést, és segítsünk nekik eladni a halat, hogy ne csak egy család lakjon jól, hanem egy egész falu vagy egy város is!

Tomas Tobé (PPE). – Mr President, Commissioner, it is crucial that we improve the impact of European development finance. To do this, we first have to increase our efforts for better coordination and cooperation between European development finance institutions, reduce red tape and make the system more effective and focused on ensuring optimal use for our limited resources.

Secondly, we need a powerful policy direction to ensure that the activities of other development finance institutions are aligned with our values and also our strategic interests.

Finally, we have to also scale up private-sector mobilisation for sustainable development, including support to micro—, small and medium enterprises in partner countries to enable growth.

I therefore very much welcome this report, and I would like to thank our rapporteur and all the DEVE colleagues that have been working on this.

Mónica Silvana González (S&D). – Señor presidente, señor comisario, sabemos que el escenario para el desarrollo cada vez es más difícil y será más difícil cumplir con los objetivos de la Agenda 2030.

Por ello, es urgente crear una arquitectura financiera para el desarrollo efectiva, que tenga mecanismos de seguimiento y evaluación que midan su impacto. Hacemos mucho, pero no conocemos el impacto real, por ejemplo, en Latinoamérica, donde vemos que cada vez China está más presente, también en materia de desarrollo.

Para lograr que el Global Gateway sea una realidad y no solo una declaración europea de intenciones, en esta arquitectura financiera, el Banco Europeo de Inversiones, junto con los bancos nacionales y el Banco Europeo de Reconstrucción y Desarrollo, deben desempeñar un papel clave, pero deben estar coordinados. Por eso le pedimos a usted, comisario, que lidere esta coordinación.

La incorporación del sector privado, regulada y supervisada desde lo público, es cada vez más necesaria, pues no podemos cubrir todo solo desde la ayuda oficial al desarrollo. El apalancamiento puede ser una solución, pero debe contar con mecanismos de seguimiento claros.

Necesitamos financiación innovadora. Tiene el apoyo de este Parlamento, como ya se lo está dando también en materia de ayuda humanitaria, para trabajar en la línea de la financiación innovadora.

Gianna Gancia (ID). – Signor Presidente, onorevoli colleghi, oggi quando parliamo di contesto finanziario nella cooperazione allo sviluppo, siamo costretti a riconoscere un'amara realtà.

Il fatto che in molti Stati membri si rimbalzi sull'immigrazione e ci siano anche delle discussioni così stupide tra Stati credo che derivi proprio dal fatto che non si parte da un'evidenza di fatto e dalla realtà. Gli esseri umani, gli uomini, finché avranno fame e dovranno scappare dalla sete, dalla fame, purtroppo dalla guerra e da qualunque altro bisogno primario, è sicuro che cercheranno la sopravvivenza loro e dei propri figli e quindi anche un porto sicuro in Europa.

Il fatto che ci apprestiamo a votare questo testo, che è una relazione equilibrata e puntuale, approvata all'unanimità in sede di Commissione, è proprio perché siamo consapevoli che occorre un maggiore sviluppo, una maggiore cooperazione proprio…

(Il Presidente ritira la parola all'oratrice)

President. – Colleague, you had one minute, I gave you almost one and a half minutes. I interrupt all colleagues. I have the same judgement to everybody. You do not have the floor anymore, I am sorry. You do not have the floor and the microphone is off.

Ich rufe Sie zur Ordnung, Frau Kollegin. Das geht nicht.

(Der Präsident reagiert auf einen ohne Mikrofon vorgebrachten Zwischenruf von Frau Gancia) Keine Ursache.

Hildegard Bentele (PPE). – Herr Präsident, meine sehr geehrten Damen und Herren! Vor drei Jahren hat die Europäische Union ihre Entwicklungshilfe neu aufgestellt, in der Hoffnung, dass sie flexibler und effizienter wirken kann. Wir als EVP haben darauf hingewirkt, dass wir parallel dazu auch eine Debatte über die Neuausrichtung unserer europäischen Entwicklungsfinanzierungsinstitutionen anstoßen, denn in der Welt gibt es mehr Wettbewerb – denken wir nur an China – und mehr Aufgaben – denken wir nur an den Klimawandel.

Die Entscheidung ist nun nicht für eine Komplettreform gefallen, sondern für einen Status Quo Plus, das heißt, die Europäische Investitionsbank und die Europäische Bank für Wiederaufbau und Entwicklung sollen beide weiter fortbestehen. Vor diesem Hintergrund ist mir die Umsetzung des Plus besonders wichtig: Verbesserung der Präsenz der EIB vor Ort und Ausdehnung auf Subsahara-Afrika.

Ich möchte hinzufügen, dass es elementar sein wird, dass wir unsere Entwicklungsbanken und den Privatsektor viel besser als bisher mit geeigneten Finanzierungs- und Risikoabsicherungsinstrumenten begleiten müssen, denn vor allem über dessen gesteigertes Engagement werden wir echte Perspektiven für die Menschen in unseren Partnerländern erreichen. Wenn wir dazu konsequente politische Flankierung kombinieren, dann könnten unsere geopolitischen Ambitionen tatsächlich Gestalt annehmen. Viel Erfolg nun erstmal der EIB und der EBRD für ihre Neuausrichtung!

Ilan De Basso (S&D). – Herr talman! EU är världens största biståndsgivare, men med dagens politik är både klimatmålen och de globala hållbarhetsmålen utom räckhåll. Samtidigt hopar sig kriserna: krig i Europa, översvämningar i Pakistan och svältkatastrofen på Afrikas horn. Det är viktigt att det här parlamentet tar ställning för en ambitiös biståndspolitik. Vi förstår att mer måste göras. Samtidigt har vi en regering i Sverige som sluter slottsavtal bortkopplade från verkligheten. När världen står i brand väljer man att strypa det svenska biståndet. Det är en regering som sviker sina hållbarhetsmål, som sviker klimatet, som sviker sina vallöften och som nu sviker omvärlden. Jag är glad att EU väljer en annan väg. Vi fortsätter att stå för solidaritet, för att utveckla och effektivisera biståndet.

Spontane Wortmeldungen

Barry Andrews (Renew). – Mr President, I think one of the major problems in this space is that almost nobody in international development understands finance, and very few people in international finance understand development. So there's a major knowledge gap, there's a cultural gap, I would say. And we have to work very hard to address the scepticism. I think people have mentioned already the European Court of Auditors' assessment of EFSD+, which was very negative, and academic papers that were presented to the Development Committee, which were very negative on EFSD+.

So I welcome the focus of this resolution, but I really think we need to have a debate on global gateway, because it's central to everything we're doing around the financial architecture for development. It is supposedly a bolt-on to NDICI, and yet it has none of the safeguards of NDICI in terms of transparency and parliamentary oversight.

And we were also presented, when we had a public consultation on the European financial architecture for development, was that either we set up a European development bank or we expanded the mandate of the existing ones. And EBRD has failed to expand its mandate to sub-Saharan Africa. I understand the reasons why, but it needs to happen at its next annual meeting in 2023.

Mick Wallace (The Left). – Mr President, poverty is not a natural phenomenon that can be fixed with aid. Poverty is a historical and political problem.

Poor countries are poor because of the history of European colonialism and because they are integrated into the global economic system on unequal terms. The aid and development narrative hides the deep patterns of wealth extraction that causes poverty and inequality in the first place: rigged trade deals, tax evasion, land grabs and the offshoring of the impact of excess resource consumption in the global North to the global South.

Aid and development aren't working. Since 1960, the income gap between the North and South has roughly tripled in size. A recent Jason Hickel study revealed that the global North's imperialist financial appropriation from the South is worth over USD 10 trillion a year in Northern prices, and that the South's losses outstrip their aid receipts by a factor of 30.

Poverty is a political problem. Therefore it requires a political solution. Poor countries don't need our aid – they need us to stop plundering them!

(Ende der spontanen Wortmeldungen)

Janez Lenarčič, *Member of the Commission*. – Mr President, many thanks for this debate and for the many relevant points raised. Through the European financial architecture for development and with our Team Europe initiatives and the global gateway what we aim to do is to address the world's most pressing challenges in a number of world regions, including sub-Saharan Africa.

And I am pleased to know that we are making good progress across all key areas of the EFAD roadmap. We are attracting an increasing number of national and European development finance institutions who built the fabric of EFAD. Global gateway will itself catalyse effort and incentivise stakeholders to work in the same direction because it requires better alignment of the various sources of EU funding, including notably the funding by the European Investment Bank.

Global gateway also creates a new strategic framework for bringing in more partners and more finances towards development outcomes in our partner countries. This includes the private sector, but it does not imply that funds are reallocated to the private sector. We rather see it the other way around. We want to ensure that also private-sector investments are aligned with our and partner countries' political priorities in support of the development objectives.

I cannot underline enough the need for stronger collaboration between all relevant European actors, including in particular the European Parliament. So as a next step, dear President, dear rapporteur, dear Members, we will consider the observations and recommendations of this report very carefully, and the Commission progress report on effort, which is due next spring, will provide further information for your consideration. Thank you once again for the interest and your cooperation on this very important issue.

Der Präsident. – Vielen Dank, Herr Kommissar Lenarčič! Gestatten Sie mir, dass ich eine persönliche Bemerkung mache.

Es ärgert mich sehr, auch persönlich, dass ich Kollegen, die viel zu sagen haben, die die Redezeit überschreiten, dann das Wort entziehen muss, weil eben die Redezeit kein Vorschlag ist, sondern eine Regel, diese Kollegen aber von Anfang bis Ende der Debatte da sind, wie der Kollege Bullmann, während andere Kollegen nur für ihre Rede hier reinkommen, anschließend sofort wieder rausgehen und sich auch noch unziemlich verhalten, wenn sie die Redezeit wirklich über Gebühr überschreiten und man ihnen das Wort entzieht.

Das ärgert mich sehr, und es ist der Würde dieses Hauses nicht angemessen.

Charles Goerens, *rapporteur*. – Monsieur le Président, le débat en séance plénière a confirmé qu'il y a une large diversité de vues sur les objectifs exposés dans mon rapport. Les objectifs de développement durable sont un objectif pour toute la communauté internationale, y compris pour l'Union européenne. L'accord de Paris est un engagement de toute la communauté internationale, y compris de l'Union européenne. Les promesses faites à Addis-Abeba en 2015 sont un engagement de toute la communauté internationale, y compris de l'Union européenne.

J'admets la critique de ceux qui disent: «Mais la Chine doit faire son travail». Bien entendu, ce n'est pas la Chine ou l'Union européenne. C'est l'Union européenne et la Chine et tous les autres qui ont le devoir d'apporter des réponses à la situation qui est faite par un gouffre financier de plus de 4 000 milliards qui manquent chaque année pour réaliser les objectifs de développement durable.

Alors, à ceux qui critiquent l'accès à l'emprunt, je dirais quand même: mais où allons-nous trouver l'argent si les banques et institutions financières de développement ne sont pas à même de faire la collecte de l'épargne en vue de l'investir à des fins de développement, dans le respect de l'accord de partenariat, dans l'esprit du principe de l'appropriation? Tout cela constitue une énorme liste de charges auxquelles doivent répondre les institutions financières. De mon point de vue, le recours à l'emprunt est tout à fait défendable s'il permet d'investir dans le long terme et si, aussi longtemps que le pays en question doit rembourser, les générations futures peuvent encore en profiter.

Finalement, je dirais à ceux qui disent que le pillage des ressources doit cesser: bien entendu, il doit cesser. M. Wallace l'a dit. Mais ce n'est pas le pillage ou les contributions financières à travers l'aide publique au développement ou les fonds mobilisés par les institutions financières, c'est l'un et l'autre. Ce n'est pas l'un ou l'autre, c'est bien l'un et l'autre.

Finalement, l'Union européenne peut faire beaucoup. Elle ne peut pas tout faire. Comme disait Michel Rocard, nous ne pouvons pas accueillir toute la misère du monde, mais nous devons prendre notre part.

Der Präsident. – Die Aussprache ist geschlossen.

Die Abstimmung findet morgen, Donnerstag, 24. November 2022, statt.

13. Zusammensetzung des Parlaments

Der Präsident. – Ich habe zunächst zwei Bekanntgaben, bevor wir in der Tagesordnung fortfahren. Die zuständigen Behörden Dänemarks haben die Präsidentin von der Wahl von Herrn Bergur Løkke Rasmussen, von Herrn Erik Poulsen und von Herrn Anders Vistisen zu Mitgliedern des Europäischen Parlaments mit Wirkung vom 22. November 2022 unterrichtet. Sie treten an die Stelle von Herrn Søren Gade, Frau Linea Søgaard-Lidell bzw. Herrn Peter Kofod.

Ich heiße diese neuen Kollegen willkommen und erinnere daran, dass sie nunmehr vorbehaltlich der Prüfung ihrer Mandate mit vollen Rechten an den Sitzungen des Parlaments und seiner Organe teilnehmen.

14. Zusammensetzung der Ausschüsse und Delegationen

Der Präsident. – Die Fraktion Renew Europe hat der Präsidentin Beschlüsse über die Änderung von Ernennungen in Ausschüsse und Delegationen übermittelt. Diese Beschlüsse werden im Protokoll der heutigen Sitzung aufgeführt und treten am Tag dieser Ankündigung in Kraft.

15. Die Menschenrechtslage in Ägypten (Aussprache)

Der Präsident. – Als nächster Punkt der Tagesordnung folgt die Aussprache über die Erklärung der Kommission zur Menschenrechtslage in Ägypten (2022/2962(RSP)).

Janez Lenarčič, *Member of the Commission*. – Mr President, honourable Members, let me start by stressing that respect for human rights and fundamental freedoms constitutes a key element of EU-Egypt relations.

Our approach is to have a constructive engagement and achieve progress in the EU-Egypt human rights dialogue, as this will help advance our partnership. In this regard, human rights are identified as an area of cooperation in the EU-Egypt Partnership Priorities, which is the political framework of our partnership. The European Parliament resolution in December 2020 and the resolution on the UN Climate Change Conference in Sharm el-Sheikh in October 2022 raised important points that we have sought to address in our work.

We engage continuously with our Egyptian counterparts on the issue of human rights at all levels. The High Representative/Vice-President last discussed human rights with Foreign Minister Shoukry during the 9th EU-Egypt Association Council in June.

Our engagement on human rights has facilitated the first visit of the EU Special Representative for Human Rights to Egypt in April this year. Plans for the effective implementation of Egypt's National Human Rights Strategy were at the centre of all his discussions. The right to political dissent, freedom of speech and freedom of assembly are a particular object of attention.

The EU delegation in Cairo engages with civil society actors and human rights defenders, supports the work of civil society organisations and reaches out to government officials. At the same time, we engage in Brussels with Egyptian human rights activists, Egyptian and international non-governmental organisations, as well as the Egyptian mission.

A year ago, Egypt published its first National Strategy on Human Rights. Its effective implementation and sustained progress are now of the essence. We are looking forward to the first year review to take stock of the progress achieved. In the framework of the EU-Egypt Association Agreement, the Subcommittee on Political Matters and Human Rights, scheduled for December, will be another opportunity to exchange in this regard.

We welcome the personal commitment by President el-Sisi to progress on human rights, even in areas where this is controversial in Egypt.

Meanwhile, we have also taken note of the reinstatement of the presidential pardon committee and the subsequent number of prisoner releases. The EU has called for the release of the remaining detained human rights defenders and journalists. In our engagements, we encourage Egyptian authorities to make sure that the released detainees are fully reintegrated into society at large; this is very important.

In the run up to COP27, we maintained that ensuring a meaningful participation of youth and NGOs was of the utmost importance. We have seen that civil society was given the space to discuss the challenges of climate change and also address human rights issues at COP27. This is something that we need to take positive note of and welcome.

I thank you for your attention and I am looking forward to our exchange.

Andrey Kovatchev, *on behalf of the PPE Group*. – Mr President, Commissioner, dear colleagues, the European Union and Egypt are partners and friends and as such, we can share our concerns and engage with goodwill and in good faith for the improvement of the human rights situation in Egypt. We believe that only with such positive engagement can we achieve good results for the benefit of the citizens of Egypt, as well as for the civil society, the free media and all minority groups in the country. We do not believe that we can achieve this goal by pressuring the government with non-constructive resolutions. We need to engage with open minds and at a different level with the Egyptian Government and civil society as the EU and the Commission has already been doing.

Egypt is a key and strategic partner for the EU and an important regional player in a region defined by instability and conflict. The EU-Egypt relations entail a multitude of important areas from energy, trade, science and cultural cooperation to the fight against international terrorism. The EU has supported Egypt in its security, economic and political challenges, and the European Commission has allocated EUR 100 million to Egypt from the mechanism Food and Resilience Facility in order to mitigate the impact of the Russian aggression against Ukraine.

We observe the work of the Egyptian presidential pardon committee, which conducts investigation of cases of prisoners' situations that are not complying with international human rights standards. Up to this moment, we have seen over 1 000 detainees released, which is a step in the right direction. However, we should like to see all people arrested in relation to the protests in Egypt released.

Following the ninth EU-Egypt Association Council meeting this summer it is critical to keep up and reinforce the EU commitment and willingness to cooperate with Egypt in the important area of democracy, fundamental freedoms and human rights, gender equality and equal opportunity, as well to address the root causes of terrorism and extremism.

Javi López, *en nombre del Grupo S&D*. – Señor presidente, ahora que ha llegado a su fin la COP27, celebrada en Egipto, en Sharm el Sheij, pero que la pesadilla que viven los activistas y defensores de derechos humanos, periodistas y sociedad civil no ha acabado en el país, es un buen momento para hablar de ello, para arrojar luz sobre los más de 60 000 presos políticos que tiene el país: mujeres y hombres encarcelados de forma arbitraria y que no tienen acceso a un juicio justo.

Yo querría hacer dos pequeños comentarios sobre las intervenciones que me han precedido.

La Comisión Europea ha dicho literalmente que aplaudía el compromiso del presidente Al-Sisi con los derechos humanos: ¿usted diría del presidente de una autocracia brutal que viola sistemáticamente los derechos humanos una calificación como esta?

Al mismo tiempo, hemos escuchado una intervención de otro grupo político sobre su postura y sobre los avances. Yo creo que lo único que deberíamos intentar hacer es tener una exigencia compartida, porque, luego, cuando venimos aquí y hablamos de China, o de Irán, o de Rusia, ¿por qué no utilizamos el mismo lenguaje? ¿por qué hablamos de forma tan diferente? Y luego el resto del mundo nos dice, con razón, que si utilizamos dobles estándares.

Yo lo único que pido es un poco de exigencia. Porque lo que podría parecer una oportunidad como la COP, al final ha sido un espejismo. No ha habido avances reales, se han hecho gestos que no se han convertido en realidad, se vive una situación deplorable en el país… Al final ha sido un escaparate para la represión, que es lo que hemos podido ver la delegación en la COP, con una presencia de fuerzas de seguridad egipcias dentro del recinto absolutamente desproporcionada y sin precedentes.

Cabe recordar los casos de Alaa Abdel Fattah, de Zaki y, obviamente de Giulio Regeni, para el que pedimos justicia, reparación y, sobre todo, verdad.

Hay que continuar colaborando, trabajando, con las autoridades egipcias, pero dejar de hacer aquello que no funciona. Y no están funcionando los trabajos en términos de derechos humanos con el país.

Jan-Christoph Oetjen, *on behalf of the Renew Group*. – Mr President, colleagues COP 27 has shed a light on the dire situation of human rights in Egypt, and COP 27 could have been an opportunity to bring a better situation for human rights, for the government to show that Egypt is committed to human rights. But all they're doing is just the contrary. Yes, they have put in place a presidential pardon committee. But let's be honest colleagues, they pardoned people that never should have been detained. They detain arbitrarily people that are against the regime. No opposition is allowed. And so then afterwards, they say, 'OK, we do a presidential pardon'. Sorry, colleagues, this is not a step forward for human rights. This is just nonsense from my point of view.

And we should be very clear: there are hundreds and thousands of people detained arbitrarily that have no access to fair trials. These are lawyers. These are journalists. These are human rights defenders, bloggers, etc. So all those people, we want them to be free, to be able to speak out loud what's happening in their country at the moment. And I want to name personally Alaa Abd El-Fattah. He is in prison since a long time, and he was close to death only a couple of days ago during COP 27. And I call on the European Commission and the Member States to step up for Alaa Abdel Fattah. I call on the Egyptian Government to free him because he should be free and he should go back to UK, to his family.

Bas Eickhout, *on behalf of the Verts/ALE Group*. – Mr President, we are indeed back from Sharm el-Sheikh, from the COP27, where I was last week as a delegation leader of the European Parliament's delegation to COP27. I have to be very honest, if I then hear the Commission say that they are very happy with the room for civil society that was there, then sorry but you were not there. There is a shrinking space for civil society there in Sharm el-Sheikh. People were intimidated, harassed. There is even a complaint by the German Government; they don't do that for nothing.

We, with this badge, were harassed at the entrance, where we were only making the claim that political prisoners should be freed. We were harassed for that. I expect the Commission to speak out on that, and not say that it's all fine, and that indeed we see, as my colleague from Renew said, that some prisoners were freed, because at the same time we know that since then at least 1 953 Egyptians were imprisoned. That should be the focus of our story, that should be the focus of this discussion.

We have left Sharm el-Sheikh. We can go freely back to Europe, but the civil society of Egypt stays in Egypt, and are now under close scrutiny after COP27. That should be our concern and prime focus.

I'm sincerely disappointed by the speech by the European Commission. Because we do know what the political prisoners are ongoing, and that civil society is getting less and less room in Egypt.

We have a standing rapporteur, Mr Mounir Satouri, who will keep on following this situation, but that is the message we should give to the civil society in Egypt: that maybe COP27 moved on, but we will keep on keeping this issue very close. That's also the message that this resolution is giving, and also the message to the UN, that for the next time, the next COPs, there should be room for freedom of expression and for civil society to make their voices heard in any UN conference that is being organised – and that I also expect to hear from the Commission.

Thierry Mariani, *au nom du groupe ID*. – Monsieur le Président, l'Égypte vient d'organiser brillamment la COP 27. Évidemment, le contenu des discussions est sujet à de nombreux débats politiques. Toutefois, nous pouvons nous accorder sur une chose: Le Caire a parfaitement fait les choses. Notre Parlement passe son temps à donner des leçons d'écologie à la planète entière. On aurait pu saisir au moins l'occasion de ce débat pour féliciter l'Égypte et son peuple.

Mais l'occasion était trop belle. L'occasion était trop belle de reprendre le discours des associations qui n'ont pas digéré l'éviction des Frères musulmans du pouvoir. L'occasion était trop belle de servir la soupe au réseau Soros, qui attaque la France pour sa relation privilégiée avec Le Caire. Il est d'ailleurs fascinant de constater la différence de traitement qui est faite dans ce Parlement entre l'Égypte et le Qatar.

Le Qatar a participé à la déstabilisation de tout le Moyen-Orient. Il a soutenu des rébellions islamistes parmi les plus sanglantes de l'histoire. Il continue à héberger les prêcheurs les plus fondamentalistes du monde arabe. Le Parlement européen présentera bientôt une résolution qui lui pardonne tout et le félicite sur bien des points.

L'Égypte du président al-Sissi fait des progrès en matière de liberté religieuse, combat l'islamisme sur son sol, influence son voisinage pour résister aux djihadistes. Le Parlement européen présente une résolution aux termes aussi injustes que violents contre elle.

Encore une fois, le monde arabe va lire ces initiatives comme un modèle de la duplicité et de l'hypocrisie de l'Union européenne. Encore une fois, le reste du monde va se demander comment l'Europe peut se tromper à ce point dans le choix de ses partenaires régionaux. Encore une fois, les citoyens des États membres vont se poser une question légitime: pourquoi une telle soumission au Qatar, en Europe, alors que ce pays finance des associations et des médias qui s'ingèrent dans la vie publique?

Bien sûr qu'il faut encourager l'Égypte à continuer ses progrès humains et économiques, à moderniser ses infrastructures et à continuer à s'impliquer dans la lutte contre l'immigration illégale et surtout à avoir une politique courageuse de lutte contre le terrorisme. Nous devons être, pour cela, à ses côtés.

Denis Nesci, *a nome del gruppo ECR*. – Signor Presidente, signor Commissario, onorevoli colleghi, l'Egitto rappresenta un paese amico e un partner strategico con il quale abbiamo obiettivi condivisi per costruire un futuro di stabilità, pace e prosperità nel Mediterraneo.

Sarà fondamentale rafforzare la nostra cooperazione riguardo alle politiche commerciali, alla sicurezza energetica, al contrasto dell'immigrazione illegale e al traffico degli esseri umani, nonché al terrorismo e ai fenomeni di radicalizzazione.

Tuttavia, l'Unione europea e i suoi Stati membri devono continuare a svolgere una forte azione diplomatica per spingere l'Egitto a compiere quei progressi nel campo dei diritti umani e della tutela delle minoranze, penso ai soprusi subiti dai copti nel paese.

Ma da italiano ed europeo credo sia giunto il momento di pretendere la verità sul rapimento e la morte di Giulio Regeni, avvenuta nel gennaio 2016, esortando le autorità egiziane a mettere da parte quel clima di ostilità e di scarsa collaborazione avuta finora, a cooperare con le autorità italiane riguardo ai quattro agenti dell'intelligence egiziana sospettati del rapimento e ad assicurare alla giustizia i veri responsabili.

Questo lo dobbiamo innanzitutto alla famiglia di Giulio Regeni, alla nostra credibilità nel contesto internazionale e alla volontà di mettere in campo con l'Egitto delle relazioni bilaterali stabili, leali e credibili.

Mick Wallace, *on behalf of The Left Group*. – Mr President, Commissioner, attending the COP last week in Egypt we heard testimony of el-Sisi's brutal crackdown on activists and journalists who live in constant fear for their lives. They face intimidation, harassment and surveillance on a daily basis. The harassment even extended to attendees of the climate summit. While we were there, 400 new ones were arrested and three died from lack of care in prison.

Egypt's US-backed regime has effectively banned the right to peaceful assembly and moved to shut down civil society. An estimated 65 000 political prisoners are unjustly detained. Among them is Alaa Abd el-Fattah, arrested for his opposition to the government and imprisoned for over nine years now. His recent hunger strike was ended by being force fed by the Egyptian authorities.

Sisi's dictatorship not only gets a free pass for its repression, last year Macron decorated Sisi with the Grand Cross of the Legion of Honour, a praise I imagine France gives to all brutal dictators who choose France as their number one weapons dealer.

We never shut up about human rights in here, but we only call for action against enemies of the US. We have zero credibility on human rights as long as the likes of France, Germany and Italy profit from Egypt's oppression and warmongering. As long as we maintain these double standards, the EU will rightly be seen as a joke when moralising on the world stage.

Would it be too much to ask of the EU to ask its US Member States to stop supplying Sisi's dictatorship with weapons until all political prisoners are released?

Spontane Wortmeldungen

Seán Kelly (PPE). – *A Uachtaráin*, having attended COP last week in Egypt, obviously the main focus was on climate change, which of course was the primary purpose. And I think we did an awful lot of that. But we did have an opportunity to engage also with human rights activists in Egypt, and their stories certainly were very strong and very compelling. And we did promise that we would bring these to the attention of our colleagues here in the European Parliament, which this debate allows us to do.

Some people would say maybe that events like COP and maybe the World Cup in Qatar shouldn't take place in those countries, but I think if we utilise it to ensure that we aren't mugged, that we bring back the messages and act accordingly, then we can turn that into a benefit, because if you don't go to a lot of countries where there are human rights issues, then the number unfortunately that you'll be going to will be probably very limited.

But definitely it's good that we have the opportunity to bring back the message: Egypt must step up to the plate and reduce a lot of these human rights and human abuses which are too prevalent altogether.

Clare Daly (The Left). – Mr President, I'd just like to really add my comments to the strong words of colleagues that we do ourselves no favours by being geopolitical in which human rights that we condemn. And the testimony of activists in Egypt is really quite frightening. At least 520 websites blocked, 129 of them news sites. The government actively tracking down and targeting those who publish content on social media which is critical of government policies, even as people experience very difficult living conditions. And we've even had a number of women who had used TikTok to present dancing content being imprisoned on the grounds of protecting morals.

So we have to be very clear in calling out that there has to be an end to the internet censorship, including blocking news websites, particularly Mada Masr, Al-Manassa and Darb. We must encourage the government to adopt amendments to the NGO law, which effectively means that the security services decide which NGOs can operate. And we must call and add our call to the call of this Parliament for Alaa Abd El-Fattah to be released and freed from his illegal detention.

(Ende der spontanen Wortmeldungen)

Janez Lenarčič, *Member of the Commission*. – Mr President, honourable Members, thank you very much for your interventions. We take a very careful note of them.

I would like to assure you all that respect for human rights and fundamental freedoms is part and parcel of EU-Egypt relations. There are issues that need to be addressed, and this includes the case of Alaa Abd el-Fattah. This includes the Regini case, among others. As for any other country, this is our continuous endeavour. The EU will continue cooperating and engaging on human rights with Egypt, also after COP27.

The European Union has a clear interest to support Egypt in maintaining long-term stability and security. But we at the same time very much believe that this can only be achieved if all aspects of human rights are fully implemented and upheld.

We will further advance and strengthen our engagement with our Egyptian partners, and we look forward to continuing this work, including in the upcoming established dialogue which will take place in December in the Subcommittee on Human Rights.

Der Präsident. – Die Aussprache ist geschlossen.

Die Abstimmung findet morgen, Donnerstag, 24. November 2022, statt.

16. Aussprache über Fälle von Verletzungen der Menschenrechte, der Demokratie und der Rechtsstaatlichkeit (Aussprache)

16.1. Die Menschenrechtslage in Afghanistan, insbesondere mit Blick auf die Verschlechterung der Frauenrechte und die Anschläge auf Bildungseinrichtungen

Der Präsident. – Als nächster Punkt der Tagesordnung folgt die Aussprache über sechs Entschließungsanträge zur Menschenrechtslage in Afghanistan, insbesondere mit Blick auf die Verschlechterung der Frauenrechte und die Anschläge auf Bildungseinrichtungen (2022/2955(RSP)) (*).

Željana Zovko, *author.* – Mr President, Commissioner, I deeply deplore the recent attacks against the educational institutions in Afghanistan and call on the authorities to hold those responsible accountable. The deteriorating situation for women and girls in Afghanistan continues to be of grave concern. Since the Taliban took power, they have undone women's position in society, removed them from public life, closed secondary schools for girls, and restricted women's right to freedom of movement, employment and political participation.

I strongly condemn this systematic rollback. With our resolution, we send a strong message of support to all those women and girls that are affected. We demand respect for and protection of their rights. We urge to ensure that broad education is equally accessible for all, for boys and girls, and in line with UNESCO's standards and principles.

In the end, I was in Peshawar five years ago, where they repatriated these women. I still remember the sad eyes of the girl who spoke to me and who said that the only thing she wants in her life is to get an education, but her father doesn't allow her that. She is in Afghanistan somewhere now. I wish her well and I wish that her situation changes.

Evin Incir, *author.* – Mr President, since 15 August 2021, when the Taliban stole power in Afghanistan, the situation in the country has deteriorated quickly, in particular the situation for women and girls, and especially for minority groups such as the Hazara. The extremist Taliban group initiated their rule by appointing an all-male cabinet, which they call a government. For me, as a social Democrat and a feminist, it is nothing less than a group of terrorists that destroys the lives of the people and the progress made in Afghanistan.

They decide on what women and girls should wear. They decide on where women and girls should walk. They decide on what women and girls can or cannot say. The Taliban gender apartheid is despicable and it must end now.

Commissioner, you need to expand the list of targeted measures against the Taliban leadership responsible for this, because dismantling human rights must come with a price. The EU must step up its efforts to share information with the International Criminal Court to ensure the end of impunity. Violating international law must have consequences, and EU countries should increase their humanitarian assistance to the UN, and NGOs' unprecedented and urgent needs must be met. Women and girls in Afghanistan are suffering right now.

(') Siehe Protokoll

SĒDI VADA: ROBERTS ZĪLE

Priekšsēdētājas vietnieks

María Soraya Rodríguez Ramos, *autora*. – Señor presidente, en Afganistán, más de un año después de la toma del poder de los talibanes, no hay discriminación de género, hay un verdadero *apartheid* de género: un sistema de segregación sistemática pensado para borrar a las mujeres y niñas del espacio público.

Esta es una demanda de las defensoras de los derechos humanos en Afganistán, de la que hoy nos hacemos eco en este Parlamento, que va a ser la primera institución de la comunidad internacional que va a adoptar este término. Llamemos a las cosas por su nombre. Las niñas y las mujeres en Afganistán viven en un auténtico infierno. 430 días llevan ya las niñas en Afganistán con sus colegios cerrados.

Pero pensemos también que desde aquí tenemos responsabilidad. Podemos hacer más cosas. Tenemos que coordinar nuestros esfuerzos a nivel internacional para la protección de las defensoras, ofreciéndoles opciones de educación y empleo. Tenemos que revisar nuestros puntos de acuerdo para trabajar con Afganistán. Nuestras relaciones no pueden pasar nunca por la legitimación de unas autoridades terroristas que han declarado la guerra a las mujeres. Un verdadero *apartheid* de género.

Tineke Strik, *author*. – Mr President, Commissioner, the situation in Afghanistan continues to be a hell after the Taliban takeover. And since our resolution in April, the lives of Afghans have even turned worse. Women and girls face horrible repression. They are excluded from public life to such an extent that it amounts to gender apartheid. Minorities are brutally attacked. Day by day, flagrant human rights violations take place without any accountability.

The humanitarian situation is equally dramatic. Nearly half of the population faces acute food insecurity, and this will only increase. So I call on the EU and the UN to step up humanitarian aid and make engagement with the Taliban conditional on the respect for human rights, but refrain from legitimising this ruthless criminal gang; hold them accountable and extend the sanctions list.

Mr President, the human rights defenders, journalists, judges – all who are targeted by the Taliban need our help to leave the country. But the opposite is happening: Afghan refugees are stuck in unsafe transit countries. Many arrivals in Europe are left in limbo despite the reality that they cannot return.

So Member States: stop these senseless and inhuman policies. Afghans deserve our help inside and outside the country. Bring them in safety and offer them sustainable protection, don't leave them alone.

Ryszard Czarnecki, *autor*. – Panie Przewodniczący! Panie Komisarzu! To bardzo ważna debata, ponieważ ona jest potrzebna zwłaszcza tym spośród nas, także tym z unijnej dyplomacji, którzy chcą prowadzić taką „realpolitik" z Afganistanem, którzy chcą na ołtarzu – no, pewnych relacji, zachowania pewnych relacji, może ich polepszania – poświęcić prawa człowieka, w tym prawa kobiet.

I myślę, że tak naprawdę przesłanie tej debaty, w której – jak widzę, i dobrze – jesteśmy ponad podziałami, ono powinno trafić do tych po naszej stronie, po stronie Unii Europejskiej, którzy tak naprawdę wolą być ślepi na to, co się dzieje w Afganistanie, na to, co się dzieje pod rządami talibów. Oczywiście słyszymy cały czas, że oni są lepsi niż ci talibowie sprzed 20 lat, bardziej wykształceni, bardziej umiarkowani. Ale cały czas chodzi o to samo. Cały czas chodzi o łamanie praw człowieka, w tym praw kobiet. W tej sprawie musimy naprawdę być solidarni i musimy naszych kolegów, którzy chcą być za taką „realpolitik", przekonywać.

Marisa Matias, *Autora*. – Senhor Presidente, sabemos que o regime talibã viola sistematicamente os direitos das mulheres e meninas. Sabemos que existe um *apartheid* de género. Sabemos que 850 000 raparigas foram impedidas de frequentar o ensino secundário durante mais de um ano. Sabemos e condenamos tudo isso.

Exigimos a total responsabilização do regime talibã e congratulamo-nos com o reatamento da investigação do Tribunal Penal Internacional sobre os crimes de guerra contra a Humanidade e crimes de guerra no Afeganistão.

Mas é preciso ir muito mais longe. Precisamos que os ataques crescentes contra os grupos minoritários, como os Hazara, sejam chamados pelo nome, genocídio, conforme declarou o relator especial. Precisamos que os países da União Europeia concedam vistos humanitários aos afegãos que aqui procuram proteção, dando prioridade às mulheres e raparigas. Precisamos que os Estados-Membros apoiem a aplicação da Diretiva relativa à Proteção Temporária aos afegãos.

É insustentável o regime assumido de dois pesos e duas medidas na União Europeia. Precisamos de ajudar os países de acolhimento de refugiados com assistência humanitária, financeira e técnica. Precisamos de rotas legalizadas e viagens seguras para os refugiados afegãos e precisamos, sobretudo e também, de assumir responsabilidades.

20 anos após a intervenção ilegal dos Estados Unidos e da NATO, o conflito causou um grande sofrimento e graves danos ao desenvolvimento económico e social do Afeganistão. Precisamos, por isso e também, de corrigir o legado de abusos de direitos humanos dos últimos 20 anos.

Krzysztof Hetman, *w imieniu grupy PPE*. – Panie Przewodniczący! Panie Komisarzu! Szanowne Koleżanki i Koledzy! Powiedzieć, że sytuacja praw człowieka w Afganistanie, a w szczególności sytuacja kobiet i mniejszości religijnych, jest trudna, to jak nie powiedzieć nic. Systemowe eliminowanie kobiet z życia publicznego, zakaz ich wstępu do parków czy obiektów sportowych, ograniczanie wolności przemieszczania się – to tylko niektóre przykłady. Najpoważniejszym z zakazów jest uniemożliwienie młodym dziewczętom kontynuowania edukacji, co będzie miało ogromne negatywne skutki dla kobiet w Afganistanie na lata, spowoduje ich marginalizację, wzrost ryzyka zawierania małżeństw przez dzieci i poważnie obniży perspektywy zawodowe kobiet.

Unia Europejska powinna aktywnie wspierać organizacje i aktywistów działających w obronie praw człowieka, chroniących kobiety i mniejszości w Afganistanie. Ponadto, oprócz wezwania władz w Afganistanie do poszanowania praw człowieka i prawa międzynarodowego, powinniśmy także domagać się utworzenia przy Radzie Praw Człowieka ONZ niezależnego ciała badającego i dokumentującego wszelkie naruszenia prawa międzynarodowego i praw człowieka w tym kraju. Nie możemy dopuścić, aby osoby odpowiedzialne uciekły od jakiejkolwiek odpowiedzialności za te wszystkie czyny.

Karsten Lucke, *im Namen der S&D-Fraktion*. – Sehr geehrter Herr Präsident, Herr Kommissar! Wir alle kennen das berühmte Zitat von Nelson Mandela: „Bildung ist die mächtigste Waffe, die du verwenden kannst, um die Welt zu verändern." Und bei all den Begründungen, die vermeintlich durch die Taliban angeführt werden, warum Mädchen und Frauen in Afghanistan von der Bildung ausgeschlossen werden, ist vielleicht der wirkliche Grund für die Repression durch die Taliban, dass sie Angst vor der Veränderung haben, dass der Verlust des eigenen Machtstatus zur Disposition steht, und die Angst vor der Kraft der Mädchen und jungen Frauen für eine positive Veränderung hin zu einem freien und blühenden Afghanistan.

Ich bin davon überzeugt, am Ende wird der Wunsch nach der Freiheit siegen, und das Verlangen nach den Menschenrechten wird größer und mächtiger sein als das verbrecherische Regime der Taliban.

Das bedeutet allerdings nicht, dass wir abwarten und zuschauen dürfen. Wir müssen als Europäische Union aktiv Unterstützung leisten und den Mädchen und Frauen in Afghanistan auf ihrem Weg zur freien Selbstentfaltung helfen. Dabei ist Bildung ein –wenn nicht vielleicht sogar der zentrale – Baustein.

Ich schließe mit den Worten der 17-jährigen Afghanin Mursal Fasihi, die sagt:

„I hope that young girls will not give up. It's OK to be scared, it's OK to cry, but giving up is not an option. Our bright morning will come."

Petras Auštrevičius, *on behalf of the Renew Group*. – Mr President, Commissioner, dear colleagues, the return of the Taliban to power in Afghanistan has turned this country, ravaged by decades of conflict and tension, into a radical Islam reserve where entire social groups, primarily minorities and women, have become second-class citizens.

The Taliban's systematic action in restricting women's social and political rights and denying girls access to education is inexcusable. It is a complete waste of the progress of the last 20 years and a reversal of the promise of a better future. The Taliban's actions deserve to be clearly labelled as gender-based apartheid. These are crimes that must be immediately ceased, investigated and punished.

I call on the ICC Prosecutor to immediately undertake an investigation into the Taliban's crimes of discrimination against and attempted erasure of women and girls from public life. I also call for more EU and international efforts to support women's rights defenders and for continued action to empower Afghan women and girls.

Erik Marquardt, *im Namen der Verts/ALE-Fraktion*. – Herr Präsident! Herr Kommissar, sehr gut, dass Sie anwesend sind, und auch sehr gut, dass wir diese Debatte führen, dass wir diese Entschließung haben, dass wir zeigen, dass wir das Leid der Menschen in Afghanistan nicht vergessen, und insbesondere auch, dass es uns auch nicht egal ist, wie wir in der Zukunft die Situation verbessern können.

Wir müssen einfach schauen: Wie können wir auf der einen Seite die humanitäre Situation in Afghanistan verbessern? Wie können wir auf der anderen Seite aber auch klarmachen, dass die größte Gefahr für Afghanistan am Ende immer die Taliban bleiben?

Wir sind uns ja einig, dass man den Menschen in Afghanistan helfen muss. Was mich ein bisschen besorgt, ist – in den Debatten der letzten Wochen –, dass wir auf der einen Seite mit den Menschen in Afghanistan fühlen, solange sie in Afghanistan sind; aber sobald sie aus dem Land fliehen, versuchen, auf sehr unsicheren Wegen mit irgendwelchen Schleppernetzwerken, irgendwelchen Mafias – weil es keine legalen Fluchtwege gibt – aus dem Land zu kommen, dann fehlt uns die Empathie, dann sind wir sehr groß darin, zu sagen, dass man die Balkanroute endlich schließen muss; eine der größten Gruppen sind ja Menschen aus Afghanistan.

Ich würde mir wünschen, dass wir die Empathie, die wir in der Entschließung mit den Menschen in Afghanistan zeigen, auch mit den Menschen aus Afghanistan haben, wenn sie nicht mehr weiterwissen und fliehen müssen.

Bernhard Zimniok, *im Namen der ID-Fraktion*. – Herr Präsident, Herr Kommissar! Das ist nun gefühlt die einhundertste Debatte zur Lage der Frauen in Afghanistan. Nichts hat sich geändert – 20 Jahre erfolgloser Werteexport.

Wir müssen endlich akzeptieren, dass es andere Kulturen und Wertesysteme gibt. Afghanistan wird euch immer fremd bleiben. So haben 80 % der afghanischen Frauen bei einer Umfrage der Weltbank 2015 ihren Männern das Recht zugesprochen, sie bei Verfehlungen wie zu widersprechen, Sex zu verweigern oder ohne Genehmigung aus dem Haus zu gehen, zu schlagen.

Die Welt da draußen ist kein grün-roter Ponyhof. Wie immer ist unsere Herangehensweise durch unsere westliche Perspektive geprägt und meist völlig kontraproduktiv. So will Deutschland bis zu 1 000 Afghanen monatlich aufnehmen, die aufgrund ihres Kampfes für Demokratie und Menschenrechte besonders gefährdet sind. Mal ganz abgesehen davon, dass unsere Kapazitäten diese Menschen nicht aufnehmen können – diese Menschen können einen Wandel von innen heraus bewirken, den wir nicht können.

Wir müssen endlich aufhören, aus westlicher Arroganz heraus zu entscheiden, was gut für Afghanistan, was gut für den Rest der Welt ist.

Clare Daly, *on behalf of the The Left Group*. – Mr President, more than a year after the international community adopted a policy of not dealing with the Taliban. More than a year after the US froze USD 7 billion of Afghan financial resources and continued vicious sanctions against that country, and more than a year after the EU spent a mere EUR 400 million on humanitarian aid for Afghanistan, despite the US spending USD 300 million a day for 20 years during the war, we have got to a place where now women are even banned from public parks. What an absolute unmitigated disaster.

Ignoring Afghanistan is not a solution. Yes, we should open our borders and take in refugees. Daily, I have met with desperate pleas of people, but how many are we going to take? One million, two million? Then what are we going to do with the millions who are left behind?

I'm assuming that nobody here is mad enough to think of invading again. If that's the case, we have to deal with reality. The most basic human right is the right to life. We have to start allowing the economy to function, linking improvements to that. Anything else is condemning Afghan women not just to exclusion, but to death. We have to stop standing idly by.

Seán Kelly (PPE). – *A Uachtaráin*, Afghanistan is about to endure its second winter since the Taliban's seizure of power in August 2021. Since then, the rights of women have been trampled on. Conflict, violence and human rights violations have become an inseparable part of the lives of ordinary citizens. The country's economy is in a shambles and a major food crisis is escalating.

Life has become particularly tough for female scholars and students. Thousands have fled to neighbouring Iran and Pakistan and have applied to organisations that help academics to find posts in other countries. However, fewer than 10% have been successful as visa wait-times continue to be a challenge for many. I have encountered the same difficulties as I have tried to help a lady academic and her family escape the clutches of the Taliban.

I urge the EU to take immediate action to secure the lives and careers of Afghanistan's women and scholars, and I call for a more coordinated response to protect those most vulnerable.

Catch-the-eye procedure

Tomislav Sokol (PPE). – Poštovani predsjedavajući, nakon više od godinu dana od ponovnog dolaska talibana na vlast, očito je da se život običnih Afganistanaca jako pogoršao, što je bilo i za očekivati. Militantni islamisti tom zemljom vladaju kroz nasilje i zabrane te progon manjina, posebno Hazara i kršćana.

Talibanski režim masovno krši ljudska prava, osobito prava žena. Mladim djevojkama je zabranjeno srednjoškolsko obrazovanje. Treba otvoreno reći da trenutno stanje u Afganistanu predstavlja katastrofalni vojni i geopolitički poraz Zapada.

U razdoblju nakon 2001. NATO se oslonio uglavnom na potpuno nekompetentne i korumpirane domaće kadrove, što je nužno dovelo do ubrzanog urušavanja vlade s povlačenjem savezničkih snaga. Danas Afganistan predstavlja izvor nestabilnosti, polazišnu točku za ilegalne migracije prema Europi, što predstavlja golemi sigurnosni problem.

Utjecaj Kine i Rusije u središnjoj Aziji je ojačao, ovdje sa zapada oslabio. Europska unija mora jasnije definirati vlastite prioritete u ovom dijelu svijeta i konkretnije se angažirati u stvaranju saveza s državama s kojima dijeli zajednički interes. U suprotnom, ostat će vanjskopolitički patuljak kakav je danas.

Michaela Šojdrová (PPE). – Pane předsedající, dámy a pánové, podporuji tuto rezoluci, protože je důležité, aby Evropský parlament podpořil ty, kteří bojují za lidská práva, v tomto případě zejména za vzdělávání, ženy, které se hlásí o své právo na vzdělání. Je neuvěřitelné, že Afghánistán, který přijal v loňském roce finanční pomoc od EU ve výši jedné miliardy eur, je schopen takovýmto způsobem ponižovat ženy, pronásledovat náboženské menšiny včetně křesťanů. Tálibán zná sílu vzdělání, a o to více si přeji, aby afghánské ženy vytrvaly ve svých protestech a nenechaly se umlčet stejně tak jako vědci, jako novináři. Vyzýváme Evropskou komisi, aby podmínila další čerpání finanční pomoci dodržováním lidských práv včetně práva na vzdělání.

Mick Wallace (The Left). – Mr President, Afghanistan is not a good place to be a woman. While the Taliban government put in place more restrictions on women's rights, Western sanctions slowly starve the country to death. We helped to destroy the place for 20 years. Now we have a responsibility to provide shelter to those who are suffering as a result.

The EU response to the Ukraine refugee crisis shows what is possible when the political will is there. What we were aiming to do with this resolution is stress the need for similar protection for Afghan refugees. But the big groups in here weren't having it. They seem content with the two-tier system we put in place all over Europe for refugees and asylum seekers.

Nowhere is that more obvious than in Ireland, a country long criticised for its cruel Direct Provision system. We have thrown open the doors for Ukrainian refugees while leaving them closed to the rest.

In an interview with *The Irish Times*, a young Afghan woman talked about the different treatment refugees received, particularly in terms of accommodation, where host families are now paid EUR 100 a month to host Ukrainian refugees but nothing to host refugees from Afghanistan or elsewhere.

She said it's sad that they are seen as less than Ukrainians. It's not just sad, it's racism – and shame on all the politicians who are perpetrating it!

(End of catch-the-eye procedure)

Janez Lenarčič, *Member of the Commission*. – Mr President, honourable Members, the European Union has a clear commitment to the Afghan people, and we follow closely the human rights situation in the country and in particular, the rights of women and girls. As it has been said by many in this debate, there is a systematic deterioration of women's rights in Afghanistan since the Taliban took power. They have deprived girls of secondary education, issued restrictions on women's dress, work and movement, even barring them from entering public parks and gyms.

Women have been excluded from most aspects of economic and social life. Shelters and mechanisms to protect women and girls from violence and forced marriages have been dismantled, severely restricting women's ability to seek help, despite reports of an increase in gender-based violence.

In the past year, Afghanistan has also seen repeated attacks on educational institutions, on students eager to learn, with many of these attacks claimed by ISIS. The terrorist attacks also targeted religious and ethnic minorities, particularly the Hazara community.

The European Union condemns all the restrictions on women's rights and continues to call on the de facto authorities to honour Afghanistan's obligations under international law, in particular human rights, refugee and international humanitarian law. They have the obligation to protect all the population, to bring perpetrators to justice, and to ensure respect for human rights and fundamental freedoms of the entire Afghan population.

We will continue to support Afghan human rights activists and civil society as we do worldwide as a fundamental principle of the European Union. This support includes raising individual cases of human rights defenders in our engagement with the de facto authorities, issuing statements on specific cases or developments of acute concern, financial support to civil society organisations and continuation of safe-passage operations for those Afghans that are particularly at risk and that want to leave.

The humanitarian situation in Afghanistan is beyond dramatic. The recent United Nations humanitarian needs overview states that in 2023, over 28 million people out of 34 million Afghan population will need humanitarian assistance. Estimations are that the United Nations will therefore call for USD 4.6 billion for next year for humanitarian aid alone.

There are alarming levels of poverty and food insecurity and limited access to healthcare, particularly for women and children. The European Union has already mobilised EUR 396 million for humanitarian aid in Afghanistan for 2021 and 2022. And this is more than 10 times of what was initially allocated for the country before the Taliban takeover. Where is this funding going? It is going to many things, including financing programmes on protection, financing community-based education for girls who are deprived of their right to school, financing basic healthcare for women and girls. And we have also recently redirected EUR 450 million of development aid for the basic needs of Afghan people; needs like health, nutrition, education, water and sanitation and livelihoods. And also in these fields we have a specific focus on the needs of women and girls. An additional EUR 20 million have been also allocated for crisis response.

We shall continue to do our utmost to alleviate this major humanitarian, social, economic and human rights crisis.

Sēdes vadītājs. – Debates ir slēgtas.

Balsošana notiks rītdien.

Rakstiski paziņojumi (171. pants)

Dominique Bilde (ID), *par écrit*. – Plus d'un an après le retour des talibans au pouvoir, que reste-t-il des espoirs de quelques gogos crédules quant à l'avènement d'un gouvernement «modéré»? Bien peu de choses, de même, du reste, que s'agissant des droits les plus élémentaires des femmes. De l'éducation à la tenue vestimentaire, en passant par les avanies les plus mesquines, à l'instar des restrictions relatives à la fréquentation des parcs et jardins de Kaboul, rien n'aura été épargné à ces dernières.

Au-delà de l'indignation que suscite cette litanie de persécutions, il faut aussi souligner l'absurdité qu'elles représentent à l'heure où la population afghane crie famine. Car, au travers des femmes, de leur travail et de leur contribution indispensable à leur foyer, ce sont des enfants et des familles entières qui se trouvent réduits à la misère.

Pour nous autres, Occidentaux, il s'agit également de savoir jusqu'à quel point l'impératif humanitaire doit nous conduire à transiger sur nos valeurs fondamentales. Que dire, en effet, lorsque les talibans entravent les femmes œuvrant pour les organisations humanitaires dans l'exercice de leur mission? À l'évidence, dans notre engagement pour la condition féminine dans le monde, il nous appartient de montrer l'exemple.

16.2. Die anhaltende Unterdrückung der demokratischen Opposition und der Zivilgesellschaft in Belarus

Sēdes vadītājs. – Nākamais darba kārtības punkts ir debates par pieciem rezolūciju priekšlikumiem attiecībā uz pastāvīgajām represijām pret demokrātisko opozīciju un pilsonisko sabiedrību Baltkrievijā (2022/2956(RSP)) (*).

Miriam Lexmann, *author*. – Mr President, colleagues, while Lukashenko's illegitimate regime enables Putin's aggression against Ukraine, it continues to oppress and terrorise its own people. There are now at least 1 450 political prisoners and tens of thousands more who are suffering under the regime's oppression.

In particular, I would like to highlight my brave friend Pavel Seviarynets, who has been held in inhuman conditions for more than two years and has spent more than a decade in and out of Lukashenko's prisons. Pavel and all the political prisoners and their families, those fleeing Lukashenko's oppression and all the people of Belarus deserve our unwavering support and solidarity.

I especially call on the European political parties to provide all necessary assistance to their Belarus member parties. At the same time, let us exert maximum pressure on the illegitimate regime so that Belarus can be free and sovereign and its people enjoy freedom and democracy.

Finally, let me thank colleagues for all the cross-party support in this House, for their support of Belarus, which this House continues to show.

Juozas Olekas, *Autorius.* – Gerbiamas Pirmininke, gerbiamas Komisijos nary, gerbiami kolegos. Nusikalstamas Lukašenkos režimas Baltarusijoje toliau stiprina represijas prieš bet kokią valdžios kritiką. Šalyje jau virš tūkstančio keturių šimtų politinių kalinių, virš tūkstančio keturių šimtų žmonių kalėjimuose vien dėl to, kad jie norėjo išreikšti savo nuomonę ir nepabijojo to padaryti. Europos Sąjunga turi likti vieninga ir toliau spausti režimą. Ateinančiame sankcijų pakete reikia suvienodinti Rusijai ir Baltarusijai taikomas sankcijas, kad Rusija negalėtų naudotis Lukašenkos pagalba apeinant esančius ribojimus. Kuriant specialųjį tarptautinį tribunolą, skirtą Rusijos karo nusikaltimams Ukrainoje, į jo jurisdikciją reikia iškarto įtraukti ir pagalbininkus iš kitų šalių, tokius kaip Lukašenka, kurie leido Baltarusijos teritorija naudotis karo nusikaltimams prieš Ukrainą. Europos Sąjunga turi toliau remti Baltarusijos demokratinę opoziciją, didinti sisteminį bendradarbiavimą su ja, skatinti jos stiprėjimą ir vienijimąsi, kad tuomet, kai Baltarusijos diktatorius pagaliau bus nuverstas, opozicinės jėgos galėtų pradėti kurti modernią ir demokratišką Baltarusiją.

Petras Auštrevičius, *author.* – Mr President, Commissioner, dear colleagues, Belarus is a hostage of post-Soviet tyranny. The prosecution of critics and political opponents and fierce violence continue to dominate the Lukashenko regime's policies. This year's Nobel Peace Prize for the Belarus human rights organisation 'Vesna' is a symbol of the understanding we all have of what is really happening in Belarus and of the support expressed to its democratic opposition and civil society.

We must do everything possible to ensure that political opponents and civil society activists return to freedom from overcrowded Belarusian prisons. It is they, together with the country society, not Lukashenko's gang, who will determine the future of Belarus. I invite you to continue to strengthen our joint action to help the people of Belarus to move away from their dictatorial past. We must continue diplomatic and political pressure, as well as strengthen economic sanctions against the Lukashenko regime. Let us be under no illusions, this is a terrorist policy regime just like the one in the Kremlin.

Viola von Cramon-Taubadel, *Verfasserin.* – Herr Präsident, Herr Kommissar, liebe Kolleginnen und Kollegen! Es ist wichtig, dass wir trotz des brutalen Angriffskriegs Russlands in der Ukraine die Situation in Belarus nicht vergessen, denn die Schicksale dieser beiden Länder – Belarus und Ukraine – sind eng miteinander verbunden. Erst wenn Putin besiegt ist, wird auch Lukaschenkos Herrschaft zu einem Ende kommen.

Genauso wie die Menschen in der Ukraine sind die Menschen in Belarus wahre Kämpfer. Sie kämpfen seit langem für Freiheit und Demokratie, für eine bessere Zukunft ihrer Kinder, für eine Zukunft frei von Terror und Unterdrückung. Für diese Grundwerte, die auch unseren entsprechen, zahlen sie einen hohen Preis. Zehntausende wurden von Lukaschenkos Schergen verhaftet, inhaftiert und gefoltert. Über 1400 Belarussen – ganz normale Bürgerinnen und Bürger wie du und ich – werden mittlerweile als politische Häftlinge in Kerkern gehalten.

Ähnlich wie die Ukraine ist auch Belarus durch Russland besetzt. Lukaschenko erlaubte Putin den freien Zugriff von seinem Territorium aus auf die Ukraine. Der Verrat durch Lukaschenkos Regime ist etwas, das die Ukrainerinnen und Ukrainer und der Rest der Welt niemals vergessen werden. Die Welt wird niemals hunderte Raketen und Drohnen, abgefeuert aus Belarus, vergessen, die unendlich viele unschuldige Leben in der Ukraine auf dem Gewissen haben. Aber die Welt wird auch die Namen der Toten in Belarus, wie zum Beispiel Raman Bandarenka, Alexander Taraikowski oder auch Vitold Ashurak und viele andere nicht vergessen.

Die Geschichte lehrt uns: Früher oder später wird das Regime fallen – entweder vor dem Internationalen Gerichtshof oder am Ende durch das eigene Volk. Lukaschenko wird hier keine Ausnahme sein.

Anna Fotyga, *author.* – Mr President, Commissioner, terror and repression imposed by the usurper Lukashenko and his regime on Belarusian people, thousands of them imprisoned, including the Nobel Peace Prize laureate Ales Bieletski and Andrzej Poczobut – over 600 days in prison.

Young journalists in cages during court proceedings, de-routing of Poles and Lithuanians, Russifying very actively Belarusians enabling Putin to wage his war of aggression on Ukraine.

Despite all of this, Belarusian people consolidate in opposing the regime. They build structures. They actively fight together with Ukrainians against illegal aggression. Despite all of this!

(The speaker used a slogan in a non-EU language)

Andrzej Halicki, *w imieniu grupy PPE*. – Panie Przewodniczący! Reżim Łukaszenki stosuje terror wobec własnego społeczeństwa. Ostatnie wyroki: 25 lat, 20 lat. Tragiczne warunki. To tylko dowód jego słabości. Aleś Bialacki, noblista, także przedstawiciele polskiej mniejszości: wymieniony Andrzej Poczobut, Andżelika Borys, ale także zupełnie niewinni ludzie jak zdolny informatyk Siergiej Korszun, który nigdy nie złamał prawa – oni nie dadzą się zastraszyć. Nie da się zastraszyć białoruskie dzielne społeczeństwo. I Białoruś będzie demokratyczna i wolna. I apelujemy o uwolnienie więźniów politycznych natychmiast. Ale też apeluję o utworzenie tu w Parlamencie, w naszej siedzibie biura dla białoruskiej demokratycznej opozycji, dla przedstawicieli tego dzielnego społeczeństwa, byśmy natychmiast mieli informacje, prawdziwe fakty i mogli je upowszechniać. Dla Aleksandra Łukaszenki mam tylko jedną wiadomość: tyrani kończą marnie.

Thijs Reuten, *on behalf of the S&D Group*. – Mr President, Commissioner, a pro-Kremlin group just took down the website of the European Parliament because we called Russia and Lukashenko's regime exactly what they are. Russia is a state sponsor of terrorism and Lukashenko is its eager accomplice. Let me make this very clear. The voices of freedom will not be silenced. Lukashenko can throw 1400 peaceful democracy activists in jail, including even Nobel Prize laureate Ales Bialiatski; he can try to crush any remaining dissent; he can invite Russian occupation troops into Belarus in a desperate attempt to hold on to power, but he will not succeed. His dictatorship will end, and Belarus will be democratic and free.

Our European Union must give the legitimate representatives of the Belarusian people all the assistance they need. I call on you personally, Mr President, to ensure that our Parliament does the same – building solid relationships with the democratic opposition. *(The speaker used a slogan in a non-EU language)*

Karin Karlsbro, *on behalf of the Renew Group*. – Mr President, Commissioner, colleagues, the Nobel Peace Prize winner Ales Bialiatski is one of the courageous human rights activists in Belarus. Since last summer, he has been imprisoned without trial.

A desperate dictator tries to keep the people in fear. It's not only the Belarusian people who suffer from Lukashenko's tyranny. By allowing Russia to use Belarusian territory for attacks against Ukraine, the regime in Minsk continues to enable Russia's unjustified war of aggression against Ukraine.

We cannot let Lukashenko get away with this. He is, together with Putin, responsible for the war crimes in Ukraine and should be held accountable. It is Lukashenko who should be imprisoned while Ales and his 1 449 fellow political prisoners should go free.

(The speaker used a slogan in a non-EU language)

Markéta Gregorová, *on behalf of the Verts/ALE Group*. – Mr President, dear colleagues, when I say 1 400 political prisoners in Belarus, do you imagine a face? I do. I will probably never forget Kasia Budzko, now 21 years old. She studied to become a teacher and now, for two years of her still so very brief life, she is in a penal colony because of challenging the authorities.

I have the same activist nature. I can't stand oppression and injustice. If I live one day in dictatorship, I am certain I will end up the same as her, or dead. Maybe then someone will read my name in a room like this. But can it change anything?

I'm trying not to lose hope. With every resolution like this, naming those who suffer under dictators, with every euro we block from the hands of Lukashenko and his sugar daddy, Putin, with support to democrats in an out of Belarus who keep fighting, I believe Kasia will become a great teacher for future generations – maybe with her work, but mainly with her example, attaining freedom. Let's help her get it!

Patricia Chagnon, *au nom du groupe ID*. – Monsieur le Président, Monsieur le Commissaire, Mesdames, Messieurs, chers collègues, vous êtes une nouvelle fois ici dans le registre de la morale. Comme une nouvelle église qui veut s'imposer avec des prêtres, des messes et des serments. Le nouveau monde vous regarde avec ironie. Les nations ont leurs histoires, les États ont leurs contraintes, les individus ont leurs affections – territoriales, familiales et biologiques.

L'action politique appelle le réalisme. Ça ne veut pas dire qu'il ne faut pas défendre le droit ou la démocratie. Mais votre logique fait que nos pays décrochent en Afrique, en Asie, même dans des pays amis. Vous ne faites que vous isoler. Et vous faites perdurer un sentiment inapproprié de l'arrogance anachronique de l'Occident.

Ryszard Czarnecki, *w imieniu grupy ECR*. – Panie Przewodniczący! Panie Komisarzu! Szanowni Państwo! Białoruś to jest część Europy. Ludzie na Białorusi to Europejczycy. Oni mają nieeuropejskie władze, ale bardzo bym chciał, abyśmy nie odwracali się plecami do Białorusi. A to oznacza, że mamy wspierać tych, którzy myślą tak, jak my: myślą w kategoriach wolności, w kategoriach praw człowieka, w kategoriach wolności mediów.

Musimy także dzisiaj głośno stawać w obronie mniejszości narodowych na Białorusi. Tam największą mniejszością są moi rodacy, Polacy, którzy bardzo jednoznacznie opowiedzieli się za wolnością i dlatego dzisiaj są represjonowani. Dlatego dzisiaj siedzą w więzieniach. Nie tylko oni, rzecz jasna. W moim przekonaniu nasz głos musi być donośny. I dobrze, że jest głosem z różnych części naszego Parlamentu. Nie relatywizujmy polityki, która tam ma miejsce. Nie udawajmy, że Łukaszenko nie jest pomocnikiem Putina – bo jest.

Rasa Juknevičienė (PPE). – Mr President, colleagues, there is the war criminal and usurper Lukashenko, and there are the people of Belarus on the other side. Thousands of them are imprisoned; most of them are silenced in captivity, but it will not always be like this. Belarus will be free because Ukraine will win. That is why the Kastuś Kalinoŭski Regiment is fighting on the Ukrainian front against Russia, and that is why President-elect Sviatlana Tsikhanouskaya and other leaders of the Belarusian people are working actively through diplomatic means.

Both war criminals, Putin and Lukashenko, will be convicted in a special tribunal. I believe that in my lifetime, Belarus, a nation with the honourable European history, will become part of the EU family. However, before that, Lukashenko and Putin have to be completely isolated and the EU has to continue to support the democratically elected leaders of Belarus, who are the real representatives of the people of Belarus. *(The speaker used a slogan in a non-EU language)*

Isabel Santos (S&D). – Senhor Presidente, as detenções arbitrárias, as buscas, a tortura e o tratamento desumano e degradante são uma constante do regime de Lukashenko.

É extenso o rol de opositores, ativistas e manifestantes que integram a lista negra de mais de 1 500 pessoas afastadas dos mais elementares direitos cívicos. Longa é também a lista de órgãos de comunicação social e organizações não governamentais interditadas.

A intimidação e a imposição de penas de prisão através de julgamentos politicamente motivados, como nos casos de Mikalay Autukhovich e Palina Panasiuk, entre tantos outros, continuam a ser uma constante para quem tem a coragem de contestar a situação no país.

Apelamos, por isso, mais uma vez, à libertação rápida e incondicional de todos quantos se encontram nestas condições. Mas devemos ir mais longe, necessitamos mesmo de ir mais longe, e, por isso, apelamos ao reforço e à rápida e eficaz implementação de sanções contra Lukashenko e os seus apoiantes.

Estas são medidas urgentes que exigimos que sejam implementadas pela União Europeia.

Catch-the-eye procedure

Stanislav Polčák (PPE). – Pane předsedající, běloruský režim ukazuje už po řadu let svoji pravou tvář – mučení, zatýkání, věznění, mrtví, novináři, kteří jsou pronásledováni, zničené rodiny. Jde o teror běloruských občanů. Jde o teror, nevyhlášenou válku vlastní společnosti, kterou vede sám prezident Lukašenko. Ten není prezident, nebyl zvolen legitimní cestou, ale tuto nevyhlášenou válku on vede i vůči Ukrajině. A je třeba říci, že nebude žádné místo, nebude žádná zemljanka, kde by se Lukašenko se svými přisluhovači schoval. Budeme vyšetřovat každý zločin, budeme soudit a myslím, že bude i nalezena spravedlnost pro všechny oběti. Živě Bělarus!

Tomáš Zdechovský (PPE). – Pane předsedající, vážení kolegové, Evropa čelí nájezdu a okolí několika psychopatů. Tím prvním je prezident Putin, tím druhým je prezident Lukašenko. Já myslím, že pro jejich chování není žádná omluva a pro jejich režim není žádná lidská spravedlnost spravedlivá. Já si myslím, že musíme udělat maximum pro to a vyvinout maximální tlak na to, aby jednou se pan prezident Lukašenko zodpovídal ze svých činů nejenom proti opozici, nejenom proti demokracii, nejenom proti řádně zvoleným představitelům, ale i proti tomu, co udělal a dělá systematicky proti Ukrajině. On je součástí toho, co Rusko páchá na Ukrajině. On je největší podporovatel Vladimira Putina. On je stejný zločinec jako Vladimir Putin. Sláva Ukrajině, sláva běloruské opozici!

Clare Daly (The Left). – Mr President, in recent months, we've seen the arrest and imprisonment of trade union representatives in Belarus. Most recently, the Vice-President of the Belarusian Independent Labour Union was sentenced to 30 months in prison. And protests and strikes led by working-class people have highlighted the level of discontent with the Lukashenko government.

As a former trade unionist, I absolutely support the struggles of workers everywhere. But I think it's interesting we have a second plenary in a row where we're discussing the repression of the opposition in Belarus, and we've never once mentioned the repression of the opposition in Ukraine, the banning of opposition parties, the kill-lists of dissidents, the banning of trade unions, the decimation of workers' rights in that state. And the European Union has to stop looking at protests in countries we don't like as an opportunity to have a go at them. The Belarus protests are not guided by neoliberal-inspired policies of the West. They have a right to have their protests without Western interference.

If you're interested in workers' rights and democratic rights, stand by the workers who are being persecuted inside the European Union.

Mick Wallace (The Left). – Mr President, we don't interfere with you when you're talking nonsense. Thanks very much, Mr President. Like most countries, Belarus has a lot of problems, and if I was living in Belarus, I'm sure I'd want rid of Lukashenko too. The treatment of workers and the imprisonment of political prisoners is really sad to see. I would call on Lukashenko to release all political prisoners. However, for the life of me, I don't actually understand how you think that interfering in the place is actually going to help. Can you name one country that you've interfered in in the last 50 years where you have helped? All across Africa, Afghanistan, Iraq and Syria. European countries are pumping arms into Yemen now to help in the Saudi genocide. If you think that Ukraine is going to be a better place after supporting this US-NATO proxy war, with as much money as you can muster, God help us.

(End of catch-the-eye procedure)

Janez Lenarčič, *Member of the Commission*. – Mr President, honourable Members, I wish to thank this Parliament for again having the situation in Belarus on the agenda and for your relentless support to the people of Belarus. We addressed the situation in Belarus and its involvement in Russia's war of aggression against Ukraine at the last plenary on 19 October 2022. On that occasion, the High Representative, Josep Borrell, condemned the involvement by Belarus in the strongest possible terms and expressed EU support to Belarussians facing the worsening repression of Lukashenko's regime.

Unfortunately, this repression continues to intensify. There are now more than 1450 political prisoners – a number that increases by the day and that includes Nobel Peace Prize winner, Ales Bialiatski. This is just the tip of the iceberg. Since August 2020, almost 40 000 people have been temporarily arrested, including some 500 journalists, of whom 33 remain in prison.

Political opponents have been sentenced to long prison terms, up to 18 years, and the opposition in exile is criminalised and would face draconian sentences if they were to return to Belarus. Recent amendments to the Criminal Code, which can be used retroactively, open the possibility of the use of the death penalty to punish 'attempted acts of terrorism'. Most political activists are potentially affected by these amendments.

The EU has led three successful resolutions in the UN Human Rights Council to report on the situation in Belarus and establish a robust accountability mechanism under the High Commissioner for Human Rights. We support, both politically and financially, the International Accountability Platform for Belarus, which collects evidence of the crimes with a view to holding the perpetrators accountable. The EU has clearly declared that the Lukashenko regime lacks any democratic legitimacy, and the EU strongly supports the demand for free and fair elections.

In this context, we continue to support the democratic forces and we strongly encourage them to remain united. We will continue to provide strong support to the civil society and to the people of Belarus, as we have already done with over EUR 100 million in direct support. Also, as you know, the EU has already imposed six rounds of sanctions against the Belarus regime, and work is currently ongoing to adopt more sanctions in the context of human rights violations, for instance, against judges and prosecutors. In the event of further Belarusian involvement in Russia's war against Ukraine, further areas will be identified.

We also regularly engage with the main leader of the Belarussian opposition, Ms Tsikhanouskaya. She has been received by the EU at the highest levels, including by President of the Commission, Ursula von der Leyen, and by President of the European Council, Charles Michel. Most recently, she also had an informal meeting with all EU foreign ministers ahead of the November Foreign Affairs Council.

To conclude, our engagement remains strong. We will continue to support the legitimate quest of Belarussian people for the rule of law, for free and fair elections, and for independence.

Sēdes vadītājs. – Debates ir slēgtas.

Balsošana notiks rītdien.

(*) Sk. protokolu.

16.3. Vertreibung von Menschen infolge des eskalierenden Konflikts im Osten der Demokratischen Republik Kongo

Sēdes vadītājs. – Nākamais darba kārtības punkts ir debates par pieciem rezolūciju priekšlikumiem attiecībā uz iedzīvotāju piespiedu pārvietošanu saistībā ar konflikta saasināšanos Kongo Demokrātiskās Republikas (KDR) austrumu daļā (2022/2957(RSP)) (*).

Tomáš Zdechovský, *Autor.* – Pane předsedající, vážený pane komisaři, vážené dámy, vážení pánové, v posledních měsících ozbrojené skupiny na východě Konžské demokratické republiky eskalovaly násilí. Můžeme to vidět na povstalecké skupině Hnutí 23. března, která se snaží v současné době vyhnat miliony žen a dětí z jejich území a systematicky se snaží opravdu znásilňovat ženy a dosáhnout tak svého politického postupu v rámci tohoto území. Lidé tam často trpí nedostatkem jídla a vody, a proto se Evropský parlament rozhodl přijmout urgentní rezoluci, ve které vyzývá mezinárodní společenství, aby se snažilo zatlačit na všechny aktéry v této oblasti a vyřešit to. Já musím říct, že na této rezoluci se shodly všechny skupiny od levice po pravici. A já myslím, že tím vysíláme poměrně pevný a jasný signál všem zúčastněným stranám, že chceme tento konflikt vyřešit a záleží nám na tom, aby toto násilí přestalo.

Hannes Heide, *Verfasser.* – Herr Präsident, Herr Kommissar! Seitdem sich der bewaffnete Konflikt zwischen der Armee der Demokratischen Republik Kongo und der Miliz „23. März" erneut zugespitzt hat, sind über 262 000 Menschen vertrieben worden – bei weitem die meisten von ihnen sind Frauen und Kinder. 2,4 Millionen Kinder leiden an akuter Unterernährung. 7,5 Millionen Menschen haben aktuell keinen Zugang zu sauberem Trinkwasser und hygienischer Grundversorgung. Die Vereinten Nationen dokumentieren schwere Menschenrechtsverletzungen, sexuelle Gewalt gegen Frauen und Zwangsarbeit von Kindern. Die Zustände in den Flüchtlingslagern sind dramatisch.

Die Gewalt ist kein Zufall – ist doch die Region im östlichen Kongo reich an Bodenschätzen. Die bewaffneten Gruppen finanzieren sich auch durch illegalen Handel mit Mineralien, die für die Rüstungsindustrie bedeutend sind. Die Nachbarländer, besonders die Regierung von Ruanda, sind aufgefordert, den illegalen Mineralhandel durch ihre Länder zu stoppen, jedwede Finanzierung von Rebellengruppen zu beenden.

Die Europäische Kommission muss mit der EU-Strategie für die afrikanischen Großen Seen klare Botschaften aussenden und den von den katastrophalen Umständen betroffenen Menschen in der Demokratischen Republik Kongo humanitäre Hilfe zukommen lassen.

Mittwoch, 23. November 2022

Abir Al-Sahlani, *author.* – Mr President, Commissioner, dear colleagues, Twizire and Rebecca are two young Congolese women who are at the moment, as we speak, being treated for horrendous wounds after being raped at the same time as them being pregnant. They are like tens of thousands of Congolese women who are being treated for their wounds, and even more who never got treated. Rape is used as a systematic, strategic weapon of war by landlords who are financed by state actors in the region.

On 20 October, over 180 000 Congolese were forced to be displaced, adding up now to nearly 6 million internally displaced Congolese. This madness has to stop. I call upon you, colleagues, I call upon the Commission and the Council, to keep pushing for peacebuilding in Congo.

But there cannot be peace without justice. That's why I promise tonight that these men, these landlords who are raping are going to be brought to justice. Mark my words: you're all going to be punished.

Malte Gallée, *Verfasser.* – Herr Präsident, Herr Kommissar, liebe Kolleginnen und Kollegen! Woher kommen denn unsere Rohstoffe? Die Frage stellen wir uns viel zu selten, und viel zu oft ist die Antwort: aus einem Kriegsgebiet. Aus dem Osten der DR Kongo beziehen wir über 70 % des Kobalts, dort lagern mehr als 60 % des Coltans. Das sind alles Stoffe, die in jedem einzelnen Handy stecken. Und genau dort mussten in den letzten Tagen fast 200 000 Menschen vor bewaffneten Rebellengruppen wie M23, FDLR usw. fliehen.

Im Kongo sind mittlerweile fast 6 Millionen Menschen intern Vertriebene. Das ist die höchste Rate weltweit, aber hier bei uns ist es nur einer von vielen vergessenen Konflikten. Das darf nicht so weitergehen!

Wir tragen verdammt noch mal Verantwortung für diese Menschen, schon allein, weil wir so viele Rohstoffe von dort beziehen. Das heißt, wir müssen jetzt sofort humanitäre Hilfe leisten. Die Nachbarländer müssen den illegalen Import der Konfliktrohstoffe stoppen und unterbinden. Wir müssen aber auch langfristig die Finanzierung dieser Rebellengruppen stoppen und dafür sorgen, dass die Konfliktrohstoffverordnung auch wirklich wirkt.

Aber vor allem müssen alle regionalen Konfliktparteien zusammenkommen und endlich ein für alle Mal ihre geoökonomischen Interessen klären, sonst wird der Krieg und die Vertreibung von Menschen nie ein Ende nehmen.

Marc Botenga, *auteur.* – Monsieur le Président, il est avéré maintenant, depuis des années, même par les Nations unies, que le gouvernement rwandais soutient les rebelles du M23 au Rwanda. Des rebelles qui sèment la terreur et la mort en République démocratique du Congo, notamment à l'est, où ce conflit a déjà fait des millions de morts. Nous savons donc toute la responsabilité du gouvernement rwandais.

Et alors, que fait l'Union européenne? Que font les pays européens? On s'attendrait à des sanctions. C'est la réponse que l'Union européenne a souvent quand on voit ce genre d'action de la part d'un pays contre un autre. Mais non, non. Les gouvernements européens décident aujourd'hui de renforcer leur coopération militaire avec le Rwanda. La France, notamment, annonce un renforcement de sa coopération militaire. L'Union européenne va donner 20 millions au Rwanda pour sa participation au Mozambique. Et les États-Unis, vous le savez depuis longtemps, sont un partenaire très important du Rwanda. Tandis que vous savez qu'aujourd'hui, si un État veut vendre des armes à la République démocratique du Congo, il doit le notifier aux Nations unies, ce qui ralentit, voire empêche évidemment la livraison des armes à un pays trop souvent et si souvent agressé.

Cette politique – où on dit en mots, en paroles que nous respectons la souveraineté congolaise, mais en réalité, notre politique l'entrave et la sape – est inacceptable. Il faut cesser ça tout de suite parce que nous avons besoin, et les Congolais ont besoin, de paix aujourd'hui.

Benoît Lutgen, *au nom du groupe PPE.* – Monsieur le Président, chers collègues, au regard des atrocités commises – comme des viols, des déplacements de populations, des massacres de différentes familles – toutes, toutes les forces étrangères présentes au Congo sous différentes formes qui occupent illégalement le territoire, notamment le M23 et l'ADF, doivent quitter immédiatement et sans conditions le Congo. Tous ces actes – et cela a été dit par certains auteurs avec beaucoup de force et je les rejoins – qui relèvent clairement de violations des droits de l'homme, de crimes internationaux graves, doivent être sévèrement poursuivis.

L'Union européenne, c'est vrai, a un rôle majeur à jouer face à ces exigences cruciales pour permettre que le Congo retrouve l'apaisement – à l'aube d'élections prévues dans les prochains mois. Il ne peut y avoir de démocratie sans mettre fin à ce conflit cyclique et sans jugement. J'exprime de tout mon cœur que toutes les forces démocratiques se retrouvent rapidement autour de la table et s'entendent pour déterminer le processus électoral. Différents travaux ont déjà été réalisés. On doit aller maintenant plus loin, il y a urgence en la matière.

Un dialogue doit s'installer de manière pérenne. Ce ne sera possible qu'en trouvant une solution au conflit actuel. J'espère bien sûr que les Nations unies entendront notre message et prendront le relais en adoptant une résolution pour apporter l'apaisement et la paix au Congo.

Carlos Zorrinho, *em nome do Grupo S&D.* – Senhor Presidente, Senhor Comissário, são já dezenas as resoluções debatidas e votadas neste Parlamento sobre a República Democrática do Congo nos últimos anos, mas a situação continua a deteriorar-se em termos de segurança e a agravar-se em matéria de direitos humanos.

É preciso agir. Mobilizar a comunidade internacional e sensibilizar ativamente as autoridades locais para que sejam condenadas e punidas exemplarmente as agressões a civis pelos grupos armados na parte oriental da República do Congo; para que sejam neutralizados os grupos armados que atuam no país, com o apoio internacional; para que sejam investigadas, denunciadas e criminalizadas as violações de direitos humanos perpetradas no país, muito particularmente os abusos levados a cabo sobre as meninas e mulheres usadas como armas de guerra; para que seja criada uma plataforma de diálogo que envolva todas as partes do conflito, de modo a que, através da negociação, se criem as condições para o retorno de milhares de civis deslocados às suas casas.

A República Democrática do Congo vive num quadro de grande fragilidade democrática, política e social, que gera fortes ameaças à estabilidade nacional e regional, com interferência acrescida de movimentos rebeldes de inspiração terrorista ligados ao Daesh e ao ISIS. A exploração desordenada dos recursos naturais alimenta a conflitualidade e financia os grupos armados, ao mesmo tempo que cria uma situação humanitária intolerável.

Não basta aprovar mais uma resolução. Temos que ser nós, europeus, também parte da solução.

Jan-Christoph Oetjen, *au nom du groupe Renew.* – Monsieur le Président, chers collègues, une catastrophe humanitaire est en train de se produire au Congo. Six millions de personnes ont été déplacées à l'intérieur du pays. Deux millions et demi d'enfants sont malnutris. Chers collègues, on ne peut pas fermer les yeux face à cela. Et tout cela parce qu'un conflit armé a lieu au Congo, qui est soutenu parfois par des forces extérieures, ce qui vient d'être dit.

Il faut que cette violence cesse. Il faut que les rebelles, qui sont soutenus par d'autres pays, soient désarmés. Mais surtout, chers collègues, il faut que les atrocités commises dans ce pays – surtout en ce qui concerne la violence sexuelle contre les femmes, qui est utilisée de manière systématique et comme une arme de guerre – il faut que ces atrocités cessent et que tous ceux qui commettent de tels crimes soient traînés devant la justice et qu'ils soient jugés.

Pierrette Herzberger-Fofana, *au nom du groupe Verts/ALE.* – Monsieur le Président, chers collègues, la situation humanitaire s'est drastiquement aggravée dans l'est du Congo. Dans le respect des accords de Cotonou, l'Union européenne doit se joindre aux efforts de médiation internationale afin que la paix revienne dans cette partie du territoire.

Actuellement, près de 6 millions de personnes déplacées à l'intérieur de la RDC sont témoins directs de ce conflit caractérisé par une brutalité inouïe. Depuis deux décennies, chaque groupe armé, notamment le M23, est responsable de violations massives de droits humains en toute impunité. Ces violations détruisent des vies humaines ainsi que leurs moyens de subsistance. En effet, des atrocités sont commises envers les populations civiles. Il s'agit surtout de meurtres, de viols et d'enlèvements. Des civils innocents sont pris dans ce tourbillon de violences et de déplacements. Le nombre d'enfants enrôlés au sein des forces rebelles est en croissance exponentielle.

Ainsi, selon le docteur Mukwege, notre lauréat du prix Sakharov 2014, la violence macabre ne connaît aucune limite – je le cite. Cette violence aveugle touche l'ensemble de la population sans distinction ethnique, religieuse ou professionnelle. Les viols comme arme de guerre, les enlèvements et les abus sexuels sont à l'ordre du jour.

Cette recrudescence de violences bloque aussi l'acheminement d'une aide humanitaire substantielle. Il est primordial de protéger les générations actuelles et futures qui seront traumatisées par un environnement d'une telle violence. On ne peut que souhaiter que tous les belligérants puissent entamer des négociations et s'asseoir à la table afin que la paix revienne.

Stanislav Polčák (PPE). – Pane předsedající, humanitární krize se v Demokratické republice Kongo podle posledních zpráv dramaticky prohlubuje. Další desetitisíce lidí prchají ze svých domovů na východě této země uprostřed bojů mezi rebely z tzv. skupiny M23 a vládními silami. Obyvatelé už nevěří, že nová jednání v Keni přinesou mír. Většině uprchlíků chybí základní potřeby, chybí čistá voda nebo dokonce plachty na vybudování úkrytů před častými dešti. V utečeneckých táborech se dokonce objevuje cholera, a to samozřejmě velmi násobí problémy, se kterými se za chvíli může potýkat celý region. Pokusy o obnovení míru ve východní části Konga byly obnoveny teprve před pár dny. Bývalý keňský prezident Kenyatta, který je zprostředkovatelem těchto rozhovorů, apeloval na povstalecké skupiny, aby složily své zbraně, ale zatím se samozřejmě tato snaha míjí účinkem. Mezitím umírají a trpí další lidé. Zítra, myslím si, že musíme zaujmout adekvátní postoj v zájmu těchto desetitisíců, ba statisíců ohrožených lidí.

Maria Arena (S&D). – Monsieur le Président, Monsieur le Commissaire, en octobre, le M23, soutenu par le Rwanda, a lancé une offensive contre l'armée régulière de la République démocratique du Congo qui replonge le pays dans des violences extrêmes.

Ces violences et l'instabilité dans la région, vous le savez, ne datent pas d'aujourd'hui et trouvent leur source essentiellement dans la question des ressources du sous-sol de cette région, ressources qui sont pillées par les voisins au profit d'entreprises et de groupes internationaux qui alimentent la corruption, qui financent des groupes armés pour se garantir l'accès au moindre coût.

Nous devons absolument plaider pour une solution régionale à court terme et à moyen terme. Bien entendu, à court terme, la question humanitaire doit être prise en compte pour les personnes déplacées. Mais si nous ne faisons que du court terme, nous serons toujours à nouveau dans le même cycle de violence. Donc, une résolution régionale du conflit est importante. Nous devons lutter contre la corruption et mettre des sanctions sur des personnes et des entreprises, telles que M. Dan Gertler, qui est un opérateur excessivement puissant aujourd'hui en RDC, sanctionné par les Américains et qui, pourtant, trouve refuge en Europe pour cacher son argent.

Nous devons évaluer la loi sur les minerais des conflits qui aujourd'hui n'est pas d'application sur le territoire et nous devons mettre en place des tribunaux mixtes qui sont des tribunaux qui luttent contre l'impunité en République démocratique du Congo.

Catch-the-eye procedure

Mick Wallace (The Left). – Mr President, as we sit here having this debate about the Democratic Republic of Congo, I think it's important to remember that during the scramble for Africa, the DRC was made King Leopold's personal possession. He oversaw the death of 10 to 15 million Congolese, while enriching himself and Belgium from 1885 to 1906. The genocidal monster is still honoured in Belgium today.

Today, France and TotalEnergies are the ones looking to enrich themselves at the expense of the Congolese lives in order to avoid a Mozambique-like disaster, where Total's reckless activities have created an insurgency. France has been training security forces in the DRC and Uganda in order to secure and speed up the crude oil pipeline projects around Lake Albert. The militarisation has heightened already tense relations between Rwanda and Uganda, and is likely the cause of the revival of the M23 rebel group that is at the heart of the violence in East DRC today.

If the EU really wants to help: stop the colonisation and work for the peace process, bringing everyone to the negotiating table.

Clare Daly (The Left). – Mr President, Eastern Congo is one of the wealthiest regions in the world, home to a variety of natural resources – gold, diamonds, oil – and the largest producer of cobalt, at 70%. And because of this, it's been plagued by fighting with massively over 120 rebel groups in that area for over 25 years, with Rwanda accused of stirring it up in a proxy war to gain access to those resources.

And the consequences for the people of that region have already been tragically articulated in this Chamber. The systemic and deliberate use of mass rapes, designed terror in order to force people to flee from their homes, leading to massive trauma, which will be felt for generations. This absolutely has to be dealt with.

Now, last week, the DRC's National Assembly voted to exclude the option of dialogue with M23. The Supreme Defence Council decided to increase the strike force of defence and security forces against M23. This is lunacy. There cannot be a military solution. There will be no justice without peace. Absolutely everything has to be done to get that, so those responsible can be held to account.

(End of catch-the-eye procedure)

Janez Lenarčič, *Member of the Commission*. – Mr President, honourable Members, the news from the eastern part of the Democratic Republic of the Congo is extremely distressing. Renewed fighting has worsened an already dire humanitarian situation and thousands of people have been forced to flee their homes.

How is the EU responding? Firstly, by almost doubling its humanitarian assistance, which now amounts to nearly EUR 80 million for the country, with a very strong focus on the eastern provinces, and in particular on the large-scale food distribution and provision of primary healthcare services. Second, we have responded by dedicating part of our development cooperation to the eastern part of the country in the areas of health, sustainable development and gender equality, among others. Third, we are responding by supporting regional initiatives, addressing the security crisis in the Congo and the Great Lakes region, namely the mediation by the President Lourenço of Angola and the Nairobi Process chaired by former President Kenyatta of Kenya.

The EU is examining how to further strengthen its support to these processes. However, this will not be enough, I'm afraid. Unless the root causes of this recurring insecurity in the Eastern Congo are seriously addressed, the endless cycle of violence will never stop.

Now who is to address these root causes? First and foremost, it's the Congolese authorities with, of course, the support of regional and international partners, including ourselves. These root causes include major governance challenges, the struggle for control over land and natural resources, corruption and impunity for human rights violations.

The European Union will continue to stand by the people of the Democratic Republic of the Congo and the region to tackle these challenges and finally unleash the prosperity potential of this region. The Foreign Affairs Council of 14 November started a reflection on the right policy approach that we will be implementing together with the countries in the region and our international partners.

Sēdes vadītājs. – Debates ir slēgtas.

Balsošana notiks rītdien.

Rakstiski paziņojumi (171. pants)

Beata Kempa (ECR), *na piśmie*. – Sytuacja w Demokratycznej Republice Konga pogarsza się z każdym rokiem. Wzrasta napięcie religijne, co skutkuje brutalnymi atakami na chrześcijan, szczególnie w prowincjach Ituria i Północne Kivu. Brutalne i krwawe ataki służą jednemu celowi: wyniszczeniu i wykluczeniu społeczności chrześcijan. Noszą tym samym znamiona czystek religijnych. Unia Europejska musi zacząć aktywnie działać. Rezolucje to za mało. Tylko twarde działanie jest w stanie powstrzymać chaos i krwawe rzezie. Dlatego państwa członkowskie powinny podjąć się misji stabilizacyjnej w regionach szczególnie dotkniętych atakami islamskich bojówek z powiązanej z ISIS organizacji ADF NALU. Grupa ta od dawna realizuje islamską strategię ekspansji w Afryce. W Światowym Indeksie Prześladowań 2022 Demokratyczna Republika Konga zajmuje wysokie 40. miejsce wśród krajów, w których chrześcijanie są najbardziej prześladowani za wiarę. Musimy też jak najszybciej wzmocnić nasze działania w kontekście pomocy humanitarnej dla najbardziej potrzebujących mieszkańców Konga.

(') Sk. protokolu.

Mittwoch, 23. November 2022

17. Schutz der Viehwirtschaft und der Großraubtiere in Europa (Aussprache)

Sēdes vadītājs. – Nākamais darba kārtības punkts ir debates par Komisijas paziņojumu par lopkopības aizsardzību un lielajiem plēsējiem Eiropā (2022/2952(RSP)).

Janez Lenarčič, *Member of the Commission*. – Mr President, honourable Members, thank you for adding this important debate on today's agenda. Let me start by reassuring this House that the Commission takes this issue very seriously and that we are looking at how best to address it, and I'll try to describe that as thoroughly as I can. I apologise in advance if I go a bit over the time allocated.

Since the beginning of this mandate, we have been in dialogue with stakeholders, with regional authorities and Members of this House to discuss how livestock farming can be better protected from large carnivores, especially where it is particularly exposed. I know that this Parliament shares the commitment to protecting Europe's biodiversity, its habitats and species and that it is fully conscious of the sense of urgency. As regards the wildlife species covered by the Habitats Directive, the 2020 report on the State of Nature in the EU highlighted that favourable conservation status has only been reached in less than one third of the cases – less than one third of cases.

Also, from the Worldwide Fund for Nature's Living Planet Report 2022, we recently learned of a 69% global decline in populations of wild mammals, birds, fish, reptiles and amphibians since 1970. But we also learned that wild nature is resilient and can recover under the right conditions. The new Wildlife Comeback in Europe report, released by Rewilding Europe on 27 September 2022, shows improvements in populations and the distribution of several iconic species, such as the beaver, alpine ibex, grey seal, black stork and wolf.

Let me assure you, the Commission is fully aware that the return of large carnivores such as the wolf, the brown bear and the lynx is, in some regions in Europe, a challenge. While predation by large carnivores may not be considered a key driver of abandonment of livestock farming in European mountain areas, or cannot be blamed for the demographic challenges of rural areas, it is a particular challenge for livestock grazing in areas where these species have long been absent.

It is equally clear that livestock farmers need to be adequately supported. It is essential to address this additional challenge and to implement appropriate livestock protection practices to reduce the risks of predation.

We believe that it is possible to ensure the continuation of sustainable livestock farming systems and the conservation of large carnivores. Both play an important role for the conservation of European ecosystems.

I would like to recall at this point the letter sent by Commissioners Wojciechowski and Sinkevičius to all Agriculture and Environment Ministers in November last year, urging them to make the best use of available EU and national funding opportunities.

Under the new Common Agricultural Policy Strategic Plans, the European Agricultural Fund for Rural Development can provide support for preventive actions and investments aimed at mitigating the risk of damage by large carnivores to livestock farming. It also provides for measures on training, advice and cooperation between rural actors aimed at ensuring coexistence. These activities can be funded up to 100% of their costs. Several Member States are already making use of this possibility and have included targeted interventions in their strategic plans.

The Commission can support many of these actions through the LIFE Programme. Examples include the implementation of protection measures for livestock, setting up of emergency teams, the establishment of volunteer and ambassador networks to assist livestock farmers and the promotion of a participatory approach with the active involvement of all the parties concerned.

In addition, EU state aid rules allow Member States to compensate up to 100% of the direct and indirect costs of damage caused by protected species. It is also possible to finance up to 100% of preventive instruments. In order to find the most suitable coexistence solutions, measures should be elaborated and implemented with the involvement of the stakeholders concerned and should be tailored to specific local needs and priorities. I think that this approach is fully in line with the requests expressed by the European Parliament in its resolution on the EU Biodiversity Strategy for 2030. Member States or regions within Member States do have a means to act.

I would like to stress that EU nature legislation includes the possibility for Member States to authorise individual derogations to the strict protection regime. Several Member States make use of this possibility. It nevertheless remains important to recall that this option exists. Responsibility to apply these provisions, including for the removal of specimens of protected species, lie solely with the competent authorities of the Member States.

One year ago, the Commission adopted a new guidance document focusing on the strict protection of the species covered by the Habitats Directive. In it, it clarified the possibilities and conditions for derogations in line with the case law of the EU Court of Justice.

As regards the monitoring of large carnivores and assessment of their conservation status, the wolf and other large carnivores are among the most intensively monitored species in Europe. A comprehensive and harmonised system is already in place to assess and report the conservation status of all protected species at European level. Although monitoring remains a task for the relevant national authorities, the Commission encourages trans-boundary coordination in the monitoring of those species whose populations are shared by several Member States. Member States can make use of available EU funds under the LIFE Programme or under Cohesion Policy to improve their monitoring systems.

The Commission is keeping the legal and policy frameworks under regular review. Current EU environmental and agricultural legislation provides Member States with important instruments, funds and tools to ensure that the conservation of protected large carnivores and the continuation of sustainable farming practices and public safety can go hand-in-hand. Numerous experiences, including in the framework of LIFE projects, have demonstrated that adaptation is feasible and it can work, and that we need to encourage and promote the sharing of good practices.

Honourable Members, I hope you find these clarifications helpful. I can assure you that the Commission is actively monitoring the issue at various levels and that, based on that monitoring, we will assess whether further measures are needed.

Herbert Dorfmann, *im Namen der PPE-Fraktion*. – Herr Präsident, Herr Kommissar, Kolleginnen und Kollegen! 1992, als mit der Habitat-Richtlinie der Wolf und andere große Beutegreifer – der Braunbär, der Luchs – in der EU unter Schutz gestellt wurden, waren diese Arten in der Europäischen Union praktisch ausgestorben. Heute, 30 Jahre später, hat diese Richtlinie Erfolg gezeigt. Alle diese Arten sind zurück in den Lebensräumen der Europäischen Union – aber sie schaffen leider auch Probleme.

Die Koexistenz zwischen Weidetieren und großen Beutegreifern ist schwierig und in manchen Räumen, wie zum Beispiel auf alpinen Weiden, wahrscheinlich unmöglich. Und all jene, die immer wieder von diesen schönen Projekten – auch Sie, Herr Kommissar, haben das gerade gesagt – reden und sagen, dass es da tolle Koexistenz gibt, frage ich: Wo sind diese? Ich frage seit Jahren danach, ich habe sie nicht gefunden. Und ich habe den Eindruck, sie existieren einfach mehr in den Köpfen derer, die nicht bei Tag und Nacht auf ihre Tiere aufpassen müssen oder die ein Gemetzel nach einem Angriff aufräumen müssen.

Dem vollkommen geschützten Wolf steht nämlich das vollkommen ungeschützte Schaf oder die Ziege gegenüber. Der heutige Schutzstatus ist in vielen Regionen einfach nicht mehr notwendig. Wir haben inzwischen stabile Populationen, und die werden auch mit einem abgeschwächten Schutz bestehen bleiben – das zeigen die Erfahrungen. Und wir werden eine breite Akzeptanz für diese Arten nur bekommen, wenn wir diesen Tatsachen auch in die Augen schauen und nicht mit ideologischer Träumerei jedes Management verhindern.

Und abschließend: Natürlich braucht es auch einen verstärkten Einsatz für Koexistenz und Herdenschutz. Das kostet, und das kann nicht nur mit der Gemeinsamen Agrarpolitik bezahlt werden. Wenn unsere Bürger Wölfe, Bären und Luchse in unseren Wäldern wollen, dann müssen sie dafür auch bezahlen und nicht den Bauern diese Kosten aufhalsen. Sie müssen dann mit ihrem eigenen Steuergeld für die Kosten und auch für die Schäden geradestehen.

Clara Aguilera, *en nombre del Grupo S&D*. – Señor presidente, bienvenido es este debate en nombre de los ganaderos europeos y bienvenida es una Resolución común de seis grupos políticos. Porque eso demuestra unidad y fortaleza para defender la coexistencia necesaria de la ganadería —que está experimentando una coexistencia difícil, como vienen denunciando los ganaderos— en esa protección de los grandes carnívoros y su incremento. Indudablemente son carnívoros y eso tiene una repercusión en la ganadería, en una ganadería como la extensiva, que es la que protege el Pacto Verde Europeo. Y, por tanto, esa es la principal perjudicada.

Por tanto, defendemos, desde mi grupo, la coexistencia pacífica. Pero que pierdan los ganaderos no lo podemos consentir. Es decir, por tanto, hay que articular medidas. Y había que celebrar este debate. Se lo merecen los ganaderos.

Había que celebrar este debate y hay que defender mañana —a todos los grupos se lo pido— que se apoye la Resolución y ninguna de las enmiendas presentadas, porque yo creo que la fuerza está en la unión común. Lo que no se ha sacado en una mesa de negociación… No hay que intentar sacar una estrategia de partido. Por respeto a la ganadería, apoyemos la Resolución de los seis grupos políticos.

Ulrike Müller, *im Namen der Renew-Fraktion*. –. Herr Präsident, sehr geehrter Herr Kommissar, liebe Kolleginnen und Kollegen! Die Rückkehr einst ausgestorbener Arten ist ein Erfolg des Artenschutzes. Aber Koexistenz bedeutet, dass beide Seiten ein Recht auf eine Existenz haben.

Die Bauern und vor allem die Tiere leiden massiv unter den Angriffen von Wölfen und mancherorts Bären. Die stetig wachsende Zahl von tödlichen Angriffen auf Schafe, Pferde, Rinder und Kälber darf nicht länger totgeschwiegen werden. Allzu gerne werden die Verantwortlichen und die Naturschützer davor die Augen zumachen. Klar, die Bilder und die Videos sind kein schöner Anblick. Für mich ist aber eines klar: Wenn der Wolf kommt, geht die Weide, und mit ihr gehen viele Pflanzenarten, Insektenarten und auch die Bienen.

Die Bauern fühlen sich seit Jahren alleingelassen. Das darf nicht so weitergehen. Ich appelliere deshalb an Sie: Wir müssen die Unterstützung für die Prävention und die Kompensation verbessern, und das ist keine Aufgabe der Gemeinsamen Agrarpolitik, sondern des Artenschutzbudgets.

Herr Kommissar, überprüfen Sie die Anhänge der Habitat-Richtlinie und überarbeiten Sie die *guidelines* zur Nutzung der Flexibilitäten, damit es hier endlich weniger Verwirrung und mehr Klarheit gibt!

Thomas Waitz, *im Namen der Verts/ALE-Fraktion*. – Herr Präsident, Herr Kommissar! Vorweg: Wölfe fressen nicht Ihre Großmutter, und Wölfe fressen auch nicht Ihre Kinder auf dem Weg zum Schulbus. Das ist Panikmache, die von Teilen der ÖVP kommt, die von Teilen des Bauernbundes kommt. Und was meint der Österreichische Bauernbund mit wolfsfreien Zonen? Wollen wir den Wolf wieder ausrotten in Österreich? Ich denke, diese Beiträge sind keine guten Beiträge zu einer sachlichen Debatte, denn genau die brauchen wir hier.

Die Wiederansiedlung des Wolfs in der EU ist ein Erfolg für den Natur- und Artenschutz – unzweifelhaft. Und zugleich bedeutet der Wolf für Bäuerinnen und Bauern durchaus eine Herausforderung, und zwar insbesondere für jene, die Weidewirtschaft betreiben, die besonders klimafreundliche und besonders naturfreundliche Landwirtschaft betreiben, besonders für jene Bäuerinnen und Bauern, die in den Gebirgszonen leben und dort, wo die Union dünner besiedelt ist.

Wir müssen uns dessen bewusst sein, dass Naturschutz eine gesamtgesellschaftliche Aufgabe ist, und die Gesamtgesellschaft hat auch die Verantwortung dafür zu übernehmen. Wir müssen gemeinsam dafür Sorge tragen, dass unsere Weidetiere gut geschützt sind, und wir müssen gemeinsam dafür Sorge tragen, dass unsere Bäuerinnen und Bauern nicht den Preis zu zahlen haben, sondern höchstmöglich unterstützt werden in der Sicherung ihrer Tiere und in der Sicherung auch ihres Einkommens, denn genau diese Betriebe sind oft jene, die am wenigsten verdienen bei uns.

Naturschutz und Landwirtschaft gehen Hand in Hand. Wir brauchen konkrete Maßnahmen auf beiden Seiten, und um diese konkreten Maßnahmen zu erarbeiten, haben wir uns zu einer gemeinsamen Entschließung zusammengefunden, und da haben wir zu liefern, und ich danke hier für die gute Zusammenarbeit und für den gemeinsamen Sechs-Parteien-Antrag.

Sylvia Limmer, *im Namen der ID-Fraktion*. – Herr Präsident! Lassen Sie mich mit einer Klarstellung beginnen: Nur weil der Wolf in Westeuropa ausgerottet war, war er dennoch nie eine gefährdete Spezies oder gar vom Aussterben bedroht. Das Überleben von *Canis lupus* war also niemals abhängig davon, dass er durch strengste Schutzverordnungen in dichtbesiedelten Landstrichen quasi zwangsangesiedelt wurde.

Inzwischen hat Brandenburg weltweit die höchste Wolfsdichte. 2020 wurden allein 4 000 vom Wolf gerissene Nutztiere in Deutschland erfasst; das waren 40 % mehr als im Vorjahr. Und nun wundert man sich ernsthaft, warum die Akzeptanz dem Wolf gegenüber abnimmt – nicht nur bei landwirtschaftlichen Tierhaltern.

Als Tierärztin empfehle ich allen Schreibstuben-Wolfsliebhabern, sich einmal live die vom Wolf gerissenen und angerichteten Schäden anzusehen. Die Hälfte aller Wolfsattacken erfolgt übrigens auf geschützten Weiden, und Herdenschutzhunde werden immer öfter selbst zur Wolfsbeute.

Die Weidetierhaltung muss unbedingten Vorrang vor dem Wolf haben, denn ohne Weidetiere werden Almen und artenreiche Weidewiesen der Vergangenheit angehören. Daher unterstützen wir die Forderung nach einer Schutzstatusänderung von „streng geschützt“ zu „bedingt geschützt“. Wir brauchen Gebiete mit Managementmaßnahmen, in denen der Wolfsbestand strikt reguliert wird, aber auch wolfsfreie Gebiete im Sinne der Gefahrenabwehr für Mensch und Tier in urbanen Gebieten und Gebieten mit Weidehaltung.

Ich bin – selbst auf dem Land lebend – es zunehmend leid, dass wir, die Landbevölkerung, die Landwirte, den Rahmen für einen realitätsfernen romantischen Wolfszoo für eine grünwoke Stadtbevölkerung abgeben sollen.

Bert-Jan Ruissen, *namens de ECR-Fractie*. – Voorzitter, beste collega's, niets is zo vervelend als te moeten werken met achterhaalde wetgeving. En precies dat is wat er nu aan de hand is rond de wolf. Dertig jaar geleden aangewezen als een beschermde diersoort omdat hij toen op het punt van verdwijnen stond. Maar de situatie is nu volstrekt anders. Europa telt inmiddels ruim 21 000 wolven. Met alle gevolgen van dien. Ook in mijn land Nederland, zoals in Drenthe, zien we vrijwel dagelijks opengereten schapen, kalveren en pony's. Ik voorspel u: doen we niets, dan kijken we over tien jaar naar een leeg platteland. Geen boer durft dan nog zijn vee buiten te laten lopen. Is dat wat we willen? Of een platteland vol met hoge hekken die slimme wolven toch weten te omzeilen?

Laten we de realiteit onder ogen zien. Actief beheer is onontkoombaar. Tot dusver zegt de Europese Commissie steeds dat overheden maar een ontheffing moeten aanvragen of moeten verlenen. Dat is een omweg en geen oplossing. Het wordt tijd om de strikte bescherming van de wolf en de habitatrichtlijn te verlagen. De wolf hoort niet langer thuis in bijlage vier en zolang dat niet geregeld is, roep ik de lidstaten op in ieder geval actief gebruik te maken van de derogatiemogelijkheid in artikel zestien, zodat probleemwolven toch aangepakt kunnen worden. Want niets doen is geen optie.

Anja Hazekamp, *namens de The Left-Fractie*. – Voorzitter, ruim 150 jaar nadat wolven in grote delen van Europa waren uitgeroeid met het jachtgeweer en door verlies van hun leefgebied, hebben enkele wolven hun weg teruggevonden naar Nederland. Dat is goed nieuws voor onze natuur. Het zijn ook prachtige dieren. Zo konden we vandaag de eerste beelden bewonderen van spelende welpen in Drenthe. Echt geweldig! Desondanks pleiten enkele boeren, jagers en hun politieke spreekbuizen ervoor om wolven na hun moeizame terugkeer opnieuw de nek om te draaien. Ze spreken over emotionele schade voor boeren als hun schapen gedood worden door een wolf. Wanneer een dier dood wordt aangetroffen, is dat inderdaad vreselijk. Maar waarom slachten we dan ieder jaar 60 miljoen schapen in Europa, vaak onverdoofd? En waarom verslepen we onder hartverscheurende omstandigheden honderdduizenden schapen naar Noord-Afrika en het Midden-Oosten?

Ik zou willen dat diegenen die zeggen dat we schapen moeten beschermen tegen de wolf zich samen met ons hard maken om de schapen te beschermen tegen de mens. De Partij voor de Dieren heet de wolf van harte welkom. Wij maken ons grotere zorgen over het gevaar van de vee-industrie voor het voortbestaan van duizenden dieren- en plantensoorten dan over het gevaar van één enkele diersoort voor de vee-industrie. Juist in tijden dat economische activiteiten de grenzen van de natuur fors overschrijden, is het belangrijk natuurbescherming overeind te houden en te versterken. Voorts ben ik van mening dat de Europese landbouwsubsidies moeten worden afgeschaft.

Mittwoch, 23. November 2022

Daniel Buda (PPE). – Domnule președinte, domnule comisar, doamnelor și domnilor colegi, trăim realități care nu pot fi contestate. Astăzi, fermierii din întreaga Uniune Europeană sunt afectați de prezența marilor prădători.

Regiuni întregi, mai ales din zona montană, sunt pur și simplu abandonate ca urmare a distrugerii fermelor de către animalele sălbatice. Turismul din diverse zone este de asemenea afectat și multe locuri nu mai sunt frecventate de turiști de teama lupilor sau ursilor.

În România trăiesc aproximativ 13.000 de urși, iar incidentele devin din ce în ce mai frecvente. Orașele din zona montană sunt tot mai des vizitate de urși, iar pe terenurile de sport din curtea școlii prezența ursului este o realitate înfricoșătoare.

Directiva privind conservarea habitatelor și-a atins obiectivele în ceea ce privește lupul și ursul, iar Comisia Europeană trebuie să ia în calcul revizuirea imediată în vederea flexibilizării dispozițiilor acesteia.

Pentru cei de la Comisia Europeană și din Parlamentul European, care faceți scut împotriva revizuirii acestei directive, vă cer să mergeți pe pășunile montane să vedeți ce înseamnă atacul lupului sau ursului și să apreciați cu propriile dumnea-voastră simțuri ceea ce reprezintă să fiți în proximitatea acestor animale.

Toți cei care astăzi plângeți de mila marilor prădători vă cer să vă uitați în ochii fermierilor și să le explicați că viața animalelor sălbatice este mai importantă ca viața și munca lor. De asemenea, vă invit să vorbiți cu cele 269 de persoane din România mutilate de urs în ultimii patru ani și să vorbiți cu copiii celor 29 de persoane ucise de urs în aceeași perioadă.

César Luena (S&D). – Señor presidente, los carnívoros y en especial el lobo desempeñan un papel ecológico muy importante, pues prestan servicios ecosistémicos clave. Este animal lo ha hecho siempre, hasta que la presión humana lo llevó al borde de la extinción y por eso su protección ha sido fundamental. La Directiva de Hábitats no tiene otra explicación. Es esa.

Pero es verdad: su reintroducción en zonas donde estuvo ausente durante muchos años evidencia los problemas de la coexistencia entre los seres humanos y estos animales en las zonas rurales. Por eso son necesarias mayores medidas de prevención, de mitigación y de compensación para los ganaderos.

En definitiva, tenemos que garantizar una coexistencia equilibrada, sin eludir el impacto que provocan en la ganadería extensiva, pero sin menoscabo nunca, nunca, del estatuto de protección de los grandes carnívoros y también del lobo.

La Resolución común que hemos pactado, tal como está, sin ninguna enmienda ni ningún apaño de última hora, es un buen acuerdo para que esta Cámara pueda resolver este problema.

Creo que además tenemos que afrontar esta realidad con acuerdos y sin introducir elementos divisivos y de polarización.

Róża Thun und Hohenstein (Renew). – Mr President, after those very clear words of Commissioner Lenarčič – thank you very much for them – I would like to address those who want to introduce changes in the Habitats Directive or its annexes. The amendments are not justified from both a conservative and a legal point of view.

The Habitat Directive does not envisage any rule or automatic mechanism according to which as soon as a species achieves favourable conservation status, its protection status would be lowered. Because if you applied that logic, the species would decline rapidly again, and all the effort to protect it and all the public money spent on that would have to start from scratch again. And this doesn't seem very logical.

Some species are subject to a very high level of human-caused mortality, especially because of poaching. So colleagues, as we know, and we just heard it, the existing possibility under Article 16 of the Habitats Directive to manage wolf and bear populations is necessary. The Commission guidelines need to be clarified, Commissioner, and this is also in our resolution, so please vote for it with no amendments. It includes most of our expectations.

Alessandro Panza (ID). – Signor Presidente, onorevoli colleghi, qualche settimana fa in un comune della Valchiavenna è stata rinvenuta la testa di un lupo appesa a un cartello stradale. È stato un atto deprecabile, violento, da condannare, che tuttavia testimonia il grado di conflittualità tra grandi carnivori e popolazioni locali e dimostra il fallimento dei programmi LIFE, con più di 24 milioni di euro spesi.

La realtà è che la popolazione dei lupi in Europa è in costante aumento: sono ormai più di 21 000 le unità accertate, anche se sappiamo essere molte di più. Agricoltori e allevatori, i veri custodi dell'ecosistema montano e della biodiversità, si sentono abbandonati e addirittura presi in giro da quelle istituzioni che invece dovrebbero sostenerli e tutelarli. Solo in Italia in cinque anni si sono registrate 18 000 predazioni, con 44 000 capi abbattuti a causa del lupo. E questi sono solo una minima parte, perché ormai gli allevatori non denunciano nemmeno più.

Si dice che per risolvere un problema il primo passo sia prenderne atto, Commissario, ecco, prendetene atto, noi ormai l'abbiamo fatto da tempo. Voi invece non girate la testa dall'altra parte, permettete che vengano messi in campo tutti gli strumenti possibili per superare questa situazione. La parola d'ordine deve essere gestione, altrimenti lo scontro non potrà che peggiorare.

Esistono proposte condivisibili – penso a quella svizzera – che possono trovare un punto di incontro sostenibile tra le esigenze delle popolazioni locali che, per quanto mi riguarda, avranno sempre la priorità, e le esigenze naturalistiche e di conservazione di biodiversità.

Non vanificate secoli di storia, tradizione e sacrificio nella ricerca di un falso mito nelle nostre montagne, che invece rischia di riportare il lupo ma di far sparire l'uomo.

Mazaly Aguilar (ECR). – Señor presidente, pues no, no es verdad que el lobo sea un animal en peligro de extinción. En Europa, tan solo este año, se han contabilizado 21 500 ejemplares.

Pero lo que sí es verdad es que los ganaderos están desprotegidos y se están arruinando por estos ataques que no paran. Por ello, reclaman protección, más indemnizaciones justas, que cubran tanto los daños directos como indirectos, y, por supuesto, un control poblacional más exhaustivo del lobo. O protegemos a nuestros ganaderos o ellos no podrán seguir con sus explotaciones.

Claro que sabemos que este conflicto es un conflicto social. Pero, ¿saben qué? El ganado tiene que estar a salvo, los lobos, en las reservas, para que los ganaderos puedan estar tranquilos y puedan seguir con sus explotaciones.

Y permítanme insistir. El lobo no está en peligro de extinción, pero, al paso que vamos, los ganaderos sí.

Alexander Bernhuber (PPE). – Sehr geehrter Herr Präsident, sehr geehrter Herr Kommissar! In Österreich wurden im letzten Jahr 680 Tiere vom Wolf gerissen; bis zum November dieses Jahres waren es bereits 730 nachgewiesene Wolfsrisse. Ja, wir können das als Erfolg sehen, dass sich eine vom Aussterben bedrohte Art endlich wieder ausgebreitet hat, aber wir müssen auch die Probleme sehen. Und wenn jetzt meine Kolleginnen und Kollegen hier kommen mit tollen Ideen – wir brauchen Herdenschutzhunde, zwei Meter hohe Zäune oder Hirten –, dann lade ich die alle nächstes Jahr im Sommer ein, auf eine Alm zu kommen auf 1 500, 2 000 Meter Seehöhe im hochalpinen Gebiet und dann einen Zaun aufzustellen oder eine Schafherde zu hirten. Viel Spaß dabei, es wird einfach nicht funktionieren.

Und, lieber Herr Kommissar, Sie dürfen sich hier einfach nicht aus der Verantwortung ziehen. Wir warten seit 2019 auf ganz konkrete Vorschläge, und gekommen ist einfach nichts. Wir brauchen ein vernünftiges europäisches Wolfsmanagement, das an Wissenschaft und Fakten orientiert ist, und wir brauchen endlich eine Neubewertung des Schutzstatus, damit unsere Mitgliedstaaten endlich den nötigen Spielraum bekommen, um ein sinnvolles Wolfsmanagement durchzuführen.

Günther Sidl (S&D). – Sehr geehrter Herr Präsident, Herr Kommissar! Wir erleben wieder einmal eine sehr emotionale Debatte um die Rückkehr des Wolfes in unseren Lebensraum.

Was ich wirklich kritisiere, ist aber die Art und Weise, wie von manchen politischen Kräften in den letzten Jahren eine Debatte hochgezogen wurde, die losgelöst von Fakten und ohne konkrete Handlungsvorschläge und Lösungsvorschläge in erster Linie mit Ängsten agiert und gearbeitet hat. Am Ende bleibt nur hängen: Der Wolf ist für Mensch und Tier eine große Gefahr. Das habe ich schon als Abgeordneter zu einem regionalen Parlament kritisiert, und das tue ich auch heute hier. Und ja, wenn es Problemtiere gibt, dann muss man auch konsequent vorgehen.

Vollkommen klar ist, dass wir die Weide- und Almtierhaltung bei dieser großen Herausforderung unterstützen müssen – für unsere Landschaft, für unser Ökosystem – und dass die Wegefreiheit in der Natur weiterhin gegeben sein muss. Die Landwirtschaft braucht hier jede – auch finanzielle – Unterstützung. Wir verfügen über genügend Fonds und Programme, die dies ermöglichen und sogar zusätzliche Mittel ausschütten können.

Die vorliegende Entschließung – sie wird ja von sechs Fraktionen getragen – ist ein gutes Beispiel für eine sachliche und gute Entschließung, und ich ersuche daher, diese zu unterstützen und jeglichen weiteren Änderungsanträgen eine Absage zu erteilen.

Elsi Katainen (Renew). – Arvoisa puhemies, on hyvä, että parlamentissa keskustellaan suurpedoista, koska useissa jäsenvaltioissa, Suomi mukaan lukien, on jo pitkään kärsitty suurpetojen aiheuttamista vahingoista.

Suurpedot kuuluvat luontoon. Ne ovat osa ekosysteemiä, ja niiden kestävästä kannasta on edelleen pidettävä huolta. Samalla kuitenkin meillä päättäjillä on vastuu ja velvollisuus suojella myös ihmisiä, kotieläimiä ja tuotantoeläimiä suurpetojen aiheuttamilta vahingoilta. Pedot eivät kuulu ihmisten pihoille eivätkä eläinsuojiin. Tasapaino on löydyttävä.

Suurpetopopulaatioiden arvioinnissa onkin tehtävä yhteistyötä Euroopan tasolla ja samalla on seurattava eri maiden vaihtelevia tilanteita. Meidän on myös löydettävä tasapaino eurooppalaisen päätöksenteon ja kansallisten joustojen välille. Esimerkiksi suotuisan suojelun määrää pitää arvioida ja tarvittaessa päivittää aktiivisesti EU:ssa. Toivon todella, että komissio on valmis keskustelemaan tästä jäsenvaltioiden ja parlamentin kanssa.

Roman Haider (ID). – Herr Präsident! Inzwischen gibt es in Europa wieder mehr als 20 000 Wölfe, also ein mehr als günstiger Erhaltungszustand. Die Anzahl der Wolfsrisse hat sich dementsprechend allein in Österreich innerhalb eines Jahres auf fast 700 Risse mehr als verdoppelt. Dagegen sind die EU-Vorschriften aus dem Jahr 1992, als es in ganz Europa noch fast keine Wölfe gegeben hat.

Es ist also jetzt höchst an der Zeit, der geänderten Situation Rechnung zu tragen. Gerade die Alm- und Weidewirtschaft im alpinen Bereich ist ernsthaft bedroht, und deswegen müssen die lokalen Behörden endlich auch flexibel reagieren können. Und dazu muss der Schutzstatus des Wolfs in der Fauna-Flora-Habitat-Richtlinie von Anhang 4 in Anhang 5 verschoben werden. Damit wären rasche, effiziente und vor allem rechtssichere Maßnahmen durch die lokalen Behörden möglich.

Und darum mein Appell an die Kommission: Geben Sie Ihre Blockadehaltung auf! Ermöglichen Sie auch in Zukunft ein positives Zusammenleben von Mensch, Wolf und Nutztier!

Pietro Fiocchi (ECR). – Signor Presidente, signor Commissario, onorevoli colleghi, sono appena tornato da una serie di visite sul territorio alpino a seguito delle centinaia di segnalazioni di predazione da parte di grandi carnivori di pecore, capre, asini, mucche, lo sapete, ma ultimamente anche di cani da compagnia, nelle vicinanze di insediamenti umani.

Ho osservato episodi raccapriccianti, il peggiore dei quali su una predazione di pecore, una decina, alcune delle quali uccise dai lupi con la loro consolidata tecnica di rendere incapace l'animale e di mangiarlo vivo partendo dallo stomaco. Ho ancora in testa gli occhi di questi poveri animali tra la sofferenza e il terrore, come sono morti e quanto tempo ci hanno messo.

Per cui chiedo alla Commissione, ma anche alle delegazioni nazionali, di cui voi siete dei rappresentanti di fatto, che saranno presenti alla riunione della Convenzione di Berna la settimana prossima a Strasburgo, di appoggiare la richiesta del governo svizzero di declassificare il lupo da altamente protetto a solamente protetto, in modo da dare uno strumento di gestione più efficace e in sintonia con i bisogni regionali, richiesta supportata da dati scientifici che classificano il lupo non più come in pericolo critico ma vulnerabili o di minor preoccupazione a seconda della regione.

A oggi se io devo scegliere tra il lupo e la pecora, io sto con la pecora.

VORSITZ: OTHMAR KARAS

Vizepräsident

Juan Ignacio Zoido Álvarez (PPE). – Señor presidente, la situación del lobo en Europa es muy grave. El crecimiento exponencial de este depredador ha incrementado los ataques contra el ganado e incluso contra los humanos.

Y en España la situación es todavía peor. Una decisión puramente ideológica y radical del Gobierno de Sánchez ha restringido la gestión cinegética de la especie al norte del río Duero. La población de los lobos se ha disparado de tal modo que, tan solo en Galicia, que apenas representa el 5 % de la superficie española, hay tres veces más lobos que en toda Francia.

El desastre es triple: económico, porque cada oveja asesinada por un lobo supone una pérdida añadida a la cada vez más mermada renta de los ganaderos; social, porque cada vez más ganaderos están abandonando el pastoreo y, con ello, aumentando la despoblación rural; y medioambiental, porque la despoblación está llevando al abandono de miles de hectáreas forestales, lo que ha disparado el riesgo de incendio.

Si queremos preservar el futuro del mundo rural, debemos poner fin a la ceguera ideológica ecologista en España y en Europa y garantizar una coexistencia equilibrada y consensuada.

Carmen Avram (S&D). – Domnule președinte, cei care cred că această dezbatere e doar despre despăgubiri mai mari pentru fermieri sau despre promovarea vânătorii se înșeală amarnic. Ea este și trebuie să fie despre cum recuperăm echilibrul pierdut între floră, faună și om, căci în țara mea pierderea acestui echilibru costă, ne costă vieți omenești.

Într-un deceniu România a înregistrat cel mai mare număr de victime ale prădătorilor din toată Uniunea. Peste 20 de oameni uciși și 200 răniți, ne costă turme decimate, ferme închise, sate părăsite și tradiții milenare protejate UNESCO pe cale de dispariție. Ne costă pierderea biodiversității, a pășunilor și a peisajelor montane. Ne costă degradarea unui animal, Ursul, care din rege al pădurilor a ajuns un căutător prin gunoaie, cu pădure de patru ori mai puțină decât Suedia, România are de cinci ori mai mulți urși. Nemaigăsind hrană, ies din păduri, traversează șosele, produc accidente și intră în curțile oamenilor, în magazine, școli, blocuri și spitale.

Îi cer deci Comisiei Europene, din respect pentru viața a sute de mii de români care trăiesc zilnic în pericol să găsească o soluție.

Nicolae Ștefănuță (Renew). – Domnule președinte, „Atenție, URS !" - așa sunt protejate animalele sălbatice în zilele noastre, dar așa sunt protejați și oamenii. Un SMS nu rezolvă cu nimic problema, și anume faptul că animalele sălbatice rămân an de an fără habitat din cauza tăierilor ilegale și agresive de copaci.

Pădurile sunt casa lor, habitatul lor și acesta este pierdut an de an. Însă lupta între animal sălbatic și om nu trebuie să existe, nu asta ne învață civilizația. Civilizația ne învață că trebuie să fie loc pentru fiecare.

Guvernele pot face mult mai mult decât un SMS, hai să spunem, pe cea dreaptă. Fermierii afectați trebuie să aștepte luni de zile până își primesc banii pentru daune sau pur și simplu nu știu că au dreptul la ajutor financiar dacă vor să ia măsuri pentru a preveni atacurile animalelor sălbatice.

Directiva Habitat permite toate acestea, permite. Dar trebuie și guvernele să își facă treaba în acest sens. Dragi colegi, în loc să urlăm la lună despre cum ar trebui să eliminăm amenințarea lupilor și urșilor, mai bine hai să ne concentrăm pe prevenție, pe coabitare, pe educație, necesare Europei în care ne pasă de mediu.

Anne Sander (PPE). – Monsieur le Président, Monsieur le Commissaire, chers collègues, je crois qu'il est vraiment urgent d'agir. Jura, Doubs, tout près d'ici. Eh bien, ces dernières semaines, les attaques de loups se sont multipliées. Ici comme ailleurs en France et en Europe. Nous devons donc intervenir rapidement parce que, aujourd'hui, les populations de loups se déplacent et causent des pertes inestimables, des pertes économiques, mais aussi des pertes psychologiques pour nos éleveurs et leurs familles. Et au delà de cela, la préservation du pastoralisme et l'entretien de certaines terres sont clairement en jeu.

Alors oui, il faut clairement repenser le classement du loup dans nos régions, parce que cette espèce n'est définitivement plus menacée aujourd'hui. Il faut aussi un meilleur suivi des meutes de loups, notamment à travers une approche transfrontalière. Il faut une meilleure gestion et on ne peut pas sans arrêt renvoyer la balle aux États membres. Les mesures préventives ne suffisent plus, il faut passer à l'action. C'est aussi le renouvellement de nos générations d'agriculteurs qui est en jeu.

Asger Christensen (Renew). – Hr. formand! Siden 2016 er ulvebestanden vokset med over 30 % i EU. Det betyder, at der er over 20.000 ulve i EU nu. Det er der ikke plads til. Hverken i EU eller i Danmark. Landmændene føler sig magtesløse over gentagne angreb. Desværre spænder habitatdirektivet ben for, at vi kan løse problemet. Det kan ikke passe, at en gammel lov fra 1992 ikke kan komme problemet til livs. Når bestanden af rovdyr udvikler sig ud over beskyttelsesniveauet, ja så må vi handle. Det handler ikke kun om ulven. Også skarven, bramgæs og sæler udgør et større og større problem i habitatdirektivet. Både dyr og mennesker lider under den lovgivning, vi har lige nu. Hverken hegn eller penge løser problemet. Vi skal have genåbnet habitatdirektivet. Habitatdirektivet skal moderniseres, så det passer til situationen i virkeligheden og i dag.

Simone Schmiedtbauer (PPE). – Sehr geehrter Herr Präsident, geschätzte Kolleginnen und Kollegen! Der Schutz unserer ländlichen Regionen, unserer landwirtschaftlichen Familienbetriebe, ist mir ein Herzensanliegen. Für sie bin ich hier im Parlament, und für sie möchte ich mich auch einsetzen.

Ein Almbauer in meinem Heimatland Österreich treibt im Schnitt elf Tiere auf die Alm auf – elf Tiere. Und wenn nur ein einziges dem Wolf zum Opfer fällt, ist es eine Katastrophe; dann reden wir bereits von rund 10 %. Dieses Jahr haben sich solche Katastrophen in Österreich bereits rund 1 200 Mal ereignet. 1 200 Verluste für Landwirtinnen und Landwirte, 1 200 Mal eine große emotionale Belastung und 1 200 Mal großes, vermeidbares Tierleid.

Es ist daher dringendst notwendig, dass sich, so hoffe ich, erstmals in der Geschichte des Europäischen Parlaments eine Mehrheit hier im Plenum für eine vernünftige Entschließung im Sinne der ländlichen Bevölkerung und der heimischen kleinstrukturierten Landwirtschaft, für die Nutztierhaltung und gegen die unkontrollierte Ausbreitung von Wölfen aussprechen wird.

Es geht hier um viel mehr, und das muss die Europäische Kommission auch einsehen. Es geht darum, den Wolf auf einer wissenschaftlichen Basis, den Schutzstatus zu überprüfen. Nicht der Wolf ist vom Aussterben bedroht, sondern unsere ländlichen Regionen.

Michal Wiezik (Renew). – Vážený pán predsedajúci, je to vskutku zvláštna rezolúcia, ktorá žiada to, čo už je dávno legálne možné. Všetky nástroje, ktoré žiadame, majú členské štáty dávno v rukách, vrátane usmrcovania problematických jedincov chránených druhov vlka, medveďa či rysa tam, kde je to skutočne posledná a jediná možnosť.

Treba naozaj povedať jasne, že s touto iniciatívou prišiel výbor AGRI, no pôvodný zámer bol otvoriť smernicu o biotopoch, znížiť ochranu vlka, medveďa a rysa a umožniť ich plošné lovenie. Pre takúto ambíciu nemám porozumenie hlavne z dôvodu obrovského významu týchto druhov pre ekosystémy a biodiverzitu, rovnako ako pre veľkú podporu u verejnosti.

Som preto rád, že máme predložený vyrokovaný text, ktorý plne podporujem, a takisto k tomu vyzývam všetkých vás: zastavme už alebo ukončime túto kapitolu, venujme sa skutočne dôležitým veciam, ako je napríklad hľadanie kompatibility s touto planétou, ktorá však nebude možná bez spolužitia s divokou neregulovanou prírodou.

Franc Bogovič (PPE). – Gospod predsednik, spoštovani gospod komisar, cenjene kolegice. Direktiva o habitatih odlično deluje na primeru divjih zveri, kajti populacija, ki je bila povsem ogrožena, je postala tako številčna, da sedaj ogroža druge v naravi.

V Sloveniji, v državi, od koder prihajava z gospodom komisarjem, je v desetih letih iz 300 volkov nastalo 1200 volkov, iz 20 do 30, pardon, medvedov – od 300 do 400 do 1200. Od 30 volkov je sedaj približno 130 volkov.

Spoštovani komisar, povabim vas, da greva skupaj na Bloke, na Kočevsko, na Gorenjsko in se pogovoriva s kmeti, ki jim dnevno napadajo zveri te živali. In mislim, da bova prišla do zaključka, da je potrebno v statusu zaščite nekaj storiti.

Veseli me, da je končno ta obravnava prišla sem v Evropski parlament, vendar to ne bo dovolj. Moramo ukrepati in spremeniti status zaščite in pomagati regulirati ravnovesje v naravi, ki je danes porušeno.

Benoît Lutgen (PPE). – Monsieur le Président, chers collègues, d'abord une rectification par rapport à ce que j'ai pu entendre: dire que la forêt européenne est en déclin et qu'on perd des hectares chaque année est totalement faux. On voit grand. La forêt européenne a grandi de l'équivalent du Portugal en 25 ans, ce qui n'est pas rien. Ça ne veut pas dire qu'il n'y a pas de problème de biodiversité, bien sûr.

Alors, on doit entendre l'appel des hommes, des femmes, des bergers, des bergères, des éleveurs, qui sont effectivement peut-être encore plus proches de la nature que n'importe qui dans cette assemblée et qui ont besoin effectivement de notre soutien. Qu'on puisse répondre effectivement à cette croissance du nombre de loups au niveau européen en prenant des mesures adaptées dans différentes zones.

Ces mesures adaptées, ce sont aussi les indemnisations. Dans certains États membres, dont le mien, les indemnisations prennent un temps incroyable. Les agriculteurs doivent se battre pour pouvoir faire reconnaître ces attaques de loups. L'indemnisation doit être totale, au niveau de l'ensemble de la couverture des coûts, pour l'ensemble des agriculteurs et il faut avoir les mesures adaptées au niveau de chaque État membre pour que cette régulation puisse se retrouver le plus rapidement possible.

Marlene Mortler (PPE). – Herr Präsident, liebe Kollegen! Der Wolf hat inzwischen alles widerlegt, was man versucht hat, uns einzureden – dass er nicht springt, dass er als Ökopolizei im Wald lebt und sich von den dortigen Tieren ernährt, dass er nicht an Großtiere wie Rinder oder Pferde geht oder dass ihn ein guter Zaun abhält. Herdenschutz und Herdenschutzzäune versagen oft kläglich, wenn ein Wolf oder ein Rudel Weidetiere reißen, weil sie längst Blut geleckt haben.

Immer mehr auffällige Wölfe töten jährlich tausende Tiere. Der Fortbestand der europäischen Weidetiere und ihrer Halter steht auf dem Spiel. Dass beweidetes Grünland zu den artenreichsten Flächen gehört, ist zigfach bewiesen. Diesen Artenreichtum dürfen wir nicht für diese eine Art – den Wolf – opfern.

Stellen wir uns der Realität und fordern die Kommission auf, endlich ihre überfälligen Hausaufgaben zu machen. Der Schutzstatus des Wolfs muss angepasst und damit das Wolfsmanagement erleichtert werden.

Francisco José Millán Mon (PPE). – Señor presidente, la recuperación de las poblaciones de lobos en Europa provoca grandes retos medioambientales y agrícolas, tanto en la fauna silvestre como, sobre todo, en las reses de los ganaderos, que están sufriendo importantes daños. Hace falta una respuesta inmediata por parte de las autoridades nacionales y también de las europeas.

El estado de conservación del lobo justifica ya una revisión de su nivel de protección. Además, tanto la Comisión Europea como los Gobiernos de los Estados miembros deben apoyar a aquellas regiones donde la coexistencia entre lobos y ganaderos es cada vez más difícil.

En mi país, en España, las principales regiones afectadas son Galicia, Castilla y León, Asturias y Cantabria. Lamentablemente, el Gobierno español, lejos de contribuir a la solución, ha prohibido la extracción del lobo de forma indiscriminada en todo el territorio. El Gobierno de España debe rectificar y permitir una gestión activa del lobo. Además, sería intolerable e incomprensible que una región como Galicia, la segunda región española que más lobos alberga, quedase fuera del fondo de 20 millones de euros para mitigar los daños del lobo.

Catch-the-eye procedure

Barbara Thaler (PPE). – Herr Präsident, liebe Kolleginnen und Kollegen! Ich bin wirklich froh, dass wir heute über das Thema diskutieren. Wir haben ein Jahr lang dafür gekämpft, die großen Beutegreifer diese Woche hier auf unserer Tagesordnung zu haben.

Und wir haben in der vergangenen Stunde viele Beispiele aus allen Regionen Europas gehört: dass wachsende Wolfspopulationen zu immer mehr Schäden, aber auch zu immer mehr Leid führen und damit zu einem immer größer werdenden Problem werden. Und deshalb ist es umso besser, dass wir heute endlich darüber diskutieren, weil ich glaube, dass die EU-Institutionen nicht die Augen davor verschließen dürfen, sondern für Lösungen sorgen müssen.

Liebe Kommission, lieber Herr Kommissar, wir werden Sie beim Wort nehmen und mit unserer Abstimmung morgen zur Entschließung Sie ganz konkret auffordern, sich des Problems anzunehmen, nicht nur im Sinne von finanziellen Kompensationszahlungen, sondern auch im Sinne von praktikablen Lösungen für die Regionen der Europäischen Union und vor allem für kleinere Mitgliedstaaten.

Jérémy Decerle (Renew). – Monsieur le Président, pendant que nous pesons avec beaucoup de précaution nos mots pour tenter de concilier l'inconciliable, des éleveurs de plus en plus nombreux dans toute l'Europe se sentent acculés, ignorés, incompris. Je veux leur rendre hommage pour tout le travail qu'ils font et le courage qu'ils ont. Leur détresse profonde devrait nous alerter.

Peut-on à la fois protéger le loup et l'élevage? Peut-être, mais certainement pas partout. Quels que soient les moyens qu'on voudra y mettre, quelles que soient les protections et les indemnisations, il y a des zones où la cohabitation restera impossible. Admettons-le.

Ce débat aujourd'hui en plénière montre au moins que nous ne fermons pas les yeux. Mais nous devons avoir plus de courage politique. Très concrètement, nous devons tout de suite donner plus de flexibilité à la règlementation pour que les États membres puissent agir plus efficacement. Et agir ne veut pas dire compter les carcasses de moutons et de vaches. Agir veut dire abattre de façon ciblée les prédateurs aux comportements dévastateurs.

Caroline Roose (Verts/ALE). – Monsieur le Président, la question de la cohabitation entre le loup et les activités humaines est une question qui est très complexe et multiplier le nombre de loups tués chaque année n'est pas la solution. En France, le gouvernement a autorisé à ce que 174 loups soient tués en 2022. C'est énorme! Et pour quel résultat? La France est le pays qui tue le plus, mais qui a le moins de résultats.

Au lieu de tuer les loups, il faut accompagner les éleveurs. Des expérimentations impliquant des chiens de berger comme le patou ont été menées dans ma région et ont montré des résultats très positifs permettant de diminuer significativement le nombre d'attaques. Les paysans demandent par exemple à ce que les zones où les achats de patous sont subventionnés soient étendues à tout le territoire. Alors sortons de la caricature et agissons vraiment pour vivre avec le loup.

Peter Jahr (PPE). – Herr Präsident, liebe Kolleginnen und Kollegen, liebe Kommission! Betrachten Sie diese Entschließung als einen Hilferuf an Sie: Tut endlich was!

Die Ansiedelung des Wolfes ist eine Erfolgsgeschichte. Wir haben stabile, wachsende Wolfsbestände, das heißt, der Schutzstatus kann gemindert werden; der Bestand kann reguliert werden. Entwickeln Sie europaweite *guidelines*! Definieren Sie wolfsfreie Zonen! Helfen Sie unseren Bäuerinnen und Bauern, helfen Sie unserer Kulturlandschaft, helfen Sie unserem ländlichen Raum!

Liebe Kommission, tun Sie endlich etwas, und machen Sie die Erfolgsgeschichte Wolf nicht kaputt!

Mick Wallace (The Left). – Mr President, large carnivores, such as wolves and bears, are legally protected species in the EU under the Habitats Directive and the Bern Convention. However, many of these large carnivore species have not yet achieved favourable conservation status.

Of course, coexistence with large carnivores can cause conflict with human socio-economic interests, but hundreds of wolves are already killed each year in the EU using the existing exemptions in the Habitats Directive. The legal protections for large carnivores must be upheld. Instead of decreasing these protections, the EU and Member States need to more rigorously pursue mitigation strategies to achieve greater coexistence and implement measures to quickly and adequately compensate farmers for any losses.

Large carnivores belong to the European biodiversity heritage that the EU has committed to restore and preserve through the adoption of the Habitats Directive and the biodiversity strategy. It is crucial that the Commission and Council reject the concerted and coordinated campaign to reduce protection for these animals.

Stanislav Polčák (PPE). – Pane předsedající, soužití dobytka a velkých šelem zní skoro jako velký protimluv. Přesto úspěchem Evropské komise a myslím, že i nás všech bylo právě to, že tyto šelmy se na evropském kontinentu takto rozmnožily. Možná, že podle některých až příliš. Samozřejmě, že pastva dobytka, kde je vlk, je složitá. To já nebudu vůbec popírat a chápu obavy lidí. Chápu i rozhořčení zemědělců. Myslím si, že je dobré využívat zase osvědčené postupy, o kterých zde bylo hovořeno. Bylo zde hovořeno o kompenzacích, monitoringu. Možná, že to nestačí. Já to nebudu rozhodně zpochybňovat. Každopádně najít řešení koexistence, jak řekl pan komisař, bude velmi obtížné. Já osobně jsem proti unáhleným posunům a změnám. Osobně podpořím návrh této rezoluce, ale myslím si, že biodiverzita by měla být pro nás také velmi významnou hodnotou.

Charlie Weimers (ECR). – Herr talman! Jag kommer från ett av de vargtätaste områdena i norra Europa. För er på vänstersidan som tycker att EU under inga omständigheter ska förändra sin skyddsstatus, tänkte jag berätta någonting från Värmland: ”Vi kunde se fåren från köksfönstret. Några låg bara ett tjugotal meter från huset. De flesta var döda. Två fick jag skjuta i hagen”, berättar lantbrukaren Mats Eriksson, Brandbols gård, utanför Gräsmark, hemma i mitt Värmland.

Vi har hundägare som inte vågar gå ut med sina hundar längre och föräldrar som inte vågar släppa ut sina barn. Vi har haft en ökning från tiotalet vargar – 17 vargar i Sverige, när den här skyddsstatusen slogs fast – till över 400 vargar i dag. Och ni vill inte röra skyddsstatusen. Det håller inte. Ni undergräver förtroendet för EU genom detta. Det är dags att ändra vargens skyddsstatus.

Janez Lenarčič, *Member of the Commission*. – Mr President, honourable Members, thank you very much for this debate. I think it has proven that this is a very important issue.

I would like, first of all, to try and address some of the concerns that have been voiced by some of you.

On the costs of co-existence measures, I would like to give you some perspective about the costs. In the framework of the prioritised action frameworks, the Member States have estimated that the total needs for compensation, prevention and mitigation measures in relation to all protected species would amount to around EUR 180 million per year. At the same time, the common agricultural policy has specifically earmarked for biodiversity EUR 10.7 billion per year. This means that the potential maximum contribution from the common agricultural policy for wolf protection would then be a very, very small amount in comparison to the total biodiversity spending claimed from the common agricultural policy.

On the effectiveness of livestock protection measures, these have been proven effective. They have been proven to prevent, or at least significantly reduce, predation risks – of course when properly implemented and tailored to the specific situation and to the specific context in which they’re applied.

Let me share with you just one of many examples of the prevention measures that were implemented under the Life Wolfalps project, which is a project implemented in the Italian Alps. This project led to a reduction of attacks of about 96%. The measures concern both cattle and sheep and were targeted to the different livestock breeders. They included electric fences, night-time enclosures, acoustic devices, livestock guarding dogs and the like. There are also some other examples with similar, or even higher, successful reduction, going up to 100%.

On the level of protection of wolves, it is true that the wolf is no longer at risk of extinction in Europe. That's true. However, in most EU Member States, it has not yet achieved a favourable status, according to national reports. The situation of this species is still fragile and is subject to a high level of human-caused mortality from poaching, from car accidents and from authorised culling.

So we need to act very carefully. We believe that a strict protection status is still necessary in order to be able to achieve and to maintain a favourable conservation status, while I would like to recall that the removal of individual wolves is already permitted under certain conditions.

On the impact of wolves on livestock farming in Europe, it is known that wolves prey primarily on wild animals like red deer, roe deer, wild boar and chamois, and so on. It is also true, of course, that if livestock is not properly protected in wolf areas, the risk of predation can become significant at local level. But according to the study carried out for the European Parliament back in 2018, wolf predation numbers at EU level concern around 20 000 sheep per year. This is a big figure which can be drastically reduced with proper protection measures. But this figure, 20 000, represents 0.06% of the sheep numbers in the concerned countries – 0.06%.

So I do not believe that the crisis of sheep farming or land abandonment are caused by large carnivores, also because this actually occurs in many areas where there is no presence of such carnivores, but where we also have issues of land abandonment and crisis in sheep farming.

Finally, on the impact of large carnivores on public safety, aggressiveness of large carnivores towards humans is considered to be an extremely rare phenomenon. For instance, we know that fatal wolf attacks on humans have been reported in historical times, but none, not one, has been recorded in the 21st century in Europe. Not a single one – even though there have been thousands of documented close encounters between wolves and humans.

Bear attacks are a different matter. They are documented in some cases in Northern Europe and the Southeast Balkans, but they also occur under very specific circumstances, often as a defensive mechanism such as the protection of offspring. But let me just put the whole of this issue in the wider context. It is useful to recall that by far most of the actual risks of animal attacks on humans actually come from domestic animals, primarily dogs.

Honourable Members, It's time to conclude from my side. Nowadays there is a great deal of knowledge and experience on the different conflicts with wildlife species, including large carnivores, and also on the possible ways to address them. I can assure you that we, the European Commission, are actively monitoring the issue at various levels with a view to supporting targeted and suitable solutions to achieve the objectives which we believe we share.

The Commission is committed to protect Europe's biodiversity, its habitats and species. That said, it is the Member States who are responsible for wildlife management and for the implementation of EU nature legislation. The Commission will, of course, contribute to the research, dissemination, promotion and support of good practices aiming at preventing and reducing possible conflicts caused by wildlife protected species.

Der Präsident. – Zum Abschluss der Aussprache wurden sieben Entschließungsanträge eingereicht.

Die Aussprache ist geschlossen.

Die Abstimmung findet am Donnerstag, 24. November 2022, statt.

Schriftliche Erklärungen (Artikel 171)

Tom Vandenkendelaere (PPE), *schriftelijk*. – De wetgeving om wolven te beschermen was destijds meer dan nodig en heeft ondertussen ook haar nut bewezen. Tegelijk is de situatie dusdanig veranderd dat er maatregelen nodig zijn. Door de toename van de wolvenpopulatie zien we ook een toename van aanvallen met als gevolg dode of gewonde landbouwdieren. Vooral hun aanwezigheid in dichtbevolkte plattelandsgebieden zoals Vlaanderen heeft een negatieve impact op de landbouw maar ook op het toerisme. De huidige preventiemaatregelen volstaan niet, met oplopende kosten voor onze landbouwers. De schadeloosstellingen dekken immers vaak niet alle kosten van de berokkende schade. Het kan niet de bedoeling zijn dat de aanwezigheid van wolven tot grote economische verliezen voor landbouwbedrijven leiden. We moeten daarom de Europese Commissie oproepen om de schade voor boeren beter te compenseren en samen met de regio's de huidige beheersmaatregelen flexibel toe te passen als preventie niet voldoende is. Als de populatie in bepaalde regio's zodanig is toegenomen dat een verlaging van het beschermingsniveau uit de habitatrichtlijn gerechtvaardigd is, mogen we niet langer twijfelen. Wat mij betreft moet een herplaatsing van de wolven in die situaties zeker tot de mogelijkheden behoren.

18. Erklärungen zur Abstimmung

Der Präsident. – Als nächster Punkt der Tagesordnung folgen die Erklärungen zur Abstimmung.

18.1. Eigenmittelsystem der Europäischen Union (A9-0266/2022 - Valérie Hayer, José Manuel Fernandes)

Mündliche Stimmerklärungen

Charlie Weimers (ECR). – Herr talman! När riksdagen godkände EU:s coronafond skulle det vara en temporär engångsföreteelse. Sverigedemokraterna, revisionsrätten i Tyskland och många andra varnade för att ett prejudikat för att flytta kostnaden för framtida kriser till EU-nivå etablerades. Nu är nästa kris här, och ni centralister vägrar förstås att skära i stödfonderna, slöseriet eller byråkratin. Till och med islamistbidragen är heliga.

I stället kräver parlamentet en gemensam upplåning, som ett normalt sätt för att finansiera EU:s utgifter – en massiv maktökning på medlemsstaternas bekostnad. Skuldsättningens syfte är att öka trycket på medlemsstaterna och godkänna införandet av flera nya EU-skatter för att betala tillbaka lånen. SD röstar nej till skulderna och skatterna. Jag hoppas att statsministern i Sverige hörsammar sin föregångares varning – den som är satt i skuld är icke fri – och håller sitt löfte om nej till EU-skatter.

Clare Daly (The Left). – Mr President, I voted in favour of this report. The plan to raise EUR 17 billion a year for the EU budget from a new system of taxation on corporations and levies on emissions has been around for a while and is okay as far as it goes. But I do have some sympathy for people who are concerned about EU overreach.

But a much bigger concern I have is that the EU hasn't exactly been the most reliable guardian of the money that it already collects. We've had EUR 8 billion kicked into a slush fund for the arms industry through the European Defence Fund, EUR 5.7 billion through the sick joke of a European Peace Facility and EUR 1.9 billion to the Internal Security Fund. If that wasn't bad enough, the EU budget now has a bonanza for weapons manufacturing with a staggering EUR 43.9 billion in public money going to security and defence. That's EUR 43.9 billion earmarked for arms surveillance, border control, military R&D, and so on.

You have to ask, will this EUR 17 billion end up being spent on the same stuff? Will it help people heat their homes, house the homeless, or will it pour into the pockets of the arms industry?

Stanislav Polčák (PPE). – Pane předsedající, já jsem tuto zprávu našich kolegů podpořil. Myslím si, že musíme hledat vlastní zdroje EU a reformovat náš rozpočet. Je to zodpovědné vůči budoucnosti Unie, vůči budoucnosti i našich dětí a nepochybně se nesmíme spoléhat pouze na členské státy. Tudíž tuto zprávu jsem podpořil. Stojí před námi velké závazky, velké výzvy i z minulého období, z koronavirového období, splatit dluhy. Jsou před námi nové výdaje v sociálním a klimatickém fondu, výdaje, které budeme směřovat na Ukrajinu, na její obranu i na její obnovu, pevně věřím. A je třeba na všechny tyto nové výzvy pamatovat a mít připravené i odpovídající rozpočtové kapitoly. Evropa musí hledat vlastní zdroje financování a myslím si, že tato zpráva jde správným směrem, proto jsem ji tedy skutečně podpořil.

18.2. Einstufung der Russischen Föderation als dem Terrorismus Vorschub leistender Staat (RC-B9-0482/2022, B9-0482/2022, B9-0483/2022, B9-0485/2022, B9-0486/2022, B9-0487/2022)

Mündliche Stimmerklärungen

Charlie Weimers (ECR). – Mr President, today the European Parliament decided to designate the Russian Federation as a state sponsor of terrorism. Now, some Members of this House were trying to water down this resolution and delete this designation. And I'm glad those efforts did not succeed, because right after this vote, two things happened. The Russian Federation started to terror-bomb Ukraine and Russians hacked the European Parliament's IT system, which means that this vote actually made a difference, something that was confirmed by the message by President Zelenskyy.

Now, my message here today to the Member States, to the Council is: take this seriously. Establish a European legal framework to designate Russia a sponsor of terrorism. Do it quickly. It's needed.

Eugen Tomac (PPE). – Domnule președinte, sunt unul dintre inițiatorii acestei rezoluții și mi se pare extrem de important să reținem mesajul pe care l-am primit imediat de la Moscova, de îndată ce s-a adoptat această rezoluție cu o largă majoritate.

Însă pe mine mă uimește că avem aproape 100 de colegi care nu înțeleg că Rusia este un stat care susține formele de exprimare prin acte de terorism. La Mariupol au fost omorâți 22.000 de cetățeni civili, 95% din acest oraș de peste jumătate de milion de cetățeni a fost distrus.

Acest regim susține și acționează prin metode teroriste, iar faptul că au reacționat imediat atacând portalul Parlamentului European este o dovadă cât se poate de clară că s-au simțit vizați și evident că trebuie să mergem mai departe și să susținem Ucraina și Republica Moldova să facă față acestor agresiuni din partea Rusiei.

Elena Yoncheva (S&D). – Monsieur le Président, chers collègues, voulons-nous la guerre en Europe? Car avec cette résolution, nous ne faisons qu'alimenter le conflit et rapprocher l'Europe d'une catastrophe majeure. Déclarer la Russie comme un État promouvant le terrorisme réduit la possibilité de trouver une solution pacifique au conflit, parce qu'on ne négocie pas avec un terroriste. En votant en faveur de ce document honteux, nous laissons tout se décider sur le champ de bataille.

Est-ce que vous comprenez ce que cela signifie? Une guerre avec une force nucléaire majeure ne peut pas être gagnée. Nous condamnons l'Ukraine à une guerre longue, nous condamnons l'Europe à l'épuisement et nous ouvrons la voie à une catastrophe nucléaire mondiale.

Chers députés, nous avons besoin d'une stratégie européenne pour arrêter la guerre. L'Europe doit engager des négociations de paix, insister sur un compromis, raisonnable et acceptable. Au lieu de cela, avec cette résolution, nous faisons un pas de plus vers l'entraînement de l'Europe dans cette guerre.

(Le Président retire la parole à l'oratrice)

Mick Wallace (The Left). – Mr President, there is no legal framework for the EU to recognise a state sponsor of terrorism. You just pulled this antagonistic performance out of thin air. Even the US, who have such a legal mechanism, have refrained from applying the label to Russia. Biden has argued that doing so could impact future efforts to negotiate a peace deal.

The European Parliament, instead of pursuing peace and an end to this bloody war – a war that's killing tens of thousands, decimating European industry and jobs, creating soaring inflation and an unprecedented cost of living crisis – instead of any effort at diplomacy to remedy this disaster, you have voted to call Russia names.

What's worse, NATO is one of the most blood-drenched terrorist groups to curse this earth. It has murdered millions of human beings. The idea that any representative of a NATO member state would label anyone else a sponsor of terrorism before calling out their own state is absurd.

Stanislav Polčák (PPE). – Pane předsedající, já jsem tento návrh rezoluce podpořil. Stejně tak jsem doufal, že tato sněmovna tento návrh rezoluce podpoří, protože Rusko vraždí Ukrajince, Rusko mučí Ukrajince, Rusko znásilňuje ukrajinské ženy a muže, Rusko unáší ukrajinské děti, Rusko loupí a ničí ukrajinský majetek. Řekněte mi: Jak se liší tento způsob jednání od jiného teroristy? Je jednoznačné, že Rusko se nám představuje jako terorista. Jako terorista, který neváhá, neštítí se používat všechny hanebné postupy. A je jednoznačné, že svým dnešním kybernetickým útokem i vůči této sněmovně jenom zvýšilo naše odhodlání vytrvat.

Miriam Lexmann (PPE). – Mr President, I welcome today's resolution recognising the Russian Federation as a state sponsor of terrorism. Putin's Russia is waging a brutal war against the Ukrainian people. It is bombing civilian targets, including homes, hospitals, schools and churches and systematically attacking Ukrainian critical infrastructure. It is breaking all international conventions governing warfare and committing unspeakable crimes.

That is why we must do all in our power to support the brave people of Ukraine and ensure that Putin's regime one day faces international justice for the crimes committed.

18.3. Neue Strategie der EU für die Erweiterung (A9-0251/2022 - Tonino Picula)

Mündliche Stimmerklärungen

Eugen Tomac (PPE). – Domnule președinte, cred că criza de securitate ne-a scos în față noi provocări și Uniunea Europeană întotdeauna a depășit toate obstacolele pe care le-a avut prin două decizii majore: pe de-o parte extindere, pe de altă parte, mai multă integrare.

Iată că statele afectate de agresiunea rusă au primit același răspuns, au fost invitate să adere la Uniunea Europeană. Însă, pentru a ajuta Ucraina și Republica Moldova astăzi mai avem nevoie de un pas extrem de important, și anume ca Austria și Olanda să nu se opună integrării României și Bulgariei în spațiul Schengen.

Moldova și Ucraina pot primi oricât de mulți bani putem oferi, însă nu pot supraviețui economic dacă nu vor avea lângă ei frontiera Schengen pentru a putea să se integreze rapid economic. Întârzierea extinderii spațiului Schengen agravează foarte mult și inclusiv aceste state din punct de vedere economic.

Clare Daly (The Left). – Mr President, I abstained on this report. To the spotless minds in Europe, EU enlargement is about growing our happy family of democratic nations, prospering together in a brotherly paradise of enterprise and free trade. But the truth is, it's a rich boys' club, in which membership hinges upon sweeping neoliberal reforms –the last batch about boosting NATO and a pool of cheap labour for the West.

And for the last 20 years, we've left candidate countries in the Balkans in accession purgatory, while we've lorded it over them through one thing or another. And now we're going in the opposite direction for all the wrong reasons.

The report is infected with megalomania. Enlargement is now explicitly described as part of an EU geographic strategy against Russia. Wow! What a proposition to put to the working people in our neighbourhood. We want your country as a chess piece. You, too, can be like Ukraine.

The world isn't our chessboard and the EU shouldn't have an enlargement strategy. We should welcome those who want to join, respect those who don't and stop ending this meddling.

Miriam Lexmann (PPE). – Mr President, for too long we lacked the vision and political will to utilise the transformative nature of the enlargement process. The consequences of this failure are there for us to see. Non-democratic regimes are challenging European peace and security, threatening the stability of our neighbours and using malign investments to roll back years of democratic reforms. Reclaiming this vision and will is crucial for our society.

However, we must also be creative about the integration process. We need to enhance constructive political dialogue with the candidate, potential candidate and associated countries. Include them as observers in Commission comitology proceedings, Council working groups, as well as specific meetings of the EU ministers and heads of state.

We must work together to pursue our common values and interests and address the many challenges facing us today.

18.4. Lage in Libyen (A9-0252/2022 - Giuliano Pisapia)

Mündliche Stimmerklärungen

Clare Daly (The Left). – Mr President, I voted against this report. Its timing is pretty appropriate coming, as it does, a few short weeks after the 11th anniversary of the day Libyan leader Muammar Gaddafi was killed during the NATO assault on Libya: sodomised with a bayonet and shot in the head. The NATO intervention in Libya, carried out in the name of protecting freedom, democracy and human rights, is one we'd do well to remember as NATO plays out its proxy war in Ukraine in the name of, you've guessed it, freedom, democracy and human rights.

Because what happens after NATO intervenes in your country on this basis? Terror, death, lawlessness, rape, poverty, starvation. Libya is a country riven by conflict, its economy shattered, its population – formerly the wealthiest in Africa – ridden and mired in poverty. Migrants are bought and sold in slave markets. A million people rely on humanitarian aid. It's a country of mass graves, of crimes against humanity. This is NATO's legacy. This is NATO's right strategy and democracy.

Mick Wallace (The Left). – Mr President, the report claims the EU is redoubling its diplomatic efforts to promote peace in Libya. France spearheaded the illegal and unprovoked NATO war of aggression on Libya because it saw Gaddafi as a threat to its interests in the region – in particular, France's precious colonial cash-cow, the CFA franc.

In the process of this war, massive quantities of weapons were pumped into the region by NATO and Gulf states. Today, multiple militias fight each other with these weapons and continue to receive military supplies from European states, Gulf states, Turkey and Russia.

Why do these reports always fail to acknowledge our role in the destabilisation we claim to be so worried about? Two years ago, Italy was engaged in a proxy war against France and Russia for control of resources in Libya. How can we square that with the notion that we want to promote peace in Libya? How in God's name can we have any credibility?

18.5. Förderung von regionaler Stabilität und Sicherheit in den Ländern des Nahen und Mittleren Ostens (A9-0256/2022 - Manu Pineda)

Mündliche Stimmerklärungen

Mick Wallace (The Left). – Mr President, this report on stability and security in the broader Middle East is incredible for what it manages to ignore and conceal. Apparently in this region, instability and wars just spontaneously happen. It says the underlying causes of instability must be addressed, but there are none in the report. There was No Iraq War, there was no regime change operation in Syria. In this fairy tale, France, Turkey, Saudi Arabia, the UK and the US didn't train, arm and finance al-Qaida and Syria. Saudi Arabia, the UAE, France and the UK have not been bombing the daylights out of Yemen for eight years. Iran, Russia and Turkey are active in Syria, but America and Israelis are nowhere. America and Israelis are not illegally occupying Syria and the Israelis are not bombing Syria every week. And the US and the EU are not sanctioning the Syrian people to death.

If we are incapable of talking honestly about our criminal actions, we are doomed to repeat them.

18.6. Vorbeugung von, Umgang mit und bessere Versorgung bei Diabetes in der EU anlässlich des Weltdiabetestags (B9-0492/2022)

Mündliche Stimmerklärungen

Stanislav Polčák (PPE). – Pane předsedající, já jsem tento návrh podpořil. Je nezbytně nutné si uvědomit, že diabetes je bohužel nemoc velmi na vzestupu a je stále nebezpečnou nemocí. V evropském prostoru trpí touto nemocí 35 milionů lidí a většinou se jedná o cukrovku 2. typu, tzn. získanou řekněme životním stylem, jistými návyky. A to představuje nepochybně velkou výzvu, ale také zátěž pro náš zdravotní systém. Je důležité, aby si státy stanovily jednoznačné, měřitelné cíle, své plány, jak předcházet vzniku této nemoci. Myslím si, že zpráva byla velmi dobrá, a já jsem ji podporoval a je důležité, aby našla i sluch u těch, kterým je určena, to znamená našim evropským občanům, aby se zamysleli i nad svým životním stylem.

Der Präsident. – Damit ist dieser Tagesordnungspunkt geschlossen.

19. Tagesordnung der nächsten Sitzung

Der Präsident. – Die nächste Sitzung findet morgen, Donnerstag, 24. November 2022, um 9.00 Uhr statt.

Die Tagesordnung wurde veröffentlicht und ist auf der Website des Europäischen Parlaments verfügbar.

20. Genehmigung des Protokolls der laufenden Sitzung

Der Präsident. – Das Protokoll dieser Sitzung wird dem Parlament morgen zu Beginn der Nachmittagssitzung zur Genehmigung vorgelegt.

21. Schluss der Sitzung

(Die Sitzung wird um 21.50 Uhr geschlossen)

Donnerstag, 24. November 2022

AUSFÜHRLICHE SITZUNGSBERICHTE VOM 24. NOVEMBER 2022

(2023/C 240/04)

Inhalt Seite

1. Eröffnung der Sitzung . . . 348

2. Politikprogramm für 2030 „Weg in die digitale Dekade“ (Aussprache) . . . 348

3. Europäisches Jahr der Jugend 2022 — Vermächtnis (Aussprache) . . . 361

4. Wiederaufnahme der Sitzung . . . 378

5. Abstimmungsstunde . . . 379

5.1. Änderung der Verordnung (EU, Euratom) 2020/2093 des Rates vom 17. Dezember 2020 zur Festlegung des mehrjährigen Finanzrahmens für den Zeitraum von 2021 bis 2027 (C9-0386/2022) (Abstimmung) . . . 379

5.2. Änderung der Verordnung (EU, Euratom) 2018/1046 im Hinblick auf die Festlegung einer diversifizierten Finanzierungsstrategie als allgemeine Methode für die Mittelaufnahme (C9-0374/2022) (Abstimmung) . . . 379

5.3. Instrument zur Unterstützung der Ukraine im Jahr 2023 (Makrofinanzhilfe+) (C9-0373/2022) (Abstimmung) . . . 379

5.4. Nichtanerkennung von in besetzten ausländischen Gebieten ausgestellten russischen Reisedokumenten (C9-0302/2022 - Juan Fernando López Aguilar) (Abstimmung) . . . 379

5.5. Politikprogramm für 2030 „Weg in die digitale Dekade“ (A9-0159/2022 - Martina Dlabajová) (Abstimmung) . . . 379

5.6. Empfehlung für einen Beschluss, keine Einwände gegen einen delegierten Rechtsakt einzulegen: befristete Sofortmaßnahmen in Bezug auf die Anforderungen an Sicherheiten (B9-0491/2022) (Abstimmung) . . . 379

5.7. Empfehlung für einen Beschluss, keine Einwände gegen einen delegierten Rechtsakt einzulegen: Wert für die Clearingschwelle für Positionen in OTC-Warenderivatekontrakten und anderen OTC-Derivatekontrakten (B9-0490/2022) (Abstimmung) . . . 379

5.8. Die Menschenrechtslage in Afghanistan, insbesondere mit Blick auf die Verschlechterung der Frauenrechte und die Anschläge auf Bildungseinrichtungen (B9-0501/2022, RC-B9-0506/2022, B9-0506/2022, B9-0522/2022, B9-0524/2022, B9-0525/2022, B9-0526/2022) (Abstimmung) 379

5.9. Die anhaltende Unterdrückung der demokratischen Opposition und der Zivilgesellschaft in Belarus (RC-B9-0508/2022, B9-0508/2022, B9-0521/2022, B9-0530/2022, B9-0531/2022, B9-0532/2022) (Abstimmung) . . . 380

5.10. Vertreibung von Menschen infolge des eskalierenden Konflikts im Osten der Demokratischen Republik Kongo (B9-0500/2022, RC-B9-0507/2022, B9-0507/2022, B9-0523/2022, B9-0527/2022, B9-0528/2022, B9-0529/2022) (Abstimmung) . . . 380

5.11. Künftige europäische Finanzarchitektur zur Förderung der Entwicklung (A9-0270/2022 - Charles Goerens) (Abstimmung) . . . 380

5.12. Ergebnis der Modernisierung des Vertrags über die Energiecharta (RC-B9-0498/2022, B9-0498/2022, B9-0502/2022, B9-0510/2022, B9-0513/2022, B9-0536/2022) (Abstimmung) 380

5.13. Bewertung der Einhaltung der Rechtsstaatlichkeitsbedingungen durch Ungarn im Rahmen der Konditionalitätsverordnung sowie des Stands des ungarischen Aufbau- und Resilienzplans (B9-0511/2022) (Abstimmung) . . . 380

5.14. Schutz der Viehwirtschaft und der Großraubtiere in Europa (RC-B9-0503/2022, B9-0503/2022, B9-0504/2022, B9-0509/2022, B9-0514/2022, B9-0518/2022, B9-0519/2022, B9-0520/2022) (Abstimmung) 380

5.15. Europäisches Jahr der Jugend 2022 — Vermächtnis (B9-0512/2022) (Abstimmung) . . . 380

Donnerstag, 24. November 2022

Inhalt Seite

5.16. Verbesserung der EU-Vorschriften für wild lebende und exotische Tiere, die in der Europäischen Union als Haustiere gehalten werden, durch eine Positivliste der EU (B9-0489/2022) (Abstimmung) . . . 380

5.17. Die Menschenrechtslage in Ägypten (B9-0496/2022, B9-0497/2022, RC-B9-0505/2022, B9-0505/2022, B9-0515/2022, B9-0533/2022, B9-0534/2022, B9-0535/2022) (Abstimmung) 380

5.18. Die Menschenrechtslage im Zusammenhang mit der bevorstehenden FIFA-Weltmeisterschaft in Katar (B9-0539/2022, B9-0541/2022, B9-0542/2022, B9-0543/2022, B9-0537/2022, RC-B9-0538/2022, B9-0538/2022) (Abstimmung) . . . 380

6. Wiederaufnahme der Sitzung . . . 381

7. Antrag auf Aufhebung der Immunität . . . 381

8. Genehmigung des Protokolls der vorangegangenen Sitzung . . . 381

9. Überarbeitung der Verordnung über Medizinprodukte – wie kann die Verfügbarkeit von Medizinprodukten sichergestellt werden? (Aussprache) . . . 381

10. Erklärungen zur Abstimmung . . . 387

10.1. Instrument zur Unterstützung der Ukraine im Jahr 2023 (Makrofinanzhilfe+) (C9-0373/2022) . 388

10.2. Politikprogramm für 2030 „Weg in die digitale Dekade“ (A9-0159/2022 - Martina Dlabajová) . 388

10.3. Künftige europäische Finanzarchitektur zur Förderung der Entwicklung (A9-0270/2022 - Charles Goerens) . . . 388

10.4. Ergebnis der Modernisierung des Vertrags über die Energiecharta (RC-B9-0498/2022, B9-0498/2022, B9-0502/2022, B9-0510/2022, B9-0513/2022, B9-0536/2022) . . . 389

10.5. Bewertung der Einhaltung der Rechtsstaatlichkeitsbedingungen durch Ungarn im Rahmen der Konditionalitätsverordnung sowie des Stands des ungarischen Aufbau- und Resilienzplans (B9-0511/2022) . . . 389

10.6. Schutz der Viehwirtschaft und der Großraubtiere in Europa (RC-B9-0503/2022, B9-0503/2022, B9-0504/2022, B9-0509/2022, B9-0514/2022, B9-0518/2022, B9-0519/2022, B9-0520/2022) 389

10.7. Europäisches Jahr der Jugend 2022 — Vermächtnis (B9-0512/2022) . . . 390

11. Genehmigung des Protokolls der laufenden Sitzung und Übermittlung der angenommenen Texte . . . 390

12. Zeitpunkt der nächsten Sitzungen . . . 390

13. Schluss der Sitzung . . . 390

14. Unterbrechung der Sitzungsperiode . . . 390

Donnerstag, 24. November 2022

AUSFÜHRLICHE SITZUNGSBERICHTE VOM 24. NOVEMBER 2022

VORSITZ: EVELYN REGNER

Vizepräsidentin

1. Eröffnung der Sitzung

(Die Sitzung wird um 9.02 Uhr eröffnet.)

2. Politikprogramm für 2030 „Weg in die digitale Dekade“ (Aussprache)

Die Präsidentin. – Als nächster Punkt der Tagesordnung folgt die Aussprache über den Bericht von Martina Dlabajová im Namen des Ausschusses für Industrie, Forschung und Energie über den Vorschlag für einen Beschluss des Europäischen Parlaments und des Rates über das Politikprogramm für 2030 „Weg in die digitale Dekade“ (COM(2021)0574 – C9-0359/2021 – 2021/0293(COD)) (A9-0159/2022).

Martina Dlabajová, *rapporteur.* – Mr Commissioner, I am speaking in Czech.

— Paní předsedající, cloudové služby, *big data*, umělá inteligence, veřejné služby online, digitální identifikace, přístup ke zdravotnickým dokumentům odkudkoliv nebo běžně využívané elektronické faktury, to není sci-fi, to musí být velmi brzy realita nás všech. Evropa má šanci dnes úspěšně vykročit na cestu, která nás do konce dekády dovede k plné digitální transformaci naší ekonomiky i společnosti. Do doby, kdy občané a firmy budou plně využívat výhody, které nabízí digitalizace a které přináší používání nových moderních technologií.

Politický program ‘Cesta k digitální dekádě’ na rok 2030 nevymýšlí nic nového, ale nakládá s tím, co už je. Vychází z předpokladu, že samotné státy chtějí neustále pracovat na zlepšování a chtějí vzájemně spolupracovat a posouvat se společně dál. Cíle digitalizace, se kterými digitální dekáda počítá, prošly konzultacemi se členskými státy a já věřím, že i proto jsou reálné a splnitelné. Osobně jsem dbala na to, aby se do konzultací zapojili také zástupci podniků, a to nejen těch velkých, ale i malých a středních a start-upů. Často jsou to právě malé a střední firmy, které jsou průkopníky v nějaké oblasti, a ostatní od nich nová řešení přebírají nebo v nich hledají inspiraci. Co považuji za největší úspěch našich jednání a výsledného kompromisu? Digitální dekáda přichází s šikovným návodem, jak co nejlépe a nejefektivněji zkombinovat investice z rozpočtu EU, včetně Nástroje pro obnovu a odolnost, investice z členských států a také ze soukromého sektoru. Synergie jsou pak alfou a omegou úspěšnosti a přidané hodnoty. Díky politickému programu digitální dekáda můžeme lépe vyrovnávat rozdíly mezi členskými státy v oblastech, kde je to nejvíce potřeba. A v neposlední řadě se otevíráme možnostem mezinárodní spolupráce. Avšak za jasně narýsovaných podmínek a podle dohodnutých pravidel na hřišti vykolíkovaném programy, které ji financují.

A bez čeho se neobejdeme? Za prvé je to konektivita. Bez zajištění připojení, které pořád není po celé Evropě samozřejmostí, nezmůžeme nic a můžeme jít hned teď všichni domů. Zabezpečená a udržitelná digitální infrastruktura je naprostý základ. Včerejší den, kdy se Evropský parlament stal terčem kybernetického útoku, je toho názornou ukázkou. Za druhé, neobejdeme se bez digitálních dovedností, a to nejen těch základních, které by do konce roku 2030 mělo mít minimálně 80 % populace. Firmám a také státní správě např. stále chybí lidé, kteří by dokázali školit a předávat své know-how dál. Postrádám také motivaci pro ty, co už na trhu práce jsou, aby se učili novým dovednostem a dále se rozvíjeli. O dlouholetém zoufalém volání pracovního trhu po specialistech v informačních a komunikačních technologiích ani nemluvím. Za třetí potřebujeme digitalizované služby veřejné správy. Pokud opravdu chceme, aby občané a firmy pokládali digitalizaci za přínos a viděli v ní příležitosti, musíme jít příkladem. Digitalizace státu, přístup ke klí-

čovým veřejným službám online, elektronické zdravotnictví a mohla bych pokračovat – to nesmí zůstávat na papíře a doslova v papírové formě. A konečně digitální transformace podniků. Téma, kterým bychom mohli zaplnit agendu celého plenárního zasedání, a ještě by to nestačilo. Digitalizace musí podnikům velkým i malým otevírat cestu k lepšímu podnikání. A nesmí je v žádném případě neúměrně zatěžovat a demotivovat. Věřím, že to zvládneme. A jak už jsem řekla, pokud dnes digitální dekádu schválíme, první krok na cestě k ní jsme už udělali.

Thierry Breton, *membre de la Commission*. – Madame la Présidente, Mesdames et Messieurs les députés, tout d'abord, je voudrais remercier chaleureusement M[me] la rapporteure, Martina Dlabajová, chère Martina, et toute l'équipe de rapporteurs fictifs qui ont travaillé sans relâche et en un laps de temps extrêmement court afin de finaliser dans un temps record cette proposition. Alors grâce à ce texte, comme cela vient d'être rappelé par la rapporteure, nous allons donner à l'Europe les moyens d'organiser une transformation numérique ambitieuse.

Ces trois dernières années, face à l'ensemble des défis que nous avons eu à gérer – et on sait qu'on en aura encore beaucoup à gérer devant nous –, nous avons pu voir les possibilités réelles offertes par l'ensemble des technologies numériques pour toute notre économie, nos économies et d'une façon plus générale pour la société. Et nous avons mis en place une relance économique également, je vous le rappelle, fortement basée sur la transformation numérique.

Le programme d'action pour la décennie numérique est évidemment la vision, la pierre angulaire de cette transformation. Pour la première fois, en effet, nous fixons au niveau européen des objectifs concrets, quantitatifs et mesurables. C'est très important pour nous permettre d'atteindre ce que nous devons réaliser d'ici à 2030 dans le domaine du numérique, car il n'y a pas de décennies numériques ni d'Europe résiliente sans l'excellence de nos ingénieurs, sans une meilleure connectivité partout en Europe, sans que les PME possèdent elles aussi toutes les infrastructures nécessaires, sans processeurs compétitifs et durables – et de plus en plus, on le souhaite, fabriqués sur le continent européen.

Nous voulons que l'Europe soit un continent pleinement connecté, doté d'infrastructures nécessaires, capables de stocker, de transmettre, de traiter de très vastes domaines, de gigantesques volumes de données, et qui permettent par la suite d'autres évolutions technologiques. Et c'est la raison pour laquelle nous avons fixé des objectifs très concrets pour la fibre optique, la 5G, le *cloud*, le quantique, qui est aussi très important, la microélectronique, etc.

Les entreprises qui maîtrisent les technologies numériques sont celles qui résistent le mieux à la crise. On le voit tous les jours. C'est donc pour être plus résilient que, d'ici à 2030, nous voulons que 90 % de nos PME accroissent leur capacité en termes de technologies numériques.

Une société formée à l'ère du numérique est aussi nécessaire pour que nos entreprises soient propulsées par des femmes et des hommes de talents. Notre objectif dans ce domaine est de renforcer très sensiblement les compétences numériques de l'ensemble de nos concitoyens européens et de disposer aussi de 20 millions d'ingénieurs spécialisés dans le numérique en Europe d'ici à 2030. Et je dis que c'est un objectif très ambitieux dans lequel les femmes doivent prendre toute leur place. Il y a vraiment un très grand avenir pour elles dans ce domaine et nous devons les aider à y parvenir.

Nous avons également pour objectif de garantir l'accès à des services publics modernes, numériques et de haute qualité dans l'ensemble de l'Union européenne. En effet, il ne s'agit pas de se fixer des objectifs, encore faut-il se donner les moyens de les atteindre. Et c'est tout l'enjeu du processus structuré, du suivi de gouvernance que nous mettons en place. Il va nous permettre de progresser ensemble et sans délai en engageant l'intégralité des États membres. C'est pourquoi le programme d'action comprend une gouvernance solide, transparente, mais aussi, dans le même temps, assez souple pour pouvoir suivre les objectifs et nous adapter. Et pour cela, on va s'appuyer sur l'expérience acquise, notamment dans le cadre des plans nationaux pour la reprise et la résilience et, évidemment, en coordination avec le Semestre européen.

En conclusion, je voudrais dire que le programme d'action comprend également un cadre pour l'élaboration et la mise en œuvre de projets multi-pays, c'est-à-dire de projets à grande échelle visant à réaliser la transformation numérique de l'Union et les objectifs également très importants de relance industrielle. On le sait, dans ce domaine comme dans bien d'autres, aucun pays ne peut désormais y parvenir seul.

C'est pour cela que nous nous dotons d'un nouvel outil, le Consortium pour une infrastructure numérique européenne, dit EDIC, et ce mécanisme facilitera la mise en commun des ressources des États membres, du budget de l'Union et des investissements privés. Il permettra ainsi de déployer et de gérer des infrastructures paneuropéennes de manière efficace, par exemple les espaces européens de données ou des infrastructures de *blockchain*. Et de notre côté, je tiens à vous le redire ici, Mesdames et Messieurs les parlementaires, la Commission est prête à réagir très vite, dès l'adoption de cette décision, pour soutenir les projets de consortium matures.

Sabine Verheyen, *Verfasserin der Stellungnahme des mitberatenden Ausschusses für Kultur und Bildung*. – Frau Präsidentin, sehr geehrter Herr Kommissar! Die Europäische Union darf sich bei der Digitalisierung nicht abhängen lassen. Der Aufbruch Europas in die digitale Dekade ist überfällig, wenn wir global mithalten wollen. Doch alle technischen Fortschritte, die wir machen, bedeuten nichts, wenn wir die Menschen nicht dafür bereitmachen und sie mitnehmen. *Digital literacy* wird in der Zukunft zu den wichtigsten Fähigkeiten gehören, die wir beherrschen sollten. Ich bin der festen Überzeugung, dass dies ein entscheidender Faktor für den Arbeitsmarkt sein wird.

Doch um das bei möglichst vielen Menschen zu erreichen, gilt ein Grundsatz: *First teach the teachers*. Zunächst brauchen wir ausgebildetes Personal, das das Wissen weitergeben kann, sonst kann uns eine grundlegende Digitalisierung der Bevölkerung nicht gelingen. Das betrifft das Lehrpersonal in Schulen, aber auch vor allem im Bereich der Weiterbildung. Wir dürfen bei der Digitalisierung niemanden zurücklassen – egal welche Altersklasse, egal welche soziale Schicht. Meiner Meinung nach müssen wir dabei drei Punkte erfüllen, um erfolgreich zu sein: Wir müssen Lehrpersonal weiterbilden, wir müssen das lebenslange Lernen fördern und die nötige digitale Infrastruktur in Schulen und Bildungseinrichtungen schaffen.

Einige Länder der EU sind bereits deutlich weiter fortgeschritten bei der Digitalisierung als andere. Aber wie sagt man im Sport so schön: Wir sind nur so stark wie unser schwächstes Mitglied. Packen wir es also gemeinsam an und bringen Europa in die digitale Dekade! Nutzen wir die Zeit jetzt, um die notwendigen Investments in Menschen und Infrastruktur zu schaffen!

Dragoș Pîslaru, *rapporteur for the opinion of the Committee on Employment and Social Affairs*. – Madam President, Commissioner Breton, dear colleagues, congratulations to the rapporteur Martina Dlabajová for the great job on this file. I will begin by saying something that I firmly believe: Europe in the future will be digital or it won't work at all. There are risks since the dawn of time with all new technologies but, harnessed properly, digitalisation can lead to more access and opportunity for those often left behind, not just for companies and tech giants. We can also use inclusive technologies to integrate people with disabilities. AI can avoid previous human biases in recruitment and, with the right digital skills, more people will gain access to new social prospects. But this will not happen by itself. We have to ensure that digitalisation leaves no one behind, nor is it used to create gaps in our legislation or to exploit workers or curtail their rights. Happy workers mean happy companies. So let's use the Digital Decade to make that happen in Europe.

Ivan Štefanec, *za skupinu PPE*. – Vážená pani predsedajúca, od úrovne digitalizácie závisí úspech ekonomickej úrovne celej Únie aj úroveň života našich občanov.

Z môjho pohľadu sú dôležité tri oblasti. Po prvé, je to úroveň infraštruktúry. Musíme viac investovať do digitálnej infraštruktúry. Musíme motivovať súkromných investorov, aby investovali do digitálnej infraštruktúry, a od toho súvisí aj naša legislatívna práca, aby sme motivovali čo najviac pre lepšie investície, pre lepšiu dostupnosť internetu. Preto, aby pre občanov a firmy bol internet dostupnejší a cenovo prístupnejší.

Po druhé, je to legislatívna úroveň. V tomto Parlamente sme prijali mnohé zákony a je dobré, že nastavujeme celosvetové štandardy digitálnej legislatíve. No a po tretie, je to úroveň zručností. Musíme viac a viac investovať do digitálnych zručností aj z európskych peňazí. Dôležitou témou sú takisto malé podniky, ktoré zamestnávajú najviac pracovníkov, a ich úroveň digitalizácie takisto bude determinovať náš úspech.

Verím, že tie ambiciózne ciele, aby do roku 2030 sme mali všetky dokumenty online v styku s verejnou správou, v styku s verejnými inštitúciami, aby všetky zdravotné záznamy boli online, sú splniteľné, a verím, že úrovňou digitalizácie posunieme aj životnú úroveň občanov.

Josianne Cutajar, *on behalf of the S&D Group*. – Madam President, the EU is finally taking a tangible commitment towards digitalisation through important trajectories and targets.

The digital decade we've negotiated with the Council gives Member States enough flexibility to pursue digitalisation whilst taking into account their different starting points. Yet digitalisation is not an end in itself, but a means to broader societal outcomes. We have committed to achieving reliable, fast and secure connectivity for everywhere in the Union, including in rural and remote areas such as islands. By 2030, 80% of those aged 16 to 74 should have basic digital skills. There are targets for our SMEs and targets when it comes to big data and AI. A fast and steady creation of digital skills is essential if we want to also address cybersecurity concerns. In this regard, it's very important that we continue working together.

Until then, however, let's keep in mind the disadvantaged, our elderly who cannot access the internet and let's maintain offline accessibility of public services whilst we transit. Whilst the new measures will encourage social inclusion, democratisation of digital skills, narrowing the gender gap, our fight towards a just digital market should continue and our strive towards this. And in this regard, we should agree and work towards stronger digital rights, including access to the internet as a fundamental right.

Let's ensure that the Europe of 2030 will be digitally ready, fully connected, leading ahead whilst leaving no one behind.

Vlad-Marius Botoș, *în numele grupului Renew*. – Doamnă președintă, domnule comisar Breton, doamnă Martina Dlabajová, stimați colegi, fie că ne place sau nu, întreaga lume trece rapid într o eră digitală. Însă această digitalizare accelerată trebuie să pună în centrul ei interesul cetățeanului.

Succesul sau insuccesul nostru ca societate, ca uniune va depinde de câteva aspecte deosebit de importante. Va trebui să stimulăm domeniul digital, companiile implicate în digitalizare și să dăm posibilitatea specialiștilor să-și dezvolte ideile aici, în Uniunea Europeană. Va fi absolută nevoie de programe și proiecte care să învețe cetățenii să utilizeze instrumentele digitale, să creeze și să trăiască într un mediu digital. Nu în ultimul rând, trebuie să ținem cont că această digitalizare trebuie să ușureze munca și viața oamenilor.

Nu facem digitalizarea de dragul digitalizării, ci o facem în beneficiul oamenilor. Toate acestea însă vor putea fi făcute doar dacă vom avea o abordare europeană la nivel de Uniune, pentru a ne asigura că drepturile tuturor cetățenilor europeni sunt respectate, că toți avem aceleași șanse, indiferent în ce regiune trăim, că nimeni nu este lăsat în urmă.

Jordi Solé, *on behalf of the Verts/ALE Group*. – Madam President, Mr Commissioner, rapporteurs, shadow rapporteurs, colleagues, during this decade, we want to give the EU's digital transition a decisive boost. We had the Compass and now, with today's decision, we have the concrete targets that we as a Union need to achieve by 2030 and the way to get there. Now all we need to do is to add political will and financial resources to these tools.

In the digitalisation of the economy and society, much is at stake. We have to avoid lagging behind in terms of competitiveness for our economy and companies. We strive to be able to compete for leadership positions in the field of ICT and other advanced technologies. Issues such as territorial balance, technological sovereignty, the efficiency of public services and administration, energy sustainability or social cohesion are also at stake.

Incorporation into the digital world should not result in more fractures and divides in our societies. This is why it is so important that the targets that we have agreed upon produce positive effects in each and every of these areas.

On the positive balance of the final outcome, I want to emphasise the fact that we included the regional dimension in the digital transition. There are sub-state governments, like the Catalan government, that are very active in digital policies, and it's good that they become involved with the joint endeavour to reach the 2030 targets.

On the negative side, I regret that governments didn't accept even the possibility for the Commission to issue recommendations to those Member States not on track with digital benchmarks. That no doubt would have helped the implementation of the targets.

It's also regrettable that we couldn't fully counter the big push from some big Member States to introduce in the final text a reference, albeit indirectly, to the so-called fair share principle for investments in digital infrastructures. We need to ensure that net neutrality rules will not be changed and consumers and businesses will not have to pay more for online services due to a misleading concept of fair share. But this is a story to be continued.

Elena Lizzi, *a nome del gruppo ID*. – Signora Presidente, signor Commissario, on. Dlabajová, onorevoli colleghi, per prima cosa vorrei ringraziare la collega Dlabajová per la proficua collaborazione e per avere anche accolto i nostri contributi.

Questa decisione stabilisce obiettivi digitali concreti che l'Unione europea intende raggiungere entro la fine del decennio, come è stato detto, e noi abbiamo ritenuto che si vada nella giusta direzione. Abbiamo però inserito ed evidenziato il problema del *reskilling* perché bisogna trovare i finanziamenti per digitalizzare le persone over 50 che non hanno dimestichezza con questi nuovi strumenti e che devono aggiornarsi per fronteggiare le nuove esigenze. Queste generazioni possiedono un ampio know-how, ricchezza di informazioni e contenuti e possono sostenere con l'esperienza le nuove leve, che avranno le competenze informatiche digitali.

L'incontro intergenerazionale deve essere inclusivo affinché tutti traggano vantaggio e anche per raggiungere l'obiettivo di avere i 20 milioni di specialisti impiegati nel settore delle tecnologie dell'informazione e della comunicazione. Così l'Unione europea deve ricorrere all'utilizzo di tutti i programmi, soprattutto della ricerca, come per esempio creare un legame più forte con l'EIT e con la KIC Digital.

Bene l'attenzione prestata alle piccole e medie imprese, bisogna dedicare loro tutta la nostra attenzione per evitare che il nostro tessuto economico e sociale si deteriori. Le nostre aziende devono essere supportate nel processo di transizione con corsi e finanziamenti mirati e di questo si deve occupare la politica europea.

Poi ci è piaciuto che la Commissione svilupperà insieme agli Stati membri traiettorie a livello europeo per ciascuno degli obiettivi digitali dell'Unione europea e, a loro volta, gli Stati membri dovranno impegnarsi a sviluppare le traiettorie e le tabelle di marcia strategiche nazionali per raggiungere questi obiettivi, che devono essere chiari e sostenibili.

Inoltre, il concetto di progetti multinazionali faciliterà gli investimenti in settori quali il calcolo ad alte prestazioni, le infrastrutture e i servizi di dati comuni, la blockchain, il partenariato ad alta tecnologia per le competenze digitali e le infrastrutture quantistiche sicure, nonché la rete di centri di sicurezza informatica, la pubblica amministrazione digitale, le strutture di prova e i cluster di innovazione digitale.

Molte aziende e industrie italiane sono interessate a questi progetti infrastrutturali e speriamo che il nostro voto favorevole serva da propulsore per il raggiungimento degli obiettivi stabiliti.

Johan Nissinen, *för ECR-gruppen*. – Fru talman! EU har blivit världsmästare på att reglera digitaliseringen, i stället för att stödja innovation och nytänkande. Vi har därför halkat efter på global nivå. Jag stöder idén att satsa på digital utveckling, eftersom det är någonting bra, men jag fruktar att denna strategi kommer att misslyckas. Jag hoppas att jag har fel. Den innehåller många vackra ord och otroligt ambitiösa mål, i stället för en effektiv strategi som kommer ge valuta för våra pengar. Det är genom ekonomiska reformer och utbildning som vi skapar varaktig utveckling för framtiden och inte genom ineffektiv byråkrati som ger upphov till slöseri.

Trots att EU spenderar mer pengar än både USA och Asien på digitaliseringen, ligger vi fortfarande efter. Detta är inte rimligt. Vi kan inte fortsätta i samma hjulspår, utan vi måste börja tänka nytt.

Sandra Pereira, *em nome do Grupo The Left*. – Senhora Presidente, as tecnologias digitais têm o potencial de melhorar o acesso dos cidadãos à informação e à cultura, bem como proporcionar-lhes uma escolha mais vasta, diversificada e fácil no acesso a bens e serviços públicos e potenciar a sua qualidade de vida.

Mas este guião para a década digital segue a cartilha neoliberal das instituições europeias, orientado para o mercado único digital, que tem sido um instrumento promotor de desigualdades entre Estados-Membros, dificultando, particularmente, a vida das micro, pequenas e médias empresas, que não conseguem fazer face à concorrência e à brutal desigualdade dos meios e dos recursos que estão ao alcance das grandes empresas multinacionais do setor, e agora também dos já institucionalizados unicórnios.

De acordo com a proposta, os Estados-Membros deverão elaborar roteiros nacionais subordinados às recomendações específicas por país, formuladas no âmbito do Semestre Europeu, a que nos opomos por ser parte integrante dos instrumentos de imposição, condicionamento e controlo da União Europeia sobre as políticas dos Estados-Membros.

A realidade mostra que o guião deveria já ser outro.

Maria da Graça Carvalho (PPE). – Senhora Presidente, Caro Comissário, caros Colegas, cara Relatora Martina Dlabajová, a transição digital é um dos pilares da estratégia da União Europeia para a próxima década. Do seu sucesso dependerá, em muito, a competitividade da nossa economia. Esta é uma corrida para a qual partimos com atraso, face a alguns países, como os Estados Unidos.

Para recuperarmos terreno temos de investir fortemente nas infraestruturas, na modernização das empresas, indústrias e serviços públicos, na economia dos dados, num forte mercado interno digital, na educação e formação, tanto nos quadros como na população em geral, na investigação científica e inovação.

A afirmação da União Europeia passará pela aposta em tecnologias emergentes como a computação quântica. Temos de ser capazes de criar as condições para que estas tecnologias se desenvolvam e sejam produzidas na Europa.

Um bom exemplo do rumo a seguir são as parcerias do Programa-Quadro Horizonte Europa, abrangendo temas como as tecnologias digitais essenciais e os circuitos integrados, a computação de alto desempenho e as redes 5G e 6G.

Este guião para a década digital, com os seus objetivos ambiciosos, só será concretizado se reunirmos todas estas condições.

Lina Gálvez Muñoz (S&D). – Señora presidenta, comisario, la digitalización abre muchísimas oportunidades para las y los europeos, también para sus territorios, pero también puede generar exclusiones y acrecentar desigualdades que sin duda tenemos que combatir desde las políticas públicas y también con una mayor participación democrática. Este itinerario para la década digital 2030 tiene el objetivo de fortalecer la soberanía digital europea, que sin duda es un elemento esencial para garantizar nuestra resiliencia y también nuestra autonomía estratégica.

Me congratula especialmente ver recogidos en el acuerdo final la necesidad de garantizar las habilidades digitales básicas y un aumento de esos objetivos para el 80 % de las personas, y permitir así a la ciudadanía tener las habilidades básicas necesarias para participar plenamente en la sociedad digital y alcanzar finalmente la alfabetización digital amplia.

Especialmente me congratula, y ha sido un esfuerzo muy grande de nuestro grupo, los socialistas y demócratas, que haya medidas específicas de apoyo para superar el grave desequilibrio de género, ya que solo una de cada seis especialistas en tecnología de la información y la comunicación, y solo una de cada tres graduadas en STEM, es decir en ciencia, tecnología, ingeniería y matemáticas, son mujeres.

Y, finalmente, también la variable regional, ya que ninguna región se puede quedar atrás de este progreso digital.

Valérie Hayer (Renew). – Madame la Présidente, Monsieur le Commissaire, chers collègues, aujourd'hui, pour la première fois, nous définissons des étapes claires pour collectivement faire de notre ambition numérique européenne une réalité. Cette ambition, c'est celle d'un monde numérique construit autour de l'humain, qui respecte les droits fondamentaux. Un monde innovant, accessible à tous. Un monde qui s'appuie sur des compétences renforcées sur l'ensemble du territoire européen.

Mes chers collègues, si nous voulons faire de cette révolution numérique une réussite, il nous faudra répondre à deux impératifs.

Premier impératif: la numérisation de nos sociétés doit aller de pair avec nos engagements climatiques. Nous avons besoin d'infrastructures durables et d'un numérique plus vert. Mais nous avons aussi besoin de développer les technologies numériques qui permettront de réduire nos émissions dans l'agriculture, dans l'énergie ou encore dans le transport.

Deuxième impératif: nous aurons besoin – nous le savons – d'investissements conséquents si nous voulons atteindre nos objectifs pour 2030. Cet effort devrait être porté de façon juste entre les principaux acteurs numériques concernés. C'est un point important. La déclaration européenne sur les droits et principes numériques pour la décennie numérique le précise. Nous aurons l'occasion d'en débattre très largement.

David Cormand (Verts/ALE). – Madame la Présidente, merci à la rapporteure, merci, Monsieur le Commissaire, d'être ici avec nous. Il y a un angle mort dans ce texte: pour moi, c'est la question durable et c'est la question verte. La décennie numérique, ça nous emmène à 2030. On a des objectifs climatiques d'ici 2030. Et dans ce texte, il n'y a rien qui encadre ce que nous décidons de mettre en œuvre comme infrastructure pour pouvoir remplir ces objectifs.

Quand on parle de développement du numérique, il y a une question qu'on ne pose pas. Pourtant, quand on veut définir des critères sociaux et des critères environnementaux, on fait des études d'impact. Ici, pour le numérique, les études d'impact sont facultatives.

La question du numérique, c'est une question d'infrastructures. Ces infrastructures, elles entraînent des usages. Toute stratégie cohérente pour une puissance économique comme la nôtre devrait être conditionnée par la question de savoir quels sont les véritables besoins. On décrète dans ce texte qu'il faudrait que 90 % des PME soient intensives en numérique. Pourquoi? D'où sortent ces chiffres? Pourquoi on n'a pas une analyse plus sobre, plus résiliente de la conception du numérique?

Je veux dire que dans le monde dans lequel nous sommes, l'Union européenne doit être une puissance politique de stratégie et de stabilisation. Aujourd'hui, il y a deux modèles numériques dominants dans le monde: celui de la Chine – on ne veut évidemment pas y ressembler – et celui des GAFAM américains – et je pense que nous ne devons pas non plus leur ressembler. Quel est l'alter-modèle européen en la matière? Depuis le début, on nous dit que le numérique est naturellement l'allié de la transition écologique. Toutes les études, toutes les études qui existent sur l'impact écologique du numérique démontrent précisément le contraire. Je souhaite que nous fassions preuve de lucidité par rapport à ce domaine. Toute technologie n'est pas bonne, forcément, en soi. C'est le pouvoir politique qui décide de faire en sorte qu'une innovation technologique est au service du bien commun. Je souhaite que dans les semaines, dans les mois et dans les années qui viennent, notre institution veille à ce que ce soit le cas pour le numérique.

Matteo Adinolfi (ID). – Signora Presidente, onorevoli colleghi, la pandemia ha messo in luce la necessità di una maggiore digitalizzazione della nostra economia e della nostra società.

La trasformazione digitale ci offre infatti una grande possibilità per creare nuove opportunità per i giovani europei e migliorare l'accessibilità alle competenze digitali e renderle più fruibili a tutti i cittadini. Accrescere le competenze digitali dei cittadini europei, che sono in una situazione di ritardo sostanziale rispetto agli altri paesi industrializzati, è di fondamentale importanza.

Ciò passa attraverso il potenziamento dell'infrastruttura digitale, che deve essere portata ai massimi standard per garantire competitività e sicurezza. In quest'ottica, la produzione europea di semiconduttori all'avanguardia e sostenibili dovrebbe rappresentare entro il 2030 almeno il 20 % del valore della produzione mondiale. L'industria europea sta infatti scontando la carenza di microchip e semiconduttori dovuta alla crisi finanziaria post COVID-19 e solo un incremento della produzione autoctona permetterà al nostro continente di stare al passo di *competitor* come Stati Uniti, India e Cina.

L'ultimo aspetto da considerare è quello della digitalizzazione dei servizi pubblici, con l'obiettivo di rendere pienamente accessibili a tutti i cittadini i servizi pubblici online entro il 2030. Tutti nell'Unione europea dovremmo beneficiare di un ambiente digitale di qualità, che offra servizi e strumenti di facile uso, efficienti e personalizzati, con elevati standard in materia di sicurezza e tutela della vita privata. Solo garantendo che tutti i servizi pubblici principali saranno disponibili online per le imprese e per i cittadini, l'Europa potrà rafforzare la sua leadership digitale e affrontare le sfide che la globalizzazione le ha imposto.

Andżelika Anna Możdżanowska (ECR). – Pani Przewodnicząca! Panie Komisarzu! Czwarta rewolucja przemysłowa, sztuczna inteligencja, pandemia COVID-19 pokazały, że transformacja naszej gospodarki i społeczeństwa w kierunku bardziej cyfrowego jest naszym pilnym celem. Musimy pilnie przyspieszyć proces kształcenia i rozwoju infrastruktury cyfrowej we wszystkich krajach Unii Europejskiej. Dlatego tak ważny jest ten wspólny program „Droga ku cyfrowej dekadzie".

Bardzo się cieszę, że tej ważnej debacie przysłuchuje się dzisiaj młodzież, bo to dla nich przyszłość całej Europy. Bowiem wy w tej cyfrowej gospodarce znajdujecie się najbardziej.

Unia Europejska musi być ambitna, nowoczesna i cyfrowa, bo zagwarantuje zysk dla Europy prawie 3 bln euro. Dla przykładu, dla mojego kraju, Polski, to blisko 500 mld złotych. Dziś niestety większość Europejczyków posiada zaledwie podstawowe kompetencje cyfrowe, a między poszczególnymi krajami utrzymują się ogromne różnice. Odsetek Europejczyków posiadających podstawowe umiejętności informatyczne waha się między 29% a 79%.

Dziś ten wypracowany kompromis przez nasz Parlament i Radę Europejską wymaga ambitnego podejścia i współpracy. Ustanowiliśmy konkretne cele polityki cyfrowej, umiejętności cyfrowych, infrastruktury i cyfryzacji przedsiębiorstw, a co najważniejsze przejrzyste ramy realizacji projektów wielonarodowych. Powinniśmy jednak w tym ambitnym projekcie zwrócić uwagę na kilka wrażliwych kwestii: w zakresie terminów synchronizacji publikacji krajowych cyfrowych map drogowych i osiągnięcia celów 70% dla przedsiębiorstw unijnych wykorzystujących cyfryzację w prowadzeniu działalności gospodarczej oraz 100% transformacji cyfrowej w dostępie do usług publicznych i dostępie obywateli, np. do dokumentacji medycznej. Jednak pamiętajmy, że w tym pędzie do światowej cywilizacji cyfrowej ważne, byśmy nie zapomnieli o drugim człowieku, o naszym bezpieczeństwie oraz byśmy zwrócili uwagę na zagrożenia, jakie niesie postęp technologiczny i cyfrowy świat.

Andreas Schwab (PPE). – Frau Präsidentin, Herr Kommissar Breton, liebe Kolleginnen und Kollegen! Wir sprechen heute über den Weg zu einer digitalen Dekade, und ich möchte gerne drei Punkte herausgreifen im Anschluss an das, was Frau Kollegin Carvalho gesagt hat.

Ich glaube zunächst einmal, dass ganz wichtig ist, dass die Europäische Union eine wertegeleitete Digitalpolitik betreibt. Und deswegen ist diese Erklärung zu den digitalen Rechten und Grundsätzen, die Sie, lieber Herr Kommissar Breton, und die Kommission vorgelegt haben, von fundamentaler Bedeutung. Die Digitalpolitik in Europa muss den gleichen Wertmaßstäben genügen wie auch die ganz klassische Wirtschafts- und Sozialpolitik, die wir betreiben. Es kann keine unterschiedliche Digitalpolitik geben.

Deswegen glaube ich, dass wir – zum Zweiten – in den vergangenen Monaten viel erreicht haben: Das Gesetz über digitale Märkte, das Gesetz über digitale Dienste, der *Data Act* – und wir warten ja immer noch auf die Spezifikation des *Data Acts* im Hinblick auf Automobile – sind wichtige Schritte. Aber wir brauchen für all diese Schritte eine Integration in die jeweiligen Fachbereiche, und wir brauchen keine separate digitale Superrevisionsbehörde, wie das momentan im Gesetz über künstliche Intelligenz angedacht ist. Digitalpolitik muss überall dort stattfinden, wo schon heute Politik stattfindet, und es muss immer einen Ausgleich geben mit analogen Diensten und digitalen Diensten.

Deswegen zuletzt, drittens, lieber Herr Kommissar Breton: Ich glaube, wir müssen auch über die *spectrum policy* nochmals neu nachdenken – denn wenn wir einen digitalen Binnenmarkt wirklich erreichen wollen, wenn wir wettbewerbsfähiger werden wollen in den Telekommunikationsdiensten, dann brauchen wir einen grenzüberschreitenden Markt, und dafür brauchen die Telekommunikationsanbieter mehr Möglichkeiten. Deswegen ist da auch Ihr Mut gefragt. Dazu möchte ich Sie ermutigen; das Parlament steht da an Ihrer Seite.

Carlos Zorrinho (S&D). – Senhora Presidente, Senhor Comissário, sejamos claros.

Num momento em que apostamos forte na Identidade Digital ao serviço de todos os cidadãos europeus, como base para termos uma televisão digital mais inclusiva e democrática, há outra identidade digital que conta: a Identidade Digital da nossa parceria, da União Europeia. Ancorada nos valores comuns, que partilhamos para a caminhada até 2030, de que são exemplo: a defesa de uma sociedade digital focada nas pessoas, inclusiva, segura e transparente, e o acesso tendencialmente universal de todos os cidadãos europeus a redes de alta qualidade, através da tecnologia, dos recursos económicos, do desenvolvimento das competências, permitindo-lhes usufruir de serviços disponíveis e, em particular, dos serviços de interesse público em formato digital.

É a afirmação desta identidade digital diferenciada que nos pode permitir não apenas cumprir os nossos objetivos enquanto parceria pela paz, pela liberdade e pela democracia, como também sermos relevantes e competitivos à escala global.

Por isso temos que combinar todas as tecnologias, incluindo as novas gerações de WI-FI, seguindo o espírito da iniciativa *Wifi4EU*, de que fui relator, e também abrir uma frente alargada de financiamento da modernização das redes, incluindo as plataformas que dela dependem.

Nicola Danti (Renew). – Signora Presidente, signor Commissario, onorevoli colleghi, quella della trasformazione digitale della nostra società e della nostra economia è una delle grandi sfide dell'Unione europea.

Bene ha fatto la Commissione a prevedere target specifici da raggiungere da qui al 2030, che ci permetteranno di giocare un ruolo a livello globale. Così come è accaduto per il Green Deal, infatti, solo se avremo obiettivi misurabili e tangibili riusciremo a monitorare i nostri progressi in questo campo.

Mi preme sottolineare due elementi di questa strategia che considero particolarmente significativi. Il primo: la necessità di investire per garantire la diffusione massima delle competenze digitali e un numero adeguato di professionisti digitali altamente qualificati, specialmente tra i giovani, per essere competitivi anche sul mercato del lavoro.

Il secondo elemento è la necessità di investire sulla digitalizzazione delle imprese, soprattutto delle piccole e medie imprese, per sfruttare al meglio le opportunità che la tecnologia offre loro.

Tutto questo passerà certamente anche dalla capacità di assicurare una connettività e infrastrutture digitali sicure e resilienti che raggiungano tutti.

Ladislav Ilčić (ECR). – Poštovana predsjedavajuća, dame i gospodo, jeste li se testirali? Jeste li pokušali vidjeti koliko minuta možete izdržati i slušati govornika na nekom službenom sastanku ili čak privatnom susretu bez da posegnete za svojim pametnim telefonom ne bi li vidjeli nešto jako važno što je upravo stiglo.

Dakle, svi mi gubimo pažnju. Svi mi tražimo atrakciju. Svi smo mi postali na neki način ovisni. I zato, kad govorimo o digitalizaciji, pogotovo o edukaciji mladih, trebamo misliti i na ljudske slabosti kako bi tehnologije zaista bile u službi čovjeka.

Također, trebali bismo točno znati koliko će ova digitalizacija smanjiti administraciju, koliko će naši građani i poduzetnici zaista manje plaćati administraciju i koliko će ti procesi biti jednostavniji, brži i lakši. Da se ne dogodi kao u Hrvatskoj u kojoj smo imali više digitalnih transformacija, ali za većinu javnih usluga uvijek vas traže još samo jedan papir.

Deirdre Clune (PPE). – Madam President, I would say that COVID has really demonstrated the value of digitalisation and technologies, how important they are to our societies. We've seen the benefits of bringing people together, delivering services, allowing business to continue, and indeed delivering particularly our education services. But we can't stop there. We need to do more. And I very much welcome the programme, the 'Path to the Digital Decade', and also the Digital Scoreboard, because I think it's good to shine a light on individual countries and set targets and how we can improve our societies, our economies.

By 2030, we want at least 80% of adults to have basic digital skills, and we must leave nobody behind. That means age, education and social background should not be a deterrent. We need to ensure that all households have gigabyte connectivity and all population areas should be covered by 5G. That's really important. We also need to ensure that our government and our state services are delivered digitally so that we don't leave anybody behind in this area, particularly those who are living in rural isolated areas.

So the targets are there and it's a challenge. But absolutely, as I started, COVID has demonstrated just how important this is for all our societies.

Tsvetelina Penkova (S&D). – Madam President, dear Commissioner Breton, dear rapporteur, colleagues, strengthening the strategic digital capacity and deployment of advanced technologies will support our businesses, benefit our citizens and definitely ensure Europe's digital autonomy. Proper implementation of Europe's digital decade policy programme will provide citizens with better jobs, better healthcare and better public services. Digital progress is crucial if we want to achieve our climate neutral, fair and green social goals.

However, we still have to guarantee four important things. First, better digital infrastructure and connectivity across Europe. Second, enhance partnership between Member States. Third, better digital skills. And fourth, effective public services across all the Member States. All these objectives are crucial if we want to achieve our goals for 2030 digital targets.

Europe has the capacity to be a global digital leader where technological advancement, fair and green economic growth, social inclusion and business competitiveness are all equally respected.

Valter Flego (Renew). – Poštovana predsjedavajuća, dame i gospodo, digitalna transformacija našeg društva i gospodarstva? Da. Digitalizacija? Apsolutno da. Ali ne smijemo zaboraviti utjecaj tehnologije na čovjeka. Čovjek mora uvijek biti u središtu svih programa, a stalna edukacija ljudi prioritet je u godinama ispred nas.

Nažalost, svjesni smo, prekomjerno korištenje digitalnih uređaja i digitalna ovisnost dio su naše svakodnevice, posebice nažalost kod mladih. Zato, poštovani povjereniče Breton, pozivam Komisiju da ojača i financijski pomogne i osnaži programe edukacije, posebice mladih ljudi, kako bi na jedan ispravan i zdrav način iskoristili mogućnosti koje su ispred nas i na tome nikada ne smije se štedjeti.

Digitalizacija i digitalna transformacija, naime, imat će uspjeha i smisla samo ako tu digitalizaciju, tu tehnologiju, budu koristile zdrave i sretne osobe, kako na poslu tako i kod kuće.

Elżbieta Kruk (ECR). – Pani Przewodnicząca! Trudno nie popierać celu, jakim jest postęp cyfryzacji dla zwiększenia innowacyjności, efektywności gospodarki czy usprawnienia administracji.

Cywilizacyjny przełom, jakiego obecnie doświadcza świat w następstwie dokonującej się czwartej rewolucji przemysłowej, niesie jednak nowe wyzwania i kontrowersje związane z wykorzystywaniem technologii cyfrowych i sztucznej inteligencji. Stwarzając ogromne szanse rozwojowe, stworzył też rozmaite zagrożenia, w tym ryzyka cyfrowych nadużyć, naruszania prywatności, inwigilacji, dehumanizacji i alienacji ludzi. Znane są liczne przypadki, w których skutkiem błędnych decyzji algorytmów komputerowych i sztucznej inteligencji jest naruszenie praw i wolności wielu obywateli.

Program „Droga ku cyfrowej dekadzie" nie daje dostatecznej odpowiedzi na społeczne obawy co do potencjalnych negatywnych skutków wdrażania technologii cyfrowych. Znajdujemy tu natomiast charakterystyczny dla dzisiejszych dokumentów unijnych zapis, że technologie te mają być zgodne z wartościami Unii.

Ale co to są te „wartości Unii"? Czy to wartości historycznie współtworzące europejskiego ducha, jak na przykład etyka chrześcijańska? Czy są raczej wyrazem lewackich dążeń ideologicznych, które zamiast dobrodziejstwa nowych technologii przyniosą nam totalitaryzm nowego wspaniałego świata?

Krzysztof Hetman (PPE). – Pani Przewodnicząca! Panie Komisarzu! Szanowni Państwo! W ostatnich latach słowa „transformacja cyfrowa" były odmieniane przez wszystkie przypadki. Pandemia COVID-19 w znacznym stopniu przyspieszyła zachodzące procesy i wymusiła na nas adaptację do nowej rzeczywistości właśnie poprzez powszechniejsze wykorzystanie technologii cyfrowych. Nie ulega jednak wątpliwości, że aby Unia Europejska mogła w naprawdę skuteczny sposób i w pełni przeprowadzić transformację cyfrową, potrzebujemy spójnej strategii. Program polityki „Droga ku cyfrowej dekadzie" do 2030 r. jest właściwym krokiem w tę stronę.

Program ma duży potencjał. Nakreśla ambitne cele cyfrowe dla całej Unii w zakresie priorytetowych obszarów. Będą one osiągane poprzez indywidualne ścieżki krajowe. Oczywiście w minutę nie sposób wspomnieć wszystkich założeń, ale do najważniejszych można zdecydowanie zaliczyć: umożliwienie obywatelom dostępu do usług publicznych w 100% online, znaczne zwiększenie liczby specjalistów w zakresie technologii cyfrowych, zwiększenie umiejętności cyfrowych i zwalczanie wykluczenia, a także ucyfrowienie przedsiębiorstw. Uważam, że dzięki tej strategii będziemy w stanie sprawniej osiągać wskazane cele na poziomie Unii.

Alex Agius Saliba (S&D). – President, Kummissarju, it-trasformazzjoni diġitali tal-ekonomiji u s-soċjetajiet Ewropej qiegħda timxi b'pass mgħaġġel ħafna, u dan qed iġib miegħu numru ta' opportunitajiet ġodda imma fl-istess ħin sfidi kritiċi li rridu nindirizzaw fiż-żmien ġejjieni.

Kriżijiet reċenti, bla dubju, jenfasizzaw ir-rwol ewlieni tat-trasformazzjoni diġitali fil-bini ta' futur sostenibbli għaċ-ċittadini Ewropej. Fl-istess ħin, dawn il-kriżijiet esponew, b'mod qawwi ħafna, il-qasma diġitali li teżisti bejn iċ-ċittadini, u l-ħtieġa li jiġu adottati soluzzjonijiet diġitali li huma aċċessibbli għal reġjuni, pajjiżi u setturi differenti. U għalhekk li neħtieġu impenji addizzjonali biex niggarantixxu tranżizzjoni ġusta, tranżizzjoni inklużiva li ma tħalli lil ħadd jaqa' lura; b'miri konkreti, investiment pubbliku u interventi f'setturi strateġiċi biex niżguraw progress ekoloġiku u diġitali għal kulħadd, inkluż l-għoti ta' protezzjonijiet u opportunitajiet anke lill-aktar komunitajiet remoti, lill-aktar komunitajiet periferali.

Għaldaqstant, nappoġġja l-kontribut li inizjattivi bħad-Deċennju Diġitali jista' jkollhom fil-kisba tat-trasformazzjoni diġitali koeżiva għas-soċjetà Ewropea sal-2030, b'mod partikolari li jegħleb id-distakk bejn iż-żoni rurali u urbani.

Eugen Jurzyca (ECR). – Vážená pani predsedajúca, je nepochybne dobré, že si stanovujeme ciele pre digitalizáciu. Bohužiaľ, nemáme ich celkom dobre zvolené.

Nemerajú výsledky pre občana. Napríklad cieľ, aby boli kľúčové verejné služby dostupné online. Nestačí predsa, že je služba dostupná online, lebo online služba môže byť urobená tak, že ňou občania stratia viac času, než keby navštívili úrad peši. Kto neverí, nech si prečíta o tom, ako fungovala online služba pre registráciu na vakcináciu proti Covidu na Slovensku, v mojom členskom štáte.

Namiesto toho vhodnejšie by boli ciele, ako napríklad, o koľko sa zvýšila úspora času, klesli náklady alebo o koľko sa zvýšila produktivita práce vďaka digitalizácii. Takéto ciele väčšinou v návrhu chýbajú a myslím si, že je to škoda. Som o tom presvedčený.

Barbara Thaler (PPE). – Frau Präsidentin, sehr geehrter Herr Kommissar, liebe Kolleginnen und Kollegen! Wir diskutieren heute unser Politikprogramm für die Digitalstrategie, um, wie man so schön sagt, fit für den Standort der Zukunft zu werden. Es geht um Infrastruktur, künstliche Intelligenz, 5G, 6G, Cloud-Computing, Blockchain und vieles mehr.

Es geht auch um Quanten-Computing, und darauf möchte ich kurz eingehen. Der Bericht – übrigens, herzlichen Glückwunsch, Frau Berichterstatterin – streicht hervor, dass Quanten-Computing-Kapazitäten zu einer entscheidenden Voraussetzung werden. Bis 2025 wollen wir unseren ersten Quantencomputer haben, damit wir bis 2030 eine absolute Spitzenposition im Bereich Quantenkapazitäten erreichen können. Und ich finde, wir haben großes Potenzial dazu als Europäische Union, um auf diesem Gebiet wirklich weltweit Vorreiter zu werden.

Mit ein bisschen Stolz, Herr Kommissar, darf ich sagen, dass in meiner Heimatregion – in Tirol – die weltweit erste Quantenarchitekturfirma sitzt. Für solche Firmen müssen wir die Rahmenbedingungen schaffen – so kann ein europäisches Ökosystem für Quanten-Computing die Welt verändern.

Adriana Maldonado López (S&D). – Señora presidenta, señor comisario, señorías, sin duda, una de las prioridades políticas de esta Comisión Europea, de este Parlamento Europeo es la Década Digital. Una Década Digital que no solamente sirve como motor de transformación, sino que este Itinerario hacia la Década Digital para 2030 pone en el horizonte problemas reales que tenemos hoy en la Unión Europea.

Y me quiero centrar principalmente en tres de ellos, que debemos de ser capaces de abordar de una forma coordinada y, sobre todo, buscando resultados para el año 2030. Están relacionados con la reducción de la brecha digital.

Los hombres ocupan a día de hoy ocho de cada diez puestos de trabajo en el sector de las telecomunicaciones en la Unión Europea. Por lo tanto, las mujeres siguen estando fuera de aquellos puestos de trabajo relacionados con la digitalización.

Pero no solamente es un problema de las mujeres, también de las pymes. En la Unión Europea tenemos una baja participación de las pymes en la digitalización y debemos, como Unión Europea, apostar por ellas.

Pero, sobre todo, también me quiero centrar en un elemento trascendental: el mundo rural. No podemos seguir creando dos Europas, a dos velocidades; la del mundo rural y la de las grandes ciudades.

Por lo tanto, este itinerario digital tiene un objetivo claro: reducir brechas. Y nuestro cometido como Parlamento Europeo, sin duda, es hacer que sea lo más efectivo posible y, sobre todo, que sea una realidad en el año 2030.

Luisa Regimenti (PPE). – Signora Presidente, signor Commissario, onorevoli colleghi, con l'incessante aumento dell'importanza e dell'utilizzo del digitale è sempre più difficile per i cittadini e le aziende rimanere al passo.

Le nuove tecnologie contribuiscono allo sviluppo economico e sociale, ma sono accompagnate da rischi, insicurezza e disinformazione. Molte piccole e medie imprese sono state abbandonate a loro stesse durante il passaggio alla gestione informatica.

Dedicare una maggiore percentuale del budget del dispositivo per la ripresa e la resilienza alla transizione digitale è indispensabile per dare l'opportunità a tutte le aziende di essere parte di una rete virtuale che collega e accomuna tutti i paesi membri.

La sicurezza dei dati inoltre viene spesso sottovalutata. Informare e fornire direttive sul tema è fondamentale per la buona riuscita di questa visione. Connettere i paesi membri può e deve servire ad aumentare le opportunità finanziarie attraverso linee guida e protocolli che facilitino lo scambio dei dati.

L'Europa dovrà dimostrarsi unita nel fissare obiettivi precisi e indicare i giusti percorsi che facilitino questo inarrestabile progresso.

Christel Schaldemose (S&D). – Fru formand! Hr. Kommissær! En fornøjelse! Digitaliseringen fylder stadig mere i vores samfund, i vores hverdag og i vores økonomi. Men selvom digitaliseringen allerede har ændret meget i vores liv, så skal vi turde at gå endnu længere. Digitaliseringen sikrer nemlig både arbejdspladser, vækst og velstand. Derfor er jeg glad for de ambitiøse mål, der er i programmet. Hvis EU skal i front i den digitale omstilling, og det synes jeg, at EU skal, så har vi brug for flere digitale eksperter, internet til alle, og at flere virksomheder og offentlige tjenester benytter sig af digitale løsninger. Jeg kommer selv fra et af verdens mest digitaliserede lande, og derfor kender jeg også til bagsiden af medaljen. Der er nogle, der mister deres job, når de bliver automatiseret, og der er nogle, der mangler digitale færdigheder for at kunne være med. Derfor er det også vigtigt, at vi sikrer, at der ikke er nogen, der bliver efterladt på perronen. Ingen skal efterlades i digitaliseringen, og derfor skal vi gøre en særlig indsats for at sikre det. Vi skal sørge for at efteruddanne dem, der mister deres job, og vi skal sørge for at give folk de færdigheder, der skal til, for at man kan være med i digitaliseringen. Måske endda også tilbyde, at man kan tilgå offentlige tjenester, uden at man har de her færdigheder. Vi skal altså være mere digitale, samtidig med at vi beskytter dem, der har svært ved at være med. Det forudsætningen for, at vi lykkes i EU.

Romana Jerković (S&D). – Madam President, dear colleagues, Commissioner, as the energy and economic crisis continue to loom large, there is a growing risk that many European citizens and companies will fall behind and not reap the benefits of the digital transformation. To accelerate the pace of digital innovation and adoption, it is crucial that we match the 2030 target with a set of investments that will help close the digital divide and keep our ambitions high.

First, we need to invest in people and education so that our citizens have the digital skills necessary to actively participate in the digital society. The digital decade must be inclusive and make digital technology work for people and for businesses. Second, the quality, access and transparency of public services through digitalisation should be improved and modernised across the EU.

The point is not to win the digital race. The point is to develop and safeguard our societies.

Spontane Wortmeldungen

Maria Grapini (S&D). – Doamnă președintă, domnule comisar, mă bucur că dezbatem acest subiect și această această problemă, digitalizarea. Sigur, știm că proverbul există în toate situațiile: „drumul spre iad e pavat cu intenții bune".

Este foarte important și mă bucur că ați vorbit, domnule comisar, că nu sunt suficiente doar investițiile în tehnologie, ci avem nevoie și de creșterea competențelor, pentru că acum, când vorbim, sunt zone întregi geografice, mai ales în rural, în care nu avem nici infrastructură, nu este semnal pentru telefon despre ce digitalizare să mai vorbim? Iar competențele trebuiesc crescute concomitent cu investițiile, pentru că altfel ar fi o pierdere dacă facem investiție în digitalizare, dar nu avem competențe pentru accesare.

De asemenea, cred în efectele pozitive ale digitalizării, în efecte bune pentru a integra persoanele cu dizabilități, dar în aceeași măsură cred foarte mult că investițiile trebuiesc țintite spre zone geografice, spre zonele în care avem încă probleme legate de competențe și infrastructură.

De aceea, eu cred că digitalizarea merge mână în mână cu investițiile și merge mână în mână cu educația și creșterea competențelor digitale a tuturor cetățenilor din spațiul pieței interne.

(Ende der spontanen Wortmeldungen)

Thierry Breton, *membre de la Commission*. – Madame la Présidente, Mesdames et Messieurs les députés, je vous remercie sincèrement pour le débat très enrichissant que nous avons eu aujourd'hui. Nous sommes évidemment tous conscients que nous devons agir d'urgence, avec détermination, pour construire la décennie numérique.

Vous nous avez déjà soutenus dans un nombre important de dossiers essentiels pour notre espace numérique, notre espace informationnel, à l'échelle de notre continent. Bien d'autres sont en cours de discussion, vous le savez. Il est donc essentiel pour nous, décideurs politiques, de tout mettre en œuvre pour que la transformation en cours réponde aux besoins et aux attentes de tous nos citoyens, je dis bien tous nos citoyens et, évidemment, de nos entreprises, qu'elles soient grandes ou petites. Il est temps de surmonter les inégalités entre ceux qui bénéficient de cette transformation et les autres, comme cela a été rappelé par nombre d'entre vous.

Affirmer notre identité et un modèle européen qui reflète nos valeurs dans un monde numérique devient effectivement un enjeu essentiel pour nous, mais aussi à l'échelle du continent et de la planète. C'est pour cela que le programme d'action pour la décennie numérique est si important. C'est notre feuille de route pour conduire la transition numérique auprès de nos citoyens, des gouvernements, des entreprises. C'est aussi crucial pour réduire nos dépendances technologiques et éviter d'en créer de nouvelles dans un monde qui va devenir de plus en plus complexe, on le sait.

La nouveauté de ce programme d'action est surtout qu'il fixe – vous l'avez rappelé à juste titre, les uns et les autres et vous-même, évidemment, Madame la rapporteure – des objectifs quantitatifs à réaliser et, ce faisant, qu'il engage les États membres dans une nouvelle gouvernance.

Je tiens à rappeler ici, en conclusion, Mesdames et Messieurs les députés, que la Commission jouera évidemment tout son rôle pour mettre en œuvre ce programme dans les meilleurs délais.

Martina Dlabajová, *zpravodajka*. – Paní předsedající, pane komisaři, kolegyně, kolegové, děkuji za všechny konstruktivní připomínky, názory a vaši podporu. Cesta k digitální dekádě nebude jednoduchá. Bude se místy klikatit, často se na ní vyskytne překážka, kterou budeme muset přeskočit nebo přelézt. I přesto jsem ráda, že jsme se na ni vydali. Děkuji Evropské komisi, děkuji členským státům, že jsme našli společnou představu o tom, jak by tato cesta měla vypadat. Poděkování si zaslouží francouzské předsednictví, které položilo základy, a české předsednictví, které navázalo a jednání úspěšně zakončilo. Děkuji také všem stínovým zpravodajům a všem našim týmům. Chtěla bych, aby ještě jednou zaznělo, že jsme se dokázali společně s Komisí i s Radou dohodnout na tom, co je nutné sledovat, abychom věděli, zda se cíle digitální dekády daří plnit nebo ne. Dostatek informací a poučení se z minulých chyb jsou základním stavebním kamenem pokroku a už teď se těším na každoroční zprávu o stavu digitální dekády.

Digitální dekáda je politický program s konkrétními cíli a je nastavena tak, že má státy vést a ukazovat směr, jak tyto cíle úspěšně splnit. Je to společná strategie a je v zájmu všech se jí řídit. Věřím, že se mi podařilo s vaší pomocí najít ten správný mix, jak dosáhnout plné digitalizace do roku 2030. Nezapomeňme, že se celou dobu tady bavíme o 20 milionech expertů v oboru ICT, o digitálních dovednostech pro více než 360 milionů obyvatel Evropy, o zajištění milionů vysokorychlostních přípojek k internetu napříč celou EU, o vytvoření 10 000 klimaticky neutrálních, vysoce zabezpečených okrajových uzlů, o prvním počítači s kvantovým zrychlením, o užití cloudových služeb, umělé inteligence, zpracování dat velkého objemu třemi čtvrtinami podniků v EU nebo o plné digitalizaci veřejné správy a zdravotnické péče. A to vše za pouhých osm let.

Možná vám to připadá stále jako science-fiction nebo pohádka, ale já věřím, že se v roce 2030 ukáže, že jsme udělali všechno správně. Nyní je to na vás a na vašem hlasování. Děkuji za pozornost a těším se, jak dnešní hlasování dopadne.

Die Präsidentin. – Die Aussprache ist geschlossen.

Die Abstimmung findet heute, Donnerstag, 24. November 2022, statt.

Schriftliche Erklärungen (Artikel 171)

Karol Karski (ECR), *na piśmie*. – Program „Droga ku cyfrowej dekadzie" przy udanej realizacji jego założeń może, według istniejących obliczeń, przyczynić się do uzyskania dodatkowych 2,8 bln euro w całej Unii. W przypadku przyspieszenia wdrażania technologii cyfrowych w Polsce i zrealizowania założeń unijnego planu możliwe jest uzyskanie w PKB dodatkowych 491 mld złotych do 2030 roku. Choć większość Europejczyków posiada podstawowe kompetencje cyfrowe, to między poszczególnymi krajami utrzymują się znaczne różnice – odsetek ludności posiadającej przynajmniej podstawowe umiejętności informatyczne waha się od 29% do 79%. Aby osiągnąć zakładany w programie cel, zgodnie z którym do 2030 roku 80% populacji powinno dysponować podstawowymi umiejętnościami cyfrowymi, konieczne jest przyspieszenie procesu kształcenia i rozwoju infrastruktury cyfrowej. Jeżeli w ciągu ostatnich pięciu lat ogólny wskaźnik rozpowszechnienia podstawowych umiejętności cyfrowych wzrósł jedynie od 4% do 5%, stawia to pod znakiem zapytania takie cele jak wzrost liczby przedsiębiorstw intensywnie wykorzystujących technologie chmury cyfrowej czy cyfryzacja usług publicznych. Jestem zadowolony z kompromisu wypracowanego przez PE i Radę UE. Zwłaszcza należy podkreślić znaczenie mechanizmu zarządzania ich realizacją i monitorowania wyników, który został zaplanowany tak, by nie generować obciążeń dla administracji publicznych państw członkowskich. Pewne niedociągnięcia widzę w niedostatecznie zsynchronizowanych terminach publikacji krajowych cyfrowych map drogowych oraz w zbyt krótkim czasie na opracowanie krajowych cyfrowych map drogowych.

3. Europäisches Jahr der Jugend 2022 — Vermächtnis (Aussprache)

Die Präsidentin. – Als nächster Punkt der Tagesordnung folgt die Aussprache über die Erklärung der Kommission zum Europäischen Jahr der Jugend 2022 — Vermächtnis (2022/2953(RSP)).

Thierry Breton, *membre de la Commission*. – Madame la Présidente, Mesdames et Messieurs les députés, tout d'abord, au nom de ma collègue Mariya Gabriel, je souhaiterais ici vous faire part des dernières observations préliminaires de la Commission concernant le bilan que nous tirons de l'Année de la jeunesse 2022.

Cette Année européenne de la jeunesse avait un objectif clair: placer les jeunes au centre, écouter ce qu'ils ont à nous dire et agir en conséquence, en renforçant leurs compétences pour qu'ils puissent développer leurs idées et surtout en les préparant à participer aux débats politiques. Cela a permis à davantage de jeunes de se mobiliser, de s'impliquer aussi au niveau politique, de s'engager et de sensibiliser leurs pairs aux opportunités qu'offre l'Union européenne. Selon les organisateurs des différentes activités, ce sont plus de 150 millions de citoyens européens qui ont été sensibilisés. Ces opportunités ont ouvert de nouveaux canaux permettant aux jeunes de faire entendre leur point de vue, de s'engager dans l'élaboration de politiques à différents niveaux et donc d'influencer leur contenu.

Mais au delà de cet aspect, il est maintenant temps d'échanger et de réfléchir sur ce qui a bien fonctionné et sur ce qui peut être davantage développé. La Commission a ainsi entamé un processus de bilan des résultats obtenus et notre débat aujourd'hui contribue à ce processus. Les retours seront accueillis auprès des coordinateurs nationaux de l'Année européenne de la jeunesse, des acteurs de la jeunesse eux-mêmes et des jeunes, et ils feront partie du rapport de la mise en œuvre de l'Année qui sera ensuite communiqué aux colégislateurs avant la fin de l'année 2023. L'ensemble de ces réflexions nourriront aussi l'évaluation de mi-parcours d'ici fin 2023 de la stratégie de l'Union en faveur de la jeunesse pour la période 2019-2027, notre plan commun à long terme visant, je le rappelle, à mobiliser les jeunes et à les connecter en leur donnant les moyens d'agir.

Sans attendre, nous avons déjà pu constater que l'Année européenne de la jeunesse a permis un certain nombre de réalisations majeures. Tout d'abord, les 28 et 29 octobre, les couloirs du Parlement européen à Bruxelles résonnaient des voix de plus de 1 300 jeunes militants qui ont participé à la conférence «LevelUp! Youth Boot Camp». Ces jeunes ont développé leurs compétences dans le cadre d'ateliers et d'événements de mise en réseau. L'événement a lui-même résonné, si je puis dire, sur les réseaux sociaux, avec près de 40 000 jeunes des quatre coins d'Europe qui se sont manifestés et qui ont communiqué ensemble. C'est l'effet d'entraînement que nous souhaitions créer.

Par ailleurs, plus de 8 000 autres activités sont à répertorier sur le portail européen de la jeunesse. Si la majorité de ces activités se sont déroulées en présentiel ou en format hybride, la mobilisation des réseaux sociaux et des campagnes en ligne ont permis de toucher des millions de jeunes partout dans l'Union.

L'année a donné lieu à de nouveaux partenariats et à de nouvelles connexions, y compris au sein de la Commission. Citons par exemple la nouvelle initiative d'automatisation sociale, dite ALMA – orientation, apprentissage, maîtrise, réussite –, dans le cadre du Fonds social européen plus. Elle vise à aider les jeunes défavorisés à s'intégrer sur le marché du travail et au sein de la société de leur pays d'origine, à la suite, par exemple, d'une expérience professionnelle ou autre dans un autre État membre.

Nous avons aussi continué à renforcer les initiatives existantes auprès de la très populaire Semaine européenne du codage afin d'assurer l'égalité d'accès aux compétences numériques à tous les enfants, indépendamment de leur milieu économique ou de l'argent.

Deux initiatives importantes dans le domaine de la recherche et de l'innovation méritent aussi d'être mises en avant. Dans le cadre du programme des villes européennes de la science, Leiden a accueilli la 33e édition du concours européen des jeunes scientifiques, rassemblant 132 jeunes, très brillants esprits, sélectionnés parmi plus de 65 000 participants du monde entier. Nous avons également lancé une nouvelle infrastructure européenne de recherche intitulée «Growing Up in Digital Europe – EuroCohort», qui constituera une source unique de données statistiques de haute qualité et fiables pour soutenir le développement de politiques sociales et améliorer le bien-être des enfants, des jeunes et de leurs familles dans toute l'Europe.

La Commission a également lancé de nouvelles initiatives qui donnent aux jeunes des opportunités et des espaces pour s'exprimer, pour faire entendre leurs visions et leurs idées, pour influencer et inspirer leurs pairs et la société au sens large. Il s'agit entre autres de la plateforme Youth Voices, du vivier de jeunes journalistes européens, des dialogues politiques avec les commissaires et les différents réseaux d'ambassadeurs de la jeunesse.

Enfin, de nouveaux partenariats et de nouveaux liens ont été établis entre les institutions de l'Union européenne, les États membres et les organisations de jeunesse. Au sein de la Commission européenne, nous réfléchissons actuellement à la manière de poursuivre la coopération avec le groupe de coordinateurs nationaux de l'Année européenne de la jeunesse ainsi qu'avec les points de contact nationaux et les parties prenantes. Outre les représentants nommés par les États membres, plus de 120 acteurs de la jeunesse faisaient partie de ce groupe. Des représentants du Parlement européen, du Comité des régions, du Comité économique et social européen faisaient également partie de ce réseau. Et je tiens à vous préciser ici que cette collaboration a été extrêmement précieuse.

Sabine Verheyen, *im Namen der PPE-Fraktion*. – Frau Präsidentin, sehr geehrter Herr Kommissar! Das Europäische Jahr der Jugend war die richtige Initiative zur richtigen Zeit, denn in der Corona-Pandemie waren die jungen Menschen besonders solidarisch. Es war deswegen nur angemessen, dass wir sie 2022 zu unserer Priorität gemacht haben.

Ich glaube aber, wir hätten es noch besser machen können, indem wir stärker in die Basis hinein, nach unten hin kommuniziert hätten. Viele junge Menschen wussten überhaupt nicht, dass wir ein Europäisches Jahr der Jugend hatten. Das ist dringend verbesserungsbedürftig. Wir hätten sie von Anfang an noch stärker mit einbinden müssen, und zwar auch an der Basis und nicht nur in der *Brussels bubble*.

Wir haben in den Austauschen mit den jungen Menschen viel gelernt in diesem Jahr: was sie bewegt, was ihre Wünsche an die Politik sind. Jetzt kommt es aber vor allem darauf an, was wir daraus machen. Das Jahr darf kein Strohfeuer sein, das am 31. Dezember verlischt. Es muss ein langfristiges Vermächtnis haben, denn wir brauchen echte politische Beteiligung junger Menschen, und wir sind ihnen auch greifbare Outputs schuldig.

Wir haben uns letztes Jahr hier versprochen, dass das Europäische Jahr der Jugend nicht nur ein *nice to have* sein soll, und jetzt ist unsere Chance zu beweisen, dass wir es ernst meinen. Lassen Sie uns den Input der jungen Menschen aufnehmen und Strukturen für eine bessere Beteiligung schaffen!

Themen wie Partizipation junger Menschen und bessere Teilhabe – zum Beispiel ein *Youth Test,* ein struktureller Dialog mit jungen Menschen –, Themen wie nachhaltige Klima- und Umweltpolitik, das Thema mentale Gesundheit, das Thema Jobs und Skills – und da ein Dankeschön an die Kommission, dass das nächste Jahr das Europäische Jahr der Skills wird; auch das greift schon einen Aspekt, den die jungen Menschen nach vorne gebracht haben, auf – und das Thema Digitalisierung: Das waren die *Big Five*, die wir auch in Zukunft verfolgen müssen; das waren die Themen, die sowohl beim EYE-Event, aber auch bei vielen, vielen anderen Jugendveranstaltungen hier immer wieder in den Fokus gerückt wurden.

Lassen Sie uns auch in den nächsten Jahren gemeinsam mit der jungen Generation daran arbeiten und nicht über die Köpfe der jungen Menschen hinweg – das wäre in meinen Augen der wichtigste Output aus diesem Jahr, dass wir mit den jungen Menschen gemeinsam agieren.

Heléne Fritzon, *för S&D-gruppen*. – Fru talman! Kommissionär! Vi har krig i Europa, vi har en klimatkris och vi har fortfarande följder av pandemin som plågar oss. Allt detta upplever ungdomar runtom i Europa och känner stor oro för. I mitt land, Sverige, svarar den unga generationen att hoppfullheten minskar. Färre än hälften ser i dag ljust på sin framtid. Därför är det så viktigt att vi tar barns och ungas oro på allvar, och därför var det välkommet med ett europeiskt ungdomsår.

EU har så mycket att erbjuda unga: högklassiga studentutbyten inom Erasmus, möjlighet att tågluffa och upptäcka Europa, ett första jobb eller en praktikplats i ett annat EU-land, kanske här i parlamentet. Vi kan dock göra ännu mer. Vi behöver fler studentutbyten, smidigare tågsträckor och anständiga löner och villkor.

Europaåret för ungdomar måste bli mer än enskilda event och seminarier. Det måste bli en kickstart för en politik för unga som visar fortsatt solidaritet med Ukraina, som är jämställd och inkluderande och som på riktigt tar klimatkrisen på allvar. Det är nämligen mycket som står på spel i vårt EU. Låt Europaåret för ungdomar bli en hoppets vändpunkt för alla unga i EU, för framtiden för vår union.

Laurence Farreng, *au nom du groupe Renew*. – Madame la Présidente, Monsieur le Commissaire, chers collègues, oui, c'était une bonne idée de faire de 2022 l'Année européenne de la jeunesse. J'ai défendu cette idée quand elle a été présentée par la présidente von der Leyen. Nous étions en pleine COVID. Les jeunes avaient souffert lourdement du confinement dans leur vie quotidienne. Cela a bouleversé leur quotidien. Oui, c'était une bonne idée, mais on ne peut pas s'arrêter là.

Alors oui, il y a eu des progrès. L'implication des jeunes a progressé, mais nous n'avons abouti à rien de concret. Et ça, c'est le pire en politique: les promesses non tenues, de celles qui font les abstentionnistes, qui font que les citoyens se détournent de nous. Nous avons demandé par exemple de respecter les engagements sur la conférence sur l'avenir de l'Europe en consultant les jeunes sur les grandes politiques qui les concernent et qui les touchent. Nous attendions cette annonce lors du discours sur l'état de l'Union d'Ursula von der Leyen, mais elle n'est pas venue.

Nous avons demandé d'engager un cadre européen pour des stages de qualité et justement rémunérés. Nous avons aussi demandé un cadre pour la santé mentale des jeunes. Rien de concret n'a été annoncé.

Alors, je suis particulièrement fière, avec mon groupe Renew, mes collègues, Dragoș Pîslaru, d'avoir mis en place un groupe de travail qui met les jeunes au cœur de la consultation politique et de nos réflexions. Nous avançons ensemble.

Mais, au plan de l'Union européenne, le travail reste à aboutir. C'est pour cela que l'Année européenne de la jeunesse doit se poursuivre encore six mois et c'est ce que nous demandons dans cette résolution.

Diana Riba i Giner, *en nombre del Grupo Verts/ALE*. – Señora presidenta, comisario, este Año Europeo de la Juventud ha puesto a nuestras instituciones ante el espejo y, desafortunadamente, no todo lo que el reflejo nos devuelve nos gusta.

Los jóvenes siguen enfrentándose a la precariedad y a una transición, casi siempre difícil, a la vida laboral.

Los impactos de la pandemia, la reciente guerra en Ucrania, el aumento del coste de la vida, la pobreza energética y una emergencia climática que hace difícil imaginar un futuro, solo han contribuido a empeorar la ya crítica situación de la salud mental de nuestras niñas y adolescentes.

Ser mujer joven, ser un joven de la comunidad LGTBIQ+, ser joven migrante, joven, refugiado, joven con discapacidad o varias de estas cosas a la vez, supone grandes desafíos como es el hecho de disponer de menos oportunidades.

Pero, como resumen, les diría que este año nos deja una buena noticia, una lección y varios retos. La buena noticia es, por ejemplo, este debate, que nos permite nombrar problemas que muchas veces se han relegado a los márgenes y poner a los jóvenes en el centro de la agenda.

La lección: un año europeo que no se prepara con anticipación difícilmente puede fijar objetivos sólidos y alcanzar metas ambiciosas.

Y los retos: tenemos que materializar lo que desde este Parlamento hemos pedido decididamente, esto es, un marco común para garantizar una remuneración justa de los períodos de prácticas, la accesibilidad a una atención de salud mental libre de estigmas y, en última instancia, pero quizás el reto más importante, involucrar y escuchar a los jóvenes en la preparación de todas las políticas europeas y también en la evaluación de su impacto.

En definitiva, tenemos que impulsar cambios estructurales para construir un sistema político europeo más inclusivo con los jóvenes desde el antirracismo, libre de discriminación y de violencia de género. Necesitamos mecanismos y políticas que reflejen positivamente la posición y el papel que juegan los jóvenes como miembros activos de la sociedad.

Durante el Año Europeo de la Juventud hemos reivindicado que se pongan las voces de los jóvenes en el centro y ahora reivindicamos que estas voces permanezcan.

Aurélia Beigneux, *au nom du groupe ID*. – Madame le Président, Monsieur le Commissaire, la conception que vous avez de la jeunesse de nos différentes nations est complètement dévoyée. Cette proposition de résolution sur l'Année européenne de la jeunesse est donc l'occasion de rappeler quelques points.

Vous ne parlez qu'à la jeunesse des métropoles, celle que vous représentez, portant le voile, pendant que la jeunesse iranienne cherche désespérément à s'en débarrasser. Celle que vous représentez adhère aux idées woke, LGBT et progressistes, alors que leur priorité réelle et immédiate est celle des fins de mois et d'un marché du travail saturé.

Pour le reste de la jeunesse, le constat est simple: vous ne l'écoutez pas et elle ne vous écoute pas. La preuve la plus flagrante de cette manipulation idéologique, ce sont les journées EYE au Parlement européen, théâtre de l'extrême gauche militante, qui fait coexister les ateliers féministes, islamistes FEMYSO, les espaces de discussion sur le racisme et les lieux de débat sur l'identité transgenre – la vérité fait mal à entendre, je le sais.

La jeunesse européenne doit savoir que c'est ainsi que vous représentez ses préoccupations du quotidien. Pour vous, la jeunesse n'est qu'une métaphore de la gauche. Vous réunissez systématiquement dans cet hémicycle les jeunes des grandes écoles, des ONG et des associations fédéralistes en faisant croire que ces personnes représentent la jeunesse européenne. La pluralité d'opinions est inexistante à chaque fois que vous leur donnez la parole. En témoigne notamment votre enquête en ligne sur les valeurs européennes. Véritable flop d'ailleurs, qui n'aura reçu que 5 000 réponses sur les 88 millions de jeunes que compte notre continent.

La jeunesse, c'est l'argument facile pour justifier votre campagne fédéraliste, gauchiste et antinationale. C'est faire croire aux peuples européens que les nouvelles générations sont prêtes à ratifier le projet d'États-Unis d'Europe préparé par de vieux fédéralistes déçus par les résultats électoraux.

Mais s'il y a bien une constante depuis que la société moderne existe, c'est que la jeunesse a toujours refusé que l'on pense à sa place. Ne mettons pas dans le même panier idéologique des jeunes de nos 27 nations si différentes. La jeunesse est en première ligne face à la crise, face à la difficulté d'entreprendre et face à la concurrence internationale. La vérité, c'est que nos jeunes combattent tous les jours les mêmes difficultés que le reste des Européens. Alors, pour la prochaine Année européenne de la jeunesse, sortez de votre délire progressiste, allez à leur rencontre dans les différents pays, plutôt que de faire venir les fils de la bourgeoisie des riches métropoles de notre continent.

Elżbieta Kruk, *w imieniu grupy ECR*. – Pani Przewodnicząca! W październiku 2021 r. Komisja Europejska przedstawiła formalny wniosek w sprawie ogłoszenia roku 2022 Europejskim Rokiem Młodzieży.

Krytykowaliśmy wówczas późne przyjęcie tej inicjatywy. Było bowiem oczywiste, że taki pośpiech spowoduje, że osiągnięcie wyznaczonych celów będzie zbyt dużym wyzwaniem. Teraz się to potwierdza. Trzeba było słuchać racjonalnych argumentów i przewidzieć wystarczający czas, aby przygotować realne działania w tak trudnych dla młodzieży czasach.

To w szczególności młodych ludzi dotknęły wszak gospodarcze, psychologiczne i społeczne konsekwencje bezprecedensowych środków, wprowadzonych pod pozorem walki z COVID-19, takich jak lockdowny czy segregacja ludzi zamiast podnoszonej tu równości. Zamykanie szkół spowodowało szkody dla edukacji. Młodzi ludzie stracili też możliwość szkolenia, wolontariatu czy pracy. A i dziś nie ułatwiają im życia napięcia gospodarcze i polityczne spowodowane między innymi agresją Rosji na Ukrainę.

Nie zmieni tego rezolucja, która ma na celu ustanowienie dziedzictwa Europejskiego Roku Młodzieży. Roku, w którym paradoksalnie średnio blisko 14 % młodych ludzi poniżej 25 roku życia w Unii Europejskiej było bez pracy.

Znajdują się też w rezolucji zapisy, których motywem jest ideologia, a nie rzeczywista troska o dobro młodzieży, oraz apele o podjęcie działań niezgodnych z zasadą pomocniczości. Do nich należy wezwanie państw członkowskich do włączenia edukacji obywatelskiej – i to w formie obywatelstwa globalnego i unijnego – do krajowych programów nauczania, choć obszar edukacji należy do wyłącznej kompetencji państw.

Niyazi Kizilyürek, *on behalf of The Left Group*. – Madam President, the EU today is admittedly in a very difficult position. In just a decade it has experienced a worldwide economic crisis, a pandemic of a deadly virus and the consequences of an aggression, of a war. At the same time, the effects of the climate crisis are intensifying. The youth has fewer employment opportunities.

For the first time since the Second World War, the youth is experiencing a lower standard of living compared to their parents. It was in this context that we have decided to dedicate the year 2022 to youth and have set four main objectives: to renew the positive perspectives for young people and help them overcome the effects of pandemic on their lives; to support and empower young people to become active and engaged citizens; to better inform young generations about opportunities available to them from public policies at EU, national, regional and local levels; and to mainstream youth policy across all relevant Union policy fields.

However, in order to meet the EU's expectations, it takes much more than designating a European Year. We have to increase public spending on education so that every child can have a high quality education, provide employment opportunities for everyone, increase wages and ban unpaid traineeships. Racism and other forms of discrimination are diseases that cut through our society to undermine our values. We should treat this immediately.

We have to focus on combating discrimination, address the challenges faced by young people who are discriminated. The creation of a fully-fledged EU youth test that will not merely become a bureaucratic checklist, but rather tackle these issues in a holistic way, can help achieve our aims.

Finally, we have to extend the year until 9 May and, more importantly, to defend and promote the legacy of the European Year of Youth. As the lyrics of a Greek song tells: 'defend the child, because if a child is saved, there is hope'.

PRESIDENZA DELL'ON. PINA PICIERNO

Vicepresidente

Chiara Gemma (NI). – Signora Presidente, signor Commissario, onorevoli colleghi, qualche rapida considerazione a conclusione di questo Anno europeo dei giovani.

Ho girato tante scuole, ho aperto le officine europee, luoghi di incontro e confronto dove costruire una partecipazione attiva e responsabile, ho ascoltato tanti giovani e ho avvertito in loro il bisogno sempre più forte di conoscenza del proprio sé emozionale.

Se la politica vuole davvero incidere sulla crescita dei nostri giovani, occorre promuovere una scuola che sappia adottare una valutazione formativa attenta ai volti e alle emozioni più che ai prodotti e ai processi cognitivi.

Occorre ristabilire un dialogo autentico con i giovani e per farlo bisogna sedersi in mezzo a loro, perché sono stanchi di sentirsi dire «devi essere più competente, devi essere responsabile, devi essere capace di progettarti, devi essere resiliente». Io ho provato a sedermi in mezzo a loro e a confrontarmi con loro, ho compreso tante cose, ma una fra tutte: sono giovani a cui piacerebbe una scuola basata su emozioni profonde e relazioni autentiche e non solo sulla mera conoscenza o su sterili voti, che poco hanno a che fare con il proprio sé emozionale.

Ho promesso loro che questa scuola è possibile, con pazienza e con coraggio continueremo a costruirla insieme.

Tomasz Frankowski (PPE). – Pani Przewodnicząca! Panie Komisarzu! Europejski Rok Młodzieży 2022 jest dowodem zaangażowania Unii Europejskiej w sprawy młodych i przyszłych pokoleń. Jednak nasze działania na rzecz młodych ludzi nie mogą się skończyć z dniem 31 grudnia. Musimy wykorzystać długoterminowe dziedzictwo tego roku, ponieważ potrzebujemy prawdziwego uczestnictwa młodych ludzi w polityce. Jesteśmy im winni konkretne wyniki.

Ubolewam nad sytuacją, w jakiej rozpoczął się rok, a zwłaszcza nad pospiesznym tempem przyjęcia rozporządzenia, co później opóźniło realizację i finansowanie wielu projektów. Mam nadzieję, że w przyszłości Komisja dopilnuje, by europejskie lata mogły zostać przygotowane w odpowiednim czasie dla wszystkich zainteresowanych stron.

W trakcie tego roku, podczas spotkań z młodymi ludźmi wiele się od nich nauczyliśmy. Wiemy, co jest dla nich ważne, jakie są ich życzenia dotyczące polityki. Zobowiązujemy się do słuchania głosów młodych ludzi, gdyż chcemy wspólnie pracować nad kształtowaniem przyszłości Unii Europejskiej, uwzględniając ich aspiracje.

Ten kończący się Europejski Rok Młodzieży powinien doprowadzić do zmiany sposobu, w jaki włączamy młodych ludzi w proces kształtowania polityki i podejmowania decyzji. Czy to w kwestiach klimatu, spraw społecznych czy rozwoju cyfrowego, młodzi ludzie są w centrum naszej polityki i priorytetów politycznych. Są przede wszystkim przyszłością naszej wspólnej Europy.

Petra Kammerevert (S&D). – Frau Präsidentin, Herr Kommissar, liebe Kolleginnen und Kollegen! Eine am Montag veröffentlichte Studie zeigt: Mehr als zwei Drittel der Jugendlichen sorgen sich um die Zukunft und bewerten die allgemeine Situation schlechter als jemals zuvor. Krieg in Europa, Inflation, Klimawandel, die Wirtschafts- und Energiekrise schaffen ein massives Gefühl von Unsicherheit; daran konnte auch das Europäische Jahr der Jugend nichts ändern.

Und wie vor einem Jahr stehe ich hier und erhebe dieselben Forderungen: Schaffen Sie endlich unbezahlte Praktika ab! Eine angemessene Vergütung für geleistete Arbeit ist eine Frage des Respekts und der Chancengerechtigkeit für junge Menschen. Ich will nicht, dass nur Jugendliche aus reichen Elternhäusern sich ein Praktikum leisten können. Und lassen Sie uns gemeinsam an Strukturen arbeiten, die dauerhaft eine spürbare Beteiligung junger Menschen sicherstellen!

Statt zu handeln, hat die Kommission es jedoch vorgezogen, mit einem Veranstaltungsmapping unter Beweis zu stellen, dass sie auch kartographisch tätig sein kann. Über 8 000 Aktivitäten wurden kartographiert – viele davon hätten sowieso stattgefunden. So diente diese Fleißarbeit eher der Selbstbestätigung. Das Jahr ging an den Jugendlichen weitgehend unbemerkt vorbei, ohne dass auch nur irgendwas für sie dabei herausgekommen wäre.

Deshalb fordern wir, das Jahr bis zum 8. Mai 2023 zu verlängern, um in der zusätzlichen Zeit endlich etwas zu liefern, das dem Jahr doch noch zum Erfolg verhelfen könnte. Legen Sie endlich einen Vorschlag zum Verbot unbezahlter Praktika vor und schlagen Sie wenigstens Ratsschlussfolgerungen zur Einbindung von Kindern und Jugendlichen in politische Entscheidungen auf allen Ebenen vor! Ein halbgarer Jugendtest, der eher einem betreuten Gesprächskreis ähnelt, als dass er wirkliche Mitbestimmung darstellt, interessiert niemand.

Lassen Sie uns gemeinsam an entsprechenden Maßnahmen bis zum 9. Mai arbeiten und diese auf den Weg bringen – ansonsten bleibt das Europäische Jahr der Jugend eine Farce.

Dragoș Pîslaru (Renew). – Madam President, dear Commissioner, indeed the European Year of Youth 2022 was a good decision. And this was a good decision because it allowed us to listen better to our young generation. In my political group, in Renew, we had the Renew Europe Task Force set to have meetings and several interactions with the young people. Our youth political organisations have been involved in, and we've exchanged about, the youth's needs: about the need for paid internships, about the need for learning opportunities, about the need for digitalisation, a more inclusive society, about the mental health challenges, about the feeling of belonging, about the need for their access to decision-making process.

And I'm really glad that we have young people that are present with us today and will hear us. The fact that we are not going to take all these things easily; we will try to put together the implementation for that.

One important part is related to the investment in the young generation, the next generation. We have the Child Guarantee, we have the Youth Guarantee, and we need to push that further. But then if we care about the youth, we should have them on board today, not in a distant future. We should allow them to be part in designing their future today. If we want better policies for youth, we need to have you, the young people, involved in decisions, and having this youth impact test mainstream today. To say that we care about young people, it means that we need to get them on board with us for their good.

Malte Gallée (Verts/ALE). – Frau Präsidentin, liebe Kolleginnen und Kollegen, Herr Kommissar! Man sagt ja immer: Jedem Anfang wohnt ein Zauber inne. Und ich glaube, das ist mit dem Leben tatsächlich genauso. Ich würde nämlich sagen – wenn ich so selber zurückschaue –, die ersten zehn Jahre, die haben sich so viel länger angefühlt als die letzten zehn Jahre, die ich jetzt auf dem Planeten bin. Deswegen finde ich den Fokus auf die Jugend extrem wichtig – das heißt, dass es das Europäische Jahr der Jugend gab, das war eine supergute Idee, auch wenn keiner etwas davon mitbekommen hat, es kein Geld dafür gab und keine Gesetze für die Jugend auf den Weg gekommen sind.

Das Europäische Jahr der Jugend droht quasi einfach nur so zu verpuffen wie der Vogel des Jahres – das ist der Wiedehopf. Und genau das müssen wir verhindern. Das Europäische Jahr der Jugend, das muss jetzt einfach nur der Startschuss sein für einen ganz klaren Fokus auf die Jugend, und ich glaube, die Kommission ist da schon auf einem einigermaßen guten Weg und hat wirklich auch verstanden, dass es, um glückliche Menschen auf diesem Kontinent zu schaffen, natürlich wichtig ist, dass man das Glück der Jugend schafft.

Aber dafür, wie gesagt, muss noch einiges auf den Weg kommen. Wir brauchen ein Verbot von unbezahlten Praktika – das wurde schon so oft angesprochen. Wir müssen endlich etwas für die mentale Gesundheit unserer jungen Menschen tun, weil das ein Riesenproblem ist auf dem gesamten Kontinent. Wir müssen das Europäische Jahr der Jugend natürlich verlängern, damit die Leute auf diesem Kontinent noch wirklich etwas davon mitbekommen. Und ich möchte Sie auch darum bitten, digitale Beteiligungsformate für die Jugend an unseren demokratischen Prozessen zu schaffen, damit die Hürden gesenkt werden.

(Der Redner ist damit einverstanden, eine Wortmeldung nach dem Verfahren der „blauen Karte" zu beantworten.)

Niklas Nienaß (Verts/ALE), *Wortmeldung nach dem Verfahren der „blauen Karte"*. – Sehr geehrter Herr Gallée! Gegenüber dem Wiedehopf gibt es schon einen Unterschied: Der Wiedehopf wird nämlich geschützt im besonderen Jahr.

Deswegen würde mich interessieren: Wir haben aktuell die Situation, dass sehr viele junge Menschen mentale Probleme haben, dass gerade sehr viele junge Menschen mit Zukunftsängsten zu kämpfen haben – Klimawandel, ein Krieg. Welche Maßnahmen der Kommission würden Sie als wichtig sehen, um da wirklich Menschen zu unterstützen?

Was kann die Europäische Kommission wirklich tun, um die mentale Gesundheit von jungen Menschen zu unterstützen und dafür zu sorgen, dass in Europa niemand mehr über Gewalt gegen sich selbst nachdenkt, über Selbstmord nachdenkt, und wir wirklich dazu kommen, dass wieder eine Zukunftspositivität entsteht?

Malte Gallée (Verts/ALE), *Antwort auf eine Wortmeldung nach dem Verfahren der „blauen Karte"*. – Was natürlich in allererster Linie das Allerwichtigste ist, ist, dass überhaupt die Lebensgrundlage für junge Menschen, auf diesem Planeten weiter zu existieren, geschaffen wird, das heißt, die Eindämmung der Klimakrise muss natürlich die absolute, höchste Priorität haben, weil das natürlich auch für die jungen Menschen die größte Bedrohung ist. Wenn wir darüber nachdenken, dass wir mit unserem CO_2-Ausstoß so weitermachen wie bisher, dann ist in 100 Jahren dieser Planet nicht mehr wahnsinnig bewohnbar. So, das steht natürlich erst mal über allem.

Dann gibt es viele weitere Projekte, die jungen Menschen wirklich Perspektiven schaffen und die Perspektiven eröffnen. Das sind Angebote zum Reisen, das sind Angebote, den Kontinent kennenzulernen. Das sind natürlich, genau wie es auch schon angesprochen wurde, ein Verbot von unbezahlten Praktika, dass wir den jungen Menschen, die eben nicht die finanziellen Ressourcen haben, wirklich auch die gleichen Chancen bieten, damit diese nicht in diese gleichen Muster verfallen und aufgefressen werden von einem System, das sie letztendlich eigentlich nur als billige Arbeitskräfte missbraucht.

Gunnar Beck (ID). – Frau Präsidentin! Anfang des Jahres fragte Ursula von der Leyen: Was bedeutet die EU wirklich für unsere Jugend? Besser hätte sie gefragt: Was hat die EU für unsere Jugend getan? Denn darauf gibt es klare Antworten.

In Deutschland sind über ein Viertel aller Kinder von Armut oder sozialer Ausgrenzung bedroht, mehr als im EU-Durchschnitt. In Deutschland erleiden heute fast 6 % der 25- bis 29-Jährigen schwere Entbehrungen, doppelt so viele wie 2019. Damit liegt Deutschland im ärmsten Quartal der 27 EU-Mitgliedstaaten. Nur 73 % aller Deutschen haben einen Sekundarschulabschluss – deutlich unter dem OECD-Durchschnitt von 80 %. Dabei war das deutsche Bildungsbudget 2019 mit fast 230 Milliarden Euro – oder 6,6 % des Bruttosozialprodukts – das höchste der EU.

Doch reichlich fließt das Geld nur für Deutschunterricht für Migranten und die Indoktrinierung der Jugend. So fallen die sprachlichen und mathematischen Fähigkeiten der Grundschüler und 15-Jährigen im internationalen Vorjahresvergleich stetig ab; das gilt für Deutsche gegenüber Europäern und für alle Europäer gegenüber Asiaten. Auch die europäischen Universitäten fallen zurück.

Und trotz massiver öffentlicher Schuldenaufnahme liegt die Jugendarbeitslosigkeit in zahlreichen Regionen Südeuropas immer noch zwischen 35 und 50 %. Dabei haben europäische Frauen heute weniger als 1,5 Lebendgeburten, Frauen in Westafrika indes im Schnitt fünf – selbstverständlich wollen Sie die alle hierherholen.

Fazit: Die Europäische Union versagt auch gegenüber unserer Jugend. Dass Jugendliche nun ab 16 Jahren wählen dürfen sollen und mehr Abgeordnete schon vor ihrem Studienabschluss gewählt werden, ändert daran gar nichts.

Jorge Buxadé Villalba (ECR). – Señora presidente, jóvenes de Europa: Bruselas proclama un Año Europeo de la Juventud, pero os dice que no seréis dueños de nada. Otros han decidido lo que tenéis que hacer, pensar, sentir, vivir o decidir hasta 2030.

Jamás en la historia se había condenado a la juventud a vivir una vida más miserable que la de sus padres. Esforzaos, estudiad, trabajad y no aceptéis las migajas de sus bonos culturales. Es su mundo el que está en ruinas, no el vuestro. Es su agenda la que os impone compartir el coche, la casa o el empleo, no la vuestra.

Sois jóvenes y tenéis todo el derecho a vivir en el peligro y en la temeridad —«no comas carne», «no tomes vino», «no tengas un empleo estable», «no disfrutes de la prosperidad en el lugar donde has nacido»—. Forjad vínculos fuertes: vuestros padres y abuelos. Cultura y tradición. Vuestra historia compartida, que es la nación. Prended fuego a todo lo que es provisional. Audacia y coraje para conquistar lo permanente.

Os acusarán de que sois jóvenes y os dirán que con entusiasmo no se cambian las cosas.

Pero yo os aseguro que, si vuestra ilusión se desborda, sabréis arrastrar a todos aquellos que quieren hipotecar vuestro futuro.

Seguridad en las calles, familias fuertes, empleos estables y una patria que os proteja.

Leila Chaibi (The Left). – Madame la Présidente, attention, Mesdames et Messieurs, roulement de tambour: l'Année européenne de la jeunesse touche à sa fin.

L'Année européenne de la jeunesse. J'ai fait le test hier soir, je suis allée à Strasbourg et j'ai demandé à tous les jeunes que je croisais s'ils avaient entendu parler de l'Année européenne de la jeunesse. Eh bien, figurez-vous que pas un seul ne m'a répondu oui. Pas un seul.

Pourtant, ça aurait pu être un événement. Elle avait toutes les raisons d'être, cette Année européenne de la jeunesse. Avec l'explosion du nombre de jeunes obligés de démarrer leur vie active en faisant la queue aux Restos du cœur. Une personne sur cinq qui fait la queue pour l'aide alimentaire a entre 15 et 25 ans – entre 15 et 25 ans! Elle avait du sens, cette Année européenne de la jeunesse, vu le nombre d'étudiants qui naviguent entre bourses et petits boulots et qui sont obligés de se contenter d'un repas par jour parce qu'ils ne peuvent pas payer leurs factures. Pourtant, nous pouvons le dire, aujourd'hui, cette Année européenne de la jeunesse a été une occasion manquée.

La garantie pour la jeunesse. La garantie pour la jeunesse aurait pu permettre aux jeunes d'accéder à un vrai emploi stable et de qualité. Mais non, finalement, elle les installe dans la précarité.

Sur le revenu minimum, on attendait une vraie directive contraignante de la Commission européenne, une directive qui donne accès à toutes et à tous au revenu minimum, quel que soit leur âge. Cette directive aurait forcé la France à mettre un terme à la discrimination des jeunes de moins de 25 ans dans l'accès au RSA. Mais non, nous avons eu une recommandation.

Même les stagiaires. Les stagiaires ont été obligés la semaine dernière de venir devant le Parlement européen pour nous demander l'interdiction de cet esclavage moderne que sont les stages non rémunérés.

Alors, c'est vrai, j'avoue, j'avais pris goût aux affiches grand format avec des jeunes souriants qui disent «Année européenne de la jeunesse» le matin quand on arrive au Parlement européen. C'est vrai que cela va me manquer. Mais avouez, avouez, on aurait pu faire tellement mieux.

Clara Ponsatí Obiols (NI). – Madam President, we're concerned about the youth participation and engagement in our European project. Well, what hundreds of Catalan youth are facing right now for their engagement in politics, following their protest, are arrests, trials and prison sentences, police brutality and abuse, and unrelentless infiltration and spying in youth organisations, without – without – judicial oversight.

This is the reality of youth today in Spain, which is in the European Union. Meanwhile, Mr Sánchez's government is about to pass new laws making repression against dissidents even easier.

Commissioner, colleagues, we say that we need to engage youth in Europe. We have it! Youth are committed to justice and freedom. What we need is that the Commission stops endorsing repression and starts protecting human rights!

Michaela Šojdrová (PPE). – Madame la Présidente, bonjour Monsieur le Commissaire, bonjour à tous ceux qui sont jeunes d'âge mais aussi d'esprit.

— Paní předsedající, Evropským rokem mládeže chceme povzbudit mladé lidi, kteří v době pandemie COVID-19 přišli o mnoho příležitostí. Víme, že mladí lidé nemají rádi formalismus a vědí dobře, že za jeden rok nemůžeme vyřešit všechny jejich problémy. Ale když už tuto příležitost máme, tak ji využijme. Já velmi ráda spolupracuji s mladými lidmi. Potřebuji jejich podněty, *feedback* a také jejich energii. A chtěla bych v tuto chvíli poděkovat těm, kteří jsou velmi aktivní v rámci *Center for European Volunteering*, *European Youth Forum*, českým mladým lidovcům a mladým demokratům, kteří mě zásobují svými podněty, a vím, že se také do letošního roku zapojili. Bylo to např. setkání *EPP4Youth*, kterého se zúčastnily stovky mladých lidí, a byli nadšeni z té možnosti potkat se se svými vrstevníky. Další akci připravujeme společně s Evropskou komisí a Radou. Bude to 6. prosince závěrečná konference s mladými lidmi, která věřím, že přinese další podněty.

Z těch, které jsou velmi často zdůrazněny právě mladými lidmi, chci zmínit jeden, který oni považují za velmi důležitý, a to je požadavek mnohem lepší informovanosti o EU v rámci školního vzdělávání. Možná to někoho překvapí, ale je to logické. Mladí vidí svoji budoucnost v Evropské unii a obávají se dezinformací. Ukazuje se, že jednou z cest by mohly být společné projekty učitelských akademií realizované v rámci Erasmus+ nebo Jean Monnet, a Evropský parlament ve svém usnesení žádá Evropskou komisi, aby přijala opatření a umožnila vznik konkrétního vzdělávacího rámce pro evropské občanství. To by byl skutečně hmatatelný výsledek letošního roku mládeže a byl by užitečný i pro mladé v budoucnosti.

Massimiliano Smeriglio (S&D). – Signora Presidente, signor Commissario, onorevoli colleghi, a poche settimane dalla sua conclusione abbiamo la possibilità di confrontarci sull'Anno europeo della gioventù.

Un anno che ha mancato i suoi obiettivi, primo tra tutti quello di raggiungere realmente le giovani generazioni europee, comprendere i loro bisogni, soprattutto dopo la pandemia e nel mezzo dell'attuale crisi sociale.

Vorrei ricordare alla Commissione che siamo ancora in tempo per agire, dando risposte concrete. Innanzitutto implementando lo «EU Youth Test» affinché vi sia un coinvolgimento significativo delle nuove generazioni nel processo decisionale politico. I giovani devono poter avere voce in capitolo quando si decide su politiche che impatteranno sul loro futuro.

È il momento di combattere la precarietà giovanile e dare loro la possibilità di affacciarsi al mondo del lavoro con opportunità di qualità, a partire da un quadro normativo a livello europeo che vieti i tirocini e apprendistati non retribuiti, e su questo aspetto la Commissione e gli Stati membri devono sicuramente fare la loro parte, ma anche il Parlamento deve essere chiaro e unito su questa richiesta. Noi per primi dobbiamo dire basta all'era del lavoro gratuito per poter fare esperienza.

L'educazione crea uguaglianza, ma se il primo passo dopo la laurea è uno stage non retribuito, ci limitiamo a mantenere intatte le disuguaglianze esistenti. La pandemia ha già costretto i giovani a mettere in pausa la loro vita. Il minimo che possiamo fare è garantire loro un inizio del percorso lavorativo senza essere indebitati. Lo dobbiamo a loro, per l'Europa del futuro.

Da ultimo, è per noi fondamentale dare continuità a questo lavoro prolungando l'Anno europeo della gioventù fino al 9 maggio 2023.

Irena Joveva (Renew). – Gospa predsednica! Evropsko leto mladih se bliža koncu ali drugače, če želite, evropskega leta mladih še ni konec. To pomeni, da nekako težko danes ugotavljamo njegov končni uspeh oziroma govorimo dovolj podrobno ali konkretno o njegovi zapuščini.

Namesto tega pa seveda lahko govorimo o konkretnih predlogih izboljšanja življenjskih razmer mladim. Ogromno je področij, ki jih je treba urediti, to vemo vsi, in v minuti jih je nemogoče našteti, je pa mogoče reči, žal, da nam tega letos ni uspelo storiti. Nam je uspelo izpeljati številne dogodke, to seveda drži in to absolutno podpiram, ampak to ni dovolj. In niti ne moremo vsega za nazaj ali za naprej nadomestiti s takšnimi aktivnostmi.

Na žalost je tako, da mladi nimajo enega krovnega zakona, direktive ali akta, ki bi bil namenjen zgolj njim, zato moramo poskrbeti, da jih vedno postavimo v ospredje. Jaz jih. Z mladimi in za mlade. Najmanj to smo jim dolžni.

Damian Boeselager (Verts/ALE). – Madam President, Commissioner, colleagues, this week we celebrated the 70th birthday of the European Parliament, which, by the way, is also the average age of a conservative politician in this House. I am obviously joking, but I have to tell it to all of us. We have to be honest. If you listen to the Beatles, the Foo Fighters or Limp Bizkit, you're not young anymore. If the people that go clubbing over the weekend are half your age, you're not young anymore. So the reality and the funny thing about an ageing societies is that if you're older, you outvote the young or, to say it a bit differently, the closer you are to death, the more you decide about the future. This obviously leads to absurd situations where you have a German chancellor, Olaf Scholz, campaigning as a full campaign promise to never touch pension schemes. That's a great strategy if you want to get the old ones.

A year of youth won't change these structural issues. And so we have to ask ourselves, what can we actually do? I think what would really help is to actually give voting rights to 16-year-olds and also to ensure that every 18-year-old across this continent has the right to stand as a candidate for elections. We should prioritise the issues that will have a longer-term effect, which means we should not concentrate too much on the short term. The longer-terms are the ones that will actually affect the people who are young now or that are still to be born. That does definitely include the climate.

And then I think as parties, as politicians, we need to make a step, an extra effort, to talk to young people more and to basically show them that it's more fun to be here to fight against oil and gas than to throw processed food at paintings.

Sandra Pereira (The Left). – Senhora Presidente, quando falamos de políticas para a juventude não as podemos desligar de respostas concretas e necessárias para os problemas que os jovens hoje enfrentam.

É essencial que se ponha fim à exploração e ao flagelo da precariedade. Que haja valorização de salários. Que se garanta aos jovens serviços públicos de qualidade e que não se ignorem as inquietações quanto às discriminações que perduram, e ainda há muitas, e quanto aos perigos para a paz num mundo que é de todos.

É necessário que os jovens vejam assegurados os seus direitos de acesso ao ensino, à cultura, ao desporto, a uma habitação digna, ao lazer, à saúde e à educação sexual, à igualdade, à participação no movimento associativo.

É mesmo preciso que a União Europeia e os seus Estados-Membros deixem a propaganda de lado e levem a cabo políticas que possibilitem aos jovens concretizar as suas expetativas, pôr as suas capacidades ao serviço do desenvolvimento e do bem-estar de todos, e que possam transformar os seus sonhos em vida.

Maria Walsh (PPE). – Madam President, the objective of our 2022 European Year of Youth was to shine a light on the importance of Europe's youth in building a better future, and to put them at the centre of decision making. I believe the EU year was successful in some parts in achieving this, but the work cannot stop. It is essential that we, as EU decision makers, continue to welcome young people in every aspect of our work.

We must build a lasting legacy. Yearly youth conferences and events should take place across all four corners of our Union, fostering local debates and encouraging young people to give their much-valued input into developing EU policy. In addition, I ask the Commission to adopt an EU youth test to mainstream a youth perspective into the preparation of all our European policies.

In September, I was delighted to welcome four aspiring parliamentarians from my Midlands–North-West constituency to the Parliament as part of the EPP's Youth Week. I saw first hand the commitment our young people have to our European peace project, our future and the invaluable perspectives they offered to us all. I want to thank Chloe, Lisa, Amy and Dean for joining us at EPP Youth Week. Let us ensure that we continue to listen to the voices of young people and make their future our ultimate mission.

(The speaker agreed to respond to a blue-card speech)

Michaela Šojdrová (PPE), *blue-card speech.* – Thank you very much, Maria. I know that you are very motivated. You are very hardworking for youth. You mentioned many activities where you participated and actions for youth. But many of our colleagues mentioned that it was late, it was less time for how to raise awareness about a European Year of Youth.

So really, do you share these concerns about awareness of the European Year of Youth? And how can we enhance this awareness of young people and include young people in this decision policy process?

Maria Walsh (PPE), *blue-card reply.* – Thank you very much for the question, colleague. I do agree with you. I think we rushed it. I think it was a fantastic year. But ultimately, look at the room right now. We should have 705 MEPs talking about how successful the European Year of Youth was in their constituency. We don't.

We should have younger people as part of this conversation, and not just the younger people sitting up here in the podiums. I think that when we talk about the European youth and protection and this lasting legacy, we also need to deep dive into what worked. I mentioned youth conferences and events, organised local events worked. But, ultimately, who wasn't in the room? It was all those with different abilities not in the room. It was issues like mental health, like climate change, like the future of digitalisation and their impact on that. Was that heard? It wasn't.

But now we have time, and ultimately I hope that in this building of a lasting legacy, we do take it seriously, and that in our Culture and Education Committee, as we had agreed, we continue to have youth voices heard because, as I mentioned, it is our mission to protect our peace project for the future.

Marcos Ros Sempere (S&D). – Señora presidenta, comisario, la juventud es el período más determinante de una vida, un momento de florecimiento personal que solo se vive una vez y, como tal, hay que aprovecharlo. De ahí la importancia de este Año Europeo de la Juventud para concienciar sobre ello.

Sin embargo, comisario, ¿cuántos jóvenes han conocido la iniciativa? Lamentablemente, no los suficientes. Hemos fracasado en el objetivo de llegar a la población general. ¿Los motivos? La organización de este año empezó tarde y ha contado con poca financiación y poca implicación.

Pero, aún así, debemos asegurarnos de que el legado de este año vaya más allá, que ayude a los jóvenes a superar los efectos de la pandemia, que los capacite para ser ciudadanos activos y comprometidos, que les informe de todas las oportunidades que ofrece la Unión Europea. La formación constituye un eje central en el desarrollo de nuestros jóvenes y, sin una educación de calidad, inclusiva y sin barreras, tendrán mucho más difícil alcanzar sus metas.

Termino con un momento clave para nuestros jóvenes, la difícil transición al mundo laboral. Es un imperativo democrático que garanticemos una remuneración justa para todos los períodos de prácticas. Es una pena no haber contado con el apoyo de la derecha para defender este derecho tan básico. Por su oposición, no lo hemos podido incluir en la resolución que vamos a votar, pero los jóvenes pueden seguir contando con que los socialistas seguiremos peleando por sus derechos.

Svenja Hahn (Renew). – Madam President, dear colleagues, when I entered this Parliament three years ago, I was president of the European Liberals, and in that capacity I had the great honour to travel through 35 European countries. I've met many young people from all over Europe. I've demonstrated for abortion rights in Poland. I've protested against upload filters. I joined the fight against youth unemployment.

All those young people I met had very similar hopes and dreams, filled with expectations for the future. There was always one thing that I heard from them when I was a youth politician, but now also being a parliamentarian: 'listen to us'. Also, in the Year of Youth, I've been to many events, and at every single one of them, I was asked to ensure that this year of the youth will be more than just a show, that it will have a lasting effect, that there will be better processes to include young people.

When I hear the disrespect from the colleagues on the right, from these populists, the disrespect for young people and their involvement, I can just say I am so proud that the Bundestag, the German Parliament, has just approved voting rights for people as of the age of 16.

Young people want to be heard, young people deserve to be heard and, dear Commissioner Breton, you should really listen to young people, especially after the Year of Youth.

(The speaker agreed to respond to a blue-card speech)

Bogdan Rzońca (ECR), *wystąpienie zasygnalizowane przez podniesienie niebieskiej kartki.* – Usłyszałem od Pani o tej aktywności, dużej aktywności Pani wśród młodzieży w ostatnich latach. Chciałbym się Pani zapytać, czy w tej aktywności była też wizyta w takich krajach, gdzie w tej chwili jest największe bezrobocie: Hiszpania, Włochy? Co Pani zrobiła, co Pani proponuje, żeby tę bardzo niekorzystną sytuację, jeśli chodzi o bezrobocie wśród młodych ludzi, zmienić? Co Pani proponuje w swojej aktywności?

Svenja Hahn (Renew), *blue-card reply.* – I think this is actually an excellent question. We have a different situation of youth unemployment throughout the whole of Europe. Young people have many shared dreams – the first apartment, the first love, and also trying to find a good education, trying to find a job.

The fact is the situation varies throughout the European Union. But also the fact is we have different circumstances. We have governments that make laws that make it harder for young people to get into employment, that favour older colleagues over newer colleagues. We have different education levels and systems in different countries. I come from a country where we have a different education system that also is very training-based.

So I think, especially on fighting youth unemployment, we need to come together to learn from best practice examples to really enable young people into the labour market. Because young people are not just cheap labour; young people are the future. Young people are the hope for better employment. They are the bright ideas of the future. They are the ones that will create jobs in the future. They are the ones that will create new companies in the future.

So it all really comes down to what we bring for education. This is really where I see the Member States in responsibility. On the European level, we can ensure, for example, by being against unpaid internships, by having best practice exchange and knowledge trainings and really bringing young people together, that we also help our Member States to put young people first.

Milan Zver (PPE). – Spoštovana gospa predsedujoča, spoštovani gospod komisar, drage kolegice in kolegi! V Evropi živi 74 milijonov mladih od 14 do 29 let. To je relativno veliko. Se splača potruditi zanje, po drugi strani pa v situaciji, ko govorimo o ostarelih družbi v Evropi, premalo. Premalo.

Toda raziskave kažejo, da mladi želijo biti bolj proaktivni v družbi, hočejo biti bolj vključeni. Opozarjajo na brezposelnost, ki v Evropi še vedno vlada in je močno prisotna v mnogih delih Evropske unije. In prav je, da jim maksimalno pomagamo. In ta pobuda, ki je prišla s strani predsednice Evropske komisije septembra 2021, da imamo naslednje leto evropsko leto mladih, je več kot dobrodošla, ampak prepozna.

Menim, da so mladinske organizacije in drugi udeleženci imeli premalo časa za dobre priprave in seveda so težave v izvedbi. In tudi za naslednje leto, ko je bilo predlagano tik pred zdajci, da bo to leto veščin, kar je perfektna ideja, zelo dobra, ampak nosi isto slabo točko kot prejšnja pobuda. Preslabo smo usklajeni v evropskih politikah glede dajanja tovrstnih pobud.

Zato imam dve veliki želji. Prva je ta, da se ta pobuda podaljša za pol leta, da bodo lahko izvedli te svoje projekte, ki so si jih mladi zastavili. In druga pobuda, polagam na dušo Evropski komisiji, da v prihodnje boljše koordinira tovrstne pobude, da se pogovori z nami, ki smo odločevalci v izobraževalnih politikah. Evropska komisija je prvenstveno izvrševalka in bi bilo več kot potrebno, da stopimo skupaj, pogledamo, analiziramo stvari in šele potem sprejmemo zelo pomembne pobude, kot je tudi ta letošnja.

Predrag Fred Matić (S&D). – Poštovana predsjedavajuća, povjereniče, što su europske institucije konkretno učinile za mlade i koji su opipljivi dugotrajni rezultati cijele ove godine? Ja na to pitanje nemam odgovor, a nisam ga čuo niti od Komisije.

Tekst koji je pred nama je relativno dobar, ali ostaje činjenica da rezultati neće biti onakvi kakvim smo se nadali. Ono što je mene najviše razočaralo jest činjenica da veliki dio Europljana ni sada ne zna da je ova godina upravo godina mladih i to dovoljno govori o načinu promocije i provedbi aktivnosti koje su, nažalost, ostale na pokušajima nekih zemalja članica, organizacija i pojedinaca, čak i nekih od nas koji smo sami provodili projekte u našim državama.

U cijelom procesu najviše nedostaju konkretna rješenja i ishodi. Ponovit ću riječi koju sam ovdje izrekao prije gotovo godinu dana. Mladima ne smijemo prodavati floskule poput vi ste naša budućnost, pouzdamo se u vas, na mladima svijet ostaje i slično. A upravo smo to učinili. Iako sam osobno zaista učinio nešto konkretno za mlade tijekom ove godine, sram me je i baš se osjećam kao da sam ih izdao. Kako se osjećaju oni koji nisu učinili baš ništa ne znam, ali sramim se i u njihovo ime.

Kolegice i kolege, simbolika je lijepa, ali to nije ono što mladi žele i strahujem da smo ih itekako razočarali.

Monica Semedo (Renew). – Madam President, 2022 is the Year of European Youth, the year of a generation that went through so many crises recently. I expected the Commission to be more ambitious, to reach those who are less interested in politics.

We, as Renew, organised Renew4Youth – an event that brought together 145 European students, young European students who had fruitful exchanges. They came from the EU but also beyond. This event changed their vision of Europe.

Next year will be the European Year of Skills, and I am proud to be the rapporteur on quality traineeships. Traineeships should be paid. They should occur in better working conditions and trainees should have a real learning experience.

So I say to you colleagues, this is not something we do for ourselves. This is something we do for young Europeans, for the next generation EU. So let's cooperate on that report, because they deserve it.

Loránt Vincze (PPE). – Madam President, Commissioner Breton, by declaring the European Year of Youth, the Commission and the entire European Union made a strong commitment towards young people. I believe this commitment, but also the responsibility of the Union.

I checked the European Year of Youth portal for my constituency. It lists nearly 2 000 events in Romania, but they are not dedicated initiatives and have little to do with the objectives set out by the Commission for the dedicated year. I learned from youth organisations that these activities would have taken place in any case and that they are part of Erasmus+, third-country or other public-entity funded projects.

Imagine that Romania had an allocation of EUR 183 000 for the whole European Year project. The Commission paid just some days ago the first EUR 80 000. Because of this late payment there has actually been no possibility to spend even EUR 1 for the European Year in Romania, when the closing European event is around the corner. This is bad implementation of an otherwise well-intended policy.

Additionally, I learned that for many youth organisations, this year was particularly difficult as the financing through the Erasmus+ programme encountered delays and less organisations received administrative funds.

Colleagues, the message of the youth for us is clear. For them, every year is the European Year of Youth. They should be continuously supported, promoted, asked for advice in youth matters and in European policies, and their organisations given opportunities to have long-term financial stability. We should not deceive them again.

João Albuquerque (S&D). – Senhora Presidente, Senhor Comissário, há pouco mais de um mês os socialistas portugueses convidaram 200 jovens a virem ao Parlamento Europeu para expressarem as suas preocupações com o presente e com o futuro. De entre trinta propostas, os jovens elegeram nove prioridades que puderam apresentar à Presidente deste Parlamento: uma estratégia europeia para a saúde mental, transportes públicos europeus gratuitos, acesso à habitação acessível e *vouchers* gratuitos foram algumas destas prioridades.

Mas há uma que emergiu inequivocamente como tendo um forte impacto na sua vida e que é o maior obstáculo à sua emancipação: o trabalho não remunerado.

Senhor Comissário, caras e caros Colegas, sejamos claros: só há uma razão para a proibição dos estágios não remunerados não estar nesta resolução e é a oposição que toda a direita mantém.

Mais uma vez, quero aqui deixar bem clara a nossa posição e apelar a que se possa avançar neste sentido: é hora de acabar de uma vez por todas com os estágios não remunerados. Em nome destes 200 jovens portugueses e, estou certo, de outros milhares e de todos aqueles que estão na galeria deste Parlamento, esta seria a melhor forma de acabar o Ano Europeu da Juventude e dar um sinal de grande esperança aos jovens europeus.

Vlad-Marius Botoș (Renew). – Doamnă președintă, stimate domnule comisar, stimați colegi, Anul European al Tineretului a fost până în acest moment un succes prin implicarea tinerilor din toate statele membre în activități care le-au arătat ce înseamnă Uniunea Europeană și mai ales politicile europene.

Un lucru foarte important, mai ales în condițiile în care ne confruntăm cu campanii extrem de agresive și, trebuie să recunoaștem, destul de eficiente de decredibilizare a Uniunii Europene ca proiect politic și democratic.

Acțiunile pe care le facem la nivel european sau finanțarea europeană trebuie să ajungă la mai mulți tineri, să aibă obiective clare și să aibă urmări efective și eficiente în politicile europene. Este nevoie ca acțiunile și politicile europene să fie orientate spre îmbunătățirea condițiilor de viață și de educație ale tuturor tinerilor, indiferent de situația lor materială sau de interesul pe care îl acordă în politică.

Faptul că mulți dintre cei care au participat la dezbaterile organizate pun pe primul loc educația arată că sunt deschiși și dornici să se dezvolte, să progreseze și este un semnal clar că Uniunea Europeană ar trebui să fie mult mai mult implicată în domeniul educațional.

Karlo Ressler (PPE). – Poštovana predsjedavajuća, Europska godina mladih opravdano je u fokus stavila mlade koji, nažalost, opet neproporcionalno osjećaju teret krize u kojoj su se našli Europa i svijet. Istodobno, nove generacije pokazuju i dalje da su pokretač razvoja i da posjeduju posebnu snagu, snagu inovacije, snagu kreativnosti, snagu izvrsnosti.

Zato zaslužuju prije svega sigurnu i mirnu, ali isto tako i održivu i digitalnu europsku budućnost.

Rat u Ukrajini još je jedan šok za mlade generacije. Umjesto da sjede u učionicama ili treniraju na sportskim terenima, mladi Ukrajinci bili su prisiljeni u svoje ruke uzeti oružje, a to je sudbina koju nitko ne zaslužuje. Zajedno s ostalom europskom mladeži, mladi Ukrajinci zaslužuju sigurnu budućnost, a to su stvari koje danas, nažalost, možda uzimamo olako, zdravo za gotovo, siguran dom, osigurano obrazovanje, siguran posao i obiteljski život.

Za mlade Europljane rat u Ukrajini, nažalost, još je jedna lekcija i podsjetnik da su to vrijednosti za koje će se i naše generacije morati boriti i morati izboriti.

Max Orville (Renew). – Madame la Présidente, Monsieur le Commissaire, chers collègues, une année pour la jeunesse était une nécessité. Se pose aujourd'hui la question de la continuité de notre action pour nos jeunes. Cette année a souligné combien nos jeunes ont de la ressource et des idées. Enseignant hier, je le voyais tous les jours. Député aujourd'hui, je souhaiterais davantage encourager leur esprit d'initiative et leur créativité.

Intensifier nos réponses pour améliorer l'insertion, l'éducation pour tous, la lutte contre la précarité ou encore répondre aux problèmes de santé mentale constituent notre priorité. Nous devons partout mieux former nos jeunes et continuer à faire de l'Europe un espace de connaissance. Les garanties européennes pour l'enfance et la jeunesse doivent être plus visibles et assorties d'une communication plus agressive. Nous devons favoriser la mobilité pour nos jeunes, en particulier ceux de nos régions ultrapériphériques, afin qu'ils explorent le monde, d'autres territoires, d'autres cultures et d'autres langues. Erasmus+ est le dispositif le plus pertinent.

Faire vivre la citoyenneté afin qu'en 2024 nos jeunes votent massivement aux élections européennes et s'impliquent de manière pérenne dans la démocratie européenne. C'est ma feuille de route pour l'héritage de cette Année de la jeunesse afin que chaque jeune sans distinction ait la place qu'il mérite dans notre société.

Peter Pollák (PPE). – Vážená pani predsedajúca, chudoba, strach, neistota, aj toto je súčasťou miliónov mladých ľudí v Európe.

Žijeme náročné časy. Pandémia Covidu-19, ale aj vojna priniesla obavy, strach či pocit izolácie. V Európe, ale aj na Slovensku, v mojej krajine, narastá počet mladých ľudí, ktorí majú extrémistické názory, stretávajú sa s otvorenou agresivitou, dokonca sme nedávno videli, ako mladý človek vraždil na Slovensku z nenávisti.

O to viac dnes mladí potrebujú našu podporu a pochopenie. Mladých ľudí musíme uistiť, že ich pohľady a názory sú pre nás veľmi dôležité. Mladí Európania musia cítiť našu podporu. Nesmieme podceniť budúcnosť mladých Európanov, pretože oni raz budú tí, ktorí budú rozhodovať o tom, aká Európa bude.

Procedura «catch the eye»

Margarida Marques (S&D). – Senhora Presidente, eu gostaria de trazer aqui, de continuar, aquilo que o meu Colega João Albuquerque já levantou aqui: o Ano Europeu da Juventude.

Os anos europeus são anos de compromisso e é de compromisso que temos que falar. E os jovens portugueses pediram os quatro compromissos que falou o meu Colega João Albuquerque, mas pedem também: investir na independência energética através das energias renováveis; promover a reconversão profissional de quem perde o emprego devido à transição digital; a limpeza dos oceanos; a proteção da biodiversidade; a ratificação por parte da União Europeia da Convenção do Conselho da Europa para a Prevenção e Combate à Violência contra as Mulheres e uma estratégia europeia sobre a saúde mental.

Isto são compromissos, compromissos que os jovens portugueses fazem às Instituições Europeias, e nós, enquanto Parlamento Europeu, temos que ter em conta estes compromissos. Porque os anos europeus só serão um sucesso se, efetivamente, nós nos comprometermos com as ideias, com os projetos, que são partilhados no debate ao longo de todo o Ano Europeu.

Sara Cerdas (S&D). – Senhora Presidente, o Ano Europeu da Juventude representou uma oportunidade sem igual de aproximarmos a União Europeia aos jovens.

Este ano tive a honra de receber no Parlamento Europeu 100 jovens, maioritariamente da Região Autónoma da Madeira, uma região ultraperiférica, para assegurar que estes jovens, que vivem mais longe e enfrentam desafios acrescidos, fazem parte das tomadas de decisão que aqui tomámos para o seu dia a dia. Porque este afastamento da Placa Continental não deve significar um afastamento do projeto europeu e as oportunidades devem ser iguais para todos, quer vivam em São Vicente, quer vivam no centro de Bruxelas.

Também aqui já foi referido o evento *9 for youth*, com muitos europeus, entre os quais 200 jovens portugueses que foram trazidos aqui ao Parlamento Europeu, no âmbito desta ação da delegação socialista portuguesa aqui deste Parlamento.

Que este Ano Europeu não seja de fachada. Tomemos ações em consequência dos seus apelos. São os mais novos os decisores políticos das próximas décadas. E serão eles, os jovens de hoje, que garantirão que este projeto europeu continua.

(Fine della procedura «catch the eye»)

Thierry Breton, *membre de la Commission*. – Madame la Présidente, merci à toutes et à tous pour ce débat intéressant, pour le soutien et l'engagement à faire avancer l'agenda européen de la jeunesse. Merci aussi aux très nombreux jeunes qui participent à ces débats et aux moins jeunes qui les accompagnent.

Un mot pour vous dire que, étant donné que les activités de l'Année ont été mises en œuvre dans un esprit, comme vous le savez, de cocréation – ce qui veut dire que c'est de la collaboration, évidemment, dont il s'agit entre les institutions de l'Union européenne, les parties prenantes, les coordinateurs nationaux et les jeunes –, la définition de l'héritage de l'Année européenne de la jeunesse implique donc également un effort collectif.

Comme annoncé, la Commission évaluera les résultats et le potentiel des initiatives, proposera des idées pour une approche future plus globale, plus intersectorielle, plus inclusive de la participation des jeunes. En particulier, dans le cadre du suivi de la conférence sur l'avenir de l'Europe, la Commission souhaite associer les jeunes à l'élaboration des politiques au travers de leur participation systémique à des panels de citoyens, ainsi qu'en accordant une attention toute particulière à l'impact des nouvelles politiques sur la jeune génération.

L'Année européenne de la jeunesse a mobilisé les pouvoirs publics à tous les niveaux – européen, national, régional et local. Grâce aux subventions qui ont été octroyées par la Commission, certains pays, comme par exemple l'Allemagne, l'Irlande ou la Finlande, ont mis en place des subventions de microfinancement accordées à des groupes de jeunes ou à des acteurs du secteur de la jeunesse.

En ce qui concerne l'appel à prolonger l'Année. Le travail se poursuivra évidemment au delà de 2022 et nous allons continuer à mettre en place des initiatives pour les jeunes et intégrer un volet jeunesse dans les initiatives existantes. Nous allons aussi maintenir la carte des activités sur le portail européen de la jeunesse, ouverte au moins jusqu'à la fin mai 2023, afin que les parties prenantes et les coordinateurs nationaux puissent encore organiser des activités au cours du premier semestre de l'année prochaine.

De même, on peut dire que la plateforme vocale restera à son tour disponible, permettant aux jeunes de continuer à exprimer leur vision. La Commission, je tiens à le dire ici, se réjouit de l'Année des compétences 2023 pour permettre plus de soutien aux jeunes pour de meilleures formations et les préparer ainsi aux réalités du marché du travail.

En conclusion, Mesdames et Messieurs les parlementaires, les institutions européennes et les États membres se sont engagés conjointement en faveur de l'Année européenne de la jeunesse 2022 et, on peut dire, l'ont d'une certaine façon créée ensemble. Alors que l'Année touche à sa fin et que nous en faisons le bilan, il s'agira donc d'élaborer, je le redis, tous ensemble un plan sur la manière dont l'héritage de cette Année peut être et doit être perpétué. La Commission se réjouit à l'avance de cette perspective et de poursuivre ainsi notre coopération pour l'avenir de la jeunesse.

Presidente. – Comunico di aver ricevuto una proposta di risoluzione1 conformemente all'articolo 132, paragrafo 2, del regolamento.

La discussione è chiusa.

La votazione si svolgerà oggi giovedì 24 novembre 2022.

1 Vedasi processo verbale.

Dichiarazioni scritte (articolo 171)

Andrea Bocskor (NI). – Az európai ifjúsági év célja az volt, hogy középpontba helyezze a fiatalokat, különösen a Covid19-járvány következtében. Több és jobb lehetőséget kell nyújtani számukra, és biztosítani, hogy meghallgassák őket, hiszen a fiatalok jelentik Európa jövőjét. Fontosnak tartom a fiatalok aktív szerepvállalását a közéletben, illetve a fiatal nemzedék bevonását a társadalmi vitákba, az ifjúságpolitika alakításába és egyes szakpolitikai döntések meghozatalába, s az is lényeges, hogy a fiatalok hangja az uniós intézményekbe is eljusson. Sajnos az elmúlt időszakban a fiatalok bizalma megingott az Unió intézményeiben, az a kép alakult ki bennük, hogy az EU központi szerveit nem érdeklik a polgárok, lesöprik az asztalról az alulról jövő kezdeményezéseket, példa erre a Minority Safepack esete.

A fiatalok, ideológiai harcok helyett a jövőjüket segítő lépéseket várnak el az EU-tól is, főleg a biztonság, az oktatás és munkahelyteremtés területein. A közösségek és értékek szerepe napjainkban különösen felértékelődik. Ebben jelentős szerepet játszanak az ifjúsági szervezetek, és azok közösségépítő és -formáló szerepe. Továbbá nagyon fontosnak tartom, hogy a fiatalok tanulási lehetőségeibe való beruházás nemcsak a fiatalok mint egyének jövőbeli életére van közvetlen hatással, hanem a társadalom egészének gazdasági egészségére és kohéziójára is.

Victor Negrescu (S&D), *in writing*. – Some 72% of young individuals considered that the most important success factor of the European Year of Youth would be if their demands would be better listened to by decision-makers. For this, we called for EYY outcomes to be mainstreamed across all related EU policies and we proposed to introduce a youth test by which we can measure the impact of all actions and policies on youth and the next generations. Access to quality and inclusive education, developing civic education modules, as well as youth entrepreneurship and environmental education are key points that we must act upon. At the same time, young people from vulnerable categories should be better supported in order for them to have a decent standard of living and more opportunities in regards to education, skills and labour. As S&D rapporteur on the EU budget, we obtained 8 million additional euro for the European Year of Youth in 2022, 123 million euro for Erasmus+ in the 2023 budget and requested financial allocations for the follow-up activities of the EYY. With almost 2000 youth activities organized in Romania, for example, I strongly believe we have to ensure continuity and coherence in our approach so that we can deliver on our commitments towards the young generation.

(La seduta è sospesa alle 11.32)

PRESIDENZA: ROBERTA METSOLA

President

4. Wiederaufnahme der Sitzung

(The sitting resumed at 12.00)

Margarita de la Pisa Carrión (ECR). – Señora presidente, señorías, ayer por la tarde acogí un evento de organizaciones de la sociedad civil. Recibimos el boicot por parte de diputados y asistentes.

Esto no responde a la pluralidad que merece ser respetada en esta institución. Damos por supuesto que se tomarán medidas para garantizar la democracia en este espacio.

Manon Aubry (The Left). – Madame la Présidente, je voudrais juste rappeler à nos chers amis de l'extrême droite la raison pour laquelle cet événement a été organisé. C'était une action pacifique qui visait à rappeler une seule chose claire et nette: le droit à l'avortement restera le droit que défendra sans relâche notre institution. Et c'était le sens de notre présence.

Je voudrais juste rappeler les mots de Simone Veil, qui disait: «Vous devrez rester vigilantes votre vie durant», «il suffira d'une crise politique, économique ou religieuse pour que le droit à l'avortement et les droits des femmes soient remis en cause». Alors sachez, collègues, que vous nous trouverez toujours sur votre chemin quand il s'agira de remettre en cause le droit des femmes.

Jorge Buxadé Villalba (ECR). – Señora presidenta, simplemente, tras oír las palabras de la presidenta del Grupo The Left, o de su representante, quedamos absolutamente liberados para realizar cualquier acto de boicot político a los eventos que se realizan en este Parlamento.

5. Abstimmungsstunde

President. – We will now move to the votes.

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

5.1. Änderung der Verordnung (EU, Euratom) 2020/2093 des Rates vom 17. Dezember 2020 zur Festlegung des mehrjährigen Finanzrahmens für den Zeitraum von 2021 bis 2027 (C9-0386/2022) (Abstimmung)

5.2. Änderung der Verordnung (EU, Euratom) 2018/1046 im Hinblick auf die Festlegung einer diversifizierten Finanzierungsstrategie als allgemeine Methode für die Mittelaufnahme (C9-0374/2022) (Abstimmung)

5.3. Instrument zur Unterstützung der Ukraine im Jahr 2023 (Makrofinanzhilfe+) (C9-0373/2022) (Abstimmung)

— *After the vote:*

President. – That is overwhelmingly adopted. This is significant.

Can I also say that this vote is significant not only for the much-needed funding it will make available for the people of Ukraine, but it matters for democracy.

Thank you for showing us, once again, that this Parliament is efficient, is effective, can act and can legislate urgently and fast. This is the democracy and legitimacy of European-level decision making.

5.4. Nichtanerkennung von in besetzten ausländischen Gebieten ausgestellten russischen Reisedokumenten (C9-0302/2022 - Juan Fernando López Aguilar) (Abstimmung)

5.5. Politikprogramm für 2030 „Weg in die digitale Dekade“ (A9-0159/2022 - Martina Dlabajová) (Abstimmung)

5.6. Empfehlung für einen Beschluss, keine Einwände gegen einen delegierten Rechtsakt einzulegen: befristete Sofortmaßnahmen in Bezug auf die Anforderungen an Sicherheiten (B9-0491/2022) (Abstimmung)

5.7. Empfehlung für einen Beschluss, keine Einwände gegen einen delegierten Rechtsakt einzulegen: Wert für die Clearingschwelle für Positionen in OTC-Warenderivatekontrakten und anderen OTC-Derivatekontrakten (B9-0490/2022) (Abstimmung)

5.8. Die Menschenrechtslage in Afghanistan, insbesondere mit Blick auf die Verschlechterung der Frauenrechte und die Anschläge auf Bildungseinrichtungen (B9-0501/2022, RC-B9-0506/2022, B9-0506/2022, B9-0522/2022, B9-0524/2022, B9-0525/2022, B9-0526/2022) (Abstimmung)

Donnerstag, 24. November 2022

5.9. Die anhaltende Unterdrückung der demokratischen Opposition und der Zivilgesellschaft in Belarus (RC-B9-0508/2022, B9-0508/2022, B9-0521/2022, B9-0530/2022, B9-0531/2022, B9-0532/2022) (Abstimmung)

5.10. Vertreibung von Menschen infolge des eskalierenden Konflikts im Osten der Demokratischen Republik Kongo (B9-0500/2022, RC-B9-0507/2022, B9-0507/2022, B9-0523/2022, B9-0527/2022, B9-0528/2022, B9-0529/2022) (Abstimmung)

5.11. Künftige europäische Finanzarchitektur zur Förderung der Entwicklung (A9-0270/2022 - Charles Goerens) (Abstimmung)

5.12. Ergebnis der Modernisierung des Vertrags über die Energiecharta (RC-B9-0498/2022, B9-0498/2022, B9-0502/2022, B9-0510/2022, B9-0513/2022, B9-0536/2022) (Abstimmung)

5.13. Bewertung der Einhaltung der Rechtsstaatlichkeitsbedingungen durch Ungarn im Rahmen der Konditionalitätsverordnung sowie des Stands des ungarischen Aufbau- und Resilienzplans (B9-0511/2022) (Abstimmung)

5.14. Schutz der Viehwirtschaft und der Großraubtiere in Europa (RC-B9-0503/2022, B9-0503/2022, B9-0504/2022, B9-0509/2022, B9-0514/2022, B9-0518/2022, B9-0519/2022, B9-0520/2022) (Abstimmung)

5.15. Europäisches Jahr der Jugend 2022 — Vermächtnis (B9-0512/2022) (Abstimmung)

5.16. Verbesserung der EU-Vorschriften für wild lebende und exotische Tiere, die in der Europäischen Union als Haustiere gehalten werden, durch eine Positivliste der EU (B9-0489/2022) (Abstimmung)

5.17. Die Menschenrechtslage in Ägypten (B9-0496/2022, B9-0497/2022, RC-B9-0505/2022, B9-0505/2022, B9-0515/2022, B9-0533/2022, B9-0534/2022, B9-0535/2022) (Abstimmung)

5.18. Die Menschenrechtslage im Zusammenhang mit der bevorstehenden FIFA-Weltmeisterschaft in Katar (B9-0539/2022, B9-0541/2022, B9-0542/2022, B9-0543/2022, B9-0537/2022, RC-B9-0538/2022, B9-0538/2022) (Abstimmung)

— *Before the vote:*

Michael Gahler (PPE). – Madam President, I'm sorry but a brief indication for my colleagues in the EPP. There's a wrong signal in three amendments. It concerns 36, 43 and 44: please vote minus. Sorry for this intervention. 36, 43, 44: vote minus, please.

Antonius Manders (PPE). – Madam President, on Monday, I had a point of order. I want to give a signal and ask the colleagues to stand up and to show a yellow card to FIFA because of their behaviour. If we stand and show our band, then we show that we are against what FIFA is doing in Qatar.

President. – That concludes the vote.

(The sitting was suspended at 12.42)

Donnerstag, 24. November 2022

VORSITZ: RAINER WIELAND

Vizepräsident

6. Wiederaufnahme der Sitzung

(Die Sitzung wird um 15.02 Uhr wieder aufgenommen.)

7. Antrag auf Aufhebung der Immunität

Der Präsident. – Die zuständigen ungarischen Behörden haben der Präsidentin einen Antrag auf Aufhebung der parlamentarischen Immunität von Frau Anna Donáth übermittelt. Dieser Antrag wird an den Rechtsausschuss des Parlaments überwiesen.

8. Genehmigung des Protokolls der vorangegangenen Sitzung

Der Präsident. – Das Protokoll der gestrigen Sitzung und die angenommenen Texte sind verfügbar. Ich sehe keine Einwände. Damit ist das Protokoll genehmigt.

9. Überarbeitung der Verordnung über Medizinprodukte – wie kann die Verfügbarkeit von Medizinprodukten sichergestellt werden? (Aussprache)

Der Präsident. – Als nächster Punkt der Tagesordnung folgt die Aussprache über die Anfrage zur mündlichen Beantwortung an die Kommission über das Thema „Überarbeitung der Verordnung über Medizinprodukte – wie kann die Verfügbarkeit von Medizinprodukten sichergestellt werden?“ von Angelika Niebler und Peter Liese im Namen der Fraktion der Europäischen Volkspartei (Christdemokraten) (O-000043/2022 – B9-0030/22) (2022/2960(RSP)).

Angelika Niebler, *Verfasserin*. – Herr Präsident, Frau Kommissarin, verehrte Kolleginnen, verehrte Kollegen! Ärzte und Ärztinnen, Krankenhäuser und Hersteller von Medizinprodukten schlagen nun seit über einem Jahr Alarm: Wichtige Medizinprodukte gehen aus, werden nicht mehr hergestellt, werden vom Markt genommen. Beispielsweise Ballonkatheter für Kinderherzen sind derzeit in Europa kaum noch verfügbar, und Kinder mit angeborenem Herzfehler können dann nicht mehr operiert werden.

Was ist passiert? Wir haben 2017 die Neufassung der Medizinprodukte-Verordnung verabschiedet. Ziel war damals, mehr Patientensicherheit zu erreichen. Auslöser für die damalige Überarbeitung der Medizinprodukte-Verordnung war der Brustimplantate-Skandal in Deutschland und Frankreich. Wir wollten mit der Neufassung verschärfte Anforderungen an die Zertifizierung von Medizinprodukten.

Heute müssen wir jedoch leider feststellen, dass zahlreiche Medizinprodukte einfach nicht neu zertifiziert werden, weil der finanzielle und der bürokratische Aufwand gerade bei vielen mittelständischen Medizinprodukteherstellern einfach zu hoch ist; insbesondere gilt das für Nischenprodukte. Daher, glaube ich – mit Blick auf die derzeitige schwierige Versorgungslage mit einigen lebensnotwendigen Medizinprodukten –, muss jetzt dringend etwas passieren. Die Kommission muss endlich einen Vorschlag für eine Änderung der Medizinprodukte-Verordnung vorlegen. Dazu haben wir die Kommission auch schon seit Monaten aufgefordert. Bis jetzt ist – zumindest nach dem, was ich feststelle – nichts passiert, und eigentlich halte ich das für einen Skandal.

Ich möchte deshalb heute drei Fragen an die Kommission richten. Erstens: Wie gedenkt die Kommission dafür Sorge zu tragen, dass Medizinprodukte insbesondere in Krankenhäusern verfügbar bleiben, damit Patienten, die dringend auf diese angewiesen sind, überleben können?

Zweitens: Ich schlage vor, dass bereits erteilte Zertifikate wenigstens so lange gültig bleiben, bis die Prüfung eines Rezertifizierungsantrags abgeschlossen ist. Frage an die Kommission: Ist das eine Überlegung, die geteilt wird?

Und drittens: Erwägt die Kommission, die Medizinprodukte-Verordnung dahingehend zu ändern, dass wenigstens für Nischenprodukte, die bereits unter dem alten Regime zertifiziert wurden, eine Rezertifizierung nicht mehr nötig ist?

Ich bin sehr neugierig, wie die Kommission auf diese drei Anfragen antwortet.

Stella Kyriakides, *Member of the Commission*. – Mr President, honourable Members, first of all I would like to thank honourable Members Niebler and Liese for putting this very important topic on the agenda today. I believe we all agree that patient access to safe medical devices in Europe is essential. And I believe that we also all agree that both access and safety are fundamental priorities in everything we do in this area.

When the European Parliament and the Council adopted the Medical Device Regulation in April 2017, the objective of this was to strengthen quality control and market surveillance. And as MEP Niebler mentioned, we must not forget the breast implant scandal of 2011 that triggered the revision of this legislation. The reasons we had to act as the EU back then for patient safety remain every bit as valid now.

In May 2024, the transitional period of the Medical Device Regulation will be coming to an end. We have made a lot of progress to implement new rules. Some 34 notified bodies have been designated under the regulation. Their capacity has significantly increased compared with the situation under previous EU directives. We have set up expert panels and their secretariat in the European Medicines Agency. They are essential for the more thorough assessment of clinical data.

Yet as we move towards the end of the transition period, it has become extremely clear that ensuring patient access to these devices is not guaranteed. And we are, in fact, facing a serious risk of shortages of medical devices.

Honourable Members, being aware of this risk, we have tasked our experts to take actions and to develop options forward. Aside from continuously monitoring the situation, we are together working with the Medical Device Coordination Group on finding solutions to this problem. A list of mitigation actions was adopted in August in order to increase notified body capacity and to boost preparedness among manufacturers. And several actions are already under way in order to be able to solve the problems that we have seen.

But beyond these efforts, there are calls for additional actions from Members of this House and from several Member States and, of course, from stakeholders. And they include calls for an amendment to the regulation to extend the transition period. We are looking into legislative measures such as amending the regulation to avert the risk of shortages of critical medical devices, and we are already consulting all relevant stakeholders as part of this assessment.

The issues raised in the oral question include the specific situation of so-called orphan devices for small patient groups, which are part of that ongoing assessment. In the meantime, I am pleased to announce and share with Parliament today that the Medical Device Coordination Group has already set up a task force on orphan devices, and has held a workshop with clinicians and industry and other stakeholders.

So what are the concrete next steps for this file? In December, at the occasion of the Health Council, I will be providing the clear proposed solutions to all EU health ministers. My objective is to address both the very short-term issues, but also the structural issues that have appeared. My other objective is the intention to keep this Parliament fully involved in this process. Your support in averting shortages of medical devices is crucial, and I look forward to hearing your views today.

Peter Liese, *im Namen der PPE-Fraktion*. – Herr Präsident, liebe Kolleginnen und Kollegen! Die medizinische Versorgung in Europa ist in höchster Gefahr. Das gilt vor allen Dingen für die Versorgung von Kindern.

Ich habe ja früher mal in einer Kinderklinik gearbeitet, und meine ärztlichen Kollegen in der Kinderchirurgie, in der Kinderkardiologie sagen: „Wir sind kurz davor, die Medizin aus den 50er Jahren zu machen, weil moderne Geräte nicht mehr zur Verfügung stehen."

Die Gründe sind vielfältig: Brexit, Corona, aber auch, aus meiner Sicht, Mehrheiten im Europäischen Parlament und im Rat, die die gute Sache übertrieben haben, die bei der guten Sache, dem Schutz der Patienten, übers Ziel hinausgeschossen sind. Wir haben damals schon vor zu viel Bürokratie gewarnt. Aber sei's drum; lamentieren nützt nichts. Die Ursachen sind auch ziemlich egal; wir brauchen jetzt eine Lösung.

Ich unterstütze eins zu eins das, was Kollegin Niebler vorgeschlagen hat. Liebe Kommissarin, liebe Stella, wir brauchen diese Schritte schnell, und wir brauchen sie mutig. Meine Fraktion ist bereit, solchen Vorschlägen sehr, sehr zügig zuzustimmen. Und es ist wichtig, dass wir langfristig – gerade bei den Kindern – tragfähige Lösungen finden. Eine *Orphan Device Regulation* – eine spezielle Regelung, die Anreize für Medizinprodukte bei Kindern zum Beispiel bringt – gibt es in den USA; wir brauchen sie auch in Europa. Der Schutz der empfindlichsten kleinen Patienten muss uns mehr wert sein als bisher.

Nicolás González Casares, *en nombre del Grupo S&D*. – Señor presidente, un clínico, con un respirador que dé 12 ventilaciones por minuto y un volumen de respiración de 0,7, lo que quiere es que en un minuto meta 8,4 litros. Esto quiere decir que sea preciso. Y eso es lo que pretendía el Reglamento de productos sanitarios que entró en vigor en 2017, es decir, que no fallaran los productos sanitarios. Ninguno. Y sabemos que hubo casos en que fue así —lo ha mencionado la comisaria—. Hubo, por ejemplo, implantes mamarios que fueron fallidos, prótesis de cadera… Eso sucedió.

Por lo tanto, este Reglamento ha sido un buen marco regulatorio para mejorar la fiabilidad de los productos sanitarios. Creemos que, además, es más transparente y justo. Además, los profesionales sanitarios y médicos así también lo han reconocido. Porque todo lo que queremos es fiabilidad.

Durante la pandemia también trabajamos en el Reglamento de refuerzo de la Agencia Europea del Medicamento, en el que pusimos también elementos que favorecen la disponibilidad de los dispositivos sanitarios, sobre todo en situaciones de crisis. Pero también debemos considerar que tenemos varias herramientas legislativas.

Por supuesto, claro que debemos valorar si, a raíz de la entrada en vigor de este Reglamento, hay algunos casos de productos sanitarios para los que exista un riesgo de escasez, sobre todo en enfermedades raras o en enfermedades pediátricas (en tratamientos pediátricos). Y es posible que sea necesario hacer ciertas derogaciones, como ya se han hecho previamente.

Habrá que estudiarlo caso por caso. Pero no creo que debamos hacer que esta legislación sea más blanda y tengamos menor confianza en aquello que utilizamos para medir o para tratar a los pacientes, para medir sus variables físicas y los tratamientos que aplicamos.

Lo ha mencionado antes Peter Liese: pueden ser otros factores (se ha interrumpido la cadena de suministro, parte de la producción no estaba basada en Europa…). Quizás tengamos que actuar sobre esos factores, localizarlos, ponerles solución y actuar sobre eso. No tanto sobre la legislación.

Por lo tanto, me parece bien que la comisaria, entre otras cosas, haya propuesto estudiar con los Estados miembros qué es lo que está ocurriendo. Pero yo creo que debemos huir de afirmaciones como la de que este Reglamento está haciendo que los pacientes de la Unión Europea reciban una peor atención sanitaria. No creo que sea este Reglamento la causa. Habrá que hacer ajustes, habrá que establecer procedimientos de mejora y habrá que buscar soluciones. Pero lo que necesitamos, sobre todo, es una gran fiabilidad y confiabilidad en los dispositivos sanitarios.

Véronique Trillet-Lenoir, *au nom du groupe Renew*. – Monsieur le Président, Madame la Commissaire, chers collègues, n'oublions jamais que la proposition de révision de la législation sur les dispositifs médicaux a été publiée suite au drame des prothèses mammaires PIP en 2012. Dix ans plus tard, nous en sommes encore à discuter de la mise en œuvre de cette législation. Cela ne répond pas à notre vision d'une Europe de la santé ambitieuse, pragmatique et surtout indépendante.

La sécurité des patients ne peut pas être une variable d'ajustement. Les normes sanitaires sont aussi, voire plus, impératives que les autres législations européennes. Nous devons effectivement admettre que la mise en œuvre du règlement est aujourd'hui en danger, de par le trop faible nombre d'organismes notifiés sûrement, mais aussi de par le manque d'anticipation de certains fabricants et la carence de personnels spécialisés.

C'est vrai, depuis plusieurs mois, tous les acteurs tirent la sonnette d'alarme et il est temps de répondre par des solutions pragmatiques et acceptables pour tous. Alors, d'accord pour adapter la réglementation une nouvelle fois, mais provisoirement et à la marge, pour éviter les ruptures d'approvisionnement potentiellement dangereuses, mais pas pour remettre en cause ce règlement ambitieux et absolument nécessaire à la sécurité des patients européens.

Tilly Metz, *on behalf of the Verts/ALE Group*. – Mr President, dear all, we have already extended the deadlines for the new rules of the Medical Devices Regulation to apply until May 2024.

The European Parliament was clear that we do not wish another postponement that would be in the disinterest of patients. Now, if the regulation poses issues that will affect access to care for patients, perhaps it really requires other changes to the regulation. So that would be my question to the Commission. What does the Commission recommend?

I would like to stress that Parliament should be involved early on regarding the discussion. I was happy to hear from the Commissioner, who said it is important that the European Parliament is involved in order to discuss possible changes to this regulation instead of having again to face another urgent procedure to extend the deadline to apply the regulation's rules, which are important.

Virginie Joron, *au nom du groupe ID*. – Monsieur le Président, chers collègues, Madame le Commissaire, pendant que le président Macron au forum de l'APEC nous demande dans quel camp nous sommes – Chine ou USA – et déclare que nous avons besoin d'un ordre mondial unique, ou encore qu'au G20 est annoncé le renforcement de la gouvernance mondiale de la santé avec le rôle de chef de file de l'OMS, l'Europe, elle, agonise sous la bureaucratie bruxelloise. La France, elle, enregistre des morts dans ses urgences pour défaut de prise en charge.

Aujourd'hui, il ne faut pas tomber malade car il n'y a plus de lits d'hospitalisation. Vous avez un cancer? Il faudra attendre que des places se libèrent ou que vous ayez un ami bien placé dans un hôpital. Les forums en jets privés n'auront jamais ces problèmes. Nous aurions en France deux fois moins de scanners par habitant que la Grèce ou le Danemark. Nos hôpitaux français manquent d'infirmières et de scanners. Nous constatons les mêmes défaillances avec ce règlement de 2017 qui a établi un nouveau cadre pour les dispositifs médicaux de diagnostic in vitro, comme les tests de dépistage du VIH, du Covid ou les tests de grossesse. On parle ici de dispositifs médicaux que les hôpitaux de l'Union européenne peuvent conserver, mais il faut savoir que la France de Macron a fermé 4 400 lits d'hôpitaux et suspendu 15 000 personnels soignants pendant la crise Covid. Au lieu de s'améliorer, les soins aux patients se sont dégradés en Europe et en France. À Poissy, cet été, une femme est morte après 28 heures passées aux urgences, sur un brancard.

On a donc des hôpitaux qui n'arrivent plus à se fournir en dispositifs médicaux, des entreprises européennes noyées dans la bureaucratie et qui doivent arrêter leur production de produits utilisés depuis toujours. Dans tous les domaines, la Commission met en place un système de sociétés privées chargées de certifier les produits. Un marché de 140 milliards d'euros en 2022.

Mais revenons à notre sujet avec des exemples concrets. Comment expliquer que le certificateur privé allemand TÜV Rheinland puisse encore exercer alors qu'il a été impliqué dans l'affaire des prothèses mammaires PIP? TÜV a certifié ces prothèses avant leur commercialisation, puis réalisé treize contrôles en treize ans sans jamais rien constater. Tout certifier, mais rien vérifier. 400 000 victimes dont 30 000 en France. Dix ans d'attente et de combat juridique. Pour les vaccins Covid, on ne parle pas de 1 000 décès en 30 ans, mais de 11 000 en un an, en Europe, selon les derniers chiffres de l'EMA.

Autres scandales pharmaceutiques: Pfizer a été condamné à 2,3 milliards de dollars en 2009 pour avoir soumis des fausses déclarations aux autorités pour l'anti-inflammatoire Bextra; Johnson & Johnson, à 775 millions de dollars en 2019 pour avoir minimisé le risque de complications mortelles à cause de son anticoagulant Xarelto.

Les forums en jets privés oublient cette triste réalité. La déclaration du G20 de Bali diffusée sur le site de la Maison-Blanche a manifestement les réponses à vos questions.

Ангел Джамбазки, *от името на групата ECR*. – Г-н Председател, г-жо Комисар, колеги, запознавайки се с фактите около преразглеждането на Регламента за медицинските изделия, за пореден път с разочарование се убеждавам, че нещо е дълбоко сбъркано в начина, по който се вземат и прилагат решенията във функционирането на този Европейски съюз. Няма никакво обяснение защо, след като е приет този регламент, поради твърде големите бюрократични и финансови усилия, необходими за повторното сертифициране на набор от медицински изделия, дори тези, които имат отлично качество и се използват дълго време, могат да изчезват неочаквано от пазара, защото дружествата решават да ги изтеглят без всякакво обяснение.

Резултатът е видим – намаляване на наличността на медицински изделия в цяла Европа, което влошава грижата към пациентите. Доскоро в тази зала всеки беше станал медицински специалист, разбираше от пандемии, обсъждаше китайския вирус, какво било, какво не било, как се изтощавали медицинските грижи, липса на лекарства, липса на вентилатори и така нататък, и така нататък. Изглежда обаче, че това е минало като обяснение, всички са го забравили и сега отново се повтарят едни и същи грешки. Необяснимо е това поведение и е необяснимо лишаването на гражданите на държавите – членки на Европейския съюз от адекватна, навременна и необходима за тях медицинска грижа.

Г-жо Комисар, време е Европейската комисия да започне да действа адекватно, да си гледа работата. Това е във ваш интерес, не в наш. Ние често ви критикуваме за тези неща, но не е лошо да вземете да прекратите тази порочна практика на законодателство, което засяга интересите на гражданите на държавите членки.

Anne Sander (PPE). – Monsieur le Président, Madame la Commissaire, chers collègues, nos hôpitaux et soignants portent sur leurs épaules une pression très forte et, aujourd'hui, une nouvelle difficulté s'ajoute à cela concernant l'approvisionnement de matériel médical. Les respirateurs, les défibrillateurs, les prothèses et bien d'autres dispositifs encore, essentiels à la santé de tous, risquent de manquer, avec tout ce que cela implique en termes de prise en charge des patients.

Les entreprises du secteur et notre Parlement ont, à plusieurs reprises déjà, alerté la Commission européenne au cours des dernières années. En plus de la situation économique actuelle, ces entreprises se voient imposer des contraintes administratives lourdes et parfois, aujourd'hui en tout cas, impossibles à remplir faute d'organismes de certification en nombre suffisant. Ces entreprises ont aujourd'hui besoin de sécurité. Alors, nous nous tournons vers la Commission européenne à qui nous demandons de trouver rapidement des solutions concrètes.

Vlad-Marius Botoş (Renew). – Herr Präsident, Frau Kommissarin, liebe Kolleginnen und Kollegen! Unser Ziel von allen am Gesetzgebungsprozess Beteiligten ist es, den Rechtsrahmen für ein sicheres und leichteres Leben der europäischen Bürgerinnen und Bürger zu gewährleisten. Dies war – davon bin ich überzeugt – auch der Sinn und Zweck der Revision der Medizinprodukte-Verordnung. Jedoch sehen sich Patienten und Anbieter von Nischenprodukten größeren Anforderungen als zuvor gegenübergestellt, vor Schwierigkeiten gestellt, für deren Lösung sie spezielle Mittel bereitstellen müssen, was hohe Kosten für Patienten oder Gesundheitssysteme in den Mitgliedstaaten bedeutet.

Ich verstehe das Ziel, die Patienten besser zu schützen, aber wir müssen die tatsächlichen Auswirkungen der Umsetzung der Vorschriften beobachten und schnell Änderungen vornehmen, damit Patienten gleichen Zugang wie zuvor zu den von ihnen benötigten Medizinprodukten haben, ohne mehr zu bezahlen. Wir müssen den Markt genau beobachten, um alle auftretenden Probleme zu erkennen und sehr schnell die Korrekturen zu finden, die die Patienten benötigen.

Michael Bloss (Verts/ALE). – Herr Präsident, liebe Kolleginnen und Kollegen, Frau Kommissarin! Wir wollen eine Transformation hin zu Nachhaltigkeit, und wir wollen sichere Medizinprodukte. Aber mich erreichen aus meinem Wahlkreis viele Hilferufe von Unternehmen: Spezialisierte Produkte, wie Skalpelle für Kinder mit wenigen Auflagen und oft gefertigt von kleinen Unternehmen, werden mit Massenprodukten von multinationalen Unternehmen in einen Topf geworfen. Die Hersteller ziehen dann die Produkte vom Markt, weil sie die Auflagen nicht erfüllen können, und das können wir nicht wollen.

Wir laufen in einen immensen Flaschenhals zu. Bis Mai 2024 laufen bis zu 24 000 Zertifikate aus, aber durch die benannten Stellen können jährlich nur 6 300 Zertifikate ausgestellt werden. Wir müssen verhindern, dass es hier zu Engpässen kommt und lebensrettende Produkte vom Markt genommen werden.

Klar ist: Der jetzige Zustand ist nicht zufriedenstellend. Wir brauchen jetzt schnelle Lösungen für die Gesundheit, aber mittelfristig muss die Verordnung auf belastbare Füße gestellt werden, sodass sich dieses Drama nicht alle paar Jahre wiederholt.

Deirdre Clune (PPE). – Mr President, colleagues, I absolutely want to see the full and effective application of the Medical Device Regulation, because it is extremely important for patients and for those providing their medical care to give assurance on the safety and the effectiveness of these devices.

But I do not want to see a situation develop whereby there will be a shortage – or, as some fear, an unavailability – of vital products. Doctors say that they are already struggling with shortages and they are fearful that this situation will become much more serious.

The slow implementation of the medical device legislation and the limited capacity of notified bodies has led to this situation. Without urgent action, this situation will only get worse and these shortages will impact on patients and on the healthcare system.

So, Commissioner, I welcome your statement today that in December you're going to bring forward clear proposals to address this situation. I would hope that this will include proposals for a targeted legislative solution that will protect those devices that are already on the market. What we need, as well, is a targeted or tailored transition period for some devices.

Spontane Wortmeldungen

Seán Kelly (PPE). – A Uachtaráin, Ireland has urgent and significant concerns regarding the Medical Devices and In Vitro Diagnostics Regulations. There are real issues with the implementation of the directive that need to be addressed.

The regulations introduce new certification requirements. However, substantial and immediate certification bottlenecks mean that Ireland could face considerable shortages in key medical products in the near future. This places patients' lives at risk and our healthcare system under strain.

If these bottlenecks are not addressed by the May 2024 deadline for certification, there is a risk that one in four med-tech products currently in use could be discontinued. At a time when Europe should be building up homegrown industry and investing in innovation, without some adjustments to the implementation of this regulation we risk losing med-tech firms to the US and other markets outside the EU, and thus losing out on investment and competitiveness in this area.

The Irish Government is calling for a legislative proposal to prevent the loss of existing safe and essential med-tech products.

Juozas Olekas (S&D). – Gerbiamas Pirmininke, gerbiama Komisijos nare, iš tikrųjų, jeigu norime suteikti gerą pagalbą savo pacientams, mes turime turėti tris dalykus: specialistus, priemones ir pacientų pasitikėjimą. Šiandien kalbame apie priemones, kurias galime panaudoti gydant pacientus. Aš norėčiau paraginti Komisiją nemažinti kokybės reikalavimų, bet sumažinti biurokratiją, kuri šiandien slegia mūsų medicinos priemonių gamintojus ir kartais neleidžia užtikrinti reikiamos kokybės ir priemonių kiekio. Aš kviesčiau, kad mes visi bendromis pastangomis pabandytume, sumažinę biurokratiją, įgyvendinti gamybos pakilimą Europos Sąjungoje ir taip užtikrinti pacientams ir gydytojams reikiamą medicinos prietaisų kiekį, bet tuo pačiu iš tikrųjų sumažinti biurokratiją, kuri slegia, ir tokiu būdu, neatidėliojant savo sprendimų tolimesniam įgyvendinimui, jau 2024 m. turėti pasikeitusią situaciją.

Andreas Schwab (PPE). – Herr Präsident, Frau Kommissarin! Auf Twitter weist der Europäische Ärzteverband heute darauf hin, dass er dringend darum bittet:

„European doctors aim to ensure the availability of medical devices."

Das ist ein Warnsignal, das wir nicht mit der sonst üblichen technischen Ruhe hier zur Kenntnis nehmen können. Wenn kleine Kinder nicht mehr behandelt werden können, weil die dafür notwendigen Gegenstände nicht mehr zur Verfügung stehen, weil es an den Genehmigungsverfahren Engpässe gibt, dann kann uns das nicht kalt lassen. Das ist zunächst einmal eine Katastrophe für die betroffenen Patientinnen und Patienten, aber es ist natürlich auch wirtschaftlich ein Problem, weil der Zulassungsprozess inzwischen in den USA schneller geht als bei uns.

Und deswegen, Frau Kommissarin Kyriakides: Hier ist *political leadership* gefordert. Es reicht nicht zu sagen, es wird dort und hier was gemacht. Sie müssen die politische Verantwortung dafür übernehmen, dass an dieser Stelle jetzt etwas vorwärts geht. Denn wenn wir jetzt nicht handeln, verlieren wir in zwei Jahren über 20 000 zertifizierte Produkte. Und das können wir uns im Interesse der Patientinnen und Patienten nicht erlauben, aber wir können es uns auch nicht erlauben, weil unsere Wirtschaft davon lebt.

Deswegen: Bitte werden Sie persönlich jetzt tätig.

(Ende der spontanen Wortmeldungen)

Stella Kyriakides, *Member of the Commission*. – Mr President, honourable Members, first of all, thank you for bringing this important file for discussion in the European Parliament. And I have said already that this is a priority for us, for the European Commission. And our intention is not, as has been heard, to hurt the citizens, but to protect them. So quality is paramount. And I can assure you that it is a political priority for the Commission and for myself, because we are fully aware of the challenges, and we have wasted no time.

Now, the data received from the notified bodies and industry show that the situation is indeed extremely challenging. Only around 2 000 certificates have been issued under the Medical Device Regulation, while about 23 000 will be expiring in May 2024. This is why the Medical Device Coordination Group has been working on a list of actions, and all stakeholders are involved, including the medical associations, in order to look at what we can change. And we expect that the important actions that we will take will make a real difference.

We are also, as a Commission, listening carefully to all calls for additional measures, including an amendment of the Medical Device Regulation. And we are proceeding with the next steps.

Now, I don't think there is anyone in this plenary who will say that the unavailability of medical devices needed for health systems and patients isn't extremely worrying. And this is a priority. But the Medical Device Regulation allows Member States to grant at national level derogations from the applicable conformity assessment procedures. And in some Member States they are able to apply these to bridge the gap between the expiry of an old certificate and the issue of a certificate under the MDR.

The Medical Device Coordination Group is now working to find a uniform approach for these measures. However, we fully recognise that as more certificates expire, the worse the situation is expected to become. So we're very conscious of the urgency that I have heard spoken in this plenary in order to avoid shortages of medical devices, which will put patient safety at risk.

The regulations on medical devices are a very important step towards providing safe and better performing devices, and these are to benefit the patients and health. As I've said, we're working on a legislative proposal plus other actions. Our task is to ensure that safe devices – and this needs to remain a priority – remain available for patients and for our health systems.

So let me assure you that I will be remaining in very close contact with this House over the next few weeks and will keep you fully informed of our next steps.

Der Präsident. – Die Aussprache ist damit geschlossen.

10. Erklärungen zur Abstimmung

Der Präsident. – Als nächster Punkt der Tagesordnung folgen die Erklärungen zur Abstimmung.

Donnerstag, 24. November 2022

10.1. Instrument zur Unterstützung der Ukraine im Jahr 2023 (Makrofinanzhilfe+) (C9-0373/2022)

Mündliche Stimmerklärungen

Ангел Джамбазки (ECR). – Г-н Председател, гласувах в подкрепа на този доклад. Неотдавнашната ескалация на бруталната военна агресия, прощавайте много, на Русия срещу Украйна, е потвърждение за нейното решение да нарушава основните права на Украйна на независимост, суверенитет и териториална цялост в рамките на международно признатите й граници и да унищожи жизнеспособността й като държава.

Смелостта, куражът и решимостта на украинския народ да защитава страната си заслужават дълбоко уважение и благодарност. Чрез подхода „Екип Европа“ Европейският съюз, неговите държави членки и европейските финансови институции мобилизираха в началото на руската военна агресия 19 милиарда евро за икономическа, социална и финансова издръжливост на Украйна. Това, съчетано с подкрепата от бюджета на Съюза – 12,4 милиарда евро, включително макрофинансовата помощ в подкрепа на Европейската инвестиционна банка, Европейската банка за възстановяване и развитие, изцяло и частично е гарантирано от бюджета на Европейския съюз, както и допълнителната финансова подкрепа от държавите членки в размер на 7,3 милиарда евро. Това би трябвало да бъде част от нашето задължение да подкрепим нападнатата държава, за да може тя да устои на агресията.

10.2. Politikprogramm für 2030 „Weg in die digitale Dekade“ (A9-0159/2022 - Martina Dlabajová)

Mündliche Stimmerklärungen

Seán Kelly (PPE). – A Uachtaráin, the Digital Decade Policy Programme is a key step towards the EU achieving its objectives for the digital transformation of society and the economy. The path to a Digital Decade Programme reinforces the EU's position as a digital leader and promotes human-centred, inclusive and sustainable digital policies.

The past number of decades has seen significant developments in the internet, the digital economy and electronics, and the Digital Decade Policy Programme will ensure the EU achieves its aims for an inclusive and sustainable digital transformation.

This programme ensures that at least 20 million ICT specialists are employed in the EU by promoting the access of women to this field. The programme will also ensure more than 90% of SMEs in the EU will reach at least a basic level of digital integration.

I am therefore pleased to support the path to a digital decade.

10.3. Künftige europäische Finanzarchitektur zur Förderung der Entwicklung (A9-0270/2022 - Charles Goerens)

Mündliche Stimmerklärungen

Seán Kelly (PPE). – A Uachtaráin, táim sásta an moladh seo d'fhorbairt Ollstruchtúir Airgeadais Eorpaigh a thacú. Beidh ról ríthábhachtach aige ag deimhniú go dtroidfidh an tAontas Eorpach i gcoinne bochtaineachta agus éagothroime. Cinnteoidh sé go n-oibreofar i dtreo spriocanna forbartha iar-bhunaithe na Náisiún Aontaithe agus go stopfar athrú aeráide na cruinne. Deimhneoidh an plean seo go n-oibreoidh tíortha an Aontais Eorpaigh agus na hinstitiúidí le chéile chun comhtháthú polasaí a bhaint amach. Ina theannta sin, cinnteoidh sé go mbainfear úsáid éifeachtach as airgead poiblí. Tagróidh an plean seo d'fhorbairt pholasaí an Aontais Eorpaigh i ndiaidh na paindéime agus i ndiaidh iarmhairtí chogadh na hÚcráine. Feabhsóidh forbairt Ollstruchtúir Airgeadais Eorpaigh léargas an Aontais agus an tionchar atá ag an Aontas ar an domhan airgeadais.

10.4. Ergebnis der Modernisierung des Vertrags über die Energiecharta (RC-B9-0498/2022, B9-0498/2022, B9-0502/2022, B9-0510/2022, B9-0513/2022, B9-0536/2022)

Mündliche Stimmerklärungen

Seán Kelly (PPE). – *A Uachtaráin*, the Energy Charter Treaty plays a key role in energy policy across Europe. However, in the absence of any substantial update of the ECT since the 1990s, it is clear that the modernisation of the Treaty is due. I welcome efforts by the EU and its Member States to drive the modernisation process of the Energy Charter Treaty, particularly on investment protection standards and the fostering of sustainable development.

I also welcome the position to end protections granted to investments in economic activities considered to be significantly harmful and that undermine the EU's climate objectives. It is clear the Energy Charter Treaty is in need of reform, particularly given the current energy crisis and the fight against climate change.

I therefore call on the European Commission and EU Member States party to the ECT to support its modernisation and to ratify the modernised treaty.

10.5. Bewertung der Einhaltung der Rechtsstaatlichkeitsbedingungen durch Ungarn im Rahmen der Konditionalitätsverordnung sowie des Stands des ungarischen Aufbau- und Resilienzplans (B9-0511/2022)

Mündliche Stimmerklärungen

Ангел Джамбазки (ECR). – Г-н Председател, гласувах против този доклад категорично, защото мерките съгласно Регламента относно обвързаността с условия на живот трябва да бъдат прилагани от Комисията, която нарушава принципите на правовата държава и пряко засяга или има сериозна опасност да засегне доброто финансово управление на Съюза. По никакъв начин тази политика, която се води от Европейския съюз и Европейския парламент по отношение на Унгария, за спиране на 65 % от бюджетните кредити за поети задължения в рамките на политиката на сближаване не отговаря на действителността и на никаква логика на Европейския съюз, на идеята за върховенство на закона.

Темата „върховенство на закона“ се използва, за да бъдат налагани политики в редица държави членки, между които и Унгария. Това е абсолютно неприемливо и недопустимо, противоречи на характера на Договорите и противоречи на идеята за Европейски съюз. По тази причина такъв подход на изнудване, на извиване на ръце не може да бъде подкрепен по никакъв начин, защото именно в тези подходи се крие и засилващата се роля на скептицизъм на много граждани на държави - членки на Европейския съюз.

10.6. Schutz der Viehwirtschaft und der Großraubtiere in Europa (RC-B9-0503/2022, B9-0503/2022, B9-0504/2022, B9-0509/2022, B9-0514/2022, B9-0518/2022, B9-0519/2022, B9-0520/2022)

Mündliche Stimmerklärungen

Ангел Джамбазки (ECR). – Г-н Председател, гласувах в подкрепа на този доклад, защото нарастващите популации на вълка в Европейския съюз и проблемът, който уж тези популации създават по отношение на биоразнообразието и традиционното животновъдство в Европа, както и необходимостта от съвместна оценка на консервационния статус и трансграничните мерки за опазване и управление на популацията на едрите хищници по научно обоснован начин, съответстват на екологичните изисквания за видовете вълци, които обитават обширни райони и извършват големи миграции. По тази причина ловът трябва да се разреши, в рамките на добрата практика, на правилата и начина, по който работят тези ловни дружинки, за да могат те да извършват полезната дейност, с която да защитават стопанството и да защитават човешки животи и стопанството на хората.

България дава положителен пример за това как в държава с най-малко инвестиции в Европа по отношение на лова на вълци, ареалът и числеността на този хищник се увеличава, въпреки мерките. От друга страна, мечката като строго защитен вид у нас през последните 10 години, намалява с повече от 30% по официални данни.

Donnerstag, 24. November 2022

10.7. Europäisches Jahr der Jugend 2022 — Vermächtnis (B9-0512/2022)

Mündliche Stimmerklärungen

Eugen Tomac (PPE). – Domnule președinte, am susținut această rezoluție, se apropie deja de final acest An al Tineretului European.

S-a discutat inclusiv în acest plen despre viitorul tinerilor din Europa, în cadrul Conferinței privind viitorul Europei, însă cred că facem prea puțin pentru tranziția de la școală spre câmpul de muncă și avem nevoie de instrumente mult mai puternice pentru a-i putea susține pe tinerii care astăzi sunt profund afectați de toate transformările.

Am trecut de la criza de sănătate publică la o nouă criză care privează tinerii de foarte multe oportunități și cred că Comisia are obligația să vegheze ca statele membre să implementeze garanția pentru copil și garanția pentru tineret, mecanisme prin care putem oferi noi soluții practice, astfel încât tinerii să se simtă mult mai bine integrați și protejați în societatea europeană.

Der Präsident. – Damit ist dieser Tagesordnungspunkt geschlossen.

11. Genehmigung des Protokolls der laufenden Sitzung und Übermittlung der angenommenen Texte

Der Präsident. – Das Protokoll dieser Sitzung wird dem Parlament zu Beginn der nächsten Tagung zur Genehmigung vorgelegt.

Wenn es keine Einwände gibt, werde ich die in der heutigen Sitzung angenommenen Entschließungen den in diesen Entschließungen genannten Personen und Gremien übermitteln.

12. Zeitpunkt der nächsten Sitzungen

Der Präsident. – Die nächste Tagung findet vom 12. bis zum 15. Dezember statt.

13. Schluss der Sitzung

Der Präsident. – Meine Damen und Herren, liebe Kolleginnen und Kollegen! Ich bedanke mich sehr für das Mittun in dieser Woche. Ich bedanke mich bei den Diensten sehr herzlich für ihre Arbeit, bei den Dolmetschern, bei den Saaldienern, bei der GD PRES.

Wenn Sie rauskommen, dann sehen Sie, dass der Straßburger Christbaum schon bereitsteht. Wir haben die längst mögliche Adventszeit; am kommenden Sonntag ist 1. Advent. Der Christbaum steht bereit, er wird jetzt noch geschmückt, und morgen wird der Straßburger Weihnachtsmarkt eröffnet.

Ich wünsche Ihnen eine gute und gesunde Nachhausereise und einen frohen Beginn der Adentszeit.

(Die Sitzung wird um 15.48 Uhr geschlossen.)

14. Unterbrechung der Sitzungsperiode

Der Präsident. – Ich erkläre die Sitzungsperiode des Europäischen Parlaments für unterbrochen.

ISSN 1977-088X (elektronische Ausgabe)
ISSN 1725-2407 (Papierausgabe)

Amt für Veröffentlichungen der Europäischen Union
L-2985 Luxemburg
LUXEMBURG

DE